

ACTION PLAN

Arkansas Strong Start to Finish English Corequisite Support

Name of college or university:		Phillips Community College of the University of Arkansas
1. English Leadership Team members and areas of responsibility. (Consider administration, advisors, student support services, faculty leads, etc. Add rows as necessary.)		
Name	Emails	Area(s) of Responsibility
Robin Bryant	bryant@pccua.edu	Chair of Arts & Sciences, Teach Comp I & II
John Thompson	jthompson@pccua.edu	Instructor, English Dept., Arkansas County
Bryant Lytle	blytle@pccua.edu	Instructor, English Dept., Arkansas County

2. Enrollment and Completion Targets:		
2a. Enter targets for percentage of underprepared students who will be enrolled in a corequisite.		
Fall 2019	Fall 2020	Fall 2021 (75% or more)
2b. Enter targets for percentage of all students completing their gateway English within one year.		
Enter Fall 2019, Complete by Summer 2020	Enter Fall 2020, Complete by Summer 2021	Enter Fall 2021, Complete by Summer 2022

3. Assessing Need/Corequisite Support Placement: Please provide a broad overview of your current plans for assessing the level of support that students need. For example, will your multiple measures algorithm include high school GPA, high school English GPA, last English course taken, non-cognitive factors, etc.?

If you do not have a current plan, please provide two or three action steps that will inform the development of your plan.

ADHE 2016 Placement policy: https://static.ark.org/eeuploads/adhe/Student_Placement.pdf

PCCUA has been slow to bring our current co-requisite model to scale. The PCCUA Model is a modified version of Peter Admans Accelerated Learning Program (ALP) which allows students to enroll in Basic Writing II doing their remedial course work concurrently with Composition I. Although we have modified the model, it is difficult because such a large number of students place in remedial education. We

have tried to promote the co-requisite but students have not been as receptive to enrolling as students have been with the co-requisite math.

Basic Writing II and Composition I

The College DataTeam examined the Writing and Composition data and discussed it with the English faculty (developmental courses for writing are provided by the English Department). Observation of the overall data yielded much information which has influenced decision making:

- Movement from EH 1023 through EH 113 has improved since the interventions were implemented.
- EH 1023 enrollment had a slight decrease in completion rates which may be explained by increased “W” grades (student withdrawals) and “EW” grades (faculty withdrawals based on absenteeism).
- More students are advancing to Composition I and more are successfully completing reflected in an upward trend line and in the percentage rates. **This was our goal.**
- While compiling data outcomes we examined the outcomes for the lowest Basic Writing Course, EH 1013 too.
- Movement from EH 1013 to EH 1023 did not improve. This group received no interventions specific to their courses. These outcomes suggest that perhaps this group does need to be provided interventions similar to the Basic Writing II group or we might consider a co-requisite at this level.

In an effort to discover more about entering cohorts, the Institutional Researcher and the Data Team have begun analyzing cohorts differently. This effort is designed to learn more about what is happening to the cohort and why we are losing any students at the lowest level.

The Pilot in Writing allowed students enrolled in EH 1023-Basic Writing II to concurrently enroll in EH 113-Composition I. Discussions about the Writing II and Composition I data outcomes included the following observations:

- The English pilot group's completion rate is slightly higher than the overall completion rate.
- The success rate is much better than for students in EH 113 who are not part of the pilot group.
- This might suggest we need more accelerated options.

4. Implementation Plan: Please provide a broad overview of the population you intend to serve with corequisites in Fall 2019 and your current plan to expand in Fall 2020. For example, “we plan to fully scale the English in Fall 2019. Another example: We plan to examine our placement data to make decisions about what students will enroll in corequisite support courses”

If you do not have a current plan, please provide two or three action steps that will inform the development of your plan. Use the English Corequisite Support Design and Execution Template to inform this section of the Action Plan.

The PCCUA Plan was designed with a specific priority.

Priority 1: Improve the completion and persistence of students in Basic Writing II and Composition I “gatekeeper” course. This has increased the rate rate of success for those enrolled in Composition I and

external interventions include the following actions:

- 1) Provide an in-depth college orientation prior to the academic year.
- 2) Establish learning labs for students.
- 3) Provide professional tutoring in the lab or in another tutoring environment.
- 4) Provide professional development for faculty related to cooperative learning and embedded writing assessment
- 5) Explore various degree tracks (paths) which culminate in a certificate and/or degrees where Comp I and Comp II writing skills are critical to success in the pathway.

Within the context of course redesign and delivery, PCCUA implemented accelerated options for a faster pace moving through developmental education and gateway course completion. This accelerated course pilot is available for students in English and math. The English pilot offers enrollment in Basic Writing II and Composition I, the English gateway, concurrently. The math has a co-requisite design pairing Intermediate Algebra with Composition I, the math gateway. In addition, the College offers a reading and writing pilot program for students in Basic Writing I (lowest developmental writing course) and Developmental Reading (lowest reading course).

Students enrolled in the English corequisite have improved. Faculty have integrated teaching and assessment alignment by developing departmental rubrics. Non-departmental instructors are encouraged to use these for grading essays and writing assignments. The English Department implemented the use of two readers for the final essays written in both developmental and composition courses. Also, faculty were asked to clearly identify student learning outcomes in the syllabus and emphasize these in the lessons.

Remember that there is not a “best” model for corequisites; there are many successful ways to structure corequisites, depending on the student and faculty composition of your institution. However, best practices exist.

<p>Do:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Align content so that students are receiving just-in-time support. • Require structured content, aligned to the content in the college-level course. • Run side-by-side or embedded support. • Provide a sufficient number of hours of support, based on student need. • Analyze course-level data regularly. 	<p>Don't:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Run a traditional remedial English course side-by-side with the college-level course. • Determine hours of support based on what is easiest to schedule. • Run an unstructured homework hour. • Focus solely on individual course pass rates (rather, inspect throughput).
---	--

Recommendations:

- Create a side-by-side syllabus for the college-level English course content to the corequisite support course content
- Provide professional development to faculty who have always taught developmental English but are now teaching college-level English.
- Encourage faculty collaboration and communication.
- Engages in continuous improvement processes, including gathering data from both students and faculty.
- Examine your disaggregated data to identify any equity gaps that can be addressed.
- Consider the psychosocial factors on which to focus and employs methods to support the development of those factors. (growth mindset, sense of purpose, belongingness, etc.)
- Carefully consider whether to assign one grade or separate grades and how to address students who fail the college-level course or the support course. Be open to analyzing these decisions and changing if necessary.
- The corequisite class is not a grammar class. Any instruction in this area should focus on editing skills and will involve editing of student work, not decontextualized exercises.

For more information, please visit: <https://completecollege.org/strategy/corequisite-support/>

5. Implementation Details: For the corequisites described in #4, please give structural details (cohort vs. co-mingle, one instructor or two, current thinking on grades, etc.)

If you do not have a current plan, please provide two or three action steps that will inform the development of your plan. Use the English Corequisite Support Design and Execution Template to inform this section of the Action Plan.

Outcome of Co-Requisite for EH 113, Composition I & EH 1023, Basic Writing II							
Instructor 1-Success	Basic Writing II		Composition I		Composition II		Notes
Semester	Pass	GPA	Pass	GPA	Pass	GPA	General Observation
Fall 2017	8/9	3.33	7/9	2.88	4/5	2.0	Others not ready to enroll in Comp II, will enroll next semester or not needed for certificate.
Fall 2018	6/6	3.6	5/6	2.5	1/6	2.0	Others not ready to enroll in EH 123 will enroll next semester.
Instructor 2	Basic Writing II		Composition I		Composition II		
Spring 2018	3/4	3.0	3/4	2.75	1/4	2	Others not ready to enroll in EH 123, will enroll next semester or not needed for certificate.
Spring 2019	4/4	3.0	4/4	3.0	1/4		Others not ready to enroll in EH 123, will enroll next semester

The past four semesters we have tried encouraging enrollment on the Helena Campus only. Outcomes are positive and we lost very few students. Faculty at the College have decided to offer it this fall in Helena

and encourage this model in Arkansas County in Spring of 2020. Once that has been implemented, we hope to increase the number of students enrolling in this model.

6. Plans for formative assessment of the corequisites DURING the Fall 2019 semester. Consider content/grades, feedback from both faculty and students via surveys or focus groups, etc. Plan now that adjustments will take place if necessary.

Faculty Inquiry Groups (FIG) have initiated data driven discussions in both English and math. As a result, these inquiries help instructors investigate student learning and make a conscious effort to be more collaborative.

PCCUA has adopted five core indicators which we use to assess student progress. We frequently share and track outcomes related to these indicators with all stakeholders (faculty, administrators, staff, students) through newsletters, the Web and other ways. The indicators include course completion, successful course completion, progression from Composition I to Composition II, program completion (AA, AS, AAS TC). In addition the FIG groups examine pre and post test indicators to gauge improvement. This data helps with decision making about faculty and staff.

We plan to take the following actions this fall to gather more information.

1. We will use a focus group approach with students who are not enrolled in the co-requisite to determine why some are reluctant to enroll.
2. We will continue to monitor enrollment outcomes.
3. We will prepare for program expansion implementing the model at the Arkansas County campuses (or at least Stuttgart).
4. We will canvas faculty teaching the co-requisites and departmental faculty to identify other champions.
5. Faculty will meet to discuss outcomes, placement, alternative measures for placement, and co-requisite instruction.
6. Faculty will identify other co-requisite instructors and the college will provide professional development opportunities and planning time for the 2020 implementation of the existing or modified co-requisite model used.

7. Plans for program assessment of the corequisites AFTER the Fall 2019 semester. Consider content/grades, feedback from both faculty and students via surveys or focus groups, etc.

Recording data outcomes is also part of the data gathering, analyzing, and dissemination process used by PCCUA for assessing and decision making. It usually focuses on enrollment, grade distribution, "W" and "EW" rates, course success, success in the next course in a sequence, course and program completion, course repeating, success with transfer or job placement. All programs provide assessments for student learning. These are submitted annually and posted to the Assessment and Institutional Effectiveness page.

<http://www.pccua.edu/assessment/>

Students enrolled in the English Pilot are in a variety of majors. One important priority has been to determine if we are improving the performance outcomes of students in remedial education course and the gateway course. Although our numbers are small, we do track course and assessment data. This includes question success, test and course review success, test item analysis, cross section writing analysis (used extensively), and other methods. Basically, the primary goal is to improve writing outcomes so student writing samples are very important to assessment.

We have held faculty conversations discussing the use of short and long term indicators related to tracking course outcomes with programs. Institutionally, we have college-wide assessment and planning, have decision input, we have become more efficient about aligning initiatives, and we have increased the capacity of resources available to improve student success. Because we are a small college and we have three campuses, creating multiple co-curricular classes is somewhat challenging to our resources.

This learning which has resulted from the math and English work has increased an interest in realigning policies and practices at the institution so that we are student learning and success oriented in all of our practices. We are using the English data as a baseline for more work related to find out if certain kinds of student support is more effective in assuring student success than others. We are asking faculty to identify in the syllabus the first critical assessment, and we want that assessment of learning to be given no later than the fourth week of the course (or earlier in on-line or short courses). We are asking them to explain interventions to students on the first day and to remind students after the first assessment that they can receive help if they are having difficulty with the material. PCCUA faculty have been receptive to this and most helpful leading data discussions and sharing “best practices” so that faculty actually are learning from each other about what is working and what isn’t.

The faculty inquiry has moved from reporting outcomes to course queries about the outcome and strategic departmental queries and analysis. Some of this has led to forecasting the outcome of interventions but also in identifying, at the student point of entry, what kind of help a student might need.

The greatest institutional imperative we face is to raise the analytic skills of faculty and administrators. We have one institutional researcher, and the only way we will increase our capacity to understand assessment outcomes, learning, and other important concerns related to learning is to engage more people examining and understanding the patterns of evidence in the student learning outcomes. This will allow the instructor and the college to take action and make decisions about interventions (course, program, or college support level). We have learned we can change patterns which result in a negative impact on student learning or implement better more effective strategies, examine the outcome of newly implemented strategies over a period of time to determine effectiveness, and positively impact student learning. This is very important in moving the institution toward implementing the co-requisite model to a higher level. During the next year we do intend to increase the number of co-requisite opportunities and to increase the number of students enrolled in these cohorts.

Complete the table below to gather baseline data for comparison. To accurately assess whether underprepared students were better served by corequisites rather than prerequisite developmental, institutions must consider the “throughput” of students under the traditional model.

To do so:

Choose a starting semester under the old model (in this example, Fall 2016)

Follow those students for two years to gather completion data (in this example, followed until August 2018)

Consider your Fall 2016 enrollment.	Number	%
a. How many of those students were First-Time-In-College (FTIC) freshmen?	198	11.3%
b. How many of those FTIC freshmen needed to complete a gateway English course for their program of study?	110	55.6%
c. How many of the freshmen in (b) actually completed that gateway English course by August 2017 ?	73	66.4%

<p>d. How many of the freshmen in (b) actually completed that gateway English course by August 2018? <i>That will also include the students who completed by August 2017.</i></p>	75	68.1%
<p>e. How many of the freshmen in (b) were designated as underprepared? <i>Disaggregate by age 25+, Pell eligible, and race/ethnicity.</i></p>	<p>Total - 50 Non-trad - 1 Pell eligible - 40 Hispanic - 2 American Indian - 1 Black - 23 White - 24</p>	<p>Total - 45.5% Non-trad - 0.9% Pell eligible - 36.4% Hispanic - 1.8% American Indian - 0.9% Black - 20.9% White - 21.8%</p>
<p>The rows below represent your developmental throughput. They will be your basis for comparison to success rates for co-requisite students.</p>		
<p>f. How many of the freshmen in (e) completed their gateway English course by August 2017? <i>Disaggregate by age 25+, Pell eligible, and race/ethnicity.</i></p>	<p>Total - 22 Non-trad - 0 Pell eligible - 14 Hispanic - 0 American Indian - 0 Black - 8 White - 14</p>	<p>Total - 44% Non-trad - 0% Pell eligible - 28% Hispanic - 0% American Indian - 0% Black - 16% White - 28%</p>
<p>g. How many of the freshmen in (e) completed their gateway English course by August 2018? <i>Disaggregate by age 25+, Pell eligible, and race/ethnicity.</i></p>	<p>Total - 24 Non-trad - 0 Pell eligible - 16 Hispanic - 1 American Indian - 0 Black - 9 White - 14</p>	<p>Total - 48% Non-trad - 0% Pell eligible - 32% Hispanic - 2% American Indian - 0% Black - 18% White - 28%</p>

8. Current outstanding questions or supports needed from ADHE, ACC, CCA, or Dana Center Regional Coordinators.

The College needs more professional development opportunities.