

INSTRUCTION PROGRAM REVIEW: SPRING 2013 SUBMISSION CYCLE

Program Name: English (and Literature)
Faculty Contact: James Carranza and Madeleine Murphy

Academic Year: 2011-2012
Submission Date: March 25, 2013

I. Description of Program

Provide a brief description of the program and how it supports the college's [College Mission and Diversity Statements](#), [Institutional Priorities, 2008-2013](#), [5 in 5 College Strategies, Spring 2011](#), and other [institutional planning documents](#) as appropriate.

The English department plays an essential role in supporting and promoting the College Mission and Diversity Statements. The program provides high quality, integrated reading/writing composition courses—basic skills through transfer. And it offers a small selection of literature courses to support students transferring and taking English AA or AA-T degrees. (The English department's AA-T degree is in process and is on schedule to be approved next year.) The English department directly supports *Institutional Priorities* 1, 2, 3, and 5. As the program review below reports, department faculty thoughtfully monitor student success at every level and promote students' progress, basic skills through transfer. The department astutely assesses its course and program SLOs to ensure continual improvement and high-quality course programming. In addition, English department collaborative projects or initiatives over the past two years have both promoted the College's Institutional Priorities and implemented the *5 in 5 College Strategies*:

5 in 5 College Strategies, Basic Skills

Strategy 1: English has begun an informal partnership with Hillsdale High English.

Strategy 2: *Connections Sections* is a basic skills English and Counseling learning community that "implements intrusive core" support services.

Strategy 4: *Pathway to College*—English is participating in this Learning Center program, providing one English instructor.

5 in 5 College Strategies, Transfer

Strategy 2: One English faculty member coordinates the college Honors Project— five full-time and four adjunct department faculty are actively involved in the project.

Strategy 2: English has implemented the Puente Project in collaboration with Counseling, dedicating one full-timer, with three faculty in support and scheduled to rotate into the program in order to provide longevity for Puente.

Strategy 4: The English department has developed the following "themed," integrated learning communities in the past two years.

1. *Operation Homecoming* is a veteran focused developmental English and Counseling learning community.
2. *Voices of a Stranger* is a transfer-level ENGL 110 learning community.
3. *Writing in the End Zone I, II, III* is a developmental through transfer English and football learning community.
4. The Puente Project is a developmental through transfer English and Counseling learning community.
5. *Connections Sections*

The English department faculty take the college's mission to serve all students of San Mateo county quite seriously, and we recognize, as our partnering with other programs and services across campus clearly demonstrates, that increasing student success requires more effort and

INSTRUCTION PROGRAM REVIEW: SPRING 2013 SUBMISSION CYCLE

resources than a single department can provide. To that end, our department initiatives are specifically designed to promote CSM's Institutional Priorities—Student Success, Academic Excellence, Relevant High Quality Programs and Services, and Institutional Dialogue.

II. Summary of Student and Program Data

A. Student Learning Outcomes Assessment

Summarize recent SLO assessments, identify trends, and discuss areas in need of improvement.

English:

At the end of the Spring 2012 semester, faculty collected a total 124 essays from a spread of all English courses except ENGL 838 (between 8 and 24 essays from each course) and evaluated the student learning outcomes demonstrated in each. The results were collected and analyzed at the annual faculty retreat on October 5, 2012.

We have two primary goals in assessing SLO results:

First, we want to track whether our SLO results match our pass rates. To be clear, we do not expect or aim to have a perfect match between passing rates and SLO success rates. The SLOs for each course represent the minimum skills a successful student will master by the end of the course, but they do not necessarily represent the lower threshold required to earn a passing grade in the course. Also, we use final or penultimate essay assignments for our SLO evaluations – which means that failing students who have already stopped submitting work (a substantial number) are rarely included in SLO assessments, though they are, of course, included in success rates. However, with that caveat, we do look at divergence between the SLO success rates and student success rates for ways to improve course content, the language of the SLOs themselves, our evaluation procedures or policies, and other factors.

Second, we want to identify trends in student success and areas that need specific attention.

Summary of 2012 SLO evaluation:

- Overall, SLO success rates hovered between 54% and 75%. (There were a couple of outliers, discussed below.)
Analysis: On the whole, faculty felt these results reflected what we see in our classrooms.
- In pre-transfer courses measured (ENGL 828, 848), SLO success rates exceeded the pass rate of the class.
Analysis: Most SLO success rates in these courses stood between 68% to 75%, which reflects fairly accurately the percentage of active students one would expect to pass. (Pass rates for both courses were about 56%.) However, one ENGL 828 SLO had an almost 94% pass rate, suggesting that it could not be meaningfully measured.
- In ENGL 100 and 110, the pass rates exceeded the SLO success rates.
Analysis: The discrepancy suggests the possibility of grade inflation. This reflects a long-standing, ongoing faculty concern about the clarity, consistency, and rigor of grading at all levels, but especially in transfer courses.
- Only two SLO rates departed from the 50%-75% range. One SLO in ENGL 828 had a success rate of almost 94% while another in ENGL 110 had a success rate of just under 42%.
Analysis: In the case of the ENGL 828 SLO, participants in the evaluation process commented that the SLO was not measurable. The low-scoring ENGL 110 SLO addressed essay competence, a central skill, and one that is measurable. It suggests that ENGL 110 students may have less solid preparation than is required for success in the course, reflecting both the findings regarding the possible grade inflation in ENGL 100 and confirming an anecdotal

INSTRUCTION PROGRAM REVIEW: SPRING 2013 SUBMISSION CYCLE

perception on the part of many faculty that the skill level of ENGL 110 students has gone down in recent years. It may also indicate that the skills gap between the ENGL 100 and ENGL 110 levels is too wide and students passing ENGL 100 with Cs are not adequately prepared for the rigor of ENGL 110.

- In almost all transfer level courses (ENGL 100, ENGL 100/102, and ENGL 110) the lowest SLO success rates were those addressing sentence-level skills. Less than 44% of ENGL 100 students, and only 54% of ENGL 100/102 students, could “construct syntactically mature and grammatically sound prose,” and as noted above, the SLO addressing essay competence in ENGL 110 (which includes the ability to use “a variety of sentence structures”) had the lowest success rates of all SLOs in all courses.

Trend: Sentence-level competence continues to be the weak spot in the composition program.

Action:

The SLO evaluations suggest that inconsistent levels of preparation may be a factor in low SLO success rates in ENGL 100 and 110 (especially in light of their relatively high pass rates). Thus, English faculty, at their October retreat, focused on the need for consistent grading of student achievement in ENGL 100, constituting adequate preparation for the next level.

Such consistency and rigor, like physical fitness, is not simply achieved once and for all: it must be continuously maintained by ongoing faculty contacts, discussions, teaching circles, and other forms of collaboration. However, we also considered policies and course outline reviews that might support consistency of content and standards at all levels.

During the AY 2012-2013 year, and starting with our SLO analysis at the October retreat, faculty have taken a number of steps:

- We have instituted regular review sessions to evaluate specific problem cases in grading, to identify causes and possible interventions for grade inflation (modeled on the medical “Morbidity and Mortality” sessions). The first of these was held on January 10, involving eleven faculty; the discussion was reported at the first department meeting on January 23, 2013.
- At their February department meeting, faculty established a number of goals for the semester, including a review of the course outlines to clarify and distinguish their content. One faculty member secured a grant to ensure adjunct participation, a key factor in keeping course content and grading consistent. Working in groups, 22 faculty (both full- and part-time) have reviewed the language and content of all course outlines for all composition classes and are working to revise them by the end of the Spring 2013 semester.
- Many composition faculty are participating in teaching circles, sharing a text and central assignments, and collaborating on grading. (This was suggested at the 2011 retreat; it is an ongoing department activity.)
- Faculty are participating in a Writing Center project, looking into ways that the Writing Center can better support classroom instruction. This is especially relevant to addressing weaknesses in sentence skills since a lot of this instruction takes place in the Writing Center. Faculty involved in the project have created new tutorials (reported at the February meeting).

INSTRUCTION PROGRAM REVIEW: SPRING 2013 SUBMISSION CYCLE

SLO assessment in literature:

In AY 2011-2012, we offered five literature classes:

Fall 2011: LIT 231 / LIT 837 (English Literature I)
 LIT 113 / LIT 813 (The Novel)

Spring 2012: LIT 232 / LIT 238 (English Literature II)
 LIT 101 / 804 (Twentieth Century Literature)
 LIT 151 / LIT 835 (Shakespeare)

SLO assessments on these classes indicated a very high rate of success, typically over 95%. Faculty are working to establish whether the high rate reflects SLOs that are too ambiguous for accurate measurement, or concrete enough to be easily achievable – or, indeed, whether successful literature students really do learn what we want them to learn. Where SLOs need adjustment, or the content of the courses clarified, course outlines will be revised.

SLO assessment in online classes:

Each semester, between them, two instructors offer between three and four sections of online English: ENGL 100, 110 and 165 (one each of the three transfer courses). In 2012, we offered an extra section of ENGL 100, for a total of seven online courses.

However, neither instructor was able to submit essays to the SLO evaluation review in Spring 2012. We are therefore unable to compare SLO success rates for the online and on-campus courses in this reporting cycle. We will prioritize SLO evaluation in these courses for AY 2012-2013. (It should be noted that because these courses are offered only by a limited pool of instructors and serve a body of students who have lower success rates overall, we can draw only limited conclusions about our English program based on a comparison of SLO success rates.)

B. Student Success Indicators

1. Review [Student Success and Core Program Indicators](#) and discuss any differences in student success indicators across demographic variables. Also refer to the [College Index](#) and other relevant sections of the [Educational Master Plan: Update, 2012](#), e.g., **Student Outcomes and Student Outcomes: Transfer. Basic Skills** programs should also refer to [ARCC](#) data.

Success rates continue to hover in the low to mid 60s. 63.1% for AY 11-12, 64.6% for AY 10-11, and 64.9% for AY 09-10. This is a little lower than the current college average of 69%, but not by much, especially given that the English composition program includes some of the more labor-intensive and demanding required courses.

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%).

Our success numbers (EMP Update, 2013), are pretty consistent with previous years' rates, at about 56% to 62% in basic skills through transfer. Our rates are comparable to programs in Math/Science and Language Arts divisions. And the College average is about 70% success.

INSTRUCTION PROGRAM REVIEW: SPRING 2013 SUBMISSION CYCLE

See Previous Goals and Plans below for steps we have taken or plan to take to address student achievement.

Specifically, success among minority students continues to be low, with African American students having the lowest completion rates at every level and, typically, very high withdrawal rates. And their 14% progression rate (848 through 110) is significantly lower than that of other groups (EMP). That is, 14% of African-American students make it from 848 to successful completion of 110 or 165.

Before going on, it's important to note that SLO assessment, success rates, withdrawal rates, or persistence rates are simply "end" measures. They tell us nothing about why students learn, succeed, withdraw, or persist.

That said, "end" measures are very helpful in identifying trends year-to-year or course-to-course. For example, our persistence rate course-to-course for all students is about 75%. That is, of the *successful* students about 75% continue on or persist to the next course. Now consider the obverse: *25% of our successful students never register for the next class.* About 50% of *successful* students disappear in two semesters—from 848 to 100, for example. At each level, we see a 25% attrition rate among successful students. So with three levels of composition, 828 through 110, we can expect to lose 75% of our *successful* students simply in the time it takes them to succeed and register for the next class. There could be any number of reasons for this—work hours, family issues, transportation costs, increases in tuition and student fees, going to Skyline or Cañada, etc. And we need to consider these as a college in order to implement more intrusive counseling services. At the same time, there may be any number of strategies our department might employ in courses and in the program as a whole to help address this trend in attrition of *successful* students.

Withdrawal rates are high, but not much higher than the college average. Minority students—Pacific Islander, Latino, and African American, in that order, have the highest withdrawal rates—25%, 24%, 22%. On average, it's about 20% for all English. While this isn't necessarily an indication that students dread our classes (so they quit early), we need to consider ways to address withdrawal in general but particularly among minority students. Instructors sometimes advise a student to withdraw if it might be in the student's best interest to focus on other classes, which might help to partially explain the high rate. But still we need to consider strategies to account for students' simply withdrawing because they've given up. Again, this might involve more intrusive counseling and financial aid services because we know that often students' success is directly tied to factors outside the classroom.

Basic Skills Initiative Data Report

The English department places very few students into basic skills ENGL courses, about six sections a year or about 150 students, per year. On average, for the past few years only about 5% of CSM students begin in basic skills ENGL courses.

Our success rate of 54% is something for us to address specifically in curriculum design but also holistically as a program by partnering with student support services. We could place more students into ENGL 828 to achieve higher success rates, but this would hardly be a service to students who benefit from beginning at the level of ENGL 838/848. The longer the path to transfer, the less likely students are to succeed.

The English department has been and remains committed to serving students in basic skills courses, which is evident in the percentage of sections taught by full-time faculty. In 2011, it was 100%. For 2012-2013 it was almost 100%, with one section taught by an adjunct who has

INSTRUCTION PROGRAM REVIEW: SPRING 2013 SUBMISSION CYCLE

specialized training in reading and composition instruction.

The Fall-to-Fall Persistence Rates for basic skills students is about 60%, which means that a significant percentage of *successful* students, for whatever reasons, are not continuing semester-to-semester for two semesters. We're losing about 30% of students from Fall-to-Fall.

2. Discuss any differences in student success indicators across modes of delivery (on-campus versus distance education). Refer to [Delivery Mode Course Comparison](#).

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:

COURSE: ENGL 100 ENGL 110 ENGL 165
PRIE Data: FALL 09, FALL 10, Fall 2011

DE success	"Traditional" success
Fall 10, 47.8% Fall 11, 55.3%, Fall 12, 35.3%	64.6% 71.6% 63.4%
DE retention	"Traditional" retention
68.7% 63.8% 51%	79.9% 81.5% 80.8%

While it is hard to draw 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 ENGL courses generally have lower rates of success and higher rates of attrition than "Face-to-Face Mode" courses.

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. We have maintained 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.

English faculty will continue to offer one section of each level of transfer composition each semester, whenever possible. And continue to improve success and retention.

The Writing Center has piloted an online component to offer essay conferencing to improve student success and is currently working on other exciting initiatives to support DE and students in general using technology.

English faculty will make use of college-wide DE resources as they are developed (for instance, in the Distance Education Resource Center).

In the past, we had one full-time English faculty member on the Distance Education Committee. We are unable to appoint someone to this committee at

INSTRUCTION PROGRAM REVIEW: SPRING 2013 SUBMISSION CYCLE

this time, given the many department, division, and college-wide committees on which our faculty already serve.

C. Program Efficiency Indicators. Do we deliver programs efficiently given our resources?

Summarize trends in program efficiency as indicated in the [Student Success and Core Program Indicators](#) (LOAD, Full-time and Part-Time FTEF, etc.).

ENGLISH

LOAD: ENGLISH – 413.9 AY 11-12 (444 AY 10-11). Since the maximum LOAD for composition courses is about 390, given the fact that we have a contractual enrollment limitation of 26, composition courses continue to run at over 100% efficiency. The current year's LOAD is slightly down from last year's (444).

We are currently over our maximum LOAD, which suggests that we are slightly over-enrolling sections. Our fill-rate must be over 100%.

LITERATURE

Productivity: LOAD: LITERATURE – 488 (AY 2010-2011). In our 2009-2010 program review, we explained our hope that organizing and publicizing our literature program would increase enrollments. It succeeded. Literature significantly increased its LOAD in 2010-2011 to 487.5. We then increased the number of sections from four, in 2008-2009, to eight in 2010-2011. Enrollments in previous years were swelling, doubling from 2008 to 2010 while in 2011-2012 they declined, leaving us with eight low enrolled sections and a LOAD of 335.4.

In previous years, specifically AY 2007-2008, AY 2008-2009 and AY 2009-2010, our Literature Committee managed literature course offerings to increase LOAD. And it worked very well. So we saw a large increase in LOAD particularly in 2010-2011, at 487.5. Our LOAD for AY 2011-2012 is 335.4. Our Lit committee in 2011-2012 already made adjustments to the schedule for this year, 2012-13 (and for next year, 2013-2014), which we aren't able to report on yet. Our 2012-2013 LOAD should be closer to 2010-2011 levels.

D. Course Outline Updates

Review the [course outline update record](#). List the courses that will be updated in the next academic year. For each course that will be updated, provide a faculty contact and the planned submission month. See the [Committee on Instruction website](#) for [course submission instructions](#). Contact your division's [COI representatives](#) if you have questions about submission deadlines. Career and Technical Education courses must be updated every two years.

Courses to be updated	Faculty contact	Submission month
All courses, including new literature courses, are up to date as of this Spring. There are no courses scheduled for updates next year.		
		Tab to add rows

INSTRUCTION PROGRAM REVIEW: SPRING 2013 SUBMISSION CYCLE

E. Website Review

Review the program's website(s) annually and update as needed.

Faculty contact(s)	Date of next review/update
Madeleine Murphy	May, 2013
	Tab to add rows

III. Student Learning Outcomes Scheduling and Alignment

A. Course SLO Assessment

Explain any recent or projected modifications to the course SLO assessment process or schedule.

Literature and non-composition courses (eg, ENGL 875, etc.). These continue to be assessed each time they are offered by the course instructor. Courses are offered so infrequently, and there is only ever one section; no other feasible means of assessment exists.

English composition courses. We continue to read essays for holistic assessments of SLOs. However, our means of collecting data and our schedule have both changed.

- *Data:* At the close of the spring semester, instructors are requested to submit eight randomly selected papers from one of each section of each course they are teaching. From this pool of papers, a total of 124 essays were distributed to participating instructors for evaluation.
- *Process:* Participants included all full-time and many part-time faculty. Over the summer, or on flex day, instructors reviewed their assigned papers and filled out a form indicating SLO success. Forms were turned into the SLO coordinator, who collated the information and distributed it at the faculty retreat in October, 2012.
- *Schedule:* We propose to repeat the same process each spring, and review the data at our annual fall retreats.
- *Reason for change:* Previously, faculty held 2-3 hour meetings to evaluate papers from each course level. These meetings were very difficult to schedule, attracted relatively few participants, and could not be held very often; thus each course was evaluated every three years or so, and often we only had perhaps 8 to 16 essays to draw on. By separating the data collection from the discussion, we are able to review all of our SLOs in all English courses annually, using far more papers, and far more quickly. We will be able to get a much clearer and readier sense of trends in student success. The analysis and planning, also, has its own space in the annual calendar (at our retreat) and so can receive unmixed attention.

INSTRUCTION PROGRAM REVIEW: SPRING 2013 SUBMISSION CYCLE

B. Program SLO Assessment

Explain any recent or projected modifications to the program SLO assessment process or schedule.

The English department has mapped SLOs for individual courses, matching them to the program SLOs which were adopted in AY 2011-2012.

English / Literature SLO course alignment with CSM's General Education SLOs: SLOs of applicable English courses (ENGL 838, 848, 100, 100/102, 110, 165, 161, 162, and 163) and Literature courses are aligned with CSM's General Education SLOs. (See attached Tracdat report). In summary, almost all SLOs for English courses (excepting those concerning MLA documentation), and all SLOs for literature courses, support the following CSM General Education SLOs:

1. **Effective Communication:** The ability of students to write, read, speak and listen in order to communicate effectively. Students should be able to:
 - Comprehend, interpret, and analyze written and oral information;
 - Express ideas and provide supporting evidence effectively in writing and speaking;
 - Communicate productively in a group or team situation.
2. **Quantitative Skills (NOT APPLICABLE)**
3. **Critical Thinking:** The ability of students to analyze information, reason critically and creatively, and formulate ideas/concepts carefully and logically from multiple perspectives and across disciplines. Students should be able to:
 - Identify, develop, and evaluate arguments;
 - Assess the adequacy of both qualitative and quantitative evidence
 - Understand diverse disciplinary perspectives and use appropriate modes of inquiry, including the scientific method.
4. **Social Awareness and Diversity:** The ability of students to recognize cultural traditions and to understand and appreciate the diversity of the human experience, past and present. Students should be able to:
 - Understand and respect the range of diversity;
 - Acknowledge the value of divergent opinions and perspectives;
 - Work effectively with others of diverse backgrounds;
 - Analyze the interconnectedness of global and local concerns, past and present.
5. **Ethical Responsibility:** The ability of students to make, with respect to individual conduct, judgments based on systems of values. Students should be able to:
 - Identify ethical issues and understand the conflicts inherent in them;
 - Identify possible courses of action in response to ethical issues and evaluate their consequences;
 - Demonstrate ethical behavior in working with students, instructors, and the campus community.

INSTRUCTION PROGRAM REVIEW: SPRING 2013 SUBMISSION CYCLE

SLO alignment with CSM's English AA Program SLOs

The TracDat reports show that English course SLOs (again excepting those concerning MLA documentation) directly support both of the English Program SLOs.

Although the report does not include literature courses, *all* CSM literature courses are aligned with both program SLOs.

These state that students successfully completing the English AA degree should:

1. Analyze and respond critically to literary and expository texts;
2. Demonstrate knowledge of a variety of authors, literary genres, and literary devices.

C. SLO Alignment

Discuss how Course SLOs support Program SLOs. Discuss how Course and/or Program SLOs support Institutional/GE SLOs. Refer to [TracDat](#) related Program and Institutional SLO reports.

All English and Literature courses require extensive writing, reading, demonstration, critical thinking, analysis, rhetorical awareness, exploration of multiple viewpoints, and metacognition.

The program SLOs call for demonstrations of analysis, critical response to different kinds of text, and some general knowledge both about writers and genres, and about the mechanics of writing.

These support CSM's General Education SLOs in the following way:

- Effective Communication: Reading, writing, and explaining with evidence support effective communication.
- Critical Thinking: Evaluating, analyzing and explaining with evidence support critical thinking.
- Social Awareness and Diversity: Exploring multiple viewpoints, analyzing and evaluating ideas, reading fictional and expository texts presenting a variety of perspectives, and self-awareness promote a better understanding of social issues and diverse points of view.
- Ethical Responsibility: Exploring multiple viewpoints, analyzing and evaluating claims, reading fictional and expository texts presenting a variety of perspectives and experiences, and better self-awareness develop students' ability to make examined judgments based on systems of values.

IV. Additional Factors

Discuss additional factors as applicable that impact the program, including changes in student populations, state-wide initiatives, transfer requirements, advisory committee recommendations, legal mandates, workforce development and employment opportunities, community needs. See [Institutional Research](#) as needed.

We are consulting with English faculty at Hillsdale high school about Common Core, the new K-12 composition curriculum, effective 2015. Hillsdale English faculty members are interested in aligning their curriculum to ours to assure their students a successful transition.

V. Institutional Planning

A. Results of Plans and Actions

Describe results, including measurable outcomes, from plans and actions in recent program reviews.

Goal 1: Maintain productivity through enrollment management.

On track in English. No update needed. The LIT committee has addressed scheduling and enrollment this year and will continue to. See Plan 2 below.

Goal 2: Address the challenges and opportunities of diversity.

On track. Continued innovation necessary. See Plan 3 below.

The English department is interested in partnering with other departments or programs to develop innovative ways to address low achievement rates specifically among African American, Pacific Islander, and Latino students.

English has been proactive, having developed, coordinated, and continued *Writing in the End Zone* (without any compensation nor other cost to the college for the past eight years). The WEZ cohort model has significantly **reduced** *withdrawal rates* at the same time it has significantly **increased** *academic success* among the lowest achieving students on campus—African-American and Pacific Islander males, 18 to 20 years old.

But the WEZ cohort of students makes up on average only about 25% of all African-American students and about 30% of all Pacific Islander students. We need to do more.

We are hopeful that reinstating Puente will help us to at least begin to address the low achievement rates of Latino students. We need to do more here as well.

Goal 3: Increase student success by exploring and developing teaching methodologies and curricula. On track: Continued innovation, particularly in course alignment, to be finalized next year. See Plan 1 below.

Each of the following learning communities has required specialized curricula:

1. *Operation Homecoming* is a veteran focused developmental English and Counseling learning community.
2. *Voices of a Stranger* is a transfer-level ENGL 110 learning community.
3. *Writing in the End Zone I, II, III* is a developmental through transfer English and football learning community.
4. The Puente Project is a developmental through transfer English and Counseling learning community.
5. *Connections Sections*

Puente and *Writing in the End Zone*, specifically, serve two low achieving minority student populations. While the others target specific groups who also need specialized support in English basic skills or transfer composition. Unfortunately, we've had to discontinue *Connections Sections*, *Operation Homecoming*, and *Voices of a Stranger* for lack of faculty. With only thirteen full-time faculty in a department of thirty-four, the department has found it exceedingly difficult to

INSTRUCTION PROGRAM REVIEW: SPRING 2013 SUBMISSION CYCLE

innovate while completing our regular department duties—screening, hiring, and evaluating new adjuncts, mentoring graduate students and new hires, assessing SLOs and so on. *Writing in the End Zone* has survived only because four faculty volunteer their time to keep it alive.

Teaching Circles/Improving Student Success Rates:

English Department faculty continue to create informal teaching circles. These teaching circles, made up of both full-time and adjunct faculty volunteers, have focused on creating assignments to improve student success in developmental courses. In Spring 2012, a teaching circle created assignments for English 838 and 848 classes based on the book *Mindset: The New Psychology of Success*. In Fall 2012 and Spring 2013, a new teaching circle created assignments based on *The Other Wes Moore* while some teachers worked on related assignments for texts such as *The Pact* and *The Willpower Instinct*. While books such as *The Willpower Instinct* and *Mindset* focus on the psychology of success, *The Other Wes Moore* and *The Pact* focus specifically on the educational struggles and success of low-income minority students. The goal for these assignments is to inspire and engage students in conversations about their own success strategies.

English faculty also formed two new teaching circles to improve student success in transfer-level courses. In Fall 2012, two faculty groups created assignments based on Samuel Barondes' *Making Sense of People* and Tracy Kidder's *Strength In What Remains*, both focusing on understanding and overcoming hardships.

B. Program Vision

What is the program's vision for sustaining and improving student learning and success during the *next six years*? Make connections to the [College Mission and Diversity Statements](#), [Institutional Priorities, 2008-2013](#), and other [institutional planning documents](#) as appropriate. Address trends in the SLO assessment results and student success indicators and data noted in Section II. Summary of Student and Program Data.

The English department is committed to maintaining high academic standards while providing both students and faculty with as much support as possible, given our limited resources. As students' needs and demographics (particularly with regard to ethnic and cultural diversity) undoubtedly will continue to change, the English department will remain proactive in its efforts to modify curriculum, provide faculty with professional development opportunities, and collaborate with Student Support Services, the Learning Center and other Learning Support Centers, the Library, colleagues across disciplines, and colleagues at local high schools.

1. To guide future faculty and staff development initiatives, describe the professional enrichment activities that would be most effective in carrying out the program's vision to improve student learning and success.

Reading comprehension is a weak point for students, and while many of our composition instructors have reading training or certificates in teaching reading, making Reading Apprenticeship available to our faculty—especially those who have no reading training—will benefit faculty and students alike. Also, specialized training in how to most effectively work with students of color would be helpful.

INSTRUCTION PROGRAM REVIEW: SPRING 2013 SUBMISSION CYCLE

2. **To guide future collaboration across student services, learning support centers, and instructional programs, describe the interactions that would help the program to improve student success.**

We'd like to revisit the *Connections Sections* model or partner with Counseling, Financial Aid, the Transfer Center and other student services in innovative ways to increase student achievement. Student "success" often involves much more than what happens in a single isolated class. We'd like to work with services and departments who might be able to help us mitigate external factors which lead students to miss days of class, withdraw, or not persist to the next course.

3. **To guide the [Institutional Planning Committee](#) (IPC) in long-range planning, discuss any major changes in resource needs anticipated in the *next six years*. Examples: faculty retirements, equipment obsolescence, space allocation. Leave sections blank if no major changes are anticipated. Specific resource requests for the next academic year should be itemized in Section VI.A below.**

Faculty: Five of our current thirteen full-time faculty members have said they will most likely be retiring in the next six years. We realize retirements aren't considered official until paperwork is submitted. But we are alarmed to say the least at what these looming retirements will mean for our department.

At our current rate of replacing retirees, English will require practically a new hire every year for the next six for us to even keep up. Also, Joyce Heyman resigned this year. So while we hired one new faculty member two years ago we still haven't gained a position.

Please note: Our department is perpetually understaffed and we commit a ridiculous amount of time to full and part-time hiring committee work. Three to four of us each semester must perpetually screen, interview, and evaluate new faculty, as adjuncts rotate in and out of the department—usually three to four a semester. It's a monumental waste of valuable faculty time. With adequate staffing, we could dedicate more time to furthering our department's plans in support of student success, the college mission, and institutional priorities.

Equipment and Technology: N/A

Instructional Materials: N/A

Classified Staff: N/A

Facilities: N/A

INSTRUCTION PROGRAM REVIEW: SPRING 2013 SUBMISSION CYCLE

C. Plans and Actions to Improve Student Success

Prioritize the plans to be carried out next year to sustain and improve student success. Briefly describe each plan and how it supports the [Institutional Priorities, 2008-2013](#). For each plan, list actions and measurable outcomes.

Plan 1

Title:

Curriculum Alignment

Description

To better facilitate students' successful progression from basic skills through transfer, English is currently in the process of revising all composition course outlines to ensure the highest level of quality to students. Priorities: 1.1, 1.3, 2.1, 2.3
--

Action(s)	Completion Date	Measurable Outcome(s)
Faculty retreats or other study sessions	Fall 2014 Retreat, Date TBA	All composition course outlines will be completed by Spring 2013.
Department Meetings	Once a month and as needed	Share ideas and organize
Teaching Circles	Ongoing, and into Fall 2014	Suggestions and recommendations to be incorporated into outlines or supplemental materials

Plan 2

Title:

Literature course scheduling

Description

The literature committee has already planned the 2012-2013 scheduling rotation. It will continue to meet to plan literature offerings for the next two years, incorporating new literature courses into the program's rotation while managing LOAD. Institutional Priorities: 1.1, 1.2, 2.1, 3.5
--

Action(s)	Completion Date	Measurable Outcome(s)
Literature Committee meetings	Fall 2013, TBD	Complete a "lit rotation" to manage enrollment for 2014-2015
Implement new lit courses in mythology, science fiction, Women in Lit, and Latino Literature	In progress (LIT 251 Women in Literature was approved at COI spring 2013)	Incorporate these into the rotation seamlessly without adversely impacting LOAD
4T	4T	4T

INSTRUCTION PROGRAM REVIEW: SPRING 2013 SUBMISSION CYCLE

Plan 3

Title:

Explore ways to improve success and persistence rates of African American, Pacific Islander and Latino students. Address attrition for all students, successful and unsuccessful

Description

English would like to consider our options in partnering with other departments, programs, or resources on campus to increase the success and completion of students of color.
Institutional Priorities: 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 1.5, 2.1, 3.5, 5.1, 5.2, 5.3

Action(s)	Completion Date	Measurable Outcome(s)
Consult with interested programs and colleagues in other disciplines	Fall 2013	Three to four meetings in fall 2013
Consider department strategies to increase persistence of students of color and all students.	Fall 2013	Department Achievement Strategies
Develop department strategies—professional development, curriculum planning, hiring, and learning community options	Spring 2014	Department Strategies

Plan 4

Title:

Mentoring of New Faculty and Graduate Students

Description

Over the past four years members of our department have actively mentored new adjunct faculty to assist them in their transition to CSM. Also, we have developed partnerships with San Francisco State and Notre Dame de Namur, mentoring graduate student interns who are interested in teaching community college composition.

Please note: Without a small portion of reassigned time for a department coordinator or Lead or Chair, the plan is minimal.

Action(s)	Completion Date	Measurable Outcome(s)
Assign full-timers to new adjuncts and graduate students	August 2013	Two meetings in fall 2013
Initial meeting	September 2013	
Follow-up meeting	November 2013	

INSTRUCTION PROGRAM REVIEW: SPRING 2013 SUBMISSION CYCLE

[Note: Itemize in Section VI.A. Any additional resources required to implement plans.]

VI. Resource Requests

A. Itemized Resource Requests

List the resources needed for ongoing program operation and to implement the plans listed above.

Faculty

Full-time faculty requests (identify specialty if applicable)	Number of positions
English composition	Two

Complete [Full-Time Faculty Position Request Form](#) for each position.

Description of reassigned or hourly time for prioritized plans	Plan #(s)	Cost

Equipment and Technology

Description (for ongoing program operation)	Cost
Twenty Document Cameras, one per classroom for English composition classes See attached Document Cameras information sheet.	\$1880 to \$44,000, depending on District's choice of technology

Description (for prioritized plans)	Plan #(s)	Cost

Instructional Materials

Description (for ongoing program operation)	Cost
None	

INSTRUCTION PROGRAM REVIEW: SPRING 2013 SUBMISSION CYCLE

Description (for prioritized plans)	Plan # #(s)	Cost

Classified Staff

Description (for ongoing program operation)	Cost
None	

Description (for prioritized plans)	Plan # #(s)	Cost

Facilities

For immediate or routine facilities requests, submit a [CSM Facility Project Request Form](#).

Description (for prioritized plans)	Plan # #(s)	Cost
None		

B. Cost for Prioritized Plans

Use the resources costs from Section VI.A. above to provide the total cost for each plan.

Plan #	Plan Title	Total Cost
1		
2		
	For additional plans, add rows and number accordingly.	