

## Kahikoluamea Comprehensive Program Review 2013-16

### **Purpose**

The Kahikoluamea Comprehensive Program Review provides a regular assessment of the effectiveness of the program. The initial review was created by the Department Chair, Student Affairs Coordinator, and the Vice Chancellor of Student Affairs (VCSA), in consultation with program faculty and staff members, were responsible for completing the report. The next CPR will be written by the department chair and structured around input from four coordinators: a Math Coordinator, a Writing Coordinator, a FYE Coordinator, and a Counseling Coordinator. The report will be approved by the Student Affairs Coordinator and VCSA. The program review allows members of the Kahikoluamea Department to assess and improve instruction, student engagement, student learning, and student achievement and success. The results of the Program Review are used to refine and improve program practices to increase student success rates. The process allows members of the Department to reflect on their practices and ensure that all planning efforts are aligned with the goals of the college. Program review results are also used by the VCSA in decision-making relative to program improvement and resource allocations.

In Fall 2012, a Committee on Self-Study for Foundational English and Math Programs was created by the Chancellor and asked to “conduct a self-study aimed at developing unified and focused Foundational English and Math Programs at KCC”. Three Kahikoluamea faculty (Sharoh Moore, Evan Yoshimura, Krista Hiser) were part of the eleven-member committee, which submitted its report to the Faculty Senate in March 2013. Policies proposed by the Foundations Task Force were:

1. Kapi’olani Community College requires first-year students who have declared a major or intend to seek a degree or certificate that requires foundational English/math courses, take the placement test to determine the most appropriate academic entry point.
2. First-year students who place into developmental English and/or math courses are required to enroll in at least one of these courses per semester with continued enrollment until qualifying for foundational courses.
3. Students (qualifying for English or math foundational courses) are highly recommended and encouraged to enroll in (their foundational English or math courses.) the level of English and mathematics indicated by their placement as early as possible.

These proposed policies have impacted the implementation plans of the department, placing greater emphasis on COMPASS testing and follow up advising (#1). The department is building capacity towards #2 (currently, classroom space is the biggest barrier to requiring students to take their dev ed courses first). Our FYE program has many registration and advising initiatives to support these proposed policies. The 2016 CPR will include full implementation of these policies.

### **Process**

Following the Foundations Task Force report, a Faculty Senate ad hoc committee was formed to investigate the formation of a campus-wide Success Center. The final report of this group was accepted by the Faculty Senate in April, 2014. Like the Foundations report, it is anticipated that the Success Center report will impact the planning process for the Kahikoluamea Department.

Overall data on Kahikoluamea instructional programs is gathered centrally by the Office of the Vice President of Community Colleges (OVPCC) and reviewed on an annual basis by the program coordinators with their respective faculty through the UHCC Annual Reports of Program Data (ARPD). The data provides a common dataset and allows campuses to benchmark their campus against other campuses in the UHCC system. Each program coordinator is responsible for submitting an analysis of the instructional program's demand, efficiency and effectiveness (retention, successful completion, and persistence) specifically for Kapi'olani Community College students is contained in the ARPD.

### **College Mission Statement Mission Statement 2008-2015**

Kapi'olani Community College...

- is a gathering place where Hawai'i's cultural diversity is celebrated, championed and reflected in the curriculum, pedagogy, support services and activities, students, faculty, staff, and administration.
- is a nurturing workplace of choice for strong and caring faculty, staff, and administrators committed to effective communication and shared vision, values, mission, and responsibilities.
- strives to provide the highest quality education and training for Hawai'i's people.
- provides open access, and promotes students' progress, learning and success with low tuition and high quality instructional programs, student development and support services, and selective areas of excellence and emphasis.
- prepares students to meet rigorous associate and baccalaureate requirements and personal enrichment goals by offering high quality liberal arts and other articulated transfer programs.
- delivers high quality 21st century career programs that prepare students for rigorous employment standards and to meet critical workforce immediate and long-term needs and contribute to a diversifying state economy.
- prepares students for lives of ethical and social responsibility by offering opportunities for increased service-learning and community engagement.
- leads locally, regionally, nationally and internationally in the development of integrated international education, enriched through global collaborations.
- uses human, physical, technological and financial resources effectively and efficiently to achieve ambitious educational goals and generate a solid return on the public's investment for a sustainable future.
- builds partnerships within the University and with other educational, governmental, business, and non-profit organizations to support improved lifelong learning.
- uses ongoing cycles of planning, best practice research, budgeting, implementation, assessment, and evaluation to drive continuous program and institutional improvement.

## Program Mission Statement

Kahikoluamea means the lashing together of three canoes for stability and strength. The Kahikoluamea Department, rooted in Hawaiian values, integrates First-Year Experience; foundational academic coursework in reading, English, & mathematics; and counseling and student success initiatives to provide a cohesive system of support that focuses on and fosters student engagement through counseling, career planning, innovative pedagogies and models, co-curricular activities, and learning support services.

## Part I. Executive Summary of ARPD

The overall program health status is healthy for writing, cautionary for math, and unhealthy for reading.

Reading: **70%** successful completion in 12-13 (persistence and subsequent level do not apply since next course is not college level)

Writing: **57%** successful completion in 12-13; 81% persistence; 75.9% successful completion of subsequent level

Math: **57%** successful completion in 12-13; 66.6% persistence to college level\*; 67.6% completion of college level from one level below.

Efficiency indicators were healthy for all three programs, with enrollment expected to increase dramatically if the policy to require students to take developmental courses (should they place into them) in their first semester. Class size increased slightly for math and writing with fill rates ranging from 84 - 92%. By Fall 2014 the department will have a full stable of qualified full time faculty in English and Math, although there is only one Reading faculty member. The department prioritizes the courses being taught by skilled full time faculty; however, many faculty in the department also teach college-level courses in LLL and Math/Science.

## Part II. Program Description History

In October 2001, the Board of Regents approved the creation of a developmental education unit and placed it under the Dean of Students. The rationale to shift basic and developmental English and math courses into a department apart from Language Arts and Math/Sciences was to: 1) provide necessary academic and counseling support to students; 2) increase communication among English, math and counseling faculty for closer integration of these disciplines within the classroom; 3) focus on student development and support; 4) create a safer environment to learn foundational skills and adjust to college; 5) attract faculty who have a commitment to creating a cohesive program that prepares developmental students for college-level classes.

As part of the college's reorganization in 2008, the Holomua Program was renamed Kahikoluamea. Merging the academic and student support functions of the former Holomua Academic Program with FYE and Malama, Kahikoluamea was designed to embody Hawaiian values. This

consolidation was designed to improve the alignment of resources and services that match the College's mission and the diverse needs of entering students.

Currently, Kahikoluamea includes 8.0 FTE faculty for math and 8.0 FTE faculty English. Support services include 4.0 FTE Kahikoluamea counselors, 2.0 FTE Pathways Faculty, 3.0 FTE First Year Experience Coordinator, 1.0 FTE secretary.

### Part III. Quantitative Indicators from ARPD

#### Remedial/Developmental Math

Demand Indicators	Program Year	11-12	12-13	13-14
		1	Enrolled in any Remedial/Developmental	1,630
2	Semester Hours Taught	300	336	
3	* Student Semester Hours (SSH) Taught	6,290	6167	
4	Full Time Students (Fall) Enrolled	599	566	
5	Full Time Students (Spring) Enrolled	394	405	
6	Number of Classes Taught	93	95	
AtD	Achieving the Dream Fall Cohort	<b>2010</b>	<b>2011</b>	<b>2012</b>
7	Percent AtD Cohort with Placement	71%	79%	
8	AtD Cohort Placing Remedial/Developmental	41%	44%	
9	Cohort Enrolling Remedial/Developmental	345	331	
9a	Percent Cohort Enrolling Remedial/Developmental	47%	49%	
10	* Increase Percent Enrolling	-3%	2%	

Efficiency Indicators	Program Year	11-12	12-13	13-14
		11	Average Class Size	21.2
12	* Fill Rate	91%	80%	
13	Number of Low-Enrolled (<10) Classes	1	9	
14	* BOR Appointed Faculty (FTE)	4.2	4.8	
15	Non-BOR Appointed Faculty Teaching Classes	13	11	
16	Percentage Classes Taught by Regular Discipline Faculty	39%	43%	
17	Percentage Classes Taught by non Regular Discipline Faculty	61%	57%	
18	Program Budget Allocation	\$805,338	\$1,384,098	
18b	Tuition & Fees	\$0	\$440,582	
19	Cost per SSH	\$128	\$224	

Effectiveness Indicators	Program Year	11-12	12-13	13-14
		Retention (Course Completion)		
20	1 Level Below College Level	88%	89%	

21	2 Levels Below College Level	95%	95%	
22	3 or More Levels Below College Level	0%	n/a	
Successful completion (Equivalent C or Higher)				
23	1 Level Below College Level	59%	57%	
23a	1 Level Below College Level	704	648	
24	Withdrawals (Grade = W)	140	123	
25	2 Levels Below College Level	57%	50%	
25a	2 Levels Below College Level	435	338	
26	Withdrawals (Grade = W)	41	34	
27	3 or More Levels Below College Level	0%	n/a	
27a	3 or More Levels Below College Level	0	n/a	
28	Withdrawals (Grade = W)	0	n/a	

Achieving the Dream	AtD Fall Cohort	2010	2011	2012
29	Cohort Enrolled in Remedial Developmental Course	345	331	
30	Cohort Successful Completion at Least One Remedial/Developmental Course within First Academic Year	198	232	
31	Percent Cohort Successful Completion	57%	70%	
Remedial/Developmental Pipeline				
32	AtD Cohort Size	1,766	1,535	
33	Percent AtD Students Placing Into Remedial/ Developmental Level	41%	44%	
34	Percent AtD Cohort Enrolled in Remedial/Developmental Course	20%	22%	
35	Percent AtD Cohort Successfully Completing Any Remedial/ Developmental Course Within First Academic Year	27%	35%	
36	Percent AtD Cohort Successfully Completing College Level Course Within First Academic Year	43%	37%	

Successful Next Level	Program Year	11-12	12-13	13-14
Persistence (Fall to Spring)				
37	* Percent From 1 Level Below College Level, To College Level	65%	66.6%	
37a	From 1 Level Below College Level, To College level	226	204	
38	Percent From 2 Levels Below College Level, To 1 Level Below	65%	59%	
38a	From 2 Levels Below College Level, To 1 Level Below	140	86	
39	Percent From 3 or More Levels Below College Level, To 2 Levels Below	N\A	n/a	
39a	From 3 or More Levels Below College Level, To 2 Levels Below	N\A	n/a	
Success in Subsequent Course (Equivalent C or Higher)				

40	College Level From 1 Level Below	132	138	
40a	* Percent College Level From 1 Level Below	58%	67.6	
41	1 Level Below From 2 Levels Below College Level	71	44	
42	2 Levels Below From 3 or More Levels Below College Level	N\A		

**Remedial/Developmental Reading**

Demand Indicators	Program Year	11-12	12-13	13-14
1	Enrolled in any Remedial/Developmental	214	160	
2	Semester Hours Taught	36	33	
3	* Student Semester Hours (SSH) Taught	672	477	
4	Full Time Students (Fall) Enrolled	44	48	
5	Full Time Students (Spring) Enrolled	16	8	
6	Number of Classes Taught	12	11	
AtD	Achieving the Dream Fall Cohort	<b>2010</b>	<b>2011</b>	<b>2012</b>
7	Percent AtD Cohort with Placement	72%	74%	
8	AtD Cohort Placing Remedial/Developmental	28%	29%	
9	Cohort Enrolling Remedial/Developmental	134	115	
9a	Percent Cohort Enrolling Remedial/Developmental	27%	25%	
10	* Increase Percent Enrolling	0%	-2%	

Efficiency Indicators	Program Year	11-12	12-13	13-14
11	Average Class Size	18.7	14.5	
12	* Fill Rate	84%	67.9%	
13	Number of Low-Enrolled (<10) Classes	2	3	
14	* BOR Appointed Faculty (FTE)	1.2	.07	
15	Non-BOR Appointed Faculty Teaching Classes	0	1	
16	Percentage Classes Taught by Regular Discipline Faculty	100%	64%	
17	Percentage Classes Taught by non Regular Discipline Faculty	0%	36%	
18	Program Budget Allocation	\$170,749	\$142,526	
18b	Tuition and Fees	\$0	\$22,450	
19	Cost per SSH	\$254	\$228	

Effectiveness Indicators	Program Year	11-12	12-13	13-14
Retention (Course Completion)				
20	1 Level Below College Level	94%	92%	
21	2 Levels Below College Level	0%	n/a	
22	3 or More Levels Below College Level	0%	Na/	
Successful completion (Equivalent C				

or Higher)				
23	1 Level Below College Level	70%	70%	
23a	Level Below College Level	156	112	
24	Withdrawals (Grade = W)	13	12	
25	2 Levels Below College Level	0%	n/a	
25a	2 Levels Below College Level	0	n/a	
26	Withdrawals (Grade = W)	0	n/a	
27	3 or More Levels Below College Level	0%	n/a	
27a	3 or More Levels Below College Level	0	n/a	
28	Withdrawals (Grade = W)	0	n/a	

Achieving the Dream	AtD Fall Cohort	2010	2011	2012
29	Cohort Enrolled in Remedial Developmental Course	134	115	
30	Cohort Successful Completion at Least One Remedial/Developmental Course within First Academic Year	72	90	
31	Percent Cohort Successful Completion	54%	78%	
Remedial/Dev elopmental Pipeline				
32	AtD Cohort Size	1,766	1,535	
33	Percent AtD Students Placing Into Remedial/ Developmental Level	28%	29%	
34	Percent AtD Cohort Enrolled in Remedial/ Developmental Course	8%	7%	
35	Percent AtD Cohort Successfully Completing Any Remedial/ Developmental Course Within First Academic Year	15%	20%	
36	Percent AtD Cohort Successfully Completing College Level Course Within First Academic Year	16%	11%	

Successful Next Level	Program Year	11-12	12-13	13-14
Persistence (Fall to Spring)				
37	* Percent From 1 Level Below College Level, To College Level	0%	n/a	
37a	From 1 Level Below College Level, To College level	0	n/a	
38	Percent From 2 Levels Below College Level, To 1 Level Below	N\A	n/a	
38a	From 2 Levels Below College Level, To 1 Level Below	N\A	n/a	
39	Percent From 3 or More Levels Below College Level, To 2 Levels Below	N\A	n/a	
39a	From 3 or More Levels Below College Level, To 2 Levels Below	N\A	n/a	n/a
Success in Subsequent Course (Equivalent C or Higher)				
40	College Level From 1 Level Below	0	n/a	
40a	* Percent College Level From 1 Level Below	N\A	n/a	
41	1 Level Below From 2 Levels Below College Level	N\A	n/a	
42	2 Levels Below From 3 or More Levels Below College Level	N/A	n/a	

**Remedial/Developmental Writing**

<b>Demand Indicators</b>	<b>Program Year</b>	<b>11-12</b>	<b>12-13</b>	<b>13-14</b>
1	Enrolled in any Remedial/Developmental	808	725	
2	Semester Hours Taught	144	153	
3	* Student Semester Hours (SSH) Taught	2,553	2316	
4	Full Time Students (Fall) Enrolled	232	241	
5	Full Time Students (Spring) Enrolled	113	122	
6	Number of Classes Taught	48	51	
Achieving the Dream	AtD Fall Cohort	<b>2010</b>	<b>2011</b>	<b>2012</b>
7	Percent AtD Cohort with Placement	71%	72%	
8	AtD Cohort Placing Remedial/Developmental	35%	35%	
9	Cohort Enrolling Remedial/Developmental	422	411	
9a	Percent Cohort Enrolling Remedial/Developmental	68%	76%	
10	* Increase Percent Enrolling	-3%	8%	

<b>Efficiency Indicators</b>	<b>Program Year</b>	<b>11-12</b>	<b>12-13</b>	<b>13-14</b>
11	Average Class Size	17.7	15.1	
12	* Fill Rate	92%	86.5%	
13	Number of Low-Enrolled (<10) Classes	0	5	
14	* BOR Appointed Faculty (FTE)	3.4	2.5	
15	Non-BOR Appointed Faculty Teaching Classes	6	10	
16	Percentage Classes Taught by Regular Discipline Faculty	71%	49%	
17	Percentage Classes Taught by non Regular Discipline Faculty	29%	51%	
18	Program Budget Allocation	\$484,474	\$624,773	
18b	Tuition & Fees	\$0	\$105,839	
19	Cost per SSH	\$190	\$270	

<b>Effectiveness Indicators</b>	<b>Program Year</b>	<b>11-12</b>	<b>12-13</b>	<b>13-14</b>
Retention (Course Completion)				
20	1 Level Below College Level	92%	90%	
21	2 Levels Below College Level	0%	n/a	
22	3 or More Levels Below College Level	0%	n/a	
Successful completion (Equivalent C or Higher)				
23	1 Level Below College Level	63%	57%	
23a	1 Level Below College Level	535	440	
24	Withdrawals (Grade = W)	65	78	
25	2 Levels Below College Level	0%	n/a	
25a	2 Levels Below College Level	0	n/a	
26	Withdrawals (Grade = W)	0	n/a	



27	3 or More Levels Below College Level	0%	n/a	
27a	3 or More Levels Below College Level	0	n/a	
28	Withdrawals (Grade = W)	0	n/a	

n/a

n/a	<b>AtD Fall Cohort</b>	<b>2010</b>	<b>2011</b>	<b>2012</b>
29	Cohort Enrolled in Remedial/ Developmental Course	422	411	
30	Cohort Successful Completion at Least One Remedial/Developmental Course within First Academic Year	286	295	
31	Percent Cohort Successful Completion	68%	72%	
Remedial/Dev elopmental Pipeline				
32	AtD Cohort Size	1,766	1,535	
33	Percent AtD Students Placing Into Remedial/Developmental Level	35%	35%	
34	Percent AtD Cohort Enrolled in Remedial/Developmental Course	24%	27%	
35	Percent AtD Cohort Successfully Completing Any Remedial/Developmental Course Within First Academic Year	47%	55%	
36	Percent AtD Cohort Successfully Completing College Level Course Within First Academic Year	100%	100%	

<b>Successful Next Level</b>	<b>Program Year</b>	<b>11-12</b>	<b>12-13</b>	<b>13-14</b>
Persistence (Fall to Spring)				
37	* Percent From 1 Level Below College Level, To College Level	80%	81.1	
37a	From 1 Level Below College Level, To College level	260	241	
38	Percent From 2 Levels Below College Level, To 1 Level Below	N\A	n/a	
38a	From 2 Levels Below College Level, To 1 Level Below	N\A	n/a	
39	Percent From 3 or More Levels Below College Level, To 2 Levels Below	N\A	n/a	
39a	From 3 or More Levels Below College Level, To 2 Levels Below	N\A	n/a	
Success in Subsequent Course (Equivalent C or Higher)			n/a	
40	College Level From 1 Level Below	210	183	
40a	* Percent College Level From 1 Level Below	81%	75.9%	
41	1 Level Below From 2 Levels Below College Level	N\A	n/a	
42	2 Levels Below From 3 or More Levels Below College Level	N\A	n/a	

\* See notes in appendix for details on reading this data

	Fall 2012 Cohort
Number of Students in Cohort (see note 1)	1,374
Students with 67% or More of Their Courses with a C or Better in the Fall Term (see note 2)	875 / 1,374 (63.68%)
Students with 67% or More of Their Courses with a C or Better in the Spring Term (see note 2)	615 / 1,044 (58.91%)
Students on Probation at the End of the Fall Term (see note 3)	1 / 1,374 (0.07%)
Students on Probation at the End of the Spring Term (see note 3)	102 / 1,044 (9.77%)
Mean and Median Credits Taken During Fall Term (see note 4)	10.29 / 12.00 all students 12.98 / 12.00 full-time students 6.11 / 6.00 part-time students
Mean and Median Credits Earned During Fall Term (see note 5)	7.73 / 9.00 10.08 / 12.00 all students 4.04 / 3.00 full-time students part-time students
Mean and Median Credits Taken During Spring Term	11.14 / 12.00 all students

(see note 4)	<p>full-time students part-time students</p>	<p>12.09 / 12.00 9.21 / 9.00</p>
(see note 5)	<p>Mean and Median Credits Earned During Spring Term</p> <p>all students full-time students part-time students</p>	<p>8.14 / 9.00 9.20 / 10.00 5.98 / 6.00</p>
	<p>Mean and Median GPA During Fall Term (see note 6)</p>	<p>2.295 / 2.600</p>
	<p>Mean and Median GPA During Spring Term (see note 6)</p>	<p>2.260 / 2.500</p>
	<p>Mean and Median GPA During First Academic Year at KapCC (see note 6)</p>	<p>2.187 / 2.426</p>
	<p>Students Completing FW (Foundation Written Communication) Requirement by the End of the First Academic Year AtD Goal 2 (see note 7)</p>	<p>586 / 1,374 (42.65%)</p>
	<p>Students Completing FS (Foundation Symbolic Reasoning) Requirement by the End of the First Academic Year AtD Goal 2 (see note 8)</p>	<p>286 / 1,374 (20.82%)</p>
	<p>Fall to Spring Reenrollment AtD Goal 4 (see note 9)</p>	<p>1,044 / 1,351 (77.28%)</p>
	<p>Spring to Fall Reenrollment (see note 9)</p>	<p>735 / 972 (75.62%)</p>
	<p>Recent HS Graduates Enrolling in 12 or more Credits in the Fall (see note 10)</p>	<p>558 / 869 (64.21%)</p>

Recent HS Graduates Awarded Federal Financial Aid Before First Day of Instruction (see note 11)	367 / 869 (42.23%)
Recent HS Graduates Awarded Federal Financial Aid Before August 1 <sup>st</sup>  (see note 11)	181 / 869 (20.83%)

**Part IV. Curriculum Revision and Review**<sup>SEP</sup>

Listing of courses reviewed during the previous three years. A minimum of 20% of existing courses are to be reviewed each year.

Developmental Math	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Math 24 was reviewed in 2012</li> <li>● Math 25 was reviewed in 2011</li> <li>● Math 81 was reviewed in 2011</li> </ul>
--------------------	--

Developmental Writing & Reading *both courses were updated to align with systemwide dev ed learning outcomes for Eng 21 and Eng 22	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● *ENG 22 was reviewed in 2013 (Writing Coordinator)</li> <li>● *ENG 21 was reviewed in 2014 (Reading Coordinator)</li> </ul>
---	--

Interdisciplinary Studies: Nawa’a: A Personal Learning Odyssey	●IS 109 was reviewed in 2013 (FYE Coordinator)
--	--

**Part V: Student Support Survey (Counseling)**

Baseline student need data was obtained through delivery of the College Student Inventory (CSI) and a survey to assess for career and major decidedness in departmental courses. Student satisfaction surveys were also administered following first year student NSO attendance/participation.

Results are as follows:

CSI

The top success recommendation/need areas for our KCC first year students and those enrolled in targeted developmental education courses (as indicated through aggregate CSI data from approximately 500 Kapi‘olani Community College students who completed the CSI during the years 2010-2012):

1. Get help with exam skills
2. Discuss qualifications for occupations
3. Get help in selecting an academic program
4. Get help with study habits
5. Get help with basic math skills
6. Get help with writing skills
7. Get help in selecting an occupation
8. Discuss job market for college graduates
9. Discuss advantages/disadvantages of occupations
10. Get help with reading skills/Get tutoring in selected areas (tie)

### Undecided Student Survey

The Kahikoluamea counselors employed a quantitative measure, through a survey, to determine how many and who amongst students in developmental level math and English courses have decided or have not decided on their career goal and major pertaining to their career goal. The counselors planned to use the result of the data to inform their program development by helping them become more aware of their student population and strategically develop targeted interventions.

A 2-question survey was administered to all students in developmental courses during the second week of Fall 2013 semester. All 25 Kahikoluamea instructors were asked to distribute the survey to all their in-person and online sections; 19 (76%) Kahikoluamea instructors participated. Out of the 1288 Kahikoluamea students, about two-thirds (790 students; 61%) responded to the survey, while one-third (498 students; 39%) did not.

Out of the 498 students who responded, the results revealed that a quarter (25%) of the respondents are undecided about their career goal and/or major. More specifically, about one-third of respondents did not know their career goal and

one-third did not know their major. After disaggregating further, results showed that about one-third of respondents do not know BOTH career goal and major (186 students; 64%); about a quarter of respondents do not know ONLY their major (70 students); and about a tenth of respondents do not know ONLY their career goal (35 students; 12%). When disaggregated between the two disciplines, both were true for both math and English.

The data revealed that although students have indicated their major when they applied to the college, a big percentage of them are unsure about their choice; revealing their need for further assistance on exploring and choosing their major and career goal. Because of this knowledge, there is a need to address this population in order to assist them in successfully moving towards a more concrete goal. The knowledge gained from the result of this survey is continuously utilized by Kahikoluamea counselors and FYE program staff to inform the development of their counseling and learning support plan.

**Student Learning: Program Pre and Post-Test:**

Surveys were included at the beginning and at the end of the program to assess for student learning, awareness, and development. Students completed a pre-test at the beginning of the semester before they began the program and a post-test was included at the end of the semester/after they completed the program (pre and post-test completion rates were not consistent due to various methods of requiring completion of post-test within classes in which the program was deployed).

**Part VI. Analysis of the Program**

**DEVELOPMENTAL MATH**

<b>DEVELOPMENTAL MATH</b>						
<b>INTERNAL</b>						
<b>Strengths</b>			<b>Weakness</b>			
	<b>Math 24</b>	<b>Math 25</b>	<b>Math 81</b>	<b>Math 24</b>	<b>Math 25</b>	<b>Math 81</b>
<b>Demand</b>			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demand is decreasing</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Inadequate resources (classrooms, computer lab, instructors, etc.)</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Students do not understand the Math 81/ Math 100</li> </ul>
<b>Efficiency</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Self-paced model lessens dependency on FTE</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Students have more options when they successfully complete this course.</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not enough self-paced sections available for incoming FY students</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Coordinator and instructors need to work more closely together</li> <li>• Grading rubric needed</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Since it is a 6-credit course, and with increased course offerings, more faculty need to be trained in teaching Math 81</li> <li>• Tests/exams have been in use for a long time</li> </ul>
<b>Effectiveness</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Success rates increasing</li> <li>• Retention rate is consistently high</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Success rate around mid 70%</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Success rate stagnant at around 50%</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Unit analysis, scientific notation and direct/indirect proportion, quadratic equations are not emphasized enough for science classes requiring this as a prerequisite</li> </ul>
<b>Overall (Common to all)</b>	Departmental first week attendance policy helps lower no-show student numbers					

<b>DEVELOPMENTAL MATH EXTERNAL</b>	
<b>Opportunities</b>	<b>Threats</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• STATway course will start in Fall 2014; demand is yet unknown.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lack of communication with system office around Math 24 initiatives</li> </ul>

**DEVELOPMENTAL READING**

<b>DEVELOPMENTAL READING INTERNAL</b>		
	<b>Strengths</b>	<b>Weakness</b>
<b>Demand</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A drop in demand is not necessarily a “weakness”</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not properly advertised for entire campus, leads to sections not filling</li> </ul>
<b>Efficiency</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The fill rate decreased from 19.5 to 18.7. However, at 84% the number is “healthy”</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The successful ENG 21/22 learning community was not offered in 2011-2012 because of low enrollment.</li> </ul>
<b>Effectiveness</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The retention rate increased from 91% to 94%</li> <li>• The successful completion rate improved from 48% to 70%</li> <li>• One factor for retention and successful rates was the very successful accelerated 8-week ENG 21 followed by an 8-week ENG 22</li> </ul>	

<b>DEVELOPMENTAL READING EXTERNAL</b>	
<b>Opportunities</b>	<b>Threats</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• OFIE did a study to see if the change in the COMPASS retake policy affected enrollment. The study showed that the change may have accounted for some of the decrease. The new online NSO may also have students being more serious about taking the COMPASS test, and therefore, more students are scoring above the ENG 21 level.</li> <li>• Shared competencies were adopted in 2014 to align with the system</li> <li>• Request from the Chancellor to create a reading program</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lack of buy in from students who place into ENG21 to enroll in the course their first semester</li> <li>• Inability of single instructor to teach multiple sections during morning hours</li> </ul>



**DEVELOPMENTAL WRITING**

<b>DEVELOPMENTAL WRITING</b>		
<b>INTERNAL</b>		
	<b>Strengths</b>	<b>Weakness</b>
Demand	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demand remains steady, although enrollment fluctuates from fall to spring.</li> </ul>	
Efficiency		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Efficiency decreased with more low-enrolled ENG 22 classes in Spring 2013 and loss of 2 full-time positions</li> </ul>
Effectiveness	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Successful completion (C or Better) increased 4% in AY 2012 – 2013</li> </ul>	

<b>DEVELOPMENTAL WRITING</b>		
<b>EXTERNAL</b>		
	<b>Opportunities</b>	<b>Threats</b>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Recommendation of the Foundations Task force to require students to take developmental courses in their first semester.</li> <li>• Adoption of common SLOS developed by system dev ed committee</li> <li>• Recommendation of Success Center Committee to develop a reading and writing center and math lab to serve both developmental and foundational writing students.</li> </ul>	

**COUNSELING**

<b>Student Support</b>		
<b>INTERNAL</b>		
	<b>Strengths</b>	<b>Weakness</b>
Demand	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• N/A</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• N/A</li> </ul>
Efficiency	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• N/A</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• N/A</li> </ul>
Effectiveness	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Collaborated with some classes</li> <li>• Collaboration with different entities on campus to promote student engagement and retention</li> <li>• Help students feel more connected to campus and aware of campus resources</li> <li>• Provide structured pathway for students</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Limited classes/faculty to collaborate with – not TOTAL and consistent buy-in</li> <li>• Difficulty in finding the most effective mechanism to promote participation</li> <li>• Small student completion and full participation—student and instructor’s choice</li> <li>• Lack of sufficient monitoring/oversight of student progress and of assessment support and instrument</li> <li>• Targeted population too large – not clearly defined</li> <li>• Distracted by multiple initiatives</li> </ul>

<b>Student Support</b>	
<b>EXTERNAL</b>	
<b>Opportunities</b>	<b>Threats</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Funding (i.e. Achieving the Dream, Title 3) In Fall 2013, expanded opportunities by establishing partnership with FYE.</li> <li>• Membership to relevant professional organizations (i.e. NACADA, NADE)</li> <li>• Collaborations with other UHCC’s</li> <li>• Achieving the Dream (AtD)</li> <li>• Graduation Initiative</li> <li>• Completion Agenda</li> <li>• Native Hawaiian Initiatives</li> <li>• Shifting campus priorities and directions</li> <li>• Pathways</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Uncertainty and not knowing how their responsibilities might change from outcome of Foundations report</li> </ul>

## Part VII: Overall Tactical Plan Chart for Kahikoluamea

Strategic Goal and Performance Measure	Tactical Strategies	Data to be Gathered	Campus and Community Synergies	Key Community Partners	Resource and Request and source of funding
<p>Strategic Outcome A Performance Measure: A3</p> <p>Strategic Outcome B Performance Measure B3</p>	<p>1 - Embed into math courses math pathways charts into multiple contact points (COMPASS, NSO, classrooms, counselors college wide, etc.).</p> <p>Person Responsible: Math Program Coordinator, Sang Chung</p> <p>Implementation: Develop, plan and design LPS - Fall 2013; Pilots start - Spring 2014 Increase pilots – Fall 2014</p>	<p>Define baseline</p> <p>Quantitative Data from ARPD: Measure and compare math success, math retention and math persistence rates of pilots from Fall 2014 – Spring 2015 and compare with historical data from Fall 2011 – Spring 2013</p> <p>Qualitative Data: Student survey feedback Faculty survey feedback Counseling survey feedback</p>	<p>COMPASS FYE NSO Counselors (campus) Peer mentors Tutors Kuilei Imiloa, My Plan Math Sciences Dept. Pathways Learning Support</p>		<p>Attendance at AMAYTIC Conference to gather ideas on how math pathways are being implemented at 2-year colleges -2 math faculty on RTRF funds</p> <p>Printing cost - 25 large math pathways advising charts and 2500 brochures</p>
<p>Strategic Outcome A Performance Measure A3</p> <p>Strategic Outcome B Performance Measure B3</p>	<p>2 – Integrate reading, student success strategies, sustainability learning outcomes, and/or service learning into sections of Eng 22. Research effective strategies to increase reading skills for those scoring into Eng 21 and make recommendations</p> <p>Person Responsible: Writing Program Coordinator, Reid Sunahara Dianne Ida , for redesign of reading program</p>	<p>Reading assessment for ENG 22 students (Nelson Denny or other instrument)</p> <p>Success rates Persistence rates</p> <p>Developmental courses with “S” designation or S-L option.</p> <p>Increased Service Learning (S-L) participation in ENG 100-level courses (after pre-service experience in ENG 22)</p>	<p>Service Learning program</p> <p>ENG 21 faculty</p> <p>Kahikoluamea Counselors (Ola, CSI, etc)</p> <p>Pathways (Imiloa, Kukui, MyPlan)</p> <p>LLL Dept</p>	<p>S-L Partners within 3 mile radius (i.e. Palolo Learning Center, Waikiki Food Farm, Kaimuki High School, Leahi Hospital, etc. )</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>professional development stipends for conference attendance and PD for reading.</li> </ul>

	<p>Implementation: Fall 2015 integration with new course SLOs</p>	<p>Track progress of pilots via Reading and Writing ARPD reports</p>			
<p>Strategic Outcome A Performance Measure A3</p> <p>Strategic Outcome B Performance Measure B3</p>	<p>FYE and Counseling has partnered to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Restructure NSO</li> <li>2. Create and implement a student success guide and a learning plan for first year students (including students enrolled in developmental education courses)</li> <li>3. Identify at-risk student populations and associated possible interventions</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Achievement data</li> <li>2. Student Learning Outcomes (SLO)</li> <li>3. Service Area Outcomes (SAO)</li> </ol>	<p>Counseling, student, and learning support programs; peer mentors</p>	<p>Community donors for NSO incentives.</p>	<p>Achieving the Dream Grant already received for 2013-14</p> <p>funding (for student success guide)</p>

### **Part VIII. Resource and Budget Implications**

The resource and budget needs required to implement Kahikoluamea's strategies (listed above) focus on obtaining external or federal funds. As a department focusing on student success for developmental learners, there are grant opportunities that we are eligible to apply for. The VCSA's office will continuously research and monitor grant opportunities working closely with OFIE for this purpose.

The Kahikoluamea faculty are also focused on having adequate classroom spaces to meet the anticipated demand of student enrollment given the success of our FYE Program in increasing the number of students taking their math and English course in the first year of college. The need for additional classrooms is estimated at least four by Fall 2014. These classrooms will be dedicated to math and writing and will be shared with LLL as both ENG 22 and ENG 100 are offered as ALP.

#### **Campus Wide Technology Plan with CELTT**

The department requires 6 new computers and printers for full-time faculty and a secretary. Due to changes in technology and the need to upgrade to Windows software by the end of 2013, the department has evaluated its replacement of computers, printers, and associated software like Adobe Acrobat.

In addition, the department needs 1 overhead projector and dedicated computer for instructor for classrooms 'Iliahi 208 and 207.

## Appendix

This program includes three major components:

- 1) Instruction in English and math: a 3-credit reading course, ENG 21, Introduction to College Reading Skills; a 3-credit writing course, ENG 22, Beginning Composition, an accelerated learning pathway for writing (ALP ENG 22-100); a 3-credit Math 24 (Elementary Algebra I); a 3-credit, Math 25 (Elementary Algebra II); and a 6- credit Math 81 (Foundations of Mathematics). In Fall 2014 the department will run 10 sections of IS 109 College Success.
- 2) Student Support Counseling support services by 4.0 FTE counselors who work closely with faculty to provide co-curricular opportunities and learning experiences for students.

Tutoring services, paid for by the department in the Kahikoluamea Center, but managed by the peer mentor coordinator, offer additional learning support for students enrolled in developmental courses. Peer mentoring services, also offered in the Center, are provided by the College's Student Engagement Office.

- 3) FYE: First Year Experience is a student support program that is coordinated by a full-time Kahikoluamea faculty member (1.0 FTE). The program orients new students to the college and helps them to register for classes. FYE implements a First-Year Registration Model that requires developmental students to enroll in a math and English course during their first semester at the college so they can be on track for graduation with a degree or certificate in a timely manner.

Notes: Reading Quantitative Indicators for FYE Data set, p. 10

Note 1: The fall cohort was the number of new, first-time students (student type is Freshmen 'F' or First Time 'M') home-based and registered at KapCC at the fall census date. Special-Early Admit students (SPEA majors) were excluded.

Note 2: Final grades as of the End Of Semester 'EOS' freeze event were used. All Audit 'L', Record Delayed 'RD', Credit by Exam 'CE', and No Credit by Exam 'NCE' grades were excluded from calculations. All A, B, C, CR, and CR+ grades were considered C or better. All other grades (including I and W) were counted as less

than a C. The denominator was the number of students in the cohort for the fall term, and the number of reenrolled students for the spring term.

Note 3: Academic status as of the End Of Semester 'EOS' freeze event was used. All probation statuses were considered Probation (Accepted on Probation 'AP', Probation 'P', Probation Continued 'PC' or 'P2', Probation after Dismissal 'PD', and Probation after Suspension 'PS'.) The denominator was the number of students in the cohort for the fall term, and the number of reenrolled students for the spring term.

Note 4: Mean and median credits taken were calculated at the census freeze event using the current attempted student credit hour field.

Note 5: Mean and median credits earned were calculated at the End Of Semester 'EOS' freeze event using the current earned student credit hour field.

Note 6: GPAs were calculated at the End Of Semester 'EOS' freeze event using all grades with a gpa indicator of 'Y'. Only grades earned at KapCC were included. All Audit 'L', Record Delayed 'RD', Credit by Exam 'CE', and No Credit by Exam 'NCE' grades were excluded from calculations.

Note 7: Completion of the FW requirement required a C or better grade (A, B, C, CR, or CR+) in either ENG 100 or ESL 100 during either the fall, spring, or summer term. All Audit 'L', Record Delayed 'RD', Credit by Exam 'CE', and No Credit by Exam 'NCE' grades were excluded. Grades were extracted as of the End Of Semester 'EOS' freeze event.

Note 8: Completion of the FS requirement required a C or better grade (A, B, C, CR, or CR+) in one of the listed courses (BUS 100, BUS 250, ICS 141, ICS 241, MATH 100, MATH 100H, MATH 103, MATH 112, MATH 115, MATH 135, MATH 140, MATH 203, MATH 205, MATH 206, or PHIL 110) during either the fall, spring,

or summer term. All Audit 'L', Record Delayed 'RD', Credit by Exam 'CE', and No Credit by Exam 'NCE' grades were excluded.

Grades were extracted as of the End Of Semester 'EOS' freeze event.

Note 9: Reenrollment required a student from the cohort to be registered and home-based at KapCC during the following spring or fall. The reenrollment cohorts were modified to exclude students who transfer to another UH system college or were awarded a certificate or degree at KapCC and did not continue at KapCC. For example, fall to spring reenrollment was the number of students from the original fall cohort who were registered and home-based at KapCC in the following spring. The denominator (or spring reenrollment cohort) was the original fall cohort minus the students who changed their home base away from KapCC or received an award from KapCC and did not reenroll in the spring. Similarly, spring to fall reenrollment was the number of students who were registered and home-based at KapCC in the spring and then were registered and home-based at KapCC in the following fall. The denominator (or fall reenrollment cohort) was the number of students who were registered and home-based at KapCC in the spring minus the students who changed their home base away from KapCC or received an award from KapCC and did not reenroll in the following fall.

Note 10: Recent high school graduates were students who graduated from high school between April 1<sup>st</sup> and June 30<sup>th</sup> of the spring preceding the fall semester and were then enrolled and home based at KapCC at the fall census date. The credit hours were determined from the number of attempted credits at KapCC at the fall census date.

Note 11: Recent high school graduates were students who graduated from high school between April 1<sup>st</sup> and June 30<sup>th</sup> of the spring preceding the fall semester and were then enrolled and home based at KapCC at the fall census date. Federal financial aid was determined by a federal source code (rfrbase\_fsfc\_code equal to 'FDRL') with a



funding date (rorstat\_pckg\_comp\_date) before the UH first day of instruction or before August 1<sup>st</sup> of that year.