

FW: Placement Model

Wong, Kit (Debby)

Sent: Thursday, July 30, 2015 4:19 PM**To:** Yun, Yoon H.

FYI.

From: Smazenka, Robert L.**Sent:** Thursday, July 31, 2014 2:31 PM**To:** Duxler, William M.**Cc:** Wong, Debby; Yamada, Ryan N.; Yun, Yoon H.; Carruthers, Linda M.**Subject:** RE: Placement Model

Bill,

Thank you for your comments and questions. I will respond to each:

1. Placement level 6 should appear as on page 2 and include Math 129B.
2. The prerequisite for Math 129A is Math 105 or placement into Math 112. Your suggestion about further distinguishing the two is a good one. Math 129A,B is a two semester version of Math 112,115, and Math 125 so the curriculum is presented more quickly. A paragraph like the following would help: Math 129A is the first semester of a two semester accelerated sequence covering the Math 112, 115, and 125 curriculum. Students taking Math 129A should plan to take Math 129B to satisfy the Math 125 prerequisite and graduation requirements.
3. The change from 6 to 5 was occasioned by the mix up in topics sequences. You are correct, the fourth topic listed should be "FRAQ" which has a maximum of 9.
4. The "TP" sequence listed seems to agree with those on the test. Just to verify, they are: DEC, EQTN, EXPS, FRAC, GEOM, and INTG.
5. Please remove the level 5 placement from the EA test and change it to read: You may enroll in Math ~~425 or~~ 123C and leave it on the IA placement. Your point is well taken, we will review placement message to better inform students of the differences.

The cut scores for AR have been revised and should be ready next week after a final review. The level 3 placement, while valid for the PC test should not appear on the IA since there are no geometry questions on IA.

Thanks for your help,
Bob

Robert Smazenka, PhD
Chair, Mathematics/CSIT/Engineering Department
Tel: (818) 364-7609
Fax: (818) 833-3307

From: Duxler, William M. [DuxlerWM@email.laccd.edu]**Sent:** Wednesday, July 30, 2014 9:55 PM**To:** Smazenka, Robert L.**Cc:** Wong, Debby; Yamada, Ryan N.; Yun, Yoon H.; Carruthers, Linda M.**Subject:** Placement Model

Bob:

Here is your email back with the same attachment. I was going to put in the changes you asked for. However, there are some problems with what you asked for.

Below, when I refer to pages, consider the attachment to be a 4-page document. A page with only 1 or 2 lines is really part of the previous page.

1. On page 2 you showed the message for Placement Level 6 including Math 129B, but on page 1 you did not. Which is it? If you want to differentiate between where the placement message is coming from, you need to do that with an accompanying paragraph (of any length). Let me know what you want to do.
2. For Placement Level 9, does "You may enroll in Math 112 or Math 129A" imply the placement equally applies to Math 112 and Math 129A. If so, you should change the name of the Placement to "Math112/129A." If not, but you want to let the student know about Math 129A also, you can do it just like you asked. Math 129A not being part of the Placement Name implies Math 112 is primary. Or, you could further diminish Math 129A with something like "You may enroll in Math 112. An acceptable alternative is Math 129A." The best is to include a paragraph that tells the student what the difference is between Math 112 and Math 129A and provides enough additional information to help the student decide which to take. Let me know how you want that handled.
3. You changed the 4th Algebra Readiness subscore from 6 to 5. However, it seems you are still responding to an early comment of mine that was not informed by the realization that the subscores were all mixed up and there was actually no problem with 6 since that is still 3 below the maximum of 9 (see M309---M10 attached).
4. Please review M309---M10 (attached) to see the correct subscore maximums and master level scores. Also, please look at the attached pdf file to see how I chose the Mastery Level scores that appear on student MDTP diagnostic reports. Let me know if you want any of those changed.
5. Math 125 appears in the placement message for both Placement Levels 5 and 6. That doesn't make sense to me because each placement level is supposed to represent a different proficiency level. You should do what you can to have clear differentiations between placement levels. Subtle similarities or other comments can be best be presented in paragraphs. I keep feeling like you are forgetting how useful and powerful paragraphs can be. Let me know if you'd like more discussion about paragraphs.

I'll wait until you (or others copied on this email) respond before implementing any changes to the placement model.

Bill

William M. Duxler, Ph.D.

Consulting Instructor & Director of APMS Services
Los Angeles Community College District
(818) 999-2669 (Home Office)
(818) 207-7813 (Cell)