

Validation Report for
College Test for English Placement (CTEP)
at Monterey Peninsula College

Background

The English faculty at Monterey Peninsula College (MPC) has chosen to use a locally-managed assessment for placement into their English reading courses. The assessment, College Test for English Placement (CTEP), was developed by Gail Tennen, a member of the English faculty at Santa Barbara City College. Ms. Tennen has over 20 years' experience teaching reading and composition within the California Community Colleges.

The CTEP is currently being used at six community colleges other than MPC and has been evaluated and approved for local management at these colleges. MPC was first granted probationary approval to use the CTEP in 1999 and received full approval in 2000. MPC is submitting this current report to renew approval of the instrument.

This report contains a description of the CTEP content; evidence addressing content validity and consequential validity for the CTEP; evidence supporting the college-established cut scores; investigation of test bias; investigation of disproportionate impact for gender, age, ethnicity, and disability status; and a description of the accommodations available for students with disabilities.

Content-Related Description of Test

The CTEP (College Test for English Placement) is an assessment tool for placement into reading and writing courses. It was designed to measure those skills necessary for success in community college English courses. The CTEP consists of three sections: Reading Comprehension, Sentence Structure and Grammar, and Sentence and Syntax Skills. While use of the whole test is recommended for placement in both types of English courses, each part has been normed for separate usage. Each part of the CTEP is described in greater detail below.

Part 1, Reading Comprehension, consists of seven reading selections from a variety of academic disciplines and which represent a variety of rhetorical modes. This part has a total of 35 questions and a recommended time limit of 30 minutes.

The selections range in length from 150 to 550 words, with each selection broken down into passages. The passages give students enough text to develop extended and complex ideas. Students will have to demonstrate the ability to sustain thoughts and maintain focus. The passages are long enough to develop depth both in the writing and in the students' interpretation.

As students work through the test, they will find that the passages are increasingly difficult. Following each passage are several questions; however, the longer selections also have questions appearing within the passage. Having questions every two or three paragraphs will help less skilled readers to sustain their concentration and comprehension. In these longer passages, the questions at the end are more difficult. The table below shows the rhetorical mode and discipline for each passage:

Passage Number	Rhetorical Mode	Discipline	# of questions
1	Process analysis	Business Communication	4
2	Definition	Athletics Women's studies	3
3	Comparison/contrast	Health Biology	6
4	Definition	History African-American studies	3
5	Description	Zoology Environmental studies	4
6	Comparison/contrast	Ethnic studies Sociology	7
7	Classification	Literature Humanities	8

The skills tested in Part 1 are:

- Main idea
- Literal comprehension (recalling facts, understanding sequence, listing)
- Inferential comprehension (generalizing, making comparisons, separating fact from opinion)
- Critical/evaluative comprehension (understanding tone and figurative language, recognizing author's bias)
- Vocabulary in context

The table below shows the skills tested by each item of Part 1, Reading Comprehension:

Item numbers	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
Literal Comprehension							◆			◆		
Inferential Comprehension					◆							
Evaluative Comprehension			◆	◆								◆
Main Idea	◆							◆			◆	
Vocabulary in Context		◆				◆			◆			

Item numbers	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24
Literal Comprehension		◆			◆				◆			
Inferential Comprehension	◆										◆	◆
Evaluative Comprehension								◆				
Main Idea			◆				◆					
Vocabulary in Context				◆		◆				◆		

Item numbers	25	26	27	28	29	30	31	32	33	34	35
Literal Comprehension				◆							
Inferential Comprehension		◆	◆		◆	◆			◆		
Evaluative Comprehension							◆	◆			◆
Main Idea	◆									◆	
Vocabulary in Context											

Part 2, Sentence Structure and Grammar, consists of three sections. Each section has ten questions (30 questions total) designed to assess a student’s understanding of various grammatical and structural rules. The time limit on this portion of the CTEP is 20 minutes. The first section asks students to choose the correct sentence from four choices. The second asks students to fill in the blank to correctly complete a given sentence. The third gives students two sentences and asks them to choose which of the four choices correctly combines the two sentences.

The skills tested in Part 2 include recognizing and correcting:

- Sentence errors (run-ons, fragments)
- Verb errors (subject verb agreement, tense, present participle mistakes)
- Pronoun problems (case, pronoun/antecedent)
- Parallelism mistakes
- Incorrect use of modifiers
- Wordiness
- Semantic problems
- Punctuation

Part 3, Sentence and Syntax Skills, contains two cloze-type passages. In the first passage, every seventh word from a history narrative is replaced by a blank. In the second passage, every fifth word is replaced. Students are asked to select the correct mission

word for each blank from four choices. The primary purpose of this part of the CTEP is to assist in discriminating among the students scoring at either the very low or very high ends of the test. This portion, with 40 questions, is timed at 15 minutes.

*It should be pointed out that Monterey Peninsula College only uses Part 1, Reading Comprehension, to place students into English reading courses. However, Part 2 and/or Part 3 are occasionally administered for research purposes.

Evidence Addressing Content Validity

A content validity study was conducted for the College Test for English Placement (CTEP). Three faculty members of the English department were asked to review the CTEP to determine the agreement between what the CTEP has been designed to test and what skills are being taught in the English reading courses. The selected faculty were chosen due to their involvement in teaching a wide range of English reading courses, from remedial through college levels.

The English reading courses in which students at Monterey Peninsula College may be placed are: English 322 (Effective Reading Skills), English 302 (Academic Reading), English 112 (Critical Reading), and English 1A (Composition and Analytical Reading).

English 322 is an open-enrollment course with no prerequisite courses nor assessment for placement requirements. English 302 carries a prerequisite of “Qualifying assessment results or successful completion of English 322.” English 112’s prerequisite is “Qualifying assessment results or successful completion of English 302.” English 112 (in addition to a writing course) or qualifying assessment results are the prerequisites to English 1A (the college-level English reading/writing course).

Faculty first defined the skills taught in each of the English reading courses. As an example, the skills taught in English 322 are listed below:

1. *Identifying main ideas and important supporting details*
2. *Summarizing reading material*
3. *Writing reader-response journals*
4. *Using vocabulary-building strategies*
5. *Using a dictionary*

The skills taught in higher level courses build on skills taught in the lower level courses. Specifically, the skills taught in English 322 serve as the pre-skills for the next level course, English 302. Similarly, the skills taught in English 302 are the pre-skills for English 112, and skills taught in English 112 serve as the pre-skills for English 1A. The complete set of skills taught in each of the four courses is listed in Attachment A.

The next step was for faculty to determine whether the defined skills taught in each of the three pre-college reading courses corresponded to the five domains measured by the CTEP (main idea, literal comprehension, inferential comprehension, evaluative/critical

comprehension, and vocabulary in context). The faculty created matrices of the CTEP skills and the skills taught in English 322, English 302, and English 112. Each instructor independently placed a check mark in those boxes of the matrix for which there was a match between the course skills and the CTEP skills. Attachment B shows the summary matrices. The results indicate that for English 322 there is a match between the CTEP domains and the skills taught in the course; aside from one item, faculty were in 100% agreement about the match between the CTEP domains and the course skills. There also appears to be a good match between the CTEP domains and the skills taught in English 302. In general, faculty agreed that most of the skills taught in English 302 are addressed by at least two of the CTEP domains. Finally, there is good match between the CTEP and the skills taught in English 112. Faculty were in 100% agreement for most items related to English 112. One notable finding is that none of the faculty indicated a match between the skill “sustaining concentration to cover book-length works” and any of the CTEP domains.

The final step was for faculty to determine whether there is a match between the *individual test items on the CTEP* and skills taught in the reading courses. As discussed earlier, the skills taught in higher level courses build on skills taught in lower level courses. Thus, faculty identified a number of reading skills that illustrate the progression from lower level to higher level reading skills taught in the courses at MPC. These reading skills are: identifying main idea, identifying supporting details, making inferences, using context cues to derive meaning, and understanding elements such as mood and tone. Each faculty member evaluated each of these skills against each passage and item (question) of the CTEP. They indicated whether there was a match between the skill and the CTEP item. The summary analysis is shown in Attachment C. Overall, there was strong agreement among faculty. Faculty ratings indicate that all the reading course skills they had identified are assessed by several items on the CTEP. Furthermore, every item on the CTEP measures at least one of the skills taught in reading courses.

Evidence Addressing Consequential Validity

Pacific College Testing conducted a consequential validity study at 10 community colleges, including Monterey Peninsula College. A copy of the consequential validity study is included as Attachment D.

The study sought answers to the following questions posed in the assessment standards:

1. After the first few weeks of a course, how do students who test scores recommend placement into a particular class evaluate the appropriateness and/or usefulness of their placement into that course? (The Standard is at least 75% affirmative endorsement by students).
2. After the first few weeks of a class, how do instructors evaluate the readiness of individual students (those who follow their test performance recommendations) to undertake the material of their class? (The Standard is at least 75% judgment of proper placement by instructors.)

The study asked students and instructors to evaluate their course placements which had been determined using the CTEP. The student questionnaire asked students to select one of three statements related to the appropriateness of placement and to indicate how they were placed in the course. Surveys for students who were not placed in their course by the assessment process were excluded from the study. The instructor questionnaire asked instructors to rate each student's level of preparedness for the course. A detailed description of the study methodology is on pages 2-6 of Attachment D.

The student and instructor ratings for Monterey Peninsula College are presented below. The complete set of results is on pages 7-8 Attachment D.

Student responses

	N	Response 1 (too difficult)	Response 2 (right level)	Response 3 (too easy)
Study Total	4791	69 (1.4%)	4015 (83.8%)	696 (14.5%)
MPC Total	253	5 (1.9%)	186 (73.5%)	62 (24.5%)
ENGL 1A	14	0 (0.0%)	13 (92.9%)	1 (7.1%)
<i>ENGL 111</i>	<i>64</i>	<i>2 (3.1%)</i>	<i>44 (68.8%)</i>	<i>18 (28.1%)</i>
ENGL 112	12	1 (8.3%)	11 (91.7%)	0 (0.0%)
<i>ENGL 301</i>	<i>110</i>	<i>1 (0.9%)</i>	<i>78 (70.9%)</i>	<i>31 (28.2%)</i>
ENGL 302	28	1 (3.6%)	23 (82.1%)	4 (14.3%)

The results indicate that there was consequential validity for the 10 colleges that participated in the study. Although MPC fell slightly below the overall 75% standard, this was due to a fairly large percent of students in ENGL 111 and ENGL 301 who indicated that the course was too easy. It should be pointed out, however, that both of these courses are English *writing* courses. Monterey Peninsula College uses a locally developed writing sample to place students into English *writing* courses; thus, the results for ENGL 111 and ENGL 301 are not relevant to this study. In contrast, the results for the reading courses ENGL 1A (combined writing and reading), ENGL 112, and ENGL 302 indicate that consequential validity has been established.

Instructor responses

	N	Response 1 (placed too low)	Response 2, 3, 4 (correct placement)	Response 5 (placed too high)
Study Total	4791	100 (2.1%)	4589 (95.8%)	102 (2.1%)
MPC Total	253	8 (3.2%)	242 (95.6%)	3 (1.2%)
ENGL 1A	14	0 (0.0%)	13 (92.9%)	1 (7.1%)
ENGL 111	64	4 (6.3%)	60 (93.7%)	0 (0.0%)
ENGL 112	12	0 (0.0%)	12 (100.0%)	0 (0.0%)
ENGL 301	111	4 (3.6%)	105 (94.6%)	2 (1.8%)
ENGL 302	28	0 (0.0%)	28 (100.0%)	0 (0.0%)

The results in the table above indicate that instructors overwhelmingly perceived that students were placed into the appropriate level courses, in both reading and writing courses.

Evidence Supporting Cut Scores

The cut scores were established, as part of a 1999 study (see attached 1999 study) on the validity of the CTEP as a placement tool into English reading courses. Four faculty members independently rated each of the 35 test items on Part 1, Reading Comprehension, as “easy” or “difficult”, using as their criterion their expectations for students entering English 1A, MPC’s college-level English course. Twenty four of the 35 items were judged to be “easy” by three or four of the faculty raters. In addition, 4 of the 35 items were judged to be “easy” by two of the raters. The remaining seven items were judged to be “difficult” by three or four raters. Thus, 28 of the 35 items (or 80%) were deemed to be “easy” for students entering English 1A. After discussion and review of other colleges’ cut scores, the English faculty at MPC determined that a score of 28-35 (or 80% or more correct) would be appropriate for placement into English 1A. The remaining cut scores were established as follows: scores of 22-27 warrant placement into English 112, scores of 16-21 into English 302, and scores of 0-15 into English 322.

In spring 2000 the college conducted a consequential validity study. Instructors and students rated the appropriateness of placement into the English reading courses. Eighty-two percent of students placed into reading courses felt that they were appropriately placed; similarly, instructor ratings indicated that 84% of students were judged to be appropriately placed in their courses. These findings support the cut scores that were established the previous year. (See attached results from spring 2000 consequential validity study).

During 2004 the English faculty explored the possibility of using the CTEP as a tool to place students into English *writing* courses. During this process the faculty discussed cut scores for writing courses and also reviewed the existing cut scores for the reading courses. Based on their professional judgment, they felt the original cut scores for the reading courses were still appropriate.

The consequential validity evidence, described in the previous section, provide support for the cut scores established in the 1999 study. Both students and instructor ratings indicate that the CTEP results in appropriated placement into English reading courses.

Investigation of Test Bias

An investigation of test bias was conducted for the 1999 study. The following is taken from pages 8-10 of the original study submitted in 1999:

A panel of six MPC faculty, staff, and students reviewed the CTEP for test bias. Demographic information on the panel members, presented below, indicates that the panel was diverse in terms of gender, age, and ethnicity.

Demographics	Panel Member					
	1	2	3	4	5	6
Gender						
Male	✓	✓			✓	
Female			✓	✓		✓
Age						
< 30 years old						✓
30 – 45 years old		✓	✓	✓	✓	
> 45 years old	✓					
Ethnicity						
African-American				✓		
American Indian					✓	
Asian		✓				
Hispanic			✓			
White	✓					
Other						✓

Test bias evaluation was conducted during the last two weeks in September, 1998. The panel was requested to evaluate the CTEP using the directions and sample scoring sheets located in Appendix E.

The results indicate that overall, the passages and questions within the CTEP were perceived as “OK”. The following comments were offered by the panel

Part 1, Reading Passage 2: “Assumes and stereotypes wives of male athletes. Assumes and implies that men and women cannot work side by side (together).”

Part 1, Reading Passage 2, Question 7: “Unfair—what if the trainer is a male and it is a female athlete (married)?”

Part 1, Reading Passage 3, Question 13: “Context will not support the correct answer.”

Part 1, Reading Passage 6: “This passage makes the statement ‘...many Americans have reacted negatively, even hostilely to Mexican immigrants.’ It does not state or make a reference as to why this is true. It says nothing about whether this is the same for Cubans. Overall, it gives me the impression that the author favors Cubans over Mexicans.”

“Assumes without solid evidence of cultural bias between Cubans vs. Mexicanos. Regarding paragraph 6, seems to be opinion versus fact – could be offensive.”

Part 1, Reading Passage 6, Question 25: “Choice C – opinion or fact?”

Part 1, Reading Passage 6, Question 27: “Are all solutions opinion or fact?”

Part 1, Reading Passage 7: “Assumes knowledge of Willy Loman, J. Alfred Prufrock, and Ratso.”

“Most of the time it seems as if the hero is a male figure.”

Part 3, Passage 1, Question 1: “Not necessarily unfair or offensive, but could be confusing to those not used to sex-based pronoun ‘she’, especially as applied to a schooner which could be considered inanimate.”

“Word ‘flotilla’ may be too stifled for most readers. ‘Fleet’ may be better here.”

Part 3, Passage 1, Question 5: “International students may not be familiar with Ossipee. Ossipee is a proper name strictly used in the United States.”

Part 3, Passage 2, Question 20: “This question implies U.S. superiority. ‘Less stable’ countries do not necessarily infer the emotional state of the people of that country. Besides, ‘less stable’ and ‘emotional imbalance’ are vague terms and are not always analogous to each other. Maybe if more research and facts are thrown in the passage, the statement would not have been unfounded.”

Part 3, Reading Passage 3: The word ‘epidemiological’ may need more context to introduce it.”

To summarize, while there were a lot of comments given by the panel, none would constitute an overriding concern with test fairness and offensive leading to bias against any particular group. The panel seems to have the most concern with Part 1, Reading Passage 6. Reviewer comments, especially those related to Passage 6, have been relayed to the test publisher.

The Chancellor’s Office standards (March, 2001) indicate that a new review of test bias is not necessary if the test or course demographics have not changed. A review of the demographics indicates that the demographics of the students who are assessed with the CTEP have not changed; therefore, no additional study of test bias is required at this time.

Investigation of Disproportionate Impact

The CTEP Part 1 scores from fall 2004 and spring 2005 were categorized by students’ ethnicity, gender, age, and disability status. The percent of students placed into each of the reading courses was calculated for ethnicity, gender, age, and disability status. Disproportionate impact, or differential placement rates, was examined using the EEOC 80% rule against the dominant group. The results are presented on pages 10-15.

DISPROPORTIONATE IMPACT ANALYSIS FOR GENDER

ENGL 1A – Composition and Analytical Reading

Gender	N	N placed in ENGL 1A	% placed in ENGL 1A	80% of dominant group	Comments
Male	887	274	30.9%	24.7%	The male group was used as the reference group because it was the larger group. The cutoff standard is 80% * 30.9% (placement rate for dominant group), or 24.7%. More than 24.7% of females placed into ENGL 1A; therefore, there is no disproportionate impact for gender for this course.
Female	940	264	28.1%		

ENGL 112 – Critical Reading

Gender	N	N placed in ENGL 112	% placed in ENGL 112	80% of dominant group	Comments
Male	887	323	36.4%		Again, the female group was used as the reference group because it was the larger group. Again, there is no disproportionate impact for gender.
Female	940	353	37.6%	30.1%	

ENGL 302 – Academic Reading

Gender	N	N placed in ENGL 302	% placed in ENGL 302	80% of dominant group	Comments
Male	887	202	22.8%		Again, the female group was used as the reference group because it was the larger group. Again, there is no disproportionate impact for gender.
Female	940	217	23.1%	18.5%	

ENGL 322 – Effective Reading Skills

Gender	N	N placed in ENGL 322	% placed in ENGL 322	80% of dominant group	Comments
Male	887	89	10.0%		Again, the female group was used as the reference group because it was the larger group. Again, there is no disproportionate impact for gender.
Female	940	98	10.4%	8.3%	

SUMMARY: The results indicate that there was no disproportionate impact for gender in any of the English reading classes.

DISPROPORTIONATE IMPACT ANALYSIS FOR AGE

ENGL 1A – Composition and Analytical Reading

Age	N	N placed in ENGL 1A	% placed in ENGL 1A	80% of dominant group	Comments
< 19 years	1211	344	28.4%	22.7%	The group under age 19 was used as the reference group because it was the largest group. The cutoff standard is 80% * 28.4% (placement rate for dominant group), or 22.7%. More than 22.7% of 19-24 year olds and students 25 years and older placed into ENGL 1A; therefore, there is no disproportionate impact for age for this course.
19 – 24 years	365	100	27.4%		
25+ years	236	76	32.2%		

ENGL 112 – Critical Reading

Age	N	N placed in ENGL 112	% placed in ENGL 112	80% of dominant group	Comments
< 19 years	1211	466	38.5%	30.8%	Again, the group under age 19 was used as the reference group because it was the largest group. Again, there was no disproportionate impact for age for this course.
19 – 24 years	365	118	32.3%		
25+ years	236	85	36.0%		

ENGL 302 – Academic Reading

Age	N	N placed in ENGL 302	% placed in ENGL 302	80% of dominant group	Comments
< 19 years	1211	289	23.9%	19.1%	Again, the group under age 19 was used as the reference group because it was the largest group. Again, there was no disproportionate impact for age for this course.
19 – 24 years	365	94	25.7%		
25+ years	236	57	24.1%		

ENGL 322 – Effective Reading Skills

Age	N	N placed in ENGL 322	% placed in ENGL 322	80% of dominant group	Comments
< 19 years	1211	112	9.2%	7.3%	Again, the group under age 19 was used as the reference group because it was the largest group. Again, there was no disproportionate impact for age for this course.
19 – 24 years	365	53	14.5%		
25+ years	236	18	7.6%		

DISPROPORTIONATE IMPACT ANALYSIS FOR ETHNICITY

ENGL 1A – Composition and Analytical Reading

Ethnicity	N	N placed in ENGL 1A	% placed in ENGL 1A	80% of dominant group	Comments
White	866	339	39.1%	31.3%	The White ethnicity group was used as the reference group because it was the largest group. The cutoff standard is 80% * 39.1% (placement rate for dominant group), or 31.3%. Less than 31.3% of Latino, Asian/ Filipino/ Pacific Islander, and African-American students placed into ENGL 1A; therefore, these groups were placed into ENGL 1A at a disproportionately lower rate than White students.
Latino	356	58	16.3%		
Asian/ Filipino/ Pacific Islander	260	41	15.8%		
African-American	156	17	10.9%		
Other non-white	161	57	35.4%		

ENGL 112 – Critical Reading

Ethnicity	N	N placed in ENGL 112	% placed in ENGL 112	80% of dominant group	Comments
White	866	333	38.4%	30.8%	Again, the White group was used as the reference group because it was the largest group. The cutoff standard was 30.8%. There was no disproportionate impact for ENGL 112.
Latino	356	127	35.7%		
Asian/ Filipino/ Pacific Islander	260	97	37.3%		
African-American	156	52	33.3%		
Other non-white	161	57	35.4%		

ENGL 302 – Academic Reading

Ethnicity	N	N placed in ENGL 302	% placed in ENGL 302	80% of dominant group	Comments
White	866	156	18.0%		The African-American group was used as the reference group because they had the highest <i>placement rate</i> into ENGL 302. The cutoff standard is 80% * 36.5%, or 29.2%. White, Asian/ Filipino/ Pacific Islander, and other non-white students placed into this course at lower rates than Latino and African-American students.
Latino	356	118	33.1%		
Asian/ Filipino/ Pacific Islander	260	71	27.3%		
African-American	156	57	36.5%	29.2%	
Other non-white	161	34	21.1%		

ENGL 322 – Effective Reading Skills

Ethnicity	N	N placed in ENGL 322	% placed in ENGL 322	80% of dominant group	Comments
White	866	38	4.4%		Again, the African-American group was used as the reference group because they had the highest <i>placement rate</i> into ENGL 322. The cutoff standard is 80% * 20.5%, or 16.4%. White, Latino, and other non-white students placed into this course at lower rates than African-American and Asian/ Filipino/ Pacific Islander students.
Latino	356	53	14.9%		
Asian/ Filipino/ Pacific Islander	260	47	18.1%		
African-American	156	32	20.5%	16.4%	
Other non-white	161	13	8.1%		

Summary: For ENGL 1A, the highest-level course in the series, the White group was used as the reference group because it was the larger group. Non-white groups (except the “other” ethnicity group) are less likely to place into ENGL 1A. The results indicate possible disproportionate impact for the non-white students.

For ENGL112, the White group was again used as the reference group. There was no disproportionate impact for non-white students for this course.

Finally, the African-American group was group was used as the reference group in the analysis of both ENGL 302 and ENGL 322, the two lower level courses in the series. The African-American group was used because it had the highest *placement rate* into these two lower level courses. There appears to disproportionate impact for other non-white groups into these courses; however, the findings are not consistent across the two courses. There was, however, a consistent finding for White students. White students placed into both of the lower level reading courses at lower rates than African-American students. This is related to the disproportionate impact findings for ENGL 1A.

Thus, the results suggest that certain ethnic groups are less likely to place into the higher level or middle-level English reading courses, and more likely to place into the lower level course. However, the demographics of the MPC student population indicate that the students from certain non-white groups are lower income and come from high schools with lower achievement test scores. Low income and lower achievement in high school are related to achievement in college; therefore, there is no great concern that the CTEP, in itself, is causing differential placement rates.

The college is addressing the differential achievement and success rates of students. The college recently completed research that indicated that certain minority groups had lower college access rates and lower successful course completion rates. The college recently formed two committees to address recruitment and retention issues, particularly for minority students.

DISPROPORTIONATE IMPACT ANALYSIS FOR DISABILITY

ENGL 1A – Composition and Analytical Reading

Disability status	N	N placed in ENGL 1A	% placed in ENGL 1A	80% of dominant group	Comments
Learning Disability	118	28	23.7%		The non learning disabled group was used as the reference group because it was the larger group. The cutoff standard is 80% * 29.4% (placement rate for larger group), or 23.6%. Just over 23.6% of learning disabled students placed into ENGL 1A; therefore, there is no disproportionate impact for this course.
No learning disability	1630	480	29.4%	23.6%	

ENGL 112 – Critical Reading

Disability status	N	N placed in ENGL 112	% placed in ENGL 112	80% of dominant group	Comments
Learning Disability	118	38	32.2%		Again, the non learning disabled group was used as the reference group because it was the larger group. Again, there was no disproportionate impact for learning disability.
No learning disability	1630	618	37.9%	30.3%	

ENGL 302 – Academic Reading

Disability status	N	N placed in ENGL 302	% placed in ENGL 302	80% of dominant group	Comments
Learning Disability	118	23	19.5%		Again, the non learning disabled group was used as the reference group because it was the larger group. Again, there was no disproportionate impact for learning disability.
No learning disability	1630	392	24.0%	19.2%	

ENGL 322 – Effective Reading Skills

Disability status	N	N placed in ENGL 322	% placed in ENGL 322	80% of dominant group	Comments
Learning Disability	118	29	24.6%	19.7%	The learning disabled group was used as the reference group because this group had a higher <i>placement rate</i> . The cutoff standard is 80% * 24.6%, or 19.7%. Non learning disabled students placed into this course at a lower rate.
No learning disability	1630	140	8.5%		

SUMMARY:

There was no disproportionate impact for ENGL 1A, ENGL 112, or ENGL 302. However, learning disabled students were more likely to place into the ENGL 322, the lowest level reading course, than non learning disabled students. A learning disability might impair students’ reading comprehension skills; therefore, the differential placement rates into ENGL 322 might be a result of the learning disability and not caused by the CTEP itself. MPC does make accommodations for students with disabilities, as described in the next section.

Accommodations for Students with Disabilities

Students with disabilities who need special testing accommodations for English reading and writing assessments are asked to contact the college’s Supportive Services department to make arrangements for accommodation. Once the student has been verified as having a disability, a Supportive Services faculty member completes a test accommodation verification form. This form indicates the types of testing accommodations, such as extended time or testing in a distraction reduced environment, that a student may require outside the regular timed testing.

ATTACHMENT A: LIST OF SKILLS TAUGHT IN COURSES

CLASS: ENGLISH 322 – EFFECTIVE READING SKILLS

1. Identifying main ideas and important supporting details.
2. Summarizing reading material.
3. Writing reader response journals.
4. Using vocabulary-building strategies.
5. Using a dictionary.

CLASS: ENGLISH 302 – ACADEMIC READING

1. Making inferences.
2. Identifying and understanding metaphor.
3. Recognizing organizational patterns of written material.
4. Using various strategies for acquiring vocabulary.
5. Summarizing various kinds of readings.
6. Writing reader response journals.
7. Writing analytical essays in response to readings.
8. Reading college-level text with instructional support.

ATTACHMENT A: LIST OF SKILLS TAUGHT IN COURSES

CLASS: ENGLISH 112 – CRITICAL READING

1. Comprehending complex works at college-level.
2. Sustaining concentration to cover book-length works.
3. Writing accurate summaries of sophisticated material.
4. Recognizing expository strategies including comparison-contrast, process, definition, cause-effect.
5. Comprehending and analyzing an essay identifying thesis and support, style and tone.
6. Understanding the application of commonly used figurative language.
7. Applying analytical and critical reading skills, which entails recognizing patterns of organization in text, evaluating the writer's use of evidence, and drawing valid inferences.
8. Understanding character development in literary works and other elements such as setting, symbol, metaphor, motif, tone, and mood.

CLASS: ENGLISH 1A – COMPOSITION AND ANALYTICAL READING (These are the *reading* skills are taught in English 1A)

1. Analyzing reading materials commonly used in English 1A in college.
2. Identifying issues and supporting arguments, evaluating evidence and reasoning logically.
3. Digesting and evaluating information from various sources.

**ATTACHMENT B: CONTENT VALIDITY FORM COMPARING
SKILLS TESTED BY THE CTEP, Part 1 (Reading Comprehension)
AND THE PRE-SKILLS FOR THE COURSE**

ENGLISH 302 – ACADEMIC READING
(The course pre-skills are taught in English 322 – Effective Reading)

CTEP skill →	Main Idea	Literal Comprehension	Inferential Comprehension	Critical/Evaluative Comprehension	Vocab in context
Course Pre-skill ↓					
1. Identifying main ideas and important supporting details	✓✓✓	✓✓✓			
2. Summarizing reading material	✓✓✓	✓✓✓	✓✓✓		
3. Writing reader response journals		✓	✓✓✓	✓✓✓	
4. Using vocabulary-building strategies					✓✓✓
5. Using a dictionary		✓✓✓			

ENGLISH 112
CRITICAL READING
(The course pre-skills are taught in English 302 – Academic Reading)

CTEP skill →	Main Idea	Literal Comprehension	Inferential Comprehension	Critical/Evaluative Comprehension	Vocab in context
Course Pre-skill ↓					
1. Making inferences			✓✓✓	✓	✓
2. Identifying and understanding metaphor		✓✓	✓✓	✓✓✓	
3. Recognizing organizational patterns of written material	✓✓✓	✓✓✓	✓✓✓	✓✓	✓✓
4. Using various strategies for acquiring vocabulary			✓✓	✓	✓✓✓
5. Summarizing various kinds of readings	✓✓✓	✓✓✓	✓✓✓	✓✓	✓
6. Writing reader response journals	✓	✓✓	✓✓✓	✓✓✓	
7. Writing analytical essays in response to readings	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓✓	✓✓✓	
8. Reading college-level text with instructional support	✓✓✓	✓✓✓	✓✓✓	✓✓✓	✓✓✓

**ATTACHMENT B: CONTENT VALIDITY FORM COMPARING
SKILLS TESTED BY THE CTEP, Part 1 (Reading Comprehension)
AND THE PRE-SKILLS FOR THE COURSE**

ENGLISH 1A – COMPOSITION AND ANALYTICAL READING
(The course pre-skills are taught in English 112 – Critical Reading)

CTEP skill →	Main Idea	Literal Comprehension	Inferential Comprehension	Critical/Evaluative Comprehension	Vocab in context
Course Pre-skill ↓					
1. Comprehending complex works at college-level	✓✓✓	✓✓✓	✓✓✓	✓✓✓	✓✓✓
2. Sustaining concentration to cover book-length works					
3. Writing accurate summaries of sophisticated material	✓✓✓	✓✓✓	✓✓✓	✓✓✓	✓✓✓
4. Recognizing expository strategies including comparison-contrast, process, definition, cause-effect	✓✓✓	✓✓✓	✓✓✓	✓✓	
5. Comprehending and analyzing an essay identifying thesis and support, style and tone	✓✓✓	✓✓✓	✓✓✓	✓✓✓	✓✓✓
6. Understanding the application of commonly used figurative language			✓✓✓	✓✓✓	
7. Applying analytical and critical reading skills, which entails recognizing patterns of organization in text, evaluating the writer's use of evidence, and drawing valid inferences	✓✓✓	✓✓✓	✓✓✓	✓✓✓	✓✓✓
8. Understanding character development in literary works and other elements such as setting, symbol, metaphor, motif, tone, and mood		✓	✓✓✓	✓✓✓	

**ATTACHMENT C: CONTENT VALIDITY FORM COMPARING
TEST ITEMS FROM THE CTEP, Part 1 (Reading Comprehension)
AND THE PREREQUISITE SKILLS FOR THE COURSE**

Course skill → CTEP Item # ↓	Identifying main idea	Identifying supporting details	Making inferences	Using context cues to derive meaning	Understanding elements such as mood & tone
1	✓✓✓				
2				✓✓✓	
3			✓✓✓		✓✓
4		✓✓✓	✓✓		
5	✓✓✓		✓✓✓		
6				✓✓✓	
7		✓✓✓			
8	✓✓✓		✓✓✓		
9				✓✓✓	
10		✓✓✓			
11	✓✓✓		✓✓✓		
12			✓✓✓		
13		✓✓✓	✓✓		
14		✓✓✓			
15	✓✓✓				
16				✓✓✓	
17		✓✓✓	✓✓		
18				✓✓✓	
19	✓✓	✓	✓✓		
20			✓✓✓		
21		✓✓✓	✓		
22				✓✓✓	
23		✓✓✓	✓✓		
24	✓		✓✓✓		
25	✓✓✓		✓✓		
26			✓✓✓		
27		✓✓✓	✓		
28		✓✓✓			
29			✓✓✓	✓✓	
30	✓	✓	✓✓✓		
31			✓✓✓	✓	
32			✓✓✓		✓✓
33			✓✓✓	✓	
34	✓✓✓		✓✓		
35			✓✓✓	✓	✓✓✓