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Part I. Executive Summary

As the enrollment of the college increased (Fall 2006: 1781 to Fall 2011: 2705), so did course demand indicators in terms of class sections, seat enrollment and student semester hours for all sectors of Language Arts, especially Hawaiian language, Eng 100, and developmental writing.

Class fill rates are high, for the intensive student-teacher interactions and work load for all Language Arts courses necessitate small class sizes. The department employs many lecturers. The lecturers and the sections they teach outnumber the quantity of faculty and faculty-taught sections.

The effectiveness indicator, student achievement of C or higher, for all courses in the department are positive and have been stable or increasing with the exception of Eng 100. Over-reliance on lecturers may be a source of the five-year decline in success rates.

The department has met its goal to develop the Ka ʻOhana Web site to expand its potential as a campus and community resource. Its Speech and English faculty has helped design the one-stop tutoring center in the Learning Commons.

The department continues to work on long-term goals to improve classroom teaching by being innovative:
A significant number of faculty and lecturers have attend the Problem-Based Learning Workshop and the Learning to Learn workshops over the past summers to incorporate learning skills and new approaches in course work.

Supplemental Instruction, funded by Student Services, is a concept which has students serve as peer teachers. SIs began working in our composition, reading, and literature courses in Spring 2011.

Faculty attended ALP (Accelerated Learning Program) conferences to learn about accelerating learning in writing. As a result, this fall one pilot Eng22/Eng100 ALP course is being taught and two more packages of compressing a two-semester sequence into one will be offered to students in Spring 2012.

The department is competing for funding of a Developmental Education project to integrate Eng 18 and Eng 19, and Eng 21 and Eng 22 into one-semester tandem courses to decrease the number of exit points that high-risk students encounter.

An English faculty task force is developing a portfolio review system with rubrics to assess Eng 100 student work in Spring 2012.

The strength of the Language Arts department lies in its faculty members and their willingness to serve and lead-- in governance, curriculum redesign, assessment, staff development, campus service, and community service—in many endeavors that help keep the college thriving.
Part II. Mission and Student Learning Outcomes

College Mission Statement

Windward Community College offers innovative programs in the arts and sciences and opportunities to gain knowledge and understanding of Hawai‘i and its unique heritage. With a special commitment to support the access and educational needs of Native Hawaiians, we provide O‘ahu’s Ko‘olau region and beyond with liberal arts, career and lifelong learning in a supportive and challenging environment – inspiring students to excellence.

General Education Student Learning Outcomes

I  Students will be able to understand the importance of ethical conduct and practice it in their daily lives.
II Students will be able to communicate through speaking, writing and listening effectively individually and in teams.
III Students will be able to think critically and solve problems by finding, analyzing and evaluating information engaging in informed debate.
IV Students will be able to use technology to access, maintain, and analyze data and information.
V  Students will be able to make choices for a healthy mind, body, and spirit.
VI Students will be able to pursue life-long learning and share learning with others.
VII Students will be able to apply specialized skills for employment.
VIII Students will be able to appreciate and/or express themselves artistically, creatively, and culturally.
IX Students will be able to contribute to the community through active participation and support.
X  Students will develop life skills to fulfill their personal and professional potential.

Associate of Arts Student Learning Outcomes

AA1 Draw on knowledge from the liberal arts to succeed in upper division courses.
AA2 Recognize and respond to the wonders and challenges of the natural environment, both biological and physical.
AA3 Use research and technology skills to access information from multiple sources.
AA4 Use critical thinking and problem-solving skills to evaluate and synthesize information to form conclusions, ideas, and opinions.
AA5 Express ideas clearly and creatively in diverse ways through the fine and performing arts, speech and writing.
AA6 Recognize one’s role in community and global issues with a respect for diverse cultures and differing views while embracing one’s own cultural values and heritage.
AA7 Engage in civic activities with a sense of personal empowerment.
AA8 Enter and perform effectively in the work force.
AA9 Develop skills that improve personal well-being and enhance professional potential.
AA10 Use knowledge and skills to maintain and improve mental and physical well-being.
AA1 Pursue lifelong learning.
Part III. Departmental Analysis

A. Quantitative Indicators

The quantitative indicators are shown by subgroup and academic year. For this report an academic year starts in the fall, and ends in the summer. For example, AY 2006-2007 is Fall 2006, Spring 2007, and Summer 2007. The data also include indicators for yearly change and a 5 year change. Those indicators are in percent, and represents the percent increase or decrease from year to year and from AY 2006-2007 to AY 2010-2011.

Demand

1. Number of Classes Taught

Table A. Number of Classes Taught by Subgroup\(^{(1)(2)}\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100PLUS</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>-6.7%</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>-7.1%</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMPOS</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>-12.0%</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>30.8%</td>
<td>36.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEV ED</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>-31.3%</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>53.8%</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LANG</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>-5.6%</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
<td>31.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIT</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-9.1%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>-10.0%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>-18.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP-COM</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>18.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{(1)}\) concurrent and cross-listed classes are combined in the primary class with data adjustments; does not include data for secondary classes

\(^{(2)}\) data were captured using the CENSUS freeze date from Iro_Socad

![Table A. Number of Classes Taught by Subgroup](image-url)
2. Enrollment by Subgroup

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100PLUS</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>12.3%</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>-2.6%</td>
<td>23.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMPOS</td>
<td>549</td>
<td>515</td>
<td>-6.2%</td>
<td>553</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
<td>598</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
<td>716</td>
<td>19.7%</td>
<td>30.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEV ED</td>
<td>307</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>-13.0%</td>
<td>321</td>
<td>20.2%</td>
<td>401</td>
<td>24.9%</td>
<td>424</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
<td>38.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LANG</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>-0.8%</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>386</td>
<td>35.4%</td>
<td>52.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIT</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>-16.0%</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>11.0%</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>-14.1%</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>-4.2%</td>
<td>-23.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP-COM</td>
<td>370</td>
<td>357</td>
<td>-3.5%</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>394</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
<td>410</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) concurrent and cross-listed classes are combined in the primary class with data adjustments; does not include data for secondary classes
(2) data were captured using the CENSUS freeze date from Iro_Socad
(3) enrollments are adjusted registrations in the class, derived by first summing the number of students enrolled (including those with "W" grades), then adjusting for associated classes
3. Student Semester Hours by Subgroup

Table C. Student Semester Hours (SSHs) by Subgroup

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100PLUS</td>
<td>521</td>
<td>560</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
<td>575</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>662</td>
<td>15.1%</td>
<td>637</td>
<td>-3.8%</td>
<td>22.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMPOS</td>
<td>1647</td>
<td>1545</td>
<td>-6.2%</td>
<td>1659</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
<td>1794</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
<td>2148</td>
<td>19.7%</td>
<td>30.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEV ED</td>
<td>930</td>
<td>801</td>
<td>-13.9%</td>
<td>963</td>
<td>20.2%</td>
<td>1203</td>
<td>24.9%</td>
<td>1272</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
<td>36.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LANG</td>
<td>968</td>
<td>984</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>1075</td>
<td>9.2%</td>
<td>1110</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>1521</td>
<td>37.0%</td>
<td>57.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIT</td>
<td>618</td>
<td>519</td>
<td>-16.0%</td>
<td>576</td>
<td>11.0%</td>
<td>495</td>
<td>-14.1%</td>
<td>474</td>
<td>-4.2%</td>
<td>-23.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP-COM</td>
<td>1110</td>
<td>1071</td>
<td>-3.5%</td>
<td>1080</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>1182</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
<td>1230</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) concurrent and cross-listed classes are combined in the primary class with data adjustments; does not include data for secondary classes

(2) data were captured using the CENSUS freeze date from Iro_Socad

(3) SSH counts are adjusted student semester hours for classes, derived by first summing semester hours of all students enrolled in the class, then adjusting for associated classes.
Analysis of demand indicators

For the AY 2010 – 2011, the number for Language Arts classes increased slightly for most courses and significantly for Eng 100 (Composition 31% annual increase). Enrollment for most courses was steady; composition and language courses showed increases over numbers of the previous year. Student semester hours increased for all courses with the exception for 100-plus and literature courses.

Five-year trends

Over the past five years, 100Plus (Journ 205 and 285V, Eng 199/299 Rain Bird production, Eng 204A Creative Writing, Eng 209 Business Writing, Ling 102 Linguistics, Lsk 110 Learning Skills) and Speech/Communication class offerings, enrollment, and SSHs generated remained consistent with the college’s enrollment increases.

For Literature, classes offered, enrollment, and SSHs generated showed little change or negative changes. The department has offered Eng 209 Business Writing in place of some literature courses because it is required for admission to the UHM College of Business and students ask for it. In addition, all literature courses are Writing Intensive and are not available to all students because there is an Eng 100 prerequisite. There has also been an increase in Humanities Diversification course choices, so students have more options other than a literature course to fulfill their Humanities requirement.

Notable are the increases in Languages, Composition, and Developmental Education.

Last year, Languages went up from 19 to 21 sections, an increase of 10.5%; from 285 seats to 386, an increase of 35.4%; and from 1110 to 1521 SSHs, an increase of 37%.

Over five years, Languages experienced a 31.3% increase in classes offered, a 52% increase in enrollment, and a 57.1% increase in student semester hours. Spanish and Japanese offerings remained steady, so all the increases are attributable to Hawaiian language and the strong support Hawaiian Studies enjoy at our college.

Eng 100 is the only course in the Composition group. Over the past five years, composition offerings were up from 25 sections to 34, an increase of 36%; enrollment from 549 to 716 seats, an increase of 30.4%; and 1647 to 2148 SSHs, an increase of 30.4%. In 2009, a cap of 23 seats per section was set, so even though more classes were offered, the percentage of classes offered is higher than the percentages of enrollment or SSHs generated.

Also significant were the gains made by Developmental Education courses: class offerings were up from 16 to 24, a 50% increase; enrollment from 307 to 424, an increase of 38.1%; and SSHs from 930 to 1272, an increase of 36.8%.
Efficiency

1. Average Class Size

Table D. Average Class Size by Subgroup

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100PLUS</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>18.9%</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>-3.3%</td>
<td>19.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMPOS</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>-1.6%</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>-0.2%</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>-8.4%</td>
<td>-4.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEV ED</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>26.5%</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>-18.8%</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>-11.9%</td>
<td>-7.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LANG</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>-11.8%</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16.0%</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>-7.6%</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>22.5%</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIT</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>-7.6%</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>11.0%</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>-4.5%</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>-4.2%</td>
<td>-6.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP-COM</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>-3.5%</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>-2.7%</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>-1.4%</td>
<td>-6.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) concurrent and cross-listed classes are combined in the primary class with data adjustments; does not include data for secondary classes
(2) data were captured using the CENSUS freeze date from Iro_Socad
(3) average class size is obtained by adding all adjusted registrations in the course, and then dividing that by the number of classes offered
(4) average excludes courses numbered -93 (cooperative education) and -99 (directed studies)
2. Average Class Fill Rate by Subgroup

Table E. Average Class Fill Rate by Subgroup\(^{(1)(2)(3)(4)(5)}\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100PLUS</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>20.3%</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>-4.7%</td>
<td>18.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMPOS</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>-0.2%</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>-7.1%</td>
<td>-1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEV ED</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>34.6%</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>-12.8%</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>-6.7%</td>
<td>14.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LANG</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>-11.8%</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>16.0%</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>-8.0%</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>22.4%</td>
<td>15.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIT</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>-7.6%</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>11.0%</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>-4.5%</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>-4.6%</td>
<td>-6.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP-COM</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>-1.6%</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>-1.0%</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>-2.3%</td>
<td>-2.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) concurrent and cross-listed classes are combined in the primary class with data adjustments; does not include data for secondary classes
(2) data were captured using the CENSUS freeze date from Iro_Socad
(3) weighted average of all class sections in an alpha/number; i.e., a course with two sections counts twice as much as a course with one section
(4) data are in percent, and are the average of Percent fill or "fill ratio" for the class (ratio between the registrations in the class and the maximum enrollment allowable in the class), multiplied by 100. Ratios computed after adjusting for associated classes.
(5) average excludes courses numbered -93 (cooperative education) and -99 (directed studies)
3. Percent of Classes Taught by Faculty and Lecturers

Table F. Percent of Classes Taught by Faculty and Lecturers by Subgroup
(5 year average\(^1\)\(^2\))

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub Group</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100PLUS</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>78.87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lecturer</td>
<td>21.13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMPOS</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>36.64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lecturer</td>
<td>63.36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEV ED</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>60.71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lecturer</td>
<td>34.52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(blank)</td>
<td>4.76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LANG</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>38.46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lecturer</td>
<td>61.54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIT</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>81.63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lecturer</td>
<td>18.37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP-COM</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>45.88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lecturer</td>
<td>54.12%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) concurrent and cross-listed classes are combined in the primary class with data adjustments; does not include data for secondary classes
(2) data were captured using the CENSUS freeze date from Iro_Socad, and unfrozen data from Instructional_Assignment which contains all instructor assignments for scheduled offerings of a course (subject) for the academic period or faculty contract time frame
### Table F: Percent of Classes Taught by Faculty and Lecturers by Subgroup (5 year average)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subgroup</th>
<th>Faculty Percentage</th>
<th>Lecturers Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100PLUS</td>
<td>78.87%</td>
<td>21.13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>36.64%</td>
<td>63.36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lecturer</td>
<td>38.46%</td>
<td>61.54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>45.88%</td>
<td>54.12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lecturer</td>
<td>4.76%</td>
<td>95.24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEV</td>
<td>60.71%</td>
<td>39.29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>81.63%</td>
<td>18.37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lecturer</td>
<td>54.12%</td>
<td>45.88%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) Sub %; (2) Sub %;
Analysis of efficiency indicators

Class Size

For AY 2010-2011, average class size, with the exception of languages, has declined, for several reasons. The five-year gains or losses may also reflect changes in policy, although the changes in class size numbers are small.

100Plus courses for AY 2010 – 2011: Journ 205, an elective, usually does not fill. Journ 285V is also an elective with a pre- or co-requisite of enrollment in Journ 205. This newspaper production course is a necessary one for campus life, but has a relatively low enrollment. Eng 199/299 is an elective for students who produce the literary magazine and also has low enrollment. Lsk 110 is an elective that is offered occasionally, and did not have robust enrollment.

Composition and Developmental Education courses: In 2009, the policy to cap Eng 100 to 23 seats and developmental writing and remedial courses to 20 seats lowered class size. In the past, Eng 22 were as high as 26 seats and those Eng 100 classes with no in-class computers had 25 seats available.

100Plus writing (Eng 204A and Eng 209) and literature teachers were encouraged not to give capacity overrides and keep class size manageable for writing courses.

Average Class Fill rates at the 80 to 90 percent fill rate indicate that there is a demand for the courses. Language Arts courses that “count” for the AA degree enjoy a higher fill rate than a language course, for example, which is an elective course.

Faculty/Lecturer Teaching

Language Arts relies heavily on lecturers to teach its courses. Our only full-time position is in Hawaiian language; lecturers teach Japanese and Spanish. There are 1.5 positions in Speech.

For 2010 – 2011, there were 6 positions in English. The 100Plus and Literature groupings have specialty courses and are usually taught by full-time faculty. Two faculty members made the transition from ETC to the English department; after training leave and sick leave considerations, we look forward in the coming year to increasing the percentage of faculty teaching, especially in remedial and developmental courses.

But for Eng 100 courses the ratio of faculty-taught to lecturer-taught classes is very high: for last year it was 32% to 68%; the ratio for the five-year average is 36.64% to 63.36%. Lecturers offer the department flexibility in scheduling courses throughout the day and night and on-line, as well as a variety of teaching styles. Yet the trade-off may be inconsistency in promoting the Windward philosophy of teaching as well as nurturing students. Lecturers are “hired guns” who are not required to “malama” (sustain or care for) the mission of the college. Over the last five years, lecturers have taught 19 of 25 sections; 14 of 22 sections; 12 of 24 sections; 15 of 26 sections; and last year, 23 of 34 sections. For Eng 100 courses alone, there is enough work for one more composition position.
Effectiveness.

1. Success Rate by Subgroup

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100PLUS</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>-6.6%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>-3.0%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>-7.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMPOS</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>-10.4%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>-2.5%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>-9.1%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>-2.1%</td>
<td>-22.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEV ED</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>-8.0%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>32.2%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>-8.2%</td>
<td>13.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LANG</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>-11.2%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>-6.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIT</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>-6.7%</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>-10.4%</td>
<td>-11.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP-COM</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>-9.6%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>-2.3%</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>-8.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) concurrent and cross-listed classes are combined in the primary class with data adjustments; does not include data for secondary classes

(2) data were captured using the CENSUS freeze date from Iro_Socad

(3) weighted average of all class sections in an alpha/number; i.e., a course with two sections counts twice as much as a course with one section

(4) data were captured using the CENSUS and EOS freeze dates from Iro_Regs and the CENSUS freeze date from Iro_Socad

(5) data for AY 2010-2011 are fall and spring rates only; data for summer not yet available
Analysis of effectiveness indicators

Success rates of students earning C or higher grades have remained stable over the last five years as indicated by the graph for Table I (page 13).

Students finishing Developmental Education courses have had consistently lower rates of success vs. the success rates of students taking transfer courses. However, the success rates have been going up: note 43% five years ago vs. 53% two years ago, and 49% last year. Intervention programs have begun their work, and the higher success rates may be an early indication that retention, counseling, and course redesign efforts may be helping student achievement.

But there is a red flag for Composition. More Eng 100 classes are available, more students are enrolled, and there are more SSHs generated. However, the success rate of Eng 100 students has been declining: 65% five years ago, then 58%, 57%, 52%, and 51% last year. Why?

One reason could be the Student Services policy of urging that students take Eng 100 as early as possible. The transition from high school to college is a rough one, and many students may not be prepared for the rigor of Eng 100, the only course that has UH system-wide standards and the only course that is required for both the AA degree and the bachelor’s degree in the UH system.

Another reason might be that while lecturers offer flexibility and variety, there may be a cost: student success. Differences in teaching philosophy, course content, teaching methods, and grading will arise. Lecturers frequently teach at other schools and some may have a limited presence on campus for student consultations. The campus also has little authority over lecturers to stay longer and limited funds to provide them with staff development activities to promote the student-centered approach that Windward is known for. Stated again, for Eng 100 courses the ratio of faculty-taught to lecturer-taught classes is very high: for last year it was 32% to 68%; the ratio for the five-year average is 36.64% to 63.36%. Over-reliance on lecturers to teach Eng 100 may be at the expense of student achievement.

There may be other reasons. One practical step would be to find out why students who qualify for Eng 100 do not succeed. Further research into the causes for low success rates is warranted.
B. Evidence of Quality Within the Department

Ka`Ohana received another “first place” award for college newspapers from the American Scholastic Press Association for 2010-2011.

The department continues to judge the college’s annual Star Poets poetry contest for grades 3 through 12. Some of the poems from over the ten years of the Star Poets contest will be featured in the Honolulu Theatre for Youth “Poetry Fever” production that will tour the state.

Faculty involvement in college activities by the Language Arts department is high. Faculty continue to develop professionally and they contribute widely and deeply in campus, system, and community service activities. Appended are their accomplishments and goals.

Robert Barclay

**CAMPUS/SYSTEM SERVICE**
* Served as chair of the New Initiatives subcommittee of the Faculty Senate
* Served as Language Arts representative on the Faculty Senate
* Serving as Chair of the Writing Advisory Board
* Serving as Editor for accreditation self-study
* Served as Chair of Department Personnel Committee, writing four reports
* Served on one TPRC
* Language Arts rep. on the Foundations Board, including system wide meetings.
* Served on ad hoc Assigned Time Committee
* Serving as advisor to the Film Club at WCC
* Serving as Advisor to Rain Bird
* Working with the Common Book program, conducting and hosting presentations
* Meeting with graduate students of Pacific History and Pacific Island Studies
* Multiple letters of recommendation and evaluation
* Conducted assessment of English 100
* English Discipline Meetings, to improve writing classes
* Broadened teaching to include English 8

**COMMUNITY SERVICE**
* Serving as judge for Star Poets
* Conducted readings and workshops at Voyager Charter School
* Creating art and writing book for Voyager Charter School
* Conducted readings and workshops at Kamaile Academy, including fundraising
* U-8 girls AYSO soccer coach
* Volunteer work for Friends of the Library, Hawaii Bookmobile
* Conducted writing workshop at the Paliku Arts Festival
* Presentation on Marshall Islands at Hilton Hawaiian Village

**PROFESSION DEVELOPMENT**
* Hawaii Society of English Professionals, meeting regularly
* Monthly meetings with current and retired Manoa English faculty
* Member of the Hawaii Book Publisher’s Association
* Attendance at several Common Book presentations
* Attended Accelerated Learning Conference
* Published work of short fiction in *Don’t Look Back: Hawaiian Myths Made New*, from Watermark Publishing
Goals for the upcoming year
* Lead the Film Club into more advanced filmmaking
* Meet to incorporate portfolios as a tool of assessment in all English 100
* Communicate with instructors to garner more artistic and writing entries for Rain Bird
* Improve the meeting of WI hallmarks in all WI courses at WCC
* Apply for sabbatical

Ellen Ishida-Babineau
Campus Service
1. Member of Governance Subcommittee of the IEC (GSIEC)
2. Member of IEC committee
3. Convener for IEC-Subcommittee on SLOs
4. Chair for IEC-Subcommittee of Professional Development in Assessment (SPDA): planned and scheduled assessment workshops; in addition, I conducted two workshops.
5. IEC-Planning and Budget Council Auditor
6. Member of Board of Publication
7. Co-planner and facilitator in fall semester for Learning to Learn Institute and teams.
8. Assisted in conducting ENG 100 assessment (fall-spring)
9. Conducted Tenure and Promotion workshop, fall 2010
10. Member of Self-Study Accreditation, Standard IVA: Decision-Making Roles and Processes
System Service
1. Member of 2 TPRCs
2. Member of Educator’s (Cross)X-system Committee for Enhancement and Learning (EXCEL)
3. Member of Planning Committee, Logistics/Refreshments: Reading Summit, Fall 2010
Professional Development
1. Attended Reading and Writing Discipline Meeting, April 9, 2011
2. Attended Reading Summit, Spring 2011
3. Attended workshops on rubrics, SLOs for non-instructional support units, assessment data interpretation, and two Excellence in Education workshops sponsored by SPDA: Data, Data, Data and Making Your Case.
4. PBL training, May 2011
5. Facilitator training, May-June 2011
Community Service
1. Recording Secretary and Registrar for Lokahi Canoe Club
2. Advisor to Community Volunteer Group, Shinnyo-en Hawaii temple
3. Volunteer at the Okinawa Festival, Fall 2010
4. Chair of Exhibit for the Festival of Joy in Japan
Goals
1. To assist the Summer Task Force in the drafting of AA degree student learning outcomes for presentation to campus.
2. To complete the following training sessions/workshops:
   a. Concierge/Facilitator training: apply to Professional Learning Teams this fall (L2L) and Summer Task Force.
   b. Problem-Based Learning; apply strategies in classroom.
   c. Accelerated Learning Project; become a resource person for ALP.
3. To continue as a member of the IEC and GSIEC
4. To assist in the development of professional/staff development activities, particularly in the area of assessment.
Janine Oshiro  
Campus Service  
- I worked with Nancy Heu to organize and host two literary readings at the WCC Library, Out Loud in the Library. The purpose of this event is to showcase faculty and student writers at WCC, in the UH system, and the community. The first event on October 7, 2010 featured Robert Barclay from WCC, Brenda Kwon from HCC, community writer Coochie Cayan, and WCC student Jennifer Kane. Approximately 30 people attended the event. The second event on February 17, 2011 featured Desi Poteet from WCC, Eric Chock from UH-West Oahu, local writer Alexei Melnick, and WCC/UH-Manoa student Mikki O’Phelan. More than 50 people attended the event.  
- On November 9, 2010 I shared poetry and talked about writing to TRiO participants as part of their regular workshop series. Approximately 25 students attended this workshop.  
- In Spring 2011 I helped judge the entries for the Star Poets contest.  
- On April 2, 2011 for the Paliku Arts Festival I facilitated a poetry workshop. Approximately eight young people created collage poems.

System Activities  
- I attended the system-wide Reading Summits on November 13, 2010 and March 12, 2010 at WCC. At the summits, teachers worked on common SLOs for ENG21 and shared best practices.  
- I attended the Achieving the Dream conference on March 4, 2011 at WCC. One of the best presentations I saw was an ENG19 redesign by Eric Engh from Maui College. I plan on incorporating some of what I learned in my ENG19 class next semester, in particular the use of “small group instructor facilitated conferences.”  
- I attended the Developmental Reading-Writing Conference on April 9, 2011 at KCC. One of the presentations was about the Accelerated Learning Program from Baltimore Community College that KCC piloted this year. Next year I will try out an accelerated ENG22/ENG100.  
- I was selected to be a WO Learning Champion and will start my term next August.

Community Activities  
- On January 28, 2011 I shared poetry and talked to students at Pearl City High School about Celebrate Reading, an annual festival at UH-Manoa. I spoke with two periods of multiple English classes, approximately twelve classes in total.  
- On March 17, 2011 I read poetry at the M.I.A. Literary Series at the Fresh Café.  
- On April 16 at Celebrate Reading at UH-Manoa, I gave a poetry reading and facilitated a poetry workshop for young students, mostly in intermediate and high school.

Professional Development Activities  
- In Spring 2011 I took SLS620: Reading in a Second Language at UH Manoa. A project I completed for this class was a redesign of ENG19 to incorporate extensive reading, which research shows is one of the best ways to improve student writing. I also redesigned the grammar component of this course as a result of research I completed during SLS620 that shows direct grammar instruction usually has little effect or a short-term effect that disappears over time. I will implement my redesign in Fall 2011. I plan to take another reading class next year to reach my goal of teaching ENG19 and ENG21.  
- I participated in the Learn to Learn Institute, August 9-10, and follow-up meetings through the semester. The purpose of the institute was to help students develop adequate study skills.  
- Two poems were selected for Kaimana, a publication of the Hawaii Literary Arts Council.

Mary Segura  
Accomplishment for Fall 2010  
- Taught Language Arts classes for the Employment Training Center’s Learning Center;
• Coordinated the Employment Training Center’s Learning Center;
• On five months’ notice:
  Closed down a program;
  Finalized reports for students in the Essential Skills program and in Integrated  Academics;
  Located another State of Hawaii agency to accept furniture, educational  materials, and equipment from the Employment Training Center’s Learning  Center;
• Enrolled in and completed English  625;
• Served on the IEC Committee;
• Served on the MAPSAC Committee;
• Served as co-chair for Accreditation  Sub-Standard Standard IIA;

Accomplishments for Spring 2010
• Taught one section of English 22;
• Staffed the Ka Piko Writing Center;
• Enrolled in and completed English 764, Seminar in Life Writing;
• Served as co-chair for Accreditation Sub-Standard Standard IIA.

Jean Shibuya
Campus Service
1. Conducted English 100 course assessment for general education program at WCC, Fall and Spring.
2. Coordinator of English course schedule  and recruiter of English lecturers.
3. Served on one TPRC.
4. Member, Aloha Committee.
5. Resource person at Staff Development workshop on tenure and promotion, Fall 2010.
6. Gave an information talk on reading and writing courses to a seminar of new WCC counselors,  Spring 2011.
7. Served on SPDA, the Sub-committee for Professional Development in Assessment
8. Served on GSIEC, Governance Sub-committee of the Institutional Effectiveness Committee which is charged with developing policies and promoting assessment of governance on campus.

System Service
1. Served as the campus representative to the UH system’s Standing Committee on Written Communication.
2. Served as the campus representative to the System Committee of Composition Directors, a subcommittee of the Standing Committee on Written Communication.

Professional Development
1. Participated in Learning-to-Learn Summer Institute and in teaching two English 100 freshman cohort group students.
2. Attended campus workshops on rubrics and on assessment data interpretation sponsored by SPDA.
3. Attended the Reading and Writing Discipline Meeting on April 9 at Kapiolani Community College.
4. Participant in meeting at Leeward CC on implementing innovations in COMPASS testing.

Community Service
5. Served as presenter at Star Poets reading in Paliku Theatre, Spring 2010.

Goals for 2011 -2012
1. To learn and apply new teaching strategies for an Accelerated Learning Project course in English100 and English 22.
   Attend ALP workshop and conference in Baltimore in June; create syllabus and materials to teach the accelerated curriculum; teach pilot compositions courses in Fall 2011.
2. Continue to serve on Governance Sub-committee of the Institutional Effectiveness Committee.
3. Continue to recruit, orient, and mentor lecturers for composition and reading.
4. Continue to schedule English courses.
5. Continue to support the Star Poets contest by judging and helping at the awards program.
6. Continue to assist the accreditation sub-committee on learning resources with revising, editing, and documentation.
7. Continue to support the initiatives of the Language Arts department, especially in developmental education and composition.

**Lance Uyeda**

1. Leadership
   
   In August 2010, I co-directed a two-day professional development workshop with Ellen Ishida-Babineau called “Learning to Learn.” The workshop was designed for faculty teaching in the first-year student cohort groups that were organized in spring 2010 and over the summer by the student services division and participating instructors (19 in all). Major aspects of the workshop included 1) instructors’ investigation of their own teaching practices and 2) the development of study skill development/student success strategies to be implemented in the fall.

   Ellen and I continued to meet with participating faculty, who each agreed to meet with Ellen or I four times in the fall semester. My half of the faculty consultation list included four English faculty, two counselors, and three faculty in the humanities/social sciences. I also did multiple time-intensive group and individual Laulima consultations with all four of the participating counselors.

   I was the only Windward CC faculty presenter at the statewide Achieving the Dream (AtD) strategy institute, which was held here on campus in March 2011. My presentation covered where our Learning to Learn initiative had succeeded as well as where it needs to improve; it also introduced our plan to use 2010 CCSSE results to guide the initiative as it moves forward and expands in 2011-2012.

2. Committees:
   
   This year I expanded my involvement in the Credit Curriculum and Academic Affairs committee by serving on the Curriculum Policies subcommittee. This subcommittee assessed and revised the process and procedures that will guide course additions and modifications once the system-wide curriculum central database is fully functional on our campus. I joined the Standard IIB accreditation subcommittee, which is focused on the institution’s student services. I continue to serve on the AtD working group, and on the Master Planning and Space Allocation Committee. I also participated in the semi-annual TRiO SSS group session that selects grant aid recipients.

   In fall 2010, I co-chaired the crafts committee of the Windward Ho’olaule’a, which this year sold sixty-five tent spaces despite the down economy. I also created an email listserv for the committee. In spring 2011 I began work as the co-chair of the Ho’olaule’a’s silent auction committee.

   In spring 2011, I judged for the Star Poets project.

3. Coursework:
   
   In spring 2011, I enrolled in a three-credit second language studies course at UH Manoa, SLS 323, Techniques in Second Language Teaching. The course focused on teaching reading and writing to second language learners. To satisfy the requirements of the course, I completed two research projects related to the teaching of reading, and engaged in a group project on lesson planning and delivery.

4. Service to the campus & to students with academic and other needs:
   
   In December 2010, the campus’s TRiO Talent Search project submitted its grant proposal for renewed funding in 2012-2017. I served as a pro bono consultant to the student services division as they drafted proposals for two Talent Search grants—one to serve high school and intermediate school students on the windward side of the island, and another to serve students in Honolulu proper. Together, these two grant proposals are worth $5M.

5. Advising:
I am Windward CC’s Phi Theta Kappa advisor. I led the organization and planning of a 2-day statewide honors conference held at WCC in fall 2010. In 2010-2011, I attended multiple-day workshops with my students at HCC and Heald College. I helped PTK students to organize and run a number of face painting fundraisers (proceeds went to the club). I conducted all aspects of the recruitment/planning for the fall 2010 blood drive, which collected 49 pints of blood for the Hawaii Blood Bank, and for the Spring 2011 blood drive, which collected 53 pints.

At the spring 2011 Phi Theta Kappa convention, the Pacific Region’s coordinator recognized me with a “Horizon” award for my work with Windward’s chapter of the honor society.

6. Goals:

Plan and implement significant curricular changes in ENG 209 and possibly ENG 100 courses. I hope to achieve partial or complete course redesign in ENG 209 especially. To this end, I have enrolled in two time-intensive professional development institutes: 1) the Pacific Region Learning Summit, which will take place in May 2011 and which focuses on problem-based learning, and 2) the Real World Academics project, which begins in August and continues throughout the school year. The project will focus on implementing and assessing “real world” learning activities in the classroom.

Continue to expand and improve the Learning to Learn Initiative, which has been given continued funding and support under Windward CC’s new Title III grant structure. Update initiative content to use recent results of Community College Survey of Student Engagement (CCSSE) in considering/planning curricular modifications.

Continue to integrate material from Manoa education classes into current courses. Plan reading course curricula (ENG 21 and/or ENG 102).

Libby Young
• Journalism – Ka ‘Ohana received another national “first place” award from the American Scholastic Press Association for community college newspapers. We’re also waiting to hear if we’ll be named a winner for the third year in a row in the annual Pa‘i Awards of the Hawaii Publishers Association.
• Creative writing – Helped coordinate the annual Star Poets contest for public and private students in grades 3 – 12, a partnership between WCC and the Hawaii Council for the Humanities. Continuing to work with Susan St. John with a $7,500 grant from the Hawaii Council for the Humanities and a partnership with the Hawaii Writing Project to mentor more teachers in the teaching of poetry. The Honolulu Theater for Youth will also become a partner for their 2011-2012 season with the staging of “Poetry Fever,” featuring poems from the last ten years of Star Poets winners. The production will run both fall 2011 and spring 2012.
• Campus and systemwide service – Currently serve as WCC faculty senate off-campus chair and UH systemwide chair for the All-Campus Council of Faculty Senate Chairs.
• Member of the WCC Marketing Committee
• Adult Learners team leader with Carla Rogers on Title III project
• Member of Financial Resources subcommittee for WCC accreditation.
• Community/campus service – Helping to coordinate the annual Windward Ho‘olaule‘a, a partnership between WCC and the Kaneohe Business Group. Wrote the City and County $10,000 grant and other proposals as well as helped garner sponsor funding of over $25,000 to cover event costs and raise scholarship funds for WCC students. Also serve on the KBG board as past president.
• Professional development and mentoring – Attended workshops on the future of media and education in the state and am planning for a sabbatical project in fall 2011 to survey journalism education and career opportunities locally and nationally.
• Helped lead Journalism Day at UH-Manoa, Oct. 23, 2010, a day-long set of workshops for high school newspaper staffs.
C. Evidence of Student Learning

The only current date available for the College’s Institutional Research office is success rates by subgroup Table I, Appendix B).

The data suggest that Eng100-Plus and Languages courses have healthy cumulative achievement rates in the 80 to 90 percent range. Literature and Speech courses average achievement rates in the moderate 70 percentile range.

Success rates for Developmental English are rising, and the success rates for Composition (Eng 100) are declining. The results for these two groups have been discussed previously.
D. Resource Sufficiency.

The Language Arts department can continue operations with the annual budget that the Office of the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs provides to fund the Speech Lab, student help, and supplies for daily teaching.

However, the department will submit two budget requests to the Planning and Budget Council for 1) PassKey software to support remedial/developmental classes (80 seats at $40 + $3,200) 2) in anticipation of the Language Arts department relocation to the soon-to-be renovated library building (to be renamed Hale Manaleo), funds for furniture and computers for classrooms.

The department is also requesting a 1.0 FTE instructor in English. This instructor will be expected to teach all levels of composition and literature courses, but will be expected to supplant some lecturers who teach Eng 100, which is a problem course in terms of student success rates.

As discussed earlier, demand for Eng 100 has risen, by 31% over last year, and by 36% over the past five years. Class fill for Eng 100 is always high, especially during prime day times and even in the late afternoons and evenings. Yet student success rates have been declining. Perhaps it is the short-term nature of the appointments or the limited availability of some lecturers for instruction, guidance, or advising.

In a relatively small college, the demands for non-teaching responsibilities are heavy. A glance at the non-teaching activities of the Language Arts English faculty, activities that are necessary to make campus programs and projects work, will show an impressive and time-consuming array of activities. We have had to rely heavily on lecturers. And while we have been mostly lucky so far in finding good people, continuous recruitment and overseeing lecturers are a distraction. Even our junior faculty are called upon to mentor and oversee lecturers while these juniors should be involved in their own development as teachers. And when there are classroom problems, the three senior faculty must make class visits to monitor, document, and counsel.

A full-time English instructor would teach five courses in the fall and four courses in the spring, thus lessening the reliance on lecturers. Because our English faculty are generalists, this instructor will also teach developmental and literature courses. But the real payoff to the college is that the instructor will be on campus full-time and we can afford to invest in that person by providing professional development activities, mentoring, and a role in reaching long-term goals of the college.

The department’s request will promote the following system and college priorities and goals:

UH Strategic Outcome #1:

To position the University of Hawaii as one of the world’s foremost indigenous serving universities by supporting the access and success of Native Hawaiians.

Community College System Action Outcome:
1.3 Increase the number and percent of Native Hawaiian students who, if assigned to a developmental intervention, successfully complete that sequence and move on to college-level instruction.

Windward Community College Action Outcomes:

1.3 Increase the number of Native Hawaiians that complete developmental reading (from 3 to 31), writing (from 12 to 33), and math (from 29 to 51) classes to between 83% and 86% by 2015.

1.4 Increase the number of full-time Native Hawaiian students (from 25 to 37) who complete at least 20 credits in the first academic year with a GPA of 2.0 or higher, and the number of part-time Native Hawaiian students (12 to 18) who complete at least 10 credits in the first academic semester with a GPA of 2.0 or higher by % per year.

UH Strategic Outcome #2:

To increase the educational capital of the state by increasing the participation and completion of students, particularly Native Hawaiian, low-income students and those from underserved areas.

Community College System Action Outcome:

2.3 Increase the number and percent (to 80%) of students who, if assigned to a developmental intervention, enroll in and successfully complete that sequence and move on to degree applicable instruction and increase CCSSEE Active and Collaborative Learning Benchmark.

Windward Community College Action Outcome:

2.3 Increase the number of students that complete developmental reading (from 7 to 55), writing (35 to 102), and math (105 to 178) classes by 84% by 2015.

UH Strategic Outcome #4:

Address critical workplace shortages and prepare students (undergraduate, graduate, and professional) for effective engagement and leadership in a global environment.

Community College System Action Outcome:

4.6 Increase CCSSE Support for Learners Benchmark.

Windward Community College Action Outcome:

4.9: Increase CCSSE Support for Learners Benchmark to 80% by 2015.

This request is grounded in the recommendation of the America Association for University Professors that colleges work towards the benchmark of limiting reliance of non-tenure track faculty to no more than 25 percent of the total institution within any given department and the National Council of Teachers of English policy statements on a) class size and teacher workload for college teachers and on b) expectations of adjunct faculty.
E. Recommendations for improving outcomes.

Quantitative indicators for demand have been rising over the past five years in direct proportion to our increasing college enrollment, for all disciplines, especially Hawaiian language.

Average class size in the Language Arts department remained stable from year to year.

While success rates among the disciplines seem stable and healthy, the rate for Composition (Eng100) has been declining. As discussed elsewhere, the emphasis on having recent high school graduates take Eng100 in their first semester of college and the reliance on lecturers to teach Eng100 could be factors in lower student success rates of earning a C or higher.

Recommendation 1: Conduct studies to ascertain on those courses with low retention/completion rates:

1. Are there differences in the backgrounds of these students compared to those who succeed? Are they younger/older, male/female, come from particular high schools, first time (new)/continuing, etc.?

2. Of the students who need to take the Developmental Courses, what is the profile of those who do not succeed? What happens to these students?

3. Do unsuccessful students withdraw, or obtain a D/N/F grade? At what date do they withdraw or disappear?

Recommendation 2: Establish a full-time, tenure-track position in English to lessen the reliance on lecturers to teach Eng 100 and developmental writing. Discussion is on pages 22-23 of this report.
Part IV. Student Learning Outcome Assessment

A. Courses on which assessment was completed this year.


B. Courses due to be assessed next year.

AY 2011 – 2 012: Sp 181, Eng 21, Eng 271, Journ 205. Eng 270, not offered last year, will also be assessed.

E. Assessment of courses. (The Course Level Student Learning Outcomes Assessment reports for Eng 100, Journ 285V, Haw 202, Jpns 202, and Span 202 are attached.)

Eng 100: SLO 1 “Write complex and well-reasoned compositions in language, style, and structure appropriate to particular purposes and audiences” was assessed. Selected papers from all Fall 2010 Eng 100 students were scored on three aspects of SLO 1. 87% of the papers scored satisfactorily on the total of these three outcomes (6% scored unsatisfactorily on outcome 1, 15% scored unsatisfactorily on outcome 2, and 2% scored unsatisfactorily on outcome 3). Assessment results were an improvement over the last Eng 100 assessment, but the faculty believe student performance on outcome 2 “Develop a main idea clearly and concisely with appropriate content” could be strengthened. In subsequent meetings, the faculty met to share pedagogy and “practices that work.” A task force was formed to develop a format to use portfolios in place of an Eng 100 final and to create a rubric for a common portfolio assessment of Eng 100. Rather than a two-hour final exam, a portfolio allows for better assessment of all three learning outcomes and allows students to better demonstrate writing development. The task force has met regularly over the Fall 2011 semester.

Jpns 202: Assessed what students had already learned in JPNS 101, 102, and 201 and the skimming, scanning, and intensive reading skills for longer stories. Students demonstrated their abilities in two quizzes, two practice exams and a major exam. Students performed well, scoring in the 80 percentile. The instructor will focus on vocabulary and practice in reading skills.

Journ 285V: SLO 1 “Demonstrate a working knowledge of page design principles and software to produce pages for a tabloid publication.” In Spring 2010, 11 students created “dummy layouts” using a software program; six students earned A’s and five students earned B’s as they demonstrated their grasp of production and design principles. The instructor will incorporate more practice early in the course to sharpen editing visual design skills.

Haw 202: All four SLOs were assessed in Spring 2011. Students were assessed for vocabulary and grammatical acquisition in a series of quizzes, oral performances, and exams. According to the instructor, the students are able to “hold their own” in relation to Haw 202 students from other campuses.

Span 202: SLO 1: “Use accurate pronunciation, structure and vocabulary to communicate orally with speakers of Spanish, creating dialogs based on real-life situations. Students composed and performed oral dialogues twice during the semester to demonstrate knowledge of vocabulary and grammar. Instructor will stress conversational practice and will have native speakers and video presentations to increase comprehension and fluency.
# Assessment of Course Student Learning Outcomes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gen Ed SLOs Assessed</th>
<th>Course Level SLOs Assessed</th>
<th>Assessment (Performance) Tasks &amp; Success Criteria</th>
<th>Assessment Results &amp; Analysis*</th>
<th>Action(s) Proposed</th>
<th>Budget/Resources Implications</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AAS: Express ideas clearly and creatively in diverse ways through the fine arts, speech and writing</td>
<td>SLO 1: &quot;Write complex and well-reasoned compositions in language, style, and structure appropriate to particular purposes and audiences.&quot; For the exam, this SLO has been broken down into 3 learning outcomes: 1) express the main idea as a thesis, hypothesis, or other appropriate statement; 2) develop a main idea clearly and concisely with appropriate content; 3) demonstrates mastery of the conventions of writing, including grammar, spelling, and mechanics.</td>
<td>- What do students have to do to show achievement of the SLOs? - What are the various projects or tasks that will be used to assess the SLOs? - What is your benchmark? - How do you know if the SLO has been achieved successfully?</td>
<td>*Attach artifacts: summary of results, sample test, rubric, presentations, or relevant materials used to assess the SLOs. 6% of these papers scored unsatisfactorily on learning outcome 1. 15% of these papers scored unsatisfactorily on learning outcome 2. 2% of these papers scored unsatisfactorily on learning outcome 3. 87% scored satisfactorily on the total of these three outcomes. The assessment shows the SLO has been achieved successfully, and shows marked improvement over the previous assessment in all three learning outcomes. Over the last two assessments, the second outcome has scored the lowest and, although it did score satisfactorily, we believe it can be strengthened. Emphasis on sharing pedagogy (blue sheets) specific to the SLOs, via meetings and shared documents, helped to achieve the satisfactory result.</td>
<td>A task force has been formed to explore using portfolios in all sections of English 100, and to develop a rubric for a common portfolio assessment of English 100, possibly in conjunction with an in-class final. A portfolio will better assess learning outcome one, as the breadth of work in a portfolio, and the lack of a two-hour time constraint, will allow students to better demonstrate development. A portfolio will also allow us to better assess the other SLOs for English 100. none</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Assessment of Course Student Learning Outcomes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COURSE ALPHA/NUMBER: 61066/JPNS 202</th>
<th>Semester/Year: Fall 2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Instructor: Akiko I. Swan</td>
<td>Date Submitted to Department Chair:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Identify the Course Student Learning Outcomes assessed this semester.

1. Reinforce what students have already learned in JPNS 101, 102, 201 and learn to read longer stories that go beyond several paragraphs through skimming, scanning and intensive reading.

How do the above course SLOs align with the Associate of Arts or certificate program-level outcomes?

Use of the textbook/handouts to acquire reading/writing skills and necessary information

The course is also an introduction to another country’s language and culture. Through learning a foreign language, students can become aware of the differences, as well as similarities, between themselves and another society, which can broaden their perception of the world and enrich their lives.

Students develop language skills that improve their potential, help them become more culturally aware members of the community, and enhance their career potential.

What skills or competencies are necessary for the student to perform the selected SLOs?

Students need to be able to understand the contents of a story based on 202-level grammar and vocabulary through skimming, scanning and intensive reading.

What instructional methods or materials are used to prepare the students?

The course uses the textbook, “Yookoso! Continuing With Contemporary Japanese”.

The students learn to use the main grammatical points/vocabulary/phrases by practicing them in short conversations and in short reading passages and longer stories.
What assessment task(s) or tools are being used to assess the outcomes? What are the criteria for success?

1. Students were assessed based on their performance of two quizzes on the special grammatical points which were focused on in class, and on two reading practice exams and one long reading exam.

2. Grading criteria were as follows:
   a. quizzes on special grammatical points: students were given two quizzes on special grammatical points covering honorifics which had been practiced in class.
   b. reading practice exams: students were given two reading exams. The content of the first exam was a letter written by a former student to her teacher in which the honorifics were not used properly, so the students had to correct these. The second exam was a speech given at a banquet; the speech lacked the proper honorifics, so the students had to rewrite the speech using the honorifics correctly.
   c. one long reading exam on two stories: the two stories include proper honorifics, and the students had to understand the stories in their entirety.

What are the results of the assessment?

The students in the JPNS 202 class did two quizzes on the special grammatical points, two reading practice exams and one long reading exam on two stories. They scored more than 75% on average.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quizzes/Exams</th>
<th>Result Out of 100%</th>
<th>Could be improved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quiz 1</td>
<td>79.40</td>
<td>20.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quiz 2</td>
<td>82.00</td>
<td>18.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading practice exam 1</td>
<td>81.40</td>
<td>18.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading practice exam 2</td>
<td>82.00</td>
<td>18.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exam</td>
<td>82.33</td>
<td>17.67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How will you use the results? What changes do you propose to improve student learning? When?

Since all five outcomes were more than 75%, there is no indication for change. However, since some of the students were still slow in understanding the contents of the two long stories, they need to increase their vocabulary and practice more through skimming, scanning and intensive reading in JPNS 202.

Will the changes require funding? How much will the changes cost?

No funding involved.

Submit this form to your department chair for inclusion in End-of-the-Year (EOY) department reports. *The results of the assessment are not used for promotion or tenure.*
## Assessment of Course Student Learning Outcomes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COURSE ALPHA/NUMBER: SPAN 202</th>
<th>Semester/Year: 2010 -2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intermediate Spanish II</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Instructor: Laurie Tomchak   | Date Submitted to Department Chair: |

**Identify the Course Student Learning Outcomes assessed this semester.**
Use accurate pronunciation, structure and vocabulary to communicate orally with speakers of Spanish, creating dialogs based on real-life situations.

**How do the above course SLOs align with the Associate of Arts or certificate program-level outcomes?**
Not required in on-line template.

**What skills or competencies are necessary for the student to perform the selected SLOs?**
Not required in on-line template.

**What instructional methods or materials are used to prepare the students?**
Not required in on-line template.

**What assessment task(s) or tools are being used to assess the outcomes? What are the criteria for success?**
Students compose dialogues in Spanish to show their oral fluency. They compose and perform oral dialogues using vocabulary introduced in the text and in class. They composed and performed: 1. At the beginning of the semester, they discussed what they did over the summer and then performed it for the class, 2. About half-way through the class, they worked on a dialogue about selling one’s soul to the devil, modeled on the short subject DVD we watched and studied in class. Both dialogues involved talking about events in the past. I know if they have achieved the goal if they can speak together comprehensively using common vocabulary and grammar.

**What are the results of the assessment?**
Ten students completed both exercises. Their vocabulary structure on the first dialog betrayed having forgotten some of the verbs and vocabulary over the break. The second dialog was much stronger, since they had been studying and reviewing the structures and vocabulary and had the model of the short DVD to work from. More conversational practice in class more exposure to real language samples, native language videos and visits of native speakers. Video relating to subject gave them a model, study of relevant vocabulary improved comprehensibility and fluency.

**How will you use the results? What changes do you propose to improve student learning? When?**
Use of more real documents, more short videos and texts, perhaps native speaker visits, to increase fluency and comprehension. More practice in class, more comprehension exercises. More exposure to real contexts and native speakers will increase their ability to come close to real language structures, and not just English translated to Spanish.

**Will the changes require funding? How much will the changes cost?**
No financial impact. I have the materials needed, and can invite native speakers at no cost (except perhaps food or soft drinks), so it costs nothing for the college.

Submit this form to your department chair for inclusion in End-of-the-Year (EOY) department reports.  
*The results of the assessment are not used for promotion or tenure.*
Assessment of Course Student Learning Outcomes

COURSE ALPHA/NUMBER: HAW 202
Semester/Year: SPRING 2011

Instructor: Fred Kalani Meinecke
Date Submitted to Department Chair: 05/17/11

Identify the Course Student Learning Outcomes assessed this semester.

The student learning outcomes for HAW 202 are:

1. Listen and sustain comprehension of connected discourse on a variety of topics.

2. Demonstrate oral and written proficiency in grammatical patterns of greater complexity, with a working vocabulary of some 2,000 words, plus idiomatic expressions.

3. Demonstrate the ability to initiate, sustain and close a general conversation with a number of strategies appropriate to a range of circumstances and topics.

4. Demonstrate a basic familiarity with Hawaiian verbal art forms; ‘ōlelo no’eau, mele, oli, pule, mo‘olelo, and ka‘ao.

How do the above course SLOs align with the Associate of Arts or certificate program-level outcomes?

The HAW 202 course SLOs align with the HWST ASC requirements as well as the Associate of Arts outcomes, particularly outcome 4, “Express ideas clearly and creatively in diverse ways through the fine and performing arts, speech and writing.” (WCC Catalog 2009-2011, p. 28)

What skills or competencies are necessary for the student to perform the selected SLOs?

Students enrolling in HAW 202 are expected to have the skills and competencies acquired in HAW 201, for which the SLOs are:

1. Demonstrate the ability to comprehend and respond to sentence structures of greater length and complexity on a variety of topics.

2. Demonstrate the ability to comprehend, speak, read and write at the intermediate level with a working vocabulary of some 1,500 words, plus idiomatic expressions.

3. Write original expositions and communicate on a variety of topics within the student’s experience.

What instructional methods or materials are used to prepare the students?

Instructional methods and required materials include:
1. Required course textbook, KA LEI HA‘AHEO, plus Hawaiian dictionaries,
2. Quick Study Academic BarChart: “Keys to College Success”,
3. “Hawaiian Language Lessons,” available as audio correlates to every chapter in the course textbook, through UHiTunes,
4. Student-generated vocabulary card data base,
5. Numerous classroom handouts including supplemental drill materials and written exercises,
6. Instructional methods include explanations of grammatical topics, active student participation in conversational practice in small and large group settings.
What assessment task(s) or tools are being used to assess the outcomes? What are the criteria for success?

Students are assessed orally through oral quizzes, graded through a 4-pt. presentation rubric scale, through collaborative efforts in class such as team work dialogs and through oral presentations.

Students are also assessed through written quizzes, essays, reports and textbook exercises.

What are the results of the assessment?

The results yield the level of competencies for each student in vocabulary and grammatical acquisition through both oral and written demonstration.

How will you use the results? What changes do you propose to improve student learning? When?

The assessment results assist me in better evaluating student learning attainment, e.g. in identifying which topics need to be reviewed and reinforced.

Students arrive in HAW 101 with little or no understanding of language and how it works. Their comprehension of English grammar in particular is generally weak. Therefore, in enabling students to acquire the structures of Hawaiian through the medium of their English language background, the greatest challenge to the instructor is to make Hawaiian language learning attainable, insightful, and even fun. My students who have stayed on through to HAW 202 emerge having completed 24 textbook chapters, plus numerous supplemental learning aids, and would be able to hold their own vs. HAW 202 students from any other campus. (My HAW 201-202 sections draw students from many other campuses and their assessments of my teaching are very favorable.) Nevertheless, I am always on the look out for the improvement of student learning, particularly in the arena of oral proficiency which requires hours of contact and practice. Can students spare the time that is required?

Will the changes require funding? How much will the changes cost?

No funding is required.

Submit this form to your department chair for inclusion in End-of-the-Year (EOY) department reports.

The results of the assessment are not used for promotion or tenure.
### Assessment of Course Student Learning Outcomes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COURSE ALPHA/NUMBER: JOUR 285 – Newspaper Lab</th>
<th>Semester/Year: Spring 2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Instructor: Elizabeth Young</td>
<td>Date Submitted to Department Chair: 5/15/10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Identify the Course Student Learning Outcomes assessed this semester.

1. Demonstrate a working knowledge of page design principles and software to produce pages for a tabloid publication.

How do the above course SLOs align with the Associate of Arts or certificate program-level outcomes?

The JOURN 285 newspaper lab is a hands-on course in which students form the staff of Ka ‘Ohana, the monthly student newspaper. The lab holds students to professional publication and journalistic standards so they can apply these skills in upper division courses (AA SLO #1) and in the workplace (SLO #7, 8). In the process, they learn to express ideas clearly for a readership (SLO #4) and to appreciate a journalist’s role in the community (SLO #5, 6). They also learn to combine critical thinking and problem-solving with every news story, to evaluate and synthesize information and to distinguish fact from opinion in producing the final news package of story, photos, graphics, headlines, captions and video. They learn to use computer technology and desktop publishing software to communicate their ideas in a clear, meaningful and credible way.

What skills or competencies are necessary for the student to perform the selected SLOs?

SLO#1 – Students must be able to design a page of the student newspaper from scratch — using a “dummy” layout to plan, then apply InDesign desktop publishing software to bring all the page elements together in electronic form, following professional design principles and journalistic style.

What instructional methods or materials are used to prepare the students?

During the semester, students gain practice in interviewing, applying news judgment, and writing a variety of stories for each of four issues of Ka ‘Ohana. All students are expected to write and work on layout for each issue. I conference individually with students on each article to give them feedback on their rough drafts before they produce a final, publishable version. The student editors also read the articles and provide direct feedback.

For the page design, we first discuss design principles and analyze examples, based on a variety of handouts. Then students are asked to practice doing a dummy layout, followed by producing that same layout on the computer in InDesign. We demonstrate the steps in an projected screen image, accompanied by a printed tutorial for the students to keep handy if they forget the steps. A great deal of peer tutoring also occurs as veteran student staff members help the newcomers become familiar with the computer software.

The students are expected to know how to design an entire page, applying graphic design principles as well as guidelines for headline and caption writing, knowledge of the software program, tools and style sheet, and attention to proofreading and precise measuring for consistency and professionalism.

What assessment task(s) or tools are being used to assess the outcomes? What are the criteria for success?

Each student was given the “raw” elements for a page — basically stories and photos — and asked to do a dummy layout, followed by producing the actual page electronically with the InDesign program, adding all the elements we would need for a “real” page of the newspaper: headlines, bylines, captions, photo credits and keylines around photos. Students were evaluated on criteria that included how well the page design was conceived based on elements of balance, contrast, news values, readability and flow. They had to produce a "dummy layout" as their rough plan, then demonstrate their knowledge of InDesign software to replicate their plan on the computer in digital form.
What are the results of the assessment?

In the spring 2010 semester, 11 students completed the layout assessment and all passed. Of the 11, six earned A’s and five earned B’s. All 11 students were able to successfully complete a “dummy layout” for the page and apply it to a digital version in InDesign. They also demonstrated they could use the program and style sheet to choose appropriate fonts for headlines, bylines, captions and photo credits.

The major difference between those who earned A’s and those who earned B’s was in attention to detail — e.g. errors in proofreading, typos, column alignment and omission of last steps to “finish off” the page, such as borders around photos, etc.

How will you use the results? What changes do you propose to improve student learning? When?

Overall, I was pleased to see that the students seemed to grasp most of the basic skills we were testing for. However, the results of this assessment have reinforced the need to train students to pay attention to small details that make the difference between a professional publication and one that appears more amateurish and sloppy. Most students haven’t had the experience in attending to this level of accuracy for publication and need practice in a wide range of related skills — from grammar and mechanics and Hawaiian diacritical marks to thinking visually and making news judgments.

My plan is to give the class more practice earlier in identifying those kinds of errors. We’ll be using page layouts that have embedded errors so they can develop their skills between issues. With the publication of four issues each semester, we often feel the pressure of deadlines with less time to practice the basics. The challenge is to teach the whole range of skills involved in producing a newspaper — from journalistic writing to photography and web research to page and graphic design — and still meet our publication deadlines.

Will the changes require funding? How much will the changes cost?

No.

Submit this form to your department chair for inclusion in End-of-the-Year (EOY) department reports and send a copy to Ellen Ishida-Babineau, IEC.

The results of the assessment are not used for promotion or tenure.
Part V. Curriculum Revision

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Added</th>
<th>Deleted</th>
<th>Modified</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>none</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Part VII. Appendices

Appendix A. Five Year Summary Tables of Quantitative Indicators.

Appendix B.

Appendix C.