

Comprehensive
Program
Of
Developmental
English
For
2018-2019

Prepared by
Bridget Carson

15 March 2019



Table of Contents

1.0 Program Data and Resource Repository.....	3
1.1 Program Summary	3
Narrative:	3
1.2 Quantitative and Qualitative Data.....	4
Narrative:	3
2.0 Student Success	11
2.1 Define Student Success.....	11
Narrative:	11
2.2 Achieve/Promote Student Success	11
Narrative:	11
3.0 Assessment of Student Learning Outcomes	12
3.1 Reflection on assessment	12
Narrative:	12
3.2 Significant Assessment Findings	14
Narrative:	5
3.3 Ongoing Assessment Plans	15
Narrative:	15
4.0 External Constituency and Significant Trends	16
4.1: Program Advisory Committee:	16
Narrative:	16
4.2: Specialized Accreditation:.....	17
Narrative:	17
4.3: Other:.....	17
Narrative:	17
5.0 Curriculum Reflection	18
Narrative:	18
5.2 Degree and Certificate Offerings or Support.....	19
Narrative:	19
6.0 Faculty Success	19
6.1 Program Accomplishments.....	19
Narrative:	19

6.2 Faculty Accomplishments	19
Narrative:	8
6.3 Innovative Research, Teaching and Community Service	20
Narrative:	20
7.0 Program Planning & Development for Student Success	21
7.1 Narrative Reflection on Qualitative and Quantitative Data and Trends	21
Narrative:	21
7.2 Academic Program Vitality Reflection, Goals and Action Plans	22
Narrative:	22
7.3 Academic Program Goals and Action Plans	23
Narrative:	23
7.4 Mission and Strategic Plan Alignment	23
Narrative:	23
8.0 Fiscal Resource Requests/Adjustments	25
8.1 Budget Requests/Adjustments	25
Narrative:	25
9.0 Program Planning and Development Participation	27
9.1 Faculty and Staff	27
Narrative:	27
9.2 VPAA and/or Administrative Designee Response	27
Narrative:	27
10.0 Appendices	28

1.0 Program Data and Resource Repository

1.1 Program Summary

The program should provide a descriptive summary of the program.

Narrative: The Developmental English Program provides non-college credit bearing, sub-college level coursework to support the reading and writing skills of students after multiple measures have determined they are in need of additional support to be successful in displaying understanding and mastery of college level content across the curriculum. The two courses in this program are English Skills Development (DEV 0115) and Composition Preparation (DEV 0143). English Skills focuses at the sentence and paragraph level for both reading and writing. It is a 5 credit hour class and stresses reading for detail, inference, critical thinking about information, its presentation, and source reliability, and expanding vocabulary in multiple genres; it also stresses using a writing process to write clear theses, detailed support, paraphrasing, small scale citation, formal mechanical usage in an academic setting, and framing for audience including MLA formatting. Composition Preparation focuses on the five-paragraph essay structure. It is a 3 credit hour class and stresses reading for detail, inference, critical thinking about information, its presentation and source reliability, and expanding vocabulary in multiple genres more independently than in English Skills; it also stresses using a writing process to generate five paragraph essays both in an in-class setting, such as on an exam, and a revised and edited formal paper, such as a term paper, where students create introductions to theses supported by three detailed body paragraphs of support summarized by a conclusion with paraphrasing, small scale citation, formal mechanical usage in an academic setting, and framing for audience including MLA formatting. Students have track flexibility out of this program into the college level Composition sequence. A student may make a decision in the context of their overall course load to move from English Skills to Composition I or Composition I with Supplement or move from English Skills to Composition Preparation prior to entering the college level Composition sequence. English Skills and Composition Preparation both require a final grade of C or higher to move forward without signing a waiver form acknowledging a concern for the probability of their success with the college level class without additional support.

1.2 Quantitative and Qualitative Data

All programs are provided with the most recent two years of data by the Office of Institutional Research (IR) as well as two-year budget data provided by the Business Office.

The data sets provided by the Office of Institutional Research include the following elements for the most recent two (completed) academic years:

- Number of Faculty Full Time: 2; Part Time: 2; Total: 4
- Student Credit Hours by Faculty Type Full Time: 6; Part Time: 59
- Enrollment by Faculty Type Full Time: 19; Part Time: 110 (In the 2017-2018 cycle Full Time Faculty Member hours were counted as part time as those credits were only a small part of their jobs.)
- Faculty Name by Type (Full Time: Sanchez and Pinkard; Part Time: Carson and Cox)
- Average Class Size Face to Face 12.32; Online 11, Completion Face to Face 94%; Online 81.82%, and Attrition 9.5%
- Course Completion 93.37, Success and Attrition by Distance Learning v Face-to-Face: 70.345%; Online 36.36%
- Number of Degrees/Certificates Awarded N/A
- Number of Graduates Transferring (if available from IR) N/A
- Number of Graduates Working in Related Field (technical programs only) N/A
- Expenditures and Revenues

Additional data may also be available for reporting from the Office of Institutional Research, as applicable. Requests for additional data must be made through a data request.

(See Section 1.2 in the Program Review Handbook for more information.)

DEV English Assessment Data AY 2018

Number of Faculty:

1 full time (L. Pinkard)

2 part time (B. Carson, K. Cox)

Enrollment & Student credit hours:

27 credit hours taught, 83 total student enrollments

Average Class size:

11.86 students in Face-to-Face classes

0 students in online classes

11.86 students across all DEV English courses

Completion rates:

91.57% face-to-face

0% online

91.57% all DEV English courses

Pass rates (C or better):

78.95% face-to-face

0% online

78.95% all DEV English courses

% of AY2018 Students Passing Comp Prep ('C' or better):

Summer: 94.44% (17 of 18)

Fall: 100% (12 of 12)

Spring: 87.50% (14 of 16)

Total: 93.48% (43 of 46)

% of AY2018 Students Who Passed (with 'C') Comp Prep Who Completed Comp I as of Fall 2018:

Summer: 76.47% (13 of 17)

Fall: 41.67% (5 of 12)

Spring: 64.29% (9 of 14)

Total: 62.79% (27 of 43)

% of AY2018 Students Who Passed (with 'C') Comp Prep & Completed Comp I Who Passed (with 'C') Comp I as of Fall 2018:

Summer: 84.62% (11 of 13)

Fall: 80% (4 of 5)

Spring: 100% (9 of 9)

Total: 88.89% (24 of 27)

% of AY2018 Students Passing English Skills ('C' or better):

Summer: 0% (0 of 0)

Fall: 53.85% (14 of 26)

Spring: 75% (3 of 4)

Total: 56.67% (17 of 30)

% of AY2018 Students Who Passed (with 'C') English Skills (without also passing Comp Prep) Who Completed Comp I as of Fall 2018:

Summer: 0% (0 of 0)

Fall: 42.86% (6 of 14)

Spring: 66.67% (2 of 3)

Total: 47.06% (8 of 17)

% of AY2018 Students Who Passed (with 'C') English Skills (without also passing Comp Prep) & Completed Comp I Who Passed (with 'C') Comp I as of Fall 2018:

Summer: 0% (0 of 0)

Fall: 100% (6 of 6)

Spring: 100% (2 of 2)

Total: 100% (8 of 8)

% of AY2018 Students Who Completed Any Dev English Course BUT Did Not Pass English Skills or Comp Prep ('C' or better) & Completed Comp I Who Passed Comp I as of Fall 2018:

Summer: % ()

Fall: % ()

Spring: 0% (0 of 2)

Total: 0% (0 of 2)

% of AY2018 Students Who Completed English Comp I Who Hadn't Taken Any Dev English Course in the Last 2 Academic Years Who Passed

Summer: 87.50% (28 of 32)

Fall: 87.06% (249 of 286) without HS: 80.58% (112 of 139)

Spring: 70.00% (28 of 40) without HS: 70.00% (28 of 40)

Total: 85.20% (305 of 358) without HS: 79.62% (168 of 211)

DEV English Assessment Data AY 2017

Number of Faculty:

2 full time (B. Sanchez, L. Pinkard)

2part time (B. Carson, K. Cox)

Enrollment & Student credit hours by Faculty type:

Full time: 0 total credit hours taught, with 0 total student enrollments

Part time: 38 credit hours taught, 126 total student enrollments

Average Class size:

12.78 students in Face-to-Face classes

11 students in online classes

12.6 students across all DEV English courses

Completion rates:

96.52% face-to-face

81.82% online

95.24% all DEV English courses

Pass rates (C or better):

61.74% face-to-face

36.36% online

59.52% all DEV English courses

% of AY2017 Students Passing Comp Prep ('C' or better):

Summer: 83.33% (15 of 18)

Fall: 55.56% (15 of 27)

Spring: 67.86% (19 of 28)

Total: 67.12% (49 of 73)

% of AY2017 Students Who Passed (with 'C') Comp Prep Who Completed Comp I as of Fall 2017:

Summer: 80.00% (12 of 15)

Fall: 66.67% (10 of 15)

Spring: 63.16% (12 of 19)

Total: 69.39% (34 of 49)

% of AY2017 Students Who Passed (with 'C') Comp Prep & Completed Comp I Who Passed (with 'C') Comp I as of Fall 2017:

Summer: 58.33% (7 of 12)

Fall: 60.00% (6 of 10)

Spring: 100% (12 of 12)

Total: 73.53% (25 of 34)

% of AY2017 Students Passing English Skills ('C' or better):

Summer: 66.67% (8 of 12)

Fall: 46.15% (12 of 26)

Spring: 55.56% (5 of 9)

Total: 53.19% (25 of 47)

% of AY2017 Students Who Passed (with 'C') English Skills (without also passing Comp Prep) Who Completed Comp I as of Fall 2017:

Summer: 25.00% (2 of 8)

Fall: 33.33% (4 of 12)

Spring: 20.00% (1 of 5)

Total: 28.00% (7 of 25)

% of AY2017 Students Who Passed (with 'C') English Skills (without also passing Comp Prep) & Completed Comp I Who Passed (with 'C') Comp I as of Fall 2017:

Summer: 50.00% (1 of 2)

Fall: 100% (4 of 4)

Spring: 100% (1 of 1)

Total: 85.71% (6 of 7)

% of AY2017 Students Who Completed Any Dev English Course BUT Did Not Pass English Skills or Comp Prep ('C' or better) & Completed Comp I Who Passed Comp I as of Fall 2017:

Summer: % ()

Fall: % ()

Spring: 100% (2 of 2)

Total: 100% (2 of 2)

% of AY2017 Students Who Completed English Comp I Who Hadn't Taken Any Dev English Course in the Last 2 Academic Years Who Passed

Summer: 70.21% (33 of 47)

Fall: 83.38% (276 of 331) without HS: 68.28% (99 of 145)

Spring: 66.67% (38 of 57) without HS: 66.67% (38 of 57)

Total: 79.77% (347 of 435) without HS: 68.27% (170 of 249)

2.0 Student Success

2.1 Define Student Success

The program faculty should provide a definition of how student success is defined by the program. *(See Section 2.1 in the Program Review Handbook for more information.)*

Narrative: Student Success for this program is defined by the student leaving it for the college level Composition sequence, and that the majority of those who leave the Developmental Sequence with a C or higher pass Composition I on their first attempt. While the student is in the Developmental program, we work to support the writing they are doing in their concurrently-enrolled college level content classes.

2.2 Achieve/Promote Student Success

The program faculty should describe how the program achieves and promotes student success. *(See Section 2.2 in the Program Review Handbook for more information.)*

Narrative:

Student Success is promoted across campus for Developmental English Students. Faculty create targeted assignments for students to practice writing and reading skills to provide iterative practice with common errors related to writing examples from multiple genres as part of curriculum. Faculty create a climate of emotional receptivity so that students are willing to visit with them during office hours for additional support, including mentoring on assignments for content area classes and to help revise and edit for content area writing assignments. This engagement is critical when working to help the student see the strengths of their ideas and avenues for improvement. Faculty listen to the students responsively to cultivate a willingness to make errors so they can be improved. There is an attitude from the currently active members of the English Faculty as a whole that making errors is part of the experience of studentship and that it is our role to provide the opportunities for the students to make them to engender skill growth.

It is imperative for Developmental English skill acquisition that we create for the student a posture of technical language risk but not emotional risk. It is difficult to quantify, but impossible to overstate the necessity of our consistent, gentle advocacy to the students that they are worth their own investment of labor. It is the underpinning of their engagement because success is born of work. However, the faculty are far from alone in the support of student success. TRIO, a program into which students are encouraged to apply, and Student Support Services provide over 750 hours of access to student and professional tutors over the course of the semester. Library Staff engage in research and technical assistance. College Success coursework provides reinforcement for studentship skills including time management of projects and familiarity with the college's resources including online resources and on ground access to technology, tutoring, physical and mental healthcare, nutritional support, academic

Commented [AC1]: Could we break this into paragraphs? This is kind of a lot.

Commented [BC2R1]: Absolutely. Does this read easier now?

Commented [AC3R1]: So much!

Commented [BC4]: As per Anita's rec., took out narrative and put in raw data. Made a minor revision to FT v PT Faculty distinction in AY 2017 data to make it match AY 2018 data.

accommodations, and school supplies. Computer classes provide additional opportunities to develop skills in word processing and software use. Coaches organize study halls and provide additional one-on-one mentorship for writing process, vocabulary development, and encourage creative writing skills. Students' family members and friends provide emotional support and encouragement. Our Maintenance Department provides safe, clean, and comfortable facilities in which to work. Fewer of our students would progress if any one of these support systems were to waiver.

3.0 Assessment of Student Learning Outcomes

3.1 Reflection on assessment

The program faculty should provide a narrative reflection on the assessment of program curriculum. Please provide data gathered for outcomes at both program, course, and general education levels. Please review the Assessment Handbook for resources on gathering this information provided by the Assessment Committee.

Narrative:

English Skills has the following course-level learning outcomes:

1. Identify and summarize main points and sub points from various readings from multiple genres.
2. Demonstrate a mastery of grammar skills at the sentence and paragraph levels.
3. Compose organized, unified and coherent paragraphs utilizing standard paragraph structure consisting of a topic sentence, development, and a concluding sentence utilizing various rhetorical stances.

English Skills has the following common assessments to gauge completion of the course-level outcomes:

1. A Formal non-narrative Essay which includes a Works Cited with at least two citations
2. A Final Exam which includes a Narrative Essay and a Reader Response Essay.

The formalization of these common assessments took place at the close of last year, and so there is no data from across multiple sections as of yet. However, structures have been put into place to make sure that this data is collected for future annual and cumulative reviews. That said, these assessments were drawn from current practices in some of the previous course sections, and for the purposes of this document and as a starting point, the following results are included based on a custom rubric that functions on a 5-point scale for the non-narrative essay with a minimum of two citations:

Criterion (out of 5)	2017	2018
Instructions/Conventions	3.87	3.95
Support	4.13	4.00
Mechanics	3.53	3.70
MLA Formatting	3.80	4.00
% of students submitting	58%	80%

Composition Preparation has the following course-level learning outcomes:

1. Compose essays that demonstrate a mastery of introductory paragraphs, body paragraphs, concluding paragraphs and transitions that adequately support a thesis statement. ****Common Core Outcome; must be assessed using Five Paragraph Rubric Provided by institution****
2. Utilize the writing process: prewriting, organization, drafting, revision, proofreading editing.
3. Revise essays to improve style, word choice, figurative language and sentence variety.
4. Recognize and control common grammatical error such as comma splices, run-ons, shift in tense and person, fragments in student's own writing.
5. Summarize and analyze various readings from various genres.

Composition Preparation has the following common assessments to gauge completion of the course-level outcomes:

Final In-class writing graded primarily on how well student has met course competencies as listed above. Essay needs to be a significant part of course grade.

Again, as with English Skills, there has been substantial inconsistency in data collection for this course (largely due to instructor/faculty issues currently in litigation). The "Five Paragraph Rubric" referenced by the learning outcomes was not made available to the part-time faculty, and operating in a deficit of information, the AAC&U Written Communication VALUE Rubric was substituted in place of whatever custom rubric had previously been in place. This rubric is part of the VALUE Rubric suite and is a national standard. It is also the one used by the English Department for the college-level composition sequence.

As this is an in-class writing, the work is collected, assessed, and then recorded as an aggregate grade in Canvas with the specifics of the rubric criterion returned to the student when they come to collect their work. As such, there is not a way to break out the results by criterion. This gap in the data is being addressed in this year's collection cycle.

In the absence of this data, the aggregate scores on the final in-class writing from representative sections are included here:

	AY 2017	AY 2018
Average Final Grade	86.67%	87.76%

At the time of this compiling, it is not known whether there are program level outcomes for the Developmental English Program separate from the English Program outcomes. This absence speaks to the artificial divide between these two tracks as being separate, which in reality they are not. Perhaps formally, the program level outcome is for students to engage with the English Program. Without this being formalized, it is not possible to tie these assessments to it other than to point to the completion data provided by Institutional Research. In Academic Year 2018, 91.57% of those who enrolled in a Developmental English Course completed it, and 78.95% passed with a C or better. As of Fall 2018 88.89% of students who passed Composition Preparation with a C or better who attempted Composition I passed Composition I on a first attempt; this includes students who took English Skills prior to taking Composition Preparation. As of Fall 2018, 73.53% of students who passed English Skills with a C or better who moved directly to Composition I passed it on a first attempt. Combined 81.21% of students who have taken a Developmental English course with us and attempt Composition I pass it on a first

attempt. Not including concurrent students, by comparison 79.62% of “college ready” students who took no Developmental English Courses passed Composition I on a first attempt in the same time period. This speaks strongly to the fulfillment of this informal program outcome.

General Education level outcomes are as follows:

1. Access and evaluate information from credible sources
2. Collaborate respectfully with others
3. Communicate effectively through clear and accurate use of language
4. Demonstrate an understanding of the broad diversity of the human experience
5. Process numeric, symbolic, and graphic information
6. Read, analyze, and synthesize written, visual, and aural material
7. Select and apply appropriate problem-solving techniques
8. Use current technology efficiently and responsibly

When presented with the task of mapping whether courses introduce, reinforce, or demonstrate mastery of these outcomes, it was determined by the faculty present in a meeting during in-service that English Skills and Composition Preparation did not fit with the group of courses to be mapped as they are sub-college level and do not help qualify a student for graduation. That said, the work done within both English Skills and Composition Preparation lays the groundwork for supporting outcomes one, three, and six. In that the data for the common assessments for these two courses are provided in this report, tying the success at this level to the general education outcomes can be assumed by how many students who begin in the Developmental English track are successful in completing the college-level track, which is mapped to these outcomes.

3.2 Significant Assessment Findings

The program faculty should provide a narrative overview of the program's significant student learning outcomes assessment findings, any associated impact on curriculum, as well as any ongoing assessment plans. The program may attach data charts, assessment reports or other relevant materials. (*See Section 3.2 in the Program Review Handbook for more information.*)

Narrative:

The aggregate scores for English Skills show a modest improvement in three of the four categories, these being Instructions/Conventions (+0.08), Mechanics (+0.17), and MLA Formatting (+0.20). This is due at least in part to significant instructor focus on initial grammar diagnostics and an effort to tailor the general assignments and in-class practice to the particular needs of the section cohort throughout the semester. The practice of submitting multiple drafts results in more opportunities to catch formatting errors and to establish consistent habits in publication. The dip in the category of Support (-0.13) may be a reflection of the shift in focus to shore up the other three categories and the initially

stronger criterion slipping slightly. The massive increase in percentage of students submitting these common assessments (+22%) is huge and goes largely to the individual attention given these students by their instructors. By following up with individual students in a smaller section, issues with technology (difficulties with canvas or the TurnItIn LTI integration) can be quickly caught and addressed, leading to fewer instances of non-submission.

The noted and modest improvement in the aggregate final grade in Composition Preparation (+1.09) underlines the consistency in results both across sections of this course and across the years in question. That these scores are solidly upper B range is also a point of pride. As more granular data is collected in the future, it will be possible to drill further down into these numbers to assess areas of strength and areas of growth.

The primary reason for the successful nature of our overall Developmental English program in moving students to a level of skill readiness to demonstrate mastery of college level content across the curriculum is our small class size which allows for intensive mentoring in the specific and nuanced needs of individual students over the course of their progress. Students are much more successful in the face to face classes, perhaps because the online modality demands skill levels in reading for content and process analysis which they do not yet possess, nor does it allow for technology interventions by the instructor in person.

3.3 Ongoing Assessment Plans

The program faculty should describe ongoing assessment plans and attach any new assessment progress reports for the current or past academic year.

Narrative: Ongoing assessment plans include the adopting recommendations from the Assessment Committee to continue to track completion, success, and conversion rates into the college level Composition sequence. Improved data recording will include assessing at least two measures for at least one learning outcome from each section of both courses for both quantitative and qualitative data over the next program review cycle. Measure should include but are not limited to common assessments and should include an accounting for progress over the course of the semester. For example:

Selected Assessment for Composition Preparation: Carson
Learning Outcomes to be assessed Spring 2019

1. Compose essays that demonstrate a mastery of introductory paragraphs, body paragraphs, concluding paragraphs and transitions that adequately support a thesis statement. ****Common Core Outcome; must be assessed using the AAC&U Written Communication VALUE Rubric as provided by institution****
2. Utilize the writing process: prewriting, organization, drafting, revision, proofreading editing.

Commented [AC5]: This section (3) is dealing with course level assessment, so this isn't really the stuff I give you. It's the course assessment data that you should be doing every semester.

Commented [BC6R5]: Understood. Working on that now.

Commented [BC7R5]: Is this more in line with what the Board is wanting? Open to revisions as needed.

Measures for Learning Outcome 1

1. On the Final Exam Exit Diagnostic Document Based Question Essay at least 70% of the exam takers will earn 75% or higher.
2. A comparison between Entry Diagnostics, Mid-semester Diagnostic, and Exit Diagnostic should show an improvement in the quality of Thesis Statement, supporting details specificity, and use of transitions. This is a qualitative observation, not a quantitative one.
3. 70% of students turn in fourth Smelted Essay. 70% of Submissions will earn 75% or higher.

Measures for Learning Outcome 2

1. 70% or more students turn in the Outline, the Rough Draft, and the Smelted Essay for the fourth formal essay of the semester.
2. Students will participate in at least 75% of the In-class brainstorming, drafting, revision, and editing targeted practices during the course.

4.0 External Constituency and Significant Trends

An important component of maintaining a superior program lies in awareness and understanding of other possible factors that may impact the program and/or student outcomes. After consideration of these other factors, program faculty should document the relevant information within this section. As applicable, this should include the following.

4.1: Program Advisory Committee:

Narrative:

- Include Advisory Member Name/ Title/ Organization/ Length of Service on committee; note the Committee Chair with an asterisk (*).
- Upload meeting minutes from the previous spring and fall semesters and attach in the appendices section (10.0).

The Developmental English program does not have a Program Advisory Committee at this time.

4.2: Specialized Accreditation:

- Include Accrediting Agency title, abbreviation, ICC contact; Agency contact, Date of Last Visit, Reaffirmation, Next Visit, FY Projected Accreditation Budget.
- Upload the most recent self-study and site visit documents.
- Upload agency correspondence which confirm accreditation status.

Narrative:

The Developmental English program does not hold any specialized accreditation unique to the Developmental English program at this time.

4.3: Other:

Discuss any external constituencies that may apply to the program. *(See Section 4.3 in the Program Review Handbook for more information.)*

Narrative:

Independence Community College's regional accrediting body, the Higher Learning Commission (HLC), uses categories to evaluate the culture of continuous quality improvement on campus. The Developmental English program falls into the area of Criterion 3: Teaching and Learning: Quality, Resources, and Support.

5.0 Curriculum Reflection

5.1 Reflection on Current Curriculum

The program faculty should provide a narrative reflection that describes the program’s curriculum holistically. The following are prompts formulated to guide thinking/reflection on curriculum. While presented in question form, the intent of the prompts is to stimulate thought and it is not expected that programs specifically answer each and every question.

- Is the curriculum of the program appropriate to the breadth, depth, and level of the discipline?
- How does this program transfer to four-year universities? (give specific examples) N/A
- What types of jobs can students get after being in your program? (Please use state and national data) N/A
- How dynamic is the curriculum? When was the last reform or overhaul?
- In the wake of globalization, how “internationalized” is the curriculum?
- How does the program assess diversity?
- Does the program have any community-based learning components in the curriculum?

Narrative:

The program is appropriate for the breadth, depth, and level of student needs as presented. It is nontransferable but supports student success in college-level courses which are transferable. Students are better prepared for the workforce after these courses because the discussion and practice of framing for audience and situation, facility with word processing and written communication, and critical thinking are benchmarks of employability. The curriculum is highly dynamic. Over the last year, we have phased out textbooks and opted for a combination of online educational resources (OERs), instructor-generated resources, and library resources that were already in place. We updated to MLA 8 at the beginning of this Program Review period for citation to remain current.

After attending the Great Plains Accelerated Learning Program conferences at Butler Community College in 2016, 2017, and 2018, we continue to have an emphasis on self-directed placement. At the course and section level, assignments are varied each semester both to engage the specific student needs and so that students who may be repeating the class have a new opportunity to practice the same core skill. This provides a demonstration that a new semester is a new start and helps to keep them focused on new successes. The curriculum strives to be global. Readings include canonic voices, current writers’ voices, international voices, and marginalized voices. Writing assignments cover topics and include influences across both the span of the globe, the arc of history, and a range of voices. This addresses both internationalism and diversity. Example assignments are included in the Appendix.

Commented [AC8]: This sentence physically hurts to read. Remember that you are writing for the Board.

Commented [BC9R8]: Better? This can be pared down further if you think it needs it.

5.2 Degree and Certificate Offerings or Support

Program faculty should list what degrees and certificates are offered and/or describe how the program curriculum supports other degrees and/or certificates awarded by the college.

Narrative:

The courses offered by the Developmental English program do not count towards graduation. There is not a Developmental English degree, nor is there a certificate of completion.

6.0 Faculty Success

6.1 Faculty Accomplishments

The program faculty should highlight noteworthy accomplishments of individual faculty.

Narrative: All of the currently active English faculty have national publication experience in their backgrounds. English faculty members Heather Mydosh, LaTonya Pinkard, Camilo Peralta, and Bridget Carson volunteered at an Independence Public Library Book and Brew in the Spring of 2018. Bridget Carson was a selected playwright for the PlayLabs at the 2017 William Inge Theater Festival; she presented a paper at the Scholars' Conference at the 2018 William Inge Theater Festival titled Opportunities in Play Readings for Developmental Students based on reading the honoree Carlyle Brown's play Buffalo Hair with her English Skills and Composition Preparation students. LaTonya Pinkard's passionate dedication to empowering her students' engagement and confidence was featured in Season 3 of Last Chance U on Netflix. Bridget Carson successfully completed a Masters of Fine Arts in Music Composition from the Vermont College of Fine Arts February 16th, 2019 where she included in her reflective thesis a passage that her engagement in the music compositional process made her a better developmental teacher as she struggled to analyze and engage with multiple musical genres and generate, elaborate, organize, refine, and notate in software to communicate those ideas to others in a genre appropriate modality.

6.2 Program Accomplishments

The program faculty should highlight noteworthy program accomplishments.

Narrative: What is of note about this program is that our rates of conversion through Composition I after one or more courses in the Developmental Program are not only statistically equal to the general "college ready" student, but superior.

Commented [AC10]: I think you have Program Accomplishments (6.1) and Faculty Accomplishments (6.2) flipped around. Also the stuff currently in 6.2 (which again should be in 6.1) doesn't really fit either section. It feels like hollow generalizations that any program could say. I think the only thing that could fit is a BREIF discription of the Dev English program success with the % of students passing Comp I.

Commented [BC11R10]: Fixed?

Commented [AC12]: This is the best piece of evidence in this whole section and it's buried in the middle of a giant paragraph. Chop off all of the fluff before it and just focus on this part. You really could just keep this and it'd look good.

Commented [BC13R12]: Fixed?

6.3 Innovative Research, Teaching and Community Service

The program faculty should describe how faculty members are encouraged and engaged in promoting innovative research, teaching, and community service.

Narrative: Faculty members are encouraged by their peers to engage in writing, continuing education, visiting lecturing, and experimentation with different delivery modalities, interdepartmental cooperation, and community service. LaTonya Pinkard and Bridget Carson attended the Great Plains Conference on Acceleration at Butler Community College in February 2018. LaTonya Pinkard began an on-campus book group to encourage student reading and discussion. Bridget Carson is active in the Fine Arts Department both in Music and Theater where she assists in any way feasible, as a music assistant, color guard director, performer, costumer, and was one of the Playwright Mentors for the High School 24hr Plays in the Fall of 2018. Bridget Carson performs regularly with the ICC Chamber Singers and with the Midcontinent Community Band in Independence, now entering its 127th consecutive year.

7.0 Program Planning & Development for Student Success

7.1 Narrative Reflection on Qualitative and Quantitative Data and Trends

Provide a thoughtful reflection on the available assessment data. (See Section 7.1 in the Program Review Handbook examples.)

Narrative: The two most significant take aways from the available assessment data are that the entire campus community is deeply invested both in skill and attitude in creating opportunities for students who enter our classes without a pre-established skill set which is traditionally predictive of college success and that, even with significant variation from class to class and semester to semester, our Developmental English program creates a probability of a successful first attempt at Composition I higher than for students who have been determined by multiple measures to be prepared to enter it without additional support.

The data above demonstrates wild swings in class size, completion, and conversion to Composition I success. Trends to consider include Fall vs. Spring vs. Summer classes, sample size, and primary lack of either completion, passing with a C or better, or retention. ICC also tends to have lower enrollment in the Spring and Summer semesters than in the Fall allowing for even greater attention to individual student needs.

Of students who completed Composition Preparation in Academic Year 2017 88.89% passed Composition I. Of the students who passed English Skills in the same Academic Year who attempted Composition I without taking Composition Preparation first 100% passed Composition I. In the same period 0% of those who completed one of these courses with lower than a C passed Composition I. Of the general student body for whom multiple measures concluded they were prepared to enter Composition I without a developmental class prior only 79.62% passed Composition I. Our rates of conversion through Composition I after one or more courses in the Developmental Program are not only statistically equal to the general "college ready" student, but superior.

With our small class sizes, willingness to generate assignments, dedication to practice, and college wide support network, we create the capacity for students (over the course of sometimes a single 16 week semester) to leap from struggling to read and write between a fourth and eighth grade level to being able to be successful in a college-level composition class.

Commented [AC14]: This is the best piece of evidence in this whole section and it's buried in the middle of a giant paragraph. Chop off all of the fluff before it and just focus on this part. You really could just keep this and it'd look good.

Commented [BC15R14]: Clearer?

7.2 Academic Program Vitality Reflection, Goals and Action Plans

The program vitality assessment, goals and action planning are documented by completing the Program Summative Assessment form.

Programs should use previous reflection and discussion as a basis for considering program indicators of demand, quality, and resource utilization and a program self-assessment of overall program vitality. (*See Section 7.2 in the Program Review Handbook for more information.*)

Narrative:

According to the Vitality Indicators in the Program Summative Assessment Form, the Developmental English program falls in Category 2: Maintain Current Levels of Support/Continuous Improvement. We are in line with National Standards and Best Practices from the Department of Education including class size, accelerated programs, matriculation to college level composition sequence (rather than retention), cost per student (because there is no full time faculty associated solely with the program), and indicators suggest continued planned adjustments to improve student outcomes.

While small, this program is vitally needed by the students it serves. It should maintain its small class size and emphasis on reading and writing practice in multiple genres with various readings, authors, and subject areas. It serves in-district and out-of-district students alike. As long as this remains an open enrollment institution, we must provide a quality opportunity for students to close a skill gap.

Goal 1: Create more opportunities for students to have access to computers for word processing.

Plan: Investigate possibilities for weekend computing access in the Academic Building. This is primarily a question of funding staffing.

Goal 2: Encourage Developmental English students to participate in Literature Guild Activities after Lit. Guild is rebooted.

Plan: Create more opportunities for creative writing in Developmental classes focused toward presentation at reading events, and participation in National Novel Writing Month and National Poetry Month Events.

Goal 3: Incentivize attendance at on campus events across the curriculum in order to broaden student experience and destigmatize developmental status.

Plan: Inform students of upcoming events. Ask for event suggestions. Encourage participation in student government. Faculty to be visibly in attendance at such events.

7.3 Academic Program Goals and Action Plans

Programs will also establish or update 3 to 5 long-term and short-term goals and associated action plans which support student success. These goals should include consideration of co-curricular and faculty development activities. Long-term goals are considered to be those that extend 3 to 5 years out, while short-term goals are those that would be accomplished in the next 1 to 2 years. Additionally, programs should update status on current goals. Programs should use S.M.A.R.T. goal setting for this purpose. (*See Section 7.3 in the Program Review Handbook for more information.*)

Narrative:

Goal 1: Maintain Flexibility and alignment with national trends.

Plan: Continued Conference attendance at least every other year to the Great Plains Conference on Acceleration. Continued research of Department of Education findings from national studies.

Goal 2: Actively demonstrate to students writing process and lifelong learning.

Plan: Share current work, writing hygiene, and share current and recent reading.

Goal 3: Persist in helping students to generate writing schedules for papers they are writing for college level classes while they are enrolled in the Developmental English Program.

Plan: Continue asking students about their course schedules and assignments repeatedly throughout the semester and helping them break those assignments into individual task sized units.

7.4 Mission and Strategic Plan Alignment

Program faculty should indicate the ways in which the program's offerings align with the ICC mission. Also, in this section program faculty should provide narrative on the ways that initiatives may be tied to the ICC Strategic Plan and to HLC accreditation criterion. It is not necessary to consider an example for each HLC category, but program faculty are encouraged to provide one or two examples of initiatives in their program that are noteworthy. These examples may be helpful and included in future campus reporting to HLC. (Refer to section 4.3 for HLC categories)

Narrative: By the nature of fostering information management, assessment, and communication skills the Developmental English Program supports students academically, leading toward a capacity for both cognitive and non-cognitive academic excellence across the curriculum of college level content courses. The Developmental English Program promotes cultural enrichment by drawing reading examples from diverse authors and various genres. It cultivates curiosity with these readings and writing assignments while students develop the technical skills to share their voices. It encourages creativity with creative writing assignments and welcoming questions. It enhances character by empowering students to structure but not micromanaging their time management for assignment completion. These align with our mission statement and also with HLC Criterion 4.3 3.B., 3.C., and 3.D.

8.0 Fiscal Resource Requests/Adjustments

8.1 Budget Requests/Adjustments

Based on program data review, planning and development for student success, program faculty will complete and attach the budget worksheets to identify proposed resource needs and adjustments. These worksheets will be available through request from the college's Chief Financial Officer. Program faculty should explicitly state their needs/desires along with the financial amount required.

Programs should include some or all of the following, as applicable, in their annual budget proposals:

- Budget Projections (personnel and operation)
- Position Change Requests
- Educational Technology Support
- Instructional Technology Requests
- Facilities/Remodeling Requests
- Capital Equipment

- Non-Capital Furniture & Equipment
- New Capital Furniture & Equipment
- Replacement Capital Furniture & Equipment

- Other, as applicable

- Accreditation Fee Request

- Membership Fee Request
- Coordinating Reports

Resource requests should follow budgeting guidelines as approved by the Board of Trustees for each fiscal year. The resource requests should be used to provide summary and detailed information to the division Dean and other decision-makers and to inform financial decisions made throughout the year.

Narrative: The Developmental English Program can be maintained at current quality at current levels. We don't need any more faculty than we currently have, although the work allocation may shift. As the active English Department is due to shrink by attrition from 3.5 + adjuncts by one for the next year without an expected enrollment increase, it would make the most sense for scheduling ease to have one full time faculty dedicated to the Developmental Program, with two full time faculty members to teach transferable classes in the English Department. Library Resources should be maintained or increased. Turnitin.com, subscription to which is \$5,500 annually should be maintained. The CANVAS platform

should be maintained. Current levels of photocopy supplies and dry erase markers should be maintained. There is sufficient Professional Development funding to provide for conference attendance. The only associated increase that could be envisioned is to supply additional staffing hours in a computer lab during the weekend to provide additional computing access to students.

9.0 Program Planning and Development Participation

9.1 Faculty and Staff

Program faculty will provide a brief narrative of how faculty and staff participated in the program review, planning and development process. List the preparer(s) by name(s).

Narrative: This report was prepared by Bridget Carson with data provided by Anita Chappuie, Head of Institutional Research.

9.2 VPAA and/or Administrative Designee Response

After review and reflection of the *Comprehensive Program Review* or the *Annual Program Review*, the Division Chair and VPAA will write a summary of their response to the evidence provided. The Division Chair and VPAA's response will be available to programs for review and discussion prior to beginning the next annual planning and development cycle.

Narrative:

Program Review Committee Recommendation:

It is the recommendation of the committee to maintain current levels of support/continuous improvement -Category 2.

The VPAA agrees with the Category 2 designation.

10.0 Appendices

Any additional information that the programs would like to provide may be included in this section.