**Academic Program Review**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Academic Year | **2013-14** | X   Basic Skills   X   Transfer       Career Technical Education (CTE) |
| Program | English | |
| Department | English | |
| Division | Arts, Letters, and Learning Services | |
| Submitter | James Patterson | |

**I. Institutional Goals**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Institutional Goal  **1** | **Institutional Mission and Effectiveness**  ̶ The College will maintain programs and services that focus on the mission of the College supported by data-driven assessments to measure student learning and student success. |
| Institutional Goal  **2** | **Student Learning Programs and Services ̶** The College will maintain instructional programs and services which support student success and the attainment of student educational goals. |
| Institutional Goal  **3** | **Resources**  ̶ The College will develop and manage human, technological, physical, and financial resources to effectively support the College mission and the campus learning environment. |
| Institutional Goal  **4** | **Leadership and Governance ̶** The Board of Trustees and the Superintendent/President will establish policies that ensure the quality, integrity, and effectiveness of student learning programs and services, and the financial stability of the institution. |

**II. Program Goals**

**A. Past ̶ Evaluation of Previous Cycle Objectives/Program Goals (Set in Previous Year)**

List your previous objectives/goals and associated Institutional Goals. All program goals must address at least one of the institutional goals.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Past Program Goals**  (Describe past program goals) | **Institutional Goals**  (Check all that apply) |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **1** | **Past Program Goal #1** | Institutional Goal(s) |
| The English Department will continue to explore opportunities in   * online and hybrid class offerings. | 1    X   2         3         4 |
| Goal Met   X   Partially Met       Not Met  *Provide detail on any improvements/effectiveness and detail status on those not fully met*.  Eight (8) full-time instructors in the English Department completed a two-course training offered through @One. Five (5) of the eight developed an online course in Blackboard which was submitted to and approved by the Distance Education Committee. Those five classes (three ENGL 110s and two ENGL 009s) were added to the Fall 2013 schedule.  Additionally, several instructors voiced interest in developing hybrid versions of ENGL 009 or ENGL 110. The Distance Education Coordinator asked the department to hold off on development and implementation of hybrid courses until after the first release of the online courses could be evaluated.  It was observed that the Distance Education Addenda for ENGL 009 and ENGL 110 speak only to full, online delivery. These addenda will need to be modified to address the unique characteristics of hybrid delivery and re-submitted to the Curriculum Committee. |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **2** | **Past Program Goal #2** | Institutional Goal(s) |
| The English Department will continue to explore opportunities in   * pairing basic skills classes with 100-level general education classes. | 1    X   2         3         4 |
| Goal Met         Partially Met   X    Not Met  *Provide detail on any improvements/effectiveness and detail status on those not fully met*.  This goal was not pursued by the department. |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **3** | **Past Program Goal #3** | Institutional Goal(s) |
| The English Department will continue to explore opportunities in   * evaluation of textbooks appropriate for each level of instruction. | 1    X   2         3         4 |
| Goal Met         Partially Met   X   Not Met  *Provide detail on any improvements/effectiveness and detail status on those not fully met*.  This goal will be addressed in Spring 2014. |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **4** | **Past Program Goal #4** | Institutional Goal(s) |
| The English Department will continue to explore opportunities in   * funding and implementation of embedded tutors in basic skills classes. | 1    X   2         3         4 |
| Goal Met    X    Partially Met         Not Met  *Provide detail on any improvements/effectiveness and detail status on those not fully met*.  The Program Review for 2012-13 included a Resource Request for funding of this project. No funding was received. The Dean of Arts, Letters, and Learning Services has submitted a grant proposal to the Basic Skills Initiative committee to fund several embedded tutors in ENGL 009 or ENGL 010 for the spring semester 2014. |

**II. Program Goals**

**B. Present ̶ Data Analysis and Program Health**

**ENGLISH COURSES ̶ Overall**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Term | Enroll. | Fill Rate | # of  Sections | Mass  Cap | Avg.  Class Cap | Avg.  Class Size | FTES | FTEF | Productivity  (WSCH/FTEF) | Completion  Rate | Success  Rate |
| Fall 2009 | 3587 | 104.33% | 119 | 3438 | 28.89 | 30.14 | 416.09 | 21.46 |  | 73% | 55% |
| Spring 2010 | 3346 | 94.65% | 122 | 3535 | 28.98 | 27.43 | 384.68 | 22.40 |  | 74% | 55% |
| Fall 2010 | 3755 | 103.84% | 127 | 3616 | 28.47 | 29.57 | 435.72 | 25.13 | 568.52 | 77% | 56% |
| Spring 2011 | 3622 | 100.06% | 123 | 3620 | 29.43 | 29.45 | 419.34 | 24.53 | 572.89 | 80% | 60% |
| Fall 2011 | 3486 | 102.74% | 116 | 3393 | 29.25 | 30.05 | 407.37 | 23.51 | 482.99 | 82% | 60% |
| Spring 2012 | 3074 | 94.73% | 111 | 3245 | 29.23 | 27.69 | 355.22 | 22.65 | 564.36 | 82% | 59% |
| Fall 2012 | 3126 | 100.58% | 109 | 3108 | 28.51 | 28.68 | 394.65 | 26.31 | 517.65 | 88% | 50% |
| Spring 2013 | 2628 | 92.54% | 100 | 2840 | 28.40 | 26.28 | 323.98 | 24.30 | 442.30 | 86% | 50% |
| % Change  Fall terms  2010 to 2012 | -17% | -3% | -14% | -14% | 0% | -3% | -9% | 5% | -15% | 5% | -2% |
| % Change  Spring terms  2010 to 2012 | -27% | -8% | -19% | -22% | -3% | -11% | -23% | -2% | -22% | 4% | 0% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Gender | Female | | | Male | | | No Response | | |
| Term | # | Success. | Retent. | # | Success | Retent. | # | Success | Retent. |
| Fall 2010 | 2232 | 59% | 79% | 1479 | 53% | 75% | 44 | 55% | 91% |
| Spring 2011 | 2205 | 63% | 83% | 1366 | 55% | 77% | 53 | 66% | 83% |
| Fall 2011 | 2129 | 62% | 83% | 1317 | 57% | 80% | 43 | 60% | 81% |
| Spring 2012 | 1846 | 62% | 83% | 1188 | 56% | 81% | 40 | 55% | 80% |
| Fall 2012 | 1855 | 62% | 85% | 1237 | 56% | 82% | 34 | 41% | 56% |
| Spring 2013 | 1554 | 57% | 82% | 1049 | 53% | 79% | 25 | 48% | 68% |
| Total | 11821 | 61% | 82% | 7636 | 55% | 79% | 239 | 56% | 78% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Ethnicity | African-American | | | Asian | | | Hispanic | | | Native American | | |
| Term | # | Success | Retent. | # | Success | Retent. | # | Success | Retent. | # | Success | Retent. |
| Fall 2010 | 33 | 73% | 91% | 21 | 57% | 71% | 3427 | 55% | 76% | 1 | 100% | 100% |
| Spring 2011 | 26 | 69% | 81% | 32 | 84% | 94% | 3209 | 60% | 80% | 4 | 75% | 75% |
| Fall 2011 | 22 | 50% | 86% | 20 | 70% | 80% | 3160 | 60% | 82% | 2 | 50% | 50% |
| Spring 2012 | 17 | 71% | 82% | 17 | 94% | 94% | 2772 | 60% | 83% |  |  |  |
| Fall 2012 | 6 | 67% | 100% | 14 | 50% | 64% | 2845 | 59% | 83% | 1 | 100% | 100% |
| Spring 2013 | 6 | 50% | 83% | 15 | 67% | 87% | 2375 | 55% | 80% |  |  |  |
| Totals | 110 | 65% | 86% | 119 | 72% | 83% | 17788 | 58% | 81% | 8 | 75% | 75% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Ethnicity | White | | | Other | | | No Response | | |
| Term | # | Success | Retent. | # | Success | Retent. | # | Success | Retent. |
| Fall 2010 | 128 | 73% | 85% | 4 | 25% | 75% | 141 | 56% | 81% |
| Spring 2011 | 126 | 68% | 80% | 2 | 50% | 100% | 225 | 60% | 80% |
| Fall 2011 | 70 | 70% | 81% | 4 | 50% | 75% | 211 | 58% | 81% |
| Spring 2012 | 58 | 64% | 71% | 1 | 0% | 100% | 209 | 56% | 80% |
| Fall 2012 | 32 | 63% | 75% | 2 | 0% | 50% | 226 | 62% | 83% |
| Spring 2013 | 26 | 58% | 77% | 1 | 0% | 0% | 205 | 58% | 81% |
| Totals | 440 | 68% | 80% | 14 | 29% | 71% | 1217 | 59% | 81% |

Completion Rates by Day, Evening, and Online offerings

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Fall 2010 | | | Spring 2011 | | | Fall 2011 | | | Spring 2012 | | | Fall 2012 | | | Spring 2013 | | |
| ENGL | Day | Eve | Onl | Day | Eve | Onl | Day | Eve | Onl | Day | Eve | Onl | Day | Eve | Onl | Day | Eve | Onl |
| 098 | 75% | 68% | 79% | 84% | 78% | 74% | 90% | 84% | --- | 91% | 91% | --- |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 099 | 78% | 81% | 34% | 95% | 87% | 58% | 89% | 78% | 68% | 78% | 84% | 78% |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 009 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 85% | 84% | 70% | 79% | 77% | --- |
| 101 | 74% | 70% | 61% | 71% | 80% | 58% | 67% | 92% | 76% | 73% | 64% | 73% | 81% | 72% | --- | 79% | 75% | --- |

Success Rates by Day, Evening, and Online offerings

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Fall 2010 | | | Spring 2011 | | | Fall 2011 | | | Spring 2012 | | | Fall 2012 | | | Spring 2013 | | |
| ENGL | Day | Eve | Onl | Day | Eve | Onl | Day | Eve | Onl | Day | Eve | Onl | Day | Eve | Onl | Day | Eve | Onl |
| 098 | 60% | 39% | 38% | 60% | 65% | 65% | 77% | 78% | --- | 74% | 80% | --- |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 099 | 36% | 48% | 19% | 73% | 85% | 38% | 49% | 64% | 47% | 39% | 62% | 45% |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 009 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 52% | 70% | 42% | 45% | 53% | --- |
| 101 | 53% | 56% | 42% | 55% | 72% | 41% | 52% | 88% | 55% | 56% | 56% | 49% | 59% | 61% | --- | 60% | 61% | --- |

1. Summarize and analyze data.

a. Discuss the trends in enrollment and fill rate for each program by day and evening at the program level.

During the period under examination, the institution has been working to develop more effective enrollment management strategies. That, in part, has led to a reduction in the number of sections offered by the English Department. In addition, the English Department has collapsed eight developmental reading and writing courses into four which has affected the number of sections offered. The result is an overall reduction of about 13% in the number of sections offered. Fill rates in English classes have dropped from 104% to 93% over the same time period as instructors have chosen not to overextend themselves with students above the course capacity numbers.

b. What are the trends in productivity (WSCH/FTEF)? The goal is 525 as per state guidelines. A low number means that we are below target levels for productivity.

The largest factor in the decreases in FTES and Productivity has been the changes to the Reading Competency requirement for graduation. To remove the institutional requirement (which was ENGL 089 or test score), the graduation requirement for Reading Competency was shifted to ENGL 110 (formerly ENGL 101). Students appear to have interpreted the removal of the reading class requirement as a removal of the need for reading classes. In Fall 2011, 41 sections of Reading classes were offered (ENGL 86/87, 88, and 89). The number of sections of Reading classes dropped in Fall 2012 to 25 sections as ENGL 86/87 became ENGL 018 and ENGL 88 and ENGL 89 were combined into ENGL 019. Student demand for reading classes have continued to drop. In Fall 2013, only nine sections of developmental Reading Classes were offered. Only eight sections were scheduled for Spring 2014, and two sections were cancelled for low enrollment.

c. Discuss the success and retention rates by day, evening/weekend, and online classes.

During the period under review, the number of evening/weekend sections and online class offerings have shifted dramatically. The ENGL 101 numbers for the Fall 2011 semester are misleading because only one evening section was offered that semester. During other semesters, no online sections were offered. The English Department pulled all online sections for the Spring 2013 semester as instructors participated in additional training and re-built courses in ENGL 009 and ENGL 110. During semesters when evening and online sections were relatively equal, numbers for success and completion are also stable (see ENGL 101 data for Spring 2012).

d. Discuss the success and retention rates by demographic diversity of students.

The trend in demographic diversity is weighted toward the Hispanic students who make up about 90% of the students in English classes. Female students make up approximately 61% of English classes. Given that the ENGL 110 is a graduation requirement for all students, the demographics for the English department should be similar to the campus as a whole. Given that the ENGL 008, ENGL 009, READ 018, and READ 019 courses are developmental in nature, it is appropriate to see a larger percentage of students from non-English backgrounds who are speaking, reading, and writing English as a second language.

e. Discuss the trends in the number of degrees or certificates awarded.

The Associate of Arts degree in English is awarded to about 3 students each year; it is a small program. With the 2013-14 academic year, the new Associate of Arts in English for Transfer (AA-T) degree is now available. This new degree will make it easier for graduates to transfer to the CSU system, and this may increase the number of degrees awarded in the future.

f. What program changes, if any, do you expect to have a positive effect on your students?

The 3-unit ENGL 101 (first-year composition course) was re-designed as the 4-unit ENGL 110 this academic year. The additional unit represents the addition of reading competency in the course. Student outcomes will be tracked this year. Next year, the department will re-evaluate the prerequisites for ENGL 110, perhaps to specifically note a Reading prerequisite. Currently, READ 019 is recommended preparation.

Next year, the department plans to run two pilot programs. In one instance, one section of ENGL 009 and one section of ENGL 059 will be linked and marketed to students who need to re-take ENGL 009. It is anticipated that the additional work and support in English grammar and usage will significantly improve student success. In another instance, the department plans to offer two sections of ENGL 110 in a hybrid format where students meet with the instructor for face-to-face instructor once each week and complete all other course work online. It is anticipated that the hybrid format will support students who are interested in but not yet ready for fully online classes.

2. Summarize revisions, additions, deletions, and alternate delivery methods to courses and/or program based on the last program review.

This is the second year of programming for the consolidated basic skills courses: ENGL 008, ENGL 009, READ 018, and READ 109. During the early weeks of Fall 2013, students in these developmental classes were asked to re-test on the Accuplacer instrument to validate the cut scores. The assessment score data will be reviewed for appropriate placement of students in the future.

The accelerated Basic English Composition course (ENGL 010) was launched in the fall of 2011. Student success data was compared with ENGL 009 success data in the ENGL 101 courses for Spring 2012. Student success in the subsequent class for ENGL 009 and ENGL 010 students was comparable. The Department will continue to examine comparison data for subsequent years.

This is the first year of programming for the ENGL 110 (4-unit first year composition course). Assessment data will be collected, as available, to track student success in reading skills. The ENGL 110 course now meets the reading competency for graduation; the department needs to collect assessment data of reading skills to evaluate the recommended preparation of READ 019.

This is the first year of offering new online versions of ENGL 009 and ENGL 110. Student retention and success data will need to be evaluated comparing on-ground with online courses.

3. Evaluate the program's viability by addressing program completion, size (FTES), projections (growing/stable/ declining), and quality of outcomes.

The ENGL 110 course is a graduation requirement for Reading and Writing competencies. Plus, many students are admitted to Imperial Valley College needing remediation in English composition and/or Reading skills. As a result, the English Department maintains strong viability within the context of basic skills and transfer requirements. Only a few specialty classes are offered to a small number of students pursuing an AA-Transfer degree in English (students also take these courses to meet GE requirements for CSU and UC. These few classes do not hinder the broader offerings of the English Department.

Projections for the English Department are stable.

The English Department is aware of lower success rates overall; however, the overall percentage numbers for retention and success are misleading given the wide range of retention and success rates per instructor. The department faculty needs to establish benchmark standards and develop professional development support for those instructors not meeting the agreed-upon benchmarks.

**A. A. ENGLISH – COMPLETION & SUCCESS RATES**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Course | **Completion Rate (Percentage)** | | | | | | | | **Success Rate (Percentage)** | | | | | | | |
| F09 | S10 | F10 | S11 | F11 | S12 | F12 | S13 | F09 | S10 | F10 | S11 | F11 | S12 | F12 | S13 |
| ENGL 101 | 59.0 | 71.0 | 71.0 | 71.0 | 69.0 | 72.0 | 78.4 | 77.3 | 41.0 | 37.0 | 52.0 | 58.0 | 52.0 | 56.0 | 59.7 | 60.6 |
| ENGL 102 | 78.0 | 72.0 | 80.0 | 73.0 | 81.0 | 84.0 | 80.9 | 82.6 | 55.0 | 57.0 | 65.0 | 55.0 | 60.0 | 53.0 | 57.5 | 63.0 |
| ENGL 201 | 59.0 | 57.0 | 66.0 | 72.0 | 66.0 | 62.0 | 73.9 | 86.8 | 44.0 | 44.0 | 57.0 | 56.0 | 50.0 | 44.0 | 64.7 | 67.0 |
| ENGL 220/221 |  | 89.0 |  |  | 67.0 |  |  |  |  | 89.0 |  |  | 57.0 |  |  |  |
| ENGL 222/223 |  |  |  | 58.0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 42.0 |  |  |  |  |
| ENGL 224/225 | 60.0 | 65.0 | 73.0 | 80.0 |  |  | 89.5 | 87.0 | 30.0 | 35.0 | 60. | 67.0 |  |  | 68.4 | 78.3 |
| ENGL/HUM 226 | 71.0 |  | 74.0 |  | 87.0 |  |  | 96.4 | 64.0 |  | 65.0 |  | 74.0 |  |  | 82.1 |
| FILM 230 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ENGL 250 | 88.0 |  | 65.0 |  | 93.0 |  | 93.3 |  | 53.0 |  | 79.0 |  | 65.0 |  | 93.3 |  |
| ENGL 270 |  | 93.0 |  | 67.0 |  |  |  | 82.4 |  | 47.0 |  | 67.0 |  |  |  | 52.9 |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| AA degrees completed 2009-10 | AA degrees completed 2010-11 | AA degrees completed 2011-12 | AA degrees completed 2012-13 | No Certificates are Offered |
| 1 | 9 | 2 | 4 | 0 |

**II. Program Goals**

**C. Future ̶ List of SMART[[1]](#footnote-1) Program Objectives for next academic year to address Program Improvement, Growth, or Unmet Needs/Goals. All Program Goals must address at least one of the Institutional Goals.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Future Program Goals**  (Describe future program goals. List in order of budget priority.) | **Institutional Goals**  (Check all that apply) |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **1** | **Future Program Goal #1**  Budget Priority #1 | | | | **Institutional**  **Goal(s)** |
| **Identify Goal:**   Provide professional development | | | | | 1    X   2         3         4 |
| **Objective:**   To provide professional development opportunities aimed at collaborative norming of expectations and improved student learning. | | | | |
| **Task(s):**   (a) Professional Development in collaboration and coaching;  (b) Professional Development in development of learning objectives and student learning outcomes;  (c) Research in learning expectations for equivalent courses at other colleges and universities;  (d) Professional Development in lesson planning and effective teaching strategies (Explicit Direct Instruction, etc.); | | | | |
| **Timeline:**   Fall 2014 and Spring 2015 | | | | |
| **Expense Type** | | **Funding Type** | **Resource Plan** | | **Budget Request** |
| One-Time    X   Recurring | | Categorical  Specify:    X   General Fund | Facilities          Marketing          Planning & Budget    X   Professional  Development | Staffing          SLO/SAO          Student Services          Technology | $          10,000.00 |

**Rationale:** While the basic skills reading sequence is experiencing a significant decrease in student demand, the demand for basic skills writing courses continues to grow. Most instructors (9 out of 15) are qualified to teach both writing and reading courses. The basic skills program is healthy. However, the average retention and success numbers for a course such as ENGL 009 do not reflect the variance between individual instructors’ classes. The Fall 2013 data shows a range of success rates from 11% to 78%. The program would benefit greatly from increased funding and opportunities for professional development aimed at norming expectations and improving student learning.

The ENGL 101 course, which became ENGL 110 in Fall 2013, is the general education requirement for graduation. Again, the average retention and success numbers for ENGL 101 do not reflect the variance between individual instructors’ classes. The Fall 2013 data shows a range of success rates from 21% to 88%. The program would benefit greatly from increased funding and opportunities for professional development aimed at norming expectations and improving student learning.

The English Department would benefit greatly from increased funding for professional development. Individual instructors would benefit, and students would consequently benefit, from professional development opportunities in effective teaching strategies, collaborative modeling, and mentoring. A first step in this direction would be to bring onto campus curriculum and instruction trainers from ICOE and/or Palomar College. Imperial County Office of Education charges $600 for a one-day training (6 hours). For one such day of professional development, the department would need to compensate instructors at a rate of $50/hour. There are 16 full-time and 13 part-time instructors. Compensating 29 instructors for six hours of training would cost $8,700 (if all instructors participated). Thus, a one-day training offered on campus by ICOE could cost up to $9,500-10,000 (including lunch).

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **2** | **Future Program Goal #2**  Budget Priority #2 | | | | **Institutional**  **Goal(s)** |
| **Identify Goal:**   Improve student learning | | | | | \_\_  1    X   2         3         4 |
| **Objective:**   Provide embedded tutors in ENGL 009 and ENGL 010 classes. | | | | |
| **Task(s):**   (a) Provide two tutors in ENGL 009 and two tutors in ENGL 010 classes in the Fall 2014 semester; and  (b) Provide two tutors in ENGL 009 and two tutors in ENGL 010 classes in the Spring 2015 semester. | | | | |
| **Timeline:**   Spring 2014 and Fall 2014 | | | | |
| **Expense Type** | | **Funding Type** | **Resource Plan** | | **Budget Request** |
| One-Time    X   Recurring | | Categorical  Specify:    X   General Fund | Facilities          Marketing          Planning & Budget          Professional  Development | X    Staffing          SLO/SAO          Student Services          Technology | $               8,800.00 |

**Rationale**: A pilot program of embedded tutors is running during the Spring 2014 semester, funded through a BSI grant. Two ENGL 009 and two ENGL 010 classes (4 instructors) are participating in the program. Assessment data will be gathered to compare student retention and success in the traditional sections and these sections with embedded tutors.

The English Department seeks District funding on a recurring basis to continue this program in the future. We seek to expand the program to allow for four tutors in the fall and four tutors in the spring ($1,100 per tutor).

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **3** | **Future Program Goal #3**  Budget Priority #2 | | | | **Institutional**  **Goal(s)** |
| **Identify Goal:**   Improve departmental effectiveness | | | | | X   1         2         3         4 |
| **Objective:**   Evaluate recent changes to the program offerings. | | | | |
| **Task(s):**   (a) Evaluate the shift to MWF 75-minute periods on the ENGL 009 common essay examination scores; and  (b) Evaluate the shift to a 4-unit ENGL 110 related to reading and writing competencies.  (c) Negotiate 1-2 paired classes with other departments on campus for 2014-15.  (d) Develop hybrid form of ENGL 110. | | | | |
| **Timeline:**   Spring 2014 and Fall 2014 | | | | |
| **Expense Type** | | **Funding Type** | **Resource Plan** | | **Budget Request** |
| One-Time    X   Recurring | | Categorical  Specify:    X   General Fund | Facilities          Marketing          Planning & Budget    X   Professional  Development | Staffing          SLO/SAO          Student Services          Technology | $               0.00 |

**III. Institutional Student Learning Outcomes (ILSOs)**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **ISLO 1** | Communication Skills |
| **ISLO 2** | Critical Thinking Skills |
| **ISLO 3** | Personal Responsibility |
| **ISLO 4** | Information Literacy |
| **ISLO 5** | Global Awareness |

**IV. Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs)**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Program Learning Outcomes**  (Describe learning outcomes) | **ISLOs**  (Link PLO to appropriate ISLOs) |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **PLO**  **1** | **Program Learning Outcome #1** | **ISLOs** |
| Identify Program Outcome:  The student will demonstrate command of rules regarding plagiarism and academic ethics. | \_\_\_\_\_ ISLO 1  \_\_\_\_\_ ISLO 2     X   ISLO 3  \_\_\_\_\_ ISLO 4  \_\_\_\_\_ ISLO 5 |
| Measurable Outcome Summary: (from Fall 2013)  Assessment Data was drawn from 5 sections of ENGL 201, Advanced Composition.  There were 97 student submissions:  Excellent: 44 (45%)  Satisfactory: 51 (53%)  Unsatisfactory: 1 ( 2%) |
| Provide detail on any changes in curriculum or delivery strategies prompted by an analysis of the data:  No changes are being recommended at this point. The department is considering assessing PLO 1 in the ENGL 110 course as well. |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **PLO**  **2** | **Program Learning Outcome #2** | **ISLOs** |
| Identify Program Outcome:  The student will explicate and evaluate textual material in literature and rhetoric. | X    ISLO 1     X    ISLO 2  \_\_\_\_\_ ISLO 3  \_\_\_\_\_ ISLO 4     X    ISLO 5 |
| Measurable Outcome Summary: (from Fall 2013)  Assessment Data was drawn from one section of ENGL 220, Survey of American Literature I.  Eight papers were submitted.  Exemplary: 3  Satisfactory: 4  Unsatisfactory: 1 |
| Provide detail on any changes in curriculum or delivery strategies prompted by an analysis of the data:  No changes are being recommended at this time. |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **PLO**  **3** | **Program Learning Outcome #3** | **ISLOs** |
| Identify Program Outcome:  The student will produce an effective research paper using logical reasoning and analysis. | X    ISLO 1     X    ISLO 2     X    ISLO 3     X    ISLO 4     X    ISLO 5 |
| Measurable Outcome Summary: (from Fall 2013)  Assessment Data was drawn from one section of ENGL 110, Composition and Reading.   * Number of students who submitted the research paper: 341 * Number of students who submitted an effective research paper containing the standard elements (introduction, body, conclusion, in-text citations, bibliographic documentation, word count): 259 (76%) * Number of students who used logical reasoning and analysis appropriate to the assignment: 258 (76%) |
| Provide detail on any changes in curriculum or delivery strategies prompted by an analysis of the data:  The instructors will continue discussions toward development of a departmental rubric. No changes to the curriculum are being considered at this time. |

Student Learning Outcomes Assessment –completion

Student Learning Outcomes assessment was conducted in most English classes for Fall 2012 and Spring 2013. In the case of ENGL 019, Reading II: Intermediate Development, the instructors spent the year working to develop a mutually-agreed-upon common assessment. This Fall 2013, the ENGL 008 instructors piloted a common essay examination in a move toward establishing a common student learning assessment for the ENGL 008 classes similar to the tool used for ENGL 009. A fuller implementation of the ENGL 008 common essay examination will be conducted during the Spring 2014 semester.

1. **SMART** = **S**pecific **M**easurable **A**ttainable **R**elevant **T**ime-limited. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)