Scaling Corequisite Reform: Lessons Across States and What Comes Next
CCRC Webinar, December 3, 2025

Julia Raufman, CCRC Research Associate
Welcome everyone. Thank you so much for joining our webinar today. My name is Julia Raufman, and I'm a research associate at the Community College Research Center based at Teachers College, Columbia University. We're thrilled to have you here for this session on lessons across states and what comes next for scaling corequisite reform. This webinar brings together insights from three very different state and system contexts, Arkansas, the City University of New York, or CUNY, and Louisiana. And each of these places has really taken a unique path in implementing corequisite English and math reforms. And today we're going to be exploring what has worked, what challenges persist, and where leaders see the work heading in the next phase, sort of what we're informally calling Coreq 2.0. And before we get started, I wanted to briefly outline how the session is going to flow today. So we will begin with a short synthesis of what we know from the research, what the evidence says about developmental education reforms, and why corequisites have become such a central strategy nationally. From there, we'll move into a panel conversation with three leaders who have been deeply engaged in this work on the ground, and then we'll close with time for audience questions. So please feel free to drop your questions into the chat box at the bottom at any point during this webinar. And we're really excited for a rich discussion today and are really glad that you're all here. So here's a quick overview of what we're going to cover today. My CCRC colleague Hollie Daniels Sarica, will first briefly summarize what we've learned from the research literature--both from rigorous national studies and then from our recent work in states like Louisiana and systems like CUNY--and then she'll highlight what we know about outcomes, implementation models, and the broad landscape of corequisite adoption. Then we'll transition into our panel discussion where our colleagues from Arkansas, CUNY, and Louisiana will share how reforms were implemented in their own contexts, and they'll speak to the practical realities of scaling these reforms: What's worked, where colleges still feel pressure points, and how institutions are approaching continuous improvement throughout this journey. And then after the panel, we'll open things up for questions from all of you. So again, just reminding folks to please feel free to drop your questions into the chat box throughout the session, and we will collect those questions at the end. So with that, I'm going to move us into the research framing portion to ground our conversation and what we know nationally before zooming into the three states that we're highlighting today. And I will pass the mic on to Hollie.

Hollie Daniels Sarica, CCRC Research Associate
Thanks so much. Well, thank you all again so much for being here today. We're going to dive into just some of the research that CCRC has conducted, and kind of a larger body of evidence around corequisite reform and developmental education reform in general. There is a strong body of rigorous evidence that shows improvements to students' short term outcomes following developmental education reforms, and the figure on the right includes some of the recent literature on these various reforms, including corequisite remediation, math pathways, and multiple measures assessment. Research on corequisite reforms specifically has been shown to expand access to gateway English and math courses improve completion of college-level coursework, and improve outcomes among all racial/ethnic groups, so it's kind of like the rising tide, you know, lifts all boats. It is important to note that not every state, and certainly not every institution has fully transitioned away from prerequisite developmental courses. The table here shows data from a survey of 99 colleges in 2023. As you can see, some colleges still operate with a traditional or modified prerequisite sequence, and this is sometimes due to state policy, and other times due to local decisions or capacity constraints. The figure here is from the same research article, and it shows that there has been an increase in corequisite offerings in both English and math at surveyed two-year public colleges, from 2016 to 2023. Seventy-eight percent of surveyed colleges offer developmental courses in English, corequisite developmental

courses in English, and 77% offer corequisite courses in math. And in many states, these reforms have dramatically improved student progression into and through gateway English and math courses. So today we're discussing the status of corequisite policy adoption and implementation at colleges in three states, as Julia mentioned. These are states that CCRC has worked closely with over the last few years, including Arkansas, CUNY, and Louisiana. All three states or systems have faced overlapping reforms, placement changes, pandemic disruptions and policy changes, and online transformations. In Arkansas, corequisites were introduced via a statewide initiative that launched in the 2018-2019, academic year, and what followed was really a rapid increase in corequisite enrollment as colleges implemented, or in some cases expanded, corequisite course structures. In CUNY, a proficiency index placement algorithm was introduced in 2020 and remedial courses were eliminated by fall of 2022. And finally, in Louisiana, a 2022 Board of Regents policy eliminated prerequisite remedial courses, making Louisiana one of the first states to fully scale this model across all public colleges with the implementation of math corequisites, first in fall of 2023, and English in fall of 2024.

Probably unsurprisingly to those of you who know a little bit about the various decisions that are required when designing corequisites, models vary greatly across colleges and system contexts. We want to highlight some of those key differences that we saw across these three contexts in terms of how prerequisites were structured. So in Arkansas, there's been a mix of Accelerated Learning Program-style and locally adapted models and. For those who may not be familiar with ALP, this is the model that was first developed by Peter Adams at the Community College of Baltimore County, where students who place into developmental education enroll in a three-credit-hour college-level English or math course and a three-credit-hour corequisite course with the same instructor. In CUNY, we found that the ALP model was more common in English. However, in math, a single course or extended time model was more common. In Louisiana, the state actually provided two options for the models, so either the extended time or a side-by-side model. In the extended time model, students enroll in one course that usually has a greater number of credit and contact hours, whereas the side-by-side model is actually there's two separate courses that I just mentioned. We do have a visual coming up that shows these differences that really can have a lot of impacts on pedagogy, scheduling, and student experience. So what you're seeing here is a mock-up of a weekly class schedule. The orange represents the college-level course, and the blue represents the additional corequisite contact hours. And this is by far not all encompassing or every iteration of a model that we've seen, but just to kind of give you an idea of what corequisites can look like and what we've seen them look like. Some courses will add either additional hours right before the college-level course or right after, as we're showing here in model one. And in model two, the hours can be added on a different day of the week. So, we've seen like here, Monday, Wednesday, Friday, with Friday being the corequisite hours, or we've seen even just alternating days Monday through Thursday. Corequisite courses are, you know, embedding this developmental instruction support into the college-level course, but faculty members can, and certainly do go about this in a variety of ways. The most common approach that we've seen is model one depicted here, where faculty use this just-in-time support and incorporate pre-college developmental instruction when needed and as needed by their students throughout the semester.

So, in this visual, the orange represents the college-level instruction and blue represents the developmental support. Another model that we've seen is where this developmental instruction and support is kind of front loaded in the first couple of weeks of the semester, and then the college-level content is kind of the focus of the instruction through the rest of the semester. Another difference in models is that some corequisite courses co-enroll, quote, non-proficient students with proficient students in a single class, and other corequisite models only enroll non-proficient students in a single class in kind of a cohort model. We have also found that placement approaches vary greatly by state and even by system and college within the same state, depending on the context. So in Arkansas, while colleges must report a readiness exam or an entrance exam score, the state does allow other evidence-based placement criteria to be used when deciding what level of support students need to be

successful. This allows colleges to design and implement placement practices that are tailored to their specific context and student populations, resulting in wide variation in multiple measures policies. In CUNY, a multiple measures approach is used, allowing students to place directly into regular credit-bearing courses based on either the New York State Regents exams, the SAT or the ACT. And for students who do not meet cut scores on one of those tests, a proficiency index that combines GPA and test scores via an algorithm is used to determine students' readiness for college-level courses. Most applicants are proficient based on the standalone test scores, and don't actually go through the proficiency index, but it is an option. In Louisiana, multiple measures are allowable. You can use those to place students. However, standardized tests do remain the most widely used measure for placement, though there's great variation across institutions and cut scores, and whether, you know, high school measures are used at all for placement. Part of our research on corequisites has shed light on faculty members perspectives on corequisites themselves and their experiences. We have often heard that faculty feel pressure to teach two semesters in one with the move to corequisites from the prerequisite model of developmental education. We've also been told by faculty that having the same instructor, or this kind of instructor continuity when there is a side-by-side or a two-course model, is beneficial for student success, as well as small caps on student enrollment. And finally, when faculty support the model and they have resources supplied to them, like embedded tutors, for example, this helps to promote student learning and success and buy in and sustainability are obviously greater.

Some of our research has also included speaking with students enrolled in corequisites, and when we asked students about their experience in corequisite courses, they shared that embedded tutors can really help to bolster student success by offering personalized, accessible, and more comfortable avenues for support. So those embedded tutors are typically students who have previously taken the course, who are present throughout the semester to provide extra support to current students. It goes without saying that professors are critical to students' experience in a course, and so due to the structure of corequisites and the fact that students spend a couple more hours per week with their professors than they will in a typical college course, that professors really play a pivotal role in fostering student success. And we often heard that a student's professor was what they liked best about their course. The increased contact hours in corequisite courses similarly creates more opportunities for enhanced relationship building among students, and there has been described a sense of community that developed with similarly motivated and engaged peers. And that can be really impactful for students' learning experience and for their academic comfort and motivation. On the flip side, there were a few common factors that presented challenges for corequisite students. How students perceive the pacing of their corequisite dependent in part on the academic discipline, and whether that was English or math. Broadly, students said that their English class moved in an appropriate or sometimes even a slow pace. And in contrast, partly due to the cumulative nature of a math curriculum, students said that their math class moved too quickly. As I previously described, because the corequisite courses have these extended contact hours, students end up spending more time with their classmates, and that's just more opportunity for the behaviors and attitudes of their peers to influence them and become a significant part of their experiences. So while I just noted that students appreciated the sense of community that was able to develop among similarly motivated and engaged peers, the opposite is also true. When students reported that peers had a lower motivation or a negative attitude toward the course that was not too conducive to support a productive and learning environment. And we know that advising is underresourced and understaffed at many colleges, leading to high case loads and high advisor turnover. And the consequences can be seen in how many students describe their advising experiences. So of course, some students tell us about their amazing advising experiences, but many others describe their sessions with advisors as either passive or impersonal, where decisions about their course placements were primarily made by advisors. Some students were simply given a schedule of classes and perhaps never interacted with an advisor. And in other cases, students were given little to no explanation about what a corequisite course is and why they're placed into it, and that can really have a negative impact on their experience. So across states, a few lessons have been

learned. We know that mandates accelerate scaling, but we've seen success in the adoption of corequisites in a wide variety of contexts that we discussed today, thanks to clear models and resources. Next, accurate placement is absolutely essential for corequisite reforms. We observed a lot of variation in the practice of placement, but we know that across context, transparency in the placement process and clear communication with students is really essential to helping students know what to expect and why corequisites matter. The engagement of advisors and faculty in corequisite reforms is also absolutely critical. Advisors need to fully understand these evolving course structures and placement rules so they can guide students accurately and faculty buy in can truly make or break implementation. So institutional support, whether that be guidance on models encouraging instructor continuity, or limiting class sizes, or even providing embedded tutors, these can all help to sustain that engagement. And finally, the insights that we learned from students remind us that there are gaps in the policy, practice experience. Students value embedded tutors, caring instructors, and a sense of community, but they struggle with fast pacing, unmotivated peers, unclear advising, and inconsistent communication. So their experiences make it clear that strong policies need equally strong implementation on the ground. So thank you all for your time and attention. I'm going to pass it back to Julia for a wonderful panel discussion with folks from each of the states and systems that we've talked about so far.

Julia Raufman
All right, thank you, Hollie, so much for grounding us in CCRC's research and setting up such a clear foundation for today's forthcoming conversation. And so now we're going to shift into our panel discussion with our colleagues from Arkansas, CUNY, and Louisiana. As mentioned before, each of them really brings a different vantage point on corequisite reform, coming from different governance structures, different timelines, and different experiences, shaping what implementation has looked like on the ground. So I'm thrilled to introduce our panelists. First, Ricky Tompkins, the vice president for technical education and workforce development at North Arkansas College. Then we have Emily Cosper, dean of liberal arts, social sciences and education at Delgado Community College in Louisiana. And then we have Sarah Truelsch, assistant dean for policy research at the City University of New York central office, known as CUNY central office. So thank you all so much for being here. So as part of this panel, I'm going to pose sort of a series of thematic questions, and not everyone needs to respond to each one. Please just jump in where you have the strongest perspective, or where something resonates with your own experience. So to start us off, I would like to talk about governance structures, because they really shape kind of what's possible at the institutional level. So the question here is, really, how did your state or system balance the need for consistent quality across institutions with allowing local flexibility in course design and implementation, and what trade-offs emerged as colleges adopted different corequisite models. So I'm actually going to start with Sarah here. So can you, Sarah, can you share an example of how CUNY colleges really approached implementation differently, and what some of those trade-offs look like?

Sarah Truelsch, Assistant Dean for Policy Research, City University of New York
Sure. Julia, thank you so much for having me today. I'm so happy to be here with you all, and I want to thank CCRC for the great qualitative research that they've done with us that has illuminated a lot of things we're going to talk about today. So in the CUNY system, we had a systemwide mandate to scale corequisite courses by a given date, following sort of many years of experimentation and research. But within that timeline, colleges had a lot of autonomy in how they managed the scaling process and in the structures of courses that they developed. And what we saw is colleges really had very different paces of implementation. So some, some of our colleges, in the course of replacing all the remedial courses with coreq courses, had a very gradual five or six year process of phasing in the coreqs and phasing out traditional remediation. Others moved much more quickly and made the transition in about two years. Some colleges moved first on English and then second on math. Some moved first on math, second on English, some did it at the same time. So we really saw a lot of variation, just depending on

the appetite for individual faculty, leaders and administrators from college to college. The other place where we saw a lot of differences were sort of technical structures of the courses, how many additional hours of supplemental support they had, and how those were structured. Eventually we have a mandate from the system that capped the number of supplemental hours for each coreq course, sort of the non-credit-bearing portion, at no more than two hours above the credit-bearing hours. But originally we had some colleges that started with three additional non-credit hours. We have a few colleges with models for higher performing students that only have one additional hour. We saw a lot of variation there. Most of our colleges have opted to have a single course with a single instructor for their corequisite models. But a few of them, especially early on, experimented with, I think what you call the side-by-side or the two-course model, where there's a credit bearing portion of a course and then students are required to enroll in a paired corequisite, non-credit support in order to make up the full coreq course. But that's become a little bit less popular over time.

Julia Raufman
Thank you so much, Sarah. And just to follow up there, what would you say were the implications of institutions adopting different types of coreq models? I know articulation and course naming has come up in previous conversations. Is there anything you wanted to perhaps highlight there?

Sarah Truelsch
Yeah, I think there's trade offs with both credit hours and the sort of multiple course structure. So with credit with the additional hours, the advantage of course is more instructional time, but the more hours that are attached to the course, the more difficult it is for students to construct the rest of their course schedule around a six or seven hour course and there's also additional challenges for the instructor in managing a course with so many hours. For the course structures, for colleges that adopted a new single course model, that tended to be easier for the registrars to schedule courses and for students and advisors to schedule students into courses. But the disadvantage we found there is that if colleges created a brand new corequisite course that had a new course number and a new course name, those courses wouldn't necessarily articulate in transfer agreements when students transferred. The advantage of the two course model, when colleges use their existing credit bearing courses and just added on an additional supplemental course, is that those existing credit bearing courses had articulation agreements and articulation practices already set up around them and were able to continue in the transfer process. So that was sort of a lesson we learned early on.

Julia Raufman
Great, super interesting. Thank you so much. Ricky, I'd love to bring you in next. So Arkansas ultimately became a two core state. Can you briefly explain how that happened, and sort of how the state's funding formula influenced that decision?

Ricky Tompkins, Vice President for Technical Education and Workforce Development, North Arkansas College
Sure. Not only did it influence, it drove everything. So in Arkansas, we are a performance-based funding state. And so one of the areas that we are judged upon in order to get increased funding is success of at-risk students. So one of those at-risk areas is those students who are placed into developmental education, right? And so in order for us to identify those, we had to keep that 01000 level class in the state. So that's why we continue to do the side by side. Still, I would say most institutions, they connected those during registration. So usually they're back to back. They're taught by the same instructor, but that way we can identify and we mix our classes. So if you're taking Comp 1 you can be in there with someone who's in the coreq or someone who is not. And that really has worked well, because, you know, being able to surround yourself with students who didn't test in the developmental education, what we're really seeing is those cohorts create themselves within the class,

and then you get the supplemental instruction after but it really was because the big driver was that performance-based funding model. It's why we didn't get a lot of pushback. I can't believe we started this in 2018 we've been doing this for a long time now. We didn't get a whole lot of pushback when it come to really embracing the coreq model as a state, because you see the success rates it pertains directly to your funding. So it's like, okay, we're willing to throw anything at this, at this issue, and it's really worked for us.

Julia Raufman
Excellent. Thank you so much. And clearly we can see sort of the variation there across some states. So I want, we're going to move a little quickly in this panel. I know we only have an hour here, unfortunately, but the next topic I wanted to discuss is focused on supports and what is needed for the adoption and scaling of corequisites, and thinking about what types of supports in terms of state policy, leadership, funding, professional development, data, tools, etc., made the biggest difference in scaling corequisite models at your institution or across your system, and also thinking about what support did you wish had been in place earlier? So I think I'm going to start again, Ricky, with you on this one, what supports were most important in Arkansas as corequisites began to scale.

Ricky Tompkins
Yeah, I'm gonna put two side by side. One, we did an intensive amount of professional development for both faculty and for academic leadership to be able to say, okay, here's what the data is showing. This is how this is going to benefit and then down at the faculty level this is how you're going to design those things, right? So this is it, because it wasn't changed in the way instruction happened, right? And it does, and Hollie is correct, it puts a lot of strain on faculty, right, because you're really having to teach students up very quickly. So professional development was a huge part of what we were doing in the information. So both from the perspective of throughout the process at the annual conference for the Arkansas Community College Association, all of that was provided. We also included the four years. So our four years in the state are also doing coreq model and so that truly helped us as well. Also, side by side with that, was huge support from the division of higher education with the state to be able to say, I'm saying we still have local control, but here are recommendations that the state is offering with data backing up those recommendations. And so being able to have that support at the state level really allowed us to push forward very quickly, again, tied back to the performance funding model, but professional development and support by policy and by recommendation at the state level was huge for us.

Julia Raufman
Great, thank you. Emily, how about from Delgado's perspective, what institutional supports mattered the most as you were implementing your model?

Emily Cosper, Dean of Liberal Arts, Social Sciences, and Education, Delgado Community College
Hi, Julia. I have to really agree with Ricky. We are asking our faculty to completely reimagine the classroom, and if we don't provide professional development, how can they be successful? I mean, it is a big change. And at Delgado, we went from a four sequence reading and writing curriculum that could take upwards of two years for our students and kind of a skill and drill mentality, and we flipped it into this kind of metacognitive reading, heavy college work, day one model, if we didn't train up our teachers, how would they know how to do that? So I feel like professional development was really, really key to providing faculty with the tools they needed to have confidence, because we need to build confident teachers, to build confident students. And you know, when you've been doing something for 30 years, one way, we've got to help those teachers learn to do it in another way. So that definitely PD, and I really made our writing center the center for writing, research and communications. It became a

key player in all of the work that we do, because that partnership allowed us to kind of put an extra hand around our students, and so we spent a lot of time building trust and kind of a collaborative relationship with our center, and then we embedded coaches in some of our classrooms. And kind of administratively, there were many, continue to be many challenges with this embedded coaching model, but we really wanted to, you know, get everybody in the room together, get all the cooks, you know, in the kitchen to kind of raise up our students. And these relationships with the writing coach, students with embedded coaches do better. But even more importantly, they have a development, they have a relationship with the Writing Center, and they use it. And they continue to use it when they leave the English classroom, which is the relationship that we want to build.

Julia Raufman
Great, thank you. I think you both brought up a really important segue for this conversation, which is a topic of faculty who really are at the center of this work, I think, as Emily just said. And you know, corequisite reform asks faculty again to rethink pedagogy, pacing, collaboration across departments, and sometimes the entire way that they conceptualize student supports. So I wanted to shift our conversation to that focus and ask you all, how have faculty responded in your context, and what strategies have helped to build buy-in and support effective teaching? And I think Emily, I'm going to begin again with you. Can you share how faculty collaboration has shaped implementation at Delgado, or how professional development supported that transition?

Emily Cosper
Absolutely, we were fortunate, and we received some grant funds that I feel has really given us a framework that has supported faculty, students, and our success in this. At the beginning of our journey, it was top down PD, meaning I decide what we needed based on my research. And it was a little heavy handed, and faculty were resistant, because they were being told, instead of being part of a communication, a dialogue, because they too were the experts. So over time, we went from me setting the agenda based on research we have done, to a more collaborative approach. And I was able to send all of my faculty to a reading apprenticeship training because we really did the critical thinking and making reading the focus of our classroom, because our students have struggles with academic reading. So we did this very inclusive PD, that my faculty then took and over the last three years, they've created these small communities of practice where the department chair groups people based on expertise, who brings what to the group, and it's groups of three to five who every year, they observe each other, they practice lessons, they really kind of workshop and talk to each other. And that has been incredible. And I'm proud of them, because they don't have to do this anymore, right? Our funding is over. They're still doing it because it's that collaborative piece. And then two years ago, I felt we needed more kind of statewide conversation, so we did begin a state LA Gems, Louisiana gateway, English and math student symposium, where we come together from across the state and share what's working and what's not. So faculty have to be at the table. I mean, they're it.

Julia Raufman
Thank you so much for that. Sarah, turning to the CUNY context, what helps secure faculty buy-in at CUNY? And were there challenges, maybe when mandates might have moved faster than professional development could sort of keep up with?

Sarah Truelsch
Yeah, so I mentioned that we had a lot of flexibility and the structures that individual colleges could adopt, so we did not adopt any models or curricula across the entire CUNY system. And instead, what we did was pay for faculty release time for faculty, math faculty and English faculty at every college, to develop their own curricula and course models and to do PD for their colleagues. And we also had stipends for instructors to participate in that professional development, and we left a lot of flexibility

about that development to individual faculty leaders at each college. We were able to secure some grant funding from Strong Start to Finish, and we had very generous funding from the New York City Council to pay for all of that release time and the development. Our general sense is that that faculty-led creation was useful for buy-in, as were the stipends. So in addition to the long time that allowed the sense of commitment, the fact that this wasn't an unfunded mandate, but that there was dedicated resources from the central office throughout the entire transition period, I think was helpful for buy-in and reception. Of course, we've had a diversity of reception. Generally, we've gotten more enthusiasm from English departments than we have from math departments, and there's a lot of variation from college to college, faculty to faculty, and instructor to instructor, even within that. The fact that we didn't have a mandated curricula or model and had so much diversity meant that we couldn't support at a broad scale PD. So I think the PD ended up being very focused, and there were things that were very receptive to individual communities about the way we structured things, but it meant that we weren't able to necessarily offer some things at scale or on a continuing basis in a way that spoke to every college, because every college had so much autonomy to do things individually.

Julia Raufman
Excellent, thank you. And I know this is definitely surfacing questions in my mind, so if folks have questions who are attending, again, please feel free to drop those in the chat, and we will get to those later. And I'm just moving along, just for the sake of time. But our next topic is continuous improvement. So as we've sort of talked about, corequisite implementation isn't just sort of set it and then forget it reform. I think colleges are continually refining placement processes, pedagogy, supports, and advising based on data. And so one of the questions I had for our panelists is, how are you using data in terms of dashboards, student outcomes, pass rates, etc., to really support ongoing refinement with implementation. So Emily, I was going to begin with you again, if you could share an example of how faculty or your team use data to adjust or strengthen your model. And I know Hollie has a slide here that you've shared, so I think we can share that with the audience if you'd like to speak to it.

Emily Cosper
So I just when I think about our dev ed transformation, these are the areas that were really important to me. Data, being the first, one how to use data. I'm an English person. I'm really good at analyzing poetry, but you give me an Excel spreadsheet and I don't know what it means. And my faculty felt the exact same way, and they were always fearful of the DFW report. Like, really, nothing ever came of it, but they were sure that, you know, the hatchet man was coming when our DFW report came out. And I wanted to flip that script and use data to show our successes, because I knew we were having them, but also to provide discussion points about where is that room for improvement? So to get this data piece, my research office helped me build, well, they built it. They built me a Power BI dashboard. I feed in data. This is just an overview, guys. I can go in so deep. This is over the five years of our project. I can break it down by year. I can do it by class. I can do it based by modality. And really like right now, we're focusing on modality because our online students aren't doing well, right? We knew that anecdotally, now we know and we can really drill down. So this transparency, it gives us an opportunity to be better. And then quickly, each of my faculty members at the end of every semester, they get their own snapshot so they can see their own students' performance and kind of related to the college's. And then with DFW report, our writing center does very targeted outreach to students who are D or F at midterm, you know. So we're trying to use all of these data pieces that we have to make us better, not to accuse anybody of anything. And as you know, faculty are on edge often about data, because it can be scary, so I just want people to be able to see it so we know who we are and become better.

Julia Raufman

Right. Yeah. And this dashboard, I'm really glad that you shared slides with us, because it's so interesting to look at how you all are able to assess what's going on.

Emily Cosper
It's just kind of cool. And I am not a data person, but I have become one.

Julia Raufman
Great. So Ricky, we've talked, I think we talked a little bit about sort of CCRC's findings and CAPR's findings, that reforms tend to work best when they're implemented together. So how would you say Arkansas has experienced this, particularly around kind of integrating corequisites with other reforms.

Ricky Tompkins
Yeah, so at the beginning of Hollie's slide, where it had the three circles and you saw the middle and how that was all integrated with corequisites, math pathways, and then multiple measures. That was Arkansas. And now, in 2025, I can say, you know, it was just good for us, just to rip the band aid off. In 2018, 2019, it was tough, as we were going through. But looking back, they really do build upon themselves to create success, right? And so, you know, really, when you're looking at the coreq and math pathways, those ran parallel. And that really got a lot of our math folks on board with the idea of coreq, because they're looking at the data, they're also saying, hey, if we're going to make fundamental changes to the way we're doing math in the state of Arkansas, we're just going to do it all, we're going to it all the same time. And so that's what happened. So the math pathways and the coreq went side by side. And then we added on that multiple measures. And so then we really started seeing, particularly on the math side. They were like, you know, we don't want to go with Accuplacer, just Accuplacer. And, we don't want to go with just ACT. We think there are some other things out there. And that's where CAPR really came into play, to be able to say, they looked at all of our data statewide, and said, hey, you know what? High school GPA is a much better measure when it comes to placement, right? And so you're throwing all of that in there at the same time, the state changes some things at the policy level to be able to allow institutions to do that, still frame it themselves, right, and then really putting out, and I had the benefit of working for the state association, to look at all 22 2-year colleges in Arkansas and say, hey, you know what? This institution, let me connect this institution to you so your faculty can talk to their faculty, because they're seeing some great things by these little tweaks to what you're doing. Because we had one institution, we're saying, okay, yes, we're gonna do multiple measures. But we're still going to require 25 on the ACT to get into college algebra. Well, guess what? You're going to be pretty successful if you're popping a 25 on the ACT at college algebra, right? What if you're doing 19 with a coreq, or what if you're doing 19 with an A in high school math? Your Algebra Two? Throw them all together, you're getting a placement directly into that college level. So we threw it all together. It ended up working very well for us.

Julia Raufman
Excellent. Great. And Sarah, just lastly, how in this section, at least, how is CUNY using system wide data to help colleges iterate and improve? And I know, Sarah, you also shared a slide with us reflecting some of CUNY's data. So if you wanted to speak through that, that would be great.

Sarah Truelsch
Sure. So I think

Sarah Truelsch
we've used data in different ways and sort of different phases of our transition process. So it sounds much like Arkansas, we did many different types of change over more or less the same period. So part of our coreq transition was also having math pathways. So all of our core colleges offer coreq versions

of statistics courses and quantitative reasoning courses, in addition to college algebra for STEM majors. We also did reforms to our placement processes as part of that. One of the things we did at the beginning of the entire developmental education process is define a key performance indicator that we are going to use to measure progress and success. That's what's on the slide right now. We define that as the percentage of our freshman cohort that has earned credit, separately in math and in English by the end of their first year of college. And you can see from this trend line over time, I'm showing here the trend lines for just the students in our associate programs, as well as all of the freshmen across our system, because our system combines community colleges and bachelor's senior colleges, and we've had really steady progress. One of the things we really like about this KPI is that it captures all of those combined different efforts at once. So you're seeing partially the effects here of changing placement and having more students go directly into credit bearing courses, as well as the advantages of replacing traditional remediation with coreq courses, and also some advantage for having students have the option to take statistics or quantitative reasoning, not just putting everybody through an algebra pipeline. So this way of looking at success for our cohorts of students, has been a constant that we've tracked throughout our entire reform process. Early on in our process, we did a lot of process monitoring. So, how many courses were being offered? What percentage of students were taking traditional remedial courses versus corequisite courses? Did every college have a statistics version of its coreq? And we were really focused on sort of watching the ramp up happen and making sure that those transitions were happening. Since that happened in fall 2022 we were able to spend a little bit more time looking in more depth at student outcomes. Emily had mentioned modality, so we were doing a lot of this transition while we were also coping with the disruptions of the Covid 19 pandemic, and much more online and hybrid courses than we previously had. So we did a lot of analyses related to outcomes in online courses, I know I saw a question about that in the chat. Most of our colleges have returned to offering a majority of their coreq and entry-level courses in in-person models, sometimes hybrid, but always continuous, because it was sort of a faculty sense that that was a better delivery model, particularly for this population early on in their college careers. Now that we've gotten a little bit more stability coming out of the pandemic, fully scaled up courses, course designs and structures are relatively set, we're turning more and more attention to individual course level success, and I think the next frontier is more work with pedagogy and curriculum at individual course levels and really trying to increase those success rates for students.

Julia Raufman
Great. Thank you. We have surfaced so many topics now, and I think that was also a good segue to our next topic, which is just really thinking about kind of what's next and looking ahead. So yeah, so to close us out, I just wanted to look ahead here. And we're we're now more than a decade into corequisite reform, which is a long time now, thinking about my work in the field. But if, if Phase One was replacing standalone developmental courses, what does coreq 2.0 look like in each of your contexts? And I'm going to open this one up to all of you so you can each offer sort of a brief reflection on that. And so whoever wants to go first, please feel free.

Emily Cosper
I'll go ahead and go first. I'm really interested in continuing, improving, and solving the problems of embedded coaching and that model of coaching in an online class. We do continue to offer online our extended time course, that genie is out of the bottle for us, it feels like it would be very hard to get back in. And there's some interesting work being done with embedded coaching, and I really, the what we have done and that impact I've seen, I think it really has the power to be very impactful, because that coach just serves such a different role than the instructor. And I'd like to see kind of more continuity with our math instruction, like we need to continue to talk more, because our students are the same students, and I really think that's important.

Ricky Tompkins
Go ahead, Sarah.

Sarah Truelsch
I can, I can build on that. So as I said, I think similar to what Emily said, and as I said my last comments, I think the next frontier, especially in math, is getting more into what happens in classrooms and looking at curricula and pedagogy, and sort of less the questions of structure and how many hours and coreq versus prereq. I think those are sort of settled, but really fine tuning the embedded support services, tutors, and the combination of instructor practices that have most successful student outcomes. I think again, that's especially in math, and I think particularly in our college algebra courses. And we're also putting more and more attention on the math pathways. Making sure that really, students who need college algebra are going through the college algebra track, and that others are aware that statistics and quantitative reasoning are are viable and appropriate math courses for many majors. And then on the English side for us, integration of ESL, and figuring out where ESL sequences fit within English pathways, I think, is the next big frontier.

Ricky Tompkins
I'll throw out there kind of an elephant in the room for all of us. How do we handle concurrent enrollment in a coreq world? So we're getting more requests from high schools to say, hey, can you do coreq at the high school level? Now, some of us would say, y'all should be doing that, but hey, if you want us to come in, let's see what we can do. So I think as again, as so much more of our student population is on that concurrent side of the house, how do we implement a multiple measures coreq model within the concurrent enrollment framework? And also at the same time, not forgetting, because this was a question in the chat that I will bring up, not forgetting that non-traditional student who is coming to us after years upon years out of school, what model can we implement with the, to partner with the coreq? Whether that's a boot camp, those types of things, just to get that confidence up. I think there's just some populations we're going to be working with, but that concurrent question is going to become, I think, more front facing for us is that population continues to grow.

Julia Raufman
Great. Thank you so much for all of your thoughtful reflections. And definitely have some questions percolating in my head about for research purposes, so really great topics to think about. So with that, I think we're going to transition to questions from the audience. And we're a little bit behind on time, so I know we have about like five or six minutes to take some questions, maybe five. If you haven't already, feel free to drop your questions into the chat, and we'll try to take as many as we can. So I'm going to take the first question that I see. So the first question is, is the sense of community with peers stronger in a cohort model or a mixed model? Similarly, is the low motivation engagement among peers, different in cohort models or mixed? Both models present pros and cons for different groups. Totally understand if the answer is different or the answer is in terms of generalities or trends. And that is from Robert Weston. So, um, I don't know if anyone on the panel wanted to answer that. That's a great question, and I know we presented it also from our research, so I wasn't sure if Hollie wanted to chime in as well, but anyone from the panel want to chime in for that?

Ricky Tompkins
Cohorts, ideal. Cohorts tend to be somewhat impractical, sometimes based on programming schedules, full time, part time, we'd love to build a cohort model. You see technical programs do it all the time, and it works. It's just impractical for a lot of our students to be able to handle it that way. So, and the research actually shows the cohort model works. It's just difficult to implement for many of our students.

Julia Raufman
Anyone else? I'll probably just move along, just because for the sake of time here, and there's a lot of questions. So the second question here is, and in any of these states, have you looked at data on longer term persistence and degree completion? I've seen data on first year short-term success, but would love to see longer term results and how corequisites impact degree completion rates or persistence beyond students first year. From Jennifer Davis in the audience.

Emily Cosper
We're still, you know, we're at the beginning. We're not at the beginning. We're like year five, but our average student takes five years to graduate, right? So we know where we came from, where over the long term, in our developmental sequence, only, like 13% of our students ever reached credential, which is crazy, and we're just now starting to get the data. Year to year, our coreq students are far outpacing kind of that retention piece than our old model, but the, you know, we're still waiting kind of for those long term trends to reveal themselves. You know, at our college.

Sarah Truelsch
I will say, within the CUNY context, absolutely. I mean, we're always looking at retention and graduation, but we're doing many different initiatives at once. This isn't our only effort to improve academic momentum and graduation. So we certainly have a positive upward trend and graduation from our community colleges that we're very happy with. But we have a lot of other changes that we attribute that to. Part of the reason that we focus on the first year earning credit key performance indicator is that that one is so closely tied to this particular reform.

Julia Raufman
Excellent. Thank you. And Sarah brought up this question in her last response, which was really just around experiences with online coreq instruction. And that's another question from John Fisher. Are there any other folks on the panel who want to contribute to the response there about experiences in online coreqs?

Emily Cosper
We do it. It's, I mean, we're extended time, so we're not the two course model. Our success rate, our metrics, show it's not as effective. So it continues to be a conversation that we're having on how can we get the online students to be as successful? Now, it's not just coreq where there's a disparity in students success, but it's hard, and it's it's hard enough to engage students in a classroom, it's even harder to engage them online. And I think corequisite success is all about student engagement. So it's the teachers who can figure out a way to engage a student online, their students do good, but that it's hard, hard, hard work,

Ricky Tompkins
Same as Arkansas. Covid showed us we could do it. Covid didn't show us we could do it well. And I think that well part is where we're at.

Julia Raufman
Alright, I'm looking at the time. I just saw one comment here that Emily, someone is interested in the reading apprenticeship I believ? I just had it open on my screen.

Emily Cosper
So, we went through WestEd, and they have multiple courses. They could come in and work one on one with the college. The pandemic was actually an excellent thing for this because they had some residency programs. Those changed. So all of my faculty did reading apprenticeship, one on one, and

then for the college writing classroom. And it's just helping students, helping faculty, become comfortable supporting student reading, because in your corequisite English classroom, that's a lot of it. But then I was able to, I sent 17, which is a little bit over 50% to a full year course, leadership community, leadership practice. And that's where our leadership communities of practice have come from, because our faculty saw the value, and it's about being metacognitive about your teaching, which is what we need our students to do with their learning. If we're not practicing it, it's really hard for us to get our students to. So I really, it's been a pillar. It's not the only thing that has helped us, but it helped my teachers become confident with the reading piece.

Julia Raufman
Excellent. All right. Well, I see we're at, well, we're at time. I'm speeding myself up here, but before we wrap, I want to just take a moment to share a few resources that might be helpful as you continue this work. I think they're going to pop up on the screen, and then you'll also receive an email from us later today or later this week with links to today's slides, a recording of the session, and a set of resources from CCRC on dev ed reform and corequisite implementation, and those include system and state level case studies, research briefs, and tools that highlight lessons learned from colleges across the country. And also, if you're interested in learning more, or if you want to connect about what correct reform looks like in your institution or state, please don't hesitate to reach out. We're always happy to share examples, talk through questions or point you to materials that might be helpful for you. I'd also like to offer a very sincere thank you to our panelists, Ricky, Emily, and Sarah, for sharing such thoughtful insights from their own context. Their experiences illustrate just how much learning is happening across the field, and we are incredibly grateful for their time and openness today, and thank you to all of you for joining us, for the questions you asked and for the work that you do every day to support students, your engagement in these conversations is really what moves the field forward. So thank you so much with that, we'll close for today. And thank you again for being here and hope to stay connected. Have a great afternoon, everyone.

Ricky Tompkins
Thanks, everyone.