

# NADE Accreditation Commission

## Example DAD Form

General Community College  
Developmental English Program

**NOTE:** The following is provided as a commendable example of a DAD form submitted for General-Level accreditation. Both the presentation and analysis of data are admirable; a typical DAD form is neither this detailed nor lengthy.

What makes this example commendable? The data is effectively presented. The tables are clearly labeled; numbers of students and corresponding percentages are included; and the data is presented in a term-by-term and year-by year format, separately and averaged together. The data analysis is thorough and insightful, as it describes trends and patterns, proposes possible causes and solutions, and meaningfully integrates best practices, as well as insights derived from the self-study.

Readers should note the difference in expectations between General- and Advanced-Level Accreditation in terms of comparison groups. Cohort comparisons are not present in this analysis because General-Level accreditation does NOT require such comparisons. A commendable example of a DAD submitted for Advanced-Level accreditation would include comparisons to a similar cohort.

	<b>Data Analysis Document (DAD)</b>
1) <b>Name of Institution:</b> General Community College	
2) <b>Name of Program Component Seeking Certification:</b> DEP (Developmental English Program)	
3) <b>Program Component Goal:</b> Reading & Writing I (formerly Grammar & Writing and Reading Skills) students will gain necessary reading and writing skills for success in successive DEP coursework and collegiate level courses as evidenced by the following data types: a) successful completers increase to 70%, b) Nelson-Denny Reading Test score gain of 1.5 grade levels and c) Sentence Skills Pre- to Post Test Score Gains of 8%.	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> General	<input type="checkbox"/> Advanced
4) <b>**For Advanced Level Only, Comparison Group Information:</b> Type of Comparison (Check all that apply.): <input type="checkbox"/> Comparison of Baseline Data to Comparative Data <input type="checkbox"/> Comparison of Similar Cohorts <input type="checkbox"/> Comparison of Incoming Cohorts  If Cohorts Are Used, Description of Cohort Formation:	
5) <b>Type(s) of Baseline Data Collected to Assess This Goal:</b> a) Successful Completers (Grades of A, B, and C), b) Class Average of Nelson-Denny Pre- to Post Test Score Gains, and c) Class Average of Sentence Skills Pre- to Post Test Score Gains.	

**6) Presentation of Baseline Data:** (Note: # of students is in parentheses.)

Term &	Course & (# of Students)	Successful Completers (A, B, C)	Unsuccessful Completers (D, F)	Non-Completers (W)	% Gain in Pre- Post Test Scores
Fall 2011	Grammar & Writing (75)	(47) 62.66%	(21) 29.34%	(7) 8%	(42) 8%
Spring 2012	Grammar & Writing (43)	(21) 48.84%	(15) 34.88%	(7) 16.28%	(5) 8%
Fall 2011- Spring 2012 Average	Grammar & Writing (59)	(34) 57.62%	(18) 30.52%	(7) 11.86%	(23.5) 8%

Fall 2012	Grammar & Writing (79)	(49) 62.02%	(26) 32.91%	(4) 5.07%	(48) 7%
Spring 2013	Grammar & Writing (38)	(19) 50%	(15) 39.47%	(4) 10.53%	(22) 5%
Fall 2012- Spring 2013 Average	Grammar & Writing (58.5)	(34) 57.62%	(21) 35.6%	(4) 6.78%	(35) 6%
Fall 2011 & Fall 2012 Average	Grammar & Writing (77)	(48) 62.35%	(23.5) 30.5%	(5.5) 7.15%	(45) 7%
Spring 2012 & Spring 2013 Avg	Grammar & Writing (40.5)	(20) 49.5%	(15) 37%	(5.5) 13.5%	(13.5) 6%

<u>Term</u>	<u>Course</u>	<u>Successful Completers (A, B, C)</u>	<u>Unsuccessful Completers (D, F)</u>	<u>Non-Completers (W)</u>	<u>% Gain in Pre-Post Test Scores</u>
Fall 2011	Reading Skills (38)	(18) 47%	(14) 37%	(6) 16%	(10) 1.32
Spring 2012	Reading Skills (25)	(11) 44%	(8) 32%	(6) 24%	(14) -0.08
Fall 2011- Spring 2012 Average	Reading Skills (31.5)	(14.5) 46%	(11) 35%	(6) 19%	(12) 0.5
Fall 2012	Reading Skills (48)	(32) 67%	(10) 21%	(6) 13%	(36) 1.11
Spring 2013	Reading Skills (15)	(5) 33%	(8) 53%	(2) 13%	(7) 1.5
Fall 2012- Spring 2013 Average	Reading Skills (31.5)	(18.5) 58.7%	(9) 28.6%	(4) 12.7%	(21.5) 1.2
Fall 2011 & Fall 2012 Averaged	Reading Skills (43)	(25) 58%	(12) 28%	(6) 14%	(23) 1.2
Spring 2012 & Spring 2013 Averaged	Reading Skills (20)	(8) 40%	(8) 40%	(4) 20%	(10.5) .4

7) **Analysis of Baseline Data:** Per Hunter Boylan's *What Works: Research-Based Best Practices in Developmental Education* (2002), both GCC's DEP Reading and beginning Developmental English (Grammar & Writing) students' pass rates fall below the national benchmark of 72% for reading and 79% for writing. As the baseline data indicates, GCC Reading Skills students' pass rates (46% & 58%) are particularly low as compared to the benchmark. In addition, the average gain in reading levels and pre- to post test scores in grammar and usage of the DEP students seems lackluster. The lack of assessment and evaluation of student data noted in the Self-Study may contribute to the poor pass rate of Reading Skills students since lack of data-driven decisions to guide curriculum and instruction results in somewhat "blind" instruction. In addition, DEP Reading Skills students often make the statement: "I already know how to read. Why do I need this class?" Their motivation is very low since their perceived need for the class is low, even though the class average reading level per baseline data is 7.4 grade reading level. Perhaps this perception and low

motivation are part of the reason for students' low pass rates. DEP Grammar & Writing Skills students' pass rates (56%), also fall below the benchmark, but not to the extent of Reading Skills students' pass rates. In addition, since DEP writing students overall perceive that they do need to improve their writing skills, their subsequent motivation may be higher than reading skills students, which may positively impact writing students' performance and achievement. Beyond that, teaching reading skills as a separate, discrete skill from writing may also contribute to the overall low pass rates; for example, since reading and writing are emphasized as separate skills in the current (2011-2013) course design, students do not benefit from the reciprocal nature of teaching reading and writing skills jointly. Other observations per the baseline data indicate that often, but not always, spring students have an overall lower performance and successful completion rate than the fall cohort. DEP instructors have noted that within the spring classes a number of students are repeating the course, which may help explain the lower spring pass rate. In addition, the lack of common syllabi among instructors may contribute to inconsistencies in instruction and student achievement. Another factor may be the adjunct instructors who, according to the data, have a lower successful class completion rate than full-time instructors. Part of this discrepancy may be that full-time instructors are available for a minimum of 17 office hours per week. In contrast, adjunct faculty have limited office hours and availability to students who may need help. Another significant issue is the DEP's historic lack of data analysis. As results of the Self-Study indicated in Assessment & Evaluation (score 63%), although the DEP has collected data on student performance (successful completion rates) for years, the data is not always complete (particularly among adjunct instructors), and the data is not analyzed for data-driven decisions resulting in program improvement. In addition, per data from the Self-Study, lack of assessment of students' affective needs may contribute to students' lower persistence rates since some students juggle complex work or athletic schedules with their academic load. If these students concerns could be addressed through coordination with Student Services, perhaps more students would have successful completion rates.

- 8) **Action Plan(s) Based on Baseline Data and Self-Study:** Since baseline data indicate that reading skills and writing skills students' pass rates and skill level gains are well below national benchmarks, and since reading and writing skills are complementary, students' growth in reading level and writing proficiency, as well as successful course completion rates, should increase more if reading and writing instruction is integrated. According to Bartholomae and Petrosky's *Facts, Artifacts, and Counterfacts*, pairing sequenced corresponding reading and writing assignments, coupled with editing, reading, and revising those writing assignments is an effective pedagogical method of reading and writing instruction. As a result, beginning the fall of 2013, the DEP will redesign coursework that reflects integrated reading and writing curriculum. As the chart below indicates, within the GCC English program, there are two non-transferrable credit Developmental English courses (Reading & Writing Strategies I, a 5-hour non-credit course, and Reading & Writing Strategies II, a 3-hour non-credit course). Both courses are designed to enable students whose placement test scores indicate a lack of readiness for college level work, to develop college-level reading and writing competencies. Students with qualifying ACT or COMPASS scores, as noted in the chart below, may enroll in English 101 with Review, a 5-hour credit college level course with review specific to students' academic needs. MILL professional staff administers the COMPASS test and coordinate qualifying enrollment with GCC advising staff. In the case of students who place into two different levels in reading and writing, MILL professional staff averages the two scores and places students according to the "Average Range" noted in the following chart.

**READING & WRITING COMPASS CUTOFF SCORES (Fall 2013)**

<u>COURSE</u>	<u>CUTOFF</u>	<u>SCORES</u>	<u>AVERAGE RANGE</u>	<u>CLASS</u>	<u>LEVEL</u>
	<u>Reading</u>	<u>Writing</u>			
Reading & Writing Strategies I	Reading 0-50	Writing 0-37	0-44	ENG0115	1
Reading & Writing Strategies II	Reading 51-70	Writing 38-60	45-65	ENG0133	2
English 101 with Review	Reading 71-80	Writing 61-69	66-75	ENG1015	3
English 101	Reading 81→	Writing 70→	76→	ENG1013	4
*If a student tests into Reading & Writing Strategies I or II and Math Skills or Elementary Algebra, the student must enroll in Study Skills.					
**If a student has an ACT score of 21 or higher in English, no COMPASS testing is required, and the student may enroll in English 101.					

Once students have enrolled in their Developmental English courses, their DEP instructors will use multiple measures to help ensure accurate student placement; DEP instructors will administer a DEP Pretest, usually the first week of classes. The DEP Pretest will consist of reading and writing assessments: (1) a 50-question multiple-choice grammar and usage test; (2) a typed or handwritten essay; (3) a Nelson-Denny Reading Diagnostic Test; and (4) a Lexile assessment. If a student scores 80% or higher on the grammar and usage test, scores 11th grade reading level or higher on the Nelson-Denny, scores an 1100 Lexile or higher, and writes an essay approved by both a Developmental English instructor and a college-level English instructor, then that student may test out of the DEP course and enroll in college-level English coursework.

Throughout the semester, students will be reassessed through Lexile Diagnostics and writing assessments. At the end of the semester, DEP students are again assessed with a DEP Post Test: (1) a 50-question multiple-choice grammar and usage test; (2) a typed or handwritten essay; (3) a Nelson-Denny Reading Post Test; and (4) a final Lexile assessment. DEP instructors compile students' Pre- and Post Test scores and email them to the Developmental English Education Specialist, who will compile DEP Pre- and Post Test scores per semester. The compilation, evaluation, and reporting of these assessments will be shared with all stakeholders in an annual report posted in the online DEP Faculty Handbook. In addition, DEP faculty and administration will make data-driven decisions for improvement based upon these results.

9) **\*\*Only as Appropriate, Observations Following Year 1 Comparative Data:**

10) **Presentation of Comparative Data (As Compared to Baseline Data):**

<u>Term</u>	<u>Course</u>	<u>Successful Completers (A, B, C)</u>	<u>Unsuccessful Completers (D, F)</u>	<u>Non-Completers (W)</u>	<u>% Gain in Sentence Skills Pre-Post Test Scores</u>	<u>Gain in Reading Grade Level</u>
Fall 2013	Reading & Writing I (45)	(34) 75.56%	(5) 11.11%	(6) 13.33%	(35) 12%	(34) .9
Spring 2014	Reading & Writing I (22)	(11) 50%	(7) 31.82%	(4) 18.18%	(13) 5%	(13) .8
Fall 2013-Spring 2014 Avg	Reading & Writing I (33.5)	(22.5) 67.2%	(6) 17.9%	(5) 14.9%	(24) 10%	(23.5) .9
Fall 2014	Reading & Writing I (39)	(22) 56.41%	(11) 28.21%	(6) 15.38%	(41) 9%	(43) 1.7
Spring 2015	Reading & Writing I (20)	(12) 60%	(6) 30%	(2) 10%	(13) 8.3%	(13) 3.7
Fall 2014-Spring 2015 Avg	Reading & Writing I (29.5)	(17) 57.62%	(8.5) 28.81%	(4) 13.57%	(27) 8.8%	(28) 2.2
Fall 2013 & Fall 2014 Avg	Reading & Writing I (42)	(28) 66.67%	(8) 19.05%	(6) 14.28%	(38) 10.2%	(38.5) 1.4
Spring 2014 & Spring 2015 Avg	Reading & Writing I (21)	(11.5) 54.76%	(6.5) 30.95%	(3) 14.29%	(13) 7%	(13) 2.2

**11) Analysis of Comparative Data and Considerations for Future Action Plans:** The first year of integrating reading and writing instruction in Reading & Writing Strategies I yielded a higher pass rate (75.56%) than the pass rates of Grammar & Writing (57.62%) and Reading Skills (46%). Although the DEP goal pass rate of 70% was not achieved the first year comparative data was collected, DEP instructors were encouraged by the much improved pass rates, as well as Sentence Skills pre- to post test score gains (12% ) vs. Grammar & Writing Sentence Skills score gains of 8%. However, the reading level gains (.9) were not so encouraging. DEP instructors noted that previously in Reading Skills, all levels of DEP students were grouped; however, Reading & Writing I is comprised of the lowest level readers. Consequently, so many concentrated low-level readers may, in part, explain the overall lower achievement in reading level gains, and this may also be affected by the difference in the forms of our particular reading test – the one used for the post-test is a bit harder than the pretest. In addition, the DEP Reading & Writing I instructor also commented that several students did not appear to put much effort into their posttests; as a result, their minimal efforts negatively impacted their results and skewed class averages in data reporting; even though the reading level gains were not as much as expected, students still showed progress. Beyond that, to continue improving the course curriculum, on July 22, 2014, DEP instructor Minnie Mouse was invited by Pearson Education to participate in a virtual focus group session; during the session, Minnie, along with 4 other community college developmental English instructors gave feedback to facilitate revision of Kim Flachmann’s *Mosaics*-specific module in MyWritingLab (*Mosaics* is the integrated reading and writing textbook the GCC DEP uses). Minnie and other developmental English instructors requested more sequenced reading and writing assignments between the textbook and lab, in addition to more lab reading passages and measurements (Lexile). Pearson noted that revisions of the lab component would include the requested items. The revised edition will not be available until January 2016. With these revisions, GCC students and DEP instructors will have more tools to enhance the reading and writing connection, thereby increasing the potential for higher student achievement. The second year of comparative data indicated pass rates/grade distributions (57.62%) were lower than the first year and lower than goal the of 70% successful completers (70%); however, reading level gains were stronger that the first year of comparative data (2.2 vs. 9). In addition to integrated reading and writing, other factors contributing to overall higher student achievement may include common syllabi for Reading and Writing I, full-time faculty (available to help students during extended office hours), and increased meetings and communications between DEP instructors, as well as careful analysis for implementing data-driven curriculum and instruction decisions. Future actions for improvement of student achievement include implementing weekly vocabulary word tests, using word lists that come directly from the Nelson-Denny pre and post-test. Each week the student will be given 10 words. They are to find and understand the definition of the word. The quiz given on Friday of each week is two parts. The first part is to identify the actual definition of the word. The second part is identification also, but to correctly identify the proper usage of the word in a sentence. These tests are computer based and within the educational system used campus wide, Blackboard. Second, initiation of class discussion and group activities will stem from either *Up From Slavery* by Booker T. Washington or *Everyday Heroes* by Beth Johnson. The student is assigned one chapter per week with a quiz on Friday. The quiz tests the student comprehension of the assigned reading, application of selected vocabulary words from the chapter, identifying central point and main ideas, identifying the difference between supporting details and the main idea, and last, drawing a conclusion from the text. Additionally, questions are posed to the student for thinking and discussion. Two of these questions are included in the weekly quiz; a third question is utilized during group discussion of the reading. From this weekly reading assignment, the student will also be given a writing assignment, which asks them to correlate their life experiences with those of the author of the story, using words from their assigned vocabulary list. By actually concentrating on these words, the student should successfully make improvements in vocabulary and reading comprehension. As of August 2015, with this particular class, the instructor is moving to a different classroom. The set-up of the classroom will allow for group activities. Also, the class size is going from 20 to 18, which will allow for more one-on-one interaction between the student and the instructor. Group activities are suggestions from the *Mosaics: Reading and Writing Paragraphs* textbook. An example of a group activity could be explaining the steps for an outdoor adventure. This activity would pertain to the chapter in the textbook on Analyzing a Process. Students may also be asked to demonstrate the process itself. As we continue to grow and learn from the integration of Reading and Writing together as one class, we can expect to see continued growth in student achievement.