

Comprehensive Program Review Report



Program Review - English

Program Summary

2020-2021

Prepared by: Joseph Teller

What are the strengths of your area?: One of the largest divisions on campus, English generated almost 1006 FTES in 2019-20, second only to Math ("PR Dashboard"). In AY 2019-20, 206 COS students claimed English as their major, putting the English program in the top 20 academic programs at COS in terms of number of majors. We are home to 26 full-time faculty and 52 adjunct faculty who teach courses on all three COS campuses as well as at our numerous dual enrollment high school sites throughout Tulare County. In 2019-2020, the English division taught 443 course sections (excluding summer session), of which 268 were English 1 (60% of total course offerings). Because English 1 generally emphasizes not only college-level reading and composition skills, but also college-level study skills, institutional literacy, and other topics often associated with "first-year experience courses," the English division plays an important and broad role in preparing COS students for the rigors of college education.

English faculty are also campus leaders, with faculty playing important roles in governance groups such as the Academic Senate and the Faculty Enrichment Committee, as well as steering our full-time faculty bargaining unit (COSTA). This leadership has been especially important in the last six months, given the emergency conditions the college finds itself negotiating due to the COVID-19 pandemic, which has meant intense and often rapid deliberation on important issues ranging from shifting all courses into online formats to developing reopening plans, from deciding how to modify student grading schemes to developing governance procedures for the online/remote world. Additionally, English faculty have provided important campus leadership in 2019-20 as the college fully implemented AB 705. Finally, English faculty continue to be productive in their various academic fields, with a number of faculty publishing reviews and academic articles on literature and composition, as well as continuing to be active participants in academic conferences vital to the teaching of college-level English.

English faculty are also quite collegial as a whole and consciously strive to maintain a student-centered pedagogy. This is evident in our regular assessment conversations and practices, and in our "teaching buddy" system and student mentorship programs. Additionally, English faculty are providing leadership on equity issues across the college, and are vocal and passionate advocates of equity in our own curriculum and pedagogical practices.

The English division has also worked hard at increasing our overall student success rates and--perhaps most important in the current climate--at closing some equity gaps in response to mandated change (i.e., AB 705). Our overall English course success rates in 2019-20 were 68%, with English 1 success rates at 62% ("PR Dashboard"). However, though rates seem stable in comparison with the previous two years, English has witnessed a significant increase in "throughput" in our transfer level course (ENGL 1). In Fall 2018, 2,093 students enrolled in English 1, with 1,406 receiving passing grades (67%), while in Fall 2019, 3,421 students enrolled in English 1, with 2,183 students receiving passing grades (64%). Though the overall success rate decreased by 4 percentage points (due to the significantly lower success rate for English 1 students enrolled in English 301, our new corequisite support course), this actually represents an increase in volume between Fall 2018 and Fall 2019 of 777 students passing English 1 in their first attempt ("ENGL Outcome Analysis, Fall 2019"). This increased throughput also represents significant gains in closing particular equity gaps: when compared to Fall 2018, in Fall 2019, male students experienced a 65% increase in enrollment in English 1 with a 57% increase in success; Hispanic students saw a 78% increase in enrollment in English 1 with a 69% increase in success; and first-time students saw a 119% increase in enrollment in English 1, with an 84% increase in success ("Fall 2018-2019 Increases"). Though these figures are preliminary, given they are drawn from one semester's worth of data before the COVID-19 pandemic, they represent potentially significant progress on the equity front.

Finally, related to the English division's work on student success, since 2017-18, the overall student success rate for all groups in our English courses has risen 3.7 percentage points, from 64.3% in 2017-18 to 68% in 2019-20. Almost all demographic groups experienced about the same increase in overall success rates over the same interval (with the exception of the Native American population, which increased from 45.5% to 46.2 %, and the Unknown category, which decreased from 74.5% in 2017-18 to 63.3% in 2019-20. It should be noted that the Native American data comprises < 35 students each academic year, while the "Unknown" category jumped from 51 and 53 students in 2017-18 and 2018-19 respectively to 215 students in 2019-20, suggesting some shift in reporting or student population that is not clarified in the data set). (All data from "PR Dashboard").

What improvements are needed?: First, English will need to continue to work together to ensure quality academic instruction for our students throughout the COVID-19 pandemic while the College remains online. Though this will be discussed in our actions, in general, the English division/program will need to stay on top of issues like adequate online technology and software for faculty and students in order to sustain quality teaching. We will also want to promote appropriate training and professional development as needed to ensure faculty feel comfortable in the online environment.

Second, English will need to continue to develop and refine our English 301 support course and its curricular alignment with English 1. Faculty as well as some students have indicated that we need to clarify the ways in which English 301 curriculum complements student work and learning in English 301 (cf. "AB 705 Pilot Survey," 14-15). It should be noted that although our fall 2019 success rates for English 1 overall were 64%, in English 1 courses with English 301 support, success rates were 46% ("ENGL Outcome Analysis, Fall 2019"). This suggests the ongoing challenge--and opportunities--of assessing this course and the needs of students enrolled in it. This is also a key component to continuing our work on closing equity gaps.

Third, English may need to investigate ways to improve and more accurately calibrate assessment methods/practices among various sections of English 1 and English 1/301, as students have suggested this as an area of improvement in their experience of English 1 (cf. "AB 705 Pilot Survey," 14-15). In short, English can explore ways to make our assessments of and expectations for student writing more transparent and equitable across the division.

Fourth, the English division can continue to improve in regularizing SLO assessment practices and concomitant entry of SLO data into the TracDat system. This will be discussed below in other sections, as the problem is multifaceted and touches upon larger questions of course assessment and the assessment of student writing.

Fifth, English may need to think more creatively when it comes to our "specialty literature course" offerings and scheduling practices. For several semesters, we have struggled with enrollment in several of these courses (e.g., "African American Literature," "Women in Literature," "Shakespeare," "Chicano Literature"), and in the coming academic year, the English division is researching and proposing ways to address this issue as part of its work on exploring more equitable practices.

Sixth, the English division can continue to work on including dual enrollment instructors in ongoing assessment and pedagogical work. Given the drastically different scheduling universes involved between regular COS courses and COS courses taught on high school campuses, it has been historically difficult for dual enrollment instructors to participate in training and assessment sessions. In addition, we would like to examine the possible causes for the difference in student success rates when comparing the dual enrollment program to traditional COS courses (e.g., dual enrollment courses usually see over 90% success rates in English 1, compare to 64%-68% in regular COS English 1 courses), since a number of factors might contribute to the success rate difference.

Seventh, a number of classrooms assigned to the English division suffer from technology problems which occasionally impeded classroom instruction. These problems range from faulty media connections and displays (e.g., Alpine 1, and occasionally some of the Tule classrooms) to computers that simply need to be refreshed/updated. In addition, English classrooms need HDMI cables to enable faculty to use their own laptops (the current laptop cables are still analog, and most laptops no longer use these), and most English classrooms lack remote controls to adjust the projectors (which are out of reach, mounted on the ceiling). Other classrooms have overhead projectors that have intermittent projection/connection problems (e.g., they sometimes aren't "read" by the projection system). We hope to remedy these technology problems through working with IT and the dean to make sure specific classroom technology issues are addressed promptly and on an as-needed basis.

Describe any external opportunities or challenges.: First, the College is faced with remote instruction for the foreseeable future due to the COVID-19 pandemic. Although English courses are comparatively easier to convert to online modes of instruction (when compared to lab or CTE courses, for example), English faculty still face the need for solid support when it comes to online teaching best practices. This is especially true in our English 301 courses, where lesser-prepared students often struggle not only with the course material, but with the logistics of online access and instruction.

Second, the Chancellor's recent "Call to Action" imposes a number of curricular requirements, which the division will be actively working on throughout the 2020-20 academic year. This work includes review of CORs for relevant updates or revisions required by the "Call to Action," and will catalyze a number of conversations within the division regarding how best to carry out this work. See actions for more details on proposed division goals. Overall, this call for increased equity and increased awareness of equity issues will permeate all the work the English division undertakes internally and in response to external challenges.

Third, the English division has a deep interest in retaining a voice in the Writing Center even as the Writing Center comes under the umbrella of "Academic Support Services." English faculty need to continue work on the "Writing Center Steering Committee" in order to continue to provide pedagogical input, and will also help form a future "Academic Support Services Advisory Committee" to serve as part of Academic Senate as a more permanent way of providing faculty input on the Writing Center (and other tutorial services).

Overall SLO Achievement: Because many English professors tie passing grades to competence in the SLOs for the course, overall course success rates can be a helpful proxy for thinking through SLO achievement. Most English courses beyond English 1 in the program sequence (e.g., ENGL 2, ENGL 4, and the specialty literature courses) have a three-year historical success rate of 71% or higher, suggesting satisfactory SLO achievement in our above-transfer-level courses.

In our last division-wide assessment of English 1 (arguably our most important course from an institutional perspective), there was a significant mismatch between reported success rates for English 1 overall and student success in the three SLOs for the course. Although the PR Dashboard shows that the success rates for English 1 in 2018-19 was 65%, an assessment of Fall 2018 student work performed by a number of FT and adjunct English faculty across face-to-face, online, and dual enrollment sections of English 1 showed that 41.4% of students met SLO 1, 26.8% met SLO 2, and 31.7% met SLO 3. This suggests a need for ongoing division-wide assessment of English 1 student work and continued dialog among faculty regarding assessment practices and SLO content, and the potential connections between SLO achievement and grades/grading policies.

Changes Based on SLO Achievement: Because of its sheer size and because of the relative infrequency of some course offerings (e.g., some literature courses are only offered every 2 years), English has sometimes struggled to sustain division-wide buy-in and support when it comes to assessing single-section courses. In the past, we have tried a "communities of practice" model in which we group all literature courses together for assessment purposes. While this has led to some wonderfully productive pedagogical conversations and syllabus innovations, it has led to some confusion regarding the assessment of specific SLOs for individual courses. English will investigate a different model for maintaining SLO assessment cycles for English literature courses in the coming year—one that will hopefully rely on individual faculty assessing their own courses for SLO achievement and working with the division Outcomes and Assessment lead or Division Chair to develop assessment plans and to enter data.

Overall PLO Achievement: In Spring 2020, the English PLO committee administered a survey to COS English majors who had completed the ADT for English and were transferring to university. The survey asked students about how well they believed the English program had helped them meet the program learning outcomes. All survey students (4 out of 16 students responded to the survey) agreed that the English program had made them either "able" or "very able" to carry out the thinking, reading, and writing skills outlined in the PLOs. We find this data extremely satisfactory.

English also requested data from Research about the GPAs for students completing our English AA-T in Spring 2020. There were several findings that seem significant: Students completing their English program electives (i.e., specialty literature courses) AFTER completing English 4 OR BOTH English 4 and English 2 had a higher GPA in their electives than students who only took English 2 before their English electives. Similarly, students taking all of their English program electives CONCURRENTLY or AFTER taking English 4 had a higher elective GPA than students who took all electives either concurrently or after only English 2 or after English 2 and English 4. See related documents for data and summary. These findings suggest that English 4 is more directly useful for student learning in our English AA-T program, and in turn, this might suggest that English could revise its suggested course sequence for English, recommending that students take English 4 earlier in their 2-year sequence, and possibly postponing English 2 until the ultimate or penultimate semester of their program.

Changes Based on PLO Achievement: Though we are content with student response to our survey, the data we analyzed from the Research office suggests that English might revise its recommended course sequence for the English AA-T, encouraging students to take English 4 earlier in their program and English 2 later. This is because the data suggest that English 4 is more directly related to the material in English major courses (e.g., specialty lit. courses) than English 2 is. This might also suggest a need to reach out to other programs that require English 2 in their program sequence in order for those programs to request and analyze similar data for their programs in order to investigate the effectiveness of English 2 in their program course sequences.

Outcome cycle evaluation: Virtually all English courses have been assessed within the established cycles, with the exception of a few of the specialty literature courses, which are being updated presently.

The division could improve its SLO assessment practices by working towards broader participation in assessment activities as outlined above.

Action: 2020-2021--Improve and maintain quality instruction in the remote-learning/virtual environment due to the COVID-19 pandemic.

The English division will maintain online resources and promote collegial support, including appropriate training and professional development, for online teaching during the COVID-19 pandemic in order to ensure quality instruction in our courses and continued growth in our students.

Leave Blank:

Implementation Timeline: 2020 - 2021

Leave Blank:

Leave Blank:

Identify related course/program outcomes: Institutional Learning Outcome, "Communication"

English PLOs: 1. Writing Effectively; 2. Reading Closely and Critically; 3. Critical and Creative Thinking

Person(s) Responsible (Name and Position): Dean Richard Lubben, DC Joseph Teller, volunteer English faculty as needed.

Rationale (With supporting data): All instruction in English will be carried out online throughout the rest of this academic year. Making sure we support our faculty with adequate technology and software is absolutely vital to ensure the academic quality of our courses and student success in them.

Priority: High

Safety Issue: No

External Mandate: Yes

Safety/Mandate Explanation: The external mandate is the global pandemic and the College's decision to keep all instruction (with some exceptions) online through this entire academic year.

Link Actions to District Objectives

District Objectives: 2018-2021

District Objective 2.2 - Increase the number of students who transfer to a four-year institution by 10 percent over three years

District Objective 3.2 - By 2021, increase the percentage of students in targeted groups who complete transfer-level English (by 10 percentage points) and transfer-level math (by 5 percentage points) within their first year

Action: 2020-2021--Assess English curriculum and CORs in light of Chancellor's "Call to Action" of 6/5/20.

The English division will undertake an evaluation and potential revision of CORs based on the Chancellor's "Call to Action," item 3. Any proposed revisions will be debated through usual division governance processes and forwarded through regular College curriculum processes.

Leave Blank:

Implementation Timeline: 2020 - 2021

Leave Blank:

Leave Blank:

Identify related course/program outcomes: Institutional Learning Outcome, "Civic Engagement"

English PLO 3: Critical and Creative Thinking

Person(s) Responsible (Name and Position): English faculty volunteers on workgroups for this purpose; Joseph Teller (DC).

Rationale (With supporting data): This action will comply with an external mandate/challenge from the Chancellor's office.

Priority: High

Safety Issue: No

External Mandate: Yes

Safety/Mandate Explanation: Cf. Chancellor's Office "Call to Action," codified in a letter of June 5, 2020, and particularly item #3, "Campuses must audit classroom climate and create an action plan to create inclusive classrooms and anti-racist curriculum."

Link Actions to District Objectives

Program Review - English

District Objectives: 2018-2021

District Objective 3.2 - By 2021, increase the percentage of students in targeted groups who complete transfer-level English (by 10 percentage points) and transfer-level math (by 5 percentage points) within their first year

Action: 2020-2021--Assess overall effectiveness of ENGL 301 as a support course for ENGL 1.

The division will examine its curriculum for ENGL 301 and determine whether any revisions are needed to the COR in order to make the course maximally effective for students. If the division should determine that the 301 COR should be substantially revised, a proposed revision can be undertaken starting in late Spring 2021 at the earliest.

Leave Blank:

Implementation Timeline: 2020 - 2021

Leave Blank:

Leave Blank:

Identify related course/program outcomes: District Objective 2.1: Increase the percentage of students who earn an associate degree or certificate (CTE and non-CTE) by 5 percentage points over three years.

District Objective 2.2: Increase the number of students who transfer to four-year institutions by 10 percent over three years.

District Objective 2.3: By 2021, increase the percentage of students who complete transfer-level English by 15 percentage points and transfer-level math by 10 percentage points within their first year.

Institutional Learning Outcome, "Communication"

Person(s) Responsible (Name and Position): English faculty who regularly teach ENGL 301; other designated ENGL faculty; Joseph Teller (DC)

Rationale (With supporting data): As ENGL 301 is a relatively new course; as the success rate for ENGL 1 students enrolled in ENGL 301 in Fall 2019 was 46% ("Fall 2019 AB705 Results"); and as some students have indicated in the "AB 705 Pilot Survey" that they would like the work in ENGL 301 to more directly support their work in ENGL 1, the English division should reassess its ENGL 301 goals and objectives to ensure the work done in 301 effectively and directly supports student learning in ENGL 1.

Priority: High

Safety Issue: No

External Mandate: No

Safety/Mandate Explanation:

Link Actions to District Objectives

District Objectives: 2018-2021

District Objective 2.3 - By 2021, increase the percentage of students who complete transfer-level English by 15 percentage points and transfer-level math by 10 percentage point with their first year.

District Objective 3.2 - By 2021, increase the percentage of students in targeted groups who complete transfer-level English (by 10 percentage points) and transfer-level math (by 5 percentage points) within their first year

Action: 2019-2021--Re-institute Department-Wide Portfolio Reads to improve assessment of student writing and promote best practices

The English Division will reinstitute optional department-wide Portfolio Reads for English 1.

Leave Blank:

Implementation Timeline: 2019 - 2020, 2020 - 2021

Leave Blank:

Leave Blank:

Identify related course/program outcomes:

Person(s) Responsible (Name and Position): Joseph Teller (DC 2020-21); Josh Geist (DC 2019-2020); English faculty

Program Review - English

Rationale (With supporting data): In the English Division, we essentially have two kinds of classes: specialty classes (like Creative Writing and our various Literature classes), of which we offer a handful of sections every semester, and composition classes, of which we offer several dozen sections every semester. Prior to 2013, English had a thriving regular assessment practice driving valuable discussion about our composition classes, which represent the bulk of our work, but fell short in our assessment work around our more specialized classes.

Our English 251 Portfolio Reads, which were held twice each semester, and which allowed a broad range of instructors to read and discuss student work, to assess student performance, and to develop norms and assumptions that held extended beyond Engl 251 backward into Engl 360 and forward into Engl 1. While this was invaluable for those classes, the result was that very little department attention was paid to our literature and creative writing classes.

As CoS changed its approach to assessment in response to our Show Cause status, English too changed our approach to assessment, focusing on a different course each semester. While this helped us keep current on assessment, it meant that participation gradually and steadily dwindled as the courses we assessed were relevant to increasingly small subsets of our faculty.

Over the last couple of years, we have changed our approach to assessment for our specialty courses, creating Assessment Communities of Practice allowing interested instructors to share work on assessment in our specialty courses, as well as aligning and synchronizing our Literature course assessment to allow for more frequent and meaningful outcomes assessment. Moreover, with AB 705 eliminating Engl 251, 261, and 360, Engl 1 now comprises the majority of the workload for nearly all English instructors.

Therefore, this year we will be reinstituting department-wide Portfolio Reads for English 1. We hope that this change will generate renewed interest in our Dialog Day activities, create a more robust process for assessing English 1, and allow us to do some of the work in disaggregating the differences between students in English 1 sections with and without support.

Priority: High

Safety Issue: No

External Mandate: No

Safety/Mandate Explanation:

Update on Action

Updates

Update Year: 2020 - 2021

09/07/2020

Status: Continue Action Next Year

As our other actions, work on this action was begun in 2019-20 but was halted by the COVID-19 pandemic. We will continue to discuss and develop procedures for virtual/remote portfolio readings and for assessment/norming conversations as we navigate the current remote learning/online environment, since this work is essential to the academic quality and consistency of the English program.

Impact on District Objectives/Unit Outcomes (Not Required):

Link Actions to District Objectives

District Objectives: 2018-2021

District Objective 2.3 - By 2021, increase the percentage of students who complete transfer-level English by 15 percentage points and transfer-level math by 10 percentage point with their first year.

District Objective 3.2 - By 2021, increase the percentage of students in targeted groups who complete transfer-level English (by 10 percentage points) and transfer-level math (by 5 percentage points) within their first year

Action: 2020-2021--Update and maintain English division website with equity statement and adequate, useful teaching and institutional

Program Review - English

materials.

The division will update its official website with a new equity statement and materials useful for teaching and for institutional navigation.

Leave Blank:

Implementation Timeline: 2020 - 2021

Leave Blank:

Leave Blank:

Identify related course/program outcomes: District Objective 4.3: Increase professional development opportunities for and participation of District employees in support of improving operational effectiveness.

Institutional Learning Outcome, "Civic Engagement"

Person(s) Responsible (Name and Position): Designated faculty on equity statement workgroup; other volunteer faculty; Joseph Teller (DC)

Rationale (With supporting data): Producing and publishing online a division equity statement will help meet the Chancellor's office "Call to Action." Additionally, maintaining an updated website will help make English-related materials and services easily available to English faculty during the COVID-19 crisis, which will in turn help sustain the quality of our academic program and our commitment to student success.

Priority: High

Safety Issue: No

External Mandate: Yes

Safety/Mandate Explanation: Maintaining an updated website that includes an equity statement as well as materials for teaching and institutional navigation will address both the Chancellor's "Call to Action" and the exigencies of the COVID-19 pandemic.

Link Actions to District Objectives

District Objectives: 2018-2021

District Objective 4.2 - Improve organizational effectiveness by strengthening operations of and communication between District departments, divisions, and constituents

Action: 2019-2021--Expand and increase the offerings of survey and specialty literature courses.

The English Division will increase the number of survey and specialty literature classes to increase student access to CSU/UC transferability.

Leave Blank:

Implementation Timeline: 2019 - 2020, 2020 - 2021

Leave Blank:

Leave Blank:

Identify related course/program outcomes:

Person(s) Responsible (Name and Position): Joseph Teller, DC (2020-21); Josh Geist, DC (2019-2020); Richard Lubben, Dean

Rationale (With supporting data): Because our survey literature and specialty literature courses are on such a restricted rotation, we have heard many reports that students cannot transfer in a timely manner with their desired/required coursework. This limits students' ability to truly transfer to any CSU or UC within two years. The enrollment data for the survey literature courses speaks for itself:

F17 – Engl 30 = 23/25

S18 – Engl 31 = 36/30

F18 – Engl 15 = 30/25

S19 – Engl 16 = 27/28

Program Review - English

F19 – Engl 44 = 29/30

Engl 44 (online) = 24/30

When these courses finally become available, students must rush for them, and we must open more sections or take above the cap in order to meet student need. It would be more effective if we offered more sections more frequently so that students have greater opportunity to take the courses they need without impacting the courses and without students missing a course they desire.

The specialty literature courses, on the other hand, have less enrollment, but they have different constraints within GE patterns, even though they are vitally important to English majors. Further, we argue that the 3-year rotation of these courses makes them even more unattractive to students because they cannot take them when they need them. For example, if you are an English major interested in Chicano Literature and want to graduate in two years, you will only get the course if you are lucky to start your program within its rotation; thus, students supplement their major requirements with other courses.

With AB 705 composition changes, students will be able to complete English 001 prerequisites more readily, so we will likely see even more interest in both survey and specialty literature courses as students will have greater access to these courses even earlier in their first two years of college.

Priority: Medium

Safety Issue: No

External Mandate: Yes

Safety/Mandate Explanation: Our English degree is one of the required Associate Degrees for Transfer. An explicit agreement with ADTs is that students can complete their AA in two years and then transfer to a CSU and complete the remainder in two years—a truly four-year degree. We are obligated to ensure that students who declare an ADT major can complete in two years. As well, upcoming UC transfer pathways may increase that need. As it stands, according to the Transfer Admission Guide (TAG), UCs also require that students have more literature preparation to be eligible for transfer as an English major:

One course in English composition = ENGL 001

One course in English critical reading and writing = ENGL 002 or possibly ENGL 004

One year survey of literature in English

British literature to 1850 = ENGL 015 and ENGL 016

Either British lit from 1850 or survey of American lit = ENGL 030 and ENGL 031

Two years of one foreign language or a combination of courses in foreign language and foreign literature in translation = ENGL 44 and ENGL 45 + one year of foreign language

Update on Action

Updates

Update Year: 2020 - 2021

09/07/2020

Status: Continue Action Next Year

Preliminary work on this issue began in AY 2019-20, and the English division now offers ENGL 30 (Fall) and ENGL 31 (Spring) every academic year, with ENGL 15 (Fall) and 16 (Spring) alternating academic years with ENGL 44 (Fall) and 45 (Spring). These survey courses are now filling quite quickly, leading to added sections: in Spring 2020, we added an extra section of ENGL 45 (online), and in Fall 2020, we added an extra section of ENGL 30 (online).

However, despite this achievement in scheduling our literature survey courses, further work on specialty literature course offerings and rotation was halted by COVID-19 and the statewide shift to remote instruction.

The English division will continue to investigate specialty literature course offerings and schedule rotations as part of its larger conversation about equity and access in 2020-21, and will consider issues such as the English 1 prerequisite for literature courses,

Program Review - English

as well as other curricular and institutional issues that might affect enrollment in specialty literature courses (e.g., overlap between our courses and topics in other disciplines; potential development of new specialty literature courses; rethinking scheduling based primarily on student demand).

Impact on District Objectives/Unit Outcomes (Not Required):

Link Actions to District Objectives

District Objectives: 2018-2021

District Objective 2.2 - Increase the number of students who transfer to a four-year institution by 10 percent over three years

Action: 2020-2021--Review and revise SLO assessment cycles for literature courses to maintain course assessment currency and promote wider division buy-in

The Division will review current assessment practices for our literature courses and revise the structure of assessment as necessary to keep up with the regular assessment cycle.

Leave Blank:

Implementation Timeline: 2020 - 2021

Leave Blank:

Leave Blank:

Identify related course/program outcomes: Assessment of SLOs is necessary to maintain courses--external, institutional mandate.

Person(s) Responsible (Name and Position): English faculty teaching literature courses; English Outcomes and Assessment Lead; Joseph Teller (DC).

Rationale (With supporting data): Outcomes and assessment practices are vital for maintaining a culture of instructional improvement. This action will help maintain the academic quality of our courses and program, and will provide us with more up-to-date and relevant SLO assessment in English courses taught less frequently than English 1 or 2.

Priority: Medium

Safety Issue: No

External Mandate: Yes

Safety/Mandate Explanation: SLO assessment is an external, institutional mandate.

Link Actions to District Objectives

District Objectives: 2018-2021

District Objective 4.1 - Increase the use of data for decision-making at the District and department/unit level

Action: 2020-2021--Improve student support in English courses through more effective use of AI tutors

Increase use of AI tutors in our English courses and streamline training of tutors for English courses.

Leave Blank:

Implementation Timeline: 2020 - 2021

Leave Blank:

Leave Blank:

Identify related course/program outcomes: 1. Writing Effectively: At the end of this degree program, students can produce effective, meaningful writing for a variety of contexts, purposes, and audiences.

2. Reading Closely and Critically: At the end of this degree program, students can read literature and other texts closely and critically.

3. Critical and Creative Thinking: At the end of this degree program, students can think critically and creatively about issues and ideas.

Program Review - English

Person(s) Responsible (Name and Position): Joseph Teller (DC); English faculty coordinating with AI program; Dean Angela Sanchez

Rationale (With supporting data): Although COS has effectively institutionalized the AI program, we have not made full use of AI tutors in the past academic year. More regular use of AI tutors, especially in courses such as English 301 and English 1, could be an effective way to improve student achievement rates in those courses.

Additionally, AI tutoring could benefit from a faculty "coordinator" who is paid hourly compensation to promote AI with faculty, conduct student and faculty training and offer other forms of support for this program. The work is projected to take 20 hours per semester, and Educational Support Services estimates an allocation of approximately \$2500 per academic year would cover the cost.

Priority: High

Safety Issue: No

External Mandate: No

Safety/Mandate Explanation:

Resources Description

Personnel - Faculty - As per Educational Support Services: although the AI tutoring program has been increasingly institutionalized during 2019-20 (see most recent update on last year's English action, "Formalize and Institutionalize the English AI Program"), there is still a need for a "faculty coordinator" for the AI program in English. A faculty coordinator would work approximately 20 hours per semester at an hourly rate to liaison with English faculty, train tutors, advise tutors and faculty of best practices, and otherwise support tutors' work. This approximately 40 hours per academic year would be paid at a faculty member's lecture rate. (Active) (Active)

Why is this resource required for this action?: In order to make tutoring more available and effective for English courses, the English division needs regular and predictable contact with the AI program. Additionally, AI tutors need to be aware of current pedagogical practices in the division, and relatively frequent turnover rate in tutors given the nature of a two-year institution means having a faculty coordinator to serve as a liaison and as a source of training is necessary for effective tutoring and increased use of AI tutors in English courses.

Notes (optional):

Cost of Request (Nothing will be funded over the amount listed.): 2500

Related Documents:

[Email for AI Coordinator Compensation.pdf](#)

Link Actions to District Objectives

District Objectives: 2018-2021

District Objective 2.2 - Increase the number of students who transfer to a four-year institution by 10 percent over three years

District Objective 2.3 - By 2021, increase the percentage of students who complete transfer-level English by 15 percentage points and transfer-level math by 10 percentage point with their first year.

Action: 2016-2021--Streamline Writing Center Leadership

The Writing Center will reduce redundancy, create leadership stability, and increase efficiency by revising its leadership structure.

Leave Blank:

Implementation Timeline: 2020 - 2021

Leave Blank:

Leave Blank:

Identify related course/program outcomes: District Objectives 2.3, 4.2

Person(s) Responsible (Name and Position): Josh Geist, Writing Center Director; Writing Center Steering Committee (2020-21)

Rationale (With supporting data): 1. A request for a split-time faculty coordinator was made as part of our 2015-2016 Program Review, it was not funded. A request for a position under the Learning Assistance designation was made as a part of our 2016-2017 Program Review, but in Instructional Council we were asked to begin the process in Curriculum. The Learning Assistance designation was approved by the Curriculum Committee on Wednesday, October 3, 2018.

Program Review - English

2. Faculty leadership is common and desirable in writing centers around the world. The International Writing Centers Association's "Position Statement on Two-Year College Writing Centers" notes that while "writing center administrators should be tenure-stream or continuing contract salaried employees, depending on local context," the Association prefers that "they have faculty status with a minimum of 50% release from their teaching responsibilities per semester to oversee the writing center." Many of our local Writing Centers, including Fresno City College and Fresno State, are helmed by faculty coordinators.

3. Our institution includes two similar positions that might be considered precedent positions for this assignment: Distance Education Coordinator and Curriculum Coordinator. A job description for a Writing Center Coordinator might be modeled on those positions.

4. As a program, the Writing Center is significant. It includes five individual courses, one certificate program, and is considered a unit for program review. Given that each of these entities requires qualified assessment, faculty leadership is appropriate.

5. As we've grown to serve more students and locations, our current faculty director's responsibilities and load have grown beyond what can reasonably be accomplished on top of a full-time faculty teaching schedule.

6. Moreover, the current faculty director's position was defunded in 2019, meaning that at present, all faculty leadership, including assessment, staff support, and Program Review contributions, are done on a volunteer basis.

7. Our current full-time classified coordinator position is funded through Student Success and not permanently; the Writing Center's leadership needs to be institutionalized.

8. The Tutorial Task Force Recommendations (See Document "Tutorial Task Force Recommendations.pdf") call for the establishment of a "Faculty Director" role, including a list of enumerated duties. The indicated position extends beyond the Writing Center alone, and "Director" may not be the desired term, but the Recommendations do call for a faculty position to engage in this work across Tutorial.

9. The Tutorial Task Force has included the responsibility of creating the job description for this "Faculty Director" role in its commission of the incipient Tutorial Work Group being convened in Fall 2020. For that reason, we are currently marking the resource request attached to this action as "Inactive." The need for this position still exists, and we anticipate requesting a full-time position for Tutorial Services more broadly in 2021, but our intention is to delay the request for that position until the Tutorial Work Group is able to more fully enumerate its details and duties.

Priority: High

Safety Issue: No

External Mandate: No

Safety/Mandate Explanation:

Update on Action

Updates

Update Year: 2020 - 2021

10/09/2020

Status: Continue Action Next Year

As a part of the ongoing restructuring of Tutorial Services, the Tutorial Task Force reconvened during AY 2019-20. District Objective 2.3.6 calls on the District to "integrate and align peer academic support programs" across the landscape of Tutorial Services. As a part of its recommendations, the Task Force called for the establishment of a "faculty director position," whose duties would include many of the responsibilities enumerated above. As such, we continue to work on this action this year by supporting the nascent Tutorial Workgroup in establishing a job description for that faculty position. This year, we are suspending our resource request for a full-time faculty position under the assumption that we will bring it forward with a broader purview next year.

Impact on District Objectives/Unit Outcomes (Not Required):

Link Actions to District Objectives

Program Review - English

District Objectives: 2018-2021

District Objective 4.2 - Improve organizational effectiveness by strengthening operations of and communication between District departments, divisions, and constituents

District Objectives: 2015-2018

District Objectives - 2.3 - Increase course success and completion rates in pre-transfer English, Math, and English as a Second Language courses annually.

District Objectives - 4.2 -Improve the efficiency, effectiveness and communication of human, physical, technological, and financial resources to advance the District Mission.

Action: 2016-20--Formalize and Institutionalize the English AI Program

In conjunction with the English unit, the Writing Center will formalize their unofficial role in recruiting, training, and supporting the AI tutors working in English classes.

Leave Blank:

Implementation Timeline: 2019 - 2020

Leave Blank:

Leave Blank:

Identify related course/program outcomes: District Objectives 2.3, 3.1, 4.2

Person(s) Responsible (Name and Position): Joshua Geist (Writing Center Director), Erik Armstrong (English Faculty)

Rationale (With supporting data): The AI program has a history at COS, and its most recent incarnation has been an effort to support students in developmental English courses (ENGL 251, 261, 360). Over years of Writing Center data, we know that students who collaborate with writing tutors have better odds of success and better grades in their English courses, and when we looked at ENGL 261 courses with embedded tutors, we found those students used the Writing Center much more frequently than students in ENGL 251 or ENGL 360, and students who used the Writing Center had a dramatic increase in success: ~70% success for students who used the Writing Center just one time versus ~40% success for students who did not use the Writing Center. The value of students working with tutors is clear, but the AI program has been less reliable because it has historically relied upon grant and categorical funding, and when the funding ends or lessens, the AI program greatly constricts. This year, Fall 2019, is a great example. The AI program went from grant funding in BSSOT to relying on Basic Skills funds, and now with no person to coordinate them. Thus, in perhaps the semester and year we might most need those tutors, we only have 2 embedded tutors, but we have 22 sections of ENGL 301. Many of our students who might need the additional support the most are missing out on a potential key to their success.

Priority: Medium

Safety Issue: No

External Mandate: No

Safety/Mandate Explanation:

Update on Action

Updates

Update Year: 2020 - 2021

09/15/2020

Status: Action Completed

As of Fall 2020, AI tutors are paid out of equity funds through Educational Support Services, supervised by Dean Angela Sanchez. Each tutor costs about \$1300-\$1500 per semester, and Dean Sanchez has assured us that if there is an increase in demand, money can be reallocated to cover additional costs.

Each semester, an email is sent from Educational Support Services to English faculty teaching ENGL 1/301 courses soliciting requests for AI tutor for their courses. The Writing Center Coordinator (Erin Alvarez as of 9/2020) fields these requests and assists in recruiting and assigning tutors with faculty input. Tutor are trained by Ms. Alvarez and Prof. Katie Beberian. There is also ongoing monthly training of AI tutors by the Writing Center Coordinator and faculty. In the coming year, English faculty will work on finding ways to use this program more widely, as determined by student and faculty need in our English courses.

Program Review - English

Impact on District Objectives/Unit Outcomes (Not Required):

Resources Description

Adjustment to Base Budget - Funding for 10 tutors (or equivalent tutoring hours) to support ENGL 301 courses. (Active)

Why is this resource required for this action?: AI tutors have previously been funded out of an assortment of categorical funding, but with the end of BSSOT, there is no clear funding source for what has proven historically to be a very successful program in supporting student success.

Notes (optional): \$13 / hour x 2.1706% (benefits) = \$13.29 / hour --> \$13.29 x 8 hrs / week = \$106.32 / week for 1 tutor --> \$106.32 x 17.5 weeks = \$1,860.60 / semester for 1 tutor --> \$1,860.60 x 10 tutors = \$18,606 / semester for 10 tutors --> \$18,606 x 2 semesters = \$37,212 / year for 10 tutors.

Cost of Request (Nothing will be funded over the amount listed.): 37212

Personnel - Faculty - As per Educational Support Services: although the AI tutoring program has been increasingly institutionalized during 2019-20 (see 2020-21 update for this action), there is still a need for a "faculty coordinator" for the AI program in English. A faculty coordinator would work approximately 20 hours per semester at an hourly rate to liaison with English faculty, train tutors, advise tutors and faculty of best practices, and otherwise support tutors' work. This approximately 40 hours per academic year would be paid at a faculty member's lecture rate. (Active)

Why is this resource required for this action?:

Notes (optional):

Cost of Request (Nothing will be funded over the amount listed.): 2500

Link Actions to District Objectives

District Objectives: 2018-2021

District Objective 2.2 - Increase the number of students who transfer to a four-year institution by 10 percent over three years

District Objective 2.3 - By 2021, increase the percentage of students who complete transfer-level English by 15 percentage points and transfer-level math by 10 percentage point with their first year.

District Objectives: 2015-2018

District Objectives - 2.3 - Increase course success and completion rates in pre-transfer English, Math, and English as a Second Language courses annually.

District Objectives - 3.1 - Reduce the achievement gap of disproportionately impacted student groups annually, as identified in the Student Equity Plan.

District Objectives - 4.2 - Improve the efficiency, effectiveness and communication of human, physical, technological, and financial resources to advance the District Mission.

Action: 2019-2020--Keep Pace with District Growth

Provide as many sections of English classes as will meet the demands of students, counselors, and administration across three campuses and in a growing number of area high schools.

Leave Blank:

Implementation Timeline: 2019 - 2020

Leave Blank:

Leave Blank:

Identify related course/program outcomes: Mission Statement:

College of the Sequoias is committed to supporting students' mastery of basic skills and to providing access to programs and services that foster student success.

Institutional Learning Outcome:

Writing and Reading:

Program Review - English

Write coherently and effectively, adjusting to a variety of audiences and purposes, while taking into account others' writings and ideas.

District Objective 1.1: Increase overall enrollment by 1.75% annually.

District Objective 2.1: Increase the number of students who are transfer-prepared annually.

District Objective 2.2: Increase the number of students who earn an associate degree or certificate annually.

District Objective 2.3: Increase course success and completion rates in pre-transfer English, Math, and English as a Second Language courses annually.

District Objective 3.1: Reduce the achievement gap of disproportionately impacted student groups annually, as identified in the Student Equity Plan.

Academic Services continues to expand a high school pathway program in area high schools. The English Department supports this program, but the additional classes put an additional stress upon our available faculty resources.

Person(s) Responsible (Name and Position): Joshua Geist, Language Arts Division Chair (2019-20); Joseph Teller, Division Chair (2020-21); Richard Lubben, Dean of Arts and Letters

Rationale (With supporting data): District Objective 1.1 describes a growth goal which, while seemingly modest, actually has a much more substantial impact on English than on other academic units. As the District grows, so too must English, offering sections adequate to keep up with increasing District need.

The changes in our FTES are also noteworthy in this area. Our implementation of AB 705 reduced the unit load in English the average student would need significantly, from a maximum of 14 units to a maximum of 6. This change suggested to us that we would see a slight decrease in English FTES this year given our early implementation of the new placement logic. Instead, we saw a slight increase over AY 2017-18, from 1084.28 FTES to 1088.18.[6]

We have had two retirements this year, and as a result this semester's enrollment has found us beyond capacity. Our Waitlist Demand for English 1 this year would easily support three additional sections of English 1, which we are unfortunately unable to staff. In addition, the limitations of Banner with regard to section co-requisites means that we can't even estimate with confidence what additional demand for English 1 with support was present. Given the rapid turnaround among our adjuncts and the changing landscape of pre-transfer English, consistent staffing remains an issue.

[6]: See Document "COS Faculty Growth Dashboard – English 2019.pdf" in Repository.

Priority: High

Safety Issue: No

External Mandate: No

Safety/Mandate Explanation:

Update on Action

Updates

Update Year: 2020 - 2021

09/07/2020

Status: Action Completed

As the English division has fully implemented AB 705, we have seen a reduction in FTES from 1088.04 in 2018-19 to 1005.9 in 2019-20. In addition to this modest reduction, we have seen several shifts: while FTES from pre-transfer courses have disappeared (ENGL 251 and 360 are no longer offered), English 1 FTES have grown from 540.93 in 2018-19 to 678.46 in 2019-20 (25%), and English 2 FTES have grown from 159.57 in 2018-19 to 212.79 in 2019-20 (33%). Our FTES/FTEF ratio in 2019-20 is 12.68, reflecting a slight decrease from the 13.10 of 2018-19. Thus, we have effectively completed this action for the time being, and as a division, we will monitor course offerings and enrollments in the future to ensure we have optimal stability in staffing. This is crucial in light of the fact of several potential destabilizing factors, including the COVID-19 pandemic and the effects of AB 705 implementation on student needs.

Impact on District Objectives/Unit Outcomes (Not Required):

Program Review - English

Resources Description

Faculty- New/Replacement - Hire two Full-time, tenure track English Professors in Spring 2020 to start in Fall 2020.
(Active)

Why is this resource required for this action?: As indicated previously, our implementation of AB 705 reduced the unit load in English the average student would need significantly, from a maximum of 14 units to a maximum of 6. This change suggested to us that we would see a slight decrease in English FTES this year given our early implementation of the new placement logic. Instead, we saw a slight increase over AY 2017-18, from 1084.28 FTES to 1088.18.[6]

We have had two retirements this year, and as a result this semester's enrollment has found us beyond capacity. Our Waitlist Demand for English 1 this year would easily support three additional sections of English 1, which we are unfortunately unable to staff. In addition, the limitations of Banner with regard to section co-requisites means that we can't even estimate with confidence what additional demand for English 1 with support was present. While it is true that for the first time in recent memory, we have no FTT faculty in English, nevertheless the rapid turnaround among our adjuncts and the changing landscape of pre-transfer English means that consistent staffing remains an issue. Therefore, we seek two positions to replace our two retirements.

[6]: See Document "COS Faculty Growth Dashboard – English 2019.pdf" in Repository.

Notes (optional):

Cost of Request (Nothing will be funded over the amount listed.): 200000

Related Documents:

[COS Faculty Growth Dashboard – English 2019.pdf](#)

Link Actions to District Objectives

| |
|--|
| District Objectives: 2018-2021 |
| District Objective 1.1 - The District will increase FTES by 1.75% over the three years |
| District Objective 2.2 - Increase the number of students who transfer to a four-year institution by 10 percent over three years |
| District Objective 2.3 - By 2021, increase the percentage of students who complete transfer-level English by 15 percentage points and transfer-level math by 10 percentage point with their first year. |
| District Objective 3.2 - By 2021, increase the percentage of students in targeted groups who complete transfer-level English (by 10 percentage points) and transfer-level math (by 5 percentage points) within their first year |
| District Objectives: 2015-2018 |
| District Objectives - 1.1 - Increase overall enrollment by 1.75% annually |
| District Objectives - 2.1 - Increase the number of students who are transfer-prepared annually. |
| District Objectives - 2.2 - Increase the number of students who earn an associate degree or certificate annually. |
| District Objectives - 2.3 - Increase course success and completion rates in pre-transfer English, Math, and English as a Second Language courses annually. |
| District Objectives - 3.1 - Reduce the achievement gap of disproportionately impacted student groups annually, as identified in the Student Equity Plan. |

Action: 2019 - Implement Staff Equitable Teaching Practices Training

Implement Staff Equitable Teaching Practices Training

Leave Blank:

Implementation Timeline: 2019 - 2020

Leave Blank:

Leave Blank:

Program Review - English

Identify related course/program outcomes:

Person(s) Responsible (Name and Position): Matthew Nelson, English Professor; Megan Baptista, English Professor

Rationale (With supporting data): AB 705's changes to placement will dramatically change the demographics of our classrooms both inside of the English division and outside, as long-standing prerequisites for writing no longer limit access to coursework. While these changes are themselves likely to positively affect disproportionately impacted student groups at our college, our changing classrooms will require us to develop new best practices, tools, and assignments to better serve our diverse student populations.

The COS Master Plan 2015-2025's Goal 3 charges us to "strategically tailor and implement academic programs and student services that match the unique needs of its student population and the demands of ongoing changes in the workforce." The Strategic Plan 2018-2021's District Objectives for Goal 3 ask us to "by 2021, increase the percentage of students in targeted groups who complete transfer-level English (by 10 percentage points) and transfer-level math (by 5 percentage points) within their first year." District Action 3.2.2 asks COS to "implement best practices/interventions to increase completion rates for targeted student groups."

While AB705 will help us toward this goal, we cannot only view equity gaps as a placement issue. We believe that in order to meet this goal on an institution-wide level, we must be willing to discuss equity gaps as pedagogical problems that require us to reassess our individual teaching practices and set measurable instructor-level goals in alignment with those set by the district and the CCCCO.

The conversations around equity and educational attainment are complex and fraught. They ask us to consider how racism and other kinds of prejudice--institutional, personal, and cultural--have impacted not only our students, but how we see, interact with, and respond to them. We anticipate that for many faculty, these conversations will be uncomfortable. However, that discomfort is the critical first step to making change. In order to encourage fully active and engaged participation, we need to spend some time away from the distractions and excuses that might get between faculty and our discomfort. For this reason, we plan to spend our first, critical hours together away from campus in order to allow us to focus on our context, our practices, and our data.

NB: We are also pursuing other funding sources for this Action.

Priority: Medium

Safety Issue: No

External Mandate: Yes

Safety/Mandate Explanation: The CCCCO's Vision for Success calls upon us to "reduce equity gaps [...] through faster improvements among traditionally underrepresented student groups, with the goal of cutting achievement gaps by 40 percent within 5 years and fully closing those achievement gaps within 10 years."

Update on Action

Updates

Update Year: 2020 - 2021

09/07/2020

Status: Action Completed

In 2019-20, the English division presented a series of "equitable teaching practices" workshops and discussion sessions throughout the academic year. Topics ranged from grade contracts to best practices in teaching research, from developing writing assignment prompts to thinking through equitable language for course syllabuses. Although the COVID-19 pandemic forced the division to cancel the last session or two in Spring 2020, overall, this action was completed.

Impact on District Objectives/Unit Outcomes (Not Required):

Resources Description

Fund the Equity in Teaching Institute for 2020-2021. A detailed cost breakdown is available in document "Equitable Teaching Practices Cost Estimate.pdf" in Repository. (Active)

Why is this resource required for this action?:

Notes (optional):

Cost of Request (Nothing will be funded over the amount listed.): 18100

Program Review - English

Related Documents:

[Equitable Teaching Practices Cost Estimate.pdf](#)

Link Actions to District Objectives

District Objectives: 2018-2021

District Objective 2.3 - By 2021, increase the percentage of students who complete transfer-level English by 15 percentage points and transfer-level math by 10 percentage point with their first year.

District Objective 3.2 - By 2021, increase the percentage of students in targeted groups who complete transfer-level English (by 10 percentage points) and transfer-level math (by 5 percentage points) within their first year

District Objective 4.1 - Increase the use of data for decision-making at the District and department/unit level

District Objective 4.3 - College of the Sequoias Board of Trustees, administration, faculty, and staff will engage in best practices and staff development to sustain effective operational systems for institutional assessment and continuous improvement.

Action: 2018 - Update classroom technology in advance of AB 705 implementation

Some technology in English classrooms is in need of refreshing. More broadly, increased need for computers in Engl 301 will likely mean that we need additional space to schedule sections of 301 into.

Leave Blank: Nonessential/Nice to have

Implementation Timeline: 2019 - 2020

Leave Blank:

Leave Blank:

Identify related course/program outcomes: The Course Outcomes for Engl 301 in particular center around in-class revision and research activities which depend on computers.

Person(s) Responsible (Name and Position): Joshua Geist, Division Chair; Richard Lubben, Dean

Rationale (With supporting data): As we implement AB 705 and the co-requisite model in English, we will need to schedule an unpredictable number of sections of Engl 301 in lab spaces. Currently, the only such spaces we can schedule into are Alpine 1 and Kern 740, both of which have limitations. We anticipate needing between 20 and 30 sections of Engl 301, which will be difficult to schedule effectively in those spaces.

Priority: Medium

Safety Issue: No

External Mandate: No

Safety/Mandate Explanation:

Update on Action

Updates

Update Year: 2020 - 2021

09/07/2020

Status: Action Completed

As of this writing, the English division was able to provide either computer labs for 301 sections (e.g., LRC 205), or classrooms equipped with laptop smart carts (e.g., Alpine 2). Though there is a considerable need to equip all English 1 classrooms with tools for digital composing, and though our current classrooms are in need of several technology updates to address ongoing technical problems, the present action is complete (and the others will be the subject of a new action for 2020-21).

Impact on District Objectives/Unit Outcomes (Not Required):

Resources Description

Equipment - Instructional - An additional lab space in the Tule Building, or an equivalent laptop cart. (Active)

Why is this resource required for this action?: The majority of our English classes are scheduled in Tule, and having a lab space in that area would allow us considerably more flexibility in scheduling our Engl 301 courses.

Notes (optional): Estimate based on previous conversations with ELI for a laptop cart; if a classroom is converted, cost may

Program Review - English

be higher.

Cost of Request (Nothing will be funded over the amount listed.): 35000

Equipment - Instructional - Document camera replacement in English classrooms (Active)

Why is this resource required for this action?: Many of the document cameras in English classrooms are poorly designed and oversensitive, making them very difficult to work with. We request that those document cameras be replaced with more reliable models.

Notes (optional):

Cost of Request (Nothing will be funded over the amount listed.):