



**CELSA ASSESSMENT  
VALIDATION REPORT**

**FALL 2004**

Assessment Center  
Mission College  
3000 Mission College Blvd.  
Santa Clara, CA 95054

## Introduction

During the sixth and seventh week of the Fall 2004 semester, Mission College along with seven other California community colleges participated in a collaborative effort between CAPP and The Association of Classroom Teacher Testers (ACTT) to revalidate both the CELSA ESL assessment and the CTEP English and Reading assessment. The results of the consequential validity study were submitted to the California Community College Chancellor's Office in a request to maintain current status on the state-approved list of assessments. Subsequently, all data collected from Mission College were returned and processed for local validation purposes, the results of which are detailed in this report.

The consequential validity study collected input from both students and teachers. Both groups were asked to complete a survey requesting information on appropriate placement. The surveys were designed to gather the following information:

- 1) How the student was placed into the course. Question #2 on the student survey asked how the student was placed into the course. Only responses "by the results from the assessment test" were included in the research. All others were discarded,
- 2) The student's satisfaction with his or her placement in the course,
- 3) The instructor's satisfaction with the student's placement based on the student's level of preparedness for the course.

All students were asked to complete the survey, however, only the data on those who placed into the class via a placement test were used in the study. Likewise, instructors were asked to complete the survey requesting information on all students, however, only those students who placed into the class were used in the data set. The participation rate for the study was as follows: 83% of all sections of English (n=35), 72% of all sections of Reading (n=13) and 76% of all sections of ESL (n=59). The rates exceeded the anticipated participation rate of 70%.

This report contains an analysis of the findings in two areas for both tests: 1) Consequential validity to determine the adequacy of placement rules and cut score as demonstrated through a judgmental approach using the standard 75% judgment of proper placement by both faculty and student, and 2) Disproportionate impact used to determine fairness in placement testing by evaluating whether placement into different levels differs significantly for students in a particular demographic.

## Consequential Validity Study Results

As seen in Table 1 and Table 2 overall students and instructors were generally satisfied with the ESL placement process into all levels of ESL. Student satisfaction exceeded the 75% standard by 16% and instructor satisfaction exceeded the 75% standard by 19% except in ESL 950PL (see Table 4). In this course only three students placed into the course from the CELSA placement exam and they all thought the course “is the correct level for me.” The instructor ratings for this course, however, indicated that one of the three students “definitely should have been placed in a lower course.” The details for each of the rating groups (student and instructor) can be found in tables 3 and 4.

**Table 1. Student Rating**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
<b>Satisfied with Placement</b>	<i>305</i>	<i>91.9</i>	<i>91.9</i>	<i>100.0</i>
<b>Not Satisfied with Placement</b>	<i>27</i>	<i>8.1</i>	<i>8.1</i>	<i>8.1</i>
<b>Total</b>	<i>332</i>	<i>100.0</i>	<i>100.0</i>	

**Table 2. Instructor Rating**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
<b>Satisfied with Placement</b>	<i>312</i>	<i>94.0</i>	<i>94.0</i>	<i>100.0</i>
<b>Not Satisfied with Placement</b>	<i>20</i>	<i>6.0</i>	<i>6.0</i>	<i>6.0</i>
<b>Total</b>	<i>332</i>	<i>100.0</i>	<i>100.0</i>	

**Table 3. Student Rating By Course**

			Student Rating			Total
			I should be in a lower level course	I belong in this course	I should be in a higher level course	
ESL 930	ESL 930GW	Count	2	40	1	43
		% within ESL Course	4.7%	93.0%	2.3%	100.0%
		% within Student Rating	14.3%	13.1%	7.7%	13.0%
	ESL 930LS	Count	3	30	0	33
		% within ESL Course	9.1%	90.9%	.0%	100.0%
		% within Student Rating	21.4%	9.8%	.0%	9.9%
	ESL 930RV	Count	1	15	1	17
		% within ESL Course	5.9%	88.2%	5.9%	100.0%
		% within Student Rating	7.1%	4.9%	7.7%	5.1%
ESL 940	ESL 940GW	Count	1	41	4	46
		% within ESL Course	2.2%	89.1%	8.7%	100.0%
		% within Student Rating	7.1%	13.4%	30.8%	13.9%
	ESL 940LS	Count	0	39	4	43
		% within ESL Course	.0%	90.7%	9.3%	100.0%
		% within Student Rating	.0%	12.8%	30.8%	13.0%
	ESL 940RV	Count	2	48	1	51
		% within ESL Course	3.9%	94.1%	2.0%	100.0%
		% within Student Rating	14.3%	15.7%	7.7%	15.4%
ESL 950	ESL 950G	Count	1	13	0	14
		% within ESL Course	7.1%	92.9%	.0%	100.0%
		% within Student Rating	7.1%	4.3%	.0%	4.2%
	ESL 950LS	Count	1	14	1	16
		% within ESL Course	6.3%	87.5%	6.3%	100.0%
		% within Student Rating	7.1%	4.6%	7.7%	4.8%
	ESL 950PL	Count	0	3	0	3
		% within ESL Course	.0%	100.0%	.0%	100.0%
		% within Student Rating	.0%	1.0%	.0%	.9%
ESL 950RW	Count	3	13	1	17	
	% within ESL Course	17.6%	76.5%	5.9%	100.0%	
	% within Student Rating	21.4%	4.3%	7.7%	5.1%	
ESL 960	ESL 960G	Count	0	13	0	13
		% within ESL Course	.0%	100.0%	.0%	100.0%
		% within Student Rating	.0%	4.3%	.0%	3.9%
	ESL 960LS	Count	0	5	0	5
		% within ESL Course	.0%	100.0%	.0%	100.0%
		% within Student Rating	.0%	1.6%	.0%	1.5%
	ESL 960RW	Count	0	14	0	14
		% within ESL Course	.0%	100.0%	.0%	100.0%
		% within Student Rating	.0%	4.6%	.0%	4.2%
ESL 970	ESL 970G	Count	0	6	0	6
		% within ESL Course	.0%	100.0%	.0%	100.0%
		% within Student Rating	.0%	2.0%	.0%	1.8%
	ESL 970LS	Count	0	6	0	6
		% within ESL Course	.0%	100.0%	.0%	100.0%
		% within Student Rating	.0%	2.0%	.0%	1.8%
	ESL 970RW	Count	0	5	0	5
		% within ESL Course	.0%	100.0%	.0%	100.0%
		% within Student Rating	.0%	1.6%	.0%	1.5%
Total	Count	14	305	13	332	
	% within ESL Course	4.2%	91.9%	3.9%	100.0%	
	% within Student Rating	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	



## Disproportionate Impact Study-Results

Using the EEOC guidelines and the Kangas method to determine disproportionality (1992), the CELSA was compared for both ethnic and gender bias. The EEOC guidelines suggest computing the average placement scores across demographic groupings and then multiplying the average score by 80%. Groupings that fall below the 80% level are an indication of possible disproportionate impact. In the case of disproportionate impact the institution would conduct an expert panel review of content to determine test bias. The following tables represent the result from the comparison study.

### Comparison By Gender

For each course the average placement scores within each grouping (male and female) were compared to 80% of the average placement score overall. In all courses, placement rates met or exceeded the EEOC guideline for disproportionate impact. Consequently, there appears to be minimal test bias among groupings by gender and apparent fairness in testing for these groups.

#### ESL 930

*Number Correct (Raw Score)*

		Mean	N	Std. Deviation
Gender	Male	36.83	24	6.539
	Female	34.26	65	7.627
	Total	34.72	93	7.361

#### ESL 940

		Mean	N	Std. Deviation
Gender	Male	45.91	43	5.911
	Female	46.13	95	5.497
	Total	46.19	140	5.669

#### ESL 950

		Mean	N	Std. Deviation
Gender	Male	54.25	16	8.258
	Female	58.03	32	4.461
	0	57.00	2	1.414
	Total	56.78	50	6.052

## ESL 960

### *Number Correct (Raw Score)*

		Mean	N	Std. Deviation
Gender	Male	<i>62.71</i>	<i>7</i>	<i>1.890</i>
	Female	<i>62.80</i>	<i>25</i>	<i>6.390</i>
	Total	<i>62.78</i>	<i>32</i>	<i>5.684</i>

## ESL 970

		Mean	N	Std. Deviation
Gender	Male	<i>66.33</i>	<i>3</i>	<i>2.309</i>
	Female	<i>66.38</i>	<i>13</i>	<i>1.325</i>
	Total	<i>66.37</i>	<i>16</i>	<i>1.455</i>

### **Comparison by Ethnicity**

For each course the average placement scores within each grouping (Asian, Black, Filipino, Hispanic, Pacific Islander, White, Other, Decline to state) were compared to 80% of the average placement score overall. In all courses, placement rates met or exceeded the EEOC guideline for disproportionate impact. Consequently, there appears to be minimal test bias among groupings by ethnicity and apparent fairness in testing for these groups.

## ESL 940

		Mean	N	Std. Deviation
Ethnicity	Asian	<i>45.88</i>	<i>96</i>	<i>5.367</i>
	Black/Not of Hispanic Origin	<i>43.00</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>.</i>
	White/Not of Hispanic Origin	<i>50.00</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>.</i>
	Hispanic	<i>44.35</i>	<i>23</i>	<i>6.162</i>
	Filipino	<i>54.00</i>	<i>3</i>	<i>.000</i>
	Other	<i>52.00</i>	<i>3</i>	<i>.000</i>
	Declined to state	<i>48.54</i>	<i>13</i>	<i>5.967</i>
	Total	<i>46.19</i>	<i>140</i>	<i>5.669</i>

### ESL 950

#### *Number Correct (Raw Score)*

		Mean	N	Std. Deviation
Ethnicity	Asian	57.58	33	6.987
	Pacific Islander	56.00	1	.
	Black/Not of Hispanic Origin	54.00	1	.
	White/Not of Hispanic Origin	55.75	4	1.500
	Hispanic	55.60	5	2.510
	Filipino	60.00	1	.
	Other	55.00	3	.000
	Declined to state	51.50	2	9.192
	Total	56.78	50	6.052

### ESL 960

		Mean	N	Std. Deviation
Ethnicity	Asian	62.10	21	6.633
	Hispanic	63.14	7	2.193
	Filipino	62.50	2	2.121
	Other	69.00	2	.000
	Total	62.78	32	5.684

### ESL 970

		Mean	N	Std. Deviation
Ethnicity	Asian	66.91	11	1.375
	Hispanic	65.50	4	.577
	Filipino	64.00	1	.
	Total	66.37	16	1.455