



UNIVERSITY OF HAWAII

OFFICE OF THE VICE PRESIDENT
COMMUNITY COLLEGES

University of Hawai'i Community Colleges
Dole Street Offices Conference Room/ (polycom)
2:30 – 4:30 PM Thursday, May 4, 2006
UHCC Prerequisite Validation Pilot Study Advisory Group 2006
Proceedings

PRESENT

Frank Abou-Sayf, *Institutional Support Kapiolani Community College*
Cheryl Chappell-Long, *OVPCC, Director*
Pam Hudson, *Faculty Hawaii Community College*
Kristine Korey-Smith, *Faculty, Kapiolani Community College*
Wei Ling Landers, *Faculty, Windward Community College*
Gail Levy, *Faculty Leeward Community College*
Guy Nishimoto, *Faculty and Acting Coordinator I.R. Kapiolani Community College*
Jeannie Pezzoli, *Maui Community College*
Sam Prather, *OVPCC Institutional Analyst*
Peter Quigley, *Interim Chancellor Leeward Community College*
Guests: Gwen Kimura and Donna Moore, *Faculty Hawaii Community College*

INTRODUCTIONS

CONTINUING BUSINESS

- Pilot Study Charge – Cheryl Chappell-Long reviewed the UHCC Chancellors charge memo dated September 16, 2005. The UHCC system will design and conduct a pilot study to validate prerequisite requirements. The pilot study will begin with the validation of reading course prerequisites for developmental and baccalaureate transfer level writing courses. The study will be conducted under the leadership of the Community Colleges' Director of Academic Planning, Assessment, and Policy Analysis with broad systemwide participation in the design and analysis of the study.
- Pilot Study
 - Research Question - At the January 26 meeting the group discussed words/phrases to use such as “highly unlikely”, “improved performance”, “success”, “essential”, etc. Cheryl Chappell-Long stated more discussions were held with

researchers to clarify the language needed to frame the research question. The research question in general –

“ Is successful completion of the prerequisite course essential to successful completion of the subsequent course?”

- The UHCC pilot study research questions will be:
 - “**Is successful completion of English 21 essential to successful completion of English 22?**”
 - “**Is successful completion of English 21 essential to successful completion of English 100?**”

- DISCUSSION - Cheryl Chappell-Long stated that a California “Best Practices” model was used as the basic reference in designing the UHCC pilot study (California has a Code of Regulations section that addresses prerequisites). There was group consensus on the research question after a lengthy discussion which addressed the following concerns:
 - The word “essential” is too precise/limiting. It sets a higher standard than that used in the COMPASS course placement studies.
 - Pilot study is based on a faulty assumption – ENG 21/22 courses have not been articulated across the system. ENG 21/22 are not system courses, the course content is not the same at all colleges.
 - English 22 is not a subsequent course at all colleges.

- Research Design – Frank Abou-Sayf reviewed the UHCC pilot study research design and noted that this design is much better than the California model as the UHCC pilot study will take persistence into account.
 1. Students selected will be those whose COMPASS Reading scores (56 to 78 inclusive) placed them into ENG 21 according to the January 26, 1998, systemwide memo.
 2. We will eliminate the records of those students who had previously taken courses in the UH system, or who transferred from other colleges. Only students with no prior college experience and whose first semester at any UHCC is between January 2002 and January 2005 will remain in the "pool."
 3. We will divide this group into two groups:
 - a. Group A --those who subsequently took ENG 21
 - b. Group B --those who did not take ENG 21
 4. We will try to find students in Group B who DID take ENG 22 [or ENG 100] within 3 semesters of being placed by COMPASS Reading Test, and compare their success in ENG 22 [or ENG 100] to those of students in Group A who took ENG 22 [or ENG 100] within the same amount of semesters.

5. Additionally, we will try to find students who within two semesters of being placed by COMPASS Reading Test who took ENG 21 and 22 back-to back.
 - DISCUSSION – some voiced concern over using numbers only (quantitative study) without other qualitative considerations to help interpret the findings. Others stated not to be skeptical of the numbers and not be too restrictive with statistical controls, this is the first pilot study and it should give us a sense of what is going on with prerequisites. The research design was agreed to with the addition that concurrent English classes will be excluded. Other reservations/comments/caveats:
 - Research design is too narrow, other factors need to be considered such as student learning outcomes (SLOs), grading procedures, etc. Some noted that not all colleges have defined SLOs.
 - Need to include student survey data with responses to questions like “Did ENG 21 help you?”
 - DISCUSSION SUMMARY – Cheryl Chappell-Long stated that the caveats/reservations expressed by the group would be included in the study.
 - Statistical Method – group agreed to use of contingency tables/chi square.
 - Analysis of Results – to be determined
 - Interpretation and dissemination of the results – to be determined
- Next Steps
 - Timelines – Cheryl Chappell-Long stated that Frank Abou-Sayf and Guy Nishimoto had volunteered to complete the data gathering and analysis with work to be done over the summer. Goal is to have a draft for review in September and be completed by first of October.
 - Next meeting – Cheryl Chappell-Long stated that the next meeting will be early September and requested members to forward dates (e.g. Thursdays after 2:00) that would be convenient for them.

Attachments: Agenda