HAWAI'I COMMUNITY COLLEGE
ANNUAL PROGRAM REVIEW (APR)

Co-Req English

Date: April 15, 2019

Review Period
July 1, 2017 to June 30, 2018

Initiators: Joni Onishi, Melanie Wilson
Writer: Robyn Kalauli

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

The English department offers two accelerated learning programs: English 102/21, College Reading/Introduction to College Reading and English 100/21, Composition I/Introduction to Composition. We also offer English 20, Reading and Writing Essentials, which combines reading and writing instruction for students who do not place into the English 102/21 and English 100/22 ALP courses.

ARPD Data: Analysis of Quantitative Indicators (required by UH System)
Program data can be found on the ARPD website: http://www.hawaii.edu/offices/cc/arpd/

Analyze the program's data for the review period.
Describe, discuss, and provide context for the data based on the categories included in the ARPD data sheet provided by UH Systems.

	New Students[1]	Enrolled in any English	Did not Enroll
Fall 2016	489	280 or 57%	209 or 43%
Fall 2017	481	276 or 57%	205 or 43%

Table 1 (above) shows that for both Fall 2016 and Fall 2017, we have remained consistent in the number of new students enrolling for English courses within the first year. Since the data only includes writing courses, this number would be higher if reading courses were also included as many students take reading courses before writing courses. Also, we do not currently have a policy that requires students to enroll in English within their first year, and students are not always advised to take English in the first year. Moreover, our campus is just implementing mandatory advising for new students, so some students may have registered for classes completely own their own in AY 16-17 and AY 17-18.

Table 2. Strategic Directions: College-Level English Completion by Placement, New Students[1]

	AY 16-17		
	Enrolled	Completed[2]	% Completed College Level
College	290	164	57%
1-level	97	36	37%
2+ levels	46	7	15%
No Placement	6	4	67%
TOTAL	439	211	48%
AY 17-18			

Enrolled	Completed[2]	% Completed College Level
296	163	55%
69	19	28%
58	25	43%
19	9	47%
442	214	48%

Table 2 shows that from AY 16-17 to AY 17-18, the success rate for students taking 1-level and 2+ levels below college level by placement and no placement varied significantly while the success rates for college level were almost the same. This suggests that we need to reexamine our placement options to ensure that students are correctly placed. Many factors may affect the data for placement shown above, so we need to carefully examine all placement options for accuracy.

	AY 16-17			AY 17-18		
English Course	Enrolled	Completed	% Completed	Enrolled	Completed	% Completed
100	871	545	63%	793	452	57%
20W	84	57	68%	25	15	60%
22	201	109	54%	135	83	61%
97	-	-		31	19	61%

Table 3 shows English course completion rates for all students. Again, this data only contains information for writing courses and excludes reading courses. It is unclear from the data provided why the success rates were higher overall in AY 16-17 than AY 17-18. More specific data is needed to better interpret this data to make improvements in completion rates.

What else is relevant to understanding the program's data? Describe any trends, internal/external factors, strengths and/or challenge that can help the reader understand the program's data but are not discussed above.	The English 102/21 ALP courses are not included in the ARPD data, which makes the data inaccurate for our campus. We encourage students to take the reading ALP first (if students need to take both the reading and writing ALP), so often students do take English within the first year, but they take reading courses, which are not reflected in the ARPD data. Success rates for the reading ALP courses are also not included in ARPD data.

PROGRAM ACTIVITIES

Report and discuss all major actions and activities that occurred in the program during the AY17-18 review period.
Creation of ENG 97 and ESL 97X experimental courses, designed to serve students placing 2-levels below college level in reading and writing (first run in Fall 17). ENG 97 is not a permanent course, ENG 20, and ESL 97X is in the process of becoming a permanent course. Achievement results from the first year of the Co-Requisite Initiative indicate success for a number of students (particularly one level below college level) in completing two or more levels of English in fewer semesters. The Department's professional development/wraparound support program has enabled instructors to spend needed time with students outside of class to provide additional support.   Course changes   ENG 18 - Retired (ENG) ENG 19 - Retired (ENG) ENG 20 - New course (ENG) ENG 20R - Retired (ENG) ENG 21 - 20% course review modifications (ENG) ENG 105 - 20% course review modifications (ENG) ENG 205 - Retired (ENG) ENG 257A - 20% course review modifications (ENG) ENG 257E - 20% course review modifications (ENG)

AY18-19 PROGRAM ACTION PLAN

Provide a detailed narrative discussion of the program's overall action plan for AY18-19, based on analysis of the Program's AY17-18 data and the overall results of course learning outcomes assessments conducted during the AY17-18 review period.   **This Action Plan should identify the program's specific goals and objectives for AY18-19 and must provide benchmarks or timelines for achieving each goal.**
To create and implement an effective action plan, we need accurate data to reflect the actual number of our students who are enrolling and completing English courses within the first year of attending college. Currently, only writing courses are included in the FYE data, but several of our students take reading courses before writing courses, so we need the inclusion of our reading classes in the FYE data to make informed decisions regarding improving first year enrollment. I am working with Melanie Dorado Wilson, Dean for Liberal Arts and Public Services, to collect and analyze data that will reflect accurate FYE information for English. The timeline for this goal is to collect and analyze data in fall 2019. Another goal is to work with Student Services to increase the number of students taking ENG courses in the first year.   By working with student services, we can help students enroll in ENG courses in the first year, and the ENG department will schedule adequate classes to meet these needs. The English department met with counselors this semester, and I will continue to work with counseling in fall 2019 to achieve this goal. Additionally, we will continue the ENG department Professional Development Program, continue to provide training for faculty regarding FYE best practices

(such as AVID), and we will continue to pilot FYE components in ENG 102 courses and possibly ENG 100 courses. Continual professional development is crucial to help ENG faculty best meet student needs in ENG courses. Our professional development program offers collaboration and current best practices/pedagogy, while AVID trainings help improve student retention and success rates in courses. Our pilot courses that incorporate certain FYE components into ENG 102 will help with not only retention and success in ENG courses but for all courses in general. These courses were offered in spring 2019; I will meet with the faculty who taught these classes for feedback, and the English department will continue to pilot courses that incorporate certain FYE components into ENG 102 in fall 2019.

ACTION ITEMS TO ACCOMPLISH ACTION PLAN

For each Action Item below, describe the strategies, tactics, initiatives, innovations, activities, etc., that the program plans to implement in order to accomplish the goals described in the Action Plan above.

For each Action Item below, discuss how implementing this action will help lead to improvements in student learning and their attainment of the program's learning outcomes (PLOs).

Action Item 1:
Collect and analyze the following data:
1. Request data for first year enrollment for all ENG courses- to include reading and writing – to get an accurate number of students taking ENG courses in the first year.
2. Request data for success rates for all ENG courses- to include reading and writing- to get an accurate number of students successfully completing ENG courses in the first year.
3. Request students' Accuplacer reading and writing scores compared to their ENG 100 and ENG 102 performance to assess placement into ENG courses.
Once we have accurate data regarding first year enrollment, completion, and placement, we can make more informed decisions regarding how to make specific changes to best help students succeed in ENG courses.

Action Item 2:
Work with Student Services to increase the number of students taking ENG courses in the first year.
1. Discuss mandatory advising for all new students.
2. Discuss national data regarding the benefits of taking ENG courses in the first year to encourage counselors to advise students to take ENG courses in the first year.

3. Ensure that enough ENG courses are offered to accommodate students taking ENG course in the first year. By working with student services, we can help students enroll in ENG courses in the first year; the ENG department will schedule adequate classes to meet these needs.	

Action Item 3:

Continue the ENG department Professional Development Program, continue to provide training for faculty regarding FYE best practices (such as AVID), continue to pilot FYE components in ENG 102 courses and possibly ENG 100 courses.

Continual professional development is crucial to help ENG faculty best meet student needs in ENG courses. Our professional development program offers collaboration and current best practices/pedagogy, while AVID trainings help improve student retention and success rates in courses. Our pilot courses that incorporate certain FYE components into ENG 102 will help with not only retention and success in ENG courses but for all courses in general.

LEARNING OUTCOMES ASSESSMENTS

For all parts of this section, please provide information based on CLO (course learning outcomes) or PLO (program learning outcomes) assessments conducted in AY17-18.

Courses Assessed

List all program courses assessed during AY17-18, including Initial and "Closing the Loop" assessments.

Assessed Course Alpha, No., & Title	Semester assessed	CLOs assessed (CLO#s)	PLO alignment (PLO#s)
ENG 100 Composition I	Spring 2018	CLO 1: compose college-level writing with a clear purpose, in a form appropriate to intended audiences; CLO 2: demonstrate critical thinking in the process of writing; CLO 3: document credible sources in accordance with an appropriate style guide	CLO 1- PLO 1 CLO 2- PLO 2 CLO 3- PLO 1

Assessment Strategies

For each course assessed in AY17-18 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.);
- a description of <u>how student artefacts were selected for assessment</u> (e.g., the assessment included summative assignments from all students in the course, <u>OR</u> a sample of students' summative assignments was randomly selected for assessment based on a representative percentage of students in each section of the course);
- a brief discussion of the <u>assessment rubric/scoring guide</u> and the criteria/categories and standards used in the assessment.

Course Alpha/#: ENG 100

In an effort to norm ENG 100 writing expectations across the UHCC system, the community colleges conducted a system-wide assessment of ENG 100, collecting artifacts from the Fall 2017 semester and reviewing a selected sample of them, in a large, system-wide norming session, in Spring 2018. All the colleges participated , with each ENG 100 instructor asked to submit one student's summative assignment as stated in these directions: Every CC instructor who taught ENG 100 and/or its accelerated or co-requisite counterpart anonymously submitted one student essay that met the following criteria: • Minimally passing (where pass/not pass is in question, i.e., low C or high D) • Thesis-driven and with at least one student-selected source (e.g., research, analysis, argument, report) • From the second half of the Fall 2017 semester and for an assignment meant to represent that the student has met the course SLOs The norming was be done by participants of the system-wide English discipline meeting on April 13th , 2018. The outcome of this norming provided a set of exemplars and descriptors for minimally passing essays, including how various instructors measure the passing of an essay given a writer's variable skills to meet the rubric.

Expected Levels of Achievement

For each course assessed in AY17-18 listed above, state the standard (benchmark, goal) for student success for each CLO assessed AND the percentage of students expected to meet that standard for each CLO.

Example: "CLO#1: The standard for student success is that students will answer 80% of the questions on the final exam related to CLO#1 correctly. The expectation is that 85% of students will meet this standard for CLO#1."

Example: "CLO#4: The standard for student success is that students will be able to perform skills associated with CLO#4 with 80% proficiency. The expectation is that 75% of students will meet this standard for CLO#4."

Assessed Course Alpha, No., & Title	Assessed CLO#	Standard for Success	% of Students Expected to Meet Standard
ENG 100 Composition I	1, 2, 3	There is a parity of expectations throughout the	This was system-wide essay norming activity that did not specify a

		system for a minimally passing ENG 100 essay.	specific percentage of students to meet a specific standard.

Results of Course Assessments

For each course assessed in AY17-18 listed above, provide: • **a statement of the quantitative results;**   • **a brief narrative analysis of those results.**

Course Alpha/#: ENG 100

A total of 54 instructors submitted samples, and the norming committee selected eight of these essays in an effort to reduce the number of random samples to a reasonable size and to provide a view of a range of problems in the essays that made the borderline. Instructors redacted the student name and their name from the essays and submitted them via Google form either as an attachment or as an anonymous "copy and paste" entry. At the UHCC English Summit on April 13th, 2018, representatives from all of the CCs and Maui read and scored the eight samples using the rubric approved at the Fall meeting as their guideline. They then worked with a small, cross-system group to discuss their findings and select which of the eight essays to advance as the best exemplar of a minimally passing essay. Each group presented its results and rationale to prompt discussion on the challenges and strategies used in evaluating student work. Results (sorted by names of the essays) The following essays were chosen as exemplars of minimally passing essays by the groups, to different degrees: • "Corporal Punishment": Four groups selected this essay as a sample of minimally passing work. The essay contains a thesis, demonstrates some critical thinking and promising ideas, and is adequately organized. While the essay generally exhibits passable source use and evaluation, it nonetheless contains several instances of plagiarism. Participants generally disagreed about whether these instances should automatically fail a paper at the ENG 100 level. Discussion ensued about plagiarism policies and about how to best deal with accidental plagiarism and its varying levels of severity (just forgot a citation? paraphrased poorly? ignorance of quotation use and basic source integration?). Some argue that plagiarism in any form should not be tolerated, whereas others worry that penalizing students too strictly may keep promising students back from further learning later. Overall, many agreed that instructor's evaluation of papers with plagiarism is very much dependent on the context: what we know about each student and his/her learning progression. • "The War on Food": Three groups selected this essay as a sample of minimally passing work. Although the essay was repetitive at times, it nonetheless contained a recognizable organization. Some evaluated the thesis as adequately aligned with the support; others saw drift from the thesis as demonstrating inadequate skill. Some assessed source evaluation/choices as weak because the writer didn't appear to have developed enough contextual knowledge and understanding of the source material to handle the topic, whereas others saw the source use and literacy info as adequate for minimally passing. • "The War on Substance Abuse": Two groups selected this essay as a sample of minimally passing work. The essay demonstrates rudimentary organizational skills (a

"protoorganization") and adequate ability to think critically (in the first body paragraph); neither ability is fully developed and articulated. The essay proposes a solution that showed some thought. The essay also demonstrates emerging ability to identify and use credible sources rather than simply producing a research "dump." Although the essay needs more sources and more synthesis of those sources, it demonstrates the writer's potential to manage in higher level writing classes. • "Homelessness": One group selected this as an example of the work produced by a writer who may have just the bare minimum skills needed to survive in future courses. The sentences generally make sense, and the writer avoided plagiarism even if he/she still uses sources poorly. The organization is weak but nonetheless demonstrates a rudimentary understanding of paragraphing. • "Brackish Water Aquaponics": One group selected this essay as an example of a barely passing essay that demonstrated some critical thinking and some attempt to structure the writer's ideas. One group, however, considered the essay to have scored too high to qualify as minimally passing. The essay includes some plagiarism. Feedback on the Rubric There is variation in rubric interpretation; numbering system can lead to confusion We need to define the distinction between support and evidence; clarify where to place MLA documentation, source integration, choosing sources, use of sources; identify where to evaluate students' explanations and analysis of sources Critical thinking -- there might be an attempt but where do those students fall between rating 2 (weak) and 3 (demonstrating) Thesis ← → Development/Support -- These are so connected but in the rubric they're separate which needed some discussion Should improvement be measured on the rubric? Has the student been trending upwards in generating ideas and their writing process? Maybe the execution was not there but the process is showing promise. How many sourced papers have these students written? How much practice with documentation, etc.? All we know is these papers are from the 2nd half of the semester. Improve consistency of the language used in the rubric How can we bring in "engaging for the reader" into the rubric? Grammar and sentence mechanics -- some students wrote short, simple, correct sentences; some stretched and wrote more complex sentences but ended up with errors. Where or how can this be incorporated into the rubric? How is plagiarism reflected in this rubric? (in level 1 = "skillfully"; in level 2 it just says "consistent")

Other Comments

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

Since the ENG 100 assessment was part of a system-wide essay norming assessment effort, we focused on system-wide alignment for assessing ENG 100 essays (grade norming).

Discuss, if relevant, a summary of student survey results, CCSSE, e-CAFE, graduate-leaver surveys, special evaluations, or other assessment instruments that are not discussed elsewhere in this report.

N/A

Next Steps – ASSESSMENT ACTION PLAN for AY18-19

Describe the program's intended next steps to improve student learning, based on the program's overall AY17-18 assessment results. Include any specific strategies, tactics, activities or plans for improvement in program or course assessment practices, methods or tools, rubrics, schedules, etc.
After the summit, instructors were sent an evaluation asking for feedback on the assessment activity. About half of the summit participants responded to the evaluation. The results showed that 80% of respondents thought that their grading would change as a result of the session. While these results could mean many things, they suggest that grade norming can be useful for helping instructors to re-think the way they evaluate essays, and to perhaps be more aligned with their colleagues. Only 20% of respondents said that they would not change at all; on the other hand, 20% said that they would change their grading a lot.   At the moment, there are no actions plans for system-wide assessment, but we're hopeful that department chairs will share the exemplars of minimally passing essays so that faculty can discuss them within departments. Norming is valuable and effective in helping colleagues to become less subjective in the complex task of grading student work.