

**SUMMARY OF LEGISLATION,
REGULATIONS, AND REPORTS**

**CONCERNING BASIC SKILLS INSTRUCTION
IN THE COMMUNITY COLLEGES
1987-1991**

**ACADEMIC SENATE
FOR
CALIFORNIA COMMUNITY COLLEGES**

Prepared by: Irene Menegas, Diablo Valley College

INTRODUCTION

Basic skills instruction is not new to higher education or to the California Community Colleges. For a variety of reasons, private and public institutions of higher learning have always had significant numbers of first year students who failed, dropped out or simply from college due to their inability to meet course requirements. In 1874, Harvard first offered freshman English at the request of faculty members dissatisfied with students' preparation in formal writing. In 1907 over half the students who matriculated at Harvard, Yale, Princeton, and Columbia failed to meet entrance requirements. And from 1930 to 1939, colleges and universities began establishing remedial reading clinics, including New York University, Harvard University and University of Minnesota. (Maxwell, Improving Student Learning Skills, 1979, Jossey-Bass)

In 1983, the California Postsecondary Education Commission's report, "Promises to Keep," gave a comprehensive look at remediation policies and practices in California's three public segments of higher education. Although the report recommends that the community colleges be the primary provider of remedial education to prepare students for college level work, it is clear that both the University of California and the California State University will continue to provide remediation to students who otherwise meet regular or special admission requirements.

Since 1983, the Board of Governors of the California Community College and the California Legislature have given considerable attention to developing policies to address the growing need for basic skills instruction in the community colleges. The following paper is offered for those interested in remedial education in an effort to provide in one document a chronological summary of the legislation and regulations adopted from 1987-1990 which govern credit basic skills instruction in the community colleges.

The following seven documents have been summarized:

- Assembly Bill 3 (Seymour-Campbell Matriculation Act, Chapter 1467, Statutes of 1986)
- "Proposals for Strengthening Academic Standards," adopted by the Board of Governors, January 1987
- Assembly Bill 1725 (Chapter 973, Statutes of 1988)
- "AB 1725 Regulations: Remedial Course Work Limitation," adopted by the Board of Governors, January 1990.
- "Matriculation Second-Year Implementation Report," March 1990
- "Precollegiate Basic Skills in the California Community Colleges," May 1990, report to the Board of Governors by the Chancellor's Office Basic Skills Task Force
- "Matriculation Third-Year Implementation Report," March 1990

These documents are available from Kathy Warriner, Curriculum Analyst, Basic Skills & Literacy Educational Standards and Evaluation, Chancellor's Office, (916) 327-5484.

1. **SEYMOUR-CAMPBELL MATRICULATION ACT OF 1986**
(Assembly Bill 3)
(Chapter 1467, Statutes of 1986)

Outlines the intent of the Matriculation Act and defines “matriculation” as “a process that brings a college and a student who enrolls for credit into an agreement for the purpose of realizing the student’s educational objectives.” This section outlines the student’s responsibilities to declare a broad educational intent upon enrollment, a specific educational objective within a reasonable period after enrollment, and completion of courses and maintenance of progress toward an educational goal according to standards established by the college, district and state.

Colleges are responsible for providing matriculation services which include processing admissions applications; providing orientation and preorientation services to provide information concerning campus procedures, academic expectations, financial assistance and other matters; administering assessment instruments to determine student competency in computation and language skills; assisting students in identifying aptitudes, interests and educational objectives; evaluating student study and learning skills; referring students to specialized support services as needed; advising students on course selection; evaluating students’ progress and requiring counseling or advisement for students enrolled in remedial courses, who have not declared an educational objective, or who are on academic probation. [Section 78212]

The bill also limits the use of assessment instruments to those authorized by the Chancellor, requires that all tests used be sensitive to cultural and language differences between students, and sets conditions for the use of approved assessment instruments. “Assessment instruments shall be used as an advisory tool to assist students in the selection of an educational program,” and “Assessment instruments shall not be used to exclude students from admission to community college.” [Section 78213]

In directing the Chancellor to develop a funding formula for matriculation, the legislation identifies a consideration of students in need of remedial instruction as one of the factors to be included in the funding formula.

2. **PROPOSALS FOR STRENGTHENING ACADEMIC STANDARDS**
Action Item, Board of Governors, January 22, 1987

In approving this item, the Board of Governors adopted four academic standards policies to be phased in over three years. The policies define community college responsibilities for pre-collegiate basic skills instruction and Adult Basic Education, require colleges to establish skills requisites for entry-level certificate and degree-applicable courses, require upgrading and enforcement of student progress standards and the establishing of a 30-semester (45-quarter) unit limit on enrollment in pre-collegiate basic skills courses, and define the scope of student assessment programs required of the colleges.

Policy Statement #1 - Defines colleges’ responsibilities in pre-collegiate basic skills instruction and

Adult Basic Education.

In the area of pre-collegiate basic skills, this policy **requires colleges to provide the “full range of pre-collegiate basic skills instruction needed to correct the skills deficiencies of those students who enroll with an intent to complete degree and certificate courses and/or programs.”** The full range of skills of basic skills is defined as courses designed to correct English reading and writing skills deficiencies and computational skills deficiencies of students assessed as not meeting the skills requisites for certificate and degree applicable courses which have been recommended through college and/or district curriculum committees and approved by the local board. “Development of critical thinking skills shall also be an objective of such courses.”

The “full range” of levels of instruction are those necessary to address the range of student skill deficiencies identified through college’s matriculation assessment processes. **The curricula “shall be sequenced by levels and shall be taught with a rigor and intensity that meet the standards of Title 5, Section 55002(b)** and that are designed to build students’ skills to meet the certificate and degree course requisites.” This policy also establishes the 30-semester (45-quarter) unit limit on such courses, excluding English as a Second language or special instruction for disabled students.

This policy requires that beginning in 1988-89 matriculation plans include a description of the pre-collegiate basic skills curriculum each college will offer and an explanation of how components of the program relate to the range of skills deficiencies and needs of students as identified through the assessment process.

Policy Statement #2 - Establishes requisites for entry-level certificate and degree applicable courses and for levels of pre-collegiate basic skills instruction.

This policy requires colleges through their curriculum committees to establish minimum skill and/or competency requisites for enrollment in college level and certificate courses. **Requisites are to be based on “systematically derived evidence of a relationship between student assessment measures and students’ performance in the course.” The policy specifically prohibits excluding students from any course based on a single test score.** Courses may be exempted from having any reading, writing, computational or critical thinking requisites if “systematically derived evidence” demonstrates that such skills are not necessary for successful performance in the course. The Board is to review the policies and practices of colleges within three years of full implementation of this policy.

Policy Statement #3 - Refines and enforces student progress standards.

This policy states that student academic progress standards, including probation, dismissal and return rights, should be the same for students in precollegiate basic skills courses as for all other students enrolled for credit. It also establishes a 30-semester (45-quarter) unit limit on enrollment in non-degree applicable basic skills courses. Students who have not gained the skills necessary for enrollment in college- or certificate-level courses shall be dismissed and referred to noncredit adult basic education courses when appropriate.

The policy also **directs districts to adopt policies and procedures for appeal and/or waiver of the unit limitation on enrollment in pre-collegiate basic skills courses when a student has made “consistent and significant progress but has not quite attained eligibility for college courses.”** Such policies are to be developed in consultation with faculty and staff, including the academic senate.

Policy Statement #4 - Defines the required scope of assessment to assure proper placement and equity for students.

This policy identifies college assessment programs as the basis for establishing skills requisites for college level and certificate courses as well as for precollegiate basic skills courses. College assessment programs are to include at a minimum measure of students’ language and computational skills as well as to provide assistance in identifying aptitudes, interests and educational goals, evaluation of learning and study skills, and referral to specialized support services. They should also provide for early identification of limited English speaking and disabled students who may need special or supplemental assessment processes. The policy requires college assessment programs to be “sufficiently comprehensive and valid to assure appropriate placement of students and also prohibit unlawful discrimination.”

3. **AB 1725 (CHAPTER 973, STATUTES OF 1988)**

Notes the “massive and growing demand” in the state for remedial education and **recognizes the provision of remedial education as “an essential and important mission of the community colleges” along with the provision of English as a second language instruction.** [Section 2 (i),(j),(l)] This section also links the provision of a “full range of courses of remedial instruction and related support services” to the success of the assessment, counseling, and placement system in community colleges. **Noncredit adult education, including adult literacy and citizenship programs, offered through community colleges are also cited as “important and essential functions” of the system.** [Section 2 (r)]

In outlining the accountability system to be required of community colleges, the legislation includes the adequacy of basic skills and English as a Second Language courses and instruction in its list of areas for measurement. [Section 19 84381]

Section 68 requires the Board of Governors by January 1990 to adopt regulations limiting the amount of remedial coursework a student may take. **The policy is to include a limit of 30-semester (45-quarter) units of instruction in remedial coursework, except for students enrolled in English as a Second Language courses or who are identified as having a learning disability. The limit may be waived if students show “significant, measurable progress toward the development of skills appropriate to his or her enrollment in college level courses.”** Students needing additional remediation shall be referred to appropriate noncredit adult basic education programs or to appropriate community services.

The Board of Governors is to review the effects of the remedial limit, including student success rate,

attrition rates, and movement into other programs of study or employment, as well as an analysis of the composition by ethnicity and gender of the students reaching the limit. The study, due to the education policy committees of the Senate and Assembly by December 31, 1991, must also include a “review of district efforts to use faculty and support service personnel to promote the success rate of students in remedial courses.”

4. **AB 1725 REGULATIONS: REMEDIAL COURSE WORK LIMITATION**

Action Item, Board of Governors, January 18-19, 1990

Adds Section 55756.5, entitled Remedial Limit, to Chapter 9 of Division 6 of Part VI of Title 5 of the California Code of Regulations.

The regulations adopted by the Board of Governors establish a limit of 30 semester units (or 45 quarter units) of credit for remedial coursework. “Remedial coursework” is defined as precollegiate basic skills courses which are defined in subsection (d) of Section 55502 of Title 5. Students’ need for remedial coursework are to be determined by the use of “appropriate assessment instruments, methods or procedures” pursuant to Section 55500 of Chapter 6, Division 6 of the Education Code. Students enrolled in one or more English as a Second Language courses and those identified as having a learning disability are exempted from the limitation on remedial coursework.

The regulations permit the provision of a waiver of the limitation on remedial coursework for students who “show significant, measurable progress toward the development of skills appropriate to his or her enrollment in college level courses.” Such waivers must be developed according to local standards and approved by the governing board. **The standards must include provisions which ensure that waivers are only given “for specified periods of time or for specified numbers of units.”**

Students needing additional remediation beyond the limit who are not granted a waiver are to be dismissed and referred to appropriate adult noncredit programs. Students may be reinstated upon successful completion of appropriate remedial coursework or “upon demonstration of skills levels which will reasonably assure success in college-level courses.”

In response to reporting requirements of AB 1725, these regulations require districts to report through the Management Information System information concerning the effect of the remedial limit on students by sex, age and ethnicity; success rates and attrition rates for students enrolled in remedial coursework; rates at which students are referred to and enroll in adult noncredit instruction; rates at which students referred to adult noncredit instruction subsequently enroll in college-level courses; term-to-term persistence rates for students; rates at which students directly enter employment after completing remedial coursework; numbers of students exempted from the limitation; numbers of students receiving waivers; and the rate at which students are dismissed.

5. **MATRICULATION SECOND-YEAR IMPLEMENTATION REPORT, 1988-89**

Prepared by the Chancellor's Office Matriculation Unit, March 1990

Reports on the progress toward full implementation of matriculation based on information gathered by the Matriculation Unit of the Chancellor's Office and by the Evaluation and Training Institute (ETI), an independent consultant. The report is based on data submitted by colleges in their 1988-89 Matriculation Progress and Expenditure Reports and on campus visits made by the consultants during the fall of 1989.

The appendices of this report include AB 3 (Chapter 1467, Statutes of 1986); the Chancellor's Office implementation plan, describing Board of Governors policies on matriculation adopted January 1987; and matriculation regulations.

According to the report's findings, more students in need of basic skills instruction were identified at colleges due to increased assessment. In response to this need, 79% of the colleges made additions or changes to their curricula, and one-half of colleges reported increasing the number of basic skills courses offered. Twenty percent also added or increased the number of ESL classes or hired an ESL instructor. Due to limited funding, many colleges delayed implementation of new follow-up activities although the majority of colleges conducted some type of follow-up of students in basic skills classes as required by matriculation regulations.

In its summary of the impact of matriculation, the report cites basic skills programs as one of three areas most affected by matriculation. Although the increase in identification of the need for basic skills instruction was positively perceived by some colleges, it also posed difficulties for colleges to find qualified instructors, additional facilities for added classes and necessary funds to meet the new demand. More than half the colleges reported that some students were unable to enroll in basic skills courses because classes filled up early in the term and because the demand for basic skills courses was greater than anticipated. To meet the need for more instructors, some colleges required existing faculty to teach more basic skills classes, while other colleges increased their hiring of part-timer instructors.

According to the report, many colleges appeared to be "overwhelmed" by the impact of matriculation on their basic skills programs. After two years of matriculation implementation, most colleges were just beginning to address the long term need for instructional changes and increased developmental courses as well as a re-examination at some colleges for their instructional priorities.

Appendix A: AB 3 (Chapter 1467, Statues of 1986) - summarized above.

Appendix B: Implementation Plan for Matriculation, Adopted by the Board of Governors, January 1987

Provides minimum requirements and recommendations for each of the seven components of matriculation as well as the district allocation formula for matriculation, including an additional .4 weight for the number of enrollments in precollegiate basic skills courses.

Appendix D: Matriculation Regulations Added to Chapter 1 of Division 2 of Title 5 and to Chapter 6 of Part VI of Title 5 (Adopted May 1990, Effective July 6, 1990)

Establishes regulations concerning the scope, planning and administration, evaluation, required services, prohibited practices of matriculation as well as students' rights and responsibilities, waiver and appeal requirements, and limitations on establishing course prerequisites.

6. **PRECOLLEGIATE BASIC SKILLS IN THE CALIFORNIA
COMMUNITY COLLEGES**
Report to the Board of Governors, May 10-11, 1990

Summarizes recommendations of the Basic Skills Task Force, to meet the requirements of AB 1725 and AB 3 and identifies the need for revision of Title 5 regulations. This task force was chaired by Kathy Warriner, Chancellor's Office Curriculum Analyst, Basic Skills and Literacy Educational Standards and Evaluation.

Recommendation One (This definition differs slightly from Matriculation regulations adopted later in July 1990.)

Proposes expansion of 1987 Board policy definition of basic skills instruction to include a "core" of precollegiate basic skills courses designed to correct skills deficiencies in English reading and writing, English as a Second Language and computation. Colleges may also include a set of courses that may be offered in direct response to the needs of students, as identified by assessment and other matriculation services, such as learning strategies, critical thinking, and listening and oral communication. This requirement attempts to clarify previous language concerning the "full range" of precollegiate basic skills instruction required of colleges.

Only "core" courses, excluding English as a Second Language and/or special instruction for students with disabilities would count toward the 30-semester-unit (45-quarter unit) limitation required by AB 1725. Included in this recommendation is a requirement that community colleges regularly evaluate the effectiveness of their precollegiate basic skills curricula in terms of specified student outcomes. Such information is to be included in matriculation reports.

Recommendation Two

Identifies the need to revise Section 55002(b) and (c) of Title 5 to more clearly define the characteristics and conduct of nondegree applicable precollegiate basic skills courses; other nondegree applicable courses and Adult Basic Education and other noncredit courses. The Chancellor's Office Basic Skills Task Force has drafted revised regulations for Section 55002 (b) and (c) to be presented to the Board of Governors at its May 1991 meeting. Also recommends the review of Title 5, Section 55758 (b) of Title 5, pertaining to the calculation of grade point averages to determine whether grades in precollegiate basic skills and other nondegree applicable courses need to be included in these calculation. The current Chancellor's Office Basic Skills Task Force will also present recommendations for grade point average calculations to the Board in May 1991.

Recommendation Three

Recommends that in accordance with AB 1725 the Chancellor prepare an annual report for the Board of Governors and the Legislature that describes (a) the extent of precollegiate basic skills instruction offered by colleges; (b) the numbers of students receiving such instruction by gender, age and ethnicity; (c) the extent to which there is disproportionate impact on ethnic and/or language minority students; (d) the extent to which students are moving through precollegiate basic skills instruction and into associate degree and occupational-level work; and (e) the impact of the 30-semester-unit (45-quarter-unit) limitation on students and institutional academic master planning.

Recommendation Four

Suggests the Chancellor ensure that any guidelines for staff development and flexible calendar activities recognize the need for training and retraining faculty in the effective delivery of precollegiate basic skills instruction. Also urges the Chancellor to include in program based funding guidelines information on development of local policies that will ensure adequate support for and provision of the core of nondegree applicable credit precollegiate basic skills instruction.

Recommendation Five

Encourages colleges to develop local strategies to “ensure support for and provision of basic skills instruction in the nondegree-applicable credit mode,” as required by Board policy, as they develop policies and procedures to implement AB 3 and AB 1725, according to previously established timelines.

7. MATRICULATION THIRD-YEAR IMPLEMENTATION REPORT, 1989-90 Prepared by the Chancellor’s Office Matriculation Unit, March 1991

Reports of the progress of the community colleges toward full implementation of matriculation during 1989-90 based on information gathered by the Matriculation Unit of the Chancellor’s Office, the Evaluation and Training Institute (ETI), an independent consultant, and the Research Unit of the Chancellor’s Office. The report is based on information gathered by the Matriculation Unit of the Chancellor’s Office through 1989-90 Matriculation Progress and Expenditure Reports submitted by the colleges, by ETI’s college visits and surveys, by the Chancellor’s Office site visits, and by the Research Unit of the Chancellor’s Office through a study of student services programs at twelve representative colleges.

The 1989-90 year is particularly significant because it was the first year colleges received full funding for matriculation. It was also the year in which the Board of Governors adopted Title 5 regulations for matriculation which went into effect in July 1990 in anticipation of full implementation of matriculation by June 30, 1991.

The appendices of this report include AB 3 (Chapter 1467, Statutes of 1986) and Matriculation Regulations adopted May 1990, both of which are reviewed above.

The report shows substantial progress made by the colleges toward full implementation of matriculation, with a dramatic increase in the number of students served by all components of matriculation programs and by the addition of considerable numbers of classified and certificated positions.

Perhaps the most significant finding is the strong positive relationship between matriculation services and student success. A preliminary analysis of data for a sample of over 11,000 community college students collected by the Chancellors' Office Research and Analysis Unit has revealed two important findings:

1. matriculation services appear to improve student academic performance, particularly for students whose language and computational skills are below college level and for students who come from disadvantaged socioeconomic backgrounds; and
2. students who received more matriculation services persisted from Fall 1989 into Spring 1990 at higher rates than those who received admissions services only. This was most significant for students entering with skills below college level.

In terms of academic performance, students entering with skills at the precollegiate level who received two or more matriculation services earned a cumulative grade point average (GPA) of 2.07 compared with similarly skilled students who received only the admissions service who earned a cumulative GPA of 1.33. Similarly, 85 percent of students entering with skills below college level who received more than one matriculation service persisted from the Fall 1989 semester to the Spring 1990 semester compared to only 58 percent of similarly skilled students who received admissions services only.

As in the Second-Year Implementation Report, the increased recognition of the need for basic skills instruction is cited as one of the most significant effects of matriculation. Colleges reported that enrollment in basic skills classes had increased by 24 percent over the prior year. Despite an increase in the offerings of basic skills courses reported by 50 percent of the colleges during 1988-89, more than half of the colleges reported that they were unable to meet the demand for credit basic skills courses during 1989-90. Many colleges reported difficulty finding enough qualified instructors to teach additional sections of reading, writing, basic mathematics and ESL classes. They also cited insufficient resources and facilities as contributing to their inability to offer sufficient sections of basic skills courses.