



**CTEP ASSESSMENT
VALIDATION REPORT**

FALL 2004

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

Table of Contents

Introduction	2
Consequential Validity Study	3
Table 1. Instructor Rating	
Table 2. Student Rating	
Table 3. Instructor Rating Crosstabulation	
Table 4 Student Rating Crosstabulation	
Disproportionate Impact Study	6
Comparison by Ethnicity	
Comparison by Gender	

Table of Contents

Introduction	2
Consequential Validity Study	3
Table 1. Instructor Rating	
Table 2. Student Rating	
Table 3. Instructor Rating Crosstabulation	
Table 4 Student Rating Crosstabulation	
Disproportionate Impact Study	6
Comparison by Ethnicity	
Comparison by Gender	

Introduction

During the sixth and seventh week of the Fall 2004 semester, Mission College along with nine other California community colleges participated in a collaborative effort between CAPP and The Association of Classroom Teacher Testers (ACTT) to revalidate 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 exceeded the expected participation rate of 70% as follows: 83% of all sections of English (n=35) and 72% of all sections of Reading (n=13).

This report contains an analysis of the findings in two areas: 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

As seen in Table 1 and Table 2 students were satisfied overall with the English and Reading placement process. Student satisfaction exceeded the 75% standard by 11%. The average rating of student satisfaction was 87% for English courses and 86% for Reading courses. Similarly, instructor satisfaction overall exceeded the 75% standard by an even greater margin, 17%. The average rating of instructor satisfaction by instructors was 94% for English and 96% for Reading courses. The details for each of the rating groups (student and instructor) by course can be found in tables 3 and 4.

Table 1. Instructor Rating

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
	Not Satisfied with Placement	<i>26</i>	<i>7.8</i>	<i>7.8</i>	<i>7.8</i>
	Satisfied with Placement	<i>309</i>	<i>92.2</i>	<i>92.2</i>	<i>100.0</i>
	Total	<i>335</i>	<i>100.0</i>	<i>100.0</i>	

Table 2. Student Rating

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Satisfied with Placement	<i>287</i>	<i>85.7</i>	<i>85.7</i>	<i>100.0</i>
	Not Satisfied with Placement	<i>48</i>	<i>14.3</i>	<i>14.3</i>	<i>14.3</i>
	Total	<i>335</i>	<i>100.0</i>	<i>100.0</i>	

Table 3. Instructor Rating Crosstabulation

		Instructor Rating					Total	
		Student definitely belongs in a higher level class	Student belongs in class, above average	Student belongs in class, average	Student belongs in class, below average	Student definitely belongs in a lower level class		
COURSE	ENG 108A	Count	3	23	56	15	11	108
		% within COURSE	2.8%	21.3%	51.9%	13.9%	10.2%	100.0%
		% within Instructor Rating	33.3%	29.9%	30.6%	30.6%	64.7%	32.2%
	ENG 1A	Count	0	18	33	8	1	60
		% within COURSE	.0%	30.0%	55.0%	13.3%	1.7%	100.0%
		% within Instructor Rating	.0%	23.4%	18.0%	16.3%	5.9%	17.9%
	ENG 903	Count	0	0	3	0	0	3
		% within COURSE	.0%	.0%	100.0%	.0%	.0%	100.0%
		% within Instructor Rating	.0%	.0%	1.6%	.0%	.0%	.9%
	ENG 905	Count	2	11	29	13	4	59
		% within COURSE	3.4%	18.6%	49.2%	22.0%	6.8%	100.0%
		% within Instructor Rating	22.2%	14.3%	15.8%	26.5%	23.5%	17.6%
	READ 53	Count	2	19	30	9	1	61
		% within COURSE	3.3%	31.1%	49.2%	14.8%	1.6%	100.0%
		% within Instructor Rating	22.2%	24.7%	16.4%	18.4%	5.9%	18.2%
	READ 960	Count	0	3	5	1	0	9
		% within COURSE	.0%	33.3%	55.6%	11.1%	.0%	100.0%
		% within Instructor Rating	.0%	3.9%	2.7%	2.0%	.0%	2.7%
READ 961	Count	2	3	27	3	0	35	
	% within COURSE	5.7%	8.6%	77.1%	8.6%	.0%	100.0%	
	% within Instructor Rating	22.2%	3.9%	14.8%	6.1%	.0%	10.4%	
Total	Count	9	77	183	49	17	335	
	% within COURSE	2.7%	23.0%	54.6%	14.6%	5.1%	100.0%	
	% within Instructor Rating	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	

Table 4. Student Rating Crosstabulation

		Student Rating			Total	
		I should be in a lower level course	I belong in this course	I should be in a higher level course		
COURSE	ENG 108A	Count	8	93	7	108
		% within COURSE	7.4%	86.1%	6.5%	100.0%
		% within Student Rating	61.5%	32.4%	20.0%	32.2%
	ENG 1A	Count	3	52	5	60
		% within COURSE	5.0%	86.7%	8.3%	100.0%
		% within Student Rating	23.1%	18.1%	14.3%	17.9%
	ENG 903	Count	0	3	0	3
		% within COURSE	.0%	100.0%	.0%	100.0%
		% within Student Rating	.0%	1.0%	.0%	.9%
	ENG 905	Count	1	45	13	59
		% within COURSE	1.7%	76.3%	22.0%	100.0%
		% within Student Rating	7.7%	15.7%	37.1%	17.6%
	READ 53	Count	1	57	3	61
		% within COURSE	1.6%	93.4%	4.9%	100.0%
		% within Student Rating	7.7%	19.9%	8.6%	18.2%
	READ 960	Count	0	7	2	9
		% within COURSE	.0%	77.8%	22.2%	100.0%
		% within Student Rating	.0%	2.4%	5.7%	2.7%
	READ 961	Count	0	30	5	35
		% within COURSE	.0%	85.7%	14.3%	100.0%
		% within Student Rating	.0%	10.5%	14.3%	10.4%
Total	Count	13	287	35	335	
	% within COURSE	3.9%	85.7%	10.4%	100.0%	
	% within Student Rating	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	

Disproportionate Impact Study

Using the EEOC guidelines and the Kangas method to determine disproportionality (1992), the CTEP 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 where in the test there is bias. The following tables represent the result from the comparison study.

Comparison By Ethnicity

For each course the average placement scores within each grouping (American Indian/Alaskan Native, 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.

Reading 53

Reading Score

		Mean	N	Std. Deviation
ETHNICITY	American Indian/Alaskan Native	<i>23.00</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>.</i>
	Asian	<i>20.25</i>	<i>24</i>	<i>3.467</i>
	Pacific Islander	<i>24.00</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>.</i>
	Black/Not of Hispanic Origin	<i>20.20</i>	<i>5</i>	<i>3.493</i>
	White/Not of Hispanic Origin	<i>21.17</i>	<i>6</i>	<i>2.041</i>
	Hispanic	<i>21.45</i>	<i>11</i>	<i>1.753</i>
	Filipino	<i>19.75</i>	<i>8</i>	<i>1.669</i>
	Other	<i>21.00</i>	<i>4</i>	<i>2.160</i>
	Declined to state	<i>19.00</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>.</i>
	Total	<i>20.62</i>	<i>61</i>	<i>2.740</i>

Reading 961

Reading Score

		Mean	N	Std. Deviation
ETHNICITY	Asian	14.23	13	1.787
	Pacific Islander	16.00	1	.
	Black/Not of Hispanic Origin	15.50	2	.707
	White/Not of Hispanic Origin	16.40	5	1.517
	Hispanic	14.80	5	3.114
	Filipino	14.83	6	2.041
	Declined to state	14.00	3	1.000
	Total	14.83	35	1.963

Reading 960

		Mean	N	Std. Deviation
ETHNICITY	Asian	9.25	4	2.217
	Black/Not of Hispanic Origin	10.00	1	.
	Filipino	9.50	2	2.121
	Declined to state	9.00	2	1.414
	Total	9.33	9	1.658

English 1A

		Mean	N	Std. Deviation
ETHNICITY	American Indian/Alaskan Native	23.50	2	.707
	Asian	23.06	17	2.536
	Pacific Islander	24.00	1	.
	White/Not of Hispanic Origin	23.63	19	2.338
	Hispanic	21.75	8	3.059
	Filipino	24.17	6	2.317
	Other	24.50	4	2.082
	Declined to state	22.67	3	2.082
	Total	23.28	60	2.436

English 108A

Grammar Score

		Mean	N	Std. Deviation
ETHNICITY	Asian	18.74	31	2.221
	Pacific Islander	20.67	3	.577
	Black/Not of Hispanic Origin	18.83	6	2.563
	White/Not of Hispanic Origin	18.77	13	2.948
	Hispanic	19.95	20	2.523
	Filipino	19.58	24	3.574
	Other	21.20	5	1.304
	Declined to state	22.00	4	1.633
	Total	19.42	108	2.742

English 905

		Mean	N	Std. Deviation
ETHNICITY	Asian	13.77	26	3.154
	Black/Not of Hispanic Origin	12.50	6	2.510
	White/Not of Hispanic Origin	16.67	3	1.155
	Hispanic	14.40	10	3.471
	Filipino	12.91	11	3.534
	Declined to state	13.67	3	2.887
	Total	13.73	59	3.161

English 903

		Mean	N	Std. Deviation
ETHNICITY	Declined to state	10.00	1	.
	Hispanic	9.50	2	2.121
	Total	9.67	3	1.528

English 1A

Syntax Score

		Mean	N	Std. Deviation
ETHNICITY	Declined to state	<i>32.00</i>	<i>3</i>	<i>4.359</i>
	American Indian/Alaskan Native	<i>28.50</i>	<i>2</i>	<i>.707</i>
	Asian	<i>27.94</i>	<i>17</i>	<i>2.794</i>
	Pacific Islander	<i>31.00</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>.</i>
	White/Not of Hispanic Origin	<i>32.89</i>	<i>19</i>	<i>3.178</i>
	Hispanic	<i>29.38</i>	<i>8</i>	<i>2.722</i>
	Filipino	<i>30.50</i>	<i>6</i>	<i>2.588</i>
	Other	<i>31.00</i>	<i>4</i>	<i>4.243</i>
	Total	<i>30.43</i>	<i>60</i>	<i>3.519</i>

English 108A

		Mean	N	Std. Deviation
ETHNICITY	Asian	<i>21.77</i>	<i>31</i>	<i>2.717</i>
	Pacific Islander	<i>26.33</i>	<i>3</i>	<i>2.082</i>
	Black/Not of Hispanic Origin	<i>21.67</i>	<i>6</i>	<i>3.777</i>
	White/Not of Hispanic Origin	<i>23.62</i>	<i>13</i>	<i>3.203</i>
	Hispanic	<i>23.10</i>	<i>20</i>	<i>3.538</i>
	Filipino	<i>22.50</i>	<i>24</i>	<i>3.310</i>
	Other	<i>21.00</i>	<i>5</i>	<i>3.464</i>
	Declined to state	<i>22.00</i>	<i>4</i>	<i>7.303</i>
	Total	<i>22.49</i>	<i>108</i>	<i>3.389</i>

English 905

Syntax Score

		Mean	N	Std. Deviation
ETHNICITY	Declined to state	<i>16.67</i>	<i>3</i>	<i>2.887</i>
	Asian	<i>15.27</i>	<i>26</i>	<i>3.986</i>
	Black/Not of Hispanic Origin	<i>15.67</i>	<i>6</i>	<i>2.338</i>
	White/Not of Hispanic Origin	<i>19.33</i>	<i>3</i>	<i>3.512</i>
	Hispanic	<i>14.70</i>	<i>10</i>	<i>2.791</i>
	Filipino	<i>17.00</i>	<i>11</i>	<i>3.066</i>
	Total	<i>15.81</i>	<i>59</i>	<i>3.486</i>

English 903

		Mean	N	Std. Deviation
ETHNICITY	Declined to state	<i>15.00</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>.</i>
	Hispanic	<i>13.00</i>	<i>2</i>	<i>2.828</i>
	Total	<i>13.67</i>	<i>3</i>	<i>2.309</i>

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.

Reading 53

		Mean	N	Std. Deviation
GENDER	Male	<i>21.81</i>	<i>21</i>	<i>1.778</i>
	Female	<i>20.00</i>	<i>40</i>	<i>2.961</i>
	Total	<i>20.62</i>	<i>61</i>	<i>2.740</i>

Reading 961

Reading Score

		Mean	N	Std. Deviation
GENDER	Male	14.52	23	2.020
	Female	15.27	11	1.794
	Total	14.83	35	1.963

Reading 960

		Mean	N	Std. Deviation
GENDER	Male	8.25	4	1.258
	Female	10.20	5	1.483
	Total	9.33	9	1.658

English 1A

		Mean	N	Std. Deviation
GENDER	Male	23.10	29	2.554
	Female	23.45	31	2.350
	Total	23.28	60	2.436

English 108A

		Mean	N	Std. Deviation
GENDER	Male	19.30	37	2.332
	Female	19.37	68	2.942
	Total	19.42	108	2.742

English 905

		Mean	N	Std. Deviation
GENDER	Male	13.55	29	3.355
	Female	13.90	30	3.010
	Total	13.73	59	3.161

English 903

Grammar Score

		Mean	N	Std. Deviation
GENDER	Male	10.50	2	.707
	Female	8.00	1	.
	Total	9.67	3	1.528

English 1A

		Mean	N	Std. Deviation
GENDER	Male	30.86	29	3.681
	Female	30.03	31	3.371
	Total	30.43	60	3.519

English 108A

		Mean	N	Std. Deviation
GENDER	Male	22.49	37	3.709
	Female	22.40	68	3.101
	Total	22.49	108	3.389

English 905

		Mean	N	Std. Deviation
GENDER	Male	16.31	29	3.403
	Female	15.33	30	3.556
	Total	15.81	59	3.486

English 903

		Mean	N	Std. Deviation
GENDER	Male	13.00	2	2.828
	Female	15.00	1	.
	Total	13.67	3	2.309