

# LMC Comprehensive Program Review

## Instructional Units

2017-2018

Program/Discipline: **ENGLISH**\_\_\_\_\_

The following provides an outline of the required elements for a comprehensive unit/program review for Instructional Programs and Units. Upon completion of this report, please upload your document in the unit/program review application data/documents tab.

### 1. Program Changes (SARA, JILL, CAITLIN)

1.1. How have your degree and certificate offerings changed over the last 5 years? ( e.g. new programs, discontinued or major changes to existing programs)

We now have an English transfer degree, which five years ago we didn't have. Our AA-T in English was offered for the first time in the Fall 14-15 catalog. Since the 2014-15 year when we first offered our AA-T degree, we've written new courses to be added to the major including LGBT Lit and the recently approved creative writing courses (English 113 and 114).

We've also undergone another major programmatic change. Whereas we used to have two separate programs, Developmental and Transfer, we now only have one: our major. We discontinued two of our developmental courses, English 70 and 90, and added English 95 in an effort to accelerate students through to transfer-level English. We've also created a new co-requisite course, English 100S for certain English 100 sections in an effort to offer more support to students who traditionally would be placed below transfer level. We've added a new support course as well called English 85, Introduction to College Reading which students at any level can take.

1.2. What changes are you planning to your degree and certificate offering over the next 5 years? What is the rationale for the anticipated changes? Will these changes require any additional resources?

We plan to continue expanding our major by writing new courses and promoting the major on campus. Some new courses we plan to offer include another creative writing course focused on playwriting, Eng 210 Latino Lit, and Eng 211 Chicano Lit. The more we are able to provide a robust transfer degree in English, the better off our students will be when they do transfer. Offering more courses in both literature and creative writing will give students those credits they need when going on to a university where they may have a major emphasis in either one, which will also benefit students financially.

### 2. Degree and Certificate Requirements (APRILL, STACEY)

Please review the data provided on all degree/certificate completions in your program, including locally approved College Skills Certificates from Fall 2012—Spring 2017.

2.1. For each degree/certificate offered, map a pathway to completion of courses within the major in a maximum of 4 semesters, assuming a maximum of 6-10 units of major courses within a semester. Use the following format:

ENGLISH AAT				
Semester	Semester 1 - FALL	Semester 2- SPRING	Semester 3 - FALL	Semester 4 - SPRING
List Courses Needed for Degree or Certificate in each semester.	<p><b>Required:</b> (Prerequisite for 221) English 100 <b>AND</b> <b>Elective (List B – 3 Units required):</b> English 111 English 128 English 129 English 133 English 231 English 220</p> <p><b>AND/OR</b></p> <p><b>Elective: (List C – 3 Units Required)</b> English 112 Humanities 024 Journalism 110 Drama 016 <i>(These are here because they only require eligibility for English 100)</i></p>	<p><b>Required:</b> English 221 <b>AND</b> <b>Elective: (List B – 3 Units required):</b> English 127 English 132 English 205** English 220** <i>(**These are here because they require English 100 as a prerequisite.)</i></p> <p><b>OR</b></p> <p><b>Elective: (List C – 3 Units Required)</b> English 112 Humanities 024 Journalism 110 Drama 016</p>	<p><b>Required:</b> English 230 <b>AND</b> <b>List A – 6 Units Required:</b> English 140</p>	<p><b>List A – 6 Units Required:</b> English 145 &amp; - if they have not completed the following: <b>Elective (List B – 3 Units required):</b> English 127 English 132 English 205 English 220</p> <p><b>OR</b></p> <p><b>Elective: (List C – 3 Units Required)</b> English 112 Humanities 024 Journalism 110 Drama 016</p>

2.2. What changes are you planning to your degree and certificate offering over the next 5 years? What is the rationale for the anticipated changes? Will these changes require any additional resources?

### 3. Frequency of Course Offerings (YONGMIN, TESS)

Please review the data provided on frequency of all courses offered in your discipline in the last 2 years (Fall 2015-Spring 2017).

3.1. If a course has not been offered in the past two years, but is required for a degree or certificate, please explain why it has not been offered, and what the plan is to offer it in the future.

N/A.

3.2. If the course is not required for a degree or certificate, is the course still needed in the curriculum or is the department considering deleting it?

N/A

3.3. For the next two years, project how frequently your program intends to offer each course. Please provide a rationale for any major changes from the last 2 years that you anticipate.

Course	Estimated Number of Sections Offered by Semester			
	Fall 2018	Spring 2019	Fall 2019	Spring 2020
COURSE 83	2	2	2	2
COURSE 85	2	2	2	2
COURSE 95	9	9	9	9
COURSE 100/100S	24	24	24	24
COURSE 100	17	17	17	17
COURSE 111	1	0	1	0
COURSE 112	0	0	0	0
COURSE 113	0	1	0	1
COURSE 114	1	0	1	0
COURSE 124	1	0	1	0
COURSE 127	0	1	0	1
COURSE 128	1	0	1	0
COURSE 129	1	0	1	0
COURSE 132	0	1	0	1
COURSE 133	1	0	1	0
COURSE 135	1	1	1	1
COURSE 136	0	1	0	1
COURSE 140	1	0	1	0
COURSE 145	0	1	0	1
COURSE 150	0	1	0	1
COURSE 205	0	1	0	1
COURSE 210	1	0	1	0
COURSE 211	0	1	0	1
COURSE 220	5	5	5	5
COURSE 221	16	20	16	20

<i>COURSE 230</i>	4	6	4	6
<i>COURSE 231</i>	0	1	0	1
<b>Rationale for any Major Changes</b>				

## 4. Existing Curriculum Analysis

### 4.1. Course Outline Updates NA

Please review the data provided on the status of COORs in your discipline. (Note: This data does not reflect courses submitted after May 2017.) For each COOR that has *not* been updated since Spring 2012, please indicate the faculty member responsible for submitting the updated COOR to the Curriculum Committee by April 18, 2018.

Course	Faculty Responsible for COOR Update
<i>COURSE 001</i>	
<i>COURSE 002</i>	
<i>COURSE 003</i>	

### 4.2. Course Offerings/Content (JOELLEN)

<p>How have your courses changed over the past 5 years (new courses, significant changes to existing courses)?</p>	<p>In Fall 2012, the English department offered 16 sections of English 70, a course two levels below transfer-level English, and 26 sections of English 90, a course one level below transfer-level English. We offered 23 sections of English 100, the first transfer-level course in the English curricular sequence. Of these three entry-level courses, 65% of the sections were pre transfer-level, meaning that students would have to take anywhere from one to two courses to gain access to transfer-level English curriculum.</p> <p>In Fall 2017, the English department offered no sections of either English 70 or 90, and 10 sections of English 95, the pre-transfer-level course. We offered 52 sections of transfer-level English (either through the stand-alone English</p>
--	--

	<p>100 course, or through Engl 100/100S). Of these two entry-level courses, 16% of the sections were pre-transfer-level, meaning that the majority of incoming students were placed directly into transfer-level courses.</p> <p>Obviously, this is an enormous shift, made possible through the creation of new courses as well as changes to the mechanisms through which students are placed into their initial English courses.</p>
<p>How have these changes enhanced your program?</p>	<p>The change to more accurate placement, and therefore to placing the majority of incoming students into transfer-level courses (with or without an additional support class) has helped the department address a policy that was having a negative disproportionate impact on access to transfer-level courses for certain populations. Though access is only one aspect of institutional inequity in higher education, and does not solve the larger issue of ensuring equitable success in courses, it is an important issue, and to the extent that our curricular changes have helped minimize that impact, we consider it successful. Since we are in our first semester of these changes (placement reform and co-requisite transfer-level course), the outcome for student success remains to be seen, and we will address any needed changes as they become clear, so that more students not only enter transfer-level courses, but complete them successfully, and that inequities in success rates between student populations are decreased.</p> <p>The curricular changes have also shifted the department focus from one that focuses mainly on “developmental” or “remedial” coursework, to one that focuses on preparing students for college-level reading and writing, and to moving students through gateway courses successfully and more quickly. It also has the effect of creating a need for more sections of courses at</p>

	the 200 level since we are moving students through the 100 level more quickly.
--	--

## 5. New Curriculum Analysis

### 5.1. If you are creating new degrees or certificates in the next 5 years: (Indicate N/A if no new degrees or certificates are planned.)

What additional courses will need to be created to support the new degree or certificate?	<b>none</b>
What significant changes to existing course content would need to be made to support the new degree or certificate?	<i>We plan to create a Certificate in Creative Writing. We currently have English 111: Introduction to Creative Writing, which has been offered consistently for years, and the college has just approved two new courses in this field: English 113: Creative Writing: Poetry and English 114: Creative Writing: Introduction to Story. These two new courses will be offered along with English 111 in the 2018-2019 academic year. English 115: Creative Writing: Playwriting is still in development and we hope to have it approved in the fall of 2018.</i>

## 6. Advisory Board Update (For all CTE TOP coded programs) NA

Give an overview of the current purpose, structure, and effectiveness of your Advisory Board. Include: membership, dates of last meetings over the past two years.

## 7. Assessment Effectiveness:

### 7.1. Course Level Assessment

**Please review the data provided on assessment status of courses in your discipline in Cycle 1 ( 2012-2017).**

7.1.1. If there were any courses that were not assessed in Cycle 1, please explain why they were not assessed. NA

- 7.1.2. If a course was not assessed in Cycle 1 because it was not offered, what is the future of that course? NA
- Delete the course
  - Market/promote the course to gain enrollments
  - Other

7.1.3. Course level assessment should be meaningful, measurable and manageable. Overall, reflecting on the course level assessment, please rate the degree to which you feel your assessments meet these 3M's. (MORGAN, ALEX)

Meaningful:

1	2	3
The assessment was not meaningful in collecting data or information that supported course improvement or pedagogical changes.	The intent was understood, but the outcome fell short of meeting the objective of course assessment, which is to improve student learning. The changes to the course or pedagogy to support the course were not clear.	Changes were made to the course content or delivery to improve course effectiveness. The process promoted pedagogical dialog within the department, and changes were adopted accordingly.

Measurable:

1	2	3
The data collected did not inform teaching and learning.	The assessment produced some measurable information, but created more questions than answers.	Results were straightforward and easy to interpret. The course of action to improve the course or its delivery was clear from the data that was collected.

Manageable:

1	2	3
Assessment was not manageable.	The assessment process was somewhat manageable, but posed challenges to implement across the program.	The assessment was easily scaled across the department so that full- and part-time faculty could participate with meaningful outcomes.

7.1.4. **What changes in the assessment process itself would result in more meaningful data to improve student learning?** (MORGAN, ALEX)

- Many CSLO Assessments for our literature courses were conducted by 1-2 instructors in isolation and the results were not shared out.
- Many CSLO Assessments relied on assessments of performance (an essay, test, etc.) rather than learning, so it was hard to see how the course itself was impacting the outcomes instructors were documenting.

- There were almost no pre-/post assessments making it difficult to know what skills/prior knowledge students came in with that would impact their performance on the assessments.
- It was hard to see what impact the CSLO assessment had on subsequent courses or the program as a whole.

Overall, therefore, while the assessments seemed somewhat meaningful for individual instructors occasionally, they mostly seemed to know what the instructor already knew because the instructor was grading the assignment anyway. There were reflections on what the instructor might do differently, but those were not documented anywhere and they were not shared out. Thus, we ultimately found the assessments to not be very meaningful. There were manageable, but not meaningful.

The quantitative data—how many were HP, P, and NP—seems meaningless. All it shows is whether individual instructors were pleased with students' work. Therefore, the reports are more meaningful when (a) the author provides a lot of detail about the assessments given, and (b) *qualitative* observations are given in depth.

In many courses with an English 100 prerequisite (140, 145, 221, 230, 231), instructors found that students did more poorly when they had to write an essay, or when the writing was longer. Eng 221 instructors, in particular, lamented students' sometimes poor writing abilities. A 230 instructor remarked that class time should not be devoted to skills students should have learned in Eng 100. This suggests the need for paper-scoring/norming activities at the 100 and 200 levels, to establish what level of writing is expected or counts as passing. Then when we do CSLO assessments the results will have more meaning.

- 7.1.5. Share an outcome where assessment had a positive impact on student learning and program effectiveness.** (MORGAN, ALEX)  
We don't have a compelling example of this happening.

## **7.2. Program Level Assessment** (JOANN, SCOTT)

- 7.2.1. In 2016-2017, units engaged in program level assessment. **Please submit all Program Level Assessment Reports using the link provided.** Describe one important thing you learned from your program level assessment.

**From the report: The strongest area for students in both courses was for PSLO #1 which addresses critical reading and thinking. Students met or exceeded proficiency for PSLO #2 which addresses responding to texts in critical, creative and personal ways. In both courses, students struggled with proficiency in PSLO #3 which addresses writing literary analysis. We were not surprised by these results as students often do not have a lot of preparation in writing literary analysis in English 100.**



7.2.2. What was the biggest challenge in conducting program level assessment?

**Because our English Transfer Degree is so new, we did not have a lot of data to work with. We chose to assess English 140 and 145 because all students who are English majors are required to take these courses.**

7.2.3. What resource needs, if any, were identified in your program level assessment?

**We would like to have more faculty development focused on teaching literary analysis. We also will need data to assess enrollments and success rates of our online offerings for English 140, 145 and the other elective literature courses. We hope to build enrollments to offer English 140 and 145 F2F.**

## 8. Course Success/Retention Analysis (JAMES, MICHAEL)

**Please review the data provided on course retention and success, which has been disaggregated by as many elements as district can provide in their SQL Report**

One of our college goals as stated in our Integrated Plan is to “Increase successful course completion, and term to term persistence.” Our Equity Plan identifies African- American and low income students as disproportionately impacted in terms of successful course completion. (Foster youth are also disproportionately impacted on this indicator, but numbers are too small to disaggregate by discipline/program) Please indicate how well students in these groups are succeeding in your discipline.

	African-American	Low Income Students	All students in program/discipline
<b>Completion Rate (program/discipline)</b>	74.5%	79.6%	80.9
<b>Success Rate (program/discipline)</b>	57.4%	67.0%	69.4%

8.1. In looking at disaggregated data on success/retention, is there anything else that stands out?

After analyzing the data, two major things stand out. Firstly, the success rates of African-Americans and lower income students are significantly lower than the groups that they are juxtaposed with. For instance, whereas African-American students had a 57.4% success rate, Asian students had a 79.5% success rate and white students a 76.4% success rate. Similarly, the success rate for lower

income was also lower than that of non-lower income. Secondly, it was also evident that since 2014, the success rates, for both African-American and low-income students, have not dramatically changed.

8.2. What are some strategies that might help students, particularly African-American, foster youth, and low-income students successfully complete courses in your discipline? What resources would be needed to implement these strategies?

Striving, as a department, to become more culturally competent will enable us to meet these groups of students where they are more effectively. In “Culturally Relevant Pedagogy: Ingredients for Critical Teacher Reflection” (2010), Tyrone Howard stresses the importance of critical reflection as a way to develop culturally competent instructional strategies. Resources, such as workshops and conference, that will help us to develop these strategies might be a good place to start. Additionally, developing effective ways to record student progress could also be an effective measure. Our institution has developed resources such as Starfish; comparable resources could help to improve success rates at Los Medanos College.

## 9. Goals (ALEX)

9.1. Review your program’s goals as listed in response to the final question of your 2012-2013 Comprehensive Program Review posted in the Data Repository of the PRST.

<p>Highlight some of the key goals that were achieved over the past 5 years. What were the key elements that led to success?</p>	<p><b>(Transfer #4) Improve the effectiveness of our pedagogy, face to face and online, and the use of smart technologies by means of on-going, comprehensive professional development.</b></p> <p><b>(DE #2) Sustain our professional development programs such as the Teaching Community (a forum for faculty inquiry and training), and develop new opportunities as necessary.</b></p> <p>Required training for teaching English 95 and English 100S has given a huge boost to our professional development efforts, possibly tripling the number of participants in English PD, both during flex week and during the semester. We’ve also had several semesters of a mentor program, and we have started to offer PD for teachers of the critical thinking and advanced comp courses (220, 221, 230).</p> <p><b>(Transfer #1) In order to increase and accelerate student program completion, we plan to offer a Transfer Degree in English. (This, of course, will be contingent upon the ability to sustain offerings of courses required for major.)</b></p> <p>We now offer an English major.</p> <p><b>(DE #5) Evaluate the current placement and assessment processes to evaluate the effect of these on the success of our students. This</b></p>
--	---

	<p><b>will include an analysis of the effects of the cessation of English 50 and 60.</b>  <b>(DE #6) Investigate ways to implement state-wide initiatives in our program: Habits of Mind, Reading Apprenticeship, contextualization and acceleration.</b></p> <p>As of Fall 2017, we have switched to a multiple measures placement system in which most students are placed by high school GPA. As of Fall 2017 most students are now being placed directly into Eng 100 (or 100/100S), a reversal of the old placement which required most to start in 70, 90, or 95.</p> <p>Acceleration has been our major focus for the last 3 years or so with the help of the Transformation Grant. Eng 70 and 95 have been replaced by Eng 95. English 100/100S was launched in Fall 2017.</p> <p><b>(Transfer #5) Innovate our curriculum and pedagogy by procuring a “home” for English classes equipped with Smart Technology.</b></p> <p>As of Spring 2018 we will have 2 new classrooms in the English area, and we also will have carts full of laptops for our classes in the English area and for Brentwood English classes. We also have a refurbished computer lab.</p> <p><b>(DE #3) Sustain and expand our efforts in equity for underserved and underrepresented students.</b></p> <p>This one is part success, part failure. By accelerating, the number of underserved and underrepresented students taking transfer level English (100) is dramatically larger, and in Spr 18 we may see a similar increase in the numbers of students taking advanced courses (especially 221 and 230). However, achievement gaps have persisted—see below.</p>
<p>Were there any goals that did not go according to plan? What were the key elements that impeded the progress on these goals?</p>	<p><b>(Transfer #2) Improve success rates for all students in transfer level courses, with a particular goal to close the achievement gap for African- American students.</b></p> <p>The achievement gap for African American students has persisted; success rates for black students are 9 to 10% below average (-9.5% in spr 17). Success rates for Pacific Islanders (a smaller population, 93 students) was worse, -14.2% in spr 17. In 2012 the numbers were similar:</p> <p><b>(DE #5) Evaluate the current placement and assessment processes to evaluate the effect of these on the success of our students. This will include an analysis of the effects of the cessation of English 50 and 60.</b></p> <p>We have eliminated 50, 60, 70, and 90, but the effects are unclear as of Fall 2017. This is a work in progress.</p>

	<p><b>(DE #4) Sustain and improve our efforts to increase student ability to use campus resources, an integral part of which is the Counseling Partnership.</b></p> <p>Since the Counseling Partnership was a part of English 70, which has been eliminated, the status of such a partnership at the DE level is uncertain. However, the use of embedded student tutors, graduate instructional assistants, and the introduction of NetTutor have strengthened our efforts in other ways.</p>
--	---

**9.2. Consider the College’s Strategic Directions along with our Integrated Planning Goals listed here:**

College Strategic Directions 2014-2019	Integrated Planning Goals
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Increase equitable student engagement, learning, and success.</li> <li>2. Strengthen community engagement and partnerships.</li> <li>3. Promote innovation, expand organizational capacity, and enhance institutional effectiveness.</li> <li>4. Invest in technology, fortify infrastructure, and enhance fiscal resources.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>ACCESS:</b> increase access through enrollment of students currently underserved in our community.</li> <li>2. <b>IDENTIFYING PATHWAYS:</b> Increase the number of students that define a goal and pathway by the end of their first year.</li> <li>3. <b>COLLEGE-LEVEL TRANSITION:</b> Increase the number of students successfully transitioning into college level math and English courses.</li> <li>4. <b>PERSISTENCE &amp; COMPLETION:</b> Increase successful course completions, and term to term persistence.</li> <li>5. <b>EQUITABLE SUCCESS:</b> Improve the number of LMC students who earn associates degrees, certificates of achievement, transfer, or obtain career employment.</li> <li>6. <b>LEARNING CULTURE:</b> Enhance staff, faculty and administration’s understanding and use of culturally inclusive practices/pedagogy, demonstrating empathy and compassion when working with students.</li> </ol>

**List 3 – 5 longer term (5 year) new goals for your program. For each goal, pick 1 – 2 College Strategic Directions and/or 1 – 2 Integrated Planning Goals to which your new goal aligns.**

Goals	Aligned College Strategic Direction(s)	Aligned Integrated Planning Goal(s)
Goal 1: Assess and improve our new placement system, composition sequence, and DE course offerings. Establish standards for success in English 100.	1	3, 5
Goal 2: Institutionalize support services and professional development for 95 and 100S, such as instructional assistants, Nettutor, and in-class student tutors.	1	5
Goal 3: Increase success rates for African American and other underserved students (e.g. low-income, Pacific Islanders, foster youth) while closely monitoring the achievement gap. Continue research and PD on equity-related issues.	1	5
Goal 4: Revise the DE Lead position in keeping with our new composition sequence, and to ensure leadership when the Transformation Grant ends.	3	6
Goal 5: Create roles for English in the guided pathways model.	1,2	2, 4

**OPTIONAL**

**9.3 Resource needs to meet five-year goals**

<b><u>Faculty/Staff Resource Request</u></b>			
<b>Department/Unit Goal - Reference #</b>		<b>Strategic Objective - Reference #</b>	
<b>Department/Unit Name</b>		<b>Position Name/Classification</b>	<b>FTE</b>
<b>Position Type</b>	<b>Funding Duration</b>	<b>Funding Source</b>	<b>Est. Salary &amp; Benefits</b>

<input type="checkbox"/> Faculty R/T <input type="checkbox"/> Classified <input type="checkbox"/> Manager <input type="checkbox"/> Student	<input type="checkbox"/> On-going/Permanent <input type="checkbox"/> One-time	<input type="checkbox"/> Operations (Fund 11) <input type="checkbox"/> Other <input type="text"/>	
<b>Justification:</b>			

<b><u>Operating Resource Request</u></b>	
Department/Unit Goal - Reference #	Strategic Objective - Reference #
Department/Unit Name	Resource Type
	<input type="checkbox"/> Equipment <input type="checkbox"/> IT Hardware/Software <input type="checkbox"/> Supplies <input type="checkbox"/> Facility Improvement <input type="checkbox"/> Service/Contract <input type="checkbox"/> Other
General Description	Est. Expense
<b>Justification:</b>	

<b><u>Professional Development Resource Request</u></b>	
Department/Unit Goal - Reference #	Strategic Objective - Reference #
Department/Unit Name	Resource Type

Instructional Comprehensive Program Review

---

		<input type="checkbox"/> Conference/Meeting	<input type="checkbox"/> Materials/Supplies
		<input type="checkbox"/> Online Learning	<input type="checkbox"/> IT Hardware/Software
		<input type="checkbox"/> Other	
<b>General Description</b>		<b>Est. Expense</b>	
<b>Justification:</b>			