

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

-Academic Senate for California Community Colleges

INSTRUCTIONS

For information about cycles for *Comprehensive Program Review and Planning*, see Instructional and Student Services program review rotation schedules posted online in their respective sections of the program review webpage:

http://collegeofsanmateo.edu/prie/program_review/program_review.php)

Resources for Supporting Documentation:

A listing of resources and documents which provide data or information for each section is included at the end of this document, after the final signature page. These resources are posted online and their URLs are listed at the end of this document.

(You may delete this section, when you submit your final program review.)

Next Steps:

Program Review and Planning reports are due March 25, 2010. This date is aligned with CSM's *Integrated Planning Calendar*.

(See: http://collegeofsanmateo.edu/prie/institutional_documents.php)

Upon its completion, please email this *Program Review and Planning* report to the Vice President of Instruction, the Vice President of Student Services, the appropriate division dean, the CSM Academic Senate President, and the Dean of Planning, Research, and Institutional Effectiveness (PRIE).

Diana Bennett, Academic Senate President, bennettd@smccd.edu

Susan Estes, Vice President of Instruction, estes@smccd.edu

Jennifer Hughes, Vice President of Student Services, hughesj@smccd.edu

John Sewart, Dean (PRIE), sewart@smccd.edu

DEPARTMENT OR PROGRAM:

Reading Department Fall 2009-Spring 2010

DIVISION: **Language Arts**

I. DESCRIPTION OF PROGRAM

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

But, it is the Reading Department alone charged with the singular and sole focus of helping students improve their reading skills – and improve their reading skills in every aspect of reading related academic activity: comprehending college-level textbooks, critically thinking, evaluating digital text, reading in test-taking situations, using writing to analyze texts, and writing in response to thoughts formed from readings comprehended. The Reading Department is instrumental in preparing many students for careers such as nursing, fire technology, and administration of justice in addition to preparing students to transfer to four-year colleges/universities.

The curriculum of the College of San Mateo's Reading Department includes both developmental-level and transfer-level courses. It addresses the reading deficiencies of students who place below college-level reading in addition to strengthening the critical reading and study-reading abilities of students who are at college-level reading. Our Reading courses, designed for both Native and Non-Native Speakers of English, are connected to our college's goals of providing developmental education in language required for the successful completion of educational goals. In addition, the Reading courses provide skills to enable students to transfer to baccalaureate institutions.

List of curricular offerings

Reading Course #	Course Title	Number of Sections		
		Fall 2009	Spring 2010	Summer 2010
400	Academic Textbook Reading	1	1	0
405	Critical Reading Skills	0	0	0
412*	College-Level Individualized Reading Improvement	1	1	1
415*	Reading Across the Disciplines: Individualized Improvement	2	1	0
454*	College-Level Vocabulary Improvement I	2	2	1
455*	College-Level Vocabulary Improvement II	2	2	1
807	Basic Phonic Skills for Non-Native Speakers	0	1	0
808	Basic Phonic Skills for Non-Native Speakers	0	1	0
809	Spelling for ESL Students	0	0	0
812*	Individualized Reading Improvement	1	1	1
814*	Basic Spelling Mastery	1	1	1
815*	Advanced Spelling Mastery	1	1	1
825	Introduction to College Reading	3	3	1
830	College and Career Reading	4	3	1
852*	Vocabulary Improvement I	2	2	1
853*	Vocabulary Improvement II	2	2	1
* Lab-Only Courses				
Total Number of Courses		22	22	10

Over the past 4 academic years, the number of sections offered has decreased due to reduced funding.

Academic Year

Fall 2006-Spring 2007-Summer 2007

Number of Sections

55 (All courses funded by Language Arts Division)

Fall 2007-Spring 2008-Summer 2008

53 (1 course funded by Nursing Department Grant **AND** one section of READ 830 not offered in spring 2008 when one full-time instructor was recovering from surgery)

Fall 2008-Spring 2009-Summer 2009

50 (1 course funded by Nursing Department Grant **AND** 4 lab courses not offered spring semester)

Fall 2009-Spring 2010-Summer 2010

54 (2 courses funded by Nursing Department Grant)

NOTE: The Language Arts Division stopped funding three (3) of the classes offered by the Reading Department between Fall 2006 and Spring 2010.

As evidenced by the classifications below, CSM's Reading courses provide students with a basic-skills focused curriculum that also includes both degree applicable and transferable components.

(Excluding Summer)	2006/2007	2007/2008	2008/2009	2009/2010
Vocational Education	0%	0%	0%	0%
Transferable	11%	*35%	32%	38.5%
Degree Applicable	19%	16%	18%	7.7%
Basic Skills	70%	49%	50%	53.8%

(Including Summer)	2006/2007	2007/2008	2008/2009	2009/2010
Vocational Education	0%	0%	0%	0%
Transferable	9%	*34%	32%	33%
Degree Applicable	16%	15%	16%	15%
Basic Skills	75%	51%	52%	52%

*In Fall 2007, 3 lab-only courses became transfer-level courses.

Program Review Section I: DESCRIPTION OF PROGRAM
Numbers of Course Sections taught: Fall 2006 – Spring 2010

Course #	Fall 2006	Spring 2007	Fall 2007	Spring 2008	Fall 2008	Spring 2009	Fall 2009	Spring 2010
400	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
405	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
412	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	1
415	1	1	1	2	1	2	2	1
454	0	0	2	2	2	1	2	2
455	0	0	2	2	2	1	2	2
807	1	1	0	1	0	1	0	1
808	1	1	0	1	0	1	0	1
809	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
812	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
814	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
815	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
825	2	3	2	3	3	3	3	3
830	4	4	4	3	4	3	4	3
852	2	2	2	2	2	1	2	2
853	2	2	2	2	2	1	2	2
854	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0
855	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0

Note: John Sewart, Dean of Planning, Research, and Institutional Effectiveness (PRIE), confirmed the Fall 2009, Spring 2010, and Summer 2010 number of sections listed above. However, the data originally provided by PRIE for the above semesters did not include many of the Reading Department courses.

II. STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES (SLOs)

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

Which courses or programs were assessed?

All SLOs in Reading courses (traditional, lab, and online) have been assessed.

How were they assessed?

Our system:

- (1) Steps 2-4 of the cycle (data gathering and evaluation of outcomes) are accomplished during the semester being evaluated.
- (2) Steps 5-6 (reviewing evidence, identifying weaknesses and implementing changes) take place during a department meeting during the following semester.

Our cycles:

- (1) Fall 2007 – READ 825, 830, and 400 had major SLOs assessed; READ 400 had all SLOs assessed. (Data not entered in TracDat.)
- (2) Fall 2008 – READ 825, 830, and 400 again had same SLOs assessed; READ 400 again had all SLOs assessed and all lab-only courses (READ 412, 454, 455, 812, 814, 815, 852, and 853) had all SLOs assessed. (Data not entered in TracDat)
- (3) Fall 2009 – all courses (excluding lab-only courses assessed in Fall 2008) had ALL SLOs assessed; in addition, READ 807/808 (only offered now in spring semesters) had ALL SLOs assessed in Spring 2009. All data is entered in TracDat.
- (4) The cycle will continue each year with major courses having some critical SLOs assessed each year and all SLOs assessed for those courses every 3 years. The lab-only courses will have all SLOs assessed every 2 years.

Method: Assessment Tools and Assessment

Most courses:

- We assess courses each year through final exam questions developed by department faculty and shared for READ 825 and 830.
- Faculty also assessed other SLOs with similar types of instructor-generated homework assignments, reading logs/ journals, reflection papers, skill tests, and quizzes. Faculty coordinated all assessments so they were similar and covered the same content and skills at the same level of difficulty.
- READ 415 instructors developed and shared common survey questions.
- READ 807/808 faculty developed and shared final exam, test, homework, quiz, and in-class assignments.

READ 400 SLOs were assessed using assignments, tests, quizzes, and final exam questions similar to those developed by current and former faculty who taught the courses.

Lab-Only Courses:

All student work was examined. Most lab-only courses require passing (with 70% or higher) mastery tests of skills or vocabulary studied and on-line or computerized programs that carefully monitor each student's progress. The spelling and vocabulary courses also require students to pass final exams with a minimum of 80% success.

Method: Evaluation and Recommended Action

The rates of achievement of each SLO are tallied; and difficulties in either the SLO, the students' performance, the assignments or the course itself are discussed. Tentative recommendations and discussed and finalized during the following semester.

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

What are the findings of the assessments?

A. In general: So far, SLO assessments reflect rates that are much higher than student success rates. Between 90-100% of our students received 70% or higher scores on the various assessments. However, the overall success rates for our courses in Fall 2009/Spring 2010 was 62%. We believe that this discrepancy may be caused by two factors: (1) the SLO assessments include only the students who complete the courses without dropping and (2) lab-only courses may not be reflected in the success rates shown for our department.

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

- Continue creating assignments that reflect current pedagogy and elicit appropriately challenging work
- Explore ways to address the success of our least successful group ---18-24 year-olds.

- **B. In particular:** SLO evaluations revealed four (4) useful findings:

-
- 1. Instructors need to communicate clearly and often to ensure cooperation while allowing for academic freedom.
-
- 2. Working together for selection of assessment tools and the follow-up evaluation has helped Reading faculty members to share ideas, discuss skill assessment methods and maintain consistent levels of difficulty and depth and at the same level of difficulty.
-
- 3. Most students who pass the Reading courses are successfully mastering the SLOs in all of our courses.
- 4. As we move forward, we want to ensure that the data includes the success of the lab-only students.

Overall evaluation of our assessments

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

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

- We will continue to use the same method and routine for SLO assessments, analysis, and recommendations;
- We continue to work on the wording of the SLOs themselves, to ensure that they accurately reflect meaningful measurable outcomes, as distinct from course goals (which may be broader);
- We continue to re-evaluate our SLOs to ensure that they also reflect national core student outcomes for reading courses in community colleges;
-
- We will continue to monitor the role of the Reading & ESL Center /on-line hour-by-arrangement assignments to make sure that they continue to directly assist in student SLO mastery and that the students receive the help and support they need;

We will look for up-to-date computer programs to assist the assessment of SLOs of online instruction and ensure that it corresponds with in-class assessment tools;

- We will continue to look for opportunities for instructors to work together on assignments, grading, and curriculum. For example, we plan to develop a common assessment tool for a novel that is used by both faculty members in READ 825.
-

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

The primary resource we would need, in order to make the best use of what the SLO data tell us, is time. We are a very small department, so all SLO work and resulting changes require time to understand our different approaches and how those can result in a common dialog for a more unified department while maintaining the common SLOs. As our online course options expand, we need to ensure that in-class and online assessments are compatible. We need to ensure that an adequate number of hours are assigned to Reading Department faculty in the Reading and ESL Center. Also, we need the continued support of our well-educated, extremely competent Instructional Aides in the Reading and ESL Center.

Below please update the program's SLO Alignment Grid. The column headings identify the GE-SLOs. In the row headings (down the left-most column), input the course numbers (e.g. ENGL 100); add or remove rows as necessary. Then mark the corresponding boxes for each GE-SLO with which each course aligns. The definitions of the GE-SLOs can be found on the CSM SLOAC website:

http://www.smccd.net/accounts/csmsloac/sl_sloac.htm (click on the "Institutional" link under the "Student Learning Outcomes" heading.) If this Program Review and Planning

report refers to a vocational program or a certificate program that aligns with alternative institutional-level SLOs, please replace the GE-SLOs with the appropriate corresponding SLOs.

GE-SLOs→ Program Courses ↓	Effective Communication	Quantitative Skills	Critical Thinking	Social Awareness and Diversity	Ethical Responsibility
READ 400	X	X	X	X	X
READ 412	X		X	X	X
READ 415	X	X	X	X	X
READ 454	X		X		
READ 455	X		X		
READ 807	X		X		
READ 808	X		X		
READ 812	X		X	X	X
READ 814	X		X		
READ 815	X		X		
READ 825	X	X	X	X	X
READ 830	X	X	X	X	X
READ 854	X		X		
READ 855	X		X		

III. DATA EVALUATION

- a. Referring to the Enrollment and WSCH data, evaluate the current data and projections. If applicable, what programmatic, course offering or scheduling changes do trends in these areas suggest? Will any major changes being implemented in the program (e.g. changes in prerequisites, hours by arrangement, lab components) require significant adjustments to the Enrollment and WSCH projections?

Because enrollment and WSCH have been relatively consistent between Fall 2007 and Spring 2010, we do not anticipate making any major changes to our pre-transfer or transfer programs. The slight dip in enrollment is not significant and is basically stable. In Summer 2010, the headcount increased, WSCH decreased a little, but was up from 2008/2009. FTES also decreased a little that semester, possibly due to the higher number of lab-only students enrolled in the summer.

However, we DO want to offer several courses that are no longer being funded by our division or by grants from other departments. These courses either have been banked or are now offered only once a year. Not only are the courses important for students improving their reading skills, but faculty in other disciplines at CSM have asked that several of the courses (READ 807: Basic Phonics Skills for Non-Native Speakers and READ 415: Reading Across the Disciplines: Individualized Preparation) be offered as in the past because those courses are so helpful to the students in other content-area courses.

The Reading Department plans to continue offering the HBA for its courses, a resource that provides direct support and one-on-one help to students enrolled in Reading courses.

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

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

The FTEF ratio of full-time to part-time faculty for Fall 2009 through Spring 2010 is ranges from 4.07 to 4.2 (full-time) and .4 to .2 for adjunct. In 2009-2010, the total FTEF was reduced by the equivalent of half of a full-time faculty compared with 2008-2009 while the LOAD for the same time increased due to increased student contact hours. This may be the result of one fewer section being offered, but the number of students enrolled in lab-only courses increased.

In terms of the actual number of instructors, the above FT/PT ratio reflects 2 full-time faculty members and 2 adjunct faculty members who are not offered courses to teach on a regular basis. Budget cuts have eliminated courses and lab hours that adjunct faculty previously taught. As a result, only two instructors are teaching essentially all of the courses, and the adjunct pool is small or non-existent because of the lack of teaching opportunities.

Additionally, one of the two full-time instructors will retire in June 2013, *leaving a sole faculty member* to execute all of the teaching responsibilities and department responsibilities currently carried out by two full-time faculty members:

- *teach a full load of courses,
- *complete all of the action steps,
- *oversee the extensive reading portion of the Reading & ESL Center (as co-lead),
- *work with faculty in other departments who are teaching transfer-level courses,
- *collaborate with faculty from other disciplines such as ESL, math, DSPS, etc.,
- *develop and update curriculum and create on-line/hybrid courses,
- *hire and evaluate adjunct faculty,
- *assess and update SLOs,
- *write the Program Review each year,
- * do all outreach currently done by both faculty members,
- *attend Basic Skills Committee meetings and activities, and
- *participate in committee assignments, division activities, and college-wide responsibilities.

- c. Referring to the Productivity [LOAD] data, discuss and evaluate the program's productivity relative to its target number. If applicable, what programmatic changes or other measures will the department consider or implement in order to reach its productivity target? If the productivity target needs to be adjusted, please provide a rationale.

The Reading Department LOAD has varied from 658 in 2007/2008 to 494 in 2008/2009 to 551 in 2009/2010. The LOAD was highest when there were fewer faculty members in the Reading Department. The Fall 2009/2010 LOAD for the department was slightly below the college-wide average of 590. It is relevant to note that many courses college-wide enroll 35-50 students, whereas Reading courses have a maximum enrollment of 28 students. This has a direct bearing on the numbers presented here.

The Productivity (LOAD) rate of 551 for the Reading Department I 2009-2010 was higher than the 420 rate for courses with 28 students. Some of the difference can be attributed to the HBA requirement of many of the Reading courses. Even so, the 131-point difference reflects the Reading Department's high level of Productivity. Additionally, the Reading Department has a higher LOAD/Level of Productivity (551) compared to the Language Arts Division (492).

Because our FTEF decreased while our LOAD increased in 2009/2010, more instructional activity or contact time occurred with fewer faculty members. This may in part be due to the increase in lab-only students. This reason for the LOAD is not, and should not be, sustainable because we need more Reading faculty in the Reading & ESL Center. Also, the loss of one full-time Reading faculty at the end of the academic year 2012/2013 will require the replacement of the lead faculty for the Reading part of the Reading & ESL Center. Therefore, the Reading Department will definitely require a new full-time faculty member as of July 2013.

IV. STUDENT SUCCESS EVALUATION AND ANALYSIS

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

Success:

Coupled with the rigor rightly associated with Reading courses, the Department's success rate of 62% for Fall 2009/Spring 2010, while below the College's rate of 70%, is encouraging. The online success data (provided only for Fall 2009) for one section of READ 830 was 63% while the college online success for that semester was 56.5%.

In addition, the success rate of the Basic Skills Reading classes in Fall 2009 was 59.3% while the college-wide average of Basic Skills courses was 53.3%. Overall, our success rate looks positive with improvement always a goal.

Retention:

A retention rate of 77% for the Fall 2009/Spring 2010 semesters was very similar to the retention rates of 2007/2008 and 2008/2009. The online retention rate (only for Fall 2009) for one section of READ 830 was exceptionally high: 88.9% contrasted with the college-wide online retention rate of 77.9% for that same semester. Additionally, the Reading Department retention rate (74.3%) for Basic Skills classes in Fall 2009/Spring 2010 was essentially the same as the college-wide retention rate (74.2%) for Basic Skills classes.

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

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

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

Student equity—diversity, age, and gender.

Diversity:

The largest ethnic group enrolled in the Reading Department courses in Fall 2009/Spring 2010 was Hispanic (34%) followed by Whites (21%) and Asians (18%). Blacks, Filipinos, and Pacific Islanders enrolled in much smaller numbers (3-6%) in Reading courses. The percentage of success was highest with Asians (77%) and Filipinos (73%) followed by Blacks (67%) and Hispanics (62%). Whites had 54% success while Pacific Islanders had the lowest success rate of

only 50%. The Native Americans (only 2) had 100% success in Reading courses that academic year. Some of the white students who are not successful are DSPS students who do not take advantage of the many support services offered at our college.

The Reading Department purposely selects textbooks and novels for the Reading courses that incorporate readings about various racial and ethnic groups. Both full-time instructors are members of CSM's DIAG (Diversity in Action Group) and work hard to make all ethnic and racial groups on campus inclusive in our classrooms. We also plan to work closely with DSPS to ensure that students (who could benefit from the support services) prepare for the Reading courses before starting their first semester.

Age:

Age appears to be the most important factor in student success in Reading courses. Students between the ages of 19 (or less) and 24 have a 50-50% success rate, the lowest of any age group enrolled in Reading courses. However, students between the ages of 25-40 have an average of 76% success. Even students aged 40-50 have a 67-68% success rate in Reading courses.

To attempt to deal with the age-related success statistics, the Reading Department will work with the BSI Committee and other resources to improve these statistics. The department also plans to collaborate with local high school faculty and counselors to create a better transition to college for the younger students.

Gender:

Close to 65% of the students enrolled in Reading courses in Fall 2009/Spring 2010 were females. However, the success rate was similar for men and women: 65% for women and 61% for men. The remaining students did not declare their gender status. It appears that gender is not a critical factor in determining success in Reading courses.

V. REFLECTIVE ASSESSMENT OF INTERNAL AND EXTERNAL FACTORS AND PROGRAM/STUDENT

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

	INTERNAL FACTORS	EXTERNAL FACTORS		
Strengths	A. Reading is a skill that crosses all disciplines and an integral component to almost all college work. A strength of our department is that we address reading needs throughout the campus. As a result, our department members deliver	<table border="1" style="width: 100%;"> <tr> <td style="padding: 5px;">A. Listed below are strengths of the Reading Department that are attributed to external factors.</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="padding: 5px;">1. Enrollment has been strong in all levels of reading classes, including the on-line class, day</td> </tr> </table>	A. Listed below are strengths of the Reading Department that are attributed to external factors.	1. Enrollment has been strong in all levels of reading classes, including the on-line class, day
A. Listed below are strengths of the Reading Department that are attributed to external factors.				
1. Enrollment has been strong in all levels of reading classes, including the on-line class, day				

	<p>both instruction and support to students, faculty members, and counselors across the campus.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Both full-time faculty continue to actively participate in a wide range of long-term and short-term projects, programs, and activities aimed at meeting student need and increasing student success, including but not limited to the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An instructor developed and began teaching an on-line section of READ 830; • One instructor worked with a publishing company to adapt the company's on-line resources to correspond to the READ 825 SLOs; • Two Reading Department faculty received a CSM Trustee's Grant to create several components of an on-line WebAccess interactive reading skill program (Reading Skills Tutorial) that is currently being used in 5 courses; • Faculty attended and participated in various workshops and presentations that focused on teaching methods and curriculum to better serve the needs of under-prepared students; • Faculty participated in developing the plans/budget for CSM's Basic Skills Committee, attended monthly meetings, and participated in various functions sponsored by the committee; • Reading Across the Disciplines (RAD) READ 415 continued to (1) improve the academic success rates of some of CSM's basic skills students in their transfer-level 	<p>and evening classes, and lab-only classes.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. Most classes have waiting lists at the beginning of each semester. 3. The lab-only vocabulary courses offered to the women in the Redwood City jail are popular and have been expanded to include more students. This program has wide support in our division as evidenced by the donations from our division members to help pay for the books. 4. The Director of CSM's Nursing Program believes our department courses will greatly help students who plan to plan to become nursing students. For example, she (a) periodically has spoken at counselor meetings to encourage them to enroll students in Reading courses, (b) has sent letters before registration time to counselors and advisors and recommends that students preparing for nursing majors enroll in our reading courses until completing READ 400, (c) has required incoming nursing students take our college Reading Placement Test to have an accurate indicator of student reading skills, (d) provided funding from Nursing Grants to pay for sections of READ 415 to support nursing students with their reading and study skills, and (e) provided funding from Nursing Grants to pay for the development of an online reading skills program which is being used by both future nursing students and remediating nursing students. 5. Recognizing diverse student schedules and popularity of learning online, the
--	---	---

	<p>content area courses (2) improve the success and retention rates of students concurrently enrolled in both first and second-year CSM nursing courses;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An instructor taught in a basic skills learning community (<i>Dead Man Walking</i>) and in a transfer-level learning community (<i>Tragedy of the Commons</i>); • Two Reading Department members participated with faculty members from other divisions on campus in CSM's Writing Across the Curriculum for several years; • The Reading Department continues to work with the ESL Department and to collaborate whenever possible; • One Reading faculty member served (and continues to do so) on the Distance Education Advisory Committee, working to strengthen CSM's distance education offerings; • Faculty frequently connect with faculty members in various disciplines across the campus to discuss the reading needs of the content courses and to offer support and ideas to the faculty; and • Faculty worked closely with DSPS to assist students and to revise the Reading Placement Test scores to correctly guide students with low reading skills into appropriate courses. 	<p>department offers one developmental-level online Reading course. It has been offered successfully for several semesters. With the support and encouragement from some of the students, even a few parents and siblings of former students have now enrolled.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 6. The Trustees' Grant and Nursing Department grants have helped fund the development of on-line WebAccess reading skills materials that are current, interactive, easily revised, and are currently being used by students in five different courses. 7. CSM's Reading & ESL Center received additional copies of its lab materials, such as the computerized speed and comprehension program Reading Plus, when the Half Moon Bay Reading & ESL Center unfortunately permanently closed. 8. Students preparing to take the TEAS: Test of Essential Academic Skills (test now required for students entering CSM's and Canada's nursing programs) are enrolling in READ 400 and/or READ 412 and deciding the courses are helpful preparation. 9. The SMCCD Board of Trustees made Basic Skills, including reading, an institutional priority. 10. In 2010, the San Mateo County voters supported Measure G funding which listed reading as an area to specifically fund. 11. Nation-side publicity and disclosure of data show how severely unprepared high
	<p>B. Strength: Reading Program's Reading & ESL Center. Our department regularly looks at how the Center can best serve our reading students; how the HBA assignments and lab-only courses strengthen the skills of the reading students; and how the students benefit from well-developed</p>	

	<p>resources in the Center.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Reading & ESL Center continues to adapt to the needs of our students. Since Spring 2008, faculty and lab staff have done various activities aimed at meeting student need and increasing student success, including but not limited to the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Developed new on-line reading skills tutorials; exercises, and mastery tests; • Revised the directions and steps for other materials in response to student need; • Developed a power-point Reading & ESL Center orientation; • Expanded the HBA assignment materials that can be checked out overnight at CSM's library; • Provided some access on-line to books used for lab assignments; and • Expanded and updated use of Kurzweil for lab assignments for students who need to hear assignments while reading. 2. The Reading & ESL Center is viewed very favorably as evidenced in several years of surveys and documented in more detail in the Reading & ESL Center Program Review. The Reading & ESL Center and its staff have received very favorable overall evaluations on student surveys. We are very fortunate to have Instructional Aides who, in addition to their extensive education and experience, are adept in helping students of diverse backgrounds and reading skill levels. 	<p>school graduates are multiple areas for college. The widespread problem strongly justifies the need for qualified reading instructors and for a strong Reading Program at our college.</p>
--	--	--

	<p>3. The Reading & ESL Center is a vital component of the Reading Department and the ESL Department. Student usage of the Center's materials and programs (for HBA assignments and lab-only courses) totaled 20,879 hours for the academic year 2009/2010 and 23,189 hours including Summer 2010.</p>	
	<p>C. Strength: Outreach to members of the community</p>	
	<p>1. Our department has reached outside the campus to help people understand our program and to help people improve their reading skills.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Women in the Redwood City jail have been enrolling in and successfully completing our vocabulary courses for several years. • Our department has been in contact with learning disability specialists and ESL teachers at Hillsdale High School. 	
<p>Weaknesses</p>	<p>INTERNAL FACTORS</p>	<p>EXTERNAL FACTORS</p>
	<p>Cutbacks in funding since 2008 have exponentially affected our department in several negative ways.</p>	<p>Between 70-80% of incoming students at the College of San Mateo have reading skills that are below college-level, but external factors are preventing the Reading Department from providing strong support for these students.</p>
	<p>1. The Reading Department needs a pool of qualified and experienced adjunct reading instructors for several reasons, including but no limited to the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Many Reading Department courses have been banked, sections have been reduced, and faculty hours in the Reading & ESL Center have been reduced; • The summer session is the only semester that the department 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Cutbacks in funding have stopped our department and the college as a whole from meeting the reading needs of College of San Mateo students. 2. The lack of college funding is greatly undermining our Reading Program. 3. The number of students who

	<p>has openings for adjunct faculty; and</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The department regularly loses adjunct faculty because it can so seldom offer adjunct classes. Therefore the quality of our adjunct pool is diminished. <p>2. The cutbacks in the past years have reduced the number of faculty in our department, causing an increased load of administrative tasks and committee work falling to two FT faculty are a constant drain on time and energy they could be devoting directly to their students. In addition to SLO development and assessment and an expanded Program Review, Reading faculty have developed and revised courses, developed on-line reading materials, and participated in various committees and campus activities. The number of hours required for these types of tasks and responsibilities has increased while the number of FT faculty has not. As a result, faculty morale has suffered. While we recognize the value of these tasks and committees, the number of hours in a day remains finite.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Both Reading FT faculty regularly participate in a wide range of special projects such as preparing to teach on-line and developing an on-line course, BSI, Learning Communities, Writing Across the Curriculum, etc. These projects, many of which involve extensive collaboration with faculty and student service personnel across the campus and even the District, benefit students directly and help rejuvenate faculty. For most of these projects faculty receive no 	<p>should be enrolled in Reading courses in order to be successful in college continues to be large, yet many courses have been banked, sections have been reduced, and faculty hours in the lab have been reduced.</p>
--	---	---

	<p>reassigned time.</p> <p>3. Faculty members from across campus in multiple departments have requested that READ 415 (Reading Across the Disciplines) be reinstated. Therefore, the Reading Department needs to offer levels, offer multiple sections of READ 415 (Reading Across the Disciplines) to assist students reading in various content courses.</p> <p>4. The ESL Department faculty have specifically requested that the Reading Department restore READ 807 (Basic Phonics for Non-Native Speakers) that was eliminated in the fall semesters.</p> <p>5. The reduced number of Reading faculty hours in the Reading & ESL Center is not enough to meet student need. Therefore, the Reading faculty hours in the Center need to be expanded.</p> <p>6. Each year, 70-80% of students place below college-level reading on CSM's Reading Placement Test. Therefore, the CSM Reading Department needs to offer more sections of reading courses at various levels to prepare students to comprehend college-level textbooks as they take courses to earn certificates, degrees, and to transfer to 4-year colleges and universities.</p> <p>7. The Reading Department does not have a "smart lab" for class or small group use.</p> <p>8. Projects in some of the Reading classes are increasingly requiring digital media (e-portfolios, etc.). However, the students have no place on campus to work collaboratively on such projects or to get technical assistance.</p>	
--	--	--

	<p>9. More reading students need student support such as tutoring to help them with assignments. This has been a problem since the Tutoring Center was closed several years ago.</p> <p>10. The general frustration level of students and faculty has increased as classes are cut, lab appointment hours and other student services are reduced. Students who feel that they are not being served or can be better served elsewhere may decide to leave CSM.</p> <p>11. With a department that has gone from 3 full-time faculty members and 5 regular adjunct faculty, maintaining communication within the department at times has been a challenge (see opportunities).</p>	
Opportunities	INTERNAL FACTORS	EXTERNAL FACTORS
	<p>A. The Reading Department will strengthen relationships and collaborations within our department and with other departments and disciplines at CSM.</p>	<p>The Reading Department will strengthen relationships and collaborations with local high schools and other community groups.</p>
	<p>1. Reading Department faculty will continue to work to strengthen relationships with colleagues and programs outside our department such as (a) meeting individually and in small groups with counselors to discuss effective and appropriate placement of students in courses, (b) meeting individually with staff in DSPS to best meet the needs of our students with various disabilities and assess the new cut scores and referrals for placement tests, (c) collaborate with student support groups such as the Veteran advisor and the International Student advisor.</p>	<p>1. Reading Department faculty will continue to strengthen relations with learning disability and special education faculty at our feeder schools so they are more aware of the expectations and limited help for the reading courses their students will take.</p> <p>2. The Reading faculty will collaborate with the reading and faculty at the 3 San Mateo high schools to learn more about the expectation for students enrolled in Reading courses in high school and in college, to discuss the skills students will need when they arrive at CSM, and to share assignments and</p>

	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. The Reading faculty will meet with ESL faculty teaching higher-level writing classes and pre-transfer and English 100 faculty to improve collaboration. 3. The Reading faculty will strengthen intra-department communication. <div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 5px; margin: 5px 0;"> B. The Reading Department will explore ways to revitalize our program that has experienced major budget cuts. </div> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. We will explore the possibility of bringing back highly successful courses eliminated due to budget cuts such as READ 415 and READ 807/808. 2. The department plans to investigate opportunities to expand digitally-delivered text in our Reading courses. 3. Consider revising SLOs to integrate digitally text and consider data from national core reading standards when revising our SLOs. 	<p>teaching strategies.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3. The Reading Department will explore other outreach opportunities such as groups that support the women in the Redwood City jail and also explore ways to fund the cost of the books used by the inmates.
Threats	INTERNAL FACTORS	EXTERNAL FACTORS
	<p>The general lack of funding has had and will continue to have a negative impact on our department and students.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The lack of adjunct and full-time faculty members in the department threatens its success. 2. The general frustration level of students and faculty has increased as classes are cut, lab appointment hours and other student services are reduced. Students who feel that they are not being served or can be better served elsewhere may decide to leave CSM. 3. The school and department may will have a more difficult time attracting and keeping quality 	<p>The general lack of funding and increased student costs/problems have had and will continue to have a negative impact on our department and the CSM students in general.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Proposed student fee increases may have an adverse affect upon enrollment. 2. The challenging economic conditions may be affecting our student enrollment and success rates if some are unable to afford the time or money it requires to enroll in or successfully complete ESL courses. Minimum course enrollment requirements of EOPS may also become increasingly difficult for students to meet as the economy suffers. 3. Financial aid cutbacks from the

	<p>faculty and staff if educational objectives at CSM go unsupported – or appear to.</p> <p>4. The reduction of ESL courses offered at CSM may affect the enrollment of the Reading Department over time.</p> <p>5. A lack of funding has reduced faculty hours in the Reading/ESL Center, making it difficult for students to meet with an instructor for their Hour-by-Arrangement and lab-only requirements.</p> <p>5. The reduction of release time for faculty puts a burden on departments, particularly small departments such as Reading. Fewer opportunities exist for faculty to pursue professional and/or curriculum development, and faculty are expected to spend extra time on a greater number of non-teaching duties than in the past – and without any form of compensation.</p> <p>6. More reading students need student support such as tutoring to help them with assignments. This has been a problem since the Tutoring Center was closed several years ago.</p> <p>7. The Reading Department is often excluded when Basic Skills courses/departments are mentioned in reports or included in projects or proposals.</p> <p>8. The Reading Department wants to be certain that devastating funding cuts for the Reading & ESL Center faculty, staff, and student assistants do not occur.</p> <p>9. The type of student who enrolls in a reading class is by definition a teacher-time-intensive student. The success of that student is of course the department's top priority.</p>	<p>state will greatly affect many of our students.</p> <p>4. The high cost of living in the Bay Area, particularly here on the peninsula – our service area – limits our student population.</p> <p>5. The uncertainty surrounding the future of Hour-by-Arrangement courses and the role of labs at community colleges threatens the future of the Reading/ESL Center.</p> <p>6. Service reduction of bus and train service due to budget problems will affect many of our students.</p> <p>7. As college departments and faculty are affected by budget cuts, support for teaching under-prepared students is jeopardized.</p>
--	--	--

	However, each year, the numerous other department and college responsibilities threaten to place the students in secondary importance.	
--	--	--

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

Although cutbacks have hurt the Reading Department, funding for a few projects and the replacement of the old computers in the Reading & ESL Center have been extremely helpful. Funding for expanding and updating of some of the materials in the Reading & ESL Center plus Professional Development funding, especially for on-line teaching, have been very important to our efforts to help CSM students improve their reading skills.

VI. Goals, Action Steps, and Outcomes

- a. Identify the program's goals. Goals should be broad issues and concerns that incorporate some sort of measurable action and should connect to CSM's *Institutional Priorities 2008-2011*, *Educational Master Plan, 2008*, the Division work plan, and GE- or certificate SLOs.

The Goals of the Reading Program (as defined by "a" above):

- 1. Improve Student Success**
- 2. Maintain Reading Program and Enhance Course Offerings**
- 3. Expand Outreach**

(See table below)

- b. Identify the action steps your program will undertake to meet the goals you have identified.

See table below

- c. Briefly explain, specifically, how the program’s goals and their actions steps relate to the *Educational Master Plan*.

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

But, it is the Reading Department alone charged with the singular and sole focus o of helping students improve their reading skills – and improve their reading skills in every aspect of reading related academic activity: comprehending college-level textbooks, critically thinking, evaluating digital text, reading in test-taking situations, using writing to analyze texts, and writing in response to thoughts formed from readings comprehended. The Reading Department is instrumental in preparing many students for careers such as nursing, fire technology, and administration of justice in addition to preparing students to transfer to four-year colleges/universities.

The College of San Mateo’s Reading Department’s goals and actions steps are directly related to the College of San Mateo’s Educational Master plan. See table below for the links that correspond the most directly.

CSM Educational Master Plan Recommendations and Action Step”	CSM Reading Department
Enrollment	
a. “marketing, outreach, recruiting, and retention”	a. Goals A, B, C
b. “increase use of alternative instructional...delivery modes”	b. Goals B
Basic Skills	
a. “College needs to develop specific strategies and allocate resources to address this issue.”	a. Goals A, B, and C
Transfer	
a. “The College must ...develop strategies to increase the transfer rate.”	a. Goals A, B, and C
Career and Technical Programs	
a. “add to the existing allied health programs or create new programs where there is a demand”	a. The Reading Department works closely with the Nursing Department, see Goals B and C
Student Success	See Goal A
Student Expectation of Convenience and Choice	See Goal A, B, and C

- d. Identify and explain the program’s outcomes, the measurable “mileposts” which will allow you to determine when the goals are reached.

Table for items b and d:

Goal Area	Action Step	Measurable “mileposts”:	Timeline
Goal A: Improve Student Success			
1.	Explore offering mini-workshops on reading and study skills to students campus-wide	Meet at least once a semester	Have two meetings by end of next academic year
2.	Explore revising our SLOs and realign them to address national core/common standards to address gaps students have coming out of high schools.	Meet at least once in the fall and the spring.	Meet twice each year
3.	Investigate ways to assist our youngest students who are most likely to fail or drop out of our classes.	Meet at least once in the fall and the spring.	Meet twice each year
4.	Create a space in Bldg. 18 for workshops and office-hours to work with small groups of students.	Meet with ESL and Instructional Aides in Fall 2011.	Make decision by mid-fall 2011.
5.	Be available during some of our office hours in the new space in Bldg. 18.	See above	See above
6.	Seek to develop and/or use common books, assessment tools, and course assignments when possible and pertinent.	Meet once each semester	Have newly developed tools or assignments ready prior to start of each semester (if being used for that semester).
7.	Increase the number of course books in the library available for student overnight check-out.	Check with bookstore and library once a semester.	Have books in place prior to the beginning of each semester.

Goal B: Maintain Reading Program and Enhance Course Offerings			
1.	Increase PR for the Reading Classes each semester	Talk in various classes, prepare publicity materials	Accomplish once each semester
2.	Continue offering the Vocabulary Program for the women in jail (Redwood City).	Collaborate with Redwood Jail Personnel once a year.	Meet one time in the academic year 2011-2012.
3.	Look into expanding the department's face-to-face offerings.	Meet once each semester	This is dependent upon college funds.
4.	Look into expanding our online offerings.	Meet once each semester	Submit at least one or more new course outlines in the next academic year.
5.	Increase multi-methods of delivery (such as developing more online or hybrid versions of our current course offerings).	Discuss once each semester	Develop new course outlines and submit to COI when/if decision is reached to change delivery method.
6.	Seek ways to bring back Read 415 and other courses (even if it means in an altered delivery method).	Discuss once each semester	This is dependent upon college funds.
7.	Seek ways to bring back an offering of Read 807/808 twice a year, as in the past.	Discuss once each semester	This is dependent upon college funds.
8.	Expand our pool of interviewed and approved adjunct faculty.	Screen paperwork and interview.	Interview during the academic years.
9.	For Read/ESL Center update and upgrade equipment including office equipment and instructional materials.	Review needs once a year.	Submit requisition and seek funding as needs as possible each academic year.
10.	Explore adding software that offers a prescriptive/diagnostic profile for each reading student using the Read/ESL Center.	Discuss once each year. Research as possible once each academic year.	This is dependent upon the findings of such software's availability and college funding.

Goal C: Expand Outreach			
1.	Increase communication between the Reading Department and faculty members of other departments such as ESL, Math, English, Nursing, Social Science, and Biology.	Meet minimum of once each year (with each group).	Once during academic year.
2.	Increase communication between Reading Department and counselors/advisors in areas such as nursing/multicultural/ ESL/ veterans/international students, etc.	Meet minimum of once each year (with each group).	Once during academic year.
3.	Explore utilizing resources of the Society of St. Vincent de Paul of San Mateo for aid to our women in jail program alums.	Research this possibility with pertinent group and funding source(s).	Prior to start of spring semester
4.	Collaborate with people involved with the execution of all aspects of the Redwood City's women in jail program.	Meet minimum of once each year.	Once during each academic year
5.	Meet with instructors from high school in the disciplines of learning disabilities and special education to improve proper placement. (Also pertains to Student Success)	Meet once each spring.	Spring of the academic year
6.	Meet with learning disabled students and their instructors so that course assistance (i.e. CDs for their books) can be obtained early in the semester (also pertains to Student Success).	Meet once each spring (fall also if possible)	Prior to the start of each semester of the academic year
7.	Collaborate with high school faculty and counselors to better prepare students for the transition to college reading courses.	Meet once each academic year.	Meet in the academic year 2011- 2012.

VII. SUMMARY OF RESOURCES NEEDED TO REACH PROGRAM ACTION STEPS

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

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

Full-Time Faculty Positions Requested	Expected Outcomes if Granted and Expected Impact if Not Granted	If applicable, <u>briefly</u> indicate how the requested resources will link to achieving department action steps based on SLO assessment.
<p>As of July 2012, an additional full-time faculty position will be needed due to retirement of one Reading Department faculty in 2013. It is critical that the new faculty member have one academic year to be mentored by the department, with the inclusion of the retiring faculty member. to ensure a smooth transition.</p>	<p>A sole faculty member cannot complete all of the action steps and teach a full load of courses in addition to also hiring adjunct faculty, overseeing the extensive reading portion of the Reading & ESL Center, and doing all department functions such as program review, committee assignments, and Reading Department responsibilities in the Language Arts Division and college-wide. Hiring a new full-time faculty member as of July 2013 is imperative.</p>	<p>Action steps cannot be completed by one faculty member. The Reading Program cannot be sustained without replacing the retiring instructor with a new full-time Reading faculty member.</p>

Classified Positions Requested	Expected Outcomes if Granted and Expected Impact if Not Granted	If applicable, <u>briefly</u> indicate how the requested resources will link to achieving department action steps based on SLO assessment.
<p>At a minimum, the current staffing situation of one full-time Instructional Aide and one part-time Instructional Aide positions must be maintained.</p>	<p>The students served by the Reading & ESL Center will be negatively impacted. The HBA and the lab-only classes will be severely reduced. The SLOs of the courses also will be greatly affected.</p>	<p>A reduction of the current classified positions in the Reading & ESL Center would result in the elimination of the following action steps listed above: *Student Success Action Steps # 3, 4, 9, and 10; * Maintaining the Reading Program Action Step #2; and</p>

		* Outreach Action Step #4.
--	--	----------------------------

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

Resources Requested	Expected Outcomes if Granted and Expected Impact if Not Granted	If applicable, <u>briefly</u> indicate how the requested resources will link to achieving department action steps based on SLO assessment.
Item: DVDs Number: estimated 20-25 Vendors: Insight Media and The Teaching Company (for <i>The Art of Reading</i> at \$69.00@; <i>The Successful Student</i> at 49.00@) Unit price: (Carole Wills – has list) Total Cost: 3,500.00 Status*: new	Many of our students were born and raised in a world of visual technology/digital media. As a result, we have found it helpful to provide visual models (via DVDs/other electronic formats) before the students apply the strategies to their readings. Students have responded very positively to the DVDs currently offered in the lab.	See items 2 and 6 under goal of Student Success
Item: File Drawer (Hon 510 series lockable 4 drawer) Number: 1 Vendor: Office Depot Unit price: \$360.00 Total Cost: \$360.00 Status*: new	Currently, many files and materials are stacked in boxes on the floor because we do not have enough storage space. The lab will be disorganized and look messy without these.	See items #2 and #6 under goal of Student Success.
Item: Visograph (eye movement recorder) Number: 1 Vendor: Reading Plus Unit price: 3400.00 Total Cost: 3800.00 Status*: new	This equipment goes with the Reading Plus program. While it is not a core part of the program, it provides great help to the students who have bad reading habits such as regressing. It would complete the Reading Plus program and is something we definitely want in the lab, especially for basic skills students.	See item #4 under goal of Student Success.
Item: Multimedia Projector:	Our current Reading & ESL	

PowerLite Projector 1720 Number: 1 Vendor: Epson Unit price: 999.00 Total Cost: 1,091.00 Status*: new	Center does not have a projector. We need one for small group instruction.	See item #3, #4, and# 5 under goal of Student Success.
--	--	--

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

VIII. Course Outlines

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

Course Number	Last Update Date	Six-year Update Due Date
READ 400	2002	Currently due (will be finalized in Sp'11).
READ 412	2006	2012
READ 415	2006	2012
READ 454	2006	2012
READ 455	2006	2012
READ 807 & 808	1988	Currently due (will be finalized in Sp'11).
READ 812	2006	2012
READ 814	2006	2012
READ 815	2006	2012
READ 825	2002	Currently due (will be finalized in Sp'11).
READ 830	2009	2015
READ 852	2006	2012
READ 853	2006	2012

IX. Advisory and Consultation Team (ACT)

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

List ACT names here.

Kristi Ridgway, ESL Department Associate Professor

Attach or paste ACT report here.

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

- **Kristi Ridgway asked us to clarify some of the data. After reviewing the information, we expanded the analysis of the data.**
- **She noticed the many strengths of our department. Following her advice, we emphasized some of them.**
- **Kristi Ridgway noted that the Reading Department's Productivity rate was higher than the Language Art Division's rate and advised us to include that. Therefore, the rate comparison has been included.**
- **Kristi Ridgway pointed out the detriment to our program of the retirement of one full-time faculty member in two years. As per her suggestion, we delineated some of the negative effects that will need to be addressed soon by the college.**

X. PROGRAM REVIEW PARTICIPANTS AND SIGNATURES

Date of Program Review evaluation:

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

Primary program contact person: Carol Wills
Phone and email address: 650-574-6612, willsc@smccd.edu
Full-time faculty: Jamie Marron
Part-time faculty:
Administrators
Classified staff:
Students:

<hr/> <i>Primary Program Contact Person's Signature</i>	<i>Date</i>
<hr/> <i>Full-time Faculty's Signature</i>	<i>Date</i>
<hr/> <i>Part-time Faculty's Signature</i>	<i>Date</i>
<hr/> <i>Administrator's Signature</i>	<i>Date</i>
<hr/> <i>Classified Staff Person's Signature</i>	<i>Date</i>
<hr/> <i>Student's Signature</i>	<i>Date</i>
<hr/> <i>Dean's Signature</i>	<i>Date</i>

Comprehensive Program Review RESOURCES FOR SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION

Section 1

This section contains a listing of sources for data and key documents referred to in Section 2 along with other resources. Contact information for relevant people is also included.

Academic Senate

<http://www.collegeofsanmateo.edu/academicsenate/>

Contact: csmacademicsenate@smccd.edu

Diana Bennett, President, bennettd@smccd.edu, (650) 358-6769

College Catalogs and College Class Schedules are archived online:

<http://collegeofsanmateo.edu/schedule/archive.asp>

Course Outlines are found at:

<http://collegeofsanmateo.edu/articulation/outlines.asp>

Committee on Instruction

<http://www.smccd.net/accounts/csmcoi>

Contact: Laura Demsetz, Chair, demsetz@smccd.edu, (650) 574-6617.

Program Review Resources (includes forms, data, and completed program reviews for both instructional and student services program review)

Core Program and Student Success Indicators (see links for "Quantitative Data for Instructional Programs")

Distance Education Program Review Data

Glossary of Terms for Program Review

Listing of Programs Receiving Program Review Data from PRIE

Rotation Schedule for Instructional Program Review, 2008-2014

http://collegeofsanmateo.edu/prie/program_review/program_review.php

Office of Planning, Research, and Institutional Effectiveness (PRIE)

<http://collegeofsanmateo.edu/prie/>

Contact: John Sewart, Dean, sewart@smccd.edu, (650) 574-6196

Contact: Milla McConnell-Tuite, Coordinator, mccconnell@smccd.edu, (650)574-6699

At PRIE Website:

College Index, 2009-2010, http://collegeofsanmateo.edu/prie/institutional_documents.php

Comprehensive Listing of Indicators and Measures, 2009-2010

http://collegeofsanmateo.edu/prie/institutional_documents.php

Division/Department Workplans, Spring 2009 (only)

http://collegeofsanmateo.edu/prie/institutional_documents.php

Educational Master Plan, 2008, <http://collegeofsanmateo.edu/prie/emp.php>

Institutional Priorities, 2008-2011

http://collegeofsanmateo.edu/prie/institutional_documents.php

Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) website:

<http://www.collegeofsanmateo.edu/sloac/>

Contact: Frederick Gaines, Interim SLO Coordinator, gainesf@smccd.edu, (650)574-6183

Section 2

This section contains the references that serve as data sources for the individual sections of the Comprehensive Program Review Form. Explanatory notes are included.

DEPARTMENT OR PROGRAM:

To identify programs on the comprehensive program review cycle, see *Rotation Schedule for Instructional Program Review, 2008-2014* at PRIE website at page for Instructional Program Review.

Also see *Listing of Programs Receiving Program Review Data from PRIE*.

I. DESCRIPTION OF PROGRAM

- "Number of Sections" data from *Core Program and Student Success Indicators* (published by PRIE for each program)
- CSM Course Catalog
- Department records

II. STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES

- SLO records maintained by the department
- CSM SLO Coordinator
- SLO Website
- The definitions for the General Education (GE) SLOs can be found on the CSM SLOAC website.

III. DATA EVALUATION

- Enrollment, WSCH, FTEF, and productivity data for each program can be found in *Core Program and Student Success Indicators*. (Published by PRIE.)
- Productivity is also commonly known as "LOAD." See *Glossary of Terms for Program Review* for definitions of key terms.
- Faculty Load: the ratio of the weekly contact hours (WSCH) of enrolled students and a faculty's hours of instruction per week. In other words, WSCH divided by FTE. ?
- The College's general target productivity will be recommended by the Budget Planning Committee.

IV. STUDENT SUCCESS EVALUATION AND ANALYSIS

- *Educational Master Plan, 2008*
- *College Index, 2009-2010*
- *Institutional Priorities, 2008-2011*
- *Student Success (course completion and retention) data from the "Core Program and Student Success Indicators";*
- *Other reports published by PRIE regarding student success*
- *Previous Program Review and Planning reports*
- *other department records*

V. REFLECTIVE ASSESSMENT OF INTERNAL AND EXTERNAL FACTORS AND PROGRAM/STUDENT SUCCESS

- *Educational Master Plan, 2008*

- *Institutional Priorities, 2008-2011*
- *College Index, 2009-2010*
- *Student Success (course completion and retention) data from the "Core Program and Student Success Indicators";*
- *Other reports published by PRIE regarding student success*
- *Previous Program Review and Planning reports*
- *Other department records*

a. About SWOT Analysis:

SWOT Analysis is a strategic planning tool used to evaluate the **S**trengths, **W**eaknesses, **O**pportunities, and **T**hreats involved in a project or initiative. It involves specifying the objective of the venture or project and identifying the internal and external factors that are favorable and unfavorable to achieving that objective. SWOT analysis considers both internal and external conditions.

Strengths: attributes of the organization that are helpful to achieving the objective.

Weaknesses: attributes of the organization or that are harmful to achieving the objective.

Opportunities: external conditions that are helpful to achieving the objective.

Threats: external conditions that are harmful to achieving the objective

b. Reflect on data from "Core Program and Student Success Indicators"

VI. Action Steps and Outcomes

- *Educational Master Plan, 2008*
- *Institutional Priorities, 2008-2011*
- *GE- or Certificate SLOs*
- *College Index, 2009-2010*
- *Course SLOs*
- *Department records*
- *Core Program and Student Success Indicators*
- *Previous Program Review and Planning reports*
- *Division work plan*

VII. SUMMARY OF RESOURCES NEEDED TO REACH PROGRAM ACTION STEPS

- *Educational Master Plan, 2008*
- *Institutional Priorities, 2008-2011*
- *College Index, 2009-2010*
- *GE- or Certificate SLOs*
- *Course SLOs*
- *Department records*
- *Core Program and Student Success Indicators*
- *previous Program Review and Planning reports*

VIII. Course Outlines

- *Department records*
- *College Catalog*
- *Committee On Instruction*
- *Course Outlines (online)*
- *Office of the Vice President of Instruction*
- *Division Dean*