

PROLOGUE

O Boreas! Thy full-cheeked fiery wind
Belly the sails of this frail bark, whose fame
We now do sing, though by departures thinn'd,
That we may yet two (2) more positions claim.
Fair ENGLISH shines in productivity:
Our LOAD, though seeming low, doth all outdo –
'Tis but a point of relativity:
For we, per class, to twenty-six must hew.
To meet our sacred charge with practice best,
New ways to learn and teach have we explored,
All labs maintained, all SLOs assessed:
Hard labours all and hard is the reward.
For, yet, that data sheet held by our dean
Reveals the crew doth number but THIRTEEN.



Annual Update

This Annual update is due on March 25th of each year that your three-year Program review and planning document is not due. Please email a copy of this to your Division dean, the VP of Instruction and the Academic Senate President.

1. What is the name of your Department and/or Division?

Department of English
Language Arts Division

2. List the names of everyone who participated in developing this annual update.

Madeleine Murphy, Kathleen Steele, Teeka James, Juanita Alunan

3. Based on the elements in your Annual Update Data Sheet (Provided by IRP to your dean) and goals stated in your most recent Program Review, please identify any key successes and challenges.

Successes

ENGLISH

Productivity: LOAD: ENGLISH – 444 (AY 2010-2011). Since the target LOAD for composition courses is 390, composition courses continue to function at well over 100% efficiency. The current year's LOAD is slightly down from last year's (453 for AY 2009-2010), but still significantly above the LOAD from the previous year (417 for AY 2008-9).

Retention and success rates: Retention rates for AY 2010-2011 were 80%, two percent down from last year, but still consistent with retention rates for the college as a whole (84%). Success rates continue to hover in the low 60s (64% for AY 2010-2011, down 1% from the previous year, but up 2% from 2008-2009). This is a little lower than the current college average of 69%, but not much, given that the English composition program includes some of the more labor-intensive and demanding required courses.

LITERATURE

Productivity: LOAD: LITERATURE – 488 (AY 2010-2011). In our last program review, we explained our hopes that organizing and publicizing our literature program would increase enrollments. It succeeded. Literature has significantly increased its LOAD (up from 443 in

AY 2009-2010). We also have increased the number of sections from four, in 2008-2009, to eight in 2010-2011. Enrollments are also swelling rapidly: in the last three academic years (2008-9, 2009-10, 2010-11) enrollments have more than doubled, from 117 to 177 to 250.

While LOAD for literature continues to look low, compared to the ideal LOAD of 525, it is artificially lowered by the inclusion of an 800-level section for each course. These were designed originally to boost enrollments by creating a sort of book-club style non-transferable course, available without prerequisites to students who simply wanted to read books and talk about them. Initially, 800-level co-enrollments kept some of the transfer-level literature courses alive; but in recent years, 800-level enrollments have dropped, while the transfer-level section enrollments have increased. The maximum enrollment for the 800-level classes is 10, so the one or two students who enroll skew the numbers. The real measure of productivity – the numbers of actual students in the classroom – is going up. The English department will explore ways to make the literature LOAD picture clearer, perhaps by reducing or eliminating the 800-level enrollments.

Retention and success rates: Both are improving for literature courses. Retention is up to 89% in AY 2010-2011 (from 80% two years earlier), and success rates have improved significantly, from 67% in AY 2008-2009 to 75% in AY 2010-2011.

Academic Year: 2010/2011

A comparison of the overall data for AY 2010/2011 indicates that ENGLISH and LITERATURE are in line with college norms (once one reassess the overall target LOAD for ENGLISH as 390).

<u>LOAD:</u>		<u>Retention:</u>	<u>Success:</u>
ENGLISH	444	80%	64%
LITERATURE	488	89%	75%
LA DIVISION	476	80%	65%
ALL COLLEGE	576	84%	69%

Challenges

Below are some of the notable challenges facing the department in the coming academic year.

1. Administrative workload for full-time faculty

FTEF of full-time English faculty stands at 20.95 for AY 2010-2011. In real numbers, there are thirteen full-time faculty and twenty-one adjunct faculty in the department. The head-count is more important than the FTEF, in fact, because people – not the *equivalent* of people – must perform specific routine administrative tasks.

Of the thirteen full-time faculty, one is in tenure review, and thus not eligible for committee or evaluation work. So all administrative work (tenure review, hiring, peer evaluation, adjunct evaluation, committee participation, SLO assessment, revision of course outlines, program review, and so on) is shared between twelve. Full-time faculty have so far been very active. One English faculty member is currently President of Academic Senate, one more is on the Learning Center consultation group, three are serving on the Basic Skills Initiative committee, one is on the Distance Education Committee, two are serving on accreditation

sub-committees (one as co-chair), one is heading the new Honors program, one will be participating in the newly revived Puente program, two serve as AFT officers, and several have been involved with CSM's Honors societies.

With the squeeze on faculty time, a number of other, crucially important things are affected:

- *Meaningful professional development.* A lot of flex time ends up dedicated to administrative tasks, with SLO workshops and the like being offered as “professional development” activities, when in fact they are nothing of the kind. Meaningful, ongoing professional development is vital to keeping instruction fresh, creative, in touch with recent pedagogy, and responsive to students’ needs.
- *Response to SLO analysis.* While faculty have complied faithfully with SLO routines, and while our analysis of the data has produced a number of interesting proposals, we have not yet had time to implement many changes other than to amend the language of the SLOs themselves.
- *Curriculum coherence.* Many full-time faculty have partial release time; others bank units and are occasionally away on leave. Consequently, any given level of composition may be staffed mostly or almost entirely by adjunct faculty. This leaves full-time faculty sometimes out of touch with issues arising at specific course levels, which undermines the coherence of the curriculum. Teaching our courses is our primary and central task; when required to serve as part-time administrators as well, full-time faculty may sometimes be slow to identify or respond to new challenges in the classroom.
- *Adjunct evaluation.* The department has a large number of adjunct faculty, and an ever-decreasing number of full-time faculty makes adjunct evaluation and preservation of standards challenging.

2: Improving retention and success for underserved groups

Student success rates in the department's courses vary significantly by demographics. Neither ENGLISH nor LITERATURE is out of step with division or college norms on this score; for instance, in AY 2010/2011, success rates for in ENGLISH were 54% for Black students and 58% for Hispanic students; overall college success rates for these groups were 58% and 64% respectively. However, English faculty remain committed to improving success rates for these and other underserved groups.

Responses:

- Ongoing participation in college initiatives aimed at promoting student retention and success. Full-time faculty serve on the Basic Skills Committee and the Learning Center consultation group.
- Continued creation of learning communities. Along with the well-established and highly successful *Writing In the End Zone* (now with the regular participation of four instructors, who manage the program in collaboration with coaches Bret Pollack and Tim Tulloch), faculty have expanded the *Voices of a Stranger* community, and added a new learning community aimed at returning veterans, which will begin in Fall 2012.
- Continued use of the Writing Center and English 800 Lab. Maintaining the high quality of instruction in the Writing Center remains a high priority for the English department, as it offers the at-risk student individualized instruction from qualified faculty. It also offers a quiet place to work, and functioning online computers, resources which many at-risk students do not have reliable access to.

- The college has revived the Puente Program, something which English faculty (two of whom are qualified Puente instructors) have been advocating for some time.

3. Distance education: Improve retention and success

Online classes remain in high demand. In Fall 2010, both sections were fully enrolled (at the class cap of 26); in Fall 2011, the four sections of English enrolled 89 DE composition students (out of a possible maximum of 104).

However, distance education courses continue to have lower retention and success rates than traditional classes:

<u>COURSE</u>	<u>DE success</u>	<u>DE retention</u>	<u>Trad success</u>	<u>Trad retention</u>
ENGL 100	47.8%	68.7%	64.6%	79.9%
ENGL 110	55.3%	63.8%	71.6%	81.5%
ENGL 165	35.3%	51%	63.4%	80.8%

While it is hard to draw very firm inferences from these comparisons – mostly, we are looking at just one online section, and the pool of online instructors is also very small (usually one or two per semester) – online courses do generally have higher rates of attrition and lower rates of success. English faculty continue to explore ways to retain and serve online students; in Spring 2012, for instance, we introduced online essay conferencing, to improve ancillary instructional support for online students. However, this is not a problem specific to the English department. Even in the absence of any evaluation instruments specific to online courses, we have maintained good quality control of our online courses by making sure that our online instructors are either full-time or well-established adjunct faculty, very much involved with the department, very well versed in online pedagogy and very aware of departmental standards and local student issues. In fact, virtually all online general education courses are dealing with lower retention and success rates. As noted in the Distance Education Plan in 2009-2013, the Program Review cycle for Fall 2009-Spring 2010 showed that “sixty percent (61.3%) of DE courses had lower rates of completion than their on-campus counterparts,” with the differential concentrated in general education classes (online success rates in business, computing and accounting classes is about the same as in traditional classes).

Response:

- English faculty will continue to offer one section of each level of transfer composition each semester, whenever possible.
- The Writing Center has piloted an online component to offer essay conferencing to improve student success.
- English faculty will make use of college-wide DE resources as they are developed (for instance, the new Distance Education Resource Center in College Center).
- One full-time English faculty member remains on the Distance Education Committee.

4. Maintaining quality instruction in the Writing Center

The Writing Center and English 800 Lab are funded by the English composition program's TBA, and are intended primarily to serve students in the English composition program, as well as students enrolled in ENGL 850 and ESL 850 (142 and 239 enrollments in 2010-2011, respectively). As noted in last year's program review, while we see the merit in supporting students in ESL 850, using TBA funds from English classes to include ESL faculty in the staffing of the Writing Center reduces the number of English faculty that staff the center. Consequently, we are less able to serve our ENGL students, many of whom have great difficulty getting appointments. This situation will be exacerbated if the College succeeds in its goal to increase enrollments for international students, who will likely arrive with varying degrees of proficiency in written English. We must get supplementary or alternative funding; we will not be able to serve our ENGL and ESL students in the Writing Center using our current funding model.

4. Are you on track for meeting the goals/targets that your program identified in its most recent Program Review? If not, please explain possible reasons why. If needed, update your goal/targets based on these reason.

Previously Identified goals:

Goal 1: Maintain productivity through enrollment management.

On track. No update needed.

Goal 2: Address the challenges and opportunities of diversity.

On track. Continued innovation necessary.

Goal 3: Increase student success by exploring and developing teaching methodologies and curricula.

On track. Continued innovation necessary.

- Our overall student success rate has increased in ENGLISH by 2% between 2008-9 and 2010-11, and in LITERATURE by 8% over the same period. This contrasts favorably with the college's overall success rate, which has declined by 1% over the same period.
- Faculty have continued creating learning communities (see above).
- Underway in Spring 2012 semester: faculty participated in teaching circles at the ENGL 100, in an effort to experiment with standardized assignments and to model potential good practices for future ENGL 100 courses.

5. Have you identified any new goals or projects for the program to focus on during this next year? Please explain (grants, stipends, initiatives, etc.).

1. Developing the To Be Arranged (TBA) Hour

English department faculty are applying for a grant to explore creative ways to make the best use of the Writing Center, and to meet the state requirements for the TBA (To Be Arranged hour) while still maintaining the quality of instruction. Currently, the Writing Center is overwhelmed; it is unable to provide all ENGL composition students with sixteen hours' of instruction each semester as well as the ESL students it serves, yet state guidelines have

made some previous uses of the TBA – enrichment activities, such as attending a play or film – impermissible. Because the Writing Center is so important to our program, we are looking to develop ways in which it can offer students meaningful support.

2. With an increasing number of foreign students recruited by the District, the Writing Center requires more ESL faculty that will allow these students to have helpful TBA experiences. However, we cannot move forward with this goal without additional funding from the District that is independent from the TBA funding generated by ENGL composition courses.

6. Are there any critical issues you expect to face in the coming year? How will you address those challenges?

Full-time/Adjunct ratio

The current ratio is 13 full-time (of whom one is still in tenure review, and thus ineligible for most of the full-timers' administrative duties) to 21 adjunct faculty

The consequences of this are well-documented:

- In any given semester, almost all composition courses at one level or other are taught by adjunct faculty, which results in full-time faculty losing touch with the various levels of the program;
- Evaluations become especially difficult, for the same twelve faculty must constantly re-evaluate their adjunct colleagues and each other (many full-time faculty are obliged to evaluate at least one colleague every single semester);
- The increasing burden of administrative tasks (as discussed above) siphons full-time faculty's energy away from students;
- Full-time faculty sacrifice professional development opportunities in order to direct energy towards administrative tasks, most of which, although of lower priority than teaching work, must meet urgent deadlines;
- Full-time faculty generally seem to experience a good deal of unhappiness with a shared governance system that seems to increase administrative workload on a yearly basis (as attested by the Spring 2011 Campus Climate Satisfaction survey, in which a bare 53.7% of faculty agreed that "Overall, the shared governance process is working well at CSM");

A higher full-time/adjunct faculty ratio would mean more faculty to share in administrative and committee work, and more full-time faculty in the classroom when their colleagues are working on special projects.

Space for Writing Center ESL grammar workshops

We need a regular, appropriate space for the Grammar Workshops. So, if the former Speech lab/FL labs are available, let's consider in the future whether the Grammar Workshops could be held there. At a minimum, the instructor needs an OH projector, Smart Classroom projection capabilities, seating for up to 20 students and white boards to write on. It would be nice to have an appropriate and designated place to hold them that is near the WC for sign-in. Unfortunately, the CAC isn't appropriate since the instructor uses the white board a lot and doesn't have the students work at all on the computers, the Learning Center

is not convenient for 850 students who need their folders, and we cannot reserve a regular classroom in Bldg 18 until after the semester has started.

7. Student Learning Outcomes and Assessment focus for this year:

- a. Academic areas: Identify at least one course SLO on which to focus. Describe the assessment strategies you will use and your method of reflection and documentation for this cycle.

Composition:

We have traditionally conducted SLO evaluation on each course every three years. In the Fall 2010-Spring 2011 cycle, no composition courses were scheduled for SLO evaluation.

We are changing our assessment strategies (though not the method), and thus we will likely conduct SLO evaluations on each course annually in the future, to generate more data and get a better picture of changing success rates.

In Spring 2012, we were scheduled to evaluate ENGL 110. However, we are planning to evaluate all our composition courses this semester to see how well the new evaluation system works.

Strategies: We will no longer assess courses through group holistic grading sessions. Instead, instructors will put aside a random selection of essays from the course being evaluated, and submit them to the SLO coordinator for the department. Instructors interested in participating in SLO reading for that semester will submit their names. The coordinator will assign a packet of essays to each instructor, making sure that the process is anonymous at both ends (the reader will not know whose essays he is reading; the instructor will not know who is reading her students' work). The reader completes an "SLO Evaluation Form" and submits it to the SLO coordinator, who enters the results into Tracdat. We will continue to use the annual retreat day to analyze what the SLO data tell us, and to review the success of resulting initiatives.

We evaluate all SLOs at once. In some years we have prioritized specific SLOs which needed attention; in recent readings, we have given each SLO equal attention. Our last analysis of ENGL 110 revealed a problem with the SLOs; one of them, while a worthy course objective, did not fit the kinds of assignments many instructors were giving, and it was also hard to gauge. We eliminated the SLO as a result. In this reading, we will focus on ways to gauge critical thinking and reading skills in student essays (SLO 1). However, our first concern is to identify which SLO shows the lowest level of mastery, and concentrate on that.

Method of reflection: Our annual retreat (Fall 2012) will include an analysis and discussion of what the SLO data tell us, and the proposed initiatives to address it.

Documentation: SLO data is maintained in Tracdat. Retreats have traditionally been written up and circulated to faculty.

Literature and other courses offered on an occasional basis (Workplace Writing, etc.):

Achievement of SLOs is assessed through holistic essay readings, quizzes, and other projects. Typically, the SLO assessment is conducted by the instructor teaching the class; the final exam is tailored to include questions that will permit students to show mastery of SLOs. Results are submitted to the SLO coordinator for inclusion in Tracdat.

b. Student services areas: TBD

n/a

8. SUMMARY OF RESOURCES NEEDED TO REACH PROGRAM ACTION STEPS

(Data resources: Educational Master Plan, GE-SLOs, SLOs; department records; Core Program and Student Success Indicators; previous Program Review and Planning reports)

- a. In the matrices below, itemize the resources needed to reach program action steps and describe the expected outcomes for program improvement.* Specifically, describe the potential outcomes of receiving these resources and the programmatic impact if the requested resources cannot be granted.

**Note: Whenever possible, requests should stem from assessment of SLOs and the resulting program changes or plans. Ideally, SLOs are assessed, the assessments lead to planning, and the resources requested link directly to those plans.*

Full-Time Faculty Positions Requested	Expected Outcomes if Granted and Expected Impact if Not Granted	If applicable, <u>briefly</u> indicate how the requested resources will link to achieving department action steps based on SLO assessment.
<p>We request two replacement full-time, tenure-track faculty positions to account for two recent departures from Department.</p> <p>Connection to SLOs:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> We analyze the data from our SLO assessments at annual retreats, and put the analysis in the context of larger questions. At our most recent retreat in Fall 2011, we tackled the question of student 	<p>Outcomes if Granted:</p> <p>Two positions will lessen administrative pressure on current full-time faculty, allowing for enhanced innovation and participation within the department as determined by SLO assessment.</p> <p>Two positions will allow for full-time faculty to be responsive to and to participate in innovative college-wide student success and retention initiatives (as budget dictates).</p>	<p>Link to Department Action Steps:</p> <p>The following are all things we have discussed, but have not been able to follow up, that would certainly support the larger departmental goals of student success and diversity:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Instituting an ongoing forum for clarifying, consolidating and upholding standards at all levels of the composition curriculum; Organizing cross-section

<p>success by exploring ways to address changing expectations of students. We came up with a number of initiatives which we plan to review and prioritize. We have not had time to do so. Until we have more full-time faculty, we will continue to have insufficient time to implement a lot of what we can glean from SLO assessments, as well as other more useful ways of assessing our work.</p>	<p>Two positions will enable full-time faculty to continue to take active roles in shared governance, representing English and Language Arts on college-wide committees.</p> <p>Expected Impact if Not Granted:</p> <p>Instructors will prioritize our administrative and instructional obligations, and identify those which must be postponed.</p>	<p>orientation days for new “freshmen” (i.e., students starting their transfer-level English courses);</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ongoing collaborative teaching efforts, including visiting colleagues’ classrooms, team-teaching, collaborative seminars and other innovations; • Developing and implementing meaningful forms of assessment (portfolios, exams) at the course and degree level; • Collaborating with local feeder high schools to explore ways to support developmental writers and at-risk students; • While we are thrilled that the College is finally bringing back the Puente Project, our department’s participation (which is required) will dominate 53% of one full-time faculty member’s time (the Puente instructor will devote eight units of his load each semester to Puente, 20% to program coordination). Since each full-time faculty member represents 7.69% of the department’s total full-time workforce, our participation in Puente thins our already thinning herd by 4.1%. It would be nice to have our department’s commitment to College goals—Puente is part of the College’s Five in Five planning—not only acknowledged but supported with the additional resources of additional full-time faculty.
---	---	--

Classified Positions Requested	Expected Outcomes if Granted and Expected Impact if Not Granted	If applicable, <u>briefly</u> indicate how the requested resources will link to achieving department action steps based on SLO assessment.
None at this time	n/a	n/a

b. For instructional resources including equipment and materials, please list the exact items you want to acquire and the total costs, including tax, shipping, and handling. Include items used for instruction (such as computers, furniture for labs and centers) and all materials designed for use by students and instructors as a learning resource (such as lab equipment, books, CDs, technology-based materials, educational software, tests, non-printed materials). Add rows to the tables as necessary. If you have questions as to the specificity required, please consult with your division dean. Please list by priority.

Resources Requested	Expected Outcomes if Granted and Expected Impact if Not Granted	If applicable, <u>briefly</u> indicate how the requested resources will link to achieving department action steps based on SLO assessment.
Six (6) HP LaserJet Enterprise 600 M601n (laser printers) @ \$669.88 (total \$4,019.28)	Impacts the Writing Center's ability to support students in the writing program	Printers are needed to replace the current Writing Center printers.
One (1) iMac 21.5-inch /w (\$8 Recycle Fee) – Desktop computer @ \$1,157	Impacts the Writing Center's ability to support students in the writing program	Needed to replace the Writing Center iMac.
One (1) HP LaserJet Pro M1217nfw (Scanner / copier / printer) @ \$246.52	Impacts the Writing Center's ability to support students in the writing program	Needed to replace a non-functional scanner in the Writing Center.

2 copies, Oxford Collocations Dictionary, 1st or 2nd edition \$50, for ESL students in the Writing Center	Impacts effective instruction (especially of ESL) students in the Writing Center.	SLO assessments indicate that SLOs relating to sentence-level writing (clarity, grammatical correctness, complexity) show the lowest levels of mastery (typically around 55%). Writing Center resources are vital for improvement in sentence-level mastery.
Kristi's Editing Text (5 copies x ~\$20 each) for the Writing Center 850 students and Grammar Workshop students, purchase in Spring 2013	Impacts effective instruction (especially of ESL) students in the Writing Center.	
Use of the former speech labs for the ESL grammar workshops.	Impacts effective instruction (especially of ESL) students in the Writing Center.	As noted above, students tend to need most support in sentence-level writing. This is especially true for ESL students, who will not receive the necessary instruction in a native-speaker composition class. The grammar workshops are a very important instructional support.

* Status = New, Upgrade, Replacement, Maintenance or Repair.

Madeleine Murphy

Primary faculty contacts

March 25, 2012

Date

Kathleen Steele

Additional faculty

March 25, 2012

Date

Teeka James, Juanita Alunan

Additional faculty

March 25, 2012

Date