

# **HAWAI'I COMMUNITY COLLEGE PROGRAM ANNUAL REVIEW REPORT**

## **Developmental Writing**

**November 30, 2015**

**Review Period  
July 1, 2014 to June 30, 2015**

**Initiator: Caroline Naguwa  
Writer(s): Caroline Naguwa**

*Program/Unit Review at Hawai'i Community College is a shared governance responsibility related to strategic planning and quality assurance. Annual and 3-year Comprehensive Reviews are important planning tools for the College's budget process. This ongoing systematic assessment process supports achievement of Program/Unit Outcomes. Evaluated through a college-wide procedure, all completed Program/Unit Reviews are available to the College and community at large to enhance communication and public accountability. Please see <http://hawaii.hawaii.edu/program-unit-review/>*

## Program Description

**Please provide a brief description of your Program. Include your Program Mission statement.**

---

The developmental writing effort at HawCC consists of three writing courses offered by the English Department: English 19, English 20W, and English 22. The courses are designed to prepare students to write effectively for college courses and programs, including certificates and degrees. A significant number of students in the CTE and Liberal Arts divisions depends on developmental writing courses to support their success. To assist student success, the English Department relies on the interdependence of its reading, writing, and ESL faculty, as well as on collaboration with Student Support Services and other departments. The primary goal is to meet student needs and the needs of the community.

LBRT Program Mission:

For the learner, the general education provided by the Liberal Arts program at Hawaii Community College fosters self-awareness; broadens the understanding of an individual's role within communities and environments; supports cultural understanding; emphasizes the breadth and interconnectedness of knowledge; and creates a foundation for continued personal, intellectual and professional development.

## Part I. Review of Program Data

**Go to the Annual Reports for Program Data (ARPD) website linked below and review the data for your program.**

<http://www.hawaii.edu/offices/cc/arpd/>

## Part II. Analysis of the Program

**Based on the ARPD data in Part 1, analyze the Program in terms of Demand, Efficiency, and Effectiveness. Include significant Program actions (e.g., new certificates, stop out, gain/loss of positions) and results of prior year's action plan. Include analysis of any Perkin's Core Indicator(s) for which the Program's goal was not met. Also discuss any trends or other factors (internal/external) affecting the Program and analyze other Program changes or information not included elsewhere.**

---

### Demand Health: UNHEALTHY

Strengths:

Though demand for developmental writing classes is categorized as unhealthy (due to decreases compared to previous AY), the courses still serve a significant number of students:

- 497 students enrolled in developmental writing courses;
- 108 semester hours taught;
- 204 full-time students enrolled in the fall;
- 1,809 student semester hours taught;
- AtD cohort enrollment increased by 8% (from 55% to 63%).

Weaknesses:

- enrollment in developmental writing courses dropped from 614 to 497; semester hours taught dropped from 129 to 108; and student semester hours taught dropped from 2223 to 1809.

## Efficiency Health: HEALTHY

### Strengths:

- Average class size of 16.8 out of class capacity of 20 indicates efficiency of class size;
- fill rate for developmental writing classes is 84.9%;
- zero low enrolled courses were offered;
- percentage of classes taught by regular discipline faculty increased from 42% to 44%.

### Weakness:

- although the percentage of courses taught by regular discipline faculty rose from 42% to 44%, 56% of classes were taught by non-regular faculty.

## Effectiveness Health: UNHEALTHY

### Strengths:

- Retention rates for all levels remained above 90%;
- withdrawals dropped slightly for two levels below college level (from 10 to 8);
- the percentage of ATD cohort students successfully completing a developmental writing course within the first academic year rose by 8% (from 59% to 67%).

### Weakness:

- Successful completion rates fell for all levels, and remains below 70%;
- Withdrawals increased for one level and three levels below college level;
- persistence levels dropped between 2% to 12% for all levels;
- success at the subsequent level for one level below college level to college level dropped from 62.3% to 56.4%.

## Overall Health, Action Plan Results, and Trends

Demand Health paralleled a continuing drop in college enrollment, and declining persistence levels may reflect the decrease in enrollment and the decline in successful completion. Though Effectiveness Indicators remained unhealthy, Efficiency Indicators improved.

AY 13-14 Goals: 1) Increase full-time faculty for developmental English courses; 2) Obtain funds to allow two faculty members teaching developmental writing to attend a national level professional development conference/workshop; 3) Supply three English classrooms (2 in Hilo, 1 at UCHWH) with tablets or laptops and storage for 25 students each. Due to budget limitations, none of the goals above was reached in AY 14-15.

The UHCC Developmental Education Committee held an English Discipline meeting on February 20, 2015 in order to discuss ENG 22 CLOs, identify skills/competencies gaps as a result of reading sample ENG 22 papers from across the system, and to share assignments/strategies to address identified skills/competencies gaps.

---

### Part III. Action Plan

**Describe in detail the Program's overall action plan for the current/next academic year. Discuss how these actions support the College's Mission and can lead to improvement(s) in student learning. Include specific action plans to address any ARPD Health Call scores of "Cautionary" or "Unhealthy," and any Perkin's Core Indicator(s) for which the Program's Goal was not met.**

---

The Developmental Writing Action Plan remains much the same for AY 15-16: 1) Increase full-time developmental English faculty; 2) Obtain funds for quality professional development; 3) Obtain funds for increased classroom computer resources for developmental learners. One difference affecting the above goals is the UHCC 2015-2020 Strategic Plan's Developmental Education initiative drafted at the end of AY 14-15. This initiative seeks to increase the accelerated co-requisite developmental English course offerings by Fall 16. To prepare for such steps, the department is scaling up its accelerated writing course offerings in AY 15-16, and has a greater need than ever for the above Action Plan requests:

- Offering more Accelerated Learning Project (ALP) sections will require more teaching personnel, as one of the ALP co-requisite sections services only half the number of students as in a normal stand-alone section. This will also create a need for additional classroom space.
- Accelerated courses require additional instructional approaches, pedagogy, methodologies, techniques, resources, materials, etc. to supplement standard stand-alone course instruction. Quality professional development opportunities are critical for instructors to be adequately trained to teach such courses.
- Co-requisite course offerings requiring students to spend six hours (and up to four days) a week in English classes necessitate accessible computer resources to allow for multi-dimensional, practical learning opportunities: instructors and students must be able to combine computer/internet-type activities with regular classroom activities.

The above Actions are designed to help increase developmental students' chances for success in progressing to college-level coursework, a key goal in the College's Strategic Directions, 2015-2021. With the elimination of Compass placement in AY 16-17, more students may be placed into college-level English as a result of various placement measures; this may lead to decreased Demand Indicators. (HawCC will analyze the demand for its increased ALP courses offered in Spring 16.) Increased accelerated co-requisite course offerings will also likely lead to decreased Efficiency Indicators, as the number of students taught per section will decrease. Effects of increased accelerated co-requisite course offerings will have an undetermined effect on Effectiveness Indicators: current analysis from a sister community college campus indicates that co-requisite courses can be very successful for the higher-level developmental student; however, such success is not seen for lower-level developmental students. These results reinforce national research results. The HawCC English Department is also currently undergoing discussion/creation of linked reading-writing courses.

### Part IV. Resource Implications

---

**Please provide a brief statement about any implications of current operating resources for the Program. Budget asks are included in the 3-year Comprehensive Review, except for the following that may be included here: health and safety needs, emergency needs, and/or necessary needs to become compliant with Federal/State laws/regulations. Describe the needed item(s) in detail, including cost(s) and timeline(s). Explain how the item(s) aligns with one or more of the Strategic Initiatives of the Hawai'i Community College 2015-2021 Strategic Plan. Identify and discuss how the item(s) aligns with the Initiative's Goal, Action Strategy, and Tactic. [HAWCC Strategic Plan](#)**

New faculty position \$55,000	Personnel	\$55,000
-------------------------------	-----------	----------

Cost Item 1 aligns with *SP Outcome A.2.3 Increase the number and percent of students enrolled in developmental intervention who successfully complete at least one course in the developmental sequence within their first academic year thus making progress towards degree applicable instruction*; *SP Outcome A2.4 Increase the number of students who successfully progress and graduate, or transfer to baccalaureate institutions, while maintaining the percentage of transfers who achieve a first year GPA of 2.0 or higher at the transfer institution*; *SP B1.f. Include in a first year experience, exploration of career options and the development of literacy skills in areas such as reading, computer and technology, and global understanding*; *SP Outcome D.1 Recruit, renew and retain a qualified, effective, and diverse faculty, staff, and leadership*; and *SP D.1.c Fund new positions (faculty/staff) recommended by CERC when necessary and appropriate*. More permanent, full-time faculty are needed not only to teach high-demand developmental courses, but also to consistently participate in assessment, curriculum development, and student success strategies concerning developmental reading courses.

National developmental education conference/workshop attendance by two faculty	Personnel	\$8000
--	-----------	--------

Cost Item 2 aligns with *SP Outcome A.2.3 Increase the number and percent of students enrolled in developmental intervention who successfully complete at least one course in the developmental sequence within their first academic year thus making progress towards degree applicable instruction*; *SP Outcome A2.4 Increase the number of students who successfully progress and graduate, or transfer to baccalaureate institutions, while maintaining the percentage of transfers who achieve a first year GPA of 2.0 or higher at the transfer institution*; *SP B1.f. Include in a first year experience, exploration of career options and the development of literacy skills in areas such as reading, computer and technology, and global understanding*; *SP Outcome D.1 Recruit, renew and retain a qualified, effective, and diverse faculty, staff, and leadership*; and *SP D.1.a By 2015, staff development expenditures will be 1% of total personnel expenditures*. Annual professional development is needed for faculty to stay abreast of new instructional/curricular/program strategies addressing developmental student needs and success.

Equip three English classrooms (2 in Hilo, 1 at UHCWH) with tablets or laptops and storage for 25 students each.	Equipment	\$175,000
--	-----------	-----------

Cost Item 3 aligns with *SP A2.4.b For students who have not decided on a major, include in a first year experience: development of literacy skills in areas such as reading, computer and technology, global understanding; exploration of STEM and other career options*; *B1.f. Include in a first year experience, exploration of career options and the development of literacy skills in areas such as reading, computer and technology, and global understanding*. Increasing the technology available to students in the classroom will help to develop their information competency, technological literacy, and reading/written communication skills for college and the workplace.

## Part V. Comprehensive Review Information

**Please provide a short summary regarding the last comprehensive review for this program. Discuss any significant changes to the Program since the last comprehensive review that are not discussed elsewhere.**

As Developmental Education is not a separate program within LBRT, no comprehensive reviews are conducted.

**Required for ARPD Web Submission: Provide the URL to the specific location of this Unit's last Comprehensive Review on the HawCC Program/Unit Review website (see link on page 1):**

---

## **Part VI. Program Student Learning Outcomes**

**For all parts of this section, please provide information based on the PLOs (P-SLOs) that were assessed through PLO-aligned course assessments in AY 2014-15.**

---

As Developmental Education is not a separate program within LBRT, and LBRT PLO assessment only involves 100-level or higher courses; only course level assessment is conducted at the developmental level.

### **A) Evidence of Industry Validation (CTE Programs)**

---

**[General Pre-Professional Programs can skip industry validation.]**

Provide documentation that the program has submitted evidence and achieved certification or accreditation from an organization granting certification in an industry or profession. If the program/degree/certificate does not have a certifying body, you may submit evidence of the program's advisory committee's/board's recommendations for, approval of, and/or participation in assessment(s).

### **B) Expected Level of Achievement**

For each Course assessed in AY 2014-15: Discuss the rubric(s) standards and the benchmark goal(s) for student success (e.g., "85% of students will achieve Excellent or Good ratings in the assessed activity" or "90% of students will score Meets or Exceeds Standards on the assessment rubric").

Based on results of prior department-wide assessment, expectation for passing artifacts is 65%.

### **C) Courses Assessed**

List all Program Courses assessed during AY 2014-15. Also list Program Courses for which a follow-up "Closing the Loop" assessment was implemented in AY 2014-15.

---

Assessed Course Alpha, No., & Title	Semester assessed	PLO-aligned CLOs that were assessed
ENG 22	14-15	Communication - Speak and write to communicate information and ideas in

		professional, academic and personal settings. Critical Reading - Read critically to synthesize information to gain understanding. Critical Thinking - Make informed decisions through analyzing and evaluating information.
<b>"Closing the Loop" Assessments Alpha, No., &amp; Title</b>	<b>Semester assessed</b>	<b>PLO-aligned CLOs that were assessed</b>

#### D) Assessment Strategy/Instrument

**For each Course assessed in AY 2014-15, provide a brief description of the assessment strategy, including the type of student work or activity assessed how and when the assessment was conducted, how and why assessed artefacts were selected, and how the artefacts were analyzed.**

##### PROJECT OVERVIEW

The assessment project will help the department to determine whether students, after completing ENG 22, are ready to take ENG 100 (and complete college-level writing assignments).

##### PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The Writing Coordinator and Writing faculty decided that the project would consist of an in-class essay assignment to be written on the English Department Writing Assessment Day (May 7, 2015) or during the section's regularly-scheduled final exam time. Students will respond to a text-based prompt (from either one text or selecting between two texts/prompts—to be decided). Students will be given the reading(s) in advance, and will be allowed to discuss the text(s) in class one week prior to the in-class essay; however, students will not receive the specific writing prompt(s) until the day of the exam. Students will create a Works Cited page outside of class before the exam, and will turn it in separately. They may use a dictionary and writing handbook during the exam, but may not use electronic devices.

##### PROJECT PLAN

Spring 2014: The ENG 22 common final exam was put on hold during 2013-2014; final take-home assignments were collected from instructors during these semesters. The Writing Coordinator put together a representative collection of these take-home assignments for departmental assessment. Writing instructors read and scored the sample papers and met in May 2014 to discuss results. It was determined that the wide variety of assignments made it difficult to perform consistent assessment. Participants at the May 2014 meeting also discussed the desire for more clarity in the rubric

descriptors. (Some felt that there was too big a gap in descriptors for Levels 1 and 2, and some wanted more clarity/specificity in the Level 3 (minimum competence) descriptor.) There was also a general sense that the course assignments needed to be more substantive and meaningful, specifically with a possible increase in reading-based assignments.

#### PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION

Fall 2014: In October, Writing instructors met to discuss the nature of the upcoming assessment project. While the common final exam issue has not been resolved, faculty decided to administer a common, text-based, in-class essay assignment during Spring 15 to facilitate assessment. Students in all sections will be given the text(s) in advance, and the writing assignment will be administered after regular instruction ends. The current draft of the ENG 22 rubric will be used for the assessment project, though faculty intend to discuss potential revisions during the Spring 15 semester prior to the end-of-semester assessment.

Spring 2015: The Writing Coordinator collected potential texts for the assessment project. The Writing faculty met in February to discuss/select the assignment text and to create the assignment prompt. The assignment description, text, and rubric was distributed to all ENG 22 faculty prior to implementation. Random samples were collected from nearly all Spring 15 ENG 22 sections.

Fall 2015: The Writing faculty will score artifacts and analyze results.

#### **E) Results of Program Assessment**

---

**For each Course assessed in AY 2014-15, provide a summative description of the assessment results. Discuss how these results collectively demonstrate achievement of the Program's Learning Outcomes and support the College's Mission.**

Results will be reported after Fall 2015 assessment of student artifacts.

#### **F) Other Comments**

**Include any additional information that will help clarify the assessment results. Include comparisons to any applicable College or Program standards, or to any national standards from industry, professional organizations, or accrediting associations. Include, if relevant, a summary of student survey results, CCSSE, e-CAFE, graduate-leaver surveys, special studies, or other assessment instruments used.**

#### **G) Next Steps**

**Based on the Program's overall AY 2014-15 assessment results, describe the Program's intended next steps to enhance instruction in order to improve student learning. Instructional changes may include, for example, revision to curriculum, teaching methods, learning outcome statements, student support, and other options. Please note here if proposed changes will involve Program and/or Course modifications requiring approval.**

---

Action Plan will be generated after artifacts are evaluated in Fall 2015.



## Part VII. Cost Per SSH

Please provide the following values used to determine the total fund amount and the cost per SSH for your program:

---

General Funds	= \$	_____
Federal Funds	= \$	_____
Other Funds	= \$	_____
Tuition and Fees	= \$	_____

## Part VIII. External Data

---

If your program utilizes external licensures, enter:

Number sitting for an exam	_____
Number passed	_____

[If your program does not utilize external licensures, skip Part IX.]