

Instructional Program Review

Program Name: **English & Literature**

Program Contact: **Murphy, Madeleine**

Academic Year: **2016-2017**

Status: **Submitted for review**

Updated on: **10/28/2016 05:55 PM**

1. Description of Program

Provide a brief description of the program and how it supports the college's [College Mission and Diversity Statements](#), [CSM Strategic Goals 2013/14 to 2015/16](#), and other [Institutional Program Planning](#) as appropriate. What is the program's vision for sustaining and improving student learning and success over the next three years?

Our program

Courses

Regular course offerings include:

- integrated reading/writing composition courses, from basic skills through transfer (160 sections in 2015-2016)
- literature courses tailored to serve the English major curricular requirements (10 sections in 2015-2016, though this really means 5 sections, since the course can be taken in two ways)
- creative writing courses (12 sections in 2015-2016 - though in fact, this really translates to two actual sections, since these courses can be taken at three levels).

Occasional course offerings:

- a grammar class (ENGL 875)
- special projects (ENGL 690)

Neither ENGL 875 nor ENGL 690 were offered in the 2015-2016 academic year.

We also offer tutoring in the Writing Center through ENGL 850 (discussed in the Writing Center/ENGL 800 lab's program review).

Degrees:

English AA and AA-T

The department's support for institutional mission, goals and strategies

English is a gateway discipline; all transfer students, and many career-oriented students too, must take an English class of one kind or other.

Our department has responded, in many ways, to key college-wide priorities outlined in its various institutional documents listed above.

Learning communities

English faculty continue to participate in the following communities, targeting underserved, at-risk, or developing student populations:

- Umoja – a “transfer support program that focuses on the African American experience through the study of culture, history, literature, and identity.”

- Puente—a collaborative, transfer support program committed to supporting under-represented student populations, specifically first-generation Latino students. Currently in its 5th year at CSM, Puente provides English instruction, academic counseling, and mentorship through an integrated, student-centered curriculum. Puente coordinators design culturally-relevant curricula which are supplemented with out-of-class field trips and activities throughout the academic year.
- Writing In the End Zone – a “a learning community that links English and Physical Education” created to address the “low success, retention, and persistence rates of African American and Pacific Islander male students at College of San Mateo in English courses;”
- Students for Success – Students for Success connect six sections of English 105 with counseling and other student support services through reading and writing assignments and projects focusing on succeeding in their current classes and also making careful plans for future classes, leading to their goals of graduating, and/or transferring. Students enrolled in these sections work with an assigned counselor, participate in events such as transfer and career center workshops and engage in discussions with guest speakers focusing on the course themes.

Both Puente and Umoja faculty participate in numerous professional development activities and trainings throughout the academic year to ensure that their respective curricula are culturally relevant and that the programs they coordinate are in accordance with state standards.

These communities support

- Strategic Goals 1, 2 and 3 (to improve student success, promote academic excellence, and develop responsive, high-quality programs and services);
- the College’s Diversity Statement, by providing “equal opportunity for all;”
- key strategies outlined in the “5-in-5” (Basic Skills 2 and 4: to implement an “intrusive” core of support services, and to establish transition/bridge programs and services; and Transfer strategies 4 and 5, to establish “themed” experiences / integrated learning communities, and to implement additional model transfer programs).

English faculty also continue to participate in other learning communities focusing on transfer students:

- The Honors Project – a learning community serving students interested in transfer-level independent study.

The Honors project supports

- Strategic goals 1, 2 and 3 (to improve student success, promote academic excellence, and develop responsive, high-quality programs and services);
- The College’s Diversity Statement, by fostering “a dynamic learning and working environment that encourages multiple perspectives and the free exchange of ideas;”
- Key strategies outlined in the “5-in-5” (Transfer strategies 2 and 4, to implement an Honors Program, and to established “themed” experiences / learning communities.”

(Note: While English faculty are involved with these learning communities, and in some cases originated them, most of them report to the Academic Support and Learning Technologies division.)

Supplemental Instruction

The English department continues to implement Supplemental Instruction as another way to support our students in our developmental courses as well as in English 105. In both Spring and Fall 2016, 3 sections of English incorporated SI. Data indicates that Supplemental Instruction in English courses has a significant impact on student success. In 2 of 3 sections which offered SI, at least 70% of the students enrolled attended at least 1 SI section. For AY '15-'16, English sections with SI had a D/F/W rate of 23% while non-SI sections had a D/F/W rate of 48%. At least one instructor continues to make use of SI in Fall 2016.

The use of Supplemental Instruction supports:

- Strategic goals 1, 2 and 3 (to improve student success, and promote academic excellence, and develop responsive, high-quality programs and services);
- Key strategies outlined in the “5-in-5” (Basic Skills strategy 3, to establish a comprehensive learning center).

High school outreach

As described in our Spring 2015 Program Review, we continue to work with our local high schools to facilitate a smooth transition from our feeder high schools to our composition courses in English.

Six full time faculty met with Aragon HS English faculty during one of their professional development days on campus; we shared assignments, course outlines, and answered questions about the reading and writing tasks we ask of our students.

Our high school outreach supports:

- key strategies from the “5-in-5” (Basic Skills, strategy 1, to provide early intervention in high schools).

Other activities

The Writers’ Ruckus

Now in its third year, the Ruckus features selected student writing and an open mike. It has been a great success in each of its outings, featuring some twelve to fifteen student readers (and, occasionally, faculty readers too). The goal is to encourage and celebrate student writing, to increase the profile of literature and creative writing on campus, and also to provide students with a forum, outside the discipline-specific classroom, where they can share and discuss their work – very much in line with the spirit of learning outcomes assessment. (In 2016, the Ruckus is working more closely with *Labyrinth*, the Honors Project publication, to promote student writing.)

Committees and reassigned duties:

- virtually all full-time faculty have some reassigned time (to coordinate the Writing and ENGL 800 centers; to coordinate learning communities; to act as Student Learning Outcomes Coordinator)
- faculty participate in key committees (Academic Senate Governing Council, Committee on Instruction, Professional Development, Scholarship Screening Committee, Library Advisory Committee, AFT Executive Committee).

These activities support

- Strategic Goals 1, 3, 4 and 6 (to improve student success; to develop responsive, high-quality programs and services; to support professional development; and to enhance institutional dialog)
- The College’s Diversity Statement, reflecting its commitment to “inclusiveness that recognizes, values and reflects the diversity of the community it serves;”
- Key strategies outlined in the “5-in-5” (Transfer strategies 1, 4 and 5 – to enhance transfer services, to established “themed” experiences / integrated learning communities, and to implement model transfer programs).

Vision for the coming years

We would like to

- Continue to grow the literature program, expanding offerings and drawing in a new and more diverse body of students, as well as serving English majors
- Continue to improve student success in the transition from high school
- Continue to work on supporting students in their transfer goals

2. Student Learning and Program Data

A. Discuss Student Learning Outcomes Assessment

1. Reflect on recent SLO assessment results for courses and degrees and certificates offered by the program. Specify how SLO assessment informs curriculum development and changes to curriculum.

Composition courses SLO assessment

Our last Program Review, submitted in April 2015, discussed results from our 2013-2014 cycle.

Our most recent SLO assessment took place in Spring 2015. Here are the results next to those from Spring 2014 (included in our Spring 2015 program review submission).

Summary by course

ENGL 828

- Data pool: 8 essays
- SLO success rates: between 5 and 7 out of 8
- Passing rates: F15 54.4% - S16 53.8%
- Change from 2014-2015: Inconclusive
- Analysis:
 - SLO sample size remains too small
 - Lower rates of success may reflect factors other than a one-off gauge of competency.

ENGL 838/848

- Data pool: 24 essays
- SLO success rates: Overall writing skills remained the strongest, between 100% (for the 848 papers) and 68% (for the 838). Reading and sentence skills were weaker, especially for the 838 papers (65%).
- Passing rates: ENGL 838: F15 64.4% – 54.2% S16 ENGL 848: F15 - S16
- Change from 2014-2015: Not much
- Analysis:
 - The 848 sample size is too small – just eight papers. The 838 sample size is more substantial, and confirms the continuing trend that students have most difficulty with reading and sentence-level writing.
 - Success rates are rather lower than the SLO success rates, perhaps reflecting the difficulty in a one-off assessment, or the fact that other issues intrude on student success.

ENGL 100 / 105

- Data pool: 31 essays
- SLO success rates: The 22 ENGL 100 papers reflected a strong pattern of learning, with between 72% and 100% of student papers demonstrating proficiency (weaker areas were sentence level writing and use of MLA format). The nine papers from ENGL 105 reflected lower levels of success, with only 33% to 55% showing proficiency (interestingly, the learning outcomes that are highest here are the ones that are usually lowest, namely, the sentence-level writing outcomes, which about half of students showed competence in).
- Passing rates: ENGL 100 – F15 73.4%, S16 67.1% / ENGL 105 – F15 69%, S16 59.8%
- Change from 2014-2015: Not much
- Analysis:
 - Reading and sentence-level writing remain key areas of weakness
 - SLO success rates closely track grades in ENGL 100; not so much in ENGL 105, but from a data pool of nine papers from one class, that doesn't mean much.

ENGL 110

- Data pool: 16 essays
- SLO success rates: Critical thinking SLO scored highly, with 93% of students demonstrating proficiency. Students were weakest on MLA format (68%) and essay writing was a bit lower than the critical thinking SLO (75%).
- Passing rates: F15 75.3%, S16 77.3%
- Change from 2014-2015: Not much
- Analysis:
 - Critical thinking is an important goal of the course, but virtually impossible to measure. While this year's 93% seems like a huge improvement on last year's 73%, it likely is more a result of the difficulty of assessing critical thinking, and the smaller data pool (last year, we read twice as many essays).
 - Success rates reflect SLOs competency overall

ENGL 165

- Data pool: 5 essays
- SLO success rates: between 80% and 100%
- Passing rates: F15 73.1% - S16 83.9%
- Change from 2014-2015: We had no data sample from 2014-2015
- Analysis:
 - SLO sample size remains too small
 - Success rates are strong

Caveats

We will repeat our annual warning against casual extrapolation from SLO data:

- *It is hard to wring meaning from a lot of this data.* Virtually all SLO data in composition courses comes from essays, and these respond to different assignments. Faculty do not want to standardize their assignments; a single capstone assignment is unwelcome; and a capstone course or exit exam is impractical.
- *It is easy to misread the data.* Sentence skills stand out as an area of weakness, while critical thinking looks very competent. But surely this is also because it's very easy to measure sentence skills, while it's not possible to measure critical thinking.
- *A lot of our concerns are not captured in this data.* Many of our concerns, including diversifying the literature offerings, raising the profile of the English degree, or serving our increasing numbers of international students, aren't captured or measured by SLO assessments.

Trends

With the warnings out of the way, here is some analysis of the data.

- Reading and sentence-level writing remain key areas of weakness, for CSM students as for the rest of the country.
- The 2013-2014 data, discussed in the Spring 2015 Program Review, suggested that perhaps students were not carrying over skills from the 838/848 levels (where reading is emphasized) into ENGL 100 (where reading comprehension levels dropped). This semester, things seem different: the ENGL 838/848 papers reflected weaker reading skills, while the ENGL 100 reading skills were quite sound (the 105, however, seemed less successful). Does this mean anything? Given the relatively small samples, it's hard to tell.

In response to the above concern, however, in Fall 2015, we devoted the English department retreat to a workshop on effective essay assignments. The goal was to ensure that essay assignments integrate reading and writing, and scaffold the writing task to a level appropriate to the course, so that students can demonstrate their skills most clearly. The presenters, CSM English faculty, distilled what the research tells us about effective essay prompts; put together a packet of assignments contributed by our faculty; and led a workshop assessing each one. Some 25 full- and part-time faculty participated.

- Overall, success rates (i.e., pass rates) track SLO assessment results. Since one of our goals with SLO assessment is to make sure our grades reflect our students' abilities, this is what we want to see.

Some pre-transfer courses seem to have lower success rates than the SLO results would suggest. It's not clear what this means, if anything; the samples are generally very small. However, this might suggest that students often don't pass classes for reasons other than lack of skills – not turning in homework, failing to complete the class, and other issues may depress their grades.

This argues for continuing faculty involvement in programs designed to get students used to college work, and that link English and other courses with student support services, counseling, and other things.

Areas of Improvement

- *Wording of SLOs:* To promote curricular coherence, we have revised the wording of many of our learning outcomes in our most recent course outline revisions. In January 2015, we revised the ENGL 165 and ENGL 110 outlines to clarify the distinction between these two largely equivalent courses, and to correct student perception that one course is more advanced than the other.
- *Data collection:* This year, we're focusing once again on improving our method of data collection.

Our methods of SLO data collection have been a work in progress. We started with a qualitative approach (norming essays), but

while interesting, this yielded almost no data points – we generally looked at perhaps 10-15 papers every three years in each course. Some years ago, we switched to a more quantitative approach, with instructors exchanging packets of 8-16 essays with each other to assess the learning outcomes. But while this gave us more data, it was still rather cumbersome; and there were gaps (ENGL 828 and ENGL 165 frequently yielded only small data pools of perhaps 8 papers).

In addition, revised accreditation requirements suggest that we will need to start thinking of ways to capture SLO data associated with a student identification number, so that the information can be disaggregated. This means that we will need to change the way we collect this data. We have hitherto used SLO data to look for contrasts with course success rates, and thus have tried to keep the essays anonymous, and have them “graded” by someone other than the classroom instructor. However, that’s not compatible with disaggregatable outcomes.

In AY 2015-2016, therefore, we have taken a hiatus from SLO assessment to develop better, more reliable, and more plentiful data.

Some options we are considering:

- Using grades from embedded assignments
- Sharing a rubric for course level SLO assignments
- Using Canvas’ “Learning Mastery” tracker to capture SLO data routinely
- Where appropriate, quizzes or other instruments.

Our goal is to pilot a new version of data collection in the 2016/2017 academic year.

- *Promoting student success:* Our last Program Review noted that developmental students sometimes seem to take a step back when they transition to ENGL 100. While it’s a mistake to read too much into SLO data, this does reflect something that we’re all familiar with, namely that the smooth transition into a transfer-level curriculum continues to demand attention.

The solution is definitely *not* more levels of remediation. All the available research suggests that remedial or developmental courses can become a trap from which developing students never emerge.

However, our own experience with learning communities like WEZ and Puente, as well as more general research, suggests that developmental students are best served by more time on task, more classroom guidance, and more integrated services (notably counseling).

For transitional students, therefore, we are moving away from the model of *more* levels of remediation at the pre-transfer level, and towards the model of more *support* at the transfer level.

Thus, in Spring 2016, English faculty elected to change the cut-off scores for ENGL 105, making students who would formerly have been placed in ENGL 848 eligible for ENGL 105. We have created many more sections of ENGL 105, and reduced the numbers of sections of ENGL 848. The goal is to promote student success by making more students eligible for a structured transfer class, rather than an extra non-transfer class.

This also aligns us with the other colleges in the District, and satisfied the requirement for multiple methods of assessment and placement (MMAP).

SLO assessment informing curricular development

The English department frequently reviews its composition curriculum, because our courses are so important to transfer students, as well as to students pursuing AA degrees or some career objectives. And our courses are sequenced, with most having pre-requisites, so it’s important that the course sequence makes sense.

For instance: as noted above, in Spring 2016, faculty opted to change the cut-scores for placement into ENGL 105, the five-unit, scaffolded version of freshman English. This was in response to what we know from our own students’ experiences in basic writing, as well as what we know from the research: that many levels of remediation tend to hold students back. This is the second time in fifteen years that we’ve revised the curriculum (the last time, we eliminated Reading class pre- and co-requisites, and integrated reading instruction in the curriculum).

We have also revised our courses to include an Information Competency requirement, first attaching it to ENGL 110, and subsequently, to ENGL 100 and ENGL 105.

We gauge whether these curricular revisions are effective by reviewing many indicators of student success (see below).

SLO results, however, have not played a large part here, for a number of reasons:

- They don't tell us anything we don't already know from grades, and from our own observations. For instance, students tend to get lower scores on SLOs connected to reading comprehension and sentence level writing, as noted above. But we already knew these were areas that needed attention. We've made reading a priority for over ten years; and we have a Writing Center focused on providing one-on-one support for students.
- We have never had a data pool large enough for us to reliably spot trends.
- While we do care a great deal about the sequencing of our courses, this sequence is really more about reinforcing skills with less and less scaffolding – it isn't really about learning specific items and remembering them to continue to the next level, as in some more knowledge-based courses. So we're not going to find a blind spot from SLOs – such as, a specific fact or bit of knowledge that needs to be covered at one level for students to succeed at the next level. We tend to do a lot of review, and what really changes about our assignments is the scaffolding rather than the content. SLOs don't capture this, because it's a pedagogical strategy rather than a "student learning outcome."

LITERATURE / CREATIVE WRITING

Literature

1. Reflect on recent SLO assessment results for courses offered by the program.

Fall 2015:

LIT 231/837 Survey of British Literature Part I

Data pool: 13/1

SLO success rates: 100% in all outcomes

LIT 101/804 Twentieth Century Literature

Data pool: 23/3

SLO success rates: 100% in both courses in all outcomes

LIT 113/813 The Novel

Data pool: 12/0

SLO success rates: 100% in all SLOs

Spring 2016:

LIT 232/838 Survey of British Literature Part II

(Data for 2015-2016 not available; course assessed in Spring 2013 - 22 students, 100% success in all SLOs)

LIT 151/835 Shakespeare

Data pool: 18/1

SLO success rates: 95%-100% in both courses in all outcomes

LIT 220/820 World Literature

Data pool: 15/0

SLO success rates: 12/15 got 100% in all SLOs; 2/15 did not meet SLOs 2, 3, and 4; 1/15 did not meet SLOs 3 and 4.

SLO results have not played a large part in shaping our literature program, for a number of reasons.

- Enrolment Assessment of student learning has not been our foremost concern in the literature program. Rather, our main focus has been to keep the program alive so as to serve our English majors.
- Enrichment. Desirable learning outcomes, in a literature course, are frankly beyond the scope of quantitative data. These are not skills courses. A successful literature course gets its students excited, has them reading and thinking, and produces students who are excited and motivated to read more. Virtually none of this can be described or captured in measurable learning outcomes.

- The success rates in the literature classes are typically extremely high, as they probably should be. We are looking to include students here, not weed them out. The literature committee ensures that the curriculum is challenging, rich, and varied.

Trends and areas of improvement in literature

- **LOAD:** The LOAD in literature courses has declined slightly, from 344 in 2014-2015 to 292.5 in 2015-2016. There is no especial reason; literature courses have been underenrolled for many years, and fluctuated around low LOAD levels.
- **Diversity:** Students taking literature courses have typically been a rather less diverse group; African-American, Latino and Asian students are not represented to the same degree as they are in the college population generally.
- We have taken some steps which we hope will yield results in the coming academic years:
 - We have dropped the ENGL 100 prerequisite. This brings the literature courses in line with the many other humanities courses that require eligibility for ENGL 100, not its successful completion. (The early signs are that this strategy will work: in Fall 2016, the LOAD in literature has rocketed to 480. Watch this space.)
 - We surveyed students to determine what sort of literature might interest them. Accordingly, we have created many new courses to vary our offerings: detective fiction, the graphic novel, and a science fiction course. We hope to see a greater diversity of students taking our literature courses, and will keep working towards the goal of offering literature on subjects of relevance and interest to our student body.

Creative writing

The most recent SLO analysis for which we have data, in Spring 2013, reflected healthy completion of outcomes. Of 16 students assessed across the three different levels (Creative Writing I, II and III), 16/16 succeeded in ENGL 161, and 15/16 in ENGL 162 and 163. (New data from Spring 2016 was not available at the time of writing. However, we will be assessing all of our creative writing courses in Fall 2016.)

Our Writers' Ruckus promotes our creative writing classes, as well as literature courses.

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? Describe any additional methods used to assess program SLOs and reflect on the results of those assessments. See [course-to-program SLO alignment mapping](#).

Alignment

Course alignment is appropriate. The English program has 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.

Composition course SLOs support the first outcome; literature and creative writing SLOs typically support both.

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

We no longer administer the survey to students taking the English AA degree.

We are assessing program SLOs by looking at course SLO alignment.

1. Analyze and respond critically to literary and expository texts
 - Success in SLOs supporting this SLO generally runs between 55% and 75% on average. These are the SLOs that



relate to reading, critical thinking, essay organization, sentence skills and other composition SLOs.

2. Demonstrate a knowledge of a variety of authors, literary genres, and literary devices.

- Success in the SLOs supporting this SLO runs very high, over 95%. This reflects the relatively straightforward content knowledge required in the literature and creative writing courses.

The results do not reveal any particular pattern. We expect to see lower rates of success for PSLO 1 and PSLO 2, because the results are drawn from two different groups of students. PSLO 1 draws from data on the composition courses, which all students – not only English majors – must take. PSLO 2, however, is supported by literature and creative writing courses, which attract English majors, or students who at the least have an interest in reading and writing; they are much more likely to demonstrate proficiency in the learning outcomes.

We do not currently do any small-group, qualitative assessments for students in our program - though we would dearly love to. We do not have time to organize something like this, and since we only award approximately five degrees a year in English (six, in fact, in 2015-2016) this is not our main focus. It makes more sense for us to focus on collaborating with wider college efforts to assess transfer students who have completed their general education composition requirements.

3. 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 (and for the GE SLOs, if available) reveal about student attainment of the GE SLOs? See [GE SLO Alignment Summary Report](#)  or [All Courses GE SLO Alignment Data](#) .

GE SLO alignment

Virtually all of our courses support multiple GE-SLOs.

Our composition courses all support GESLO 1 (effective communication), and other than ENGL 828, all courses support GESLO 3 (critical thinking), GESLO 4 (diversity) and GESLO 5 (effective citizenship).

All of our transfer-level literature courses support GESLO 1, and all our literature courses support GESLOs 3, 4 and 5.

Analysis

In 2015-2016, we have two sources of data for assessing GESLOs: the student survey, and a GESLO activity addressing GESLO 1 (effective communication) from Fall, 2015.

- GESLO 1 activity: An interdisciplinary group of faculty and staff, each of whose classes or services supported GE SLO 1, met to discuss “Effective communication” goals and appropriate methods of assessment. A total of 268 students from eleven sections of eight different disciplines were assessed. The overall SLO competency rate was 78.4%. These results were dominated by the 159 students in the three sections of English, all of whose outcomes support GE SLO 1; they scored overall an average of 74.2%.

Overall, success across disciplines was relatively high – the English results were at the lower end, with classes in COMM, ADMJ and ART scoring highly.

- GE SLO survey: The first two questions on the Campus Climate and Satisfaction Survey address students’ perception of their ability to express ideas and support them orally and in writing. Over 90% of students responded positively, with the answer split about evenly between “Strongly Agree” and “Agree.”

This represents a much higher competency rate than the collaborative faculty activity would suggest, which is not surprising from a self-survey.

Areas of improvement

Again, the biggest need for improvement lies in the way we collect and analyze GE SLO data, rather than with anything we’re working on at the discipline level.

The College Assessment Committee is exploring new ways to look at student outcomes outside the classroom. The college will also be reviewing and creating maps of outcome results to support GE outcomes, providing another data pool.

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 composition and literature courses remained about the same, at 68.7% (previous two years have been at 67% and 69.5%).

Disaggregated success rates are rather encouraging. Students seem to succeed in the ballpark of the 60%-70% average. African-American, Pacific Islander and Latino students come in slightly under, with between 57% and 61% success rates, while Asian students have the highest success rate, at over 80%.

We are addressing this discrepancy, in part, through our learning communities: Writing in the End Zone, as well as Puente and Umoja. (Currently no English instructor participates in the Mana learning community.)

In our previous Program Review, we noted some trends in success across age groups: the 25-29 age group were succeeding at much higher rates (from 58.4% to 75.9%), while the 30-34 group had declined (from 68.3% to 62.8%). This year, both groups have changed direction, with a success rate of 64% in the 25-29 age group, and a success rate of 76% in the 30-34. It is, perhaps, a lesson in not drawing conclusions from one year to the next.

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

We did not offer any online English composition courses in 2015-2016; both faculty members who had been teaching online left for other positions.

This is a notable absence. English courses are heavily subscribed, and as gateway courses, our Distance Education program should include at least one section of each transfer-level English composition course.

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

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

LOAD

Composition LOAD has changed very little.

English LOAD: 409.8 (2013-2014: 408 – 2014-2015: 410.4)

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.

Literature LOAD: 292.5 (down from 344 in the previous year, and 382 the year before).

This reflects a sharp drop in headcount in 2014-2015 (from 67 the previous year, to 31). Headcounts are back up in 2015-2016, at 55, and LOAD should follow.

As discussed earlier, we are hoping to see the effects of removing the ENGL 100 prerequisite towards improving LOAD.

FTEF

Ratio of full time FTEF to hourly FTET: 22 to 20.5

Headcount of FT faculty currently teaching: 9

Headcount of PT faculty currently teaching: 22

Headcount of overload faculty: 5 (overload FTEF 2.7)

As has been the pattern, we are treading water when it comes to staffing.

We hired two more full-time faculty in the 2015-2016 academic year; but we also lost two full-time faculty, one to retirement, and one to the Counseling department. (Three more faculty are likely to retire before the next program review.)

Currently our numbers are:

- 14 full-time faculty (of which 5 are in tenure review)
- 23 part-time faculty

This works out to a per capita ratio of 51.8% full-time to part-time faculty.

In terms of course offerings, the ratio looks about the same. In 2016-2016, we offered a total of 166 sections of ENGL classes (developmental, transfer and creative writing). 83 sections were taught by full-time faculty – just under 50%.

In some key courses, for instance ENGL 100, the majority of courses are taught by adjunct faculty: 36 out of 44 sections in the 2015-2016 year, or almost 82%.

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.

A number of factors might affect the program in the coming years:

- Transition to college / student success: This remains a focus, as the Common Core will continue to change students' expectations of college work, their reading and writing strategies, and their level of preparation.
- MMAP / AA-T. There's a state-wide push for clarity and coordination between colleges, both in their transfer curriculum (hence the AA-T) and their measures of placement (hence the MMAP). We will continue to work to ensure that the English department remains committed to giving our students support both in placing into college and transferring out, while at the same time maintaining our focus on providing high quality instruction and adhering to shared standards and expectations.
- International students: As the college continues to attract more and more international students, faculty are working to make sure that these students have a smooth integration into college composition programs.
- Workload. Workload continues to be a problem, one likely to impact our working lives and our department program. All full-time faculty are involved in duties beyond the classroom, including coordination, screening, and especially evaluation committees, which because of recent changes to the evaluation process now require four rather than three full-time tenured members.

4. Planning

A. Results of Program Plans and Actions

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

Here are some of what we've done in response to areas of concern from last year's Program Review:

Literature alignment

We have dropped the ENGL 100 prerequisite and varied our course offerings. The data is not yet in, but this semester (Fall 2016) our LOAD has increased to 480, with over sixty students in two sections of literature – so the signs are good.

Course outline revision

We revised all our composition course outlines, effective Fall 2015. This will not yield measurable results, certainly not in one year, but it does clarify our program.

Revised our pre-transfer strategy

In past years, most of our incoming students placed into developmental classes. But recent research indicates that developmental classes often serve as a stumbling block, rather than a stepping stone, to student success.

In 2015, faculty explored the acceleration model for pre-transfer students. After much discussion, we decided to expand on this for the 2016-2017 academic year. We are effectively phasing out ENGL 848, hitherto our most heavily enrolled pre-transfer class. We lowered the cut-scores for students to place into ENGL 105, thus turning a large proportion of what had been developmental students into a highly supported transfer class. The lower-scoring students will be placed into ENGL 838, also a highly supported developmental class, with an emphasis on reading.

Fall 2016 is the first semester in which we are using this approach. We will be discussing its success, and considering possible improvements or changes, at our Spring 2017 retreat.

B. Future Program Plans and Actions

Prioritize the plans to be carried out to sustain and improve student success. Briefly describe each plan and how it supports the [CSM Strategic Goals 2013/14 to 2015/16](#). For each plan, list actions and measurable outcomes. Plans may extend beyond a single year. Describe the professional activities and institutional collaborations that would be most effective in carrying out the program's vision to improve student learning and success.

PLAN: To support students transitioning into transfer classes.

Action: We are restructuring our classes, to reduce the number of students in pre-transfer classes, without reducing the amount of support they get. At our February 2017 retreat, we will discuss the results of the new system and look for potential improvements.

Goal: To see improved rates of student success in the transfer level.

Measurable outcomes: Improved completion of composition programs (ENGL 100 or 105, ENGL 110 or 165); improved rates of success in transfer courses; fewer students stuck in developmental courses.

College goals supported:

- Strategic Goal 1 (to improve student success)
- the College's Diversity Statement, by providing "equal opportunity for all;"
- key strategies outlined in the "5-in-5" (Basic Skills 2 and 4: to implement an "intrusive" core of support services, and to establish transition/bridge programs and services.)

PLAN: Improve enrolment, and diversity, in the literature courses

Action: To drop the ENGL 100 pre-requisite; to introduce new courses.

Goal: More students taking literature courses; more diversity in literature courses

Measurable outcomes: Higher enrolments, especially in underrepresented groups

College goals supported:

- Strategic Goal 2 (promote academic excellence);
- the College's Diversity Statement

5. 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.**

ENGL 690 – Special Projects

Faculty contact: Madeleine Murphy

Submission month: February 2017

ENGL 850 – Individual Writing Instruction

Faculty contact: Katherine James, Juanita Alunan

Submission month: February 2017

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 2017

C. SLO Assessment Contacts

Faculty contact(s)	Date of next review/update
Madeleine Murphy	Department retreat, Spring 2017

6. Dominant Themes Summary for IPC

Briefly summarize the dominant, most important themes or trends contained in this program review, for division deans to collect and forward to the Institutional Planning Committee. What are the key program issues that matter most? (Brief paragraph or bullet points acceptable).

Faculty shortage: We are currently operating with a skeleton crew of 14 full-time faculty, five of whom are under tenure review and are not yet available for many professional activities (notably screening and evaluation committees). Only one of the five is completing tenure this semester, meaning that for at least the coming year, we have only ten full-time faculty available for the full range of full-time duties.

English faculty are now, or have been, involved in practically every important college initiative aimed at supporting student success, promoting transfer, diversifying the successful student body, and experimenting with modes of delivery. In recent years, as noted above, we've focused a lot of energy on learning communities.

But there has been triage. Here are some of the highlights:

- Distance education: We have lost touch with Distance Education, and no longer offer any online courses, which is a serious omission in the College's online offerings.
- SI: Although the faculty responded warmly to the SI initiative, we have only one SI in English this semester, simply because not enough faculty have had enough time to get involved.
- Liaising with high schools: While we are all very interested in liaising with local schools, and while there has been some follow-through, not nearly as many faculty have gotten involved as have expressed interest.
- Pathway to College: Faculty worked with Math faculty in the 2014-2015 academic year, but not last year.

English faculty participation is crucial to many transfer and student success initiatives, so our lack of involvement in some of these areas is a problem.

ENGL 105: New model for transition to transfer. As we move away from an extensive pre-transfer curriculum, towards a stronger emphasis on structured transfer courses at the entry level, we will be monitoring student success and looking for potential problems and improvements. (This is the topic for our February 2017 retreat.)

-