Las Positas College
ANNUAL PROGRAM REVIEW TEMPLATE
Review of AY 2011-12

Name of Program	Division	Author(s)
English	ALSS	Catherine Eagan

INSTRUCTIONS:

1. This Annual Program Review covers the time frame academic year 2011-2012.
2. The planning should be for the academic year 2014-2015.
3. Use the Save As feature in Word to save this template with your program name, so that you do not overwrite the original template (*e.g.*, Bio, math, EOPS)
4. In each section, click in the box under the instructions and fill in your information. The box will expand as you type. If a section is not pertinent to your program enter N/A in the box; do not leave it blank.
5. To see how other programs completed sections in the Annual Program Review, visit the Examples Template on the PR website. The examples are from a variety of programs and may give you ideas of how to respond for your own program.
6. When you have completed the form, run the spell-checker (**click inside the text in the first box**, then click on the Review tab and find Spell-Check in the far left corner of the ribbon).
7. Please address your questions to your Program Review Committee representatives or the PR co-chairs Jill Carbone and Teri Henson. Concerns, feedback and suggestions are welcome at anytime to PRC representatives or co-chairs.
8. Instructions for submitting your Annual Program Review will be available at the start of the fall semester.

STATEMENT OF PURPOSE:

- Review and reflect on the student experience, with the goals of assessing and improving
    - student learning and achievement
    - services for students
    - program effectiveness.
- Provide a forum for each program's findings to be communicated to Administration
- Create written records of what is working well, what can be improved, and specific plans for implementing chosen improvements.
- Collect information that will contribute to institutional assessment and improvement.

I. MISSION

State the current program mission
(A mission statement should address the unique role and scope of the program. Consider the operating mission of your program. Identify specific purposes within your program (e.g., certificates, degrees, general education, matriculation, assessment). Avoid vague, overbroad language.)

> The English program's mission is to develop in students with diverse learning styles and cultural contexts the reading, writing, critical thinking, and student-success skills they need to meet their academic, career, and personal goals. The program's mission to foster discrete

> language skills is also founded on a commitment to nurture in all of our students an enduring sense of competence, a dialogic approach to reading, and a perspective on writing as a creative, analytical, and reflective activity.

The mission of Las Positas College is:
Las Positas College is an inclusive, student-centered institution providing learning opportunities and support for completion of transfer, degree, basic skills, career-technical, and retraining goals.
(**NOTE:** this is the draft mission statement, currently under review.)

Discuss how the program supports the college mission.

> Our program's mission supports every aspect of the college's mission. Our basic skills, transfer composition, and critical thinking courses support the completion of transfer, degree, basic skills, career-technical, and retraining goals. Creative writing and literary analysis courses not only support transfer and degree goals but foster an appreciation of the aesthetic value of language and the capacity to make their own contribution to the discussion and creation of literature. All our courses provide learning opportunities that will help our students become well-rounded, engaged community members and citizens who recognize the centrality of reading, writing, and art to society.
>
> Our program's mission and course offerings also support all of the college's core competencies. Courses that address these competencies include, but are not limited to the following:
>
> - Communication
>   - Addressed in all courses through writing, discussion, projects and presentations
>   - Emphasized in composition courses, creative writing courses, and literature courses
> - Critical Thinking
>   - Addressed in all courses through reading, writing, discussions, projects, and presentations
>   - Emphasized in composition courses and literature courses
>   - Addressed specifically in critical thinking courses that provide students with the reasoning and assessment skills crucial to their careers and civic participation.
> - Creativity and Aesthetics
>   - Emphasized in creative writing and literature classes through reading , writing, and analysis of literary texts
>   - Also addressed in composition courses that include analysis of literary texts and writing of creative nonfiction
> - Respect and Responsibility
>   - Emphasized in all basic skills composition courses through lessons on study skills and college success strategies
>   - Addressed in all composition courses, which encourage students to respect the views of others and examine their own values and biases

- Addressed in literature and creative writing courses as students learn to respect the views of others and give constructive feedback to other peoples' writing and ideas
- Covered in all courses of the program by emphasizing responsible documentation of sources in student writing, providing lessons in correct incorporation of outside materials, and offering techniques for avoiding plagiarism.

- Technology
  - Covered in basic skills composition courses, which instruct students in the use of Blackboard and, as needed, Microsoft Word.
  - Appears in other composition courses that require use of NoodleTools, library databases, PowerPoint presentations, and other technological resources.
  - Appears in composition courses that require finding and evaluating online sources of information

II. PROGRAM ANALYSIS

A. Courses (For Instructional Programs Only)

1. Will any course outlines be revised or updated in the academic year 2014-2015?

    (Highlight the appropriate box to type in an X.)

    YES X   NO ☐

    If yes, in the table below, please list which courses will be revised or updated and the reason for the revision.

    (Click in the box under Courses to start entering information. Tab to move to the next box. Tab in the last box to create a new row.)

Course(s)	Reason for Revision
English 1A	State TBA guidelines now require that our COR describe what happens in lab. We also may revisit guidelines for research project.
English 13	We may level English 13 as we have 12 and 19.
English 20	Title V Update
English 32	Title V Update, adding LPC AC credit and maybe UCB AC credit
English 44	Title V Update
English 45	Title V Update, perhaps with transferability to UCB added

2. Will new curriculum (*e.g.,* course outlines, degrees) be submitted to the Curriculum Committee for the academic year 2014-2015?

    YES X   NO ☐

    If yes, please describe briefly what new curriculum is planned.

    1. 100A/104 pilot: We have received grant funding from the California Acceleration Project

to pilot a course that waives the cut score for 10 100A students and pulls them into a 104 of reduced size. The "100A" students in the class will get additional instruction in their small cohort. We are hoping to increase student success by shortening the pathway to 1A. Our data show that 100A students who get to 1A succeed at rates roughly equal to those of students starting in 1A, so we are curious to learn whether some 100A students really need the additional semester or whether they instead need embedded support in a higher level course. Each additional class a program requires of students increases the risk of students not passing and not continuing. It is particularly important to see if we can shorten the pathway to transfer classes in light of student success legislation (SB 1456) that would require students to complete their basic skills coursework first.

2. Revised AA: Now that our AA-T has been approved, we need to revise our AA. We would still like to offer both—the AA-T would be a clear (and guaranteed) pathway to an English BA program at a CSU and consist only of English and Mass Comm. courses, whereas the AA would provide a well-rounded, interdisciplinary variety of coursework, allowing students to explore their interests in reading, writing, and culture and still earn an AA.

B. New Initiatives (AY 2014-15)

Are any new initiatives planned for the academic year 2014-15?

(Examples of new initiatives include, but are not limited to: new degrees or certificates, new pathways, new outreach efforts.)

YES X   NO ☐

If yes, please describe briefly what new initiatives are planned.

1. **Advocate for adequate English facilities** (see Facilities, part II.G., below)>
2. **Implement Assessment and Placement plan and create process for regular collection of data and assessment of cut score.** In Fall 2012, the English Program began preparing for a review of the college's tools and processes for guiding new students into the appropriate English course: 1A, 104/105, or 100A. (The Program had applied for and received monies from the Basic Skills Task Force for this purpose.) A reasonably accurate assessment process is vital to student success on an individual level and at the college level—with student success legislation requiring that students complete basic skills coursework before moving on to their other courses, it is important that they are not placed in a course that they are over-prepared for or placed in a course that is too difficult for them.

   We formed a subcommittee to undertake the project, which would work with the Institutional Research Office, Counseling, and the Assessment Center and report periodically on its progress.   The subcommittee reviewed and discussed the academic literature on the placement process in American colleges. We learned that almost all colleges use one of two placement tests (we use one of these, Accuplacer) but that many schools have supplemented these tools with various assessments, such as the consideration of high school performance, motivation and other affective traits, and writing samples. Meanwhile, with the help of our college's institutional researcher, we gathered and analyzed data showing the success of our students in the relevant English

courses over the several years since the time of the last review. Based on this research, our expectations are that we will not necessarily replace Accuplacer, but that based on findings we might supplement Accuplacer with additional measures and/or change the current cut scores.

In Fall 2013, the subcommittee has been working with the institutional researcher to create tools and a process for measuring the efficacy of our placement practices. These include a survey for instructors, who will identify the preparedness of their students, and a survey for students to identify their own sense of preparedness. Setting up this study would not have been possible without the help of David Rodriguez, a temporary on-call assistant for Institutional Research. After the surveys are distributed and completed, this data will be synthesized with cut score data to make visible any pattern of placement that does not maximize student success. (Again, this valuable research takes significant resources from Institutional Research.) Depending on the conclusions of this part of the project, the subcommittee and Department will determine whether changes to the status quo are appropriate, and if they are, what the changes should entail. These changes may require resources; for example, an added writing sample would necessitate diagnostic readers. Adding more points for multiple measures would require working with Counseling on the change. Providing students with their Accuplacer results right after testing would necessitate training the Assessment Center to provide literature describing the different course options or to provide students with a video featuring an English teacher and students who describe the options. These decisions will be made in Spring 2014. If change is recommended, our program will organize an effort to implement the changes as quickly and smoothly as possible.

3. **Innovate and institutionalize a variety of basic skills pathways for students.**   Since 100A-100B and 104 were first created, based on Chabot College's new curriculum, in the late 1990s, English has had two pathways for students to complete their basic skills training and move on to English 1A. (Of course, some students would come to us through Learning Skills courses or prepare for 1A through the ESL sequence.) Over the past few years, alternate pathways have been experimented with, but their funding has been sporadic, the planning and training for them has ranged from intensive to nonexistent, the funding for them has been uncertain, and the research on their effectiveness has been minimal. We continue to be committed to CFS, we are committed (both pedagogically and contractually) to Puente, we continue to receive requests for participating in learning communities, and we continue to study and adjust our traditional basic skills program. What we need, though, is consistent investment in and study of our innovations' success statistics. Again, this is additionally important because of new student success legislation that will require students to complete their basic skills coursework before moving on to their other courses across the curriculum.

New innovations: We have a grant-funded upcoming Fall 2014 pilot that accelerates students who test into 100A by placing them in a 104 course with extra support.

Meanwhile, we have just begun a learning community with ECD basic skills students and would like to partner with DSPS and Paula Schoenecker to offer students who test into learning skills an option to take 100A but get extra learning skills support from Paula

New imperatives for institutionalization: We are particularly concerned about the funding for and institutionalization of CFS and Puente. CFS was conceptualized in 2005 at the urging of Dean Birgitte Ryslinge and afforded full supervisory and financial support with funding designated to fund a coordinator at 4 CAH and faculty 1 CAH for the weekly meetings. In addition to coordinator and meeting funding, the program had access to WIA funds to pay for a recruiter, recruiting cost, book stipends for students, and bus passes. While CFS has been able to function without being able to provide students with book stipends and bus passes, it has not been able to recruit a full cohort (25 cap) since this funding was stripped away in 2009-2010, and the quality of the program has suffered since the faculty are no longer compensated for weekly meeting and there is no funded coordinator. In addition, the program has faced chronic insecurity, never quite knowing if it will be funded by CEMC or whom to report to, relying on an uncompensated coordinator to try to fill in the gaps. These issues of chronic insecurity have plagued the program since Dean Ryslinge left LPC, which suggests that the college still has a way to in strengthening its efforts to fully support learning communities. Putting the new ALSS dean in charge of Learning Communities Dean was a significant step in the right direction, though the work done to institutionalize CFS under Dean Flores must now be restarted with her departure. Similarly, we need to restart discussions of Puente, also pursued with Dean Flores' help, and come to a resolution on its funding. At our April meeting, Janice Noble and Marilyn Flores came to discuss English's concern about the "home" of Puente, how it is supported, and how it will be funded. There is concern that though Puente students are "our students," as Dean Flores put it, taking the English course from the English FTEF allocated for its discipline plan has a number of detrimental effects. For one, it reduces the number of stand-alone English 105's, making it hard to determine the effectiveness of this delivery system and make improvements if it could use them. Two, students register for the Puente 105 and 1A through a different process as they are recruited for it, which removes the course from the standard registration process that is organized by priority number. This means that some of "our students" who have a higher priority number than prospective Puente students may be displaced. Three, it allows the college as a whole to see basic skills as the "property" of one department or another instead of seeing basic skills students as all of our students and funding their education "off the top." CFS at least is funded off the top, and we want to reopen discussions about pursuing this model for Puente.

New need to study program innovations and learning communities: In particular, we need to separate out learning community English 105 data from stand-alone 105 data. Fortunately, Rajinder Samra has recently provided us with this data, again investing significant time and energy to do so, even though that time and energy is in short supply in his under-funded office. Now, we can begin to study the 105 course more effectively without the significant differences between learning community and stand-alone 105's rendering the data invalid. Then we need to revisit what we've learned from our

experience in learning communities before moving forward to create any more. Our current learning community with ECD may benefit from this research, and it would help us decide if and how to pursue additional learning communities. We also need to learn more about the effectiveness of English 105 (formerly 102). The Institutional Research Office has put us on its calendar for studying how successful 102/105 students are in the next course (1A) compared to English 104. This data, which again will require significant resources of the Institutional Research office, will help us begin to understand how the basic skills models compare. Finally, we need to build research and data gathering into our upcoming 100A acceleration pilot, but that is guaranteed to happen as the pilot is grant funded. What with the relatively low amount of CAH allotted for English coordination (down from 4 CAH and absent the 6 CAH of ILC funding even though our labs still require some coordination), investing the time necessary for this research is a challenge.

4. **Maintain current level of Instructional Assistant support but shift role of basic skills Instructional Assistants from running labs and grading tests to assisting students in classroom according to the needs of instructor, with equal coverage for day and evening classes.**

In Spring 2013, we moved our basic skills Instructional Assistants out of labs, which they led using program materials and in faculty line-of-sight, because of FA concerns that instructors were not being paid for the full four units of the 104 and 100A courses and concerns that auditors would not agree with our interpretation of line-of-sight. (The faculty member providing line-of-sight was teaching his or her own class at the same time as the Instructional Assistant was running the lab.) Since that time, we have worked hard to transition faculty into using Instructional Assistants in the classroom again, which has had some very positive results. Instructors are informed that Instructional Assistants can provide a variety of types of support to faculty and students, and these ideas for support are listed in faculty training materials. With the adoption of a new sentence workbook that focuses on a creative and logical approach to sentence combining as opposed to a "skill and drill" approach to error, we may move away from as many tests as we have had. The role of the Instructional Assistant can thus shift to assisting students with their writing. Recognizing that Instructional Assistants only need an AA to qualify for their positions, we are beginning to develop ways that Instructional Assistants can help students with their writing in discrete, specific ways. For instance, instead of providing general feedback on an essay, the Instructional Assistants would help review coordinator, subordinator, and transition use in the essay, which they know very well from supporting students as they complete their workbook exercises and supporting faculty in introducing and reviewing this material.   To move the Instructional Assistants toward this role, we have begun to provide them with new types of training that we hope to continue over the course of the 2013-14 academic year and into the future. The LPC Foundation funded us to train the Instructional Assistants on supporting faculty and students with the new text, and we folded some introductory tutor training into that. We would like to continue with this kind of training before Essay 2, an essay in which students use coordination, subordination, and

transitions, is due. We plan on training them to help students insert coordinators, subordinators, and transitions into their writing and help students analyze their own writing for errors of coordination, subordination, and transition. In addition, we would like to move towards having Instructional Assistants read all the outside essays that students are reading for their classes so that they can respond to student questions on the reading and help them apply reading strategies.

Student surveys and course reflection assignments show that Instructional Assistants have been a vital part of student success in previous years, and we feel confident that this new model for Instructional Assistant support will provide even more support to students as they move through their basic skills class/es. We are glad that one Instructional Assistant's position vacancy and another's move into a higher-hour position enabled us to shift the distribution of Instructional Assistant hours so that evening instructors and students will have the same access to Instructional Assistant support that day instructors and students have long had.

C. SLOs/SAOs

- Status of course SLOs/SAOs and assessments for AY 2011-12.

   (Since the Program Review process is beginning in 2013 and the assessments for AY 2012-13 will not be complete, analyze the assessments for the AY 2011-12). Click in the box under Number of Courses Offered. Press Tab to move to the next box. Press Tab at the end of the row to create a new row.

Number of Courses Offered (AY 2011-12)	Number of Courses with SLOs (AY 2011-12)	Number of Courses Assessed within the last TWO years (AY 2010-11, AY 2011-12)
15	15	8

3. How frequently have course SLOs/SAOs been assessed? (e.g: every semester, every other semester, once a year.)

   (This is a summary; it is not a list of courses and their assessment frequency.) Click in the box and begin typing. The box will expand as you type.

These two years were a time of reassessment of our SLO process. In preparation for the 2010 self-study, we reviewed our SLO data to date: Spring 2008, Fall 2008, Spring 2009, and Fall 2009. We found that reviewing SLO data did not reveal many obvious trends that we could report on. Even for those courses, like English 104, for which we have multiple semesters of data, a department meeting devoted to analyzing 104 data determined that they were inconclusive and did not reveal any obvious trends. The 2010 Self-Study articulated our frustration with the data produced by the SLO process. We decided to move to a model of inquiry, mirroring our excellent experience conducting research on our students as part of the Faculty Inquiry Network in 2008-2010. We committed ourselves to researching student learning in the following ways: pursuing hunches and research questions that intrigued us, generating a variety of data, retaining context for data results through the narrow focus of our inquiry and discussion, using Blackboard surveys and GoogleDocs as tools more flexible and productive of complex data than eLumen; gathering student voices; and gathering and reflecting on data in reports housed on Blackboard. As a

result, the report on "Terms with Scores" does not reflect the SLO work we have been doing.

We spent two semesters (2011-2012) assessing the "Respect and Responsibility" core competency through English 104. Meanwhile, in Spring 2011 we were beginning research on whether unprepared students were bring passed from English 1A into English 4 and 7. This project narrowed to considering whether students could write a unified paragraph in Spring 2012. We developed an assessment checklist to use in a future assessment and used the June retreat to discuss student essays. We resolved to survey faculty to learn what materials they use to teach unity in 1A, which we did the following fall. The department also focused during this time on critical thinking in English 4 and 7. New SLOs were written for English 7, and a survey was created to learn more about students' abilities in those courses, but it was not deployed and no assessment was done; focus was moved in Fall 2011 to writing GE and program SLOs and to shifting our attention to assessing the creativity core competency in English 4 and 7. In English literature courses (32 and 44) and creative writing courses (13), surveys were deployed to learn more about who was taking these courses and why so that we could better understand how to assess them. In Fall 2011, the department decided to shift its focus to doing larger inquiry projects on 2 courses/competencies a year. Individual assessments were run for English 13, English 19, and English 20 (Spring 2011), English 1502, English 102, English 1A, and English 12 (Fall 2011), and English 20 (Spring 2012).

4. Status of program-level SLOs/SAOs and assessments for AY 2011-12.

Number of degrees/certificates offered	Number of degrees/certificates with SLOs	Number of program level SLOs/SAOs
2 (we also wrote GE SLOs; AA-T will be added in F 2014)	2 (again, counting GE but not AA-T for 2011-2012 data)	9

5. Analysis of SLO/SAO data for AY 2011-12.
   (Attach a summary of the program's AY 2011-12 SLO/SAO data as an appendix.)

   o Please describe the program-wide dialogue on assessment results, including assessment of distance education courses. Where would one find evidence of this dialogue?

   (This section concerns the type and variety of dialog regarding assessment results, not the assessment results themselves. For examples of evidence, consider: meeting notes, program coordinator's records of dialogue, or email.) For each of these questions, click in the following box and begin typing. The box will expand as you type.

   The program discusses SLO planning and assessments at nearly every one of its monthly meetings; this has been necessary as we have been overhauling our SLO assessment process, but we hope that will lessen beginning Fall 2013, now that we have a more

sustainable process in place. In 2011-12, we also used flex day time to discuss our process with the BRIC visitors and work on our SLOs, assessments and other research tools like assessments; however, there are no minutes from those activities. At the end of each semester, each person who has been in charge of an SLO inquiry project writes a report summarizing our "burning question," our progress, and our agreed-upon next steps; these reports are housed on our English department Blackboard site along with minutes, especially important emails documenting our discussions, and data like surveys, questionnaires, and quizzes. Finally, our June retreat minutes always have an SLO section.

o   Please summarize what was learned from the assessments, including distance education courses. How will these results be used for improvement/s?

(Please provide at least two paragraphs. One paragraph should address face-to-face assessments, the other paragraph should address distance education assessments. If the course is taught in both face-to-face and distance education modes include a paragraph comparing the assessment results.)

At this point, we have not separated out our face-to-face and distance education results and are unsure how to do so. We had four program inquiry projects (respect and responsibility/English 104, English 1A, English 7, and the literature courses), two of which generated assessments on which we "closed the loop." The remaining assessments were done in individual classes.

Respect and Responsibility/English 104: During the fall of 2011, we found through our research that students who wished to raise their grades were taking some limited actions but not visiting office hours or visiting tutoring. Starting Spring 2012, we piloted the Get Some Help! Assignment in several sections. This assignment required students to visit office hours, the Writing Center, or the Peer Tutoring Center at least once during the term to work on a class assignment.   On the end-of-semester survey, 63% of students reported that they checked their grades on Blackboard frequently, while 33% checked them occasionally. In order to raise their grades, 14% reported meeting their instructor in office hours or an appointment (up from 8% in F11). Six percent visited the Writing Center (compared with 8% in Fall 11) and 1% signed up for tutoring (compared with 2% in Fall 11). While the numbers who visited the Writing and Tutoring centers had dropped slightly (and probably statistically insignificantly), the percent visiting office hours had almost doubled. This might be due to the Get Some Help assignment being given in several sections.   We tracked the effects of this assignment in a separate Office Hours/Tutoring Survey. These results confirmed that most students who completed this assignment did so by visiting office hours rather than the Writing or Tutoring centers. This might be because of limited hours for those services due to cutbacks, or just that students would rather visit their own instructor.   Of all students whose instructors assigned the Get Some Help Assignment, 58% visited office hours, 7% visited the Writing Center, 2% visited the Tutorial Center, 5% attended some combination of these, and 28% did not visit any.   Of those who did complete the assignment, 77% of them found it very helpful, 20% somewhat helpful, and 3% not at all helpful. (On the survey, these numbers appear as 54, 14, and 2% respectively, which reflects the percentage of total students , including those who did not

complete the assignment). Most who didn't visit could not find a convenient time (19% of students), with a few others saying they didn't feel like they needed help (6% of students). Since 2011-12, we have instituted the Get Some Help! Assignment as part of our regular basic skills curriculum and have continued to find that it promotes student success in the area of Respect and Responsibility.

English 1A: As explained above, the English 1A inquiry project shifted in 2011-12 to a consideration of students' proficiency in writing a unified paragraph and essay by the end of 1A. The program (full-time faculty and some part-time) dialogued about unity at the June 2012 work and planning session, using student essays as examples to help us planning the assessment project for Fall 2012. We found there was some disagreement in terms of expectations for students, so the group decided to distribute a survey to the full and part time English faculty at LPC in order to understand the current expectations concerning our students' ability to write unified paragraphs and essays when entering and exiting English 1A. We also decided to create a multiple choice assessment that could be distributed to students across all sections of 1A at LPC which would ask students to identify unified vs. un-unified paragraphs and essays. The group agreed that a test alone would not be an authentic assessment of the students' ability to write unified paragraphs/ essays at the completion of English 1A. (The test would assess if they could identify unified paragraphs and essays, but not the higher-level skill of producing unified essays of their own.) It was determined that an assessment should be set up whereby faculty would identify specific problems with Unity that occurred in essays submitted late in the semester, using a checklist that was vetted at the meeting. This checklist would allow for registering different kinds of unity problems the instructor might see and their frequency across the whole class, thus providing more insight than a 0-4 rubric focused on whether the student achieved unity. The checklist would also allow the instructor to reflect on the unity of the paragraphs within the student essay as well as the unity of the essay as a whole. The group agreed that the main purpose of the assessment would be to identify ways that we could improve our curriculum, texts, and instruction to make sure all 1A students completed English 1A with the ability to write paragraphs and essays that exhibit college-level unity and coherence.

English 7: The English 7 project was begun in Spring of 2011, when the BRIC team visited campus. We spent an afternoon talking with them as we worked on developing inquiry projects, and Katie Eagan and Jennifer Wortman (sabbatical replacement) developed a new SLO for English 7 out of concern that students could not recognize assumptions (warrants) in their readings. We spent the English retreat in June switching gears, however—in deciding on one of our new inquiry projects, the creativity core competency, we decided to assess it in English 4 and 7, reasoning that it would be helpful to see if they can think creatively in the tight parameters of an essay assignment. Many ideas were discussed for how to foster creativity in the classroom, and an assessment was eventually run in Fall 2012.

Literature Courses: Prior to 2011-2012, we had done surveys in the English 44 and English

32 literature courses to learn more about the students' reasons for taking the course and their interest in an English Club. Twelve students were taking the course for the English major, 11 for breadth, and 15 because they enjoyed reading. 31 would consider taking more English, and 14 would be interested in an English Club and welcome social events and field trips, social media connections, forming a book club, academic support, and involvement with the Honors Transfer Program. Forty-one planned to take more English courses after transfer. Our inquiry group in Spring 2011 then looked into ways we could provide consistency of content delivered and skills acquired by these students. We talked about unpacking the SLOs for each course into discrete skills and topics, and we have done that with our program SLOs, which will now be duplicated in all courses. It remains an open question, however, whether we should adopt literature course-specific SLOs that are either content, process, or skill related—there is no consistency at this point. We discussed how to avoid redundancy with students taking multiple literature courses with different themes. We talked about creating courses that satisfy English major requirements at CSU's and UC's, which has now been done for our AA-T. In Spring 2012, Michelle Gonzales ran an assessment in her English 32 class to assess how well the students could analyze how an author uses literary techniques to develop a theme, a skill-related SLO. Out of the 22 students in the class, 9 scored a "2," which means they were able to "discus[s] theme with basic attention to how one or more of the most obvious literary techniques, for example plot, setting, or character, develops that theme." Eight students scored a "3," which meant that they were able to develop a stronger discussion and include a greater variety of literary techniques as they explored the development of the theme. Finally, five students were able to develop a sophisticated discussion that likely included some of the more complex literary techniques. In analyzing her data, Michelle observed that some of the students who scored 2's actually discussed some of the more sophisticated literary devices, but not with sufficient depth to demonstrate understanding. They also confused literary devices and literary elements. To return to the discussion above this is a skill-related SLO and likely one that might be replicated across courses. These discussions and the English 32 and 44 SLO assessment data will inform our revision of the literature courses in Fall 2013.

English 1502: As English 1502, the College Foundation Semester course, is similar to 100A, it would be instructive to compare the results with that class. A full 54.2% scored a 3, above satisfactory, meaning that their position was clear and relevant to the prompt and demonstrated some original thinking. 20% scored a 4, which meant that their position was clear and relevant to the prompt, demonstrating original thinking and complex reactions to the prompt. The two students who scored "1" had significant learning disabilities, and 12.5% scored a "2."

English 102: Martin Nash taught English 102 in Fall 2011 as part of a learning community. SLO results showed four students scoring zero (not taking the final), two students scoring a "1," 7 students scoring a "2," 6 students scoring a "3", and 5 students scoring a "4." The level of performance seems consistent with data from 104 classes (the final exam is the same) from Fall 2009, Spring 2009, Fall 2008, and Spring 2008. Now that we have started

collecting final exam data again (Spring 2013, planned for Fall 2013), because student achievement on the exam relates directly to our SLOs for the accelerated basic skills courses (104 and the course changed from 102 to 105), we will study if there is any change over time and if there is any difference in performance between the 104 and 105 courses.

English 12: Richard Dry assessed his English 12 class on the following SLO: "Identify source material for and complete two short stories or novel excerpts of 8 to 20 pages in length and revise these pieces based on useful criticism from the instructor and/or the class, resulting in work that demonstrates an understanding of the elements of fiction." Only 4.8% of his students were unable to do this—they wrote the assigned piece but did not demonstrate sufficient understanding. 19% demonstrated [some] understanding and attempted to incorporate useful peer feedback. 42.9% demonstrated an understanding of most of the elements and attempted to incorporate useful peer feedback, and 33.3% demonstrated an understanding of all of the elements of fiction and successfully incorporated useful peer feedback. All 21 students completed the final project and only one student did not adequately respond to the criticism. Four of the 21 students demonstrated an adequate understanding of the elements of fiction through their work, while 16 of the students demonstrated a clear or even strong understanding of the elements of fiction in their work.

English 13: An English 13 survey in Spring 2011 had revealed that a high number of students in this course had taken English 11 and 12 (23%), while 7.6% took English 13 once already and 30.7% had never taken a creative writing course. This indicates that leveling English 13 would be a good idea, to capture those 7.6% that might want to repeat. Even though English 1A is not required to take the course, 69% of the students surveyed had already taken it, and 61% had received an A or a B. 23% of those students feel that 1A helped them with the critiquing required by the class, but 30% were unsure about whether 1A helped them with the reading, writing, or critiquing required by the class. Interestingly, one student reported that the reading in 13 helped him/her in English 100A, and a number of students also reported that the focus on diction and analysis would help them in other classes. The SLO work done for the class in Spring 2012 found that students demonstrated their knowledge of the elements of poetry in their composition of original works, in referring to the elements in class discussion, in describing and identifying the elements, and in assessing use of the elements in classmates' poems. However, Toby felt that her measurements were too loose, that she needed more tests, and that the SLOs are outdated, as new elements have been added to the course.

English 19: This SLO was written to simply measure whether students could create the literary anthology and run the awards ceremony at the end. All 10 students in Spring 2011 scored 3's. This SLO was found to be too general and was rewritten for a Spring 2013 assessment.

English 20: Maureen O'Herin assessed her English 20 class on the following SLO: "Using the Internet, databases, journals, and books, students will research primary sources, critical

analyses, play productions, as well as historical and biographical information concerning Elizabethan theatre and Shakespeare's life and times." The outcomes for the research project in English 20 were uneven at best. Rubrics indicated that students scored lowest on the quality of source materials. (The assignment required at least three scholarly, peer reviewed sources to be included in the annotated bibliography.) Students were either not understanding the nature of scholarly vs. popular journals, or the directions were not clear to them about this part of the assignment. To address this issue, student examples of annotated bibliographies, as well as links to the scholarly sources they included in their bibliographies, were added to Bb and the assignment directions. Links were added on Bb that took students to the "Scholarly vs. Popular Journals" tutorial at the LPC Library Web page. In addition, scholarly books were put on hold at the front desk of the library, so students would have access to books and essays that would be appropriate to the project. The following semester, students scored higher, individually and as a class, on the research portion of the rubric.

English 44: Katie Eagan, who was teaching this class after a long absence, assessed the efficacy of the final exam she had created a couple of years prior. The final measured two of English 44's SLOs, but she wondered if the film review and panel discussion helped students achieve those SLOs as well as they could. Some students, she found, got so wrapped up in figuring out the genre of the film review, a new one to them, that they did not spend enough time drawing on the themes of the course while writing the review. Some of them also wanted to avoid spoiling the ending, as film reviews often do, so that short-circuited their discussion of themes on occasion. She also considered removing one of the panel discussion topics, "heroes and outlaws," because students sometimes focused on that theme to the exclusion of "border/hybridity" themes, themes that more directly address the SLO and the UC American Cultures requirements of the course. However, students often addressed those themes in the panel discussion, if not their writing. For future, Katie decided to structure the film review better so that students would know to draw on course themes and to go ahead and "spoil" the ending. She also plans to structure the panel presentation a little more tightly so that students know what types of questions they have to ask to meet the SLOs.

o   To what extent will, and how, do assessment results support resource requests for AY 2014-15?

Respect and Responsibility/English 104: Our "Get Some Help!" 104 assignment, which came out of our SLO work around the Respect and Responsibility core competency, is designed to get students to use campus support services. When we have run our survey in basic skills classes, we have found that almost 1/5 of students surveyed are not visiting their instructors or other support services because they couldn't find a convenient time. Instructors usually make other times available besides office hours if a student cannot make it, but the Reading and Writing Center and Tutorial Center are not so flexible. An Academic Support services model must be developed that allows students access any time of day and that is "intrusive," as it's often called. Our embedded counseling sessions in

100A have led us to look for other ways to get students the help they need. This may take resources to fund such embedded services in classes, but the amount of students reached would greatly increase.

English 1A, Unity: Our English 1A assessment on unity is so far indicating that students generally recognize unity and display it in their essays, but a small number of students may be struggling. We need further resources to invest the time in updating the Reading and Writing Resources website, which serves the whole campus with information and tips on the reading and writing process. We also need to devote further resources to outreach. We wonder if the updating of this site could be achieved if our college pursued a RAW Center model that hired a full-time director that could provide line-of-sight for student tutors, tutor in reading and writing him or herself for some hours when RAW tutors are unavailable or monitor the online tutoring emails, and work collaboratively with the English program to develop new content for the website and market the website among GE "content" and CTE instructors. Interesting, data recently generated by the Institutional Research office indicates that students who have a break in between their basic skills and 1A courses do better on the unity assessment. This could be because they have greater maturity at this point or they have been practicing English skills in other courses before returning to 1A. In any case, ferreting out the cause of the difference in scores could have important implications for how we counsel students to build Student Educational plans. It would cost resources to educate the counselors about this data and discuss the implications.

English 4 and 7, Critical Thinking/Creativity: Our English 4 and 7 project was not completed and had not identified resources needed, other than time to teach. A problem in 4 and 7 as well as the literature courses is that there is no room to which students can go to use computers to do surveys. Even booking a classroom with computers on an occasional basis is a challenge. We need more accessibility to computers to survey and test our students and run SLOs.

English 1502: If we compare English 1502 results to English 100A, we may find that students in 1502 are just as successful as students in 100A, which is a significant achievement considering the special needs of this group. Also, since the CFS group is more diverse than the typical 100A class, this data might support devoting more resources to CFS to meet the needs of this population.

English 102: English 102 SLO data is competitive with that of 104 for students who take the final, but fewer of them seem to be succeeding in the class. This would support resource requests for more 104's instead of 105's and new classrooms to be built on campus that provide lab space, or the use of 700 for additional teaching and lab space once the library has moved out, so that 104's can be offered in a space close to the English Center in 400 and with room for Instructional Assistants and course materials.

English 12, English 13, English 19, English 20, and English 44: No related resource

> requests.

o What are the general plans for assessments in the upcoming academic year AY 2014-15 (*i.e.* additional assessments or reassessment)?

> In 2013-14, we plan to close the loop on our English 1A unity project, but we want to do the unity survey/quiz every semester to build a body of data. We can do this in the lab. In Spring 2014 we will close the loop on the Creativity core competency project (English 4 and 7). We will also begin an SLO on research, one of our program SLOs. All year long, we will continue to track 104 students' use of the "Get Some Help" assignment through the end-of-semester survey and assess how well students are accessing help outside of the classroom (Respect and Responsibility).   In 2014-15, we also plan to implement a revised SLO process in hopes that now we have found a way to obtain meaningful data without creating too much work for ourselves with multiple inquiry projects. We will use our program outcomes as focal points for inquiries. After we finish unity in Spring 2014, for example, we will move onto research, and assess how it is being taught and learned in all composition courses. To make the data flow clearly from the course level SLO to the program SLO, we will add the program SLOs (which identify discrete skills) to the list of SLOs for each course. Then, we can more easily run assessments based on writing assignment or exam grades, if those assessments are designed to match the earned grade, and we can pursue more in-depth inquiry projects for each program SLO on a slower timetable. We will continue to discuss course assessment data and inquiry projects at our monthly meetings and at June retreats.

D. Student Data

- Analyze the student data provided by the Office of Institutional Research (http://www.laspositascollege.edu/researchandplanning/ProgramReview.php) and other data as appropriate (for example: SARS-TRAK data, library student surveys).

  o Please describe the program's dialogue about the student data. Where would one find evidence of this dialogue?

  (This dialog should be occurring as you write your Program Review of 2011-2012. Examples of evidence may include: agenda or minutes from workshops or meetings, internal reports. Smaller programs may want to consider discussing their data with related programs, their Dean, the Institutional Researcher or, for academic programs, adjunct faculty in the program.) For each of these questions, click in the following box and begin typing. The box will expand as you type.

  > The student data was discussed at our annual June retreat. (Minutes from 6 June 2013 show evidence of this dialog). Additional email discussion occurred between the coordinator and interim dean in mid-September.   We were happy to see that our success rates are strong (Email evidence). Other data sparked questions. It seems that hundreds of students are taking multiple English courses at once. This could be due in part to miscounting the basic skills labs as courses. Without our knowledge, a previous scheduler had identified our labs as courses in Banner when the labs were set up to allow students to pre-enroll in Fall 2006. In addition, the high enrollment numbers could be due in part to students taking more than one of our creative writing and literature courses. Fill rates

were consistently high in these years, as they continue to be, and were at 98% in Fall 2011. The college does not keep track of wait list numbers, but we recommend that it should; anecdotally, we know that our waitlists have been very long ever since the waitlists began, but we don't have actual numbers.   We talked about the demographic profile of our students—they are getting younger, there are fewer men, there are fewer first-time students (likely because it's harder to get classes), and the number of students of color, particularly Latinos, is increasing. Getting I status and accompanying eligibility for grants is on the horizon, so we will have to think more about this population's needs. We now have a Puente program and are piloting an ECD learning community this year, so that's a start. We might do more to survey our Latino students, looking for trends in learning, affective issues, and experience of courses. We discussed looking at the male achievement gap again and studying our African-American students' achievement more—at one time there was a campus effort to provide support to this community, but that effort fizzled. We have had a growing interest in addressing the mental health needs of our students and were shocked at data from the Student Satisfaction survey in Fall 2012 that revealed the high numbers of students who have experienced anxiety or mental illness or considered suicide. We spoke with Ernie Jones at our March meeting about how to better help this population, and he led us into a conversation about how important sleep is for mental and physical health, which might be information we can pass on to our students. We are also interested in learning the success rates of very high unit students. Research shows that students with full loads are more successful in completing their course of study and moving on, but there also needs to be additional counseling, perhaps in orientation, about the balance of work hours and units.

- ○ Please summarize what the program learned from the student data. How will these results be used for improvement/s and planning?

  (Briefly discuss trends or significant findings regarding student retention, success rates, different cohorts of students, etc. Student data may suggest the need for changes in course offerings, scheduling, teaching methodology, outreach, processes, etc., or may lead to the creation of a new SLO/SAO.)

Even though our success rates are strong, we want to do more to aid those students who are not passing. In addition, data shared with us by Chabot's Katie Hern this summer alerted us to the number of students who repeat 1A, a number we would like to bring down. SLO work will continue to learn more about what students can do or struggle with, and additional course materials will be shared on our Blackboard department website and on the RAW site to provide students with more resources. However, the data also suggests that we need to continue addressing the affective issues that might impede student progress. After Ernie Jones came to visit, for example, we discussed working with Student Services to create a video with faculty, staff, and student speakers attesting to the value of the various support services. This would be a significant effort, however, and likely require grant funding to make it a worthwhile product.   We are continuing to think about ways to help students persist all the way through English 4/7, and one way might be to shorten the path to transfer. Our English 100A acceleration pilot, which will be planned this year and launch in Fall 2014, will be one way to address that. In addition, we are studying placement

with the help of Basic Skills Committee funding. The process of looking at student data also inspired us to ask Rajinder Samra to separate out the success data for English 102's, 105's, and 1A's that have been taught as part of learning communities and the charter school 1A's and critical thinking courses. We need to learn more about English 105 in particular so that we can work on ways to improve its success.

- o To what extent, and how, do the student data results support resource requests?

  (If relevant, <u>briefly</u> explain how your student data may be improved by acquiring new or additional resources (eg: faculty, classified personnel, instructional equipment, facilities) that you plan to request. You will be asked to provide more detailed information on the resource request forms; this is just a brief summary.)

Our classes are full to bursting, and it is very difficult to accommodate students and find adequate facilities to teach them in. Our Enrollment Management sections and Facilities sections speak to these resource needs, but we also want college resources to go towards archiving waitlist numbers. We also feel it is vital to support CFS and provide college resources for recruitment. To make the Student Services video, we would have to work with Student Services and apply for a grant.

6. Enrollment Management **(Instructional programs only)**

    a. What total FTEF was approved for the program in 2012-13? This data is found in your Discipline Plans.

    46.37 FTEF was approved for the program in 2012-13.

    b. If this amount differs from 2011-12, describe what changes have occurred.

    (To find Total FTEF for AY 2011-2012 consult the Enrollment Management data on the IR website. (http://www.laspositascollege.edu/researchandplanning/ProgramReview.php). If your allocation was less than the previous year, comment on the types of courses that were cut. If the allocation was more, indicate which classes were added and why.)

    The total FTEF for 2011-2012 was 47.63. In 2012-13 (Su '12, F '12, Sp '13), a Summer basic skills class, English 104, was removed and a lower CAH course, English 7, was substituted; an English 3 was cut from Fall and not replaced; 2 English 3's were cut from Spring and not replaced. The data provided to the program by the institutional researcher listed the FTEF as 48.52, so we have to investigate the discrepancy (See II.E.1.) We do know that additional learning community 102's and a 1502 (CFS) were added to the schedule, but we are not sure how that affected our FTEF because the 102's were funded by the Basic Skills Committee.

    c. Describe and explain any changes you anticipate in course offerings for the academic year 2014-15.

Students in the 2013-2014 academic year are currently being impacted by not only the loss of courses back in 2012-2013 (a basic skills course and a net of 2 transfer courses cut), but sharp cuts to basic skills offerings in Fall and Spring. This was not the result of budget cuts but a change to the amount of CAH used by our 4-unit 104 and 100A courses. The approved FTEF in 2013-2014 was 46.47, only a hair higher than in 2012-2013, and due to the CAH change, 2 basic skills courses were cut in both Fall and Spring and one 1A was cut in Spring. This is a devastating reduction in our course offerings, and some explanation of what brought on the change of CAH is important to record. Since the basic skills program's inception in the late 1990s, English 100A and 104 were 4 unit courses for which instructors earned 5.25 CAH. The remaining .75 CAH of the class was delivered in a variety of ways, most recently by a lab in which Instructional Assistants reviewed grammar materials in faculty line of sight. Our Curriculum Committee and the FA mandated that we increase the CAH for all 100A and 104 courses from 5.25 to 6. The Curriculum Committee's concern was that the Carnegie units required three hours of class time for lab, and the FA was concerned that unit members were not getting paid for .75 of the 4-unt course. For Spring 2013, this meant an increase of 1.1 CAH, for For Fall 2013 1.05, and for Spring 2014 1.1, which threw our discipline plan out of whack. Though some additional FTEF later came from the district (made available by the passage of Prop. 30) to cover some of the gap, we were forced to cut basic skills offerings. How to address these cuts in 2014-2015 is a pressing question. The notion of cutting courses to cover the additional expenditure of FTEF is of course highly undesirable; our courses provide vital preparation for students who do not test into English 1A, which is the majority of entering students, and cutting even one section of 1A from the schedule negatively impacts students' time to transfer. Reducing the units of our highly successful basic skills courses is also not a path we are ready to consider, however. Our course is 4 units because we teach basic skills in an accelerated model; most students will only take one semester of basic skills English to prepare for 1A, as opposed to 2 or 3 semesters if they attended another college. We cram instruction in reading and writing as a process, grammar and mechanics, documentation, and plagiarism avoidance into one semester. We have also shifted our grammar instruction to intensive work on sentence combining, which takes a significant amount of class time. In addition, we provide embedded counseling and assignments designed to enhance student skills—revising one's work, annotating while reading, monitoring one's grades on Blackboard, and visiting the Reading and Writing Center or a tutor if one needs help, among other things. Cutting literature and creative writing courses is not an option, either. We now have an AA-T and have had to add literature courses to meet the TMC. We hope that a campus-wide discussion of course offerings can focus the campus on this issue, primarily because we will eventually need to add basic skills English and math courses to meet the demands of student success legislation. We need to ramp up to those additions gradually, and we can begin by restoring the cut basic skills sections. In the meantime, we were pleased to learn that we have gained back an English 105 and English 7 for Spring 2014 due to district transfer of FTEF and may have an opportunity to gain back more.

E. Human Resources (in AY 2011-12)
- Please complete the following table.

(Enrollment Management data is posted on the IR website:
(http://www.laspositascollege.edu/researchandplanning/ProgramReview.php).

Total FTEF*	FTEF from Full-Time Faculty*	% FTEF from Full-Time Faculty **
48.52	19.52	40%

*   If your program consists of multiple rubrics (eg: Anatomy, Ecology, Microbiology) sum values from all rubrics

**   If your program consists of multiple rubrics, use the following equation to calculate the % FTEF from Full-Time Faculty: Divide the FTEF from Full-Time Faculty by the Total FTEF and multiply by 100.

Type of Personnel	Number	Shared? With whom? If shared, state % of time assigned to the program	No. of hrs/wk	No. of mo/yr
full-time classified staff*	1	No	40	10
	1 (75%)	No	30	10
	1 (60%)	No	24	10
	1 (50%)	no	20	10
regular hourly classified staff**	1 (35%)	no	14	10
student assistants	0	0	0	0

*   full-time: 20 hrs/wk (50%) to 40 hrs/wk (100%)

**   regular hourly: 18 or fewer hrs/wk (45% or less)

7. Will human resources be adequate for the academic year 2014-15?

    YES ☐   NO X

    If No, briefly describe. Provide any data which support these needs.

    > As our Faculty Position Request form argues, we need to be hiring more full-time faculty not only to replace Melissa Korber's .5 position that was lost to us three years ago, but to prepare for student success legislation (SB 1456) that will require students to do their basic skills coursework first and to get more full-time instructors in each level of English—our full-time faculty are often tapped for leadership positions on campus whose release time reduces the amount of teaching they must do. Depending on the semester, data from the past two years show that depending on the semester, we can have as many as 68% full-time faculty in English 1A sections and as few as 21%; in English 4 sections as many as 69% and as few as 45%; and in English 7 sections as many as 77% and as few as 11% (data generated by English program).
    >
    > We were disheartened to learn that the Faculty Prioritization Committee placed our

> new/replacement English hire in the 9th position. The college must discuss how it is going to meet the student success legislation mandates with only 10 full-time faculty.

8. Are there Staff Development needs for the academic year 2014-15?

   YES X   NO ☐

   If yes, elaborate. Provide any data which support these needs.

> Yes. We are suffering from no longer having funding for staff development, though pay for SLOs has alleviated that somewhat. However, we want to offer trainings for part-time instructors on everything from filling out one's preference sheet to using NoodleBib to help students construct not only a Works Cited list, but the research paper itself, with note cards and an outline. We particularly feel it is important to continue offering staff development in the teaching of reading, as we teach integrated reading and writing but don't (with the exception of Elena Cole, part-timer Ben Armerding) have certificates in teaching reading. As we note in the discussion of student data above, we feel much more work needs to be done to address student reading deficits. Some faculty did Reading Apprenticeship on campus in Spring 2012, and all full-time and some part-time faculty did a Friday night staff development series on teaching reading after Elena Cole returned from sabbatical, but that was some years ago (Spring 2007).

F. Technological Resources

Are there any **new** technological needs for the academic year 2014-15?

(Do not discuss your existing technology, including replacements and repairs of existing technology. DO discuss new needs.)

YES X   NO ☐

If yes, briefly describe. Provide any data which support these needs.

(Examples of relevant data might include: enrollment information related to the growth of your program, workforce demands/trends, obsolete or outdated equipment and/or software.)

> We are fortunate that almost all the classrooms in which we teach are "smart" classrooms with document cameras, an increasingly important feature of our teaching of writing. However, we are desperate for computer labs to accommodate an increasing number of English 105's and the English 1A labs. That is more related to facilities, but it is a need. Pedagogically, we hope to eventually be teaching in computer classrooms that have retractable computers, making the classrooms usable for group work as well as individual computer work. An additional need for the basic skills classrooms would be iPads or other tablet computers that can allow instructors to sit in a group for class discussion and take notes that are then projected on the board. Students could then copy the notes and, ideally, the image could also be saved to Bb for students and the instructor to access later.

G. Facilities, Equipment, and Supplies Resources

Are there any <u>new</u> facility, equipment or supply needs for the academic year 2014-15?

(In this section consider new facilities, equipment and/or supplies that are needed to support your program. This does not include your current items that need replacement. Definitions of these terms may be found in the glossary.)

YES X   NO ☐

If yes, briefly describe. Provide any data which support these needs.
(Examples of relevant data might include: data on program's growth, change in curriculum, ADA regulations, etc.)

English has been struggling with inadequate facilities for some time. Our highly successful basic skills program provides instruction and Instructional Assistant support in the 400 building, where two classes meet in each time block: they each have their own classroom but share a computer lab, Instructional Assistant support, and course materials stored in filing cabinets and shelving adjacent to the computer lab. Before the cuts that followed the recession of 2008, we decided to import Chabot's basic skills accelerated course, English 102, so that we could pilot offering basic skills courses outside the 400 building. (We have renamed the course English 105.) However, the 102 and 105 success rates can vary widely; with basic skills courses outside 400, we find it difficult to maintain the cohesiveness of our collaboratively developed program. When classes meet in 400, by contrast, Instructional Assistants and fellow instructors can check in with each other to monitor how assignments are going, trade suggestions for how to introduce a lesson, or collaborate on helping struggling students. Since the additional hour has been added to our 104 courses to better align with Carnegie unit expectations, we have had to move additional courses out of 400. We are very concerned that the Facilities Master Plan (FMP), which mentions that 400 will be razed but provides no mention of the special needs English would have in a new building devoted to courses from multiple disciplines, is not adequate to safeguard the kind of large, multi-use, collaborative space that the program needs. We submitted a memo to the Facilities Committee stating this concern on 15 October 2012 (attached), but we may advocate for the revising of the FMP. English 1A is also struggling to find computer rooms for its 1-hour attached lab each semester. Further, English 4 and 7 do not have labs but need a computer lab that they can sometimes access to work on library research and the like. Finally, we want any new space for English to have our offices nearby and provide space for students to gather comfortably while they wait for office hour appointments and space for them to gather as English students, whether they be simply students fulfilling a requirement, students taking an English class out of personal interest, members of the Poetry Club, or AA/AA-T students.

Since the revision of the FMP is a larger discussion and involves buildings that will be built in a distant future, we have put in an application with the Facilities committee to renovate 400 to better suit students' needs and open up 700 to more classroom space. The computer carrels in 400 are getting very old and do not work well with the current design of the room, with the projector screen along the side wall and the carrels arranged parallel

> to it, forcing students to turn sideways and watch the instructor as they work. In these carrels' place, we would want computers arranged to provide opportunities to work more interactively and collaboratively. In addition, being able to stow the computers to listen to a lesson or short lecture and take notes on it would enhance concentration and recall. Currently, however, the limitations on wiring options for that room give us few options. We have been in discussions with Steve Gunderson as to how to rearrange the space and provide newer "Spectrum" computer tables that could be moved into a new facility. It might be wiser to wait for the new building and have the infrastructure to support round tables with retractable computers. As far as 700 goes, we recognize that the space will be used for the library for the next two years but encourage the campus to consider revamping the space to provide classrooms that also accommodate space for Instructional Assistants (whatever the discipline) and program materials. These classrooms, too, should have computer desks with computers that retract.

H. Financial Resources

- Is there a Program budget for the academic year 2014-15? (Include any co-curricular funds)

YES ☐   NO X

If yes, please briefly describe amount and general uses.

9. Are there any **new** financial needs for the academic year 2014-15?
   (Examples of new financial need might include: new funding needed for upcoming events, new initiatives, changes in curriculum that require new training beyond what staff development can provide, request for release time for something new, etc.)

YES X   NO ☐

If yes, briefly describe. Provide any data which support these needs.

> In 2005-2006, our operating budget was $1250.00. In 2010-2011, this was cut to $272.00. After that time, we were instructed to order supplies through the dean. Not having a supply budget is of course a strain on the program, and we are currently unable to pay our dues to the English Council of California Two-Year Colleges (ECCTYC), which is necessary for them to continue community college representation at the state level, liaisons with the CSU's and UC's, publication of their journal and mounting of their annual conference. Our budget also used to contribute to the special printing costs of the LPC Anthology. In addition, we would like to support the new English Poetry Club. We were pleased to learn that some 60 students signed up in Fall 2013 for this club. While a smaller number of students have been attending the club's weekly meetings, this demonstrates an appreciation on campus for the literary arts. To support these students and their various plans associated with the club, some level of student funding would be helpful. We have

talked of revitalizing the English Club that used to exist on campus, and the time seems ripe now that we have this Poetry Club interest and a new AA-T. We put in a Facilities small project request to set aside space for students to meet, and a small amount of funds would help make that space hospitable to students. Most importantly, we have not had money for our annual work and planning session in June. At this event, full-time and part-time faculty come together to work for two days straight on curriculum, SLOs, program review, and other important projects. Once we lost funding for rooms at a retreat center for 1-2 nights, we imposed upon Cindy Ahre for three years, but this is no longer an option. In the past, we used VITEA grant funding, and then FIN grant funding, to support the retreat, and we are looking for funding ideas for June 2014.

I. Other information pertinent to the program.

In the space below, discuss any other information which is pertinent to the program. Examples include

- Internal or external impacts on program
- (*e.g*., mandates from state, curriculum changes in one program that impact another, loss of resources due to budget cuts, changes in college mission, goals, etc.)
- Other internal or external data *(data not discussed above)*

Elsewhere in this program review, we have discussed the impact of student success legislation mandating students to get their basic skills education early. To meet this demand, we need more full-time faculty. We also need CEMC to lead a campus-wide discussion of priorities. We are down basic skills courses because of the correction that was made to our basic skills courses (shifting them from 5 CAH to 6), and that means fewer students will be prepared for their transfer-level coursework, while the Student Success Legislation wants more students to be ready.

III. SUMMARY

A. **Summarize objectives accomplished since the Program Review Update (2012)**

(The 2012 Academic Program Review Updates can be found on the Grapevine

http://grapevine.laspositascollege.edu/programreview/ipr2010-11.php

(Click on your discipline name.) Your brief discussion may include objectives accomplished since the 2010 program review, even if not discussed in the Update.)

1. One of our program maintenance forms for 2012 asked for support for **increased student access**. We defined this as filling lost faculty positions, reinstating sections that have been cut, avoiding future cuts, adding new sections as needed, and increasing our instructional assistant hours (complete list included in "Additional Information"). We of course were not able to do all of this, but we were granted a replacement for Abby McCann's position (Jim Ott), we maintained our Instructional Assistant hours, and we reinstated some sections that had been cut due to funds coming in from Proposition 30. However, in the same period, we lost sections because our basic skills courses shifted from

5 CAH to 6 CAH due to Curriculum and FA concerns about our use of Instructional Assistants to facilitate grammar labs.

2. We have also maintained support for our **non-composition courses**, including our creative writing and literature offerings. We are hoping that this support is sustained: we have leveled two of our creative writing courses, 12 and 19, in response to state changes around repeatability, we have created two new courses for an AA-T and created an AA-T, we have high enrollments in creative writing and literature courses, and the literature courses are more productive than our other offerings.

3. We have had mixed success with another program maintenance item, **maintenance of campus-wide academic supports.** Certainly, we are glad that the library has secured Measure B funding for its remodel and that Counseling has hired more counselors and continues to provide embedded counseling in English 100A. We are also grateful that the RAW budget now has a $25,000 per year line item in the budget (for tutoring and related expenses) and will not need to pay for the 8% district-related costs for benefits or the coordinator's CAH/benefits from these funds. In addition, we are glad to see that the coordinator CAH is now an item in the Academic Services budget, though of course it is not completely secure there and has additionally been reduced from 3 CAH to 2 CAH. However, having the library closed on weekends is still a hardship not only for evening and DE students in particular, but also for all students who need a quiet place to study with access to print materials, laptop rental, and librarian support. We are also hopeful that discussions between Academic Services and Tutorial Services around the institutionalization of a sustainable model for tutoring will be fruitful. We believe it is important to increase student access to RAW tutors, not only for current students who can't make its limited hours, but for future students, who will need more access as the school population increases. In addition, the college needs to expand online access, as the online RAW tutoring has been overwhelmed with student submissions.

4. As far as development, we have done a good deal of work on our **SLO process**. We went from a situation where we were collecting data that, lacking context, provided no insight to a situation where we had robust discussion of learning issues we cared about, involved part-timers for pay, and benefitted from group discussions of student work. We also documented our research and our progress with SLO reports every semester, housed on Blackboard. However, we have found this model to be quite time consuming; as such, it can not realistically meet the college goals of assessing each course every two years. Fortunately, we have just hit upon a solution in which we will add all our program SLOs to our course SLOs, so that we can run our SLO inquiries through all relevant courses (for example unity, grammar, research) in that year, and we will align the remaining SLOs with specific writing or final exam assignments so that final scores can be easily translated to the SLO 0-4 rubric. This change will allow us to more easily provide data to the college's chosen collection system, eLumen, even as we pursue more meaningful inquiry on a slower timetable. It will have the added benefit of providing us with an opportunity to discuss various program SLOs at multiple levels and refine how we teach them at each

level.

5. Our second development objective was to **ensure that our students are being placed in the appropriate level of English for their skills.** We have worked on that through a grant from the Basic Skills Committee and will conclude our study this fall and decide on the best course to take this spring. (See "New Initiatives," II.B.)

6. Our third development objective was to **increase the number of document cameras in our classrooms** to aid in the teaching of reading through "live" annotation and "think alouds" and of composition through class analysis and marking of student writing. Steve Gunderson and his team have of course been instrumental in making this happen across the campus, and we now have only two classrooms typically used by English that do not have document cameras.

7. Our fourth development objective was to **work to improve students' reading and writing skills through Reading Apprenticeship**. We did hold a Reading Apprenticeship training session in Spring 2012 with Cynthia Hicks. Four full-time English instructors, two part-time English instructors, one full-time ESL instructor, and a full-time Administration of Justice instructor were in attendance. Unfortunately, we were not able to have faculty from a previous learning community attend. In addition, we have not identified two English/ESL faculty to receive leadership training through Reading Apprenticeship. The Basic Skills Committee is wisely ending its funding of small projects, and Staff Development money is not available. We should work this year to pursue other avenues for getting this training, though, because the trained LPC faculty could offer staff development opportunities on campus at LPC at no cost.

B   Summarize objectives not accomplished since the program review update (2012) and why not.
(Your brief discussion may include objectives not accomplished since the 2010 program review, even if not discussed in the Update.)

1. Our first need is support for **program coordination**. This includes support for a program coordinator, maintenance of coordinator hours formerly for the ILC coordinator, support for our department's summer work and planning session, support for faculty training, and support for research and assessment of our program. Pressure on the funding available for release time has prevented an increase, but we will continue to push for it. 3 CAH is an inadequate amount of release time for such a large program that affects student success across campus. In addition, we still have no support for our summer work and planning session. We have always done this work without compensation, but we no longer have a place to meet (after imposing upon Cindy Ahre's home for three years) and no money for purchasing or facilities for preparing food to get us through such a grueling work schedule. In addition, there is only a small amount of release time for coordinating the Reading and Writing Center and none for coordinating CFS. Fortunately, Basic Skills Committee money and our California Acceleration Project (CAP) grant to create a 100A acceleration pilot is providing some money for research into and assessment of our program, but it is narrow in scope. And finally, we are struggling to provide adequate staff development and training

for our part-time instructors in particular. (See III.C. below.)

2. As explained above, we have had gains but also setbacks in our second maintenance goal, **increased student access**. We have asked for an additional full-time faculty position to replace Melissa Korber's .5 position, increase the amount of full-time instructors in vital basic skills and transfer classes, and address the impending student success legislation that will ask us to provide students with basic skills education before they move onto their other coursework. Our primary setback was effectively losing FTEF once we were forced to shift our basic skills courses from 5 CAH to 6 CAH. The basic skills course cuts that resulted were only partially addressed by FTEF that came from the district last year.

3. Our fourth maintenance goal was to **maintain campus-wide academic supports.** As explained above, the college has done some good work to solve the library's outdated infrastructure and shore up the RAW Center and the Tutorial Center, but all need more hours and the latter needs to sustain itself without Basic Skills funding. In addition, the release time for the RAW Coordinator has been reduced from 3 CAH to 2 CAH. It is important to maintain the number of tutors it presently has (providing approximately 240 hours/semester) and a tutor orientation every year. Though there's very little institutional support for supporting more instructor tutor hours, an expansion of hours through the use of peer tutors and a discipline specific tutor training course (paid for through General Studies as it is at Chabot) might be a way to expand. In working with the campus to find ways to fund the RAW Center, it is important to stress that it belongs to the whole college under Academic Services and is not strictly an English department service. The RAW Center should be seen as a service that helps students across the college, just as the Tutorial Center does, and be funded as such. The glaring deficit in campus-wise academic support is still the Disability Resource Center. To address this, we have begun to work with Paula Schoenecker to explore creative ways to collaborate in educating our basic skills students. Our plans are described more fully in III.C. below.

C. **What are the objectives for the academic year 2014-15?**
   (Summarize briefly the objectives you plan to accomplish or begin in 2014-15. You will describe your plan to implement/achieve these objectives in the Program Effectiveness Plan in Part IV.)

Our goals for this year are primarily enumerated in "New Initiatives," section II.B., above. There are a few additional objectives that come out of ongoing work:

1. Collaborating more closely with DSP&S: As mentioned in III.B. above, we plan to investigate ways we can partner with DSP&S and Paula Schoenecker to provide more support to our basic skills students and not duplicate resources. One way we could do this would be to develop a sidecar course with 100A. Students are coming from very robust resources in high school to no or little support in college. At the 26 April 2013 English Department meeting, Paula noted that she is teaching grammar, which most in the English Department were not aware of. If Paula collaborated with us, she could teach student skills while the English Instructor focused on English Skills. To achieve this, we will begin by setting up meetings to observe each other's classes. After that, we can gauge the best way

to coordinate teaching and resources in consultation with our deans.

2. Continuing to work with the campus community to take steps towards meeting mandates of student success legislation. This includes items such as advocating for the addition of basic skills English, math, and ESL courses to prepare students for their courses of study; adding basic skills full-time faculty to achieve the same goal; and helping facilitate the mandated campus-wide "discussion" of adding pre-requisites and making clear that there are pros and cons to doing so.

3. Finding creative ways to offer staff development opportunities in lean budget times. We will continue to use SLO compensation for part-timers as an avenue to pursue staff development, but will also look for more ways to provide staff development if part-time faculty don't feel they can take the time out to come to an uncompensated face-to-face evening or weekend meeting. One idea is to offer peer-to-peer staff development partnerships, where part-time faculty could build a relationship with a full-time faculty member and share assignments, discuss new research in the field, and discuss teaching challenges. Another is to offer videos of some of our training sessions so that instructors can access them from home. We also want to extend staff development to other programs. We would like to fulfill a goal of one of our 2012 development forms that one or more of us obtain Reading Apprenticeship training from WestEd to become a "master teacher" so that we can offer trainings on campus to those teaching in other fields. We would also like to continue updating and marketing our RAW website's "Help for Teachers" series of webpages.

D. **For all needs identified in Part II, summarize how these needs will affect student learning/achievement and impact the program.**
    (This brief summary should capture the effects on students and the program if the needs are met or unmet.)

1. **Advocate for adequate English facilities:** Students need access to computers for our basic skills courses, 1A labs, and 4 and 7 courses on an occasional basis. They also need access to an English facility that can provide high-quality instruction in the context of our collaboratively developed program materials, Instructional Assistants, and small group work spaces. They also need up-to-date classroom design that facilitates individual computer work, group interaction and collaboration and comfortable viewing of the classroom projection screen and instructor for skills modeling or lecture. This will certainly maintain student success in our basic skills courses at their currently high levels, but it may even increase it.

2. **Students deserve an assessment and placement process that is effective and that they perceive to be fair and transparent.** If refined, our placement process could do a better job of informing students about placement, the test, and its goals, placing them in the right class, and potentially shortening their journey to a degree.

3. Providing a number of basic skills pathways for students is also something that is essential to a college that seeks to meet students where they are and prepare them for transfer. In addition, adequately funding and institutionalizing those pathways is imperative. Learning communities like CFS and Puente require a significant amount of resources to be successful, and other learning communities need to access and build on the lessons learned by previous learning communities and be offered more than once to learn from their mistakes. Students deserve a more careful, tested process of preparing for and ultimately providing them with these opportunities. This also takes resources.

4. Maintaining the current level of Instructional Assistant support in English provides an invaluable asset to students. They have an additional professional in the room to guide them through curriculum, provide individual or small group support, and guide them to campus resources when they need help. Training the Instructional Assistants to help students with their writing assignments and not just preparing for tests will provide one more way of supporting student learning.

5. Collaborating more closely with DSP&S: we will potentially gain much from Paula, learning how to better meet the needs of our students in the lowest level of courses, and such a collaboration would support her recent revisions of the learning skills curriculum.

6. Continuing to work with the campus community to take steps towards meeting mandates of student success legislation. This will obviously affect student learning either way things progress—if more prerequisites are instituted, that will provide students with better preparation. If prerequisites are eschewed, we can start a dialogue with faculty in other disciplines about the resources they need to help students with their reading and writing.

7. Finding creative ways to offer staff development opportunities in lean budget times. This will help students because their instructors will be supported in their development as teachers.

Continue to the next page to complete the form.

Name of Program	Division	Author(s)
English	ALSS	Catherine Eagan

IV. PROGRAM EFFECTIVENESS PLAN

Instructions: In the table below, indicate how you plan to measure the effectiveness of each objective summarized in Part III and the resources needed.

Suggested: 0-5 Objectives (focus on a few)

Rank	Priority 1=essential 2=important 3=nice to have	Objective	SLO's/SAO's linked to objective	College goal(s) linked to objective ‡	How will effectiveness be measured?	Category*	Resources needed	Committee
1	1	Facilities	All		Renovated/updated 400, approved plans to use 700 once Library has vacated, revised FMP or response to October 2012 English memo to Facilities Committee	Facilities	Furniture, Computers, Infrastructure Redesign	Faciliities, RAC, College Council
2	2	Research and adjust, if necessary, assessment and placement process	All, if indirectly		Clear understanding of assessment design, cut score setting and consequences, successful implementation of changes if needed.	Human, Technological	Unknown at this time	AVP, Counseling
3	1	Support for diversity of	All		Improvement in financial,	Financial, Human	Support for LC	Curriculum, Deans,

Name of Program	Division	Author(s)
English	ALSS	Catherine Eagan

		basic skills pathways			institutional, and staff support, successful offering of diverse pathways and data collection as to their success.		development, LC faculty meetings, research. Necessary FTEF.	AVP
4	3	Collaborating more closely with DSPS	All		If not learning community, at least better knowledge of each other's courses and increased continuity of grammar instruction and discussion of study skills, learning styles, and coping mechanisms.	Human, Financial	Training, prep, and collaboration funding	AVP
5	2	Working with campus community to address student success legislation	All		Town meeting or other types of campus discussions, enhancement of RAW site for teachers, two RA	Human, Financial	Money for RA training, RAW updates; Human for training of faculty on prerequisite	Curriculum, AVP, Basic Skills

Name of Program	Division	Author(s)
English	ALSS	Catherine Eagan

		through discussion of prerequisites, staff development			master teachers.		considerations, supplemental help for students if not pursued	

*human, technological, facilities/supplies, financial, other

‡When College Goals become available, this column will be activated.