

**UH Composition Directors**

A subcommittee of the Standing Committee on Written Communication

Minutes

Friday, April 11, 2008

**Present**

Karla Hayashi (chair), UH Hilo

Jim Henry, UH Mānoa

Gail Harada, Kapi‘olani CC

Rick Randolph, Kaua‘i CC

Donna Matsumoto, Leeward CC

Eric Engh, Maui CC

Jean Shibuya, Windward CC

Kate Sims, Hawai‘i CC

**Unable to attend**

Dolores Donovan, Honolulu CC

Amy Nishimura, UH West O‘ahu

Pam Hudson, Hawai‘i CC

**Invited guests**

Kenton Harsch, UH Mānoa

Tom Hilgers, UH Mānoa

Lisa Fujikawa, UH Mānoa

Monica Stitt-Bergh, UH Mānoa

Seri Luangphinith, UH Hilo

**Meeting location**

Bachman Hall 113, UH Mānoa [no polycom]

The meeting was called to order at 8:40 a.m.

1. Introductions
2. October 24, 2007 meeting notes were approved by consensus.
  - a) *Update on the American Diploma Project (ADP)*. In spring 2008, high school principals, college faculty members, administrators, and campus leadership continued discussion about aligning high school English and college English 100 standards. Philosophically, high school and college groups are in alignment regarding expectations and standards. However, because high schools emphasize literature over composition (primarily because of workload issues), high school student practice in composition is limited. Hayashi noted that it is important for college faculty to understand what high schools can (and cannot) accomplish. She will continue to update the composition directors on ADP progress and accomplishments.
3. Responsibilities of this subcommittee
  - a) In the late 1980s (when writing-intensive requirements began), the Standing Committee on Written Communication was formed to oversee writing-intensive articulation. That committee decided that a separate “composition directors” subcommittee was needed to address first-year writing, specifically the system-wide coordination of the curriculum, course articulation, placement into courses, and outcomes and expectations.
4. Hawai‘i-based colleges: courses that transfer as equivalent to ENG 100 or ELI/ESL 100
 

The committee agreed to update the 2001 list (see assignments below). When conducting the review, keep in mind the following:

  - a) Review the college catalog to determine the most appropriate course to receive equivalency to UH ENG 100.
  - b) Review a course syllabus: number of words required; whether course has a research component.
  - c) For new courses: when did course begin?

**Deadline: August 15, 2008 (via email)**

<b>Hawai'i-located College</b> (ENG 100 course equivalent, 2001-present)	<b>Reviewer</b>
Brigham-Young Hawai'i Campus (English 112)	Jean Shibuya
Chaminade University (English 102)	Donna Matsumoto
Hawai'i Tokai International College (English 100)	Seri Luangphinit/Karla Hayashi
Hawai'i Pacific University (Writing 1200)	Lisa Fujikawa
Hawai'i Business College (none)	---
Heald Business College (English 201)	Jim Henry
Transpacific College (English 100)	Gail Harada
University of Phoenix (Com 210 or Com 215)	Eric Engh

## 5. Assessment and student learning outcomes

- a) Harada will send Kapiolani CC's SLOs to Fujikawa to be posted on MWP website.
- b) Maui CC ENG 22 assessment: a positive, unintended outcome was a discussion about successful teaching and gaps in the curriculum. Evaluation of student writing by a committee will continue and ENG 22 teachers may choose to base part of their students' grades on the committee's evaluation. The committee-grading method helps standardize grading. Assessment method is portfolio review: 1) in-class essay, 2) reflection essay, 3) out-of-class essay.
- c) Windward CC completed two assessments of ENG 100. After the first assessment, faculty discussions about where to make curriculum changes resulted in better scores on the second assessment. They looked at 3 outcomes (out of 9) and will investigate other outcomes in subsequent assessments. Like Maui CC's experience, faculty sharing and discussion was useful. Assessment method: in-class final exam in a computer classroom. Students received the prompt and outside sources one week before exam. Students could bring additional outside sources. A "Works Cited" page was provided and students crossed out references not cited in their text.
- d) Leeward CC. All courses are on a 6-year review cycle. An initial ENG 100 assessment investigated 3 of 6 outcomes (main idea, sources, and documentation). The initial assessment results were below expected (25% passed), and this may have been caused by a poor method (common rubric but different assignments). A second ENG 100 assessment required the same in-class assignment using an outside source and 55% of the students evaluated had a passing score.
- e) Hawaii CC. ENG 22: Campus continues its common, in-class final exam with department grading. Because ENG 100 sections vary, discussion and sharing would be useful.
- f) Kauai CC. Assessment method: evaluation of students' capstone ENG 100 project (portfolio or research paper). They have coordinated the ENG 22-100 sequence (textbooks used, etc.). Tracking of ENG 22 students showed that students who received an A or B grade in ENG 22 subsequently earned an A or B grade in ENG 100. The primary outcomes for ENG 100 include logical support of a thesis and an engaging, meaningful paper.
- g) Hilo completed an ENG 100 assessment last year with the help of an internal assessment grant. 61% of students met outcomes, despite students experiencing a range of approaches and assignments in different ENG 100 sections. Assessment can help educate deans and administrators about ENG 100 goals and demonstrated achievements, and, in turn, the need to keep enrollment caps in place and not increase teaching loads.
- h) Mānoa plans to assess one outcome each year starting this semester. Students received the rubric and SLO to be assessed and then selected their essay that best meets that SLO/rubric. They also wrote a reflection essay. Essays will be holistically assessed. Results will be reported in the

aggregate only (individual instructors will not receive their student results). Results will be confidential but not anonymous so longitudinal tracking is possible.

- i) Concerns raised: students might not pick their best essay; no control over how much help student received writing the essay.

6. Textbooks: do instructors choose a textbook or use an assigned a textbook?

Campus	Lecturers ENG 22	Faculty ENG 22	Lecturers ENG 100	Faculty ENG 100
HawCC	Choice: 2 options	Choice: 2 options	Choice	Choice
HonCC				
KapCC			Assigned, by vote of lecturers (unless teaching online)	Choice
KauCC			Assigned	Choice
LeeCC	Choice	Choice	Choice	Choice
MauiCC	Choice	Choice	Choice (unless first semester teaching)	Choice
UHH	[not applicable]	[not applicable]	Choice	Choice
UHM	[not applicable]	[not applicable]	ELI: choice from 2 options ENG: Choice	ELI: choice from 2 options ENG: Choice
UHWO				
WinCC	Assigned	Assigned	Choice from Bedford catalog	Choice from Bedford catalog

7. Mānoa's placement method: national test scores

- a) The local placement exam was discontinued in December 2007 because of curriculum changes; ability to place as accurately with SAT and ACT scores; and the growing number of mainland students who were not eligible to enroll in fall English courses.
- b) Mānoa recommends that other UH campuses
- i) Continue to use UHM's writing placement exam scores (given in 2007 and earlier)
- Coded in STAR *General Test-Manoa Writing Placement*: "2" =ENG 101 and "3"=ENG 100
  - Coded in Banner SOATEST *MWP*: "2"=ENG 101 and "3"=ENG 100
- ii) Do not use UHM students' placements based on SAT or ACT scores (given in 2008 and later)
- Coded in STAR *General Test-Manoa English FW Placement*: "101" =ENG 101 and "100"=ENG 100
  - Coded in Banner SOATEST *MFWP*: "101"=ENG 101 and "100"=ENG 100
- c) Mānoa's long term goal is for all students to take ENG 100 (or ELI if non-native speakers) with an assigned mentor. [see below, "UHM mentor initiative"].

8. ENG 100 curriculum discussion

- a) UHM mentor initiative: UHM received an NEA grant and internal grant to fund a pilot mentor program. The mentor program is part of UHM's effort to increase retention. Mentors are Masters

students who earn .25 teaching-assistant salaries and upper-division peer tutors who earn \$1,500/semester. They are trained to help students with writing as well as issues such as time management and availability of campus resources. To help assess program effects, mentors complete a *conference report form* after each conference session. When ENG 101 is discontinued (spring 2009), the goal is for each ENG 100 section to have a masters-student mentor or peer tutor.

b) 4-credit ENG 100 course (Jim Henry)

Because students and their tutors/mentors have difficulties finding time to meet, Henry suggested that ENG 100 become a 4-credit course with a required, regularly-scheduled lab component.

- i) KauCC has proposed that its developmental English become a 4-credit course with one credit for a lab.
- ii) LeeCC currently uses SmartThinking (online tutoring). No assessment of product yet. Campus also provides online tutoring and phone tutoring through a campus Resource Center.
- iii) Issues/questions
  - (1) Workload problems if ENG 100 is 4 credits
  - (2) Resources such as classroom or tutor space may not be sufficient
  - (3) Smaller campuses may not be able to hire enough tutors for the 1-credit lab component
  - (4) Tuition may not cover additional costs; not enough funds to cover a 4-credit course
  - (5) Dealing with the 1-credit lab in online ENG 100 sections
  - (6) Instead of a 1-credit writing lab, could there be an integrative 1-credit seminar as a co-requisite? For example, a UNIV 101 or LIS (library info science) course?
  - (7) Could a 3-credit course articulate as equivalent to a 4-credit course at another UH campus?
  - (8) Instead of one 4-credit course, require two 3-credit composition courses (6 credits total).

Meeting adjourned at 12:00 noon.