

PROGRAM REVIEW UPDATE 2016-2017

Program: English

Division: Arts and Humanities

Date: October 10, 2016

Writer(s): Karin Spirn, Toby Bielawski, Elena Cole, English Department

SLO/SAO Point-Person: Marty Nash

Audience: Deans, Vice Presidents of Student Services and Academic Services, All Planning and Allocation Committees. This document will be available to the public.

Purpose: To document significant program accomplishments, plans and needs between Triennial Program Reviews. This update should provide a snapshot of your program.

Uses: This update will be used to inform the campus and community about your program. It will also be used in the processes of creating Dean's Summaries, determining College Planning Priorities and allocating resources.

Time Frame: This update should reflect on program status during the 2015-16 academic year. It should describe plans starting now and continuing through 2017-18.

Topics: The first section of this Program Review Update focuses on general program reflection and planning. The second, third and fourth sections focus on reflection and planning regarding Student Learning Outcomes. Only instructional programs need to complete Sections 2, 3, and 4.

Scope: While this Program Review Update does ask for some analysis of data, detailed data reports in the form of appendices should be reserved for the Triennial Program Review.

Instructions:

- 1) Please fill in the following information as completely as possible.
 - 2) If the requested information does not apply to your program, please write "Not Applicable."
 - 3) Optional: Meet with your dean to review this document before October 10, 2016.
 - 4) Send an electronic copy of this form to the Program Review Committee Chair and your Dean by October 10, 2016.
-

Part One: Program Snapshot

A. Have there been any significant changes to your program, your program's data or your program's needs since the previous Program Planning Update?

If there are any changes, describe the relevant information and its significance in the space below.

These changes might have originated from within the program or because of an external source (the institution or the state, for example). Possible sources of relevant information might include, but are not limited to, the following:

- Data generated by your program
- Data from the Office of Institutional Research (<http://goo.gl/Ssfik2>)
- CEMC Data
- Retirements
- State Mandates
- Labor Market Data
- SLO/SAO Data (<http://goo.gl/jU2yIz>)

<p>Multiple Measures Assessment: The English department changed our assessment practices to make high school GPA a major factor in English 1A placement. Starting in Summer 2016, students were placed into English 1A based on high school GPA or their Accuplacer results, whichever was</p>

higher. This change was based on best practices data from the Multiple Measures Assessment Project (MMAAP), part of the RP Group, and it also puts us into compliance with Title V, which says that all English placements must consider multiple predictors of student success.

This change has more than doubled English 1A placements, from 35% in Fall 2015 to 78% in Fall 2016. To accommodate these students, we increased 1A sections from 30 in F15 to 39 in F16. Since multiple studies have shown that GPA is a better predictor of success than standardized testing, we are confident that these newly-placed 1A students will be successful. We will also be studying success rates closely over the next few years.

Due to this change in placements, we have suspended offerings of English 104W and English 105 while we study the new student distribution patterns.

Full-Time Hiring: We hired a new full-time instructor starting Fall 16. Last year's percent of FTEF taught by full-time faculty rose slightly in the fall (from 34% in F14 to 42% in F15), possibly due to the hiring of two full-time instructors for Fall 15. However, the spring percentages did not rise (37% in both Sp14 and Sp15). We continue to have high numbers of English faculty reassigned to campus leadership positions (including Accreditation Leads, Raw Center Coordinator, Basic Skills Coordinator, Transformations Grant Coordinator, Program Review Coordinator, Puente Coordinator and SLO Liaisons for two separate divisions).

Curriculum Changes: English 12 (Fiction Writing) and 19 (Literary Anthology) have been leveled to address repeatability issues.

Transformations Grant: We are beginning the management of a 3-year Transformations Grant, under the direction of Michelle Gonzales. This grant will fund staff development for faculty and staff and the implementation of best practices to facilitate student success through the transition from basic skills to transfer-level courses. This grant will also allow us to study and implement best practices for student placement, including Multiple Measures and the use of the new California Common Assessment.

Veterans' Learning Community: Over the past two years (2015-2016), the English department has supported the college's work-based learning initiative that focuses on training military veterans in engineering technology, in partnership with Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory, and a key goal of the program is to prepare students to gain full-time employment at the lab after completion of the program. Studies have shown that veterans who engage in expressive writing are likely to benefit in their transition from military to civilian life, and LPC is one of the few colleges nationally that offers, among the academic and technical writing assignments, college credit for student veterans to write about their military service. The program is also open to non-veterans. A few students from the first cohort have been hired by the lab and others have found related jobs in our region. Participants have reported high levels of satisfaction, but funding remains unstable.

Teaching Men of Color Training: Our department has helped spearhead bringing CORA certification for teaching men of color to campus. Approximately ten English faculty have been through the training. Training is open and available to all faculty for free until December 31.

B. What objectives, initiatives, or plans from the 2015 Program Review Update have been achieved and how? PRUs from 2015 are available here: <http://goo.gl/9iF3m9>

Multiple Measures Assessment (This information also in Question A): The English department changed our assessment practices to make high school GPA a major factor in English 1A placement. Starting in Summer 2016, students were placed into English 1A based on high school GPA or their Accuplacer results, whichever was higher. This change was based on best practices data from the Multiple Measures Assessment Project (MMAP), part of the RP Group, and it also puts us into compliance with Title V, which says that all English placements must consider multiple predictors of student success.

This change has more than doubled English 1A placements, from 35% in Fall 2015 to 78% in Fall 2016. To accommodate these students, we increased 1A sections from 30 in F15 to 39 in F16. Since multiple studies have shown that GPA is a better predictor of success than standardized testing, we are confident that these newly-placed 1A students will be successful. We will also be studying success rates closely over the next few years.

Revamping of Course Sequencing: The department did a large amount of work towards this initiative, spearheaded by Katie Eagan. We decided not to move forward with name changes for courses until our course sequence is more settled, since our course offerings and pathways are currently in transition. We are still interested in making these changes in the future.

Investigating the Needs of Low-Placing Students: This plan was suspended last year while the department analyzes changes in the placement process and its effects on the student population; it will be done this year as part of our multiple measures research and the Transformations Grant.

Accelerated 1A Pathway: This plan was tabled until we can see the effects of our new placement system. We will explore the development of this pathway in the near future.

Strengthen Documentation: Cindy Ahre has posted minutes all department meetings on our department's Blackboard site. In addition, we are documenting all SLO work and discussion on the site.

Facilities: The department has continued to advocate for dedicated space for English/Language arts facilities, but there has been no institution-wide plan created to provide this space.

Support for RAW Center: While we have continued to support the Reading and Writing Center, we have seen its funding threatened and its services decreased this Fall, particularly for online students (but also for face-to-face students). These cuts contradict our college planning priority, "Expand tutoring services to meet demand and support student success in Basic Skills, CTE and Transfer courses."

C. Discuss at least one example of how students have been impacted by the work of your program since the last program review update (if you did not already answer this in Question B).

The largest student impact has been our new placement procedures, which have doubled the rates of placement into College-Level English, saving hundreds of students time and money that would have been spent taking unneeded courses.

We have also impacted students through learning communities such as Puente and the Veterans

Work-Based Learning Initiative that help students find community and support.

D. What obstacles has your program faced in achieving objectives, initiatives, or plans?

Lack of Needed Institutionalized Funding for Vital Academic Supports: The RAW Center has struggled each year for funding beyond the amount granted in the general fund, which is about 2/3 of the amount needed to keep it open on a 4-day a week/13-week schedule. RAW Center's program review asserts that it should be part of a Tutorial Services Program, in combination with the Tutorial Center and other student support services. The burden of continually seeking funding for RAW should be an institutional concern and should not fall solely on the English Department and the division dean.

In addition, the LPC library lost most of its funding for database subscriptions and other needed materials at the end of the Measure B bond. While it is possible that the funding will be restored through Measure A funding, that has not been guaranteed. Meanwhile, the library cannot move forward supporting our courses, disciplines and students. At an institution of higher learning, the library should not have to beg for funding every year; library funding needs to be institutionalized as an ongoing college expense.

The successful veteran-oriented English 1A course associated with the college's Engineering Technology program also suffers from uncertain funding. While grant funding has been secured for spring 2017, the course has not been guaranteed funds to continue into subsequent semesters.

Need for Grants/Restricted Funds Processing Office or Coordinator: In recent years, community colleges have been lucky enough to secure 3SP money, Equity funds, and a variety of grants, most recently the Transformations Grant. These funds require a great deal of people power to secure and to disseminate. Coordinating the writing of funds proposals has been done by different people, people who are learning as they go, and often last-minute, putting a lot of strain on those who step up to do a role they should be involved in but not necessarily coordinating. Once the plans are written and the funds need to be awarded, we have also had trouble using the funds as promised and/or transparency of spending has been questionable. A processing office coordinator could aid in the coordination of grant writing, the coordination of spending, and the coordination of initiatives for the purposes of getting the most out of our dollars.

Impacted Courses: Our transfer-level GE courses (1A, 4 and 7) are impacted, and our department has had above a 100% fill rate since at least 2012.

Human Resources: Over the last two years, mistakes by the Human Resources department have caused numerous problems for the English department. During Spring 2015, the instructional assistant positions were not posted for many months after being submitted to HR, and one of the positions was posted before the others, leading to the need for two separate hiring committees. In Fall 2015, our newly-hired instructional assistant and two full-time instructors were offered contracts to sign that did not include their salaries. Being new employees, they did not know that this was improper. In one case, the actual salary was lower than the advertised salary, and the employee did not learn this until her first paycheck, after a month of work. Misstating the salary in a job announcement is unethical, unprofessional and a waste of time, money and energy for the employee

and everyone who participated in her hiring and training, as well as every applicant who invested time in applying for a falsely-advertised position. These errors may be the result of the HR department being overburdened. In any case, the district should examine the recurrence of errors by the HR department and come to a solution.

Lack of Plans to Replace Building 400 Space: While building 400, the English Center, is scheduled to be demolished as part of the Facilities Master Plan, there are still no plans to replace that dedicated space. The English basic skills program has had remarkable student success (in the 70% range, very high for a basic skills program), largely due to our instructional assistant support, collaboratively developed curriculum and dedicated space that at-risk students treat as a home base (for example, students come in for help from instructional assistants outside of their regular class time). Student success will drop if the courses are offered in scattered classrooms all over campus where instructional assistant availability will be inconsistent and curricular materials will be harder to access.

Need for Lab Rooms: With almost 80% of our students placing into English 1A, we have added sections of 1A, but are limited by the lack of available lab rooms. English 1A has one hour of lab time per week that needs to be scheduled in a room with student computers. We have added several DE sections since campus facilities were not available, but we need more sections for our face-to-face students.

Our highest-level composition classes (English 4 and 7) do not have lab times, but instructors increasingly find that in-class time with computers would be useful, particularly as the research process moves largely online. Additional campus computer lab rooms that could be reserved for classes, or a dedicated English computer room, would allow easier access to classroom computer time, which would help us meet the research outcomes for our courses.

Proctoring Center: A proctoring center is needed to help support our faculty with make-up exams and re-take exams for students and to support our DE courses, and expanded hours to supplement DSPS's proctoring. This could potentially benefit the entire campus, as many different disciplines can utilize this resource. We would need the facility and faculty/staff to support the proctoring center.

Administrative Turnover: Our program has faced difficulties moving forward on plans due to the constant turnover of administrators. For example, English is expected to move forward on initiatives in the Equity Plan, but the Vice President overseeing that plan has left and the position is currently vacant. The success in our program's planning over the last three years has without doubt been made possible by the presence of a consistent dean (after four years of a new dean every year) and campus researcher. The college should make every effort to support and retain talented administrators such as these.

E. What are your most important plans (either new or continuing) for next year?

Transformations Grant: We will begin implementing the processes for our Transformations Grant, including faculty/staff training and study of our placement process.

Continued Study of Placement Process: We will study success rates in English 1A, 4, and 7 for students who placed into 1A based on GPA (those who would have placed into basic skills using

Accuplacer scores alone). We are also surveying students and faculty about the impacts of the assessment changes. We will implement added student supports and make changes to the placement process as needed. We will also study our basic skills student population post-assessment-changes to determine the needs of this population now that many overqualified students are no longer taking basic skills classes.

Common Assessment: The new statewide Common Assessment tool requires the English faculty to map English competencies to particular courses. This test is scheduled to replace Accuplacer for Fall 17.

Source Integration: Based on our SLO study from Spring 2015, the department is planning to implement stronger practices for teaching source discussion and documentation in all levels of composition courses.

Umoja Learning Community: We hope to implement the Umoja program starting Fall 2017. Umoja is an Afro-centric learning community open to all students and particularly serving the disproportionate impacts for African American students on our campus.

Best Practices from CORA Training: The department will study ways to implement the lessons from our training through the CORA certification for teaching men of color.

Non-Credit Adult Education: The English department is participating, with other disciplines at the college and counterparts in its service area, in the college's adult education non-credit task force, whose goal is to create and offer non-credit courses that will enable adult-education students to continue progress toward career and college-readiness goals. In 2016-17, the department will create an appropriate course outline in basic skills reading and writing and submit it to the curriculum committee when a non-credit curriculum approval process is established at the college.

Curriculum Changes: English 13 (Poetry Writing) will be leveled for repeatability.

Advocate for Needed Facilities: These include dedicated space for the English basic skills courses, increased classrooms with student computer access, and a centralized "Academic Support" center that would combine the Integrated Learning Center/Open Math Lab, RAW center, Tutorial center, and Computer Lab (and possibly Math X and/or Library).

F. Instructional Programs: Detail your department's plans, if any, for adding DE courses, degrees, and/or certificates. For new DE degrees and/or certificates (those offered completely online), please include a brief rationale as to why the degree/certificate will be offered online.

Not applicable

G. Do plans listed under Question E or Question F connect to this year's planning priorities (listed below)? If so, explain how they connect.

Planning Priorities for 2016-17

- **Establish regular and ongoing processes to implement best practices to meet ACCJC standards**
- **Provide necessary institutional support for curriculum development and maintenance**
- **Develop processes to facilitate ongoing meaningful assessment of SLOs and integrate assessment of SLOs into college processes**
- **Expand tutoring services to meet demand and support student success in Basic Skills, CTE and Transfer courses.**

Our plans to support increased funding for the RAW center and to advocate for an Academic Support Center directly relate to the final planning priority.

H. Instructional programs: Did your program meet its program-set standard for successful course completion? yes no

(This data can be found here: <http://goo.gl/Ssfik2>)

If your program did not meet your program-set standard, discuss possible reasons and how this may affect program planning or resource requests.

N/A

I. Units with SAOs: Using SAO data from last year, describe the impacts of SAO practices on student learning, achievement, or institutional effectiveness. Describe the practices which led to the success. (Copy the box below if you would like to discuss multiple examples). SAO data can be found here: <http://goo.gl/jU2yIz>

SAO:

Describe the quantitative or qualitative results:

Discuss any actions taken so far (and results, if known):

Discuss your action plan for the future:

Part Two: Course-Level SLO Assessment Schedule

THIS SECTION HAS BEEN REMOVED. PLEASE SKIP TO PART THREE.

Part Three: Assessment Results
(Instructional Programs Only)

1. Describe an example of how your program used **course SLO data (SLOs)** from last year (2015-16) to impact student learning or achievement. (Copy the box below if you would like to discuss multiple examples).

Course: English 104, 1A, 4 and 7
Course SLO:
Describe the quantitative or qualitative results:
Discuss any actions taken so far (and results, if known):
Discuss your action plan for the future:

2. Degree/Certificate granting programs only: Describe an example of how your program used **program-level SLO data (PSLOs)** from last year (2015-16) to impact student learning or achievement. (Copy the box below if you would like to discuss multiple examples).

Degree/Certificate: English AA, English AAT
Program SLO: All program SLOs
Describe the quantitative or qualitative results: We reviewed our current program SLOs. We thought they reflected the outcomes for the program well but did not map as easily as we wanted to the course SLOs. For this reason, they were not measured effectively.
Discuss any actions taken so far (and results, if known): During Spring 16, the department rewrote our PSLOs for both of our degrees to better match the outcomes of our courses. Both degrees will have the same PSLOs; while the requirements for the two degrees are quite different, they share a core group of foundational courses in which program outcomes are assessed.
Discuss your action plan for the future: We will examine the F16 PSLO data for F16 to see if new trends emerge from our new PSLOs. Our findings may not necessarily reflect the students pursuing English degrees, since most students who take English courses are not English majors (this is particularly true of English 4, which has all of its SLOs mapped to the PSLOs). For this reason, we may want to pay particular attention to the PSLOs that are mapped from our literature courses, which have a higher percentage of English majors.

Part Four: Program Curriculum Map (Instructional Programs with Degrees/Certificates Only)

Background: Program-level Student Learning Outcomes

Program-level Student Learning Outcomes (PSLOs) are defined as the knowledge, skills, abilities, or attitudes that students have at the completion of a degree or certificate. Faculty within a discipline should meet to discuss the expected learning outcomes for students who complete a particular series of courses, such as those required for a certificate or a degree. PSLOs should be the big things you want students to get out of a degree or certificate. PSLOs should be developed throughout the program and in multiple courses. Discussions might also involve colleagues in other programs regarding prerequisites and transfer courses or community stakeholders regarding job expectations.

It is recommended that each program have 3-6 PSLOs. Discipline faculty members might need to have a more comprehensive list based on the requirements of external stakeholders (employers, state requirements, etc.). For most programs, PSLOs are only assessed through linked course-level SLOs. You might assess PSLOs in a capstone project or capstone course that many students complete when earning a certificate or degree. Alternatively, you could assess development of a set of skills as students advance through different courses in your program (ENG 1A -> ENG 4 or 7).

Program-level outcomes should

1. **describe** what students are able to do after completing a degree or certificate;
2. be **limited** in number (3-6 outcomes);
3. be **clear** so that students and colleagues can understand them;
4. be **observable** skills (career-specific or transferable), knowledge, attitudes, and/or values;
5. be **relevant** to meet the needs of students, employers, and transfer institutions;
6. be **rigorous** yet realistic outcomes achievable by students

Curriculum Map Directions

Note: If you have multiple degrees/certificates, choose one to map. If you have already submitted mapping to the SLO committee and do not wish to make changes, you may copy that mapping into this chart or attach the map you already created.

1. In the boxes across the top row, review all the non-GE courses required for your degree/certificate. (including those that aren't in your discipline). Make any desired changes to those courses. (Electives do not need to be included, though they may).
2. In the left column, write the program learning outcomes you have drafted for your program.
3. In the boxes in the center of the page, mark the course SLO that maps to the program SLO you have identified. Each program SLO should map to multiple courses in your program.

Example: English Associate's Degree for Transfer						
Program Learning Outcomes	Required Courses in Degree/Certificate					
	Eng 4	Eng 7	Eng 35	Eng 41	Electives* (Eng 20, 32, 45, 44)	MSCM 1*
1. Identify and evaluate implied arguments in college-level literary texts.	x					
2. Write an academic essay synthesizing multiple texts and using logic to support a thesis.	x	x				
3. Write a research paper using credible sources and correct documentation.	x	x				x
4. Analyze an author's use of literary techniques to develop a theme.			x	x	x	

*Including electives is optional.

Your Program's Map

Degree or Certificate: English AA-T									
Program Learning Outcomes (3-6 recommended)	Required Courses in Degree/Certificate*								
	4	7	35	41	20	32	45	44	
1. Identify and evaluate implied arguments in college-level literary texts.	X								
2. Write an academic essay synthesizing multiple texts and using logic to support a thesis.	X	X							
3. Write a research paper using credible sources and correct documentation.	X	X							
4. Use grammar, vocabulary and style appropriate for academic essays.	X	X							
5. Analyze an author's use of literary techniques to develop a theme.			X	X	X	X	X	X	
6. Recognize, appreciate, and compare the similarities and differences between authors, characters, and self that stem from historical era and cultural tradition.			X	X	X	X	X	X	

*All listed courses are English. Since our degree has many choices of electives, we have only charted those that map to our PSLOs.

1. Did you make any changes to your existing mapping? (circle one)

Yes

No

This degree/certificate did not have previous mapping

2. If you answered "yes" to Question 1, explain what changes you made.

We rewrote the PSLOs so they map directly to courses for our AA-T and use the same language as our course SLOs.

3. Reflection Questions: The following questions are for the consideration of your program as you look at your completed chart. You do not need to record your responses here. If you discuss these questions with others (for example, at a department meeting), you may want to take minutes documenting your discussion.

- a. How many courses help students achieve each program outcome? Do students have enough opportunities to achieve the outcome?
- b. In which course(s) are students likely to demonstrate satisfactory achievement of each program outcome? In other words, which courses(s) might be an official or unofficial capstone requirement?