HAWAI'I COMMUNITY COLLEGE
PROGRAM ANNUAL REVIEW REPORT

DEVELOPMENTAL READING

Date: February 16, 2017

Review Period
July 1, 2015 to June 30, 2016

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 and Institutional 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/files/program-unit-review/

Please remember that this review should be written in a professional manner. Mahalo.

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

Describe the Program	
Provide the short description as listed in the current catalog.	(No catalog description) The developmental reading effort at HawCC consists of three reading courses offered by the English Department: English 18, English 20R, and English 21. The courses are designed to prepare students to read 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 reading 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.
Provide and discuss the program's mission (or goals and objectives if no program mission statement is available).	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.

Comprehensive Review information: <mark>Required for ARPD Web Submission</mark>

Provide the year and URL for the location of this program's last Comprehensive Review on the HawCC Program/Unit Review website: http://hawaii.hawaii.edu/files/program-unit-review/	
Year	2015 (LBRT)
URL	http://hawaii.hawaii.edu/files/program-unit-review/docs/2015_lbrt_comprehensive_program_review.pdf
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 in this review.	Developmental Education as discussed in the 2015 Comprehensive Review: The program anticipates significant impacts from changes underway in developmental education delivery that will require resources to support students moving into college level coursework at accelerated and supported levels. These impacts have a direct bearing on staffing in English, Math, and support areas. This relates to HGI Strategy 2 and developmental education initiatives. Dev Ed Resources Requests: Instructors, tutors, peer mentors, academic coaches/case managers, and technology to support students in accelerated dev ed courses • Establish new BOR position • Fund National Developmental Education conference/workshop attendance for four faculty (2 English, 2 Math)

	• Equip three English classrooms (2 in Hilo, 1 at Palamanui) with tablets or laptops and storage for 25 students each • Tutors, peer mentors, academic coaches/case managers

QUANTITATIVE INDICATORS

ARPD Data
<mark>Please attach a copy of the program's ARPD data tables and submit with the Program Review document.</mark>

a) **If you will be submitting the Program Review document in hard copy, print and staple a copy of the data tables to the submission; the icon to print the data tables is on the upper right side, just above the data tables.**
   OR
b) **If you will be submitting the Program Review document in digital form, attach a PDF copy of the data tables along with the digital submission; the icon to download the data tables as a PDF is in the upper right side, just above the data tables.**

Program data can be found on the ARPD website: http://www.hawaii.edu/offices/cc/arpd/

ANALYSIS OF THE PROGRAM's DATA

Analyze the program's ARPD data for the review period.	
Describe, discuss, and provide context for the data, including the program's health scores in the following categories:	
Demand	UNHEALTHY Strengths: Though demand for developmental reading classes is categorized as unhealthy (due to a dramatic decrease compared to previous AY), the courses still serve a considerable number of students: • 214 students enrolled in development reading courses; • 45 semester hours taught; • 116 full-time students enrolled; and • 714 student semester hours taught. Weaknesses: • enrollment in developmental reading courses dropped from 328 to 214; student semester hours taught dropped from 1086 to 714.
Efficiency	HEALTHY Strengths: • Average class size of 15.9 out of class capacity of 20 indicates efficiency of class size;

	- fill rate for developmental reading classes increased to 79.3%; and - 2 low enrolled classes were offered. Weakness: - percentage of courses taught by regular discipline faculty decreased from 57% to 33%.
Effectiveness	UNHEALTHY Strengths: - Retention rates for all levels remained above 90%; retention rose for one level (92% to 94%) and for three or more levels (94% to 100%) below college level; - successful completion rate increased from 58% to 62% for one level below college level, and from 46% to 75% for two levels below college level; - persistence levels rose for one level (11.7% to 15.2%) and for two levels (34% to 63%) below college level; - withdrawals at all levels either decreased (one level below and three levels below college level) or stayed the same (two levels below college level); and Weakness: - retention fell slightly for two levels below college level (96% to 94%); - successful completion rates declined for three levels below college level (from 58% to 47%); - persistence levels decreased slightly (29% to 27%) for three or more levels below college level; and - success at subsequent levels decreased at all levels.
Overall Health	Cautionary: Demand Health paralleled a continuing drop in college enrollment. And though overall Effectiveness remained Unhealthy, Efficiency is Healthy, retention is high, and persistence and successful completion Indicators rose for some levels.
Distance Education	N/A
Perkins Core Indicators (if applicable)	N/A
Performance Funding Indicators (if applicable)	N/A
Describe any trends, and any internal and/or external factors that are relevant to	Overall enrollment decreased from AY 14-15; as such, Demand Health indicates decreased numbers of students enrolled. In addition, the Efficiency Indicator of Percentage of Classes Taught by Regular Discipline Faculty

understanding the program's data.	dropped significantly due to two vacant positions (due to resignations); those Regular Faculty classes were taught by lecturers until the positions were filled.
Discuss other strengths and challenges of the program that are relevant to understanding the program's data.	It is somewhat difficult to determine long-term trends in the Effectiveness and Success Indicators for two and three or more levels below college level: these levels involve relatively small numbers of students. In some cases, there may be only one or two sections offered each year, so the resulting percentages can fluctuate depending on the individual students in class.

Analyze the program's IRO data for the year under review. Discuss how data/analysis provided by the Institutional Research Office has been used for program improvement. (For example, how results from CCSSE or IRO research requests have impacted program development.)	
Describe, discuss, and provide context for the data.	In Fall 15, IRO provided data on the number of students placing into and enrolling in English courses for the purpose of anticipating scheduling changes due to the UHCCP #5.213 Time To Degree: Co-Requisite Initiative (in effect Fall 16).
Discuss changes made as a result of the IRO data.	IRO data informed department decisions regarding how many sections of different courses to schedule with the new accelerated (20R/21 and 21/102) ALP courses.

Report and discuss all major/meaningful actions and activities that occurred in the program during the review period. For example:	
Changes to the program's curriculum due to course additions, deletions, modifications (CRC, Fast Track, GE-designations), and re-sequencing	UHCCP #5.213 Time To Degree: Co-Requisite Initiative (in effect Fall 16) necessitated a complete curriculum structure change: co-requisite courses designed to enable students to complete college level English in fewer semesters were to be offered in place of stand-alone developmental education courses. In response, the English Department established a scaled up accelerated learning program (ALP) model. (ALP classes had been offered in previous years as a choice for students.) The new course offerings included English 1 (non-credit, 3 levels below college level), ENG 20R/21 ALP, and ENG 21/102 ALP. One section of stand-alone ENG 21 would be offered specifically for CTE students who needed only that level course in order to meet program requirements.
New certificates/degrees	N/A

Personnel and position additions and/or losses.	A higher number of sections was taught by lecturers in AY 15-16 due to two faculty resignations; both positions were filled for AY 16-17.
Other major/meaningful activities, including responses to previous CERC feedback.	To support the department's transition to a new accelerated curriculum model, the department created an internal professional development program with some of the Initiative funding: the program required participation in an initial 2-day training, participation in monthly meetings to discuss curricular and assessment strategies, submission of course materials, mid-term and end-of-semester feedback and reflection, and 4 hours/week (for full-time faculty) of wraparound services support for students. Faculty received reassigned time and participating lecturers received semester stipends. In support of this professional development, various faculty attended several national conferences on developmental education and accelerated learning.

Describe, analyze, and celebrate the program's successes and accomplishments. (For example, *more students were retained/graduated* **OR** *the program successfully integrated new strategies/technologies***.)**	
Discuss what the program has been doing well. Are there areas that needs to be maintained and strengthened? Please provide evidence if applicable (ex: program data reports, relevant URL links, etc.).	From the August 2015 systemwide announcement of the Initiative, the department strove to face the challenge of preparing for a new curricular structure within one year. Throughout AY 15-16, the department consistently participated in numerous systemwide Initiative committees in order to have a voice in the process of curricular model, new placement policy, and grading recommendations development. On our campus, we also worked with Student Services and Academic Affairs in order to prepare for changes involving the following: self-reported placement, advising, counselor-instructor partnerships, student needs inventory, Banner and catalog changes, and public notification of the new model. One area that did not receive sufficient attention during the planning for the curricular structure change was wraparound services. Though system English faculty voiced concern over limited development of this area, system administrative committees did not focus on this area; thus the College did not take steps to develop a more robust, comprehensive

	approach to wraparound services. As a result, the faculty decided to serve as the primary providers of this support; however, for the long-term success of the Initiative, more attention and resources must be dedicated to this component of developmental education student success.

Describe, analyze, and discuss any challenges and/or obstacles the program has faced.	
Identify and discuss the program's challenges/obstacles.	Faculty were most concerned about the lower level developmental students that may not succeed in an accelerated curriculum model. (Evidence of a lack of success for the lowest level students in accelerated/co-requisite models exists at the national level.) Faculty were also concerned about 1) the lack of curricular choice for students: most accelerated /co-req models across the country offer students a choice between stand-alone or accelerated/co-req courses; 2) the high stakes nature of the accelerated model, with 6-credit ALP course offerings; 3) the elimination of the three levels below college level course offerings for credit, which seemed to go against the College's open door policy; 4) the potential for lowered standards in response to the pressure to pass students in order to meet Initiative goals; 5) the lack of a comprehensive wraparound support services program for developmental level students; 6) Initiative funding for implementing the new model would be available for two years; however, after that time, it was unclear if there would be sufficient funding for critical support components such as tutoring, professional development, etc.
Discuss changes and actions taken to address those challenges, and any results of those actions.	The above concerns were raised in various system and College committee and departmental discussions throughout AY 15-16; however, the approved Initiative policies/recommendations and funding limitations did not allow for most of the challenges to be addressed. Though the 6-credit course offerings were a choice by the department, this was due to the fact that the ALP structure

	already existed in the department, and was a successful model also adopted at three other UHCC campuses. Also, the concern regarding maintaining standards will be taken up once results from AY 16-17 are in.
Discuss what still needs to be done in order to successfully meet and overcome these challenges.	Results of the new model and placement measures will come in AY 16-17. At that time, some of the above challenges will likely be revisited.

PROGRAM ACTION PLAN

Discuss the program's prior year's (AY14-15) action plan and results.	
Describe the program's action plan from the prior review period and discuss how it was implemented in AY15-16.	AY 14-15 Action Plan items: 1) Increase full-time faculty for developmental English courses. 2) Obtain funds to allow one faculty member teaching developmental reading to attend a national level professional development conference/workshop. 3) Supply three English classrooms (2 in Hilo, 1 at UHCWH) with tablets or laptops and storage for 25 students each. Funds were requested for above items via program review.
Discuss the results of the action plan and the program's success in achieving its goals.	1) No new position. 2) Due to Co-Requisite Initiative funding, several faculty were able to attend national level conferences: NADE: Des, Caroline; League for Innovation: Kate, Carrie; Achieving the Dream: Billie; CADE Baltimore: Kate, Sharon, Carrie, Billie, Caroline. 3) One English classroom at Hilo was equipped with laptops; PAL received one class set of laptops.
Discuss any challenges the program had in implementing that action plan or achieving its goals.	

- Did the program review its website during AY15-16? Please check the box below that applies.

☐ Reviewed website, no changes needed.

☑ Reviewed website and submitted change request to webmaster on <u>12/8/16</u>.

☐ Reviewed website and will submit change request to webmaster.

<mark>*Please note that requests for revisions to program websites must be submitted directly to the College's webmaster at*</mark>
http://hawaii.hawaii.edu/web-developer

Discuss the program's overall action plan for AY16-17, based on analysis of the Program's data and the overall results of course assessments of student learning outcomes conducted during the AY15-16 review period.	Benchmarks and Timelines for implementation and achievement of goals.
Action Goal 1: Implement new courses to expand ALP offerings and methods of delivery.	**Benchmarks/Timelines:** Fall 16
How can this action Goal lead to improvements in student learning and attainment of the program's learning outcomes (PLOs)? This goal is part of the UHCCP #5.213 Time To Degree: Co-Requisite Initiative requirements.	
Action Goal 2: Implement departmental professional development program.	**Benchmarks/Timelines:** Fall 16
How can this action Goal lead to improvements in student learning and attainment of the program's learning outcomes (PLOs)? A structured professional development program will enable faculty to collaborate regularly and purposefully regarding implementation of accelerated curricula. Discussions about instruction and assessment contribute to faculty innovation and improvement, with all efforts aimed toward increasing student learning and attainment of learning outcomes.	
Action Goal 3: Track results of new curriculum model.	**Benchmarks/Timelines:** Fall 16-Spring 17
How can this action Goal lead to improvements in student learning and attainment of the program's learning outcomes (PLOs)? In order to determine how successful the new accelerated model is for our students, data must be carefully tracked and analyzed. Results will be used to evaluate the model's effect on student learning and success.	
Action Goal 4: Participate in national level professional development.	Fall 16-Spring 17

How can this action Goal lead to improvements in student learning and attainment of the program's learning outcomes (PLOs)?
Exposure to national level innovations and practices can help faculty consider new approaches at the forefront of the discipline, especially regarding accelerated education. The aim of all instructional professional development is to improve student learning and success.

RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS

> *NOTE: General budget asks are included in the 3-year Comprehensive Review. Budget asks for the following categories only may be included in the Annual review: health and safety needs, emergency needs, and/or necessary needs to become compliant with Federal/State laws/regulations.*

Please provide a brief statement about any implications of or challenges with the program's current operating resources.

For budget asks in the allowed categories (see above):	
Describe the needed item(s) in detail.	
Include estimated cost(s) and timeline(s) for procurement.	
Explain how the item(s) aligns with one or more of the strategic initiatives of 2015-2021 Strategic Directions.	

http://hawaii.hawaii.edu/sites/default/files/docs/strategic-plan/hawcc-strategic-directions-2015-2021.pdf

LEARNING OUTCOMES ASSESSMENT

For all parts of this section, please provide information based on CLO (course learning outcomes) assessments conducted in AY 2015-16, and information on the aligned (PLOs) program learning outcomes assessed through those course assessments.

If applicable, please also include information about any PLO assessment projects voluntarily conducted by the program's faculty/staff.

Evidence of Industry Validation and Participation in Assessment (<mark>for CTE programs only</mark>)
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). **<mark>Please attach copy of industry validation for the year under review and submit with the document.</mark>**

Courses Assessed

- List all program courses assessed during AY 2015-16, including those courses for which a follow-up "Closing the Loop" assessment was implemented during the review year.

Assessed Course Alpha, No., & Title	Semester assessed	CLOs assessed (CLO# & text)	CLO-to-PLO alignment (aligned PLO# & text)
No Rem-ENG courses were scheduled for assessment in AY15-16. ENG 21 assessment was done 2014-15. ENG 20R assessment was done AY16-17.			
"Closing the Loop" Assessments Alpha, No., & Title	**Semester assessed**	**CLOs assessed (CLO# & text)**	**CLO-to-PLO alignment (aligned PLO# & text)**

Assessment Strategies

For each course assessed in AY 2015-16 listed above, provide a brief description of the assessment strategy, including:	
a description of the type of <u>student work or activity assessed</u> (e.g., research paper, lab report, hula performance, etc.);	No Rem-ENG courses were scheduled for assessment in AY15-16. ENG 21 assessment was done 2014-15. ENG 20R assessment was done AY16-17.
a description of <u>who conducted the assessment</u> (e.g., the faculty member who taught the course, or a group of program faculty, or the program's advisory council members, etc.);	
a description of <u>how student artefacts were selected for assessment</u> (did the assessment include summative student work from all students in the course or section, <u>OR</u> were student works selected based on a representative sample of students in each section of the course?);	
a brief discussion of the <u>assessment rubric/scoring guide</u> that identifies	

criteria/categories and standards.	

Expected Levels of Achievement

- For each course assessed in AY 2015-16, indicate the benchmark goal for student success for each CLO assessed.
  - example 1: "85% of students will Meet Standard or Exceed Standard for CLO#1";
  - example 2: "80% of students will attain Competency or Mastery of CLO#4."

Assessed Course Alpha, No., & Title	Benchmark Goal for Student Success for Each CLO Assessed
	No Rem-ENG courses were scheduled for assessment in AY15-16. ENG 21 assessment was done 2014-15. ENG 20R assessment was done AY16-17.

Results of Course Assessments

For each course assessed in AY 2015-16:	
provide a <u>description of the summative assessment results</u> in terms of students' attainment of the CLOs and aligned PLOs.	No Rem-ENG courses were scheduled for assessment in AY15-16. ENG 21 assessment was done 2014-15. ENG 20R assessment was done AY16-17.

Other Comments

Include any additional information that will help clarify the program's course assessment results.	
Include comparisons to any applicable College or related UH-System 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 that are not discussed elsewhere in this report.	

Next Steps – Assessment Action Plan

Describe the program's intended next steps to improve student learning, based on the program's overall AY 2015-16 assessment results. Include any specific strategies, tactics, activities, or plans for instructional change, revisions to assessment practices, and/or increased student support.	
Instructional changes may include, for example, revisions to curriculum, teaching methods, course syllabi, course outlines of record (CORs), and other curricular elements.	
Proposals for program modifications may include, for example, re-sequencing courses across semesters, or re-distribution of teaching resources, etc.	
Revisions to assessment strategies or practices may include, for example, revisions to learning outcome statements (CLOs and/or PLOs), department or course assessment rubrics (criteria and/or standards),	

development of multi-section/course summative assignments or exams, etc.	
Student support and outreach initiatives may include, for example, wrap-around student services, targeted tutoring and/or mentoring, etc.	

Part VI. 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 VII. External Data

If your program utilizes external licensures, enter:

Number sitting for an exam   _____
Number passed   _____