

# INSTRUCTION PROGRAM REVIEW: SPRING 2013 SUBMISSION CYCLE

Program Name: Reading Department  
Faculty Contact: Jamie Marron

Academic Year: 2011–2012  
Program Review Submission Date: March 25, 2013 (updated 4/26/13)

## *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.*

According to The State of Basic Skills Instruction in California Community Colleges, which was adopted in April 2000 by the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges:

*“Reading is the most essential basic skill that students need to succeed academically.”*

Reading is a skill that is required in every aspect of a college student's course of study. Nearly every division and every single course within each division at the College of San Mateo directs a component of its focus toward helping the CSM college student to read well.

The Reading Department is charged with the sole focus of helping students to improve their reading skills in every aspect of academic activity. This includes comprehending college-level textbooks, thinking critically, evaluating digital texts, taking tests, using writing to analyze texts, and writing in response to thoughts provoked by readings. The Reading Department is instrumental in preparing students for careers such as nursing, fire technology, and administration of justice, and also prepares students to transfer to four-year universities.

The curriculum of the College of San Mateo's Reading Department includes both developmental-level and transfer-level courses.

The developmental/basics skills reading courses address the needs of students who place below college-level reading, while strengthening their critical reading and study abilities. The transfer-level reading courses address the needs of students who will transfer to four-year universities.

### ***re: Mission Statement***

CSM's Mission Statement names five institutional priorities:

1. Improve Student Success
2. Promote Academic Excellence
3. Promote Relevant, High-Quality Programs and Services
4. Promote Integrated Planning, Fiscal Stability, and the Efficient Use of Resources
5. Enhance Institutional Dialog

## INSTRUCTION PROGRAM REVIEW: SPRING 2013 SUBMISSION CYCLE

Many of the students enter the college with placement scores that indicate they need a reading class. The CSM reading program provides direct instruction to those students who enroll in the department's classes, which enables them to acquire better study and reading comprehension skills, to increase their vocabulary, and to do well in their content classes. The reading program's students go on to transfer-level classes or programs, such as Nursing, Administrative Justice, Fire Science, and Electronics. Since the last program review, the Reading Department has been actively involved with the Biology Department in the Reading Apprenticeship Program that is being launched on the campus.

### *re: Diversity Statement*

The Reading Department is open to any student at CSM who wishes to take its courses. In addition, the department is committed to using instructional materials that are as diverse as possible in content and form.

## *II. Summary of Student and Program Data*

### **A. Student Learning Outcomes Assessment**

Exams, reflection papers, lab assignments, and in-class written assignments were used to assess the SLOs. We analyzed the data during department meetings and SLO discussion meetings. The data will be posted in the near future on the TracDat website.

How the Reading Program assesses the SLOs:

1. Identification of the SLOs
2. Steps 2–4 of the cycle: data gathering and evaluation of outcomes are accomplished during the semester being evaluated.
3. Steps 5–6: reviewing evidence, identifying weaknesses, and implementing changes; these steps take place during a departmental meeting during the following semester.

Our SLO cycles:

1. Fall 2007: Read 825, 830, and 400 had major SLOs assessed: Read 400 had all SLOs assessed.
2. Fall 2008: Read 825, 830, and 400 again had the same SLOs assessed. Read 400 again had all SLOs assessed and all lab-only courses (Read 412, 454, 455, 812, 814, 815, 852, and 853) had all SLOs assessed.
3. Fall 2009: All courses (excluding lab-only courses assessed in Fall 2008) had all SOLs assessed; in addition, Read 807/809 (only offered now in spring semesters, and moving to ESL Department in Fall 2013) had all SLOs assessed in Spring 2009.
4. Cycle has continued. Major courses (Read 825, Read 830, Read 400) have one SLO assessed each Fall, with all SLOs assessed over a period of four years. The lab-only courses continue to have all SLOs assessed every two years; therefore, lab-only courses were not assessed in Fall 2011–Spring 2012.

Data entry into Tracdat continues during Spring 2013.

## INSTRUCTION PROGRAM REVIEW: SPRING 2013 SUBMISSION CYCLE

**Table 1: Findings in the Reading Program, Fall 2011–Spring 2012**

<i>Course</i>	<i>Number of SLOs assessed</i>	<i>Method of Assessment</i>	<i>Findings</i>
Read 825	SLO #1, #2, #3, and #4	Final exam, journal entries for novel, quizzes	Results indicate the students are learning the materials. Pass rate of SLOs above 70%.
Read 830	SLO #1 and #4	Final exam	Results indicate the students are learning the materials. Pass rate of SLOs above 70%.
Read 400	SLO #1, #2, #3, #4, and #5	Final exam, logs, homework, quizzes, margin notes	Results indicate the students are learning the materials. Pass rate of SLOs above 70%.

### **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.*

**Table 2: Success Indicators for All Students in the Reading Program**

<i>Student Success Indicators</i>	<i>Year 2009–2010</i>	<i>Year 2010–2011</i>	<i>Year 2011–2012</i>
Success %	63	63.1	65.6
Retention %	76.8	73.2	74.7
Withdraw %	23	26.8	25.3

SOURCE: PRIE.

For 2011–2012, the Reading Program showed a moderate increase in its rate of Success (improvement of 2.5% over 2010–2011), and in its rate of Retention (improvement of 1.5% over 2010–2011), while the rate of Withdrawal showed a slight decrease (down 1.5% from 2010–2011).

Student success can be viewed from different vantage points. The Student Success Indicators

## INSTRUCTION PROGRAM REVIEW: SPRING 2013 SUBMISSION CYCLE

(SSI) for Reading: Language Arts have three broad criteria: Success rate, which has held steady from 2009–2010 (63%) to 2011–2012 (65.6%); Retention rate, which has held steady from 2009–2010 (76.8%) to 2011–2012 (74.7%); and Withdrawal rate, which has held steady from 2009–2010 (23.2%) to 2011–2012 (25.3%). (CSM Instructional Program Review: Spring 2013 Cycle, Quantitative Data, p. 185.)

In comparison, Reading: Language Arts, compared to the SSI of the Language Arts Division, showed close alignment to the Success rate of 2009–2010 (64.6%) and 2011–2012 (66.4%). The Language Arts Division Retention rate has also held steady (80%), but surpassed the Reading Program by an average of 5.6% over the three-year period. The Withdrawal rate of the Language Arts Division was an average of 19.5% over the three-year period, whereas the Withdrawal rate of the Reading: Language Arts Division was 25.1% over the same period. (CSM Instructional Review: Spring 2013 Cycle, Quantitative Data, pp. 129 and 185.)

Core Program Indicators (CPI) include Enrollments by Department, Headcount, Weekly Student Contact Hours (WSCH), Full-Time Equivalent Student (FTFS), Load (WSCH/FTEF, Productivity), and Full-Time Equivalent Faculty (FTEF). (CSM Instructional Program Review: Spring 2013 Cycle, Quantitative Data.)

Enrollment also held steady throughout the three-year cycle, with a peak of N = 762 in 2010–2011, compared to N = 710 in 2009–2010, N = 724 in 2011–2012 (CSM Instructional Program Review: Spring 2013 Cycle, Quantitative Data, pp. 185–188).

In Summer 2012, two online courses were offered (Read 825 was offered for the first time, and Read 830 was repeated for the fifth time). The enrollment was 17 students per section. In comparison, the Language Arts Division has showed a slight decline in enrollment over the past three years: N = 10,902, 2009–2010; N = 9,662, 2010–2011; N = 9,364, 2011–2012 (CSM Instructional Program Review: Spring 2013 Cycle, Quantitative Data, p. 129).

A closer look at Reading: Language Arts Demographic Variables may provide insight into successful course completion rates for 2009–2012.

**Gender:** Consistently, more female than male students have taken the Reading courses in recent years. For example, in 2010–2011 and 2011–2012, there were twice as many females as males. Furthermore, male students' Percent Success trend dropped from 61.4% in 2009–2010 to 53% in 2011–2012, with a Percent Withdrawal rate trending upward from 26.2% in 2009–2010 to 32.7% in 2011–2012. (CSM Instructional Program Review: Spring 2013 Cycle, Quantitative Data, p. 185). This is a serious concern and may be a reflection of the economic environment. In recruitment, the Reading Program will want to make an effort to recruit male students. In comparison, female students trended upward in Percent Success rate over the three-year period from 65.5% in 2009–2010, to 65.7% in 2010–2011, to 70.7% in 2011–2012. Their Percent Withdrawal rate was lower than that of the male students, although it trended up from 2009–2010, when it was 20.7% to 24.6% in 2010–2011, and then downward again in 2011–2012, when it was 22.4%.

The Language Arts Division showed more of a gender balance. Male students' Percent Success

## INSTRUCTION PROGRAM REVIEW: SPRING 2013 SUBMISSION CYCLE

rate has held steady over the three-year period at 61%, as did the Percent Withdrawal rate at 21%. Female students' Percent Success rate was parallel to their Percent Success rate in the Reading Program (70.1% in 2011–2012). The Percent Withdrawal rate has been trending downward and is currently stabler than the Percent Withdrawal rate in the Reading Program.

**Age:** The size of the 30 to 34-year-old age group has been consistently trending upward in the Reading Program during the last three years (N = 57 in 2009–2010; 79 in 2010–2011; 99 in 2011–2012). This is not consistent with the Language Arts Division, which has shown a decline and then a rise in this age group (N = 675 in 2009–2010; 531 in 2010–2011; 611 in 2011–2012).

The size of the 19-year-old or younger age group trended downward in the last three years (N = 191 in 2009–2010; 180 in 2010–2011; 175 in 2011–2012). This age group decline is consistent with the pattern in the Language Arts Division (CSM Instructional Program Review: Spring 2013 Cycle, Quantitative Data, p. 129). Clearly, targeted recruitment is needed for this age group.

There was a slow decline in the size of the 50+ age group in the Reading Program in the last three years (N = 52 in 2009–2010; 52 in 2010–2011; 42 in 2011–2012; for a 3-year drop of 19.2%). In the Language Arts Division, the decline in the numbers in this age group has been even steeper (N = 649 in 2009–2010; 350 in 2010–2011; 327 in 2011–2012; for a 3-year drop of 49.6%).

**Ethnicity:** Only three groups have consistently gone up in enrollment size each year since 2009–2010: Blacks (N = 33 in 2009–2010; 58 in 2010–2011; 68 in 2011–2012); Filipinos (N = 41 in 2009–2010; 49 in 2010–2011; 52 in 2011–2012); and Pacific Islanders (N = 16 in 2009–2010; 17 in 2010–2011; 25 in 2011–2012). Three groups went up and then down: Asians (N = 131 in 2009–2010; 140 in 2010–2011; 104 in 2011–2012); Whites (N = 150 in 2009–2010; 165 in 2010–2011; 123 in 2011–2012); and Native Americans, the smallest group in the Reading Program (N = 2 in 2009–2010; 5 in 2010–2011; 4 in 2011–2012). One group, Hispanics, the largest group in the Reading Program, first went down and then back up (N = 235 in 2009–2010; 213 in 2010–2011; 232 in 2011–2012).

In the Language Arts Division, the trend in enrollment size has been consistently downward for almost all groups (Asians: N = 1,930 in 2009–2010; 1,680 in 2010–2011; 1,576 in 2011–2012; Blacks: N = 375 in 2009–2010; 364 in 2010–2011; 361 in 2011–2012; Hispanics: N = 2,576 in 2009–2010; 2,310 in 2010–2011; 2,167 in 2011–2012; Pacific Islanders: N = 266 in 2009–2010; 264 in 2010–2011; 260 in 2011–2012; and Whites: N = 3,323 in 2009–2010; 2,588 in 2010–2011; 2,494 in 2011–2012). The two exceptions are Native Americans, who have gone consistently upward (N = 27 in 2009–2010; 30 in 2010–2011; 31 in 2011–2012); and Filipinos, who went up and then down (N = 619 in 2009–2010; 625 in 2010–2011; 573 in 2011–2012).

Some areas of concern in the Reading Program insofar as ethnicities are concerned—areas that will be addressed below in Section V—are that Blacks, Hispanics, and Filipinos have been trending downward in the Success category during the past three years (from 66.7% to 55.2% to 51.5% for Blacks; from 64.3% to 61.5% to 60.3% for Hispanics; and from 73.2% to 57.1% to 61.5% for Filipinos). This has not been true of these ethnic groups in the Language Arts Division

## INSTRUCTION PROGRAM REVIEW: SPRING 2013 SUBMISSION CYCLE

as a whole, where their Success rates have remained relatively stable (from 59.2% to 56% to 54.9% for Blacks; from 59.4% to 59.1% to 60.4% for Hispanics; and from 67% to 66.4% to 65.6% for Filipinos). On the other hand, Whites, Native Americans, and Pacific Islanders have been trending upward in the Reading Program, but holding relatively steady in the Language Arts Division. Asians have remained in the 70th percentile for Success in both categories. (See Tables 2 and 3, below).

**Table 3: Success in the Reading Program by Ethnicity**

CSM Program Review: Spring 2013 Submission Cycle  
Student Success and Core Program Indicators  
Academic Years 2009/10 to 2011/12 – Page 1

Division: 4413 - Language Arts: Reading (READ)												
INDICATOR	Academic Year			STUDENT SUCCESS INDICATORS	Academic Year							
	09-10	10-11	11-12		09-10	10-11	11-12					
Enrollments/Dup. Headcount	710	762	724	Success %	63%	63.1%	65.6%					
WSCH	2312.5	2403.6	2323.7	Retention %	76.8%	73.2%	74.7%					
FTEs	77.1	80.1	77.5	Withdraw %	23.2%	26.8%	25.3%					
LOAD (WSCH/FTEF)*	550.6	600.9	544.6									
Classroom Teaching FTEF				Sections	Academic Year							
Full-time FTEF	3.4	3.6	3.9		09-10	10-11	11-12					
Adjunct FTEF	0.2	0	0	Total	44	44	45					
Overload FTEF (F-T Faculty)	0.6	0.4	0.4	% CTE	0%	0%	0%					
Retired FTEF	0	0	0	% Transferable	34.1%	31.8%	31.1%					
Total FTEF	4.2	4	4.3	% Degree Applicable	15.9%	15.9%	15.6%					
Percent Full-time	95.2%	100%	100%	% Basic Skills	50%	52.3%	53.3%					
Successful Course Completion Rates: 2009-10 to 2011-12												
Demographic Variable	Enrollments (Duplicate Headcount)			Pct. Enrollments (Duplicate Headcount)			Percent Success			Percent Withdraw		
	09-10	10-11	11-12	09-10	10-11	11-12	09-10	10-11	11-12	09-10	10-11	11-12
<b>Ethnicity</b>												
Asian	131	140	104	18.5	18.4	14.4	77.1	70.7	76.9	15.3	22.9	13.5
Black	33	58	68	4.6	7.6	9.4	66.7	55.2	51.5	24.2	31	38.2
Filipino	41	49	52	5.8	6.4	7.2	73.2	57.1	61.5	9.8	30.6	26.9
Hispanic	235	213	232	33.1	28.0	32.0	64.3	61.5	60.3	20	26.8	30.2
Native Am	2	5	4	0.3	0.7	0.6	100	80	100	0	0	0
Pac Islander	16	17	25	2.3	2.2	3.5	50	64.7	88	37.5	23.5	8
White	150	165	123	21.1	21.7	17.0	54	64.9	69.1	31.3	24.9	24.4
Other	23	53	72	3.2	7.0	9.9	21.7	54.7	56.9	43.5	37.7	29.2
Unrecorded	79	62	44	11.1	8.1	6.1	59.5	64.5	81.8	29.1	27.4	13.6
<b>Total</b>	710	762	724	100	100	100	63	63.1	65.6	23.2	26.8	25.3
<b>Gender</b>												
Female	440	487	492	62.0	63.9	68.0	65.5	65.7	70.7	20.7	24.6	22.4
Male	233	234	202	32.8	30.7	27.9	61.4	57.3	53	26.2	31.2	32.7
Unrecorded	37	41	30	5.2	5.4	4.1	43.2	65.9	66.7	35.1	26.8	23.3
<b>Total</b>	710	762	724	100	100	100	63	63.1	65.6	23.2	26.8	25.3
<b>Age</b>												
19 or less	191	180	175	26.9	23.6	24.2	54.5	54.4	54.4	30.4	32.8	31.4
20-24	141	130	147	19.9	17.1	20.3	50.4	52.3	52.3	29.1	35.4	41.5
25-29	116	132	101	16.3	17.3	14.0	76.7	69.7	69.7	12.1	20.5	18.8
30-34	57	79	99	8.0	10.4	13.7	75.4	78.5	78.5	12.3	13.9	10.1
35-39	56	65	56	7.9	8.5	7.7	76.8	66.2	66.2	16.1	23.1	19.6
40-49	71	93	83	10.0	12.2	11.5	69	73.1	73.1	21.1	22.6	13.3
50+	52	52	42	7.3	6.8	5.8	67.3	55.8	55.8	25	32.7	28.6
Unrecorded	26	31	21	3.7	4.1	2.9	50	67.7	67.7	30.8	25.8	19.1
<b>Total</b>	710	762	724	100	100	100	63	63.1	65.6	23.2	26.8	25.3

SOURCE: PRIE.

# INSTRUCTION PROGRAM REVIEW: SPRING 2013 SUBMISSION CYCLE

## Table 4: Success in the Language Arts Division by Ethnicity

CSM Program Review: Spring 2013 Submission Cycle  
Student Success and Core Program Indicators  
Academic Years 2009/10 to 2011/12 – Page 1

Division: 4413 - Division Total: Language Arts												
INDICATOR	Academic Year			STUDENT SUCCESS INDICATORS			Academic Year					
	09-10	10-11	11-12	09-10	10-11	11-12	09-10	10-11	11-12			
Enrollments/Dup. Headcount	10902	9662	9364									
WSCH	46215.8	41064.1	38813.3									
FTES	1540.5	1368.8	1293.8									
LOAD (WSCH/FTEF)*	491.5	475.5	438.5									
<b>Classroom Teaching FTEF</b>												
Full-time FTEF	50.1	50.2	50.9									
Adjunct FTEF	38.2	29.2	31.5									
Overload FTEF (F-T Faculty)	5.8	7	6.1									
Retired FTEF	0	0	0									
Total FTEF	94	86.4	88.5									
Percent Full-time	59.4%	66.2%	64.4%									
				<b>Sections</b>								
				Total			476	395	412			
				% CTE			0.4%	0%	0%			
				% Transferable			61.8%	60%	60.9%			
				% Degree Applicable			17.7%	17.5%	16%			
				% Basic Skills			20.2%	22.5%	23.1%			
Successful Course Completion Rates: 2009-10 to 2011-12												
Demographic Variable	Enrollments (Duplicate Headcount)			Pct. Enrollments (Duplicate Headcount)			Percent Success			Percent Withdraw		
	09-10	10-11	11-12	09-10	10-11	11-12	09-10	10-11	11-12	09-10	10-11	11-12
<b>Ethnicity</b>												
Asian	1930	1680	1576	17.7	17.4	16.8	72.1	70.4	72	16.4	16.7	15
Black	375	364	361	3.4	3.8	3.9	59.2	56	54.9	19.2	24.5	23
Filipino	619	625	573	5.7	6.5	6.1	67	66.4	65.6	18.1	19.2	18.2
Hispanic	2576	2310	2167	23.6	23.9	23.1	59.4	59.1	60.4	22.5	23	24.7
Native Am	27	30	31	0.2	0.3	0.3	55.6	56.7	64.5	22.2	20	22.6
Pac Islander	266	264	260	2.4	2.7	2.8	52.3	54.6	57.7	24.8	21.6	21.2
White	3323	2588	2494	30.5	26.8	26.6	66.6	68.4	69.6	18.8	18.8	16.9
Other	489	926	1214	4.5	9.6	13.0	56.2	64.7	66	22.3	20.4	20.4
Unrecorded	1297	875	688	11.9	9.1	7.3	64.8	70.9	72	19.5	15.2	15.6
<b>Total</b>	10902	9662	9364	100	100	100	64.6	65.4	66.4	19.6	19.6	19.2
<b>Gender</b>												
Female	5704	4761	4612	52.3	49.3	49.3	67.4	68.6	70.1	18.4	18.2	17.7
Male	4599	4370	4169	42.2	45.2	44.5	61.2	61.5	61.7	21.1	21.4	21.2
Unrecorded	599	531	583	5.5	5.5	6.2	63.3	68.6	70.7	19.9	16.8	17
<b>Total</b>	10902	9662	9364	100	100	100	64.6	65.4	66.4	19.6	19.6	19.2
<b>Age</b>												
19 or less	3717	3469	3308	34.1	35.9	35.3	66.1	67.4	67.4	16.6	16.5	16.3
20-24	3212	2872	2935	29.5	29.7	31.3	62.1	61.4	61.4	21.2	21.7	21.7
25-29	1113	1031	907	10.2	10.7	9.7	65	63	63	21.9	23	22.4
30-34	675	531	611	6.2	5.5	6.5	61.9	67	67	24.2	20.7	19.2
35-39	475	452	360	4.4	4.7	3.8	64	67.5	67.5	22.1	21.5	20.3
40-49	687	620	528	6.3	6.4	5.6	67	69.7	69.7	20.7	19.7	19.9
50+	649	350	327	6.0	3.6	3.5	67.6	66.9	66.9	17.7	24	20.5
Unrecorded	374	337	388	3.4	3.5	4.1	66.3	70.9	70.9	18.2	14	14.2
<b>Total</b>	10902	9662	9364	100	100	100	64.6	65.4	66.4	19.6	19.6	19.2

SOURCE: PRIE.

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

The traditional reading courses maintained a slight increase in both Retention and Success rates over the online versions. This was consistent with the Language Arts Division and the College.

## INSTRUCTION PROGRAM REVIEW: SPRING 2013 SUBMISSION CYCLE

Read 830 (College and Career Reading), which has been online for the last three years, had a Success rate of 56.9%, which was lower by 9.4 percentage points than the Success rate for the face-to-face version of the course, and a Retention rate of 77.4%, which was lower by 4.4 percentage points than the Retention rate for the face-to-face version of the course. Nevertheless, these rates are comparable to the Success and Retention rates for the whole college (see Table 5, below).

**Table 5: Success and Retention Rates for Read 830 and Whole College**

<i>Fall 2009– Fall 2011</i>	<i>Read 830 Distance</i>	<i>Read 830 On-campus</i>	<i>College Distance</i>	<i>College On-campus</i>
No. of Sections	3	9	179	511
No. of Enrollments	72	249	5,179	16,870
Success	56.9%	66.3%	58.6%	63%
Retention	73.6%	78.7%	77.4%	81.8%

SOURCE: PRIE.

The Reading Department plans to continue its efforts to improve both the Success and the Retention rates in the Read 830 course.

### **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.).*

The enrollment in the Reading Program has consistently gone up modestly in the last three years: 6.5% from Fall 2009 to Fall 2010, and 2.8% from Fall 2010 to Fall 2011. During that time, the teaching load, for which the state assigns a standard of 526 hours, was close to that standard in 2009 (521.1) but higher than the standard in the following two years (611 in 2010, and 583.9 in 2011). (See Table 6, below.)



## INSTRUCTION PROGRAM REVIEW: SPRING 2013 SUBMISSION CYCLE

**Table 6: Efficiency Indicators for the Reading Program**

<i>Indicator</i>	<i>Fall 2009</i>	<i>Fall 2010</i>	<i>Fall 2011</i>
Enrollment/Duplicate Head Count	368	392	403
Weekly Student Contact Hours (WSCH)	1146.3	1222.1	1245.5
Full-Time Equivalent Students (FTES)	38.2	40.7	41.5
LOAD Weekly Student Contact Hours/Full-Time Equivalent Faculty (WSCH/FTEF)	521.1	611	583.9

SOURCE: PRIE.

### **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.*

The Reading Program course outlines will be using CurricuNet for the first time for this Program Review Cycle.

**Table 7: Courses to be Updated**

<i>Courses</i>	<i>Faculty Contact</i>	<i>Submission Month</i>
Read 400: Academic Textbook Reading	Jamie Marron	SP 2014, February
Read 405: College Analytical Reading	Jamie Marron	SP 2013: to be banked, follow-up F 2013, November
Read 412: College-Level Individualized Reading Improvement	Carole Wills Jamie Marron	SP 2013, May SP 2014, February
Read 415: Read Across the Disciplines: Individualized Preparation	Carole Wills	SP 2013: to be banked, follow-up Fall (F) 2013, November
Read 454 College-Level Vocabulary Improvement I	Carole Wills Jamie Marron	SP 2013, May SP 2014, February
Read 455:	Carole Wills	SP 2013, May

## INSTRUCTION PROGRAM REVIEW: SPRING 2013 SUBMISSION CYCLE

College-Level Vocabulary Improvement II	Jamie Marron	SP 2014, February
Read 807: Basic Phonics Skills for Non-Native Speakers	<i>Moving to ESL Dept.</i>	Effective F 2013
Read 808: Basic Phonic Skills	<i>Moving to ESL Dept.</i>	Effective F 2013
Read 812: Individualized Reading Improvement	Carole Wills Jamie Marron	SP 2013, May SP 2014, February
Read 814: Basic Spelling Mastery	Carole Wills Jamie Marron	SP 2013, May SP 2014, February
Read 815: Advanced Spelling Mastery	Carole Wills Jamie Marron	SP 2013, May SP 2014, February
Read 825: Introduction to College Reading	Carole Wills Jamie Marron	SP 2013, May SP 2014, February
Read 830: College and Career Reading	Jamie Marron	SP 2014, February
Read 852: Vocabulary Improvement I	Carole Wills Jamie Marron	SP 2013, May SP 2014, February
Read 853: Vocabulary Improvement II	Carole Wills Jamie Marron	SP 2013, May SP 2014, February

### E. Website Review

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

The department met with the CSM librarians in May 2012 to discuss the design and content of the Reading Program's website. The next reviews are scheduled for May 2013 (Wills) and May 2014 (Marron).

**Table 8: Schedule for Reading Program Website Review**

<i>Faculty contact(s)</i>	<i>Date of next review/update</i>
Carole Wills	SP 2013 (May)
Jamie Marron	SP 2014 (February)

### F. Additional Career Technical Education Data

*CTE programs only. (This information is required by California Ed. Code 78016.)*

*1. Review the program's Gainful Employment Disclosure Data, External Community, and other*

## INSTRUCTION PROGRAM REVIEW: SPRING 2013 SUBMISSION CYCLE

*institutional research or labor market data as applicable. Explain how the program meets a documented labor market demand without unnecessary duplication of other training programs in the area. Summarize student outcomes in terms of degrees, certificates, and employment. Identify areas of accomplishment and areas of concern.*

*Click here to enter Gainful Employment Disclosure Data narrative  
This is not applicable to the CSM Reading Program.*

*2. Review and update the program's Advisory Committee information. Provide the date of most recent advisory committee meeting.*

*Click here to update the Advisory Committee information*

### ***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.*

The Reading Department assesses one SLO per course level each academic year, with the exception of Read 400 (Academic Textbook Reading), which has been assessed for all of its SLOs once each year since 2008. This exception will cease in Fall 2013.

The department is satisfied with its assessment methods, with the exception of its evaluating the students in Read 830 for their understanding of SLO 4, which applies to a writing passage's point of view, purpose, tone, conclusions, figurative language, connotation/denotation, bias, audience, and mood. Up till now, we have tested all these variables under the umbrella of inference. In the future, we will test for each variable specifically.

#### **B. Program SLO Assessment**

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

Since one of the two full-time faculty members in the Reading Program will be leaving as of the end of May 2013, the remaining faculty member will essentially retain the current SLO assessment process and schedule until the two new part-time faculty members are in place as of Fall 2013.

#### **C. SLO Alignment**

## INSTRUCTION PROGRAM REVIEW: SPRING 2013 SUBMISSION CYCLE

*Discuss how Course SLOs support Program SLOs. Discuss how Course and/or Program SLOs support Institutional/GE SLOs. (Refer to TracDat related Programs and Institutional reports.)*

The course SLOs of the CSM Reading Department directly support the department's SLOs. They both support the Institutional/GE SLO Courses (See Table 9, below).

**Table 9: Reading Department SLO relationship to Institutional/GE SLOs**

<i>GE SLOs Program Courses</i>	<i>Effective Communication</i>	<i>Quantitative Skills</i>	<i>Critical Thinking</i>	<i>Social Awareness and Diversity</i>	<i>Ethical Responsibility</i>
Read 400	X		X	X	X
Read 412	X		X	X	X
Read 454	X		X	X	X
Read 455	X		X		
Read 807	X		X		
Read 808	X		X		
Read 812	X		X	X	X
Read 814	X		X		
Read 815	X		X		
Read 825	X		X	X	X
Read 830	X		X	X	X
Read 854	X		X		
Read 855	X		X		

## INSTRUCTION PROGRAM REVIEW: SPRING 2013 SUBMISSION CYCLE

### *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.*

1. The Reading Department's enrollment has been impacted by (a) a decision by the English Department to no longer require a reading class for students taking the lowest-level English class; (b) decisions by the ESL Department to take over the teaching of phonics and to offer its own Level 4 reading class; (c) statewide pressures influencing community colleges to get students through their academic courses in the least amount of time; and (d) the ongoing challenges of students who need reading skills at the college level being resistant to getting focused help on reading.
2. Nevertheless, the need for college students to be able to read well is recognized by virtually all educators. To that end, the College of San Mateo has initiated a focus on Reading Apprenticeship during the past academic year, which eventually will ideally affect all classes in all departments. The Reading Department, which is very involved with this initiative, is the only place where students can receive focused help solely directed on reading.
3. After the census in September 2012, at the request of the Reading Department working with the CSM Publicity and Marketing Department, the District IT Department began informing students that their placement score indicated that they should take a reading class. The numbers of students who received (and are receiving) such a message (48% and 58%) indicate the deep need this college's students have for improving their reading skills. In fact, this demonstrates the need for a reading class. It is a challenge to get students enrolled in a reading class, so the department needs the support of all institutional entities to encourage the students enroll.

**Table 10: Numbers of Students Placing into CSM Reading Courses,  
September 3, 2012—April 17, 2013**

<i>Time Period</i>	<i>Numbers of students who took the placement test</i>	<i>Numbers of students who received a message stating that they should take a reading class</i>	<i>Percentage of Students Who Placed into a Reading Class</i>
9/1/2012–2/1/2013	5,343	2,578	48%
2/1/2013–4/17/2013	1,733	1,038	59%

SOURCE: District IT Office.

## INSTRUCTION PROGRAM REVIEW: SPRING 2013 SUBMISSION CYCLE

### *V. Institutional Planning*

#### **A. Results of Plans and Actions**

*Describe results, including measurable outcomes, from plans and actions in recent program review goals for the next cycle (2011–2012):*

**Table 11: Chart for Goals Listed in Last Year’s Program Review:**

*Goals for 2011–2012*

*Results and Plans*

<p>1. Work with BSI to have reading classes supported by a counselor. BSI has funded this practice as a pilot in several English classes over two semesters. Since the practice of having BSI students receive integrated counseling is well supported by best-practices research for student success, our department will be asking BSI to support this project for Reading classes.</p>	<p>1. This could not be implemented. Counselors were unable to take part in this due to numerous other responsibilities.</p> <p>Plan: If possible, work with BSI to have a counselor assigned to reading classes in 2013–2014.</p>
<p>2. Increase enrollment through multiple efforts. Garner the support of the CSM Marketing and Publicity Department to launch and execute a campaign to make the Read Department a prominent presence on the college and in the community as part of an overall campaign to expand enrollment in the department’s classes.</p>	<p>2. Enrollment remained consistent. However, enrollment is not optimal. Outreach needs to continue. The CSM Marketing and Publicity Department assisted with the design of flyers. The faculty personally paid for all materials and participated in outreach efforts at Connect to College, County Fair, and Operation Welcome. Continuous efforts will be needed. Students are not required to take a reading class. Students are under pressure to take only courses that take them through a course of study via the quickest route.</p>
<p>3. Maintain Read 825 as the only acceptable Read Level 4 ESL Course. CSM Reading Department Program Review.</p>	<p>3. This was not achieved. The ESL Department is implementing a Level 4 reading course. This may take away from enrollment in Read 825.</p> <p>Plan: Continue all marketing efforts through all channels so that all students, including ESL students, enroll in reading classes.</p>
<p>4. Increase the pool of Reading adjunct instructors. The Reading faculty must contact Reading Departments at Cal State Fullerton, Santa Clara University, and adjunct faculty at other colleges in</p>	<p>4. This was achieved. Outreach was conducted. A number of interviews were conducted. Minimum qualifications for teaching reading at the College of San Mateo (and in the SMCCD) follow guidelines</p>

## INSTRUCTION PROGRAM REVIEW: SPRING 2013 SUBMISSION CYCLE

<p>order to expand the applicant pool. In addition, the full-time Reading faculty must work with District HR for assistance in advertising for adjuncts.</p>	<p>suggested by the College Reading and Learning Association (see Addendum of CRLA newsletter of Fall 2012).</p> <p>Recently, numerous colleges and universities have implemented master's degree programs in college reading, which has resulted in the CSM Reading Department many more qualified applicants than in the past.</p> <p>Adjunct instructors were added to the pool. A new adjunct began teaching in Spring 2013, and two new adjuncts will begin teaching in Summer and Fall 2013.</p> <p>Plan: Continue recruitment efforts to add highly qualified reading instructors to the adjunct pool for the Reading Department.</p>
<p>5. Study the current cut scores for Read 825, Read 830, and Read 400, and revise the cut scores as the data indicate. Explanation: study the correlation between current cut scores and student success in each class.</p>	<p>5. Carole Wills worked with the Dean, Counseling Department, and Testing Office to make adjustments.</p> <p>Plan: We will continue to monitor cut scores and their impact on reading levels of students who enroll in the reading classes.</p>
<p>6. Hold department meetings to discuss SLOs for Read 825, Read 830, and Read 400 to examine whether or not the department believes the course SLOs should be revised.</p>	<p>6. Achieved.</p> <p>Meetings were held in Fall 2012 and Spring 2013.</p> <p>Plan: In Fall 2013, when all new faculty members are in place, we will decide whether or not to make changes to the course SLOs. Any change recommendations will be submitted to the COI in February 2014.</p>
<p>7. Consider adding and updating materials in the Read/ESL Center for students' TBAs.</p>	<p>7. Achieved. Materials are being updated as of Spring 2013.</p> <p>Plan: Discontinue use of old materials and teacher-made materials. Choose and implement a new diagnostic reading test. Search for new materials and develop new modules (including video clips), especially ones that focus on Reading Apprenticeship strategies.</p>

## INSTRUCTION PROGRAM REVIEW: SPRING 2013 SUBMISSION CYCLE

<p>8. Discuss assessing additional SLOs in the next cycle</p>	<p>8. Achieved</p> <p>Plan: Continue discussion as the department adds new department members in F 2013.</p>
<p>9. Explore the development of a project for BSI with or without the involvement of another department. Funding will be needed.</p>	<p>9. This goal was vague. Dropped.</p>
<p>10. Participate, if possible, in WestEd's Reading Apprenticeship Program, either in the online mode or face-to-face mode. If possible, the Reading Department will do this in conjunction with one or more members of another department. Funding will be needed.</p>	<p>10. Achieved.</p> <p>The two Reading Department full-time members participated in RA training for three days in early August 2012. They participated throughout Fall 2012 and Spring 2013. They did this in conjunction with the Biology Department and some members of the Math Department.</p> <p>Plan: Send one-full time faculty member to the Reading Apprenticeship Community of Practice Training in June 2013 and February 2014. Continue the Reading Department's Faculty Inquiry Group (FIG). As possible, continue with college-wide FIG. Continue outreach to other departments.</p>
<p>11. Continue development, as possible, of webinars/virtual sessions for use in the Read/ESL Center. Software is needed for online classes. Apple Cinema Display would be helpful.</p>	<p>11. This effort is continuing. Tapings have been initiated.</p> <p>Plan: Work with the digital-media librarian and use a subscription to Lynda.com to develop modules related to Reading Apprenticeship strategies.</p>
<p>12. Attend workshops, conferences, and institutions to keep up with best practices in the teaching of reading at the community college level.</p>	<p>12. Achieved with West Ed RA.</p> <p>The workload of a two-member department prevented members from being able to participate in any other conferences.</p> <p>Plan: Send reading faculty members to conferences such as College Reading and Language Association, Student Success, OnCourse, Online Conference, including CA Online Conference and Sloan Consortium Conference (Emerging Technology, Online, Blended), STOTT training, National Council of the Teachers of English, and other related teaching improvement (best practices) reading, writing, technology/online conferences.</p>
<p>13. Work with the Dean of Language Arts, Dean of Counseling, and the CSM Testing Office to update the placement messages for all Reading courses,</p>	<p>13. Achieved.</p> <p>The department worked with the Dean and the</p>



## INSTRUCTION PROGRAM REVIEW: SPRING 2013 SUBMISSION CYCLE

<p>perhaps adding a few words regarding Reading Courses in the message a student receives for English classes.</p>	<p>District IT Department. Beginning after the census in September 2012, any student who took a placement test and placed into a reading class received a standard message encouraging him or her to enroll in a reading class.</p> <p>Plan:</p> <p>Request permission from IPC that the CSM Reading Department be given the contact information for any student who receives such a message, so that a faculty member from the Reading Department can follow up with a personal call or e-mail.</p>
<p>14. Explore other delivery options for Reading Department courses, such as lab-only courses and READ 400. The department will be responsive and, as possible, innovative in methods the students may use to complete TBAs as allowed if there are changes in the current policy.</p>	<p>14. The department has considered a number of innovative ways for lab-only courses and Read 400 to be delivered. The current rules restrict the department from moving forward on them.</p> <p>Plan: If regulations should change, the department will revisit ideas for delivery options related to TBAs.</p> <p>Plan: Increase involvement for student access and success in online delivery modes. Explore involvement in MOOCs.</p> <p>Obstacle: The requirement for students in lab-only courses to do all of the coursework while physically in the Center prevents some students from taking course or completing those courses.</p>

### **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.*

*[Note: CTE programs must address changes in the context of completion and employment rates, anticipated labor demand, and any overlap with similar programs in the area as noted in Sections II.F.1 and II.F.2.]*

*[Note: Specific plans to be implemented in the next year should be entered in Section V.C.]*

## INSTRUCTION PROGRAM REVIEW: SPRING 2013 SUBMISSION CYCLE

### *Reading Department Vision*

The CSM Reading Department's vision for reading students is to provide them, and to the degree possible the content faculty, reading instruction that provides maximum engagement, follows best-practices, and uses technology in all aspects of design and delivery.

Basic-skills students in the CSM reading courses face many challenges, some of which are directly related to reading. However, as research shows, students' challenges are also caused by financial stressors, social and cultural pressures, lack of motivation or hope, and an inability to complete what they start and gain a sense of success.

The Reading Department is committed to being actively involved in seeking assistance that will enable reading students to achieve success not only in improving their reading but in achieving the end result of graduating from the College of San Mateo with a degree or certificate. The department envisions being involved with the Umoja project, with obtaining counseling support for students in its classes, with providing delivery options that reach all students who might not otherwise be successful, and with embracing research and methods still to be determined by the many Student Success initiatives.

The department remains committed to online courses and will seek to improve its success and retention rates in those courses.

The department will strive to be a resource to students and faculty with RA resources and practices.

*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.*

The Reading Department faculty will attend conferences and workshops in areas such as online teaching, reading, Student Success, and English. For example:

*online teaching* (e.g., Stott Training, CSM Technology Assistance, CA Online Conference, Sloan Consortium, Educause, Merlot)

*reading* (e.g., College Reading and Language Association Conference, CA Reading Association, International Reading Association Conference)

*Student Success* (e.g., Reading Apprenticeship, 3csn, Best Practices)

*English* (e.g., National Council of Teachers of English, Teaching of English at Two-Year Community Colleges)

The instructional aides in the reading component of the Read/ESL Center will need training in all of the above areas.

*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.*

## INSTRUCTION PROGRAM REVIEW: SPRING 2013 SUBMISSION CYCLE

Students at CSM come from many demographic backgrounds. Many of them need the services of the Reading Program and of all the other programs that are designed to help basic-skills students who are struggling with reading.

The department will continue work with the CSM Publicity and Marketing Department, local high schools, and community groups to promote reading, with the end objective of increasing enrollment in reading classes.

The department will work with Counseling, Program Services, BSI, DSPS, and the Learning Center to increase student awareness of reading classes as a source of focused reading assistance for basic-skills students.

The department will work with Admissions and Records and IPC to obtain contact information on all students that the District IT informs would benefit from a CSM reading class. This will enable reading faculty to make a follow-up effort to encourage such students to actually enroll in a reading 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*

One full-time faculty member will leave the college at the end of May 2013 for one year of banked leave, ending with retirement at the end of May 2014. The department needs to hire one full-time tenure-track reading instructor.

### *Equipment and Technology*

The Macbook Pro used by the department for teaching online is out of warranty as of Spring 2013. This item may need to be replaced. Due to its use for online teaching and preparing online materials, a MacBook with maximum short-term memory and long-term storage and a retina display is required. In addition, two iPads and four keyboard covers will be needed.

### *Instructional Materials*

Books and software will need to be ordered.

### *Classified Staff*

### *Facilities*

Two workstations need to be created in the Read/ESL Center. Currently, there is only one. A facilities work request will be submitted. Needed: one faculty desk and chair, phone (line can be

## INSTRUCTION PROGRAM REVIEW: SPRING 2013 SUBMISSION CYCLE

shared with current line for Read/ESL Center), one of the current computers could be used.

### 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.

#### Institutional Priorities, 2008-2013

1. *Improve Student Success*
2. *Promote Academic Excellence*
3. *Promote Relevant, High-Quality Programs and Services*
4. *Promote Integrated Planning, Fiscal Stability, and the Efficient Use of Resources*
5. *Enhance Institutional Dialog*

**Table 12: Plans to Improve Students' Success**

<b>Plan</b>	<b>Institutional Priority #</b>	<b>Outcomes</b>
1. Have a counselor assigned to reading classes.	1, 2, 3	Students will be more connected to the college. Students will have direct advice on courses and career paths.
2. Increase enrollment.	1,2,4,5	More students will use the reading classes .
3. Keep Read 825 as a viable course for ESL students	1, 2, 4, 5,	ESL students wil continue to benefit from reading instruction offered in reading classes.
4. Continue to recruit highly qualified reading instructors for the Reading Department's adjunct pool.	1, 2, 3,	Students will receive reading instruction from highly-qualified instructors, following guidelines of the College Reading Association (see Addenum)
5. Continue to examine cut scores for all reading classes.	1, 2, 3, 5	Ensure placement into reading classes is accurate.
6. Examine all SLOS for all courses. Consider streamlining and	1, 2, 5	Submission of course outlines to COI in February, 2014.

## INSTRUCTION PROGRAM REVIEW: SPRING 2013 SUBMISSION CYCLE

incorporating Reading Apprenticeship outcomes.		
<p>7. Discontinue use of old materials and teacher-made materials. Choose and implement a new diagnostic reading test. Search for new materials and develop new modules (including video clips) especially ones that focus on Reading Apprenticeship strategies.</p> <p>Develop materials and modules directly geared to technical and career programs such as the programs in (and their licensing requirements. Nursing, Electronics, Fire Science, Administrative Justice, Dental Hygiene, Cosmetology, etc. Work with professionals as appropriate. Research career licensing requirements.</p>	1, 2, 3, 4	<p>Students will have access to relevant, modern, and excellent learning/reading materials.</p> <p>Students will have access to reading assistance for program and licensing exams.</p>
8. (from last year's program year) same as number 6.	<b>1, 2, 5</b>	Submission of course outlines to COI in February, 2014.
9. (from last year's program review)	N/A	N/A
<p>10. Continue faculty and instructional aides' training and involvement in RA. Send one faculty member to RA Community of Practice Training in June 2013 and February 2014. Continue RA FIG for Reading Department (and as a resource to students and faculty from other departments and divisions)</p>	1, 2, 3, 4, 5	Students will receive instruction using relevant, research-based practices. Department will engage in a Reading Department faculty inquiry group to provide consistent excellent instruction across all levels and all courses. Reading faculty will be a resource to students and faculty from across the campus.
11. Working with CSM	1, 2, 3, 4, 5	Maximum use will be

## INSTRUCTION PROGRAM REVIEW: SPRING 2013 SUBMISSION CYCLE

digital librarian and/or Lynda.com teacher-training subscription - with collaboration of reading faculty and the instructional aides develop video modules, especially pertaining to RA.		made of faculty and instructional training received in RA. Students will have access to modern, relevant materials. Faculty of other disciplines will have access to RA training.
12. Participate in conferences such as online teaching, Reading Apprenticeship, College Reading Association, and others mentioned in program review.	<b>1, 2, 3, 5</b>	Faculty will be versed in best practices. Student will receive high-quality, engaged instruction.
13. Work with Admissions and Records and IPC to obtain contact information of all students who place into a reading class (currently available via District IT Office)	<b>1, 2, 3, 4, 5</b>	Students will receive a personalized invitation to take a reading class.
14. Develop innovative ways to deliver lab-only courses that allow students more freedom and better utilize staff expertise (as law allows).	<b>1, 2, 3, 4, 5</b>	Students will have more options and receive assistance in the lab tailored more specifically to his/her reading needs.
16. Explore involvement of a reading class in the Umoja program	<b>1, 2, 3, 4, 5</b>	Help African American students belong to a community and increase their rate of success.
17. Two work stations in Read/ESL Center (relevant to Read/ESL Center)	1, 3, 4	Enable students working in the Read/ESL Center to have better conferencing conditions.

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

<b>VI. Resource Requests</b>
------------------------------

**INSTRUCTION PROGRAM REVIEW: SPRING 2013 SUBMISSION CYCLE**

**Table 13: Resource Requests**

<i>Changes</i>	<i>Resource Needs</i>			
1 retirement	One full-time tenure track reading instructor			
Computer goes out of warranty	1 Macbook pro to replace the one going out of warranty. This computer is used for online teaching and video clip development. It needs maximum memory, storage, and a retina display			
New part-time instructors	Need for 2 iPads for part-time instructors to develop video RA course resources.			
Emphasis on development of RA video modules	4 Logitech ultra-thin keyboards for new adjunct iPad and current one used in Read/ESL Center: \$400			

**A. Itemized Resource Requests**

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

## INSTRUCTION PROGRAM REVIEW: SPRING 2013 SUBMISSION CYCLE

### *Faculty*

Full-time faculty requests (identify specialty if applicable)	Number of positions
Reading Instructor (full-time, tenure track)	1

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

### *Equipment and Technology*

Description (for ongoing program operation)	Cost (approximate)
1 Macbook Pro, retina display, maximum memory and storage (current computer will be out of warranty)	\$5000
1 iPads @ \$600 each	\$1200
4 ultra-thin keyboard covers, Logitech @ \$100 each	\$400

Description (for prioritized plans)	Plan #(s)	Cost
<i>Items listed below are under Plan # 7 and # 11</i>		
2 Tripod-to iPad, iPad holder attachment @ \$40 each	\$80	
2 iPad holders @ \$19 each	\$ 58	
1 site license to Lynda.com for 5	\$800	
2 air printers @ \$250 each	\$500	
2 Apple app gift cards to purchase apps for iPad @ \$100 each	\$200	
6 thumb drives @ \$10 each	\$60	

### *Instructional Materials*

Description (for ongoing program operation)	Cost
4 <i>Reading for Understanding</i> , 2nd Edition (Reading Apprenticeship books) @ \$20.00	\$80
5 <i>Using the iPad</i> @ \$15. 00	\$60

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

### *Classified Staff*



**INSTRUCTION PROGRAM REVIEW: SPRING 2013 SUBMISSION CYCLE**

Description (for ongoing program operation)	Cost

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
Two workstations need to be created in the Read/ESL Center. Currently, there is only one. A facilities work request will be submitted. Needed: one faculty desk and chair, phone (line can be	# 17	\$1000 (estimate)

**B. Cost for Prioritized Plans**

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

Response: See information listed above.

Plan #	Plan Title	Total Cost
1		
2		

*Addendum*

Fall 2012

BRINGING TOGETHER NEWS AND IDEAS  
FOR THE CALIFORNIA CHAPTER OF CRLA

## CALIFORNIA CONNEXION

### Acceleration and the New Angle on Requiring a Reading FSA

*Our 2012 Conference*

*Theme: "Exploring new Angles on Student Learning and Diversity," strikes me as apropos. There has been much discussion amongst California Chapter members about the new "angle" of acceleration. The California Acceleration Project encourages examination of curricular sequences, but reading is not included as part of this project. English faculty are strongly encouraged to incorporate reading instruction into their accelerated courses; however, reading as a discipline is not being recognized by this*

*movement. Once again, many reading departments are feeling like the college's step child and advocating for recognition as proponents for acceleration are pushing for integrated reading and writing courses. Reading departments on some community college campuses have chosen to merge or to collapse their reading courses with English. From what I understand, this concept is based upon the idea of mutual cross training of their colleagues in Reading and English. At Fullerton College, we do not share this vision primarily because it undermines the distinction of our FSA in Reading. I believe the opportunity for col-*

*laboration between English and reading through the acceleration project is exciting, but this type of collaborative course requires expertise from both disciplines as recognized by the state of California in an FSA. We do not want to move forward working from the assumption that there is no value in having a graduate degree in reading and that only an English degree is sufficient for reading instruction. I believe the California Chapter of CRLA needs to once more come together as a united front on this issue.*

*We spoke with a collective voice to define for the state of California the qualifications to teach reading. In 1993, Gretchen Cupp represented this constituency before the California Academic Senate that proposed changing the standards for Reading instructors. Likewise, Kathleen Engstrom, wrote in 1994 a letter reiterating our role as a spokesperson for the Reading discipline in California Community Colleges. As Kathie Bartle Angus recognizes in our chapter history: "Their efforts helped establish the qualifications for instructors of reading courses as an MS in Education with an emphasis in Reading or a minimum of 12 units in graduate level Reading courses." Therefore, when we, as academic colleagues, decide to cross train and begin establishing new courses*





## A New Angle on Reading (continued)

*without meeting the FSA in Reading, we continue to undermine the recognition of our own discipline.*

*Colleagues have been fighting their "battles" on a local level. Since each campus will ultimately make their own determinations about accelerated course offerings, we will see several variations develop state wide. Since accelerated reading and writing courses are already being piloted, it is important to address the key issue:*

*How do we protect our programs and work toward a collaboration model to explore this new angle of student learning without sacrificing reading as a recognized discipline??*

*In Houston, we would like to begin to gather information about the existing accelerated courses and how campuses are determining minimum qualifications for teaching these courses. What I am asking the chapter to consider is taking a clear*

*position on requiring California Community Colleges to have accelerated courses team taught by English and Reading faculty who have the appropriate FSAs or by faculty who have both FSAs.*

---

*"I feel like a better teacher after attending the Spring CA Chapter Conference."*

---



Susan K. Wolcott

## CA Chapter Spring Meeting featuring with Susan K. Wolcott, Ph.D. Developing Students' Critical Thinking Skills: Strategies for the Classroom

The California Chapter's spring meeting was a teleconference hosted by California State University, Fullerton with participants from American River College in Sacramento; West Valley College in Saratoga; Madera College Center; and Fullerton College. Dr. Susan K. Wolcott is an educational consultant and founder of WolcottLynch. She is known for "Steps for Better Thinking" a resource to assess critical thinking and to develop

problem-solving skills. Dr. Wolcott provided extensive handouts on critical thinking, rubrics and lesson ideas. Her expertise in critical thinking was inspirational to all. It was highly successful.

If you would like to learn more about WolcottLynch or access a free online tutorial for critical thinking, visit her home page.



[www.wolcottlynch.com](http://www.wolcottlynch.com)