

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

DEVELOPMENTAL WRITING

Date: May 9, 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 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.
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: Required for ARPD Web Submission

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	2016 DEV WRITING ARPD

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.	<p>Developmental Education as discussed in the 2015 Comprehensive Review:</p> <p>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.</p> <p><u>Dev Ed Resources Requests:</u> Instructors, tutors, peer mentors, academic coaches/case managers, and technology to support students in accelerated dev ed courses</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Establish new BOR position
---	---

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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

Please attach a copy of the program's ARPD data tables and submit with the Program Review document.

- 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	<p>UNHEALTHY</p> <p>Strengths: Though demand for developmental writing classes is categorized as unhealthy (due to a dramatic decrease compared to previous AY), the courses still serve a considerable number of students:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 401 students enrolled in development writing courses; • 93 semester hours taught; • 258 full-time students enrolled; and • 1452 student semester hours taught. <p>Weaknesses:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • enrollment in developmental writing courses dropped from 497 to 401; student semester hours taught dropped from 1809 to 1452.
Efficiency	HEALTHY

	<p>Strengths:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Average class size of 15.6 out of class capacity of 20 indicates efficiency of class size; • fill rate for developmental writing classes increased to 86.5%; and • percentage of courses taught by regular discipline faculty increased from 44% to 58%. <p>Weakness:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 4 low enrolled classes were offered.
Effectiveness	<p>UNHEALTHY</p> <p>Strengths:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Retention rates remained above 90% for one level below and two levels below college level; • successful completion rates increased slightly for all levels (from 52% to 59% for one level below college level, from 66% to 70% for two levels below, and from 55% to 58% for three levels below); • persistence levels rose for two levels below college level (32% to 41%) and for three levels below (44% to 51%); and • success in the subsequent level for one level below college level increased from 56.4% to 67.3%. <p>Weakness:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • retention fell slightly for two levels below college level (95% to 92%); • withdrawals increased slight (from 8 to 10 students) for two levels below and three levels below college level; • persistence levels decreased slightly (34% to 30%) for one level below college level; and • the number of students successful in the subsequent level decreased from 24 to 19 for three levels below college level.
Overall Health	Cautionary: Demand Health paralleled a continuing drop in college enrollment. And though overall Effectiveness remained Unhealthy, Efficiency is Healthy, retention is relatively 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	Overall enrollment decreased from AY 14-15; as such, Demand Health indicates decreased numbers of students enrolled. In addition, although the

and/or external factors that are relevant to understanding the program's data.	Efficiency Indicator of Percentage of Classes Taught by Regular Discipline Faculty increased from AY 14-15, over 40% of classes are still taught by lecturers.
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 semester, 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 (20W/22 and 22/100) 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 resequencing	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 20W/22 ALP, and ENG 22/100 ALP.
New certificates/degrees	N/A
Personnel and position	A significant number of sections was taught by lecturers in AY 15-

additions and/or losses.	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, <i>more students were retained/graduated OR the program successfully integrated new strategies/technologies.</i>)	
Discuss what the program has been doing well. Are there areas that need 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.	<p>AY 14-15 Action Plan items:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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. <p>Funds were requested for above items via program review.</p>
Discuss the results of the action plan and the program's success in achieving its goals.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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 12/8/16.

- Reviewed website and will submit change request to webmaster.

Please note that requests for revisions to program websites must be submitted directly to the College's webmaster at

<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 <u>2015-2021 Strategic Directions</u> .	

<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 (for CTE programs only)

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). **Please attach copy of industry validation for the year under review and submit with the document.**

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)
ENG 22	Fall 15	CLO 2, 3, 4	PLO 1, 2
"Closing the Loop" Assessments Alpha, No., & Title	Semester assessed	CLOs assessed (CLO# & text)	CLO-to-PLO alignment (aligned PLO# & text)
ENG 22	Spring 16	CLO 3	PLO 2

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.);	<p>Fall 15 Project: In-class essay assignment written on the English Department Writing Assessment Day (May 7, 2015) or during the section's regularly-scheduled final exam time. Students responded to a text-based prompt. Students were given the reading in advance, and were allowed to discuss the text in class one week prior to the in-class essay; however, students did not receive the specific writing prompt until the day of the exam. Students created a Works Cited page outside of class before the exam, and turned it in separately. They were able to use a dictionary and writing handbook during the exam, but were not allowed to use electronic devices.</p> <p>Spring 16 Project: Source-based take-home papers were submitted for assessment: some were final papers, some not, but all submitted in late April or early May. The students' task was to read an article on higher education and respond, citing the source and using details to support their thesis in a multi-paragraph paper. The English department wanted to focus rather narrowly on the students' ability to incorporate outside sources into an argumentative response as this had been noted as a weakness for 100 level students and an important outcome for college writing. While this second outcome was the main focus, faculty members looked at a comprehensive rubric to more holistically evaluate student work.</p>
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.);	<p>Fall 15 Project: Instructors for all sections of ENG 22 in Spring 15 administered the assessment; both ENG 22 instructors and full-time faculty (regardless of whether they were teaching ENG 22) participated in the evaluation of student work.</p> <p>Spring 16 Project: Instructors for multiple sections of ENG 22 submitted student work; both ENG 22 instructors and full-time faculty (regardless of whether they were teaching ENG 22) participated in the evaluation of student work.</p>
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?);	<p>Fall 15 Project: Random samples were collected from nearly all Spring 15 ENG 22 sections.</p> <p>Spring 16 Project: Instructors submitted three student papers selected randomly from each section.</p>

<p>a brief discussion of the <u>assessment rubric/scoring guide</u> that identifies criteria/categories and standards.</p>	<p>Fall 15 Project: The “current” (for Fall 15) draft of the ENG 22 rubric was used for the assessment project, though faculty intended to discuss potential revisions during the Spring 15 semester prior to the end-of-semester assessment.</p> <p>Spring 16 Project: The same rubric was used as in the Fall 15 assessment project.</p>
--	--

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
ENG 22	<p>Fall 15 Project: 65% of papers would earn a 3 or 4 (indicating Competence)</p> <p>Spring 16 Project: 65% of papers would earn a 3 or 4 (indicating Competence)</p>

Results of Course Assessments

For each course assessed in AY 2015-16:	
<p>provide a <u>description of the summative assessment results</u> in terms of students’ attainment of the CLOs and aligned PLOs.</p>	<p>Fall 15 Project:</p> <p>Results (on a scale of 1 to 4; score of 3 or 4 indicates Competence):</p> <p>Sourcing: 6 out of 15 papers scored 3 or 4. Reasoning: 5 out of 15 papers scored 3 or 4. Structure/Organization: 5 out of 15 papers scored 3 or 4. Mechanics/Language: 5 out of 15 papers scored 3 or 4.</p> <p>*Note: Most of the papers that earned scores of 3 or 4 (noted above) received near-split scoring (e.g., five of the nine readers gave it 3 or 4). Such split scoring led to a discussion of varied performance expectation levels and the importance of norming.</p> <p>Results fall short of the 65% expected level of achievement. However, that percentage was based on prior department-wide exit assessments that were less complex and that used a more simplistic rubric. This ENG 22 assessment assignment was intentionally more challenging with a higher level of performance expectation (per a more developed rubric). Therefore, it is not surprising that the results did not meet stated expectations.</p> <p>The October 23, 2015 ENG 22 assessment meeting discussion</p>

	<p>determined the following regarding the ENG 22 assessment project:</p> <p>Identified Strengths:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Overall, students demonstrated adequate understanding of the concept of identifying sources in writing; though MLA conventions may not have been correctly followed, most artifacts demonstrated clear separation between author's and student's language • Effective reading selection <p>Identified Weaknesses:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not much of students' own thinking (outside of the article) • Ineffective paraphrasing • Prompt could have been worded more clearly to encourage student expression of own ideas, examples, thinking, etc. • Rubric could be improved to more clearly differentiate between score 2 and 3; possible separation/movement of "Development" indicator <p>Overall impressions were that students demonstrated better communication skills than critical reading and critical thinking skills. The project itself clearly indicates a strong emphasis on the Communication, Critical Reading, and Critical Thinking PLOs, especially in the faculty's choice of assignment and resulting recommendations to increase the amount of reading-based writing assignments in order to practice and require more critical thinking skills. Such reading, writing, and critical thinking skills instruction and reinforcement contribute directly to the College's mission to develop our students' abilities to succeed both academically and as lifelong learners.</p> <p>Areas of weakness included signaling outside sources, interpreting or explaining those quotations and reasoning. Overall, the group agreed that only through repetition will students gain mastery. Some of the papers reflected the first or second formal assessment of sourcing and reasoning. Using outside sources in various individual and group practices, developing exigency to create better reasoning, and practicing grammar in context will encourage better writing. An ideal of writing four pages a week was proffered as a goal for informal and formal writing.</p> <p>Spring 16 Project:</p> <p>Scores ranged from 55% to 75% achieving "at or above" standard (scores of 3 or 4).</p> <p>Individual instructors varied on what constituted, above, meets, approaching, and failing scores, so there was some discrepancy despite norming papers.</p>
--	--

	<p>The score overall was 67.5% in the collected student artifact sample papers.</p> <p>Disaggregated scores in the four areas: citing = 55% at or above standard; <i>did not meet expectations</i> reasoning = 72% at or above standard; <i>met expectations</i> structure/ organization = 75% at or above standard; <i>met expectations</i> mechanics = 68% at or above standard; <i>met expectations</i></p> <p>Areas of weakness included signaling outside sources, interpreting or explaining those quotations, and reasoning. Overall, the group agreed that only through repetition will students gain mastery. Some of the papers reflected the first or second formal assessment of sourcing and reasoning. Using outside sources in various individual and group practices, developing exigency to create better reasoning, and practicing grammar in context will encourage better writing. An ideal of four pages a week was proffered as a goal for informal and formal writing.</p> <p>The lowest scores were the citing/sourcing. This had been noted in past ENG100 assessments and as such, chosen as the skill to hone for those students coming from ENG22. Despite the low scores, it must be noted that this is not necessarily the skill that was practiced the most, and for some instructors, this was the first formal assessment of MLA conventions. It was unanimous that more practice in using citations was necessary if the skill is to be mastered at this level. Mechanics was the next lowest score, as instructors varied philosophically on how to grade student error.</p> <p>The May 13, 2016 ENG 22 assessment meeting yielded the following reflections:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Instructors felt in general these were stronger papers 2) In fact, the scores were noticeably lower. Possible reasons could be: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Higher expectations b. More and varied articles being used and synthesized c. Inconsistency in rubric application <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. In discussion with each other on specific papers, different interpretations of the same issue led to lower/higher scores. 3) Five-year plan <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. All 22s should use one article. This assessment differed in the Fall 15 project, so we were not strictly comparing like products. b. Rubric needs revising for this assignment. c. Students need more and better logic and reasoning practice. More critical thinking. d. Rethink assignments and course scaffolding more holistically, using Backward Design.
--	---

--	--

Other Comments

Include any additional information that will help clarify the program's course assessment results.

<p>Include comparisons to any applicable College or related UH-System program standards, or to any national standards from industry, professional organizations, or accrediting associations.</p> <p>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.</p>	
--	--

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.

<p>Instructional changes may include, for example, revisions to curriculum, teaching methods, course syllabi, course outlines of record (CORs), and other curricular elements.</p>	<p>Recommendations from both Fall 15 and Spring 16 projects:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More instructional emphasis on Course Objectives #4, 5 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Reading comprehension ○ Accurate/adequate paraphrasing ○ Synthesizing information ○ Integrating own ideas with source info ○ “reading like a writer” practice • More reading-based writing assignments and scaffolding • Library instruction • Norming session(s)
--	---

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ At end and/or beginning of semesters for ALL writing faculty and lecturers ○ Read a sample paper or two <u>from each course</u> (20W, 22, 100)—with emphasis on selected papers straddling the Competent (3) and Emerging (2) levels ○ Identify anchors and/or revise rubric ● Change Course Information Sheet to include requirement of a (minimal number of) reading-based writing assignment(s) ● Share best practices/sample assignments addressing source use/integration and grammar issues ● Combined Reading and Writing meetings to discuss increasing integrated reading-writing practice/assignments in BOTH classes ● Combined Reading/Writing classes: linked 100/102, 22/102 <p><u>Action Items</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● More use of outside sources or reading and response: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Low-stakes response papers ○ Summary and commentary ○ Current events/news journals ○ Peer/group sharing ● Burke's Cocktail Party (a la <i>They Say, I Say</i>) ● Teaching grammar in context ● Choosing and deconstructing good sentences ● More persuasive and argumentative papers ● Modeling academic language in class ● Opportunities for revision of essays—some instructors have not allowed
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-	See above discussion in Results and Action Plan sections (re: changes to rubric and common assessment assignment).

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 _____