



**PROGRAM REVIEW AND PLANNING**  
**Approved 9/2/08 Governing Council**

*The Program Review process should serve as a mechanism for the assessment of performance that recognizes and acknowledges good performance and academic excellence, improves the quality of instruction and services, updates programs and services, and fosters self-renewal and self-study. Further, it should provide for the identification of weak performance and assist programs in achieving needed improvement. Finally, program review should be seen as a component of campus planning that will not only lead to better utilization of existing resources, but also lead to increased quality of instruction and service. A major function of program review should be to monitor and pursue the congruence between the goals and priorities of the college and the actual practices in the program or service.*

~Academic Senate for California Community Colleges

**Department or Program:**

**Division:**

**I. DESCRIPTION OF PROGRAM** (Data resources: “Number of Sections” data from Core Program and Student Success Indicators; CSM Course Catalog; department records)

CSM’s English Department offers a full range of Composition courses at the pre-transfer (developmental) and transfer levels, as well as Literature and Creative Writing courses, a specialized course for writing in the workplace, a grammar course, a variable unit writing workshop, and a special projects course.

**Composition:**

- English 828: Basic Composition and Reading**
- English 838: Intensive Introduction to Composition and Reading**
- English 848: Introduction to Composition and Reading**
- English 100: Composition and Reading**
- English 100/102: Composition and Reading/English Practicum**
- English 110: Composition, Literature, and Critical Thinking**
- English 165: Advanced Composition**

**Creative Writing:**

- English 161/162/163: Creative Writing I, II, III**

- English 690: Special Projects: Independent study in a specific field or topic**

- English 865: Projects in Workplace Writing**

**English 875:** English Grammar

**English 882:** Composition for Workplace Writing

**Literature:** \*All of the Literature courses listed below are transferable. Students can also take the courses on a non-transferable, credit/no-credit basis for personal enrichment, in which case, writing the critical papers is optional. The 800-level Literature courses represent the credit/no-credit, non-transferable option.

\* Not every course listed below is taught every semester; rather, Literature courses are offered on an annual or biannual basis.

**Literature 101:** Twentieth Century Literature  
**Literature 105:** The Bible as Literature  
**Literature 113:** The Novel  
**Literature 151:** Shakespeare  
**Literature 201:** American Literature I  
**Literature 202:** American Literature II  
**Literature 220:** Introduction to World Literature  
**Literature 231:** Survey of English Literature I  
**Literature 232:** Survey of English Literature II  
**Literature 272:** Irish Literature  
**Literature 430:** Greek Mythology & Classical Literature

Program Review Section I: DESCRIPTION OF PROGRAM

Numbers of Course Sections taught: Fall 2006 – Spring 2009

Course #	Fall 2006	Spring 2007	Fall 2007	Spring 2008	Fall 2008	Spring 2009
828	5	3	5	3	5	3
838	6	9	6	9	7	9
848	12	10	15	12	16	12
100	25	25	26	23	26	22
100/101	4	4	4	4	4	4
110	10	13	11	17	12	17
165	7	6	5	6	5	5
161	2	2	2	3	3	3
162	2	3	2	3	3	3
163	2	3	2	3	3	3
690	3	2	3	2	4	5
850	1	1	1	1	1	2

865				1		1
875	1		1		1	
882		1				
LIT 101/804	1					
LIT 105/809		1				1
LIT 113/813						
LIT 151/835		1		1		
LIT 201/823	1		1		1	
LIT 202/824		1		1		1
LIT 220/820						
LIT 231/837	1		1			
LIT 232/838		1		1		
LIT 272/872		1				
LIT 430/830	1	1	1	1		1

II. **STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES** (*Data resources: SLO records maintained by the department; CSM SLO Coordinator; SLO Website*)

- a. Briefly describe the department’s assessment of Student Learning Outcomes. Which courses or programs were assessed? How were they assessed? What are the findings of the assessments?

**Which courses or programs were assessed?**

All SLOs in composition courses, and other regularly offered courses (e.g., Creative Writing) have been assessed.

All literature courses offered during the period under review have been assessed. Others will be assessed as they are offered. (We offer these courses in a special rotation.)

**How were they assessed?**

**Our routine:** We are on a three-year cycle.

- Steps 2-4 of the cycle (data gathering and evaluation of outcomes) are held during the last weeks of each semester.
- Steps 5-6 (reviewing evidence, identifying weaknesses and implementing changes) take place during the first weeks of the following semester, at a department meeting, flex day or retreat.

**Method:**

**Composition courses:** We assess courses through group readings of randomly selected essays, which are gathered from each section of the course under review. All instructors are invited to join in a holistic reading session to assess whether the essays reflect mastery of the SLOs. The sessions begin with a “norming,” in which common standards are established to clarify what is

appropriate to the course level. Then, working in pairs, the group (typically between 6 and 14 teachers, depending on availability) read between 30 and 100 papers. A group-wide discussion ensues; rates of achievement of each SLO are tallied; and difficulties in either the SLO, the students' performance, the assignments or the course itself are discussed. The group forms tentative recommendations which are distributed to the faculty at the follow-up SLO session early the following semester. – At this follow-up session (a retreat, flex day or department meeting), the department as a whole discusses the results and adopts or discusses the recommendations.

Literature courses: Achievement of SLOs is assessed through holistic essay readings, but also through quizzes. Typically, the SLO assessment is conducted also by the instructor teaching the class; the final quiz is tailored to include a question that will permit students to show mastery of SLOs.

Other courses: Courses like “Projects in Workplace Writing,” “Grammar” or other courses are assessed on an as-offered basis by the instructor, usually through holistic readings, quizzes, and/or questionnaires. ENGL 850 (Writing Center instruction) is assessed by analysis of pre- and post-writing samples.

### **What are the findings of the assessments?**

**In general:** So far, SLO assessments are in line with student success rates. About two-thirds of our students pass our courses, and about two-thirds of students show mastery of SLOs. This is encouraging; if students were passing but not showing mastery of SLOs, or mastering the SLOs without passing, something would be amiss.

Equally encouraging is the fact that the SLOs have not identified any challenges we weren't aware of. Our evaluations have confirmed that we need to focus on:

- Upholding consistent standards of instruction
- Ensuring continuity without repetition throughout the program
- Creating assignments that reflect current pedagogy and elicit appropriately challenging work
- Hiring and retaining the best adjunct faculty
- Hiring adjunct faculty into full-time positions

Most of these challenges reflect, in one way or another, the preponderance of adjunct faculty, and the chronic time constraints of full-time faculty.

**In particular:** SLO evaluations revealed two useful findings:

1. Sentence level writing needs to be tackled more consistently. All composition courses include a SLO relating to sentence level writing (grammar, style, clarity etc.). At all levels, this SLO had the lowest rates of mastery. The immediate result is that we have fine-tuned the wording of our sentence level SLOs to reflect more clearly the specific standards required in each course, and to keep the issue in instructors' minds.

More importantly, these findings have clarified the role of the Writing Center/ ENGL 800 lab in our composition program. While the old Writing Center was an optional service available to students enrolled in ENGL 850, it now primarily supports the hour-by-arrangement attached to our composition courses. Clearly, for those many students with sentence-level problems, there is a strong need for the ongoing, individualized instruction the Writing Center provides – instruction that can't realistically be provided in the classroom, since students exhibit a dizzying variety of sentence-level problems. The Writing Center/ ENGL 800 lab services – individualized instruction, small workshops, and so on – have, therefore, become an integral part of the composition curriculum, one that addresses an important weakness identified by our SLO cycle.

2. Instructors need to work together, on a continuing basis, to review curriculum, and to ensure assignments are appropriate to course level. At many evaluation sessions, instructors noticed that mastery of SLOs did not always correspond to passing grades. Some assignments were too easy, and thus students appeared to have mastered skills only because they were not taking on challenges appropriate to their level; other assignments were perhaps inappropriately hard to complete successfully. Where the assignment doesn't give an appropriately challenging task, gauging students' real mastery of SLOs is difficult.

To address these discrepancies in the future, seventeen of our instructors joined teaching circles, focusing primarily on supporting underprepared writers at all levels of the composition program. Teaching circles provide an opportunity to meet regularly to compare assignments, discuss evaluation methods, review curriculum, and forge common solutions to challenges.

Both part-time and full-time faculty consistently express the need for more time to work together, to compare and review assignments, handouts, grading strategies and other teaching methods. Such collaboration is vital to keep both the program, and our standards, coherent. We are trying to make SLO assessment a part of this process, rather than a distraction from it.

- b. Briefly evaluate the department's assessment of Student Learning Outcomes. If applicable, based on past SLO assessments, 1) what changes will the department consider or implement in future assessment cycles; and 2) what, if any, resources will the department or program require to implement these changes? (Please itemize these resources in section VII of this document.)

### **Overall evaluation of our assessments**

We are satisfied with our methods and routine for our SLO assessments. While they are labor intensive, our reading sessions do make the SLO evaluation process a meaningful part of evaluating and strengthening our courses and our teaching.

However, while we have been diligent about conducting evaluations and making recommendations, we have not yet created a single, consistent method for documenting the results of these readings, archiving data and publishing and disseminating SLO updates to our faculty. While those who attend the retreats and flex activities are aware of changes to SLO language or other issues, we need to make sure to centralize and coordinate the results of the SLO cycle, to ensure that everyone in the department has a chance to stay up to date.

### **What changes will the department consider or implement in future assessment cycles?**

- We will continue to use the same method and routine for SLO assessments, and we will finalize our routine (readings followed by set flex date, retreat or meeting);
- We continue to work on the wording of the SLOs themselves, to ensure that they accurately reflect meaningful measurable outcomes, as distinct from course goals (which may be broader);
- We will continue to refine the role of the Writing Center / ENGL 800 lab, and the hour-by-arrangement it services, to make sure that we close existing gaps in student SLO mastery;
- We will continue to look for opportunities for instructors to work together on assignments, grading, and curriculum (through teaching circles, classroom visits, mentoring or other activities).

### **What, if any, resources will the department or program require to implement these changes?**

The primary resource we would need, in order to make the best use of what the SLO data tell us, is time. The extra committees spawned in recent years by the budget, the accreditation crisis and the campus redevelopment, as well as the extra requirements from the state (guidelines for SLO assessment, HBA compliance, course outline review and so on) have added to the already heavy load generated by incessant faculty evaluations, screening, tenure review and program review, as well as participation in college programs and committees.

To do the things we would like to do, we need a much lighter administrative load. That means more full-time faculty.

- c. Below please update the program's SLO Alignment Grid. The column headings identify the GE-SLOs. In the row headings (down the left-most column), input the

course numbers (e.g. ENGL 100); add or remove rows as necessary. Then mark the corresponding boxes for each GE-SLO with which each course aligns. The definitions of the GE-SLOs can be found on the CSM SLOAC website: [http://www.smccd.net/accounts/csmsloac/sl\\_sloac.htm](http://www.smccd.net/accounts/csmsloac/sl_sloac.htm) (click on the “Institutional” link under the “Student Learning Outcomes” heading.) If this Program Review and Planning report refers to a vocational program or a certificate program that aligns with alternative institutional-level SLOs, please replace the GE-SLOs with the appropriate corresponding SLOs.

GE-SLOs Program Courses	Effective Communicat ion	Quantitative Skills	Critical Thinking	Social Awareness and Diversity	Ethical Responsibilit y
ENGL 828	X		X	X	X
ENGL 838/848	X		X	X	X
ENGL 100/101	X		X	X	X
ENGL 110	X		X	X	X
ENGL 165	X		X	X	X
ENGL 161-3	X		X	X	X
ENGL 875	X		X		
ENGL 850	X		X		
ENGL 690	X				
ENGL 865	X			X	X
LIT 101/804*	X		X	X	X
LIT 105/809	X		X	X	X
LIT 113/813	X		X	X	X
LIT 151/835	X		X	X	X
LIT 201/823	X		X	X	X
LIT 202/824	X		X	X	X
LIT 220	X		X	X	X
LIT 231/837	X		X	X	X
LIT 232/838	X		X	X	X
LIT 430/830	X		X	X	X

\*Note: Each of our literature classes can be taken either as transferable courses, or personal enrichment courses on a credit/no-credit basis. The 800-level literature classes represent a credit/no-credit, non-transferable enrolment.

### III. DATA EVALUATION *(Data resources: Core Program and Student Success Indicators from the Office of Planning, Research, and Institutional Effectiveness)*

- a. Referring to the Enrollment and WSCH data, evaluate the current data and projections. If applicable, what programmatic, course offering or scheduling changes do trends in these areas suggest? Will any major changes being implemented in the

program (e.g. changes in prerequisites, hours by arrangement, lab components) require significant adjustments to the Enrollment and WSCH projections?

Because enrollment and WSCH have been relatively consistent over time, we do not anticipate making any major changes to our pre-transfer or transfer programs.

English is considering eliminating the HBA from LIT courses, due to lack of consistent need among student enrolled in Literature courses, combined with limited staffing in the Writing Center. This will have no impact on enrollment, but LIT students needing additional instruction will need to enroll in ENGL 850 to utilize English Writing Center resources.

English continues to monitor student enrollment patterns and waitlists of all courses, day and evening, to determine appropriate action to address student demand for courses.

English is extremely interested in collaborating with other departments and divisions to strategize and plan how to effectively break into the "ghost town" – CSM's afternoons – and is currently offering courses in the early afternoon hours in the interest of creating a more vibrant campus community throughout the day.

- b. Referring to the Classroom Teaching FTEF data, evaluate the current data and projections. If applicable, how does the full-time and part-time FTE affect program action steps and outcomes? What programmatic changes do trends in this area suggest?

Average FTEF ratio of full-time to part-time faculty for AY 2006-2007 through AY 2008-2009 is 21.74 (full-time) to 22.01 (adjunct). In addition, full-time overload FTEF for the same period is 2.66, and reassigned FTEF for the same period averages 10.18, for a total Full-time FTEF of 34.57.

In terms of the actual number of instructors, the above FT/PT ratio reflects 15 full-time faculty (one of whose teaching load is divided between two departments) and 21 adjunct faculty.

Budget cuts have eliminated resources for innovation as full-time faculty are taking significantly less reassigned time or overload to create, coordinate, or participate in innovative Instructional projects (e.g. honors program, writing across the curriculum, learning communities).

English remains short on full-time faculty. Our department is overly reliant upon part-time faculty to teach courses. Full-time faculty manage and perform departmental administrative tasks while fulfilling division and college shared governance duties. Full-time faculty are in the process of reassessing and prioritizing our professional duties and responsibilities.

Since we have only been able to offer two of our part-time teachers full time jobs in the last five years, other community colleges are hiring away colleagues whom we wish could join us full



time. One unfortunate and ill-documented result is the seemingly never-ending screening, interviewing, hiring, mentoring, and evaluating of new part-time teachers, who cycle in and out of the department. This drains energy away from teaching students, managing the department, participating in shared governance, and implementing the various student-centered professional development projects full-time faculty lead within the department (e.g. teaching circles, workshops, retreats, mentoring).

- c. Referring to the Productivity data, discuss and evaluate the program's productivity relative to its target number. If applicable, what programmatic changes or other measures will the department consider or implement in order to reach its productivity target? If the productivity target needs to be adjusted, please provide a rationale. (Productivity is WSCH divided by FTE. The College's general target productivity will be recommended by the Budget Planning Committee.)

**2008-2009 ENGL (non-LIT) LOAD is 417.**

Target ENGL LOAD (non-LIT) for variable 3, 4, and 5 unit courses with an enrollment limitation of 26 and an HBA "hour" of 16 hours per semester is about 390. (See Instructional Productivity Metrics.)

AY 08-09 ENGL LOAD (417) is 54 points higher than AY 2007-2008 ENGL LOAD (363), a 14.9% increase.

ENGL LOAD of 417 indicates English is higher than 100% productive, 6.6% over to be precise.

We understand there are primarily three ways to increase LOAD above 390:

- 1) Over-enroll course sections
- 2) Reduce faculty units in the Writing Center/800 Lab
- 3) Increase the amount of time an "HBA hour" represents

The ENGL LOAD/productivity number has prompted English to request from PRIE specific course enrollment data in an effort to determine which factor or combination of factors has resulted in ENGL LOAD exceeding 100% of target productivity, 390.

**Online Mode: Fall 2006 to Fall 2008, "Summary: Enrollment and Student Outcomes"**

Success and retention rates for online sections of ENGL 100, 110, and 165 are significantly lower than those of courses in the traditional format. In fact, even the college-wide difference in success of Distance sections compared to Traditional sections is -12.7%.

Success, Distance sections vs. Traditional sections:

ENGL 100: 39.7% (3) vs. 61.7% (86)  
ENGL 110: 58.3% (1) vs. 78.2% (11)  
ENGL 165: 53.8% (3) vs. 62.7% (14)

The low success and retention rates of online courses are troubling, especially in times of cuts and adjunct faculty layoffs. Despite the work of the department to create high quality online courses and to promote them at the transfer level, our online success lags far behind comparable success averages of traditional transfer courses. The District has identified online courses as a high priority; yet if we are to get our money's worth, in terms of students served, from our online courses, clearly we need to find out what accounts for this discrepancy (one that appears to be part of a College-wide pattern for online courses) and come up with creative solutions – both administrative and pedagogical – for how to address it, **without compromising either instructor quality or the control of the English department over courses offered in its name.**

**2008-2009 LIT LOAD is 449.**

Target LIT LOAD (non-ENGL) for 3 unit courses with an enrollment limitation of 35 and with an HBA "hour" of 16 hours per semester is 519. (See Instructional Productivity Metrics.)

AY 08-09 LIT LOAD (449.3) is 169.3 points higher than AY 07-08 LIT LOAD (280), representing a 37.6% increase in productivity. More significantly, AY 08-09 LOAD increased 49.7% from AY 06-07 to AY 08-09.

English LIT committee enrollment management decisions have led to a remarkable increase in AY 08-09 LIT LOAD in just two years. (We are especially pleased with our walloping of the AY 06-07 LOAD number.)

Yet despite the exceptional increases in AY 08-09 LIT LOAD, a LIT LOAD of 449.3 (target: 519) indicates LIT is underproductive by 69.7 points or 15.5%.

The LIT committee will continue to implement documented, effective LOAD increasing enrollment strategies as part of its overall enrollment management plan – a carefully planned course rotation schedule and a limited number of LIT course offerings, intended to maximize enrollment.

**2008-2009 ENGL and LIT LOAD is 417.**

AY 08-09 ENGL and LIT LOAD (417) is 57 points, or 13.6%, higher than AY 2007-2008 ENGL and LIT LOAD (360).

AY 08-09 ENGL and LIT LOAD is higher than the Fall 2008 Cycle projection of 374 for AY 08-09, 10.3% higher.

Successful English and LIT program coordination have led to significant increases in overall department productivity.

English would like to acknowledge Dean Sandra Stefani-Comerford, LIT committee members, department leads in online, pre-transfer, transfer, and literature, and the English Writing Center/800 Lab coordinators for their work in designing, monitoring, and managing a comprehensive array of courses and instructional services for students in basic skills to literature courses.

**IV. STUDENT SUCCESS EVALUATION AND ANALYSIS** (*Data resources: Educational Master Plan; "Success Rates," "Dimension" data from Core Program and Student Success Indicators; previous Program Review and Planning reports; other department records*)

- a. Considering the overall "Success" and "Retention" data from the Dimension section of Core Program and Student Success Indicators, briefly discuss how effectively the program addresses students' needs relative to current, past, and projected program and college student success rates. If applicable, identify unmet student needs related to student success and describe programmatic changes or other measures the department will consider or implement in order to improve student success. (*Note that item IV b, below, specifically addresses equity, diversity, age, and gender.*)

Students seeking to transfer or take a degree enroll in one or more of the department's courses. About 50% percent of students registering for English courses are placed into ENGL 838/848, the course one level below transfer, and about 25% are placed into ENGL 828, the course two levels below transfer. Coupled with the rigor rightly associated with English courses, the Department's success rate of 61% for AY 08/09, while below the College's rate of 70%, is encouraging.

Retention rates are lower than the All College average in part because ENGL faculty often encourage students to withdraw from courses they are not passing when it is in their best interest to do so. "Retention rate" might be more practically understood as a "W" or withdrawal rate. Retention and withdrawal rates are inverse of one another. As retention rates increase, withdrawal rates decrease. As retention rates decrease, withdrawal rates increase.

Students are considered "retained" even if they receive failing grades or take Incompletes. Assigning students Ds and Fs in English while considering them "retained" is an incomplete measure of student service; retention, we believe, should be considered in relation to overall success and retention rates.

- b. Briefly discuss how effectively the program addresses students' needs specifically relative to equity, diversity, age, and gender. If applicable, identify unmet student needs and describe programmatic changes or other measures the department will consider or implement in order to improve student success with specific regard to equity, diversity, age, and gender.

**Student equity—diversity, age, and gender.**

ENGL 850 and ESL 850 (semester-long individualized instruction offered through the Writing Center) provide students not enrolled in HBA-bearing ENGL and LIT courses access to Writing Center and 800 Lab resources, for which they would otherwise not be eligible. These Writing Center and 800 Lab .5 to 3 unit courses are particularly useful for providing low-achieving students across all demographics individualized, professional instruction/tutoring services.

*Writing in the End Zone I, II, and III*, is an English department initiative (2004 to present), which has been particularly effective in supporting success, persistence, and retention of male African-American and Pacific Islander students. After six years of *Writing in the End Zone*, these students succeed far more often in their English composition classes. And there is anecdotal evidence to suggest that they are also succeeding at a higher rate in their non-English courses. We attribute the success of the WEZ project to its collaboration with the CSM football coaching staff, its collaborative work with faculty across disciplines and services, and individualized tutoring services and computer resources available in the English Writing Center/800 Lab. We are currently waiting for an update of our original AY 04/06 CSM research brief, "Writing in the End Zone I & II: Improving Student Outcomes in Developmental English."

Latino students continue to underachieve, succeeding at a rate of only 54%. The department has two specially trained, Puente Project faculty members and other instructors who are interested in being involved to provide general support. Yet the Puente Project continues to linger in our memories for lack of institutional support to hire or identify a full-time counselor to co-administer this statewide student success program, which is partially funded by the University of California.

The English department originally hired two Puente instructors in response to college need, and English has recently hired one instructor to address the need for an Honors Program. Yet we regret that in both instances the college has been unable to support either program.

English is committed to participating in an Honors Program, and so welcomes the reinstatement of adequate resources to support faculty coordination. (Currently, English department faculty continue to support students' efforts to achieve beyond the regular course curriculum at all levels in various ways, one of which is by volunteering to teach sections of ENGL 690: Independent Study, or by being paid or by volunteering to be faculty advisors for both of CSM's honors societies.)

Full-time and adjunct faculty evaluations are performed with professional rigor to insure the highest quality educational services to all students. While this creates increased administrative workload for full-time faculty in the form of repeat evaluations, and ongoing discussion, planning, and assessment of the evaluation process, English is deeply committed to providing students quality instruction at all levels and across all demographics.

English actively encourages full-time and adjunct faculty to teach a variety of courses, from basic skills to advanced composition. Over 60% of basic skills/developmental composition courses are taught by full-time faculty, the majority of whom are reading and composition specialists. For example, since 2000, English has hired eight full-time faculty, all of whom have demonstrated expertise in basic skills/developmental education. Five of the eight meet California's certification requirements to teach Reading.

English fully recognizes how essential it is to continue to address student equity in hiring and evaluation of full-time and adjunct colleagues, developing curriculum and modifying course outlines, designing and participating in student success projects or initiatives, collaborating with Student Services colleagues and those from other disciplines within Instruction.

Three English faculty serve on CSM's Basic Skills Committee, one as Co-Chair.

Three have served as advisors to CSM's honors societies.

One has worked extensively in projects related to interdisciplinary curriculum research and design, participating in the CASTL Institutional Leadership Project and in AAC&U's VALUE project. Both were two-year commitments.

English faculty regularly participate in Learning Communities and other related student success and retention projects.

Two faculty have participated in CSM Counseling Partners, collaborating with Counseling in its effort to reach out to all students, across demographics.

One English faculty has served on CSM's Distance Education Committee and the Distance Education Advisory Committee (DEAC). Several English faculty have participated in the District STOT (Structured Training for Online Teaching) program.

**V. REFLECTIVE ASSESSMENT OF INTERNAL AND EXTERNAL FACTORS AND PROGRAM/STUDENT SUCCESS** (*Data Resources: Educational Master Plan; "Dimension: Retention and Success" data from Core Program and Student Success Indicators; previous Program Review and Planning reports; department records*)

- a. Using the matrix provided below and reflecting on the program relative to students' needs, briefly analyze the program's strengths and weaknesses and identify opportunities for and possible threats to the program (SWOT). Consider both external and internal factors. For example, if applicable, consider changes in our community and beyond (demographic, educational, social, economic, workforce, and, perhaps, global trends); look at the demand for the program; review program links to other campus and District programs and services; look at similar programs at other area colleges; and investigate auxiliary funding.

	<b>INTERNAL FACTORS</b>	<b>EXTERNAL FACTORS</b>
<b>Strengths</b>	<p>1. Both full-time and adjunct faculty continue to participate, and play leadership roles, in a wide range of long-term and short-term projects, programs, and activities aimed at meeting student need and increasing student success, including but not limited to the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Two FT English faculty were awarded sabbaticals between Fall 2006 and Spring 2009.</li> <li>• Approximately 20 faculty participated in teaching circles, collaborating to develop and strengthen curriculum to better serve the needs of under-prepared students.</li> <li>• Continued to participate, and play leadership roles on BSI.</li> <li>• Writing in the End Zone – a project that continues to improve the academic success rates of CSM's historically lowest-performing student groups (African-American and Pacific Islander males) – expanded to include a 4<sup>th</sup> English instructor. English faculty and the Head Football Coach worked with a Math instructor to create Algebra in the End Zone.</li> </ul>	<p>1. Reasonably competitive salaries within the greater Bay Area for full-time faculty at all pay grades.</p> <p>2. Consistently robust student enrollment in all courses.</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 9 faculty taught in more than 20 Learning Communities.</li> <li>• English Department faculty collaborated with faculty in other Divisions in the final year of CSM’s Writing Across the Curriculum trial.</li> <li>• One English faculty member developed a new Honors Program.</li> <li>• One English faculty member served (and continues to do so) on the Distance Education Committee, working to strengthen CSM’s distance education offerings.</li> <li>• Faculty regularly teaching Literature courses continue working with the Dean of Language Arts to ensure courses are offered in a sequence, and with a frequency, that meets student demand, and that in particular serves the needs of English majors.</li> </ul> <p>2. The Writing Center and English 800 Lab continue to adapt to the needs of our students. Since Fall 2008, faculty and Writing Center staff have developed new Tutorials and revised existing ones in response to SLO assessments and student need; provided in-person Writing Center orientations for all students enrolled in English Composition courses; successfully implemented new Drop-in hours available to all CSM students, not just those enrolled in English Composition courses.</p>	
<b>Weaknesses</b>	1. Full-time/Adjunct ratio. The English Department currently consists of 15 FT faculty (one of whose load is split between English and ESL) and 21 adjunct faculty; this	None

	<p>ratio has remained essentially unchanged for many years, despite the state's recommended FT/PT ratio of 75%/25%. During the three-year period of Fall 2006 – Spring 2009, half, or more, of our courses were taught by adjunct faculty. Though adjunct faculty are paid specifically and exclusively for teaching their classes and holding office hours, they participate regularly in an impressive range of Department, Division, and College activities. However, despite their dedication to students' success, they are simply not able to fully participate in the Department, due largely to their having to work multiple jobs, both in and out of teaching. This shortage of FT faculty has the following consequences:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• In some semesters, entire course levels are staffed by adjunct faculty, and evening classes and summer session sometimes are as well.</li><li>• The increasing load of administrative tasks and committee work falling to FT faculty are a constant drain on time and energy they could be devoting directly to their students. In addition to SLO development and assessment and an expanded Program Review, English faculty have contributed extensively to CSM's Accreditation Oversight Committee, numerous task forces intended to guide new construction on campus, and ad hoc committees responding to recent funding cuts. The number of hours required for these types of tasks and</li></ul>	
--	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--



	<p>responsibilities has increased while the number of FT faculty has not. As a result, faculty morale has suffered. While we recognize the value of these tasks and committees, the number of hours in a day remains finite.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• FT English faculty regularly participate in a wide range of special projects such as BSI, Learning Communities, Writing Across the Curriculum, Honors, individual sabbaticals, etc. These projects, many of which involve extensive collaboration with faculty and student service personnel across the campus and even the District, benefit students directly and help rejuvenate faculty. For most of these projects faculty receive no reassigned time. When they do, their workload is more manageable, but consequently they teach fewer classes, further increasing the teaching load carried by adjunct faculty</li> </ul> <p>A higher FT/adjunct faculty ratio would mean more faculty to share in administrative and committee work, and more FT faculty in the classroom when their colleagues are working on special projects.</p>	
<p><b>Opportunities</b></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. English Department faculty continue to be afforded many opportunities for interdisciplinary and inter-college collaboration.</li> <li>2. The English Department regularly invites personnel</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. BSI funding: in addition to some of the larger projects funded by BSI, the English Department has been able to pay adjunct faculty to participate in teaching circles and to pay FT faculty</li> </ol>

	<p>from Counseling, Psychological Services, DSPS, and EOPS to make presentations at Department meetings, ensuring increased awareness of all of the resources available to our students. English Department faculty have worked to strengthen relationships with colleagues and programs outside our department, volunteering to tutor in EOPS, meeting with counselors to discuss effective and appropriate placement of students in courses, meeting individually with staff in DSPS to best meet the needs of our students with various disabilities.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3. All English faculty, both FT and adjunct, have the opportunity to teach the full range of Composition courses.</li> <li>4. All FT English faculty who wish to teach Literature courses either have had, or will have, the opportunity to do so, thanks in large part to more careful long-range planning of our Literature sequence.</li> </ol>	<p>to begin creating Course Books for each Composition course level, (compilations of course descriptions, “do’s” and “don’ts” for each course according to the official course outlines, listings of available student resources, sample writing assignments and sample student papers).</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. Collaboration with faculty at Hillsdale High School to learn more about the expectation for students enrolled in English courses in high school and in college, to discuss the skills students will need when they arrive at CSM, and to share assignments and teaching strategies.</li> </ol>
<p><b>Threats</b></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. FT/Adjunct faculty ratio (see weaknesses).</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Despite relatively competitive FT salaries among Bay Area Community Colleges, the cost of living in the San Mateo is higher than in many other Bay Area communities, making it difficult to attract FT faculty (when positions exist) and, especially adjunct faculty.</li> </ol>

		<p>2. Non-competitive pay for adjunct faculty. SMCCCD pays adjunct faculty significantly less than some other Bay Area community college districts (SF City College and DeAnza/Foothill in particular). This pay disparity appears to be an important factor in what has become a shrinking pool of qualified candidates for adjunct positions. In addition, the lower adjunct pay contributes to an increased turnover in adjunct faculty, lost to both full-time and part-time work at other colleges. The turnover of adjunct faculty and the need to replace them necessitates more frequent evaluations, a process that when executed thoroughly and thoughtfully, is incredibly time-consuming for FT faculty. In the final weeks of spring 2008, three FT English faculty devoted approximately 15 hours each to screening close to 100 applications and interviewing seven candidates – to teach four sections. We hired two qualified instructors, only to informed by one of them in October 2009 that he would not be returning to CSM in spring 2010; though he worked well with his new colleagues at CSM, contributed to the Department, and enjoyed</p>
--	--	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

		<p>his students, he came to realize he simply could not “afford” to keep teaching here, and would return to teaching only at DeAnza College, where he earns approximately 70% more for an equivalent workload.</p> <p>3. The California budget shortfall has negatively impacted our department in numerous ways.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• After receiving no pay increase over the last four years due to the lack of a state-funded COLA, faculty at CSM are likely facing another contract devoid of any pay increase; faculty at CSM are, in effect, taking pay cuts, at the same time that our administrative responsibilities have increased.</li> <li>• Budget cuts resulted in reductions to reassigned time for Learning Communities and Writing Across the Curriculum coordination, effectively ending these programs. Admittedly, WAC was nearing the end of a 3-year trial, but that end came sooner than anticipated. While there is nothing prohibiting faculty from participating in Learning Communities at this point, the lack of a coordinator has meant the end of most of these courses.</li> <li>• Cuts to reassigned time prevented a robust Honors program from ever actually</li> </ul>
--	--	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

		<p>getting off the ground – despite the prior investment of much time and energy from one of our department’s FT faculty.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reassigned time for BSI coordination was reduced from 9 units to 3.</li> <li>• Staffing in both the Writing Center and the English 800 Lab have been reduced, thereby reducing students’ access to faculty in both centers.</li> </ul> <p>4. Lack of a common understanding among faculty and administrators across the District about certain data have led to misinterpretations of LOAD numbers, causing some in the District to misinterpret our Department’s productivity. The magic LOAD number of 525 is applicable only to 3 unit courses. LOAD is variable according to enrollment limitations, number of units, and Lab or HBA components. Given the enrollment caps in Composition courses, our LOAD should not be higher than 390; at 390 we have reached maximum productivity.</p>
--	--	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

b. If applicable, discuss how new positions, other resources, and equipment granted in previous years have contributed towards reaching program action steps and towards overall programmatic health (you might also reflect on data from Core Program and Student Success Indicators). If new positions have been requested but not granted,

discuss how this has impacted overall programmatic health (you might also reflect on data from Core Program and Student Success Indicators).

In the last three years, the English department has requested 6 positions, and made one full-time hire (Fall 2006). At the same time, 1 full-time faculty has retired, and one has moved into administration. Consequently, our department numbers have shrunk as our administrative load has increased.

Our 2006 full-time hire has contributed enormously to the English Department and to the college. He developed an Honors program (that, regrettably, was never implemented due to budget cuts); has conducted ePortfolio workshops; currently advises CSM's Alpha Gamma Sigma society; has introduced two of our President's Lecture Series speakers; and is actively involved in our Interdisciplinary Faculty Inquiry Groups among other things. He is not unique within our department, but we need more full-time English faculty like him.

As described at some length in our Data Evaluation and Reflective Assessment above, hiring more full-time faculty remains the single most important thing we could do for program health. More full-time faculty would permit us to spend more time developing programs, implementing curricular and pedagogical innovations suggested by the SLO assessments, mentoring adjunct faculty to ensure consistent and high-quality instruction, and so on.

**VI. Action Steps and Outcomes** (*Data resources: Educational Master Plan, GE- or Certificate SLOs; course SLOs; department records; Core Program and Student Success Indicators; previous Program Review and Planning reports; Division work plan*)

- a. Identify the program's action steps. Action steps should be broad issues and concerns that incorporate some sort of measurable action and should connect to the Educational Master Plan, the Division work plan, and GE- or certificate SLOs.
- b. Briefly explain, specifically, how the program's action steps relate to the Educational Master Plan.
- c. Identify and explain the program's outcomes, the measurable "mileposts" which will allow you to determine when the action steps are reached.

<b>Goals</b>	<b>Action Steps</b>	<b>Relation to EMP</b>	<b>Outcomes</b>	<b>Mileposts</b>
To ensure that the HBA serves student need, and complies with State guidelines	1. Ensure that our Writing Center can service our HBA requirement	Supports G1	Clearly integrated composition program; improved student performance in key SLOs	- Writing Center/800Lab provides the resources necessary for students to meet their HBA requirements
To make the SLO	2. Finalize a data-	Supports G4	Routine tracking	- Adopting DAT

assessment cycle a vehicle for meaningful self-assessment	tracking system to ensure a <i>manageable, effective and meaningful</i> SLO assessment cycle		of program effectiveness; identification and implementation of improvements	TRAC or other system - Creation of complete and retrievable database of outcomes assessment
To ensure that first-rate classroom instruction remains the top priority of instructors, in the face of conflicting demands on our time  To improve faculty morale	3. Manage full-time faculty departmental and shared governance administrative workload in five years	Supports G1, G5	Better prioritized faculty workload; more faculty energy focused on teaching, program and curriculum improvement, and mentoring; more cohesive program and department; increased morale	- Two new full-time hires in English - Full-time instructors evenly spread across all levels of composition

**VII. SUMMARY OF RESOURCES NEEDED TO REACH PROGRAM ACTION STEPS**

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

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

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

<b>Full-Time Faculty Positions Requested</b>	<b>Expected Outcomes if Granted and Expected Impact if Not Granted</b>	<b>If applicable, <u>briefly</u> indicate how the requested resources will link to achieving department action steps based on SLO assessment.</b>
<b>Full-Time Faculty Positions Requested: Two.</b>  AYS 2005-2008 have seen fewer full-time faculty, who in	<b>Outcomes if Granted:</b> As a core college program, English fully acknowledges the role we must play in service to college goals and action steps.	<b>Link to Department Action Steps</b>  The requested resources will increase consistency in SLO

<p>addition to regular teaching loads, manage a very large department (forty, on average), which provides core, college Instructional programs and services.</p>	<p>Two positions will allow English to continue to address student equity in hiring and in specific core program innovation.</p> <p>Two positions will lessen administrative pressure on current FT faculty in five years, allowing for enhanced innovation and participation within the department as determined by SLO assessment.</p> <p>These positions will allow for full-time faculty to be responsive to and to participate in innovative college-wide student success and retention initiatives (as budget dictates).</p> <p>Two positions will enable full-time faculty to continue to take active roles in shared governance, representing English and Language Arts on college-wide committees.</p> <p><b>Expected Impact if Not Granted:</b> Full-time faculty will prioritize workload to maintain a 50/50 FT to PT ratio and the integrity of core programs ahead of department, division, or college-wide initiatives.</p>	<p>assessment and overall department management, innovation, and collaboration across disciplines and Student Services.</p>
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

<p><b>Classified Positions Requested</b></p>	<p><b>Expected Outcomes if Granted and Expected Impact if Not Granted</b></p>	<p><b>If applicable, <u>briefly</u> indicate how the requested resources will link to achieving department action steps based on SLO assessment.</b></p>
<p>N/A</p>	<p>N/A</p>	<p>N/A</p>



--	--	--

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

<b>Resources Requested</b>	<b>Expected Outcomes if Granted and Expected Impact if Not Granted</b>	<b>If applicable, <u>briefly</u> indicate how the requested resources will link to achieving department action steps based on SLO assessment.</b>
<p>We respectfully submit this request in order to document instructional equipment needed in the event adequate funds are made available in the next budget cycle before our yearly program review update is due.</p> <p>The English department is fully aware of the fact that minimal instructional equipment funds, if any, are available, given the state budget crisis.</p> <p><b>Item:</b> 30 iMac 20-inch computers with 2 GB RAM, 320 GB hard drives, keyboards, mice and Apple Protection Plan  <b>Number:</b> 30  <b>Vendor:</b> Apple  <b>Unit price:</b> \$1268  <b>Total Cost:</b> \$38,000</p>	<p>Instructional equipment enables the Centers to create effective learning environments in the English 800 Lab and Writing Center as well as in the “Quiet Room” and Computer Assisted Classroom (CAC), which is used to teach English classes, ESL classes, and occasionally serve as a meeting room open to the college when computers are needed.</p> <p>Older general use computers in the Writing Center and the computers in the Writing Center’s “Quiet Room” have not been updated since 2005. (Computers in the CAC have been updated within the last two years. And computers in the English 800 Lab were updated in 2008.)</p> <p><b>Expected outcomes if Granted:</b>  Students will continue to have</p>	<p>Students currently make use of all the available resources. To increase the number of students we serve, we will need more resources.</p>

<p><b>Please Note:</b> These instructional resources were requested in the English Writing Center and English 800 Lab Program Review for Centers.</p>	<p>ready access to instructional materials and resources by which to conduct research online and compose essays with the assistance of faculty in a supportive environment.</p> <p><b>Expected Outcomes if Not Granted:</b>          Limited equipment simply means limited resources for students who need the resources most, particularly low-income students and the many who prefer to compose essays and complete homework with the support the Centers provide.</p>	
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--

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

VIII. **Course Outlines** (Data Resources: department records; Committee On Instruction website; Office of the Vice President of Instruction; Division Dean)

- a. By course number (e.g. CHEM 210), please list all department or program courses included in the most recent college catalog, the date of the current Course Outline for each course, and the due date of each course's next update.

Course Number			Last Updated			Six-year Update Due	
Division Code	Dept.	Course No.	Approved Date	Revision Date	Distance Learning	Banked Date	Next 6 yr Update Due
4413	ENGL	100	Mar-88	Dec 06 & Apr 08 D/L	Apr-08		2012 & 2014 (D/L)
4413	ENGL	101	Apr-97	Dec-06		Sep-09	2012
4413	ENGL	102	Jan-09				2015
4413	ENGL	110	Mar-88	Dec 06 & Apr 08 D/L	Apr-08		2012 & 2014 (D/L)
4413	ENGL	120	Mar-88			Sp 05	
4413	ENGL	130	Mar-88			Sp 05	
4413	ENGL	135	Dec-04			Sep-08	
4413	ENGL	140	Mar-88	Dec-03		Sp 05	

4413	ENGL	161	Mar-88	Dec-03 Nov-08		2014
4413	ENGL	162	Mar-88	Dec-03		2010
4413	ENGL	163	Mar-88	Dec-03		2010
4413	ENGL	164	Apr-98		Sp 05	
4413	ENGL	165	Mar-88	Nov 06 &Apr 08 D/L	Apr-08	2012 & 2014 (D/L) 2015
4413	ENGL	828	Dec-02	Jan-09		
4413	ENGL	830	Feb-87		to be banked	
4413	ENGL	838	Dec-02	Jan-09		2015
4413	ENGL	848	Dec-02	Jan-09		2015
4413	ENGL	850	Feb-86	Sep-04		2010
4413	ENGL	853	Dec-99		May-04	
4413	ENGL	865	Nov-06			2012
4413	ENGL	875	Nov-88	Feb-05		2011
4413	LIT.	813	Oct-08			2014
4413	LIT.	101		Nov-06		2012
4413	LIT.	105		May-09		2015
4413	LIT.	111	Jan-88		May-08	
4413	LIT.	113	Feb-88	Oct-08		2014
4413	LIT.	115	Jan-88		Sp 05	
4413	LIT.	143	Mar-88		Sp 05	
4413	LIT.	151	Mar-88	Spring 01		2010
4413	LIT.	153	Mar-88		Fall 98	
4413	LIT.	201	Jan-88	Spring 02		2010
4413	LIT.	202	Jan-88	Spring 02		2010
4413	LIT.	220	Dec-06			2012
4413	LIT.	231	Jan-88	Dec-06		2012
4413	LIT.	232		Dec-06		2012
4413	LIT.	240	Mar-96		Sp 05	
4413	LIT.	251	Jan-88		May-04	
4413	LIT.	260	Sep-02		May-08	
4413	LIT.	265	Apr-98		May-08	
4413	LIT.	271	Apr-98	Dec-04	May-08	
4413	LIT.	272	Apr-98	Dec-04	May-08	
4413	LIT.	273	Apr-98	Dec-04	May-08	
4413	LIT.	275	Apr-99		May-04	
4413	LIT.	276	Apr-99	Dec-04	May-08	
4413	LIT.	277	Nov-98		Sep-08	
4413	LIT.	278	Dec-02		May-08	
4413	LIT.	430	Mar-88	Sep-04 Sep-08		2014

4413	LIT.	804	Apr-98	Nov-06		2012
4413	LIT.	809	Apr-98	May-09		2015
4413	LIT.	820	Jan-07			2013
4413	LIT.	823	Apr-98	Spring 02		2010
4413	LIT.	824	Apr-98	Spring 02		2010
4413	LIT.	830	Apr-98	Apr-07		2014
				Sep-08		
4413	LIT.	835	Apr-98	Apr-07		2013
4413	LIT.	837	May-01	Dec-06		2012
4413	LIT.	838	May-01	Dec-06		2012
4413	LIT.	860	Sep-02		May-08	
4413	LIT.	865	Apr-98		May-08	
4413	LIT.	871	Apr-98	Dec-04	May-08	
4413	LIT.	872	Apr-98	Dec-04	May-08	
4413	LIT.	873	Apr-98	Dec-04	May-08	
4413	LIT.	875	Apr-99		May-04	
4413	LIT.	876	Apr-99	Dec-04	May-08	
4413	LIT.	877	Nov-98		Sep-08	
4413	LIT.	878	Dec-02		May-08	
4413	LIT.	256-9	Dec-02		May-08	
4413	LIT.	261-3			May-08	
4413	LIT.	856-9	Dec-02		May-08	
4413	LIT.	861-3	Dec-02	Spring 03	May-08	

**IX. Advisory and Consultation Team (ACT)**

- a. Please list non-program faculty who have participated on the program’s Advisory and Consultation Team. Their charge is to review the Program Review and Planning report before its submission and to provide a brief written report with comments, commendations, and suggestions to the Program Review team. Provided that they come from outside the program’s department, ACT members may be solicited from faculty at CSM, our two sister colleges, other community colleges, colleges or universities, and professionals in relevant fields. The ACT report should be attached to this document upon submission.

List ACT names here.

Amy Sobel, ESL  
 Rob Kommas, Math

March 21, 2010

Report Regarding the English Department Program Review for Spring 2010  
By Amy Sobel, ESL Faculty, College of San Mateo

**Comments/Commendations:**

After carefully reading the English Department's Program Review, I have two main commendations.

Most importantly, I commend the department for keeping the needs of its students as its primary focus. In spite of an increasing administrative load, fewer full-time faculty, active participation in college-wide discussions (accreditation, budget, and construction), and the challenges inherent in working with a large number of both full-time and adjunct faculty (some of whom cycle in and out), the department does an amazing job of keeping pedagogy, student needs, and student success at the focus of its work. The faculty are deeply invested in the success of their students, as is clear from the activities detailed in this Program Review.

Too, the English department, perhaps more fully than any other department on campus, participates in college- and district-wide activities such as BSI, mentorship of honors students, ad-hoc and standing college-wide and district-wide committees, distance-learning committees, etc. To some extent this might be expected of such a large department that offers a multitude of courses (basic skills, transfer-level, online), but I think that this commitment to the college and the district as a whole must be noted and commended. I believe that our college, in particular, has benefitted greatly from the input of these engaged and dedicated teachers on crucial matters facing CSM.

**Suggestions:**

I have written some suggestions on the Program Review itself; the sub-committee of the English department tasked with writing this document can decide whether or not to address those suggestions as it revises the document for submission. Many of my comments were essentially intended to encourage the sub-committee to detail more fully some of the English department's successes in terms of productivity and success rates, so that other departments could learn from these successes.

I have no major suggestions for the department as a whole at this time, other than to encourage the department to continue in its thoroughly professional work.

Report by Rob Komars:

I have read two program review documents this semester. Both read well and I suspect meet the legal requirements. The difference is that with one department the program review document meets the letter of the law but the department's actions do not meet the spirit of the law, while the other department actually means what they write. To know the quality of a document such

as this one must know the people behind the document. The English department has written a good document as near as I can tell. More importantly they back it up with action dedicated to improving their programs with the primary goal of improving student learning. This document I believe will lead to improved programs and improved student learning precisely because the faculty behind it are dedicated to thorough, meaningful and thoughtful review of the work they do.

- b. Briefly describe the program's response to and intended incorporation of the ACT report recommendations.

We greatly appreciate the considerable time and effort our colleagues invested in our Program Review process. Thank you to Teeka James for her careful editing of an early draft of our Program Review. We incorporated a number of Amy Sobel's suggestions for greater specificity, particularly regarding increased productivity, and we reviewed Rob Komasa's comments, rethinking how we responded to some of the sections in the Program Review, especially the Quantitative Skills section of GE SLO's and our emphasis on the need for full-time faculty in Section V.

We will continue to maintain our focus on student needs and student success while continuing to contribute to the Language Arts Division and the college in meaningful ways as department workload permits. We are pleased that two different reviewers, from different disciplines, noted our department's commitment to student learning.

---

**Upon its completion, please email this Program Review and Planning report to the Vice President of Instruction, the appropriate division dean, and the CSM Academic Senate President.**

**Date of evaluation:**

**Please list the department's Program Review and Planning report team:**

Primary program contact person: Anne Stafford  
Phone and email address: X6348 stafford@smccd.edu

Full-time faculty: James Carranza, Madeleine Murphy, Anne Stafford and Teeka James  
Part-time faculty:  
Administrators:

Classified staff:  
Students:

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

*Faculty's signatures*

*Date*

---

*Dean's signature*

*Date*