Table 1: English 1S was designed to increase the likelihood of success and persistence in English 1A for students with a cumulative GPA below 2.6.

Recent IR data (AY 19-20) shows a higher success rate for students enrolled in 1A standalone (not supported) at several GPA microbands (2.0-2.3; 2.3-27, etc.) than for students enrolled in 1A + 1S (supported).

The overall success rate gap in Fall 19 was -3% for supported.
The overall success rate gap in SP 20 was -7% for supported.

The success rate gaps by GPA microband were inconsistent at many bands when comparing Fall 19 and Spring 20. Two microbands with consistent success rate gaps were at the far ends of the range (>2.0 and 3.7-4.0) and relatively small sample sizes. The third microband with a consistent gap was 2.7-3.0. Two of these three bands are *above* the Chancellor's Office recommended GPA range for concurrent support.

In both semesters, students with *no reported GPA* had higher success rates in supported and unsupported sections than those with reported GPA. The majority of students who enrolled for English 1A/1A+1S in Fall 2019/Spring 2020 (~60%) <u>did not</u> have HS GPA data reported.

When the data is disaggregated by race and ethnicity, the success rate gaps are most consistently connected to Latinx students and most consistently present at the Eureka campus.

The following tables identify questions in response to this data and categorize those questions by campus area of focus for research and revision and the associated Guided Pathways Scale of Adoption practices and equity considerations.

Campus area of focus	Data-Driven Inquiry Questions	Guided Pathways Scale of Adoption Areas
Curriculum Assessment Guided Pathways	Is the existing English 1A corequisite course (1S) maximizing the likelihood of success for students with a cumulative HS GPA of 2.6 and below? Are differences in success rates for students of the same GPA band taking 1A standalone and 1A + 1S connected to **curricular features** of the English 1S course? Are differences in success rates for students of the same GPA band taking 1A standalone and 1A + 1S connected to the **structural design** of the English 1S course?	SOA practice 1d Equity considerations, area 1, #1-2. Equity consideration, Area 2, #2. SOA practices 2b,d,e Equity considerations, area 4, #2-4 SOA practices 4e

Table 1 CONTINUED		
Campus area of focus	**Data-Driven Inquiry Questions**	**Guided Pathways Scale of Adoption Areas**
Advising and Placement Guided Pathways Institutional Research	What differences exist in the current advising and placement processes for students who have a reported GPA and those that do not? What might we learn from these differences that could help better support students with reported GPA in making enrollment decisions?	SOA practice 1d Equity considerations, area 1, #1-2. Equity considerations, area 3, #1 Equity considerations, area 4, #2-4 Equity consideration, Area 2, #2 SOA practices 2f
	Is our current approach to advising and placement effectively encouraging students who are estimated to benefit from 1S to enroll in 1S?	
	What are the most frequent reasons students above 2.6 GPA give for choosing to enroll in English 1S?	
	Is 1S creating unintended consequences for populations that are not 2.6 and below that choose to take the course/are recommended to take the course? If so, what changes can be made to the advising and placement process to reduce unintended consequences for students with a HS GPA above 2.6?	
	Might there be an unintended lay message created by the "recommended/highly recommended" placement letter?	
	What portion of the 40% of students with HS GPA data reported *received* the placement letter? What portion of the 40% of students with HS GPA data reported *opened* the placement letter?	
	What portion of the 40% of students with HS GPA data reported met with a counselor/advisor or attended a group advising session? What portion of the 60% of enrolled students without HS GPA data were over the age of 28/10+ years out of high school?	
	How might data on returning/older students help us understand the success rate gap more fully and better develop our curricular, cocurricular, and enrollment and advising processes to serve this population?	

Table 2: Latinx students consistently experienced the widest success gaps in the data collected so far.

The campus site where this success rate gap for Latinx students was most prevalent was Eureka.

The GPA band below 2.7 where the success rate gap was widest for Latinx students at Eureka was 2.0-2.3 (C).

The overall GPA band where the success rate gap was widest for Latinx students at Eureka overall was 2.7-3.0 (B).

28% of Latinx population at Eureka with HS GPA data took 1S.
13% of the Eureka Latinx student population with known GPA above 2.6 enrolled in 1S.

Campus area of focus	Data-Driven Inquiry Questions	Guided Pathways Scale of Adoption Areas
Advising/Placement Campus Communication Institutional research Guided Pathways	Why did a notable portion of Latinx students with a reported GPA over 2.6 underplace themselves into 1S?	SOA practice 1d Equity considerations, area 1, #1-2. Equity consideration, Area 2, #2 SOA practices 2f Equity considerations, area 4, #2-4
Pedagogy and Professional Learning Guided pathways	In what ways might the assumed academic performance of Latinx students taking 1S (compared to the actual academic performance of Latinx students taking 1S) create biases or pedagogical mismatches in the classroom?	Equity consideration, Area 2, #2. SOA practices 2b,d,e Equity considerations, area 4, #2-4 SOA practices 4e
Pedagogy and Professional Learning Guided Pathways	Do differences in success rates for all 1S students and specifically for Latinx students suggest additional professional learning in disciplinary pedagogy and culturally-responsive teaching approaches are needed?	Equity consideration, Area 2, #2. SOA practices 2b,d,e Equity considerations, area 4, #2-4 SOA practices 4e