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# 1.0 Program Data and Resource Repository

1.2 Quantitative and Qualitative Data

All programs are provided with the most recent two years of data by the Office of Institutional Research (IR) as well as two-year budget data provided by the Business Office.

The data sets provided by the Office of Institutional Research include the following elements for the most recent two (completed) academic years:

* Number of Faculty (Full Time; Part Time; Total)
* Student Credit Hours by Faculty Type
* Enrollment by Faculty Type
* Faculty Name by Type
* Average Class Size, Completion, and Attrition
* Course Completion, Success and Attrition by Distance Learning v Face-to-Face
* Number of Degrees/Certificates Awarded
* Number of Graduates Transferring (if available from IR)
* Number of Graduates Working in Related Field (technical programs only)
* Expenditures and Revenues

Additional data may also be available for reporting from the Office of Institutional Research, as applicable. Requests for additional data must be made through a data request.

*(See Section 1.2 in the Program Review Handbook for more information.)*

### Narrative:

DEV English Program Review Data AY 2019

**Number of Faculty:**

Full time: 3 (Mydosh, Peralta, Pinkard)

Part time: 1 (B. Carson)

**Enrollment & Student credit hours by Faculty type:**

Full time: 14 total credit hours taught, with 42 total student enrollments

Part time: 19 credit hours taught, 61 total student enrollments

**Average Class size:**

11.4 students in Face-to-Face classes

0 students in online classes

11.4 students across all DEV English courses

**Completion rates:**

86.4% face-to-face

0% online

86.4% all DEV English courses

**Pass rates (C or better):**

77.5% face-to-face

0% online

77.5% all DEV English courses

**% of AY2019 Students Passing Comp Prep (‘C’ or better):**

Summer: 81.8% (9 of 11)

Fall: 73.5% (25 of 32)

Spring: 87.5% (14 of 16)

Total: % (48 of 61)

**% of AY2019 Students Who Passed (with ‘C’) Comp Prep Who Completed Comp I as of Fall 2019:**

Summer: 33.3% (3 of 9)

Fall: 56.0% (14 of 25)

Spring: 50.0% (7 of 14)

Total: 50.0% (24 of 48)

**% of AY2019 Students Who Passed (with ‘C’) Comp Prep & Completed Comp I Who Passed (with ‘C’) Comp I as of Fall 2019:**

Summer: 33.3% (1 of 3)

Fall: 92.9% (13 of 14)

Spring: 100% (7 of 7)

Total: 87.5% (21 of 24)

**% of AY2019 Students Passing English Skills (‘C’ or better):**

Summer: 0% (0 of 0)

Fall: 75.0% (21 of 28)

Spring: 0% (0 of 0)

Total: % ( of )

**% of AY2019 Students Who Passed (with ‘C’) English Skills (without also passing Comp Prep) Who Completed Comp I as of Fall 2019:**

Summer: 0% (0 of 0)

Fall: 57.1% (12 of 21)

Spring: 0% (0 of 0)

Total: 57.1% (12 of 21)

**% of AY2019 Students Who Passed (with ‘C’) English Skills (without also passing Comp Prep) & Completed Comp I Who Passed (with ‘C’) Comp I as of Fall 2019:**

Summer: 0% (0 of 0)

Fall: 91.7% (11 of 12)

Spring: 0% (0 of 0)

Total: 91.7% (11 of 12)

**% of AY2019 Students Who Completed Any Dev English Course BUT Did Not Pass English Skills or Comp Prep (‘C’ or better) & Completed Comp I Who Passed Comp I as of Fall 2019:**

Summer: 0% (0 attempted)

Fall: 0% (0 of 1)

Spring: 0% (0 attempted)

Total: 0% (0 of 1)

**% of AY2019 Students Who Completed English Comp I Who Hadn’t Taken Any Dev English Course in the Last 2 Academic Years Who Passed (‘C’ or better)**

Summer: 86.7% (26 of 30)

Fall: 84.8% (168 of 198); without HS: 69.7% (53 of 76)

Spring: 60.0% (36 of 60)

Total: 79.9% (230 of 288); without HS: 69.3% (115 of 166)

Our collaborative teaching team continues to exceed national averages for students who invest their time in our developmental courses. According to a recent online article by the Center for the Analysis of Postsecondary Readiness reported that, “37 percent of students referred to developmental reading who made it through the courses went on to pass the relevant entry-level or “gatekeeper” college course. An additional 12 percent of those referred to developmental math and an additional 32 percent of those referred to developmental reading skipped the developmental courses but still passed a gatekeeper course” (Developmental Education FAQs). **We exceed this.** Our small class size, flexibility in course design to meet the learning outcomes, and the personal attention all our instructors offer supports student capacity to create consistent data acquisition and writing habits which contribute to academic success while also developing non-cognitive skills of persistence, resilience, and project management. We have not had students have an equal or higher success rate in Composition I who have placed, through multiple measures, into a Developmental Course, as seen at other institutions. We do have an over 10% higher rate of success in Composition I after passing Composition Preparation than nonconcurrent students who have placed into Composition I. The rates of passing Composition I after English Skills and or Composition Preparation vary between 50%-91% varying by cohort.

“Developmental Education FAQs.” *Center for the Analysis of Postsecondary Readiness*, 30 Nov. 2017, postsecondaryreadiness.org/developmental-education-faqs/.

# 3.0 Assessment of Student Learning Outcomes

3.2 Significant Assessment Findings

The program faculty should provide a narrative overview of the program's significant student learning outcomes assessment findings, any associated impact on curriculum, as well as any ongoing assessment plans. The program may attach data charts, assessment reports or other relevant materials. *(See Section 3.2 in the Program Review Handbook for more information.)*

### Narrative:

English Skills has the following course-level learning outcomes:

1. Identify and summarize main points and sub points from various readings from

multiple genres.

2.  Demonstrate a mastery of grammar skills at the sentence and paragraph levels.

3.  Compose organized, unified and coherent paragraphs utilizing standard paragraph

structure consisting of a topic sentence, development, and a concluding sentence utilizing various rhetorical stances.

English Skills has the following common assessments to gauge completion of the course-level outcomes:

1. A Formal non-narrative Essay which includes a Works Cited with at least two

citations

2.  A Final Exam which includes a Narrative Essay and a Reader Response Essay.

The following results are included based on a custom rubric that functions on a 5-point scale for the non-narrative essay with a minimum of two citations:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| ***Criterion (out of 5)***  | ***Fall 2018 (9am Section)***  | ***Fall 2018 (10am Section)*** |
| Instructions/Conventions   | 4.00  | 4.23  |
| Support   | 4.25  | 3.78  |
| Mechanics  | 3.60 | 3.34  |
| MLA Formatting  | 3.875  | 3.34  |
| ***% of students submitting***  | 67%  | 69%  |

There was not a section of English Skills that ran in Spring 2019, so all results are pulled from the Fall as noted. There is a modest improvement in the percentage of students who submitted work over the previous years, which is largely due to instructor diligence and increased emphasis on proactively dealing with students’ resistance to technology.

Composition Preparation has the following course-level learning outcomes:

1. Compose essays that demonstrate a mastery of introductory paragraphs, body paragraphs,

concluding paragraphs and transitions that adequately support a thesis statement. \*\*Common Core Outcome; must be assessed using Five Paragraph Rubric Provided by institution\*\*

1. Utilize the writing process: prewriting, organization, drafting, revision, proofreading

editing.

1. Revise essays to improve style, word choice, figurative language and sentence variety.
2. Recognize and control common grammatical error such as comma splices, run-ons, shift

in tense and person, fragments in student’s own writing.

1. Summarize and analyze various readings from various genres.

Composition Preparation has the following common assessments to gauge completion of the course-level outcomes:

Final In-class writing graded primarily on how well student has met course competencies as listed above. Essay needs to be a significant part of course grade.

The “Five Paragraph Rubric” referenced by the learning outcomes was not made available to the part-time faculty, and operating in a deficit of information, the AAC&U Written Communication VALUE Rubric was substituted in place of whatever custom rubric had previously been in place. This rubric is part of the VALUE Rubric suite and is a national standard. It is also the one used by the English Department for the college-level composition sequence.

As this is an in-class writing, the work is collected, assessed, and then recorded as an aggregate grade in Canvas with the specifics of the rubric criterion returned to the student when they come to collect their work. As such, there is not a way to break out the results by criterion. The aggregate scores on the final in-class writing from representative sections are included here:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Fall 2018** | **Spring 2019** |
| **Average Final Grade** | 96% | 91% |
| ***% of students submitting***  | 69% (9 of 13) | 100% (9 of 9) |

Perhaps the most remarkable element of this result is the 100% submission rate of the spring cohort, as it is rare to have everyone still enrolled in the course participating at the conclusion of it. All instructors continue to adjust in delivery based on the needs of the students presenting in their sections. The two areas in which most adjustments are being enacted are in Reading selections and computing access. Instructors are investing time in including a widening diversity of voices in reading examples both from OER literature resources and current journalism. More class time is being used in the Library or computer labs to both provide access to computing for students who do not own their own computers and to provide instruction and troubleshooting opportunities for students to be facile with CANVAS, the External LTI of Turnitin.com through CANVAS, the Online Office Suite including Word and Outlook, and overcoming computing gates which prevent students from submitting quality work which meet the parameters of the assignments.

4.0 External Constituency and Significant Trends

An important component of maintaining a superior program lies in awareness and understanding of other possible factors that may impact the program and/or student outcomes. After consideration of these other factors, program faculty should document the relevant information within this section. As applicable, this should include the following.

## 4.1: Program Advisory Committee:

### Narrative:

* IncludeAdvisory Member Name/ Title/ Organization/ Length of Service on committee; note the Committee Chair with an asterisk (\*).
* Upload meeting minutes from the previous spring and fall semesters and attach in the appendices section (10.0).

There is no Program Advisory Committee, though the English Department does work closely with Dev English to make sure students are where they need to be upon exiting the developmental track and entering the college-level compositional sequence.

## 4.2: Specialized Accreditation:

* Include Accrediting Agency title, abbreviation, ICC contact; Agency contact, Date of Last Visit, Reaffirmation, Next Visit, FY Projected Accreditation Budget.
* Upload the most recent self-study and site visit documents.
* Upload agency correspondence which confirm accreditation status.

### Narrative:

N/A

## 4.3:  Other:

Discuss any external constituencies that may apply to the program.  *(See Section 4.3 in the Program Review Handbook for more information.)*

### Narrative:

N/A

# 5.0 Curriculum Reflection

 5.1 Reflection on Current Curriculum

The program faculty should provide a narrative reflection that describes the program’s curriculum holistically. The following are prompts formulated to guide thinking/reflection on curriculum. While presented in question form, the intent of the prompts is to stimulate thought and it is not expected that programs specifically answer each and every question.

* Is the curriculum of the program appropriate to the breadth, depth, and level of the discipline?
* How does this program transfer to four-year universities? (give specific examples)
* What types of jobs can students get after being in your program? (Please use state and national data)
* How dynamic is the curriculum? When was the last reform or overhaul?
* In the wake of globalization, how “internationalized” is the curriculum?
* How does the program assess diversity?
* Does the program have any community-based learning components in the curriculum?

### Narrative:

The Curriculums for both English Skills and Composition Preparation are appropriate to the breadth, depth, and level of the discipline in that they are designed as practice-based models which divide skills for introduction, practice, and reinforcement in different genres at both the sentence and paragraph level in English Skills and at the level of the Five-Paragraph Essay in Composition Preparation.

These courses do not transfer for college credit but provide the opportunity to improve skills specifically while students focus on course content in other areas.

The curriculum is highly dynamic which allows for changes in readings, approaches to assignments, and material examples to be highly tailored to each section. Both courses now use primarily instructor aggregated and generated materials along with classic OER accessible style guides both to demonstrate to students that reading and writing are living and dynamic skills and to be as conscious as possible of students’ financial pressures.

The program strives to take reading in context and writing for audience as seriously as possible. These courses frequently include students who are English Language Learners for whom vocabulary and idiom are more important to their learning process than organization or the mechanics of Standard English.

These programs strive to be diverse in many ways. This includes using readings from multiple genres, physical, biological, and social sciences including economics and marketing; poetry, fiction, myth, and fairytales from multiple cultures round out the creative side of the house; current journalism examples from longstanding and reputable journals like NPR, National Geographic, and the Associated Press are also included and provide a wealth of easy to access conventions of writing. Assignments include time and globe spanning historic figures of multiple skills and backgrounds. Students write in both non-fiction and fiction styles in both courses. Plays, poetry, fiction, and interviews all include multiple Regional English dialects into the classroom which creates both representation and an opportunity for mechanical review which is particularly rich for quotation and the apostrophe of omission. This program exists for support; it does not recruit and accepts all the students for whom multiple measures determined need additional scaffolding to be predictors of future success. The students themselves select sections based on their schedules. Although we make no current demographic tracing for this program, anecdotal evidence would say that the courses are frequently at least 50% persons of color and are frequently more than 50% male. We also have not specifically tracked how many students who enter the program already have IEPs or Accommodations plans, in part, because we have no financial recourse for testing for those who do not already have a diagnosis who might display work that would stimulate a question concerning e.g. symbol use. We have no specific assessment structure for diversity for this program. We strive to provide examples from the great span of human experience and teach whoever our students are.

There are no community-based learning components in this curriculum.

5.2 Degree and Certificate Offerings or Support

Program faculty should list what degrees and certificates are offered and/or describe how the program curriculum supports other degrees and/or certificates awarded by the college.

### Narrative:

This program supports students’ capacity to read and write at a proficiency high enough to support their content learning in all other areas. Therefore, all degree and certificate programs into which the students who take a developmental course enter are supported by the work these students do in the Developmental English Program.

# 8.0 Fiscal Resource Requests/Adjustments

8.1 Budget Requests/Adjustments

Based on program data review, planning and development for student success, program faculty will complete and attach the budget worksheets to identify proposed resource needs and adjustments. These worksheets will be available through request from the college’s Chief Financial Officer.  Program faculty should explicitly state their needs/desires along with the financial amount required.

Programs should include some or all of the following, as applicable, in their annual budget proposals:

* Budget Projections (personnel and operation)
* Position Change Requests
* Educational Technology Support
* Instructional Technology Requests
* Facilities/Remodeling Requests
* Capital Equipment
* Non-Capital Furniture & Equipment
* New Capital Furniture & Equipment
* Replacement Capital Furniture & Equipment
* Other, as applicable
* Accreditation Fee Request
* Membership Fee Request
* Coordinating Reports

Resource requests should follow budgeting guidelines as approved by the Board of Trustees for each fiscal year. The resource requests should be used to provide summary and detailed information to the division Dean and other decision-makers and to inform financial decisions made throughout the year.

### Narrative:

Funding for this program is functionally included in many other areas. We should keep Turnitin.com. We should continue to improve our printing services on campus by maintaining paper and toner purchases and repairing and replacing photocopy machines.

We must continue to fund the Library, especially the online Learning Resources and personnel. This program frequently takes examples from our subscriptions through Opposing Viewpoints, EBSCO, Films on Demand, Encyclopedia Britannica, and Issues and Controversies.

The small class size and its capacity to create deep investment in students must be maintained by employing enough faculty to serve all of the students in classes that should remain capped at 12 for English Skills and 15 for Composition Preparation without pushing faculty teaching loads over 21 credits per semester.

The most important thing that could be done to provide additional student support would be extended computing hours, either in a staffed computer lab or through additional Library hours. The Library being consistently open until 9 p.m., Sunday (1-9 p.m.) and 7:30 a.m.-9 p.m. Monday through Thursday would provide an additional 24 hours a week of computing time for students who do not own their own computers, over 360 more hours over the course of the semester. This is about opportunity, access, and the quality of the work. It is possible to draft papers on a phone, but exceedingly difficult to revise, edit, and format them.

# 9.0 Program Planning and Development Participation

9.1 Faculty and Staff

Program faculty will provide a brief narrative of how faculty and staff participated in the program review, planning and development process. List the preparer(s) by name(s).

### Narrative:

I, Bridget Carson, prepared this report with data provided by Anita Chappuie, Director of Institutional Research. I worked with English Department Chair Heather Mydosh on processes specific to course-level assessment, and with Dr. Nyssa Crompton and Alan Shockley on assessment collection.

9.2 VPAA and/or Administrative Designee Response

After review and reflection of the *Comprehensive Program Review* or the *Annual Program Review*, the Division Chair and VPAA will write a summary of their response to the evidence provided. The Division Chair and VPAA’s response will be available to programs for review and discussion prior to beginning the next annual planning and development cycle.

### Narrative:

The Program Review Committee has reviewed this document and agrees with the faculty recommendations for the program.

# 10.0 Appendices

Any additional information that the programs would like to provide may be included in this section.

N/A