

## Northeast State Technical Community College

### DSPR 0870—Basic and Developmental Reading Redesign

#### Progress Report—Pilot II, Fall 2008

Northeast State conducted its Pilot II redesign of DSPR 0870—Basic and Developmental Reading course in fall 2008. While upholding the same initial goals and objectives of the redesign, changes were made for improvement based on the results and feedback on Pilot I. (Dr. Jarmon and Dr. Berryman: Please consult the PowerPoint for the goals, objectives, and other basic information about the redesign and Pilot I presented at the last Workshop.) Our pilot II redesign expanded to include more students, and the following are some of the major changes/highlights of the course and preliminary results for Pilot II.

#### Major Revisions and Highlights of Pilot II Redesign:

1. **A mandatory weekly reading group meeting was added as part of the required three hours in the Reading Center.** The group meeting time was used to communicate with students on matters of concern common to the group, teach major reading concepts as appropriate, provide encourage and intervention as needed, and create a sense of “connectedness” among the students. This change tremendously helped improve communication with the students as a group, and the reading group meeting gave the instructor a chance to address any concerns in a timely manner as these concerns arose.
2. **The course was restructured so that the learning materials in MyReadingLab were the primary focus.** We created course requirements and learning activities primarily focusing on the content of MyReadingLab and eliminated other online activities associated with content reading required on D2L that were part of Pilot I. Such a change helped focus students’ attention and efforts on improving the essential reading skills that were needed for success in college and made it less overwhelming to students.
3. **Online study skills and learning strategies were emphasized and taught at the very beginning of the course during the semester.** Students were taught how to learn effectively in an online environment since for many, this was the first time for them to learn in such an online mode. MyReadingLab modules were rearranged so that modules related to learning strategies were taught first. It was felt that students greatly benefitted from such teaching.
4. **A “Learning Notebook” was added as a requirement for the course.** Students were required to construct a learning notebook to help them organize the course and learn effectively. Students were required to place course documents, module concepts, and other relevant module materials in their notebook as they progress with the course. They were also required to record their progress and complete the weekly progress check sheet to present in the notebook. The learning notebook served as a useful progress checking and assessment tool not only for students but also for the instructor and the Reading Center assistants, and these notebooks were checked on a weekly basis. Students who were behind or had difficulties completing the

required modules were identified through the checking process, and necessary intervention was provided.

5. **The major reading concepts were taught and recorded using Tegrity.** The reading instructor pre-recorded mini-lectures on the major reading concepts through Tegrity, and these recordings were made available online through D2L for students to watch and learn as they needed to. Two groups of students were especially encouraged to watch these recordings. One group was those students who were behind or having difficulties with their learning, and the other was those who were ahead of the group.
6. **The course orientation was strengthened.** More time was allotted at the beginning of the course to adequately train both students and Reading Center assistants for the new learning mode. It helped students learn the program and the routine of the class and made the rest of the semester go more smoothly for the students.
7. **Early Exit of the course was strongly encouraged and assisted.** Since students had individual study plans, they could work as fast as they chose to so that they could early exit the class. Some students exited the course about one third of the semester sooner, and about 18-19% of the students exited the course early.

### **Learning Outcomes:**

The following is a preliminary assessment of the learning outcomes:

1. Sixty-seven percent of the students enrolled in the redesigned classes successfully passed the reading course, 3% more than the traditional classes, and 9% more than Pilot I.
2. Fifty-five percent of students enrolled in the redesigned classes made A's and B's vs. 41% of the students in the traditional classes.
3. Students in redesigned classes performed better on the common final exam, and the average of their scores was 3.68 points higher than that of the students in the traditional classes.
4. Nineteen percent of the students enrolled in the redesigned classes early exited the classes, and none of the students in the traditional classes had the opportunity to.
5. Financially, the cost on the redesigned classes was drastically reduced. Each redesigned class had approximately 40 students taught by one instructor with assistance of the Reading Center assistants while the average size of the traditional classes was 18.5 students per class. The redesigned class had more than twice of the students in the traditional class.

### **Looking Ahead**

We were pleased to see the results of Pilot II, although they could be better and improved. We felt that the changes we made in Pilot II positively impacted student learning and student learning outcomes and made the redesign go more smoothly. Based on the feedback and results of Pilot II, changes will be made in Pilot III in spring 2009 as follows:

1. The redesign will be expanded to include all reading students.

2. Both fulltime reading faculty will be teaching redesigned classes, and no adjunct faculty will be hired as instructors.
3. The teamwork between the instructor and the Reading Center assistants will be strengthened through implementing a better process for accountability of both the instructor and the Reading Center assistant.
4. Make other minor adjustments and changes necessary in the redesign for improvement.