Current State:
Key foundation for pathway completion is Math and English gateway course success within first year (sometimes referred to as “gateway momentum” (Jenkins & Baily, 2017: http://ccrc.tc.columbia.edu/publications/early-momentum-metrics-college-improvement.html). Placement level is inextricably linked to transfer success and valid placement that reliably predicts success, is key. Building on an increasing number of studies both nationally and throughout California, statewide analysis of data by Educational Results Partnership and the RP Group as part of the Multiple Measures Assessment Project clearly indicate that cumulative high school GPA through students’ junior year represents a better predictor of success than any single method, single instance event. Further:

• Title 5 clearly requires colleges use multiple measures for placement
• As revealed in surveys of colleges by WestEd, the CCCCO, and PPIC, colleges have traditionally relied principally upon test results and only minimally factored multiple measures into placement and in the ASCCC Multiple Measures Paper
• Historically, multiple measures validation has been weak to non-existent
• A wide variety of colleges across the state have begun implementing disjunctive use of students’ high school grades, relying most heavily on HSGPA (high school GPA), as a placement methodology and seen many more students placed higher with success rates similar to or higher than those placed by previous methods or who reach those courses through the sequence
• Placement via multiple measures using HSGPA helps mitigate substantial gaps in placement (gaps which require mitigation given the general failures of standardized assessments to meaningfully predict student performance in English and math)
• Current data from schools implementing multiple measures in combination with placement via test scores (disjunctively) indicate more valid and accurate placement
• Although a lot of work and investment in CAI testing has occurred, it still represents a single instance, single method event. However, these are not at odds as this has always been part of the forthcoming system of assessment as part of the CAI.
• Some colleges may feel that GPA is powerful enough, that testing is not necessary and their right to do so is fully supported by Title 5.
• HSGPA represents a multiple measure in and of itself with multiple grades representing tens of thousands of different formative and summative assessments from multiple teachers in a breadth of content domains over multiple years
• Placement via multiple measures using HSGPA has been developed carefully with ongoing input from stakeholders both within the Common Assessment Initiative (the Multiple Measures Work Group, the CAI Steering Committee) and from colleges throughout the state. Additionally, the method used to develop the rules is specifically built around observed predictive validity across hundreds of thousands of cases of California Community College students.

Issues:
• Statewide, high quality development and validation can be done by a central validation process. However, there has been no tracking of alternative multiple measures or standards for development.
• As a result:
  o Little information exists to provide evidence of the predictive utility of measures outside of those developed by the Multiple Measures Assessment Project using students’ high school GPA.
  o As a system we lack evidence-based multiple measures for international students and returning students, or students who never attended or completed high school.
Additional problems include:
- The requirement that colleges must use evidence-based multiple measures beyond HSGPA, despite introducing measures used with little evidence basis such as interviews or a single additional course grade.
- The problem that additional measures, that lack a comparable research basis, added to overall HSGPA could actually make the multiple measures employed less predictive.
- The specific need for the CCCCO to confirm GPA is itself “multiple measures”, combining many different measures of student capacity over four years.
- The difficulty of getting actual HS data from all students, including out of state students.

Proposed solutions and concrete next steps:
- One solution is simple – start by recognizing that student HSGPA is a superior predictor of student performance and in and of itself represents many assessments combined in an equally weighted fashion and, as such, is a far better predictor of student performance in our foundational skills sequences than any other two measures combined.
- Colleges should be allowed to implement placement based upon HSGPA as fulfilling the Title 5 requirement of multiple measures without being forced to employ additional un-validated measures and to do so without the Common Assessment (as has been the express directions given to colleges for some time).
- The system should support work to collect and evaluate measures used for non-traditional, ESL, and international students, as well as any evidence basis for their use, requiring their submission and making the most effective measures available to the entire system as part of the CAI. Without this work we cannot fully understand and support all of our students holistically and comprehensively.
- It is imperative that the data sharing agreement between the CCCCO and CDE be moved forward to support the availability of high school achievement information for all students (this has taken over two years). Arranging direct and complete sharing of CalPADS data from CDE with the CCCCO should be a high priority to make the full potential use of multiple measures a seamless reality.
- Additionally, despite every MMAP pilot college signing agreements to share their CCCApply data with MMAP to help facilitate multiple measures placement and more completely study the potential of self-reported HSGPA the data has not been readily available. The CCCCO direct CCCApply to provide data on a timely or reliable basis to assist colleges.