

Decentralized programs

Pro

Con

Students

- Students feel part of academic and/or college community; opportunities “to interact with their higher-achieving peers” (Perin 2)
- Less stigma attached to basic skills for students (faculty too)
- “the higher-functioning student may benefit most from developmental courses in a mainstreamed [decentralized] department” (Perin 2)
- Course numbers as part of “larger departmental sequence... may also have positive effects on students’ feelings about education” (Perin 2)

- Not a holistic approach to student
- Doesn’t take “tough love”/“truth in advertising” approach of being clear with students about where they are and setting up pre-reqs that might help them succeed (eventually)

Faculty/staffing

- Facilitates communication among faculty in discipline; “collaborations between remedial and college-level instructors may help the latter develop the passion that the former fell for helping underprepared students” (Perin 3).
- “involve more regular faculty” (White, untitled 10)
- Faculty identity:
 - maintain disciplinary identity
 - flexibility
 - clearer connection to college community

- Faculty identity:
 - don’t identify as basic skills faculty
 - “may view developmental teaching as a low-status assignment and even a punishment” (Perin 2)
- Professional development/instructor experience less likely to focus on developmental ed training
- More likely faculty will be assigned against will/without appropriate experience
- Hiring less likely to prioritize devel. ed. Skills/experience/dedication
- “no single spokesperson or advocate for developmental education on the campus” (White, untitled 10).

Instruction/services/etc.

- Facilitates articulation of classes w/in discipline (esp. w/ at least some instructors teaching across levels); “better potential...to align curriculum” (Perin 1); improved articulation with higher level “academic support services, e.g. skills labs” (White, untitled 10)
- “Remedial programs described as exemplary include the ‘integration of coursework within and beyond the developmental program’ (McCabe & Day, 1998, p. 25)” (Perin 1).

- Lack of communication/coordination between departments/programs
- Segments skills issues (“not my responsibility”) → *may* devalue core skills like reading/writing

Centralized programs

<u>Pro</u>	<u>Con</u>
<i>Students</i>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “One-stop-shopping” for students • “appears that the lower-level remedial student... is best served in a centralized department” (Perin 2) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Student stigma “course numbers reflect the separateness of the department” (Perin 1)
<i>Faculty/staffing</i>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hiring focuses on developmental expertise • Faculty’s primary focus on learning/basic skills (not disciplinary content) • More likelihood of a trained staff committed to working with basic skills students (rather than involuntarily assigned) • “The single administrator can serve as the campus spokesperson for developmental education and can have a greater impact on behalf of the total developmental effort” (White, untitled 9). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Faculty stigma/disciplinary identity lost • Burnout syndrome for faculty • Faculty flexibility/desire to be diversified • Likelihood of isolation from disciplinary departments • “Faculty are often tenured in other departments and their allegiances may lie there” (White, untitled 9).
<i>Instruction/services/etc.</i>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Facilitates coordination/communication • “One-stop-shopping” for students • More efficient use of resources/services • Research indicates (esp. for 4-year institutions) improved student achievement/quality of instruction • “chairs are likely to recognize the need for services for at-risk students and may be more willing than heads of regular academic departments to allocate funds for support services” (Perin 2) • Separate budget • “more likely to implement an ‘early alert’ system” (Perin 2); “may more likely be comprehensive” (White, untitled 9) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Likelihood of higher cost of independent infrastructure • Low-status programs often targeted during budget cuts (White, untitled 9).