

LOS MEDANOS COLLEGE

INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAM REVIEW & PLANNING

“The institution offers high-quality instructional programs in recognized and emerging fields of study that culminate in identified student learning outcomes leading to degrees, certificates, employment, or transfer to other higher education institutions or programs consistent with its mission. **Instructional programs are systematically assessed in order to assure currency, improve teaching and learning, and achieve stated student learning outcomes.**” This excerpt from the accreditation standards is a rationale for this work. This program review and planning document will be reviewed by the deans, and become the basis for the FPM/Block Grant, facilities planning, Box 2A and provide evidence for accreditation. Sections of this document will be reviewed by groups such as the Teaching-Learning Project, Curriculum Committee and SGC.

Program ___ENGLISH-DEVELOPMENTAL_____

___Degree ___Certificate ___Other_____

Submitted on _____ by the following faculty lead for the program:
(date)

(print name)

(signature)

Reviewed and Approved by:

Dean _____
(print name) (signature)

Sr. Dean _____
(print name) (signature)

COLLEGE GOALS and INITIATIVES

As you review and prepare plans for your program, keep in mind current goals and initiatives developed for the college's Master Plan.

COLLEGE GOALS

1. Offer high quality programs that meet the needs of the students and the community.
2. Ensure the fiscal well-being of the college.
3. Enhance a culture of innovation, inclusiveness and collaboration.
4. Improve the learning of students and the achievement of their educational goals.
5. Establish a culture of planning, implementing, assessing and improving.

STRATEGIC INITIATIVES

1. Grow enrollments productively.
2. Improve the image of the college.
3. Increase the number of transfers, degrees and certificates.

I. ANALYSIS and QUESTIONS

Program review begins with the collection and analysis of data by the research office and instructional deans. The questions posed are based on an analysis of enrollment, productivity, success/retention, curriculum, college and community participation and program resources and development. For occupational programs, a copy of the Core Indicators Report is included. To access data, go to <http://siren.4cd.net/cognos>

1. Enrollments in developmental English have been strong and 70/90 are impacted. The program is to be commended for all the efforts to create such a strong program. Great work! The English 60s are both closed with wait lists full this fall 2006. The only weak enrolled class is English 50. I am sure the program will deal with this well.

Plans for English 50, Fundamentals of English for Non-Native Speakers, will be addressed under the ESL Program Review section as this is not considered a developmental class. Additionally, this course was offered for the very first time in fall 2006 with 20 students enrolled. We see this as a strong enrollment for ESL and a brand new course.

2. Productivity is naturally lower than the average but it is higher than DVC. Retention rates are significantly lower than college and state averages and declined during 2002-2005. This is an area to be looked into.

Our core DE English courses are English 70 and 90 as these are the courses that directly prepare students to matriculate into English 100. When comparing these two core courses' retention, rather than including all courses before English 100, to either the statewide or college averages, the numbers are not far off.

- Retention in fall 2003 for these two courses is 81% whereas the statewide average is 82.9 and LMC is 82%.
- Retention in fall 2004 for the two courses is 79.5% whereas the statewide average is 83.3% and LMC is again 82%.
- For fall 2005 the two courses' retention is 77.5% whereas the statewide average is 83.4% with LMC at 82%.

Furthermore, the retention rates as reported by the Chancellor's Office for Precollegiate Basic Skills includes similar courses to our English 70 only. Statewide English 90 is not classified in the category. Hence, looking strictly at these statewide numbers is not a complete analysis. Consequently, the retention rates for English 70 and 90 are not much less than either the statewide or LMC, except perhaps for fall 2005 where the two courses have a retention rate of 6% less than the statewide and 5% less than the overall LMC retention rate.

There has been a decrease of 4%, but these numbers are a decrease from 81% in 2003 to 77.5% in 2005. The 77.5% is a result from an anomaly in a lower than usual retention rate in English 90, which we cannot explain.

3. Success rates are also 11-13% points below the average. This seems to be true for almost all ethnic groups. Another important area to study. It would be good to look at a longer trend to see the impact of the curricular changes. Your dean would be more than willing to help.

For success rates, English 70 and 90 have been *higher two out of three* years compared to the statewide average:

- fall 2003 English 70/90 is 64% whereas the statewide is 60.61,
- fall 2004 the English 70/90 success rate is 57% whereas the statewide is 59%
-
- fall 2005 English 70/90 success rate is 61% whereas the statewide is 58%.

Clearly, English 70/90 success rates are not 11 – 13% below statewide averages.

- **Another important indicator of program success is persistence, a report that we have requested from the Office of Research.**
4. Are there strong relations with high schools and colleges? Do you have plans to improve or develop outreach/articulation with other institutions?

DE outreach to the nearby high schools has been discussed at length in the DE Committee, but more we need to do more in this area. However, staff involved with Puente make presentations to the high schools, recruiting students into this program and thus LMC. Other outreach will be addressed in the ESL Program Reviews.

PLAN

Write planning objectives to address the analysis and questions.

- A. **Plans for addressing retention, success, and persistence are discussed under the plans for B) SLO's and the two-year curriculum review, for C & D) Curriculum, and staff development activities.**

III. STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES

The underlying purpose of Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) is to improve teaching and learning, the heart of the community college. Accreditation standards require evidence that the institution “demonstrates a conscious effort to produce and support student learning, measures that learning, assesses how well learning is occurring, and makes changes to improve student learning.”

PROGRAM LEVEL STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES

Consider what you expect students to know and be able to do as a result of completing your program. Form these expectations into 3-8 broad Program Level Student Learning Outcomes (PSLOs) and list them below as statements that complete the following sentence:

At the completion of the program, the student should:

English Department Program Level Student Learning Outcomes

1. Read independently for a variety of purposes in college-level materials
2. Read using a critical thinking, problem-solving approach
3. Respond coherently to text in critical, creative and personal ways
4. Write logical, coherent, developed academic essays
5. Observe, monitor and evaluate strengths and weaknesses, then apply feedback to improve skills and learning
6. Use college resources to increase learning effectiveness.

REVIEW

How will you use assessment results from your last program review cycle to improve teaching and learning? (Note: This question may not be applicable for your program *for this review cycle* because most programs have not yet identified or assessed student learning outcomes.)

The first step is to have *agreed upon student learning outcomes for each course* in our program. We have done this for the courses in our

developmental program sequence; of course, these outcomes should be periodically revisited to ensure that they are still current and desirable.

The second step is to make sure that we have a way of answering the question, "Are students who achieve a C or better in these courses demonstrating a proficient level of performance on the learning outcomes for the course?" The way we do this is by ensuring that *the major assignments in the course* -the assignments that weigh heavily in the students' final grade- *actually call for students to demonstrate their proficiency on these outcomes*. This of course means that we need some overall agreement on what "proficiency" looks like -hence the need to look at *grading criteria/rubrics*.

The third step is to explore the ways in which we *provide students with opportunities to acquire* the skills, abilities and dispositions we are measuring with our major assignments. Do we have any evidence that the classroom activities and individual study students engage in actually result in learning? How we know if lecture, demonstrations, discussions, small groups, compute aided instruction, tutoring, etc. is moving students toward proficiency in the intended learning outcomes for the course?

The fourth step is to provide *feedback to the department* that can be used to make programmatic decisions that promote improved teaching and learning. This is what we are attempting to do now. We are trying to create a departmental structure/process for systematically reviewing all of the above, and collecting information that we can use to improve our curriculum and instructional approaches, bringing us closer to our common goal- helping students gain the skills, abilities and dispositions of effective communicators who use the tools of reading and writing to address multiple audiences for multiple purposes.

PLAN

Write planning objectives that indicate which Program Level Student Learning Outcomes you will be assessing in the short term, and what college support you will need to do the assessment.

Program Level Student Learning Outcomes addressed below encompass numbers:

2. Read using a critical thinking, problem-solving approach

3. Respond coherently to text in critical, creative and personal ways
4. Write logical, coherent, developed academic essays

B. We have designed a two-year cycle to review our curriculum in English 90, essentially conducting holistic scoring of student essays written at the end of the course, all argument papers. These scoring sessions will be followed by a close analysis and revision, when needed, to the curriculum. See plan timeline below.

January 2007

Conduct holistic scoring of student essays in English 90 collected in Spring 06 and Fall 07 (random sample)

Spring 2007

Hiatus from 90 Assessment in order to focus on response to assessment findings and to discuss as a department what, why and how we are assessing the work of our English 90 students. (This will also allow Joellen to focus on creating the electronic “binders” for English 70, 90 and 100 – as well as assisting the chair with hiring and orientation of new part time faculty.)

Fall 2007 – Spring 2008

Focus faculty development efforts on responding to assessment findings of January 2007, and on the use of the newly created electronic binders. This may include teaching communities or other yet to be imagined forms of faculty development.

Collect faculty assignments and student essays on whatever assessment we have agreed upon in Spring 2007. Over Summer 2007, request that the Office of Institutional Research do the random sample, eliminating any students that did not receive at least a grade of C in English 90.

August Flex 2008

Holistic scoring of random sample of Fall 07-Spring 08 student essays.

Fall 2008 – Spring 2009

Focus on response to assessment findings of August flex 2008. This could include department meetings with a curricular/pedagogical focus, January flex workshop, and teaching communities with a particular focus, and/or other imaginative ideas.

Adjust assessment assignment as needed.

Fall 2009 – Spring 2010

Continue focus on responding to assessment findings of 2008, building on work done in 08-09.

Collect faculty assignments and student essays on agreed upon assessment. Over Summer 2010, request that the Office of Institutional Research do the random sample, eliminating any students that did not receive at least a grade of C in English 90.

August Flex 2010

Holistic scoring of random sample of Fall 2009- Spring 2010 student essays.

Fall 2010 – Spring 2011

Focus on response to assessment findings of August flex 2010. This could include department meetings with a curricular/pedagogical focus, January flex workshop, and teaching communities with a particular focus, and/or other imaginative ideas.

Adjust assessment assignment as needed.

Fall 2011 – Spring 2012

Continue focus on responding to assessment findings of 2010, building on work done in 2010-2011.

Collect faculty assignments and student essays on agreed upon assessment. Over Summer 2012, request that the Office of Institutional Research do the random sample, eliminating any students that did not receive at least a grade of C in English 90.

August Flex 2012

Holistic scoring of random sample of Fall 2011- Spring 2012 student essays.

(Etc. Etc. – Essentially, this puts us on a 2 year assessment cycle, and gives equal time and weight to responding to assesment findings as it does to collecting assessment data.)

IV. CURRICULUM

Accreditation standards and Title V require that program curriculum is current and meets student needs regardless of credit awarded, delivery mode or location.

REVIEW

1. Accreditation standard II.A.2.c. states that “High-quality instruction and appropriate breadth, depth, rigor, sequencing, time to completion, and synthesis of learning characterize all programs.” Explain how the program meets this standard, evaluating the extent to which it is coherent, comprehensive and also meets the needs of the students and community.

- **Ensuring a coherent curriculum and learning experiences for all students is especially challenging in a large English/ESL department, especially difficult with only 11 full-time faculty teaching approximately 15 of the overall 35 sections each semester. Consequently during fall 2006 flex, we began a series of discussions focused on the taught curriculum and grading practices. We began by discussing grading in general and then broke into groups to discuss the specifics of each course. Sustaining the momentum of the discussion, we dedicated one Monday meeting per month to review the major assignments and student work.**

- **Meeting the needs of the students and larger community, the English/ESL Dept. is committed to continuing Puente. In addition to having a Puente instructor, we feel that other members of the dept. need to support this position. Some ideas include having more than more instructors trained by Puente or even perhaps having a team of instructors be responsible for the two courses, English 90 and 100.**
- **Currently, English instructor, Tess Caldwell, is teaming up with the EOPS counselor, Laura Subia, as well as the EOPS manager, Newin Orante, to form a learning community for our basic skills/transitional students. An integral part of the learning community is the tutorial component. The tutors run weekly study groups as well as provide one-on-one tutoring.**

One of our entry level English 70 courses is “linked” with a Critical Literacy Course to not only build a cohesive learning community but

to offer support services for incoming EOPS students. The combined course is designed to tackle relevant and pertinent social issues such as race and gender. The ultimate goal is to improve not only the reading, writing, and critical thinking skills of students, but also to allow these students to become leaders and role models within their community. Thus far, the retention rate for the course is approximately 80%.

In the fall of 2007, we will be running two sections of the learning community. The entry level Eng 70 will be linked with the Orientation to College section and the Eng 90 (which one level below for our college composition) will be linked with the College Success section. Both of these sections will be taught by the EOPS counselor.

- **Serving the community as a whole, the discipline itself, English reading and writing, provides students with life-long skills necessary for any job.**
2. **How does the program ensure that its curriculum is up-to-date with new discoveries and changes in the discipline?**
- **Several years ago, we changed our stand alone reading courses and writing courses into single, integrated courses, English 70 and English 90. Both courses meet for six hours per week for 5 units. Because of this innovative curriculum, every year other colleges contact us about these changes, making the LMC English/ESL Dept. a leader in developmental education.**
 - **To strengthen our own knowledge about integrating and directly teaching reading to college students, five instructors attended a week long training session in Reading Apprenticeship, sponsored by West Ed, a non-profit educational research firm in Oakland.**
 - **We have also received a \$300,00 Grant from the Carnegie Foundation whereby eight English faculty (and four from math) meet every two weeks to discuss and research teaching and learning practices in each respective classroom. All faculty will produce a website, showcasing one aspect of their classroom. This will be one aspect of an LMC Developmental Education website that features relevant component of our entire DE program.**

3. Title V regulations require that all course outlines be updated at least every 5 years. Have all program course outlines been updated within the last 5 years?

No, we have not updated our core DE courses in the past five years, but we are in the planning stages this semester to complete next semester, spring 2007.

PLAN

Write planning objectives for addressing issues identified in the curriculum review. (Please note the catalog deadline of Nov. 1.)

C. This fall 2006 in preparing to update and revise our curriculum, we are collecting four major assignments from each course to determine what is actually being taught and learned in the course and to elicit faculty feedback about what works, or not, in these courses. After we determine the appropriateness of our curriculum, we plan to spend spring 2007 revising the English 70 and 90 courses.

D. In the fall of 2007, we will be running two sections of the learning community. The entry level Eng 70 will be linked with the Orientation to College section and the Eng 90 (which one level below for our college composition) will be linked with the College Success section. Both of these sections will be taught by the EOPS counselor.

V. PROGRAM RESOURCES and DEVELOPMENT

Program review and planning must be integrated with other planning processes such as the master plan, requests for staffing, and the financial planning model. It is important that the institution effectively and efficiently uses its human, physical, technological and financial resources to achieve its educational purposes, including stated student learning outcomes and improvement of institutional effectiveness.

REVIEW

1. Does the program have sufficient full-time faculty and staff? Refer to the FT/PT trends for FTEF. How does this affect the success of the program?

No, we absolutely do not have sufficient full-time faculty. In the past two years, we have lost three instructors, two retired and one resigned. This past year, we then hired three new instructors, only keeping pace with the three we lost. In the past six years, we have grown by incorporating ESL and added several sections of English 70 and 90, all accomplished without adding any full-time faculty. The overall affect hinders our success as a program and the success of our students. With the disproportionate number of part-time faculty, we are discovering that students receive an unequal education. This has become most clear when reviewing the major assignments given by instructors. Although new part-time instructors are given a two hour in-service, a 300 page binder filled with SLO's and lesson plans for each learning criteria, many still design and teach lessons either too high or too low for the respective courses. We desperately need more full-time faculty, and we have made this same request for the past seven years, only to receive positions of replacement, not growth.

2. Describe program faculty/staff participation in staff development. What staff development activities are needed to improve the program?

As previously mentioned, we have devoted most flex days to curriculum discussions; we currently have many participating in the twice monthly Carnegie Project on the scholarship of teaching. Every semester, we have had teaching communities focused on a different course: English 100, 90, 70, and ESL. (see attached reports). We have a DE lead position, a person who is available for consultation for part-time faculty and who assists the chair with hiring DE part-time instructors and conducts the in-service, all constituting staff-development activities.

3. What additional facilities and equipment is required to maintain or improve the effectiveness of the program?

With more and more faculty excited about being trained to use the computer as a pedagogical tool, we could use more smart classrooms in the English/ESL area.

Several faculty have outmoded, slow computers which hinders their timely access to information and more importantly their students.

4. Does the program have a sufficient budget? How would budget increases improve the program's effectiveness?

No, we do not have a sufficient budget. With the large number of part-time faculty, we have a large number of people needing last minute copies, more

expensive than for the full-time instructors who can and should be able to plan for copies with a two-day turn-around. We also need more books, specifically novels for tutors to borrow for the classes they tutor. We also need more dictionaries, at least a full class set of 25.

PLAN

Write planning objectives for addressing the review of staff development, and human, facilities and financial resources.

E. We plan to purchase:

**More software programs: Turnitin, Wayside, and Style Writer
New computers for Joanna Folino, Jeff Mitchell, and Karen Nakaji
Novels for all Eng 70 and 90 with tutors**

VI. OTHER ISSUES

This section is for issues not addressed previously in this report.

REVIEW

Detail other issues or items program faculty and staff have determined to be significant.

- 1. Student peer tutors are available to work in the DE courses for one hour per week. However, results and options about their effectiveness have been mixed. Consequently, we have begun to train the tutors differently from past practice. Now tutors are trained to work more with students' reading skills. Connected with the training received by the five instructors who attended the West Ed training, the tutors are now being trained to use Reading Apprenticeship, also known as reciprocal teaching: predicting, questioning, clarifying, and summarizing texts, both fiction and non-fiction.**
- 2. Encouraging English 70 students to persist and enroll in English 90, we integrated a counseling component into the curriculum. As a regular part of the class, a counselor visits twice in the semester: once in the beginning to remind students to make and keep a formal counseling appointment and to formulate an ed plan, and a second time toward the end of the semester to remind students to enroll in the next English class, English 90. And most impressive is that this past semester, fall 2006, all but one of our English 70 courses had counselor presentations. Having counselors present and be integrated into the English 70 curriculum is now the norm rather than the exception, and we feel these presentations have been crucial to students' persistence into the following course, English 90.**

PLAN

Write planning objectives to address the additional issues detailed above.

- F. We plan to review the new tutor training at the end of fall 2006. Karen Nakaji has also focused her Carnegie project on tutoring. The highlights of which will be available for review on a website.**
- G. We plan to continue the Counseling Partnership in its current configuration.**
- **Students will have an educational goal, including a major, or at least an understanding of the eventual need to declare a major.**
 - **Student will identify possible obstacles to successful completion of their courses, and will be able to access resources to help them overcome these obstacles.**
 - **Faculty will advise students of next level course recommended by week 10.**
 - **Students will have an educational plan prior to registration period for the following semester.**

VII. PROGRAM PRIORITIES

Due to resource limitations, programs need to focus on selected objectives for the short term. What changes does the program need to make based on the review? One of the key criteria for funding new initiatives via the Financial Planning Model process is the extent to which the proposal contributes to college goals and initiatives.

REVIEW

Carefully review the planning objectives generated in the previous sections. Identify them as either operational (not requiring additional funding or other resources) or new initiatives (requiring additional funding or other resources). Prioritize each set of objectives. Per accreditation standards, priorities must include the development of Program Level Student Learning Outcomes and their assessment.

PROGRAM ACTION PLAN

OPERATIONAL PLAN

Objectives	Activities	Desired Outcomes	Lead	Timeline
<u>Revise Eng 70 & 90 course outlines</u>	<u>Review four major assignments, grading practices, student work</u>	<u>That the curriculum being taught aligns with the SLO's, that instructors all teach to the same outcomes</u>	<u>Joellen Hiltbrand</u>	<u>Spring 2007</u>
<u>Review Eng 90's final assignment</u>	<u>Holistic scoring</u>	<u>That the success rate increases</u>	<u>Joellen Hiltbrand</u>	<u>Jan. 2007 flex</u>
<u>Establish a learning community for Eng 90 for EOPS</u>	<u>Partner with EOPS, recruit students, tutors, design curriculum</u>	<u>Improve success rate and persistence into Eng 100</u>	<u>Tess Caldwell</u>	<u>Spring 2007</u>
<u>Improve tutor training</u>	<u>Review tutor training curriculum, survey all participants: students, tutors and instructors</u>	<u>Increase student and instructor satisfaction and increase students reading and collaborative abilities</u>	<u>Karen Nakaji</u>	<u>Spring 2007</u>
<u>Continue Counselor Partnership</u>	<u>Counselor visits to Eng 70 classrooms</u>	<u>All Eng 70 students will have ed plans and continue on to Eng 90</u>	<u>Joellen Hiltbrand</u>	<u>Spring 2007 and every semester thereafter</u>

NEW INITIATIVE PLAN

Objectives	Activities	Desired Outcomes	Lead	Timeline
Upgrade computers	Purchase new computers for Mitchell, Folino, Nakaji	Improved instructor efficiency	Barbara Austin, Joellen Hiltbrand	Fall 2007
Upgrade software	Purchase Wayside, StyleWriter, Turnitin	Students will become better and more honest writers	Barbara Austin, Joellen Hiltbrand, Michael Yeong	Fall 2007
Dictionaries for students	Purchase at least 25 dictionaries	Students will have equal access to dictionaries	Chair	Fall 2007
Class novels for tutors	Purchase novels being read in Eng 70 & 90 with tutors	Tutors will be able to participate in book discussions with students	Karen Nakaji	Fall 2007
Sufficient copy budget	Increase copy budget	Engl/ESL budget will be balanced	Chair	Fall 2007

VIII. ANNUAL PROGRESS

Progress reports will be appended to this document each fall beginning in the academic year following completion of the program review.

FALL 2007

1. Have there been significant changes in the internal or external environment that necessitated changes to your program review and/or plan? If so, please describe them.

2. What is the status of the objectives identified in the Program Action Plan?

3. If some objectives were attained, how successful were the changes in improving program effectiveness?

4. How have you improved student progress through the program, student learning, or other aspects of program quality such as efficiency?

5. If some objectives were not attained, what were the impediments? Do you still believe these objectives will lead to program improvements?

6. What have you learned from this process that would inform future attempts to change and improve your program?

LOS MEDANOS COLLEGE

PLANNING AND RESEARCH COMMITTEE

Humberto Sale, chair, College Research Coordinator

Gil Rodriguez, co-chair, Dean, Liberal Arts and Sciences

Ramon Coria, member, President, Associated Students

Curtis Corlew, member, Faculty, Art and Journalism

Bruce Cutler, member, Director of Business Services

Ruth Goodin, member, Principal Analyst, Grants and Economic Development

Richard Livingston, member, Senior Dean of Instruction

Cindy McGrath, member, Faculty, Department Chair, Journalism

Sandra Mills, member, Coordinator, Reading and Writing Center

Jennifer Victor, member, Senior Administrative Assistant

With assistance from the following Los Medanos College members:

Peter Garcia, President

Dan Henry, Vice President

Myra Snell, Faculty, Mathematics Department

Nancy Ybarra, Faculty, English Department