

## EVALUATION OF DEVELOPMENTAL EDUCATION AT OCC

### CURRENT PRACTICES:

#### 1. Institutional Effectiveness

To date, Institutional Effectiveness project constitutes the most comprehensive effort to measure the effectiveness of Developmental Education (D.E.) at OCC. Presently Developmental Education is being evaluated as a part of the Institutional Effectiveness assessment activities that the Office of Institutional Research has been heading-up since the fall of 1998. This assessment effort aims at measuring the overall success of the College in fulfilling its six strategic Purposes, of which the provision of Developmental Education is one.

The process of assessing the institutional effectiveness of D.E. at OCC's entails the examination of courses classified as 'Developmental' according to the ACS (Activities Classification System) taxonomy. Using this criterion, Academic Literacy 105 and 106 as well as a number of Developmental Math courses (MAT 104 to MAT 110), as well as a number of 'non-traditional/other' Developmental courses are included. However the English and Math remain the primary focus of this investigation.

In order to assess its overall effectiveness, Developmental Education is divided into 2 broad categories: 1) Participation in & Completion of Developmental Education Courses and 2) Success in College-Level Study, Subsequent to Completion of Developmental Courses. Next, each of these categories is subdivided into a number of components, which in effect, constitute the individual measures that will be used to compile the necessary data. The Course Participation and Completion Measures assess the percentage of the student population who are candidates for D.E., the extent to which students are enrolling in D.E. courses, and the percentage of students taking D.E. who complete their courses with at least a satisfactory grade of 'C'. The Subsequent Success Measures track students once enrolled in D.E. courses, to examine their performance in corresponding college-level courses, and also compare the performance of the former D.E. students to that of their non-developmental peers.

The data from these measures are compiled and analyzed and the findings are presented in a report that goes to the College Planning Council (CPC), as well as other interested parties. A splinter committee of the CPC, the Analysis Committee on Institutional Effectiveness, has been formed to review all the Institutional Effectiveness reports and make recommendation to the CPC based on the reports' findings.

#### 2. Outcomes Assessment Cohort Study

As a part of a student Outcomes Assessment project, the Office of Institutional Research has been conducting a cohort study, tracking a specific group of students who first enrolled at OCC during the fall of 1998. One of the outcomes to be measured pertains to Developmental Education. Specifically it states: "Under prepared students will successfully complete their developmental courses." This outcome is articulated in much the same way as the Institutional Effectiveness, Participation & Completion Measure that identifies the percentage of students enrolled in Developmental English and Math during the Fall '98 and Winter '99 semesters, who successfully (grade of 'C' or better) completed their courses.

### 3. Academic Literacy – new program evaluation

English faculty member, Aaron Stander has been engaged in the assessment of the new Academic Literacy courses that were first implemented in the fall of 1998. Evaluation is completed using three means: Students course performance as determined by work portfolio that are created and assessed at the end of the course; students scores on standardized pre and post-course reading tests; responses to a survey asking students about their opinions and experiences regarding their Academic Literacy course. Also included in this evaluation is a comparison of the grade distributions for the ENG052 versus ENG106, and ENG 131 versus ENG106.

#### STRENGTHS

- A systematic process for collecting and analyzing data is currently in place.
- Current practices allow for a good overall view of D.E. effectiveness and student outcomes.
- The information garnered from current evaluation efforts is being incorporated into the decision-making and planning processes at a college-wide level.

#### WEAKNESSES

- Evaluation of D.E. at OCC is in its infancy. There is no real longitudinal data on the Academic Literacy program and the subsequent performance of D.E. students in college-level courses.
- For all D.E. courses, little data has been collected, tracking subsequent performance.
- More detailed data and information are needed. Specifically:
  - There is a deficiency in information about the performance of D.E. students in courses they take concurrent with their D.E. course (i.e. number of credits taken, courses taken, performance).
  - It would also be useful to know how those who are identified as candidates for D.E. but do NOT enroll in the prescribed course(s) perform, compared to those candidates who do enroll.
  - More follow-up information on the subsequent performance of students who complete D.E. courses is also needed.
- There are no benchmarks or standards by which to gauge effectiveness. What percentage of students should be completing D.E. courses at a satisfactory level? What should the grade distribution in D.E. courses look like?

#### RECOMMENDATIONS FOR IMPROVEMENT

- Continue to conduct regular evaluations of the overall effectiveness of D.E.
- Expand evaluation efforts to include more in-depth information regarding enrollment patterns among D.E. students and the subsequent performance of former D.E. students.
- Review and update measures of effectiveness regularly, to ensure relevancy and utility of information they produce.
- Establish clear goals for D.E. and benchmarks to more fully assess its effectiveness (Roueche & Roueche, 1999: 27).
- Disseminate evaluation information to a wider audience (especially practitioners), not only to inform, but also to elicit feedback which might contribute to a more effectual assessment process (Roueche & Roueche, 1999: 32).

PSY 251				
	% SATISFACTORY COMPLETIONS	AVERAGE COMBINED ASSET SCORE	AVERAGE LANGUAGE USE SCORE	AVERAGE READING SCORE
ENROLLED IN DEV. ENGLISH	50%	75.62	38.23	37.39
DID NOT ENROLL IN DEV. ENGLISH	45%	76.41	37.89	37.91
DIFFERENCE BETWEEN THOSE WHO ENROLLED & THOSE WHO DID NOT	5%	-0.79	0.34	-0.52

MAT 115				
	% SATISFACTORY COMPLETIONS	AVERAGE COMBINED ASSET SCORE	AVERAGE LANGUAGE USE SCORE	AVERAGE READING SCORE
ENROLLED IN DEV. ENGLISH	28%	76.02	39.18	36.84
DID NOT ENROLL IN DEV. ENGLISH	12%	74.59	36.96	36.96
DIFFERENCE BETWEEN THOSE WHO ENROLLED & THOSE WHO DID NOT	16%	1.43	2.22	-0.12

POL 151				
	% SATISFACTORY COMPLETIONS	AVERAGE COMBINED ASSET SCORE	AVERAGE LANGUAGE USE SCORE	AVERAGE READING SCORE
ENROLLED IN DEV. ENGLISH	43%	76.87	39	37.87
DID NOT ENROLL IN DEV. ENGLISH	43%	76.17	38.16	37.96
DIFFERENCE BETWEEN THOSE WHO ENROLLED & THOSE WHO DID NOT	0%	0.70	0.84	-0.09

CIS 105				
	% SATISFACTORY COMPLETIONS	AVERAGE COMBINED ASSET SCORE	AVERAGE LANGUAGE USE SCORE	AVERAGE READING SCORE
ENROLLED IN DEV. ENGLISH	60%	75.7	38.74	36.96
DID NOT ENROLL IN DEV. ENGLISH	34%	73.62	36.73	37.42
DIFFERENCE BETWEEN THOSE WHO ENROLLED & THOSE WHO DID NOT	26%	2.08	2.01	-0.46

DEVELOPMENTAL MATH	
	% SATISFACTORY COMPLETIONS
ENROLLED IN DEV. ENGLISH	37%
DID NOT ENROLL IN DEV. ENGLISH	35%
DIFFERENCE BETWEEN THOSE WHO ENROLLED & THOSE WHO DID NOT	1%

FALL 1999

331 STUDENTS WERE PLACED IN ESL IN THE FALL OF 1999.  
229 STUDENTS (69%) ENROLLED IN AN ESL COURSE IN THE FALL OF 1999.

A MAJORITY (78%) OF THESE STUDENTS ENROLLED IN ESL CLASSES ONLY.  
BUT 22% OF ESL STUDENTS ALSO ENROLLED IN AT LEAST ONE NON-ESL COURSE.

TOP 3 NON-ESL COURSES				
	# OF ESL STUDENTS ENROLLED	% OF ESL STUDENTS ENROLLED	# SATISFACTORY COMPLETIONS	% SATISFACTORY COMPLETIONS
CIS 105	16	7%	11	69%
MAT 115	5	2%	5	100%
PSY 251	5	2%	3	60%