

2014-2015 Instructional Program Review

Program Name: **English & Literature**

Program Contact: **Stafford, Anne**

Academic Year: **2014-2015**

Status: **Submitted for review**

Updated on: **04/03/2015 08:57 AM**

1. Description of Program

Provide a brief description of the program and how it supports the college's **College Mission and Diversity Statements, Institutional Priorities, 2013/14-2015/16, 5 in 5 College Strategies, Spring 2011**, and other **Institutional Program Planning** as appropriate.

The English department plays an essential role in supporting and promoting the College Mission. The program improves student success and promotes academic excellence by providing high quality, integrated reading/writing composition courses—basic skills through transfer—and a small selection of literature courses to support students transferring and taking English AA or AA-T degrees. (The English AA-T degree was approved in September 2013). Members of the department consistently uphold the College Diversity Statement through participation in many programs and activities to help create a dynamic work environment that encourages multiple perspectives and the free exchange of ideas. The English department most directly supports *Institutional Priorities* 1, 2, 3, and 5. As the program review below reports, department faculty monitor student success at every level and promote students' progress in all courses, basic skills through transfer. The department assesses its course and program SLOs regularly to ensure continual improvement and high-quality course programming. In addition, English department collaborative projects or initiatives in recent years have both promoted the College's Institutional Priorities and implemented the *5 in 5 College Strategies*:

5 in 5 College Strategies, Basic Skills

Strategy 1: *Begin providing early intervention in high schools.* The department continues to work with English faculty from Hillsdale High School in order to better prepare their students, many of whom attend CSM after high school, for the work they will be asked to do here.

CSM English department hosted a spring conference in April 2014, during which Hillsdale faculty observed a number of CSM English classes in the morning and met with CSM faculty in the afternoon to ask follow-up questions about our teaching strategies and pedagogy, as well as inform us about the new Common Core standards for K-12 education.

CSM English faculty used one of the January 2015 Flex days to observe English classes at Hillsdale High and met with a number of HHS faculty throughout the afternoon to discuss our observations and questions about both the particular classes we observed that day and broader questions and issues impacting "our" (Hillsdale's and CSM's) students. CSM faculty gleaned valuable information about how Hillsdale has organized itself into "houses," each with a core advisor, a model reminiscent of some of our learning communities. Among other benefits, they have experienced fewer suspensions and better retention.

Next steps: CSM and Hillsdale faculty have agreed, at a minimum, to do the following:

- share assigned reading lists in order to avoid duplication
- attempt to track retention and success rates of students deemed by Hillsdale faculty to be most vulnerable
- meet to review and discuss passing and failing essays of students enrolled at CSM
- conduct more class observations in the future
- create a mini "Summer Bridge" activity to help familiarize some of Hillsdale's students with the CSM campus and available resources

Strategy 2: *Implement an intrusive core of support services.* As a result of a teaching circle that met throughout Spring and Fall 2013, members of the department created a new learning community in Fall 2014, Students for Success, which combined six developmental English classes with counseling and other essential support services. Students in these courses worked on projects designed to improve their awareness of and access to all college support services and met regularly with an assigned full-time counselor. Two of the six sections also worked with a designated Supplemental Instruction (SI) student leader.

Over the next two years, English will continue to work closely with the Learning Center to expand our collaboration with the SI program, by continuing to incorporate it into more sections of pre-transfer English courses. In Spring 2015, two sections of English 848 are offering Supplemental Instruction. Adjunct faculty teaching these sections are working with the Learning Center, and the SI leaders were trained by Ron Andrade in the Learning Center. Six sections of the Students for Success learning community are scheduled for the same time in Fall 2015, and at least two full-time instructors of those sections plan to use Supplemental Instruction.

The department also participates in the Writing in the End Zone, Puente, and Umoja learning communities (described in greater detail below). Each of these learning communities involves close collaboration between English department faculty and faculty in other disciplines, counselors, and coaches, to ensure students make use of support services such as counseling and the Writing and English 800 Centers.

Strategy 4: Establish transition/bridge programs and services. English continues to partner with the Math department and Learning Center in Pathways to College, a summer bridge program designed to help high school students who place into Basic Skills courses prepare for college and score higher on their placement tests in English and Math. While the program focuses more on Math, the English component is essential in preparing students for the rigors of college English courses. In summer 2014 two of the six students who opted to re-take the English placement test were able to place into higher English classes, and ten of the sixteen Pathways to College participants who enrolled in fall English classes passed and enrolled in the next English class for the spring.

While the English department as a whole is no longer directly involved in Project Change, the year-long bridge program providing outreach and mentorship to students transitioning from Hillcrest Juvenile Hall to CSM, individual department faculty continue to serve as mentors, and students in Project Change enroll in learning communities including English as a core requirement. Ten students were enrolled in the original project in 2014/2015; the second cohort for 2015/2016 will be comprised of 22 students.

5 in 5 College Strategies, Transfer

Strategy 2: Implement an honors program. Though no English department faculty currently coordinate the Honors Project, an adjunct English instructor is currently teaching one of the Honors seminars for the second consecutive semester, and other English faculty continue to serve as project advisors to students in the program.

Strategy 4: Establish "themed" experiences/ integrated learning communities. The English department has developed the following "themed," integrated learning communities as a result of department discussions over the past year. Two of the programs listed below (Students for Success and Umoja) are new programs. The others listed below (and described in less detail) are ongoing programs.

1. *Students for Success:* This learning community, scheduled to begin in Fall 2014, will connect six sections of pre-transfer English (English 848, Introduction to Composition and Reading, and English 838, Intensive Introduction to Composition and Reading) with counseling and other student support services through assignments and projects focusing on planning future classes, graduating, and/or transferring. Students enrolled in these sections will work with an assigned counselor, participate in events such as visits to four-year college campuses, and engage in discussions with guest speakers focusing the course themes. In addition, all course reading and writing assignments will focus on these goals.

3. *Umoja:* Now wrapping up its first year, (2014/2015) the CSM Umoja Community is an academic and transfer support program that combines an Afro-centric curriculum with dedicated counseling, mentoring, and networking opportunities. The program also features a unique professional development program called the Indaba that brings faculty, staff, and administrators together to discuss the obstacles that students of color face at CSM. For the upcoming academic year, Umoja will test out a new model: rather than restricting enrollment in the fall semester to students eligible for ENGL 838/848, and in the spring semester to ENGL 105 students, in Fall 2015, eligible students may enroll in ENGL 828, 838, or 105 along with their Ethnic Studies course, and in Spring 2016, eligible students may enroll in ENGL 838, 105, or 110 in conjunction with their Ethnic Studies course. The same full-time English faculty member who taught this year's dedicated Umoja English courses will teach all three sections of English for Umoja students in the 2015/2016 academic year.

4. *Writing in the End Zone:* After more than a decade, WEZ, a learning community pairing ENGL 838 and 100 with required courses for student-athletes in our football program, continues to be one of CSM's most successful transfer programs. In fall 2015, WEZ will add ENGL 110.

4. *The Puente Project:* Now in its third year, Puente is an ongoing developmental through transfer English and Counseling learning community taught by full-time faculty.

Strategy 5: Implement additional model transfer programs (e.g. Puente, MESA): As noted above, English has implemented the Puente Project in collaboration with Counseling, dedicating one full-time faculty member, with additional faculty in support and to rotate into the program in the future in order to provide longevity. The department has also implemented Umoja, a learning community similar to the Puente model. The first Umoja section, with one dedicated full-time faculty member in collaboration with a full-time ethnic studies professor and a counselor began in Fall 2014. Writing in the End Zone will expand in Fall 2015 with the addition of ENGL 110.

In addition to teaching and participating in the courses and programs described above, the department has been actively involved in a number of professional development activities. A member of the department recently served as the professional enrichment co-coordinator, and a full-time English instructor will serve as the Language Arts Division representative on the reconstituted Professional Development Committee. English faculty continue to serve as representatives on the Basic Skills Initiative Committee. Several full and part-time department faculty have also been active in the Reading Apprenticeship English Faculty Inquiry Group, which aims to increase student success in college-level reading. Faculty collaborate, sharing reading strategies and materials, to gain new perspectives on reading instruction. And full and part-time faculty also serve on the Committee on Instruction, Academic Senate, the Scholarship Screening Committee, the Library Advisory Committee, the AFT Executive Committee, and more.

2. Student Learning and Program Data

A. Discuss Student Learning Outcomes Assessment

1. Reflect on recent SLO assessment results for courses offered by the program. Identify trends and discuss areas in need of improvement.

A. Discuss Student Learning Outcomes Assessment

THE COMPOSITION PROGRAM

-

SLO assessment as a measure of student success - What we look for:

We already have multiple measures of student success at course level (persistence, success rates and retention). We therefore make use of the mandate to assess learning outcomes by looking for two things that the above measures don't tell us:

1. Whether student success (i.e., grades) reflects genuine mastery of learning outcomes
2. Which skills or aspects of our program need work.

-

Method

We read student essays to determine whether or not the student has mastered learning outcomes defined for the course. Each instructor must select eight essays at random from each of his or her preps (ideally, from each section). The essays must respond to a late assignment in the term that is designed to reflect all learning outcomes. (The assignment prompt is included.) Essays are then randomized and passed on to another instructor, who reads the papers and decides whether or not each paper shows mastery of each learning outcome.

-

2013-2014 assessment

Summary by course

ENGL 828

- Data pool: 7 essays
- SLO success rates: fluctuating

- Passing rates: 50.4% in 2013-2014
- Analysis: The sample size is too small, and biased (all essays respond to the same assignment) and thus we can't draw any conclusions.

ENGL 838/848:

- Data pool: 29 essays
- SLO success rates: General reading and writing skills showed strong success rates (86%), as did writing styles (72%). Proofreading success dipped to 51%.
- Passing rates: Students passed the class at significantly lower rates – about 56.5% for ENGL 838, and 59% for ENGL 848.

ENGL 100 and 100/101:

- Data pool: 38 essays.
- SLO success rates: General writing skills were strong (78%). SLOs pertaining to reading showed less success (44%), as did those assessing sentence-level writing (44%).
- Passing rates: Students passed the class at much stronger rates than the reading and sentence level assessments suggest – ENGL 100 had a pass rate of about 66%, and ENGL 101 a higher pass rate of 77%.

ENGL 110:

- Data pool: 30 essays.
- SLO success rates: Critical thinking and reading skills showed solid success rates (73%). Essay-writing declined (63%) and MLA skills seemed iffy (43%).
- Passing rates: Students passed the class at the fairly high rate of 70%.

ENGL 165:

- Data pool: 0 essays. (We have few sections; none provided papers in S14.)
- SLO success rates: n/a
- Passing rates: 74%

Analysis

Before offering any analysis, let me reiterate what last year's program review explained. It is very, very difficult to wring meaningful information from our SLO assessments. SLO assessments serve to create big data pools that show trends and areas of weakness – and this means that they need to be as standardized as possible. Earlier methods (norming) were far too lengthy and time-consuming, and yielded little data. Our current method creates a much larger data pool, but there are still problems. Neither the essays nor the evaluation has been standardized. Passing rates include students who do not participate in the assessment (students who stop coming but don't drop, students who don't submit all their work, and so on). All of which means that it's not clear exactly what our SLO success rates mean, nor how much we can infer from discrepancies between SLO success rates and passing rates.

We will continue to explore whether there are other, better ways to assess our students' learning outcomes meaningfully in preparation for the 2015-2016 assessment cycle.

Problems and solutions

1. Sentence skills

Though they appear to be improving, sentence skills remain an area of weakness. The discrepancy between the passing rates for the ENGL 838 and 848 courses, and student success in the SLOs relating to proofreading, suggests that poor sentence writing may be a major factor in students not passing these classes.

Weak writing is a nation-wide issue, hardly confined to CSM students. All the research suggests that our approach (sentence-building, generative rhetoric; guided practice in embedding phrases and extending sentences) is the only one that works. We have a Writing Center and an English 800 Center to give students guidance and support in sentence-level writing; ESL workshops for second-language students in the composition program; and tutorials and other online resources. Our limitation here is funding – we can't give students as much time in the Writing and English 800 Centers as we would like.

We have also rewritten the learning outcomes since this last assessment. New learning outcomes have streamlined the sentence writing aspect of our curriculum, making it clearer which skills should be focused on at each level. New outcomes will be assessed in the 2015-2016 cycle.

2. Reading comprehension

SLOs gauging reading comprehension show that students continue to have difficulty engaging with college-level texts. As with sentence writing, this is neither new nor unique to us; it's part of a national trend.

However, we do see something possibly interesting in these results. Students appear to succeed at reading in the 838 and 848 levels, where these skills are strongly emphasized (86%). Yet in ENGL 100, the reading comprehension levels sink back rather sharply, to 44%. There could be a number of explanations:

- The students who do well in ENGL 100 came through our successful basic writing program; the dip in scores comes from students taking the placement test.
- Students are performing well at the 838/848 level, but don't carry skills over from one course to another.
- Success at one course level isn't synonymous with success in the next – with each, more rigorous level, some students will find they cannot maintain their previous success rates.
- This year's results are anomalous; the variety in assignments and evaluation criteria means that we can't really tell what we're looking at.

We use our retreat to discuss possible strategies, curriculum changes or initiatives in relation to our assessments. This issue will be tabled for the Fall 2015 retreat.

Important issues NOT highlighted by SLO assessment

One of the limitations of course-by-course outcome assessment is that it doesn't actually bring us face-to-face with every important issue that affects student performance. Here are some things we are actively exploring:

- ENGL 165 continues to attract very few students, largely because it is poorly understood (students think it's more "advanced" than 110, and that it doesn't satisfy the same requirements) but also because of a prevailing belief (possibly correct, if mysterious) that UC prefers students to have taken ENGL 110. The result has been that ENGL 110 sections overflow with students with no interest in analyzing and writing about literature, which is the emphasis of ENGL 110. Many prefer analyzing non-fiction arguments, and perform better on these assignments. Faculty have long noted that student performance in ENGL 110 has been extremely weak; this may be because a substantial number would be better off in ENGL 165.

We've already addressed this, to some extent. To ensure that students understand that 110 and 165 meet the same requirements, we've changed the names and reworded the course descriptions (to take effect in Fall 2015). We will be working with counselors to make sure that students understand that both courses meet the same requirements. And we will explore the articulation with UC, to ensure that whatever ENGL 110 does, 165 can do as well.

THE LITERATURE PROGRAM

In the 2013-2014 year, we fielded five literature courses. One was cancelled due to insufficient enrolment.

-

SLO assessment as a measure of student success - What we look for:

The role of SLO assessments in literature courses isn't clear. While it's helpful to understand that, say, students who fail a composition class do so because of a weakness in a specific area (sentence-level skills, for instance), there's no comparable need for dividing a literature course into different aspects. Nor do we look for grade inflation in these content courses, where the students are generally motivated, the coursework manageable, and the goals more achievable.

-

Method

All outcomes were assessed in each course by the classroom instructor at the end of the semester, through a combination of methods (quiz, essays, oral presentation etc.)

-

2013-2014 assessment

Summary by course

LIT 231/837:

- Data pool: 13/1
- SLO success rates: 100% in both

LIT 101/804:

- Data pool: 23/3
- SLO success rates: 100% in both

LIT 113/813:

- Data pool: 8/0
- SLO success rates: between 75%-100% (except for SLO 1, which had a success rate of 0%)

LIT 151/835:

- Data pool: 21/ 4
- SLO success rates: 100% in both

LIT 232/838:

- Data pool: 22/0
- SLO success rates: 100% in both

Analysis

Student success remains around 100% for all students assessed (these were students who finished the classes). There were a few outliers, notably a success rate of 0% for the first learning outcome in LIT 113 (The Novel) – almost certainly because the outcome is poorly worded or does not lend itself easily to being measured in an assignment.

This is not a problem. These courses are not designed to fail anyone. They are content courses; students who do the work will meet the learning outcomes, and virtually all of the students who take the end-of-term assessments have done the work. ENGL 100 is a prerequisite for the literature classes, so we expect high success rates for the learning outcomes relating to essay writing.

Problems and solutions

1. SLO revision may be needed

Some outcomes are vaguely worded; in some courses, they are not consistent; they are often fussy and describe hard-to-measure course goals, or identify knowledge that might not be easily captured in a given assignment; and they are often simply too numerous. This issue can be addressed at the faculty retreat in Fall 2015, and also addressed as part of our efforts to improve enrolment in our literature program (see below).

2. Methods of assessment

We use many different assessment methods. We should perhaps discuss adopting uniform methods of assessment to standardize our assessments (though it may not be possible or desirable).

Important issues NOT highlighted by SLO assessment

One of the limitations of course-by-course outcome assessment is that it doesn't actually bring us face-to-face with every important issue that affects student performance. Here are some things we are actively exploring:

- *Enrolment.* Our literature courses continue to be severely under-enrolled. We've had to make cancellations, and those courses that run barely make the required numbers. Our literature committee is exploring ways to promote our literature program: we are weighing the importance of the pre-requisite, reviewing our articulation agreements, and exploring new ways to come up with a small yet varied program.
- *Participation in the 800-level courses.* These book-club style options used to be more popular, and we believe that more adults in the community could be enticed into taking our 800-level literature classes. Our literature committee is exploring better means of publicizing them.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION – ENGLISH PROGRAM REVIEW**Student Learning Outcomes: Success Rates (By Course) and Pass Rates****COMPOSITION PROGRAM**

ENGL 828 (7 essays)	Success
Read a text and understand main point & supporting points	100% (7)
Write short, expository, text-based essays	28% (2)
Demonstrate understanding that reading & writing are meaning-making processes	100%* (7)
Show logical relationships between ideas at sentence level	28% (2)
Proofread for basic grammar and usage errors	14% (1)
COMMENTS:	
SLO 2: They didn't respond to the prompt or have a thesis, etc. *SLO 3: I have no way of judging this, sorry!	
Pass rates:	
Fall 2013 – 60.8% Spring 2014 – 40%	

ENGL 838/848 (29 essays)	Success
Use effective reading strategies (main pt & supporting pts) to comprehend a variety of texts	86% (25)
Write expository essays unified around a clear thesis statement	86% (25)
Develop essays using specific details drawn from assigned texts as well as personal experience & knowledge	86% (25)
Write fluent, clearly focused, complex sentences	72% (21)
Proofread effectively for basic grammar and usage errors	51% (15)
COMMENTS:	
SLO 1 - This was hard to gauge so I just looked at whether the student knew what he/she was talking about without respect to the sources. SLO 3: Details? Yes. Developed thoughts & analysis? Not so much.	
Pass Rates:	
Fall 2013: 838 62.4% 848 67.5%	

Spring 2014: 838 62.4% | 848 50.5%

ENGL 100/105 (38 essays)	success
Exhibit the ability to analyze and respond critically to college-level texts	44% (17)
Write effectively organized text-based expository essays	78% (30)
Demonstrate an understanding of purpose and audience in reading and writing	57% (22)
construct syntactically mature and grammatically sound prose	44% (17)
integrate textual material using standard MLA format	42% (16)
<p><u>COMMENTS –</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Poor assignment. It asked for 7 pages of research & an annotated bibliography. I don't think any students fulfilled these requirements. • SLO 1 – This will be easier to assess with our new course outline • SLO 2 – This one I have trouble assessing with confidence <p>Two essays are possibly plagiarized but I didn't bother to check.</p>	
<p><u>Pass Rates:</u></p> <p>Fall 2013: 100 67% 105 80.9%</p> <p>Spring 2014: 100 64.9% 105 73.5%</p>	

ENGL 110 (30 essays)	success
Apply critical thinking and reading skills to literature, in order to analyze the author's strategies and purpose, which is often implicit	73% (22)
Write essays analyzing literary genres using sophisticated organization and a variety of sentence structures	63% (19)
Use standard MLA format	43% (13)
<p><u>COMMENTS</u></p> <p>SLO 3: Periods on wrong side of parenthetical citation sometimes, but otherwise good</p> <p>SLO 1: Happy to see about ½ the essays meet the standards</p>	
<p><u>Pass Rates</u></p> <p>Fall 2013: 71.5%</p> <p>Spring 2014: 68.5%</p>	

LITERATURE PROGRAM – SLO RESULTS 2013-2014

LIT 231 (13 students) –Survey of British Literature I *837 (1 student)	Success
Understand the cultural and historical context of English literature, 1350-1789	100% *100%
Understand, analyze and discuss the significance of a selection of literary works	100% *100%
Understand the role of literature in critical thinking	100% *100%
Write carefully observed, detailed analyses of texts, appropriately supported and cited. (<i>LIT 231 only</i>)	100% *100%

LIT 101 – Twentieth Century Literature (23 students assessed) *804 (3 students assessed)	Success
Demonstrate an understanding of major experiments with form made by writers of fiction, poetry, and/or drama in the twentieth century and of the ways in which those experiments interact with or reflect content.	100% *100%
Demonstrate an understanding of the connections among the century's major historical events and cultural changes and the forms and themes evident in literature.	100% *100%
Demonstrate an awareness of the canonical writers of the twentieth century, important literary movements, and the emergence of new literary theories.	100% *100%
Write analytical essays using the normal conventions of literary criticism, including argumentation, presentation of evidence, and documentation in standard format. (<i>101 only</i>)	100% *100%

LIT 113 – The Novel (8 essays assessed) *813 (no students)	Success
Demonstrate an understanding of the novel as a unique literary form, compared to other genres of literature	0%
Demonstrate an understanding of the relationship between the crafting of a novel and its success as a literary work	75%

Demonstrating an understanding of how cultural movements and historical trends influence novels, both in their scope and in their literary components (plot, characterization, theme)	100%
Demonstrate an understanding of why certain novels (both canonical and non-canonical) are representative of their times	87%
Write analytical essays using the normal conventions of literary criticism, including argumentation, presentation of evidence, and documentation in standard MLA format. <i>(113 only)</i>	87%

LIT 151 – Shakespeare (21 students assessed)	Success
Develop independent critical responses to Shakespeare's works	60%
Place Shakespeare's works within a historical and literary context	100%
Explain Shakespeare's role in the development of English language and literature	100%
Identify and analyze major themes in Shakespeare's sonnets and/or longer poems	100%
Identify and analyze major themes in the tragedies, comedies, history and romance plays	100%
LIT 835 – Shakespeare (credit/no credit) – 4 students assessed	
Demonstrate a knowledge of the cultural, historical and literary context of Shakespeare's work.	100%
Demonstrate the ability to analyze and discuss the significance of a selection of literary works.	100%

LIT 232 – Survey of British Literature II (22 students assessed) *838 (no students)	Success
Understand the cultural and historical context of English literature, 1789 - 1930	100%
Demonstrate an ability to analyze and discuss the significance of a number of literary works.	100%
Demonstrate an ability to write carefully observed, detailed literary analyses of texts, appropriately supported and cited. <i>(232 only)</i>	100%

2. Comment on the success rates in the program SLOs that are aligned with specific course SLOs. What do the program SLO and course data reveal about students completing the program? Identify trends and discuss areas in need of improvement. Is the alignment between course and program SLOs appropriate and informative? See **course-to-program SLO alignment mapping**.

Method of assessment

Finding a meaningful method of assessment for program SLOs poses all kinds of problems. There are very few English majors to begin with; most students majoring in English transfer, many without bothering to take an A.A.; other than in composition, courses are not sequenced, and thus it would be difficult to create a capstone course or assignment to measure; and since students often don't register for a major until they have completed many of the courses required, we have no way of following them individually.

For the moment we use a self-reported questionnaire. In 2013-14, five students responded to three questions regarding their mastery of the learning outcomes for the degree. Not surprisingly, all five students expressed confidence in their skills, yielding SLO success rates of 100%.

Alignment with program SLOs

Course alignment is certainly appropriate. The English program has only two learning outcomes:

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

All composition courses support SLO #1; all literature courses support SLO #2.

Analysis

While we have some insight into the weaknesses and strengths of the composition program overall (see above), it's not clear how these trends apply specifically to English majors. Most likely the handful of students who have taken an AA in English are among those students who demonstrated that they had mastered the learning outcomes in composition, so whatever weaknesses might exist in the program won't apply to them.

Areas needing improvement

- Review possible methods of program assessment for the English degree to make SLO assessment more informative.

3. Evaluate the program SLOs in relation to survey data from the degree and certificate award earners survey. What does the survey data reveal about the effectiveness of the program SLOs? Identify trends and discuss areas in need of improvement.

As noted above, the degree and certificate award earners survey *is* how we assess our learning outcomes at the program level. See response to question #2 for thoughts on the trends and areas of improvement.

4. Describe any additional methods used to assess program SLOs and reflect on the results of those assessments.

None.

5. For any courses in the program that satisfy a GE requirement, which GE SLOs are supported or reinforced by the course SLOs? What do assessment results for the course SLOs reveal about student attainment of the GE SLOs? See **GE SLO Alignment Summary Report** or **All Courses GE SLO Alignment Data**.

Virtually all our courses support GE requirements.

Composition:

GE-SLO #1: Supported by all courses

GE-SLOs #2-4: Supported by ENGL 838, 848, 100, 102, 110, 161-3, 165

Literature

GE-SLO#1: Supported by all transfer-level literature courses

GE-SLO#2-4: Supported by all literature courses (transfer and 800-level)

-

Analysis

GE-SLO rates are assessed at the college level by self-reporting questionnaire. The response rate is much larger than for the English program – around 1,000 students per semester – but the problem of self-perception remains: students registering for a degree are unlikely to declare themselves incompetent in key skills identified by the GE learning outcomes. The questionnaire shows success rates in the mid- to high-90s%.

However, our assessment of our own composition programs suggests the following:

- A significant challenge to students (though by no means the only challenge) working on GE-SLO #1 (communication) is clarity and precision in sentence-level writing. - Students consistently score lower on those composition SLOs intended to gauge sentence-level skills.
- A significant challenge to faculty (though by no means the only challenge) working on GE-SLO #2 (critical thinking) is in assessment. – Critical thinking is notoriously difficult to assess; and although we have guidelines in the GE-SLO rubric, different disciplines will apply these in different ways.

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.

Overall success rates in English composition and literature courses were up slightly in 2013/2014 from the previous two years (to 66.6%) while retention/withdraw rates remained almost unchanged (overall retention was 80.7%; composition retention was 80.6%)

While African American, Filipino, Hispanic, Native American, and Pacific Islander students continue to succeed at rates lower than Asian and white students, success rates for all of the former groups increased, with the exception of Native American students. However, it is important to note that the total number of students identified as Native American was extremely small (11). African American students experienced the largest increase in success rates of any ethnic group: 7.9% over two years (2011/2012 - 2013/2014).

The data show that Writing in the End Zone, now in its twelfth year, continues to enjoy measurable success for African American and Pacific Islander male students age 21 and under. Historically the two student groups with the lowest success rates at CSM, those enrolled in WEZ have been succeeding at higher rates than their counterparts in non-WEZ English courses and withdrawing at lower rates for over a decade. The following rates are for the period of Fall 2004 - Fall 2013:

	ENGL 838		ENGL 105	
	% Success		%Success	
	WEZ	Non-WEZ	WEZ	Non-WEZ
Af-American	71.8	44.1	73.2	52.2
Pac. Island	69.0	53.8	75.8	49.3

The English department aims for similar success with additional learning communities referred to earlier in this Program Review - Puente, Umoja, and Students for Success - and with programs like Pathways to College and Project Change, using the same deep collaboration across disciplines, student-centered approaches, and focus on connecting students to appropriate campus resources. We will continue doing what we know works, and will redouble our efforts to close the success gap between minority students and white and Asian students.

Both male and female students succeeded at rates slightly higher rates over two years (66.6%), with female students succeeding at a slightly higher rate than male students (69.2% versus 64.6%).

Interestingly, success rates improved among our youngest students (29 and under) but declined among students 30 and older. The most significant increase was for students 25-29 (from 58.4% to 75.1 in two years); the most significant decline was for students 30-34 (66.2 to 24.2). This anomaly in the 30-34-year-old group is disconcerting, something we will investigate in the fall 2015 semester - after we see how that group did in Fall 2014 and Spring 2015.

A small percentage of students (roughly 5%) place into basic skills courses in English, also unchanged since the last program review.

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

Distance education courses in English continue to fill. In Fall 2013, the department offered one section each of ENGL 100, ENGL 110 and ENGL 165. ENGL 100 and ENGL 165 were fully enrolled (actually over-enrolled at 27 students each) while ENGL 110 saw 19 students enroll

Distance education courses continue to have lower retention and success rates than traditional classes:

ENGL 100, Online Mode	ENGL100, Traditional
Success: 40.7%	Success: 68.2%
Retention: 70.4%	Retention: 82.9%

ENGL 110, Online Mode	ENGL 110, Traditional
Success: 57.9%	Success: 72.2%
Retention: 68.4%	Retention: 82.6%

ENGL 165, Online Mode	ENGL 165, Traditional
Success: 74.1%	Success: 83.6%
Retention: 77.8%	Retention: 96.4%

One notable change is the significantly increased success and retention rates in the online ENGL 165 section: success went from 34.8% to 74.1%, and retention went from 65.2% to 77.8%. However, the caveat noted in the 2014 review is still relevant here: we are looking at only a few sections taught by two teachers, so it is difficult to draw reliable inferences. Overall, the success rates of online classes have remained lower than those of traditional classes over time. Because of these lower rates, the department remains reluctant to offer lower-level courses online.

To support online students, the Writing Center has improved a number of programs since the previous review.

The Writing Center is aware that many students in distance education courses face serious challenges in getting to campus for in-person meetings for help with their writing. The Centers continue to explore ways to retain and serve online students; for example, since Spring 2012, the Centers have offered online essay conferencing, to improve ancillary instructional support for online students. Adjunct faculty member Joyce Heyman has continued to serve as an online tutor with two FLCs per week that allow her to work in online essays conferences using technologies such as GoogleChat, Skype, and screen-capture software.

The online essay conferencing can also benefit some CSM students enrolled in traditional-delivery English courses. This option is ideal for students who have so many family and job commitments that they find it difficult to stay on campus beyond class time. Every semester, we advertise our online conferencing in mandatory student orientations and in English department memorandums and meetings. During drop-in hours, students who cannot get a conference are referred to online conferencing.

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.)

LOAD and other program efficiency indicators for Composition courses have changed little, if at all, since the previous program review.

ENGLISH

LOAD: 408 (down from 413 in 2011/2012, and 409 in 2012/2013). Since the maximum LOAD for composition courses is about 390, given the fact that we have a contractual enrollment limitation of 26, composition courses continue to run at over 100% efficiency.

LOAD and other program efficiency indicators for Literature courses have improved.

LITERATURE

*Note: Last year's LOAD for Literature courses was identified incorrectly as 295 (that number was for Spring 2013 only. The LOAD for 2012/2013 was 315).

LOAD: 382. We are happy to see that our LOAD is up. The Literature Committee will continue to make adjustments to the scheduling of courses in an effort to increase enrollment. The committee will also discuss whether declining enrollment is related to computerized prerequisite checking, which currently seems to discourage students who *do* meet prerequisites, but have taken courses at other colleges. As noted earlier (Section 4, Plan 2: Literature Alignment), we will also consider removing the ENGL 100 prerequisite for some Literature courses.

3. 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.

As noted in section I, the department is continuing to meet with English faculty from Hillsdale High School in order to better prepare their students, many of whom attend CSM after high school. As a result of these meetings, Hillsdale faculty observed CSM English classes during the Spring 2014 term. The following in-depth discussions focused on Common Core, the new K-12 composition curriculum effective 2015, as well as CSM faculty observations about the areas of greatest challenge facing incoming freshman. CSM English faculty observed Hillsdale English classes during one of our two January 2015 Flex days, giving us a first-hand look at what students are experiencing throughout the grade levels in preparation for college. Hillsdale faculty members continue to be interested in aligning their curriculum more closely to ours.

4. Planning

A. Results of Program Plans and Actions

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

Plan 1: Develop new methods of SLO assessment

Please refer to section 2, Student Learning and Program Data; A, Discuss Student Learning Outcomes Assessment; 1, Reflect on recent SLO assessment results for courses offered by the program. Identify trends and discuss areas in need of improvement.

Plan 2: Literature alignment

The literature committee continues working to increase enrollment in literature courses - low enrollment is an ongoing problem. In addition to offering courses that English majors need and that articulate with four-year college and universities, members of the committee are currently investigating what other community colleges in the Bay Area are doing in their programs, looking at both what works and what doesn't, and will soon consider making concurrent enrollment in, rather than completion of, English 100 the prerequisite for some literature courses.

In addition to our work aligning our Literature courses, revised Composition course outlines, from basic skills through transfer, have been approved for the Fall 2015 catalog. The department took a very different approach to this round of updates. Rather than individual faculty (in collaboration with colleagues of course) revising the course outlines for individual composition courses, a group of four faculty (following department-wide workshops and meetings devoted to creating more useful course outlines) worked together to update all of the outlines at the same time, focusing on one core element at a time (reading, writing, critical thinking) for all of the course levels. The new outlines serve a multitude of purposes:

- Make clearer the specific skills students need for success in the next course.
- Help new faculty to better understand the distinctions between the course levels.
- Help faculty in other disciplines to better understand the skills/material covered at each level as they make decisions about recommended preparation for their course.

B. Program Vision

What is the program's *vision* for sustaining and improving student learning and success over the next three years? Make connections to the **College Mission and Diversity Statements, Institutional Priorities, 2013/14-2015/16**, and other **Institutional Program Planning** as appropriate. Address discussion in the Student Learning and Program Data section: SLO assessment results and trends in student success indicators.

[Note: Specific plans to be implemented in the next year should be entered in C of the Planning section.

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 D1 and D2 of the Career Technical Education section.]

The English department is committed to maintaining high academic standards while providing both students and faculty with as much support as possible, given our limited resources. As students' needs and demographics (particularly with regard to ethnic and cultural diversity) undoubtedly will continue to change, the English department will remain proactive in its efforts to modify curriculum, work closely with the Writing and English 800 Centers to improve student engagement and success, provide faculty with professional development opportunities, and collaborate with Student Support Services, the Learning Center and the Library, colleagues across disciplines, and colleagues at local high schools. Screening committees for full and part time faculty will continue to focus on ensuring that new members of the department share our values of collaboration, diversity, and professional growth. In addition, English faculty have expressed interest in participating in more programs to address LGBTQ awareness.

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

Generally, the English Department values professional enrichment activities that involve:

- emphasis on the needs of students in Basic Skills and other pre-transfer courses
- emphasis on the needs of students in traditionally underserved/underrepresented groups
- collaboration with faculty in other disciplines
- collaboration with student support services, particularly counseling

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.

The department will continue to participate in the Basic Skills Initiative, Reading Apprenticeship, and all of the learning communities described above.

3. To guide the **Institutional Planning Budget Committee** (IPBC) in long-range planning, identify any major changes in resource needs anticipated during the next three years. Examples: faculty retirements, equipment obsolescence, space allocation.

See the Resource Requests section below to enter itemized resource requests for next year.
Leave sections blank if no major changes are anticipated.

Faculty

The English department currently includes 13 full-time faculty and 23 adjunct faculty (up from 19 in Fall 2014). One full-time faculty left last year to take a new position as Dean of Language Arts, one is scheduled to retire at the end of the current semester and another has been out on medical leave (it is not clear when/if she will return). It is almost certain that at least two additional full-time faculty will retire within the next three years. Because our department must rely so heavily on adjunct faculty to staff our classes, the rigorous and extraordinarily time-consuming processes of application screening, interviewing, and evaluating never end. We hired six new adjunct faculty for this Spring 2015 semester, and at the moment we have ten unstaffed sections for the Fall 2015 semester (of course this number may increase), which will require hiring five or more additional faculty.

In addition to evaluating all newly hired adjunct faculty in their first semester and all other adjunct faculty every two-three years, and in addition to conducting peer evaluation (now "tenured" evaluation), most tenured full-time English faculty, along with our division colleagues, are currently serving on two tenure committees. None of us is complaining about having been able to hire new faculty, but our time is a finite resource.

As earlier portions of the Program Review make clear, English faculty, both full and part-time, contribute extensively to the department, to the Language Arts Division, and the to college as a whole. English faculty play critical roles in most of the college's learning communities and the Honors Project; have been instrumental in bringing speakers to campus (Adam Johnson, Judy Budnitz, and others); serve as representatives on nearly every standing Senate committee, as advisors to student clubs (including Alpha Gamma Sigma, the largest and most active club on campus), and as leaders in our faculty union (AFT 1493); and have been and continue to be enthusiastic participants in numerous initiatives: Reading Apprenticeship, First-Year Experience, Basic Skills Initiative. We could go on, but we won't.

We are committed to supporting and mentoring our new faculty, and to the above mentioned projects, programs, and initiatives, all of which are aimed at supporting students success, the college's mission, and institutional priorities, but they all take time - and lots of it.

Equipment and Technology

Instructional Materials

Classified Staff

Facilities

C. Program 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, 2013/14-2015/16**. For each plan, list actions and measurable outcomes. (Plans may extend beyond a single year.)

Plan 1

Title:
Work to improve retention, success, and persistence rates, particularly among developmental writing students and minority students.

Description
Continue to offer existing Learning Communities; continue and expand Supplemental Instruction; explore/investigate Acceleration in Developmental courses.

Action(s)	Completion Date	Measurable Outcome(s)
Continue to utilize, and perhaps expand, Supplemental Instruction in pre-transfer courses.	Spring 2016 (Ongoing)	Increased retention and success rates in pre-transfer courses, and increased persistence rates overall.
Continue to offer Learning Communities, such as Writing in the End Zone, Puente, and Umoja, all of which target historically low-performing student groups.	Spring 2016 (Ongoing)	Increased retention, success, and persistence rates for African American, Hispanic, and Pacific Islander students.
Explore/investigate Acceleration in Developmental Composition courses as one way to reduce racial equity gaps. Evidence shows that when the number of developmental courses students need to take is reduced, success, retention, and persistence rates can improve, and racial equity gaps can diminish.	Spring 2016	A small number of faculty will join the California Acceleration Project's Community of Practice for further training and support in acceleration. Faculty will attend an Acceleration conference in June 2015 to learn more about different acceleration models. These faculty will report back to the department at at least one department meeting in Fall 2015. The department as a whole will decide whether we want to adopt (or continue investigating) some type of acceleration model as a way to reduce racial equity gaps and improve retention, success, and persistence rates overall.

Plan 2

Title:
Increase visibility of English department and major

Description
Create a new department website; host first annual reading of student work

Action(s)	Completion Date	Measurable Outcome(s)
New more user-friendly department website, including faculty photos and short biographies, more information about the English AA/AA-T as well as the Literature and Creative Writing programs, and an event calendar.	Fall 2015	Completion of website
To increase visibility of the English department, and the English major, in April/May 2015 we will be hosting what we hope is just the first annual event to honor transferring English majors and to celebrate student writing in all disciplines. This year's event (as yet unnamed) will feature readings of student work from all composition course levels as well as from literature and creative writing classes. In addition to a curated selection of student work, the event will recognize transferring English majors and will feature an open-mic reading open to writers across the campus.	Spring 2015 (Ongoing)	A strong turnout for the event, followed by equally strong or better turnout the following year. *We believe that a more dynamic website and other efforts to increase visibility of the English department and its Literature and Creative Writing programs can ultimately increase the number of English majors and boost enrollment in our Literature program. We also recognize that that this growth - if it occurs - will be a relatively slow process. We will, of course, monitor any changes for the foreseeable future.

5. Resource Requests

Itemized Resource Requests

List the resources needed for ongoing program operation.

Faculty

NOTE: To make a faculty position request, complete **Full-time Faculty Position Request Form** and notify your Dean. This request is separate from the program review.

Full-time faculty requests	Number of positions
Message will be emailed to the dean	Three

Equipment and Technology

Description	Cost

Instructional Material

Description	Cost

Classified Staff

Description	Cost

Facilities

For immediate or routine facilities requests, submit a CSM Facility Project Request Form.

Description	Cost

6. Program Maintenance

A. Course Outline Updates

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

Courses to be updated	Faculty contact	Submission month
ENGL 161	Anne Stafford	November 2015
ENGL 162	Anne Stafford	November 2015
ENGL 163	Anne Stafford	November 2015
LIT 105	Anne Stafford	November 2015
LIT 113	Anne Stafford	November 2015
LIT 430	Anne Stafford	November 2015
LIT 809	Anne Stafford	November 2015
LIT 813	Anne Stafford	November 2015
LIT 820	Anne Stafford	November 2015
LIT 830	Anne Stafford	November 2015

B. Website Review

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

Faculty contact(s)	Date of next review/update
Jeremy Wallace	Fall 2015

C. SLO Assessment Contacts

Faculty contact(s)	Date of next review/update
Madeline Murphy	Department retreat, Fall 2015 (date TBD)