

Program Overview

Program	ENGLISH
Does this program have a CTE component?	No
Academic Year	2016/2017
Review Period	6 Year
Service Areas	

A. Program Description and Goals

This section addresses the big picture. Prompts should help you describe your program and goals and the relationship to the institutional mission, vision and goals, and how the program is funded.

1. Describe the program and/or service area under review and how the program supports the mission of Santa Monica College.

The English department offers course sequences in grammar and composition, reading, and literature. In general, the department has three program levels: transfer, developmental, and basic skills. Composition classes dominate our course offerings. English 1 is consistently the highest demand class on campus, with English 2 close behind. Both courses are required in IGETC and GE Breadth patterns. English 1, required for the AA degree, is now a prerequisite for a life science course and an advisory for courses across disciplines, including Early Childhood Education, Economics, History, Philosophy, Psychology, and Political Science. Successful completion of English 1 is mandatory for nursing school admission and supportive of other College career technical education programs. A minimum of B-level (English 21A/21B) proficiency (college language skills readiness) is essential for success in most CTE programs and English 21A is also consistently among the top high demand courses. Indeed, reading, writing, and critical thinking skills are essential to the college's core mission as they contribute to workforce development, transfer, global citizenship, and lifelong learning.

The department plays a critical role in supporting institutional learning outcomes (ILO's). The first two are fundamental to all courses we teach; the majority of our courses support all. An evaluation of student learning outcomes in our pipeline courses finds that we scaffold assignments through the course sequence to develop effective communication, critical thinking, and problem solving skills. Our literature, reading, and writing curricula are core to a strong humanities program and essential to the development of ethical, responsible, deep-thinking, and articulate citizens, aware of the potential impacts of their actions and choices on others and the larger environment. The department has demonstrated an "innovative and responsive academic environment" through the continual improvement of its developmental-to-transfer pathway and students' course improvement rate. We intend that our classrooms across all levels be places where students develop the patience to listen and to engage responsively and empathetically, where they further their ability to question conscientiously, and where they deepen attitudes of inclusivity, respect, and service to community.

2. Identify the overarching goal(s) or charge/responsibilities of the program or service area. If appropriate, include ensuring/monitoring compliance with state, federal or other mandates.

The English department's overarching goal is to give students writing instruction, critical thinking experiences, and reading strategies that will enable them to find, develop, and clearly articulate their ideas so that they can succeed in their academic studies, their occupational aims, and their life aspirations; ultimately, we intend that the communication and thinking skills they learn in their English classes support them to be responsible and compassionate stewards of democracy and global resources.

3. If applicable, describe how the Institutional Learning Outcomes (ILOs), Supporting Goals, and/or Strategic Initiatives of the institution are integrated into the goals of the program or service area.

Insofar as English courses may be divided into two types, with reading and composition, on the one hand, and literature on

the other, the department recognizes that nearly all of the Institutional Learning Outcomes are inseparably part of what students learn in an English class at SMC. As reading, writing, critical thinking, and research skills are the fundamental outcomes of our English courses and the source of confidence and competence for students across the disciplines, the English department is instrumental in supporting ILOs 1, 2, and 3.

Over the last six years, and beyond, the department has shown campus leadership in addressing the high rate of students' placement into basic skills, particularly as those placement trends have impacted underrepresented students. The department has developed new accelerated courses, trained dozens of faculty in student-centered teaching practices, successfully sought grant funds for innovative programs to improve course progression rates, and worked vigorously with Institutional Research to refine our own classroom and placement practices. New literature course offerings, since 2011, are expanding the cultural and imaginative horizons of our students. In all of those efforts, the department has furthered the College's goal of an "Innovative and Responsive Academic Environment." Further, through the apportionment drawn for the lab hours of English 80, 84W, 85, and 20, the English department employs Instructional Assistants whose work also extends into the Writing and Humanities Tutoring Center and Academy of Learning Innovation and Success. Those tutoring centers are available to students from across the campus and form crucial elements of the "Supportive Learning Environment" at Santa Monica College.

4. If your program receives operating funding from any source other than District funds identify the funding source. If applicable, note the start and end dates of the funding (generally a grant), the percentage of the program budget supported by non-District funding, and list any staff positions funded wholly or in part by non-District funds. Do not include awards for non-operational items such as equipment (ex. VTEA) or value added activities (ex Margin of Excellence).

The English department is the fortunate partner in several projects funded by the Equity Committee and the Basic Skills and Student Outcomes Transformation grant; those projects include the English Academy, Summer Jams, and a project, led by Professor Joelle Adams and Chair Jason Beardsley, to improve prompt design as well as assessment and feedback practices. Professor Jason Bostick also receives Equity funds to enhance student tutor training with concepts from and mentors trained in "Teaching Men of Color in the Community College."

B. Populations Served

In this section you will provide information that describes who your program or service area serves. When comparing data from different periods, use a consistent time frame (ex. Compare one fall term to another fall term)

Saved Information For Populations Served

Area/Discipline Information Pertains To

All Disciplines (answered once)

1. Describe your students in terms of ethnicity, race, gender, age, residency status, citizenship, educational goal, enrollment status, and full/part-time status. Note any changes in student or enrollment data since the last six-year program review and the possible reasons for the changes.

English department student demographics have changed little in the last six years: A representative English student is likely to be a person of color, 19-24 years of age, transfer-oriented, with a full-time schedule in the fall semester followed by a part-time schedule in the spring.

Since 2011, however, a few notable demographic trends have emerged: Basic skills enrollment has declined by 5% while the percentage of Latino students has risen roughly 10%, as has the percentage of students who identify as having a

transfer goal, from 81% to 86.8%.

English Enrollments, Fall Term						
Year	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015
Count	10,872	10,642	10,141	9,985	9,879	9,641

2. Compare your student population with the college demographic. Are your students different from the college population?

The English student population differs from the college demographic particularly in the salient attributes described above. As compared to the college population, students in English are younger, more likely to have a transfer goal, more likely to be first-time and full-time, and more likely to be Latino.

3. What percentage of students in your program place in basic skills and, if applicable, how does this impact your program goals and/or curriculum.

A note of clarification is needed here: While the question at hand addresses "basic skills" placement, the term "basic skills," in the general parlance of the college, refers to all English (or Math) courses pre-requisite to the first transferrable course. By contrast, In the English department, the terms "basic skills" and "developmental" refer to two distinct levels of pre-requisite coursework, the so-called "C level" and "B level," respectively. The "A level" refers to those English composition courses that bear college credit; in most cases, "A level" refers exclusively to English 1.

As the following table indicates, enrollment patterns for first-time students profoundly changed in 2016 after having followed a predictable pattern for most of the last five years. While the apparent trend between 2011 and 2015 showed stability in transfer-level placement and enrollment, the ratio of developmental to basic skills enrollments did move in an unfortunate direction--showing a 6% increase in enrollment at the basic skills level and a corresponding decline in developmental English enrollments.

First-Time Student Enrollment Patterns			
Level/Semester	Fall 2011	Fall 2015	Fall 2016
A Level	42.4%	44%	54.4%
B Level	45.5%	37%	30%
C Level	12.1%	18.8%	15.5%

However, in the spring of 2016, Santa Monica College adopted HS GPA as a measure by which to place students into Math and English courses; the results of that new placement tool are readily apparent: English 1 enrollment climbed 10% over the previous fall term, with corresponding declines of 7% and 3%, respectively, in developmental and basic skills English enrollments. These placement and enrollment trends accompanied a roughly 1% decline in total enrollment for the

college and the English department. Early reports on success and retention rates for fall 2016 English courses show predictable effects of the new placement measures: While English 1 success rates may have dipped slightly, the net result has been a higher number of students completing English 1 within their first year of college.

Additional effects of the new enrollment tools, and the department's long-term planning to address those effects, will feature substantially in the rest of this review.

C. Program Evaluation

In this section programs/units are to identify how, using what tools, and when program evaluation takes place. Evaluation must include outcomes assessment as well as any other measures used by the program. Please use Section D to address program responses to the findings described in this section.

Programs/units with multiple disciplines or functions may choose to answer the following questions for each area. If this is your preferred method of responding, begin by selecting a discipline/function from the drop down, answer the set of questions and click "Save", your answers will be added to the bottom of page. Do this for each discipline/function. If you would like to answer the questions once, choose "Answer Once" from the drop down.

How would you like to answer these questions?

Saved Information For Program Evaluation

Area/Discipline Information Pertains To

All Disciplines (answered once)

1. List the specific SLOs your program or discipline has chosen to focus on this year for discussion of program improvement.

SLOs are specific, measurable statements of 'what a student should know, be able to do, or value when they complete a course'. An SLO focuses on specific knowledge, attitudes, or behaviors that students will demonstrate or possess as a result of instruction.

SLOs Regularly Assessed

Since the Spring 2016 term, the English department has continued to focus on the English 21A and English 1 SLO's, not only because the two courses constitute the largest offering of composition courses for first-time students, but because 21A must prepare students for the rigors of English 1. Ideally, that preparation would be so thorough as to permit students to skip English 21B, the second of two developmental English courses required of students who place just below college-level on the placement exam.

The English 21A SLOs are as follows:

1. The student will develop an efficient writing process, so that, given an academic and/or work-related writing situation, the student can generate and organize ideas, compose a draft called for by the audience and the purpose in the situation, and effectively revise the draft as needed for increased clarity, organization, and articulateness.
2. The student will analyze a text and write an effective response as called for in the Common Essay Exam; specifically, the student will analyze the text without classroom guidance; write an essay in response to a prompt

within a limited time; and receive a score that—according to a rubric applied by multiple instructors—reflects writing that is relatively free of basic grammar errors and that includes a summary, an introduction, a thesis, and adequate support of the thesis.

The English 1 SLOs include the following:

1. The student will demonstrate the ability to read, comprehend, and analyze college-level writing and respond with thesis-driven analytic essays, scored according to a rubric for appropriate and adequate development and clarity of language and critical thinking.
2. After defining a topic and using any combination of library, web-based, or field research, the student will write a research paper that appropriately uses carefully evaluated and well-documented research material to support a clearly articulated thesis.

2. Describe how the program assesses SLOs and uses the results for program improvement including:

- **how outcomes are assessed and how often**
- **how and when the program or discipline reviews the results and engages program/discipline faculty in the process**

SLO Assessment for Program Improvement

Because student outcomes manifest in students' written work, the English department regularly engages its faculty members in common assessments of student writing samples. Using common rubrics (by level) to assess that student work, the faculty also spend time discussing and fine-tuning the rubric as a means to reinterpret and understand the course SLOs.

- Each semester, B and C-level instructors convene to commonly assess their students' reading and writing skills through what is known as the Common Essay. Each level conducts its own exam; for the B level, all English 21A and 20 instructors (and students) are required to participate. At the C level, all English 85 and 84W instructors participate. English 1 instructors are invited to participate in the norming sessions for each of the Common Essay exams; at the B level, many instructors also teach English 1, so the cross-level conversation is baked into the norming session discussions.
- Each year, the entire department reviews and scores samples of student writing from English 1, the most popular course on campus.
- Now in its second year, the English 1 Research Essay Contest also motivates faculty to review the course SLOs and refine classroom practices to better support students' chances of nomination for the prize. Insofar as the department reads and discusses the award-winning finalists before each fall flex day, the faculty enhance their understanding of what an exemplary student learning outcome looks like.

3. If your program or discipline issues a degree or certificate list each degree or certificate and the core competencies students are expected to achieve on completion.

Core competencies focus on the body of knowledge, attitudes, and behaviors a student will have acquired upon completion of a program or certificate and are assessed by either a capstone course or success rates on SLOs for core courses.

NA

4. What other evaluation measures does your program or discipline use to inform planning? (For example, student surveys, enrollment trends, student success, retention, degrees/certificates awarded, job placement, transfer rates, TIMS report, tutor usage etc.) Note trends and differences in performance by group (ethnicity, gender, age) or enrollment type (day/evening, on-ground/on-line).

The English department regularly engages in program review and analysis using data in the following categories: placement and enrollment trends, success and retention rates, SLO reports, course progression rates, student and faculty surveys, and tutor usage reports.

A few trends observable in the aforementioned analyses will feature prominently in this program review, primarily in Section D, Part 1. Here is a rough guide to the evaluation measures used to evaluate various department initiatives:

Evaluation measure type	Projects or courses analyzed and assessed by that measure
Enrollment data	MMAP, waivers, English Academy, accelerated curriculum
Success and retention data	MMAP, waivers, English Academy, accelerated curriculum, Assessment and Feedback Protocol
SLO reports	Core pre-requisite course alignment
Student Surveys	English 85 lab, men of color in English courses, English Academy
Faculty and Instructional Assistant Surveys	English 85 and English 20 lab effectiveness
Tutor usage reports	English student use of tutoring resources, effectiveness of advertising via announcements and syllabus

D1. Objectives (Looking Back)

As part of the planning process, programs are expected to establish annual objectives that support the program's goals. Please document the status of the program/function's previous year's objectives. Add comments if you feel further explanation is needed.

1.

Create an archive of prompts and student work, from across all levels of composition, that has been assessed by a group of faculty members.

Completed

Comments: The project has started insofar as the faculty has already reviewed a few examples of student writing from English 21A and 1. However, refinements to the framework for discussion and scoring rubric are needed, as are additional samples of exemplary and unsatisfactory quality.

2.
Establish clear guidelines for lab activities in English 85 and 20.

Completed
Comments: The department will collaborate with the Learning Resources program to coordinate instructional assistants' feedback into the curriculum and standards development for English 85 and 20 labs.

3.
Identify faculty leaders for key sections of six-year self-study report.

Completed
Comments: The objective is ongoing and will likely establish faculty leaders within the department for future projects and discussion.

4.
Arrive at department consensus regarding the next set of revisions, if any, to the sequence of remedial English courses.

In Progress
Comments: Much of this report indicates reasons why the department is compelled to address this objective. Broadly speaking, the College's commitment to a responsive curriculum would seem to entail the conversation described in this objective, especially given state trends in education reform.

5.
Create faculty teams to lead professional development and discussion around course-level best practices and reading strategies.

In Progress
Comments: The department sees this structure as crucial to an effective long-term review and reflection process for the department.

6.
Create a well-defined, documented, and permanent orientation and mentorship program for new and recently new faculty, whether full- or part-time.

In Progress
Comments: As part of an ongoing effort to develop cohesion and new leadership in the department, and to continue our strong record of college engagement, this mentor program should be an effective way to more quickly engage new faculty in campus life and reflective teaching practices--which are fundamental to the ILOs.

D1. Looking Back

In this section, please document what you did last year as a result of what you described in Section C.

1. Describe any accomplishments, achievements, activities, initiatives undertaken, and any other positives the program wishes to note and document.

Basic Skills English Acceleration

Changes to the Basic Skills Course Sequence

Since the last six-year review, the department has been busy realizing the potential of curriculum changes planned and approved, but not yet implemented, in the spring of 2011. In the following academic year, the English department rolled out two courses that would profoundly alter the pre-requisite pathway imposed upon new students placing in basic skills writing or reading. The purpose of the new course sequence was to improve the rate at which basic skills students complete English 1 within three years, a standard measure of "basic skills improvement." In each annual program review since that time, the department has documented significant achievements and new research questions fundamental to the effective implementation and enhancement of the new, accelerated, course sequence. This section of the program review will summarize that new course sequence and subsequent departmental initiatives, and challenges, on the pathway to improved student success and progression. The history in these paragraphs is also meant for future English department leaders who may be facing--or proposing--further improvements to the pre-requisite course sequence.

In the 2010-2011 academic year, a student placing into the C level could have faced as many as three writing courses, and three reading courses, just to make it to the B level. At a minimum, the typical student would be required to take two reading and two writing courses at the C level. (For a view of the pre-requisite course sequence in 2010-2011, see Appendix.) If the student persisted and completed, s/he would then take English 21A, followed by 21B, in order to clear the pre-requisite conditions for English 1 enrollment. None of his or her C or B-level coursework would count as transferable credit. This lengthy remedial course sequence proved a significant barrier to student success: According to the 2011 six-year program review for English, only 15.4% of basic skill students completed English 1 within three years (16).

Beginning in the fall of 2011, however, a C-level placement meant enrolling in English 85, a new, 5-unit, combined reading and writing course comprising five lecture hours, two lab hours, and one arranged hour. Effectively, English 85 took the place of four courses, two reading and two writing, and dramatically quickened the pace of matriculation for C-level students. English 85 was the department's first "accelerated" course. In the spring of 2012, the department followed English 85 with English 20, also a combined reading and writing course, comprising five lecture hours and two lab hours. English 20 took the place of English 84W and 84R but was considered a B-level course, more or less adjacent to English 21A on the pre-requisite flow chart. However, whereas English 20 accelerated student progress by combining a reading and a writing course, English 21A was a writing course, three units, and the first course required of students whose Accuplacer score landed them in the B level. English 20 was not open to students who placed into the B level; rather, it was intended for students completing English 85 and, like English 21A, prepared students to enroll in English 21B, the immediate pre-requisite of English 1. That said, those faculty who created English 20, having studied and planned the revised course sequence with support from the California Acceleration Project, truly hoped that English 85 and 20 would prove potent enough to prepare basic skills students for a waiver past English 21B and into English 1.

Early Results of Acceleration--Positive Trends and Questions

By the fall of 2016, the progression rate of three cohorts of basic skills students could be measured against the standard three-year timeline to English 1 completion. With help from the Office of Institutional Research (OIR), the English department has learned that the accelerated course sequence first implemented in 2011-12 has profoundly improved the rate at which students complete English 1: Whereas students working through the older, pre-acceleration course sequence completed English 1 within three years at a rate of 15.4%, students in the new sequence reach the same milestone at a rate of 29.5%. For students 17-19 years of age, by far the largest demographic group in all three cohorts, the rate is even higher,

at roughly 33% (see "English Basic Skills Progress Tracker" in Appendix).

Having now doubled the rate at which basic skills students complete English 1, the department still finds room for improvement, especially when raw numbers of students are considered. For example, out of 1,824 students in three basic skills cohorts studied by OIR, only 538 completed English 1 within three years. While some factors of student success are simply beyond the reach of college personnel, the department regularly scrutinizes its own practices for evidence of barriers to student success. One topic that resurfaces during these departmental conversations is that of our total course sequence; though accelerated, it is still quite long, consisting of as many as three required courses before English 1.

In fact, given the many auxiliary support courses still available to, and sometimes recommended to, struggling basic skills students, the pathways from English 85 to English 1 are remarkably profuse, and potentially problematic. For a picture of the current pre-requisite course sequence, including support courses, see Appendix. According to OIR, "English 85 students followed about 16 different paths in their attempt to complete English 1. Only 8 of the 16 paths lead them to completing English 1 within three years" ("Course Sequence Analysis: Paths to English 1" in Appendix). In a nutshell, OIR's comment means that basic skills students drop out in a variety of ways. In a recent report by OIR Analyst Yosief Yihunie, a few salient points have captured the department's attention:

- Out of 1,824 students, only 117 followed the path of English 85, English 20, and English 1.
- The second most popular pathway, from English 85 through 20, 21B, and then English 1, was followed by 355 successful students.
- As many as 30% of basic skills students completed English 85 and then dropped out, never to complete English 1, or any other English course at SMC, in three years.
- Nearly 300 students completed English 85 *and* English 20 before dropping out, while nearly 200 students made it one step further, through 21B, and then dropped out.

Perhaps, the most shocking figures apply to students who *completed* their courses but left the program, anyway. At least 500 students out of roughly 1,800 succeeded in a course and then dropped out. The department has only been able to speculate at what would cause students to leave after successful completion: exhaustion over a long commute, frustration at a long remedial course sequence, opportunities for a shorter remedial sequence at competing colleges, or, perhaps, too many chances for difficult life events to interfere with academic commitments. Frustratingly, the college has few means by which to survey students who leave SMC, so the English department struggles to develop rational tools for stemming the flow of successful students dropping out. In the same conversations about how to address the successful-student-drop out problem, the English department has also raised concern about the gaps in equity apparent along gender and ethnic lines.

In "English Basic Skills Progress Tracker," OIR Analyst Yosief Yihunie highlights a few unsettling trends in basic skills students' progression through English 1:

- While the average for all students in the three cohorts is 29.5%, the average for male students is 26.8%.
- Students in the age group of 20-24 completed English 1 at a rate of 26.8%.
- Only 17.1% of African American students completed English 1 in three years.

The English department recognizes similarities between the basic skills progression data and other course success rates, particularly in the troubling success rates of young men of color. English faculty have spent significant time discussing equity in success rates, best practices for teaching men of color, and how to adopt culturally responsive pedagogy—efforts detailed in other areas of this report. That said, the low rates of success for men of color in basic skills courses suggests a stunningly high barrier to success that has yet to be understood and properly addressed. But we are working on it, as

subsequent sections in this report will show. As for the low progression rates among students 20-24 years of age, the department has no firm answers but could speculate, perhaps rationally, that students of that age range in the earliest cohorts of English 85 could also have been students who took several courses in the previous remedial sequence—English 81a, 81b, 83a, 83b, etc. Those who took courses in the old and new sequences were likely to face challenges in stamina, hope, and the sheer facts of life competing against a college degree. It might not be unreasonable to speculate that the group included an atypically high number of students with learning challenges. Often, students who struggle with lexical or cognitive processing are encouraged to take additional auxiliary courses rather than to face repeated failure in the same course.

The last five years with our new accelerated course sequence were not without revision and improvement, nor growing pains. At the C level, significant work has been done, under Vice Chair Eleni Hioureas' deft leadership, to create cohesion and mentorship between English 85 faculty, full- and part-time. Much of the revision to the English 85 course format has been rendered to the lab hours, which, as detailed above, originally included two assigned and one arrange hour—on top of five lecture hours.

Improvements and Challenges to the Basic Skills Curriculum

As the English Department began evaluating its Basic Skills courses for Program Review, the C-level faculty determined that it was necessary to make radical changes to the lab structure of English 85. To analyze the needs of the students and improve student success, the C-level faculty members held several meetings and considered data from Institutional Research, which included Basic Skills English success rate data; a literature review about English labs; and surveys of Santa Monica College Basic Skills English faculty, English Instructional Assistants, and students who had successfully completed English 85. The faculty aimed to ensure that, as stated in "Literature Review: English Lab," a document developed by the college's Office of Institutional research, "English Labs provide students at Santa Monica College the opportunity to engage in learning activities, allow students to strengthen and practice their skills both in reading and writing, and equip students the extra time to review in-class material and to work in conjunction with class curriculum."

Until winter 2017, for a 16-week semester structure, English 85 required 110 minutes of writing lab and 60 minutes of independent reading lab per week (adjusted accordingly for intersessions). While conducting their research, the faculty members came to the conclusion that the ideal lab structure for English 85 would involve cutting the writing lab hours in half, thereby requiring the students to attend one 50-minute lab session per week instead of two, and completely eliminating the reading lab component. The English Department Chair and Assistant Chair met with the Dean of Academic Affairs to discuss and ultimately receive approval for this arrangement. The English Department then ratified this change, and it went into effect in the Spring 2017 semester.

The rationale for eliminating the independently scheduled reading lab component was that it had become additional homework folded into the regular class sessions. Thus, it did not serve the original purpose of providing the students with supplemental support outside of class. Since resources were limited in the Writing and Humanities Tutoring Center (WHTC), as the C-level program expanded, it was simply not possible for the coordinator of the WHTC and the tutors to help all English 85 students review their lab work and receive signatures verifying completion every week. For the few instructors that did send their students to the WHTC rather than signing off on the reading lab work themselves, another issue that arose was in motivating the students to make time to visit the lab and receive credit for their work. Instructors found that many of their students who may have otherwise been in good academic standing were falling behind or were delinquent in their reading lab work despite frequent reminders and encouragement. The students often complained that their class and work schedules impeded their ability to complete that requirement or that the lab work was simply too much when they already spent five hours per week in class, two hours per week in writing lab, had homework, and also had long

commutes (typical commutes for Basic Skills students are an hour or more by bus) and worked 12 to 40 hours per week. Reducing lab time would thus help to alleviate some of the time constraints for students and reduce barriers to their success.

A similar rationale was partly responsible for the decision to reduce the writing lab hours as well. The faculty members aimed to reduce barriers that could negatively impact student grades and prevent many of them from passing the class when they were otherwise performing well. Furthermore, the Basic Skills professors observed that the amount of time required to complete the course was wearing students out and making it difficult for them to keep up with the workload; thus, faculty reasoned that reducing the lab hours would help to make lab a manageable and more impactful experience. According to the SMC IR Research Brief called “English Program Review Research: C-Level Faculty Feedback,” “In terms of duration, faculty felt that after 2+ hours of regular class time, students come to labs ‘exhausted’ and ‘restless’. Another faculty member described the combined class and lab duration as ‘pure torture’ to students. The exhaustion after long class hours made lab ineffective, as students were said to have difficulty staying focused and interested.”

In addition, because there were so many lab sessions scheduled each week between English 85, 84W, and 20, staffing for the labs was stretched thin; some English 85 labs had only one Instructional Assistant (IA), and in order to provide a proper level of individualized support, the instructors found it important to have labs staffed with two to three IAs. Moreover, some of the Monday/Wednesday courses had labs scheduled on Fridays due to scheduling constraints, and those labs suffered disproportionately from low attendance. Reducing lab hours would therefore enable the department to eliminate the more challenging schedules and provide a higher level of support for the students.

The student survey conducted by Institutional Research, the “English 85 Successful Student Survey,” reinforced the observations and reasoning of the Basic Skills faculty. These students, all of whom had passed English 85 in a previous semester, for most part found lab to be valuable but felt that the amount of time spent in lab was more than necessary to learn the skills. When asked if “[t]he documents (assignments, handouts, etc.) used in the lab were useful,” 65.7% agreed or strongly agreed; 61% agreed or strongly agreed that “[t]his lab deepened my understanding of the topics covered in English 85”; 64.6% agreed or strongly agreed that “[o]verall, the labs have helped improve my written communication skills; and 61.1% agreed or strongly agreed that “[o]verall, I felt more prepared for English 20 coursework because I attended the English 85 labs.” When it came to the amount of time spent in lab, 38% felt that it was “too long,” 55.6% felt that it was “just right,” and 6.3% believed that lab was “too short.” One student noted, “I think, personally, having to sit through the lab followed by the actual long class was really hard for me. Even though we got a break it just seemed extensive.” Another noted that there was “not enough one-on-one time.”

In addition to addressing structural issues related to lab schedules, duration, frequency, and attendance rates, the Basic Skills faculty aimed to make the lab sessions more meaningful and tied more directly to the class. Although many of the students surveyed stated that the lab helped to improve their grammar, vocabulary, and reading comprehension skills, several students contended that “at times, the lab didn't relate to the class,” which made some students feel as if those sessions were not “worth” attending. However, lab sessions that connected class and lab received enthusiastic reviews: “The labs helped with completing tasks that [the] majority of the class found rather challenging. The labs also had extra activities to ensure our understanding of the lectures which helped tremendously. In addition, they also provided great feedback on essays.” The students also appreciated working in groups and receiving more individualized attention when there were multiple IAs in the lab.

As explained in “Literature Review: English Lab,” “Just because students have access to a laboratory does not mean that the laboratory is integrated with the classroom. It requires effort to ensure that what goes on in both the classroom and the

laboratory is clearly connected and supported by each other.” In fact, one concern that several faculty members expressed, according to “English Program Review Research: C-Level Faculty Feedback,” was that “the success of current labs was dependent on a great amount of faculty involvement, which wasn’t viewed as feasible or practical for all instructors,” especially since C-level faculty are not compensated for time spent in lab, nor are they compensated for developing or coordinating lab activities. Another obstacle was that “although the current lab was designed to follow a curriculum and Lab Book created by the English department, many of the faculty communicated that the labs do not mesh with individual instructors’ curricula. Instructors find it difficult to integrate the lab and course content and emphasized that students also recognize the disjoint between lab and class material.” The IAs echoed this sentiment. According to an IA quoted in the “English Instructional Assistant Feedback Form” developed by the college’s Office of Institutional Research, “With 1 being ‘not interested’ and 10 being ‘very interested’, I would give labs a median 5. The labs where IAs are helping students directly on content related to class have a higher interest level. When lab work consists of separate articles and exercises from class, students perceive lab work as ‘busy work’, and have said as much in the past.”

To address those matters and create a stronger link between class and lab, the Basic Skills faculty collaborated with IAs to revise the curriculum and implemented the new lab book and lab plans in the Spring 2017 semester. One of the biggest changes involved creating modules that could be implemented at points in the semester when they most closely tied with the class lessons. The previous lab plan involved reading, summarizing, and writing about specific articles in a particular order. However, those lab activities, while reviewing key skills taught in class, did not necessarily relate specifically to lessons that the professor had planned on that particular day. Thus, the new “floating modules,” as they are now called, would enable greater coordination between the class and the lab.

Furthermore, to increase student engagement and address issues of equity, the Basic Skills faculty members revised the lab book and added new activities focused on helping students develop a growth mindset and improve college readiness skills. According to data from the Office of Institutional Research, African-American students have the lowest success rate, 63.4%, in English 85 out of all other ethnic groups, nearly 10% below the average success rate of 72.3%. Thus, the faculty members implemented recommendations from the CORA – Teaching Community College Men of Color program to incorporate more activities and assignments that foster a sense of belonging, help students develop a help-seeking mentality (which, according to the program, is the strongest determinant of success), and reflect on themselves and their choices. Faculty and IAs collaborated to develop the lab plans encompassing the new materials and believe that this more focused lab structure and curriculum will help the department to achieve its goals of increasing student success and engagement. During this process of curriculum development and revision, Basic Skills faculty members identified other ways to make improvements to the curriculum. However, those changes would require a greater time commitment and more careful collaboration to create, so it does not seem feasible at this time to make those changes. Then again, compensating faculty for time spent on redesigning the curriculum would facilitate this process.

While restructuring the lab and revising the English 85 curriculum were key to improving the lab, another important component required strengthening the IA training sessions. One IA quoted in the “English Instructional Assistant Feedback Form” felt that one way to improve the lab was to “train IAs on interactive methods of engaging students. Incorporate more discussion and cohorts with readings and more interactive writing activities.” Thus, various members of the English Department collaborated with the Director of Supplemental Instruction and Tutoring to enhance the training sessions for the Spring 2017 semester to improve the IAs’ understanding of the lab curriculum and how to implement the lab plans in a more engaging manner.

Developmental English Acceleration

At the developmental, or B level, the English department has similarly worked to improve students' chances of completing English 1 in a timely manner. For students in English 21A, the conventional pathway to English 1 requires the completion of English 21B; the same is true for students in English 20, who come up from English 85. Thus, at the B level, acceleration could only be a matter of helping students skip 21B in order to complete English 1 one semester sooner than the pathway would otherwise allow. Many department faculty have acutely felt the need to remove the "exit point" of English 21B; moreover, evidence from OIR suggests good reason to consider such a move: In a study of students granted a waiver to skip English 21B after success in English 21A, Research Analyst Daniel Berumen found that "[t]here were 130 students in the cohort who received a waiver to enroll into ENGL 1, but enrolled in ENGL 21B or ENGL 22 regardless. Those students had a lower ENGL 1 GPA and a lower ENGL 1 success rate than direct enrollment students. An independent samples t-test found both of those differences to be statistically significant. In other words, ENGL 21A students who chose to enroll in ENGL 21B or ENGL 22 had lower ENGL 1 outcomes than those who chose to enroll in ENGL 1 directly" ("Research Brief 633" 5, in Appendix). To put it plainly, students earning an A or B in 21A may or may not derive a long-term benefit from English 21B.

For that reason, many English 21A instructors grant English 1 waivers to successful students. In fact, the waiver has been a staple of B-level instruction but was only recently studied by OIR. In "Research Brief 633," Daniel Berumen, senior research analyst, highlighted some promising opportunities but troubling patterns in the way English instructors have been awarding waivers to English 21A students seeking to bypass English 21B so as to directly enroll in English 1. The report found that, over the period of 2009-2012, the following held true:

- About 20% of English 21A students were waived into English 1 (skipping over 21B as a result).
- White students were more than twice as likely than their Hispanic and Black classmates to be waived into English 1, at rates of 35%, 17%, and 17%, respectively.
- Students earning an A in 21A were more than four times as likely to earn a waiver to English 1 than were students earning a B. Students earning a C grade in 21A rarely received waivers to English 1.
- Only 57% of A-grade students in 21A received a waiver.
- Students who were waived from 21A into English 1 were more successful in English 1 than students who either took 21A and 21B before English 1 or placed immediately into English 1 via Accuplacer. In fact, the waived students enjoyed success rates of 83%, while the other student groups experienced success rates of about 73%
- Students who earned an A and a waiver in 21A were successful in English 1 84% of the time.
- Students who earned a waiver in 21A but decided to take 21B before English 1 actually did worse in English 1 than students who directly enrolled.

Now, to the department, the immediate upshot of these data was confirmation that the waiver policy could be used to powerfully advance our students to the transfer level. The department was delighted, and surprised, to see the remarkably high English 1 success rates of students waived from 21A. Then again, the fact that a student who completed but was waived from 21A into English 1 out-performed her or his English 1 classmates was a puzzlement, for it suggested, on the one hand, that the student may not have needed to take 21A, yet, on the other hand, that English 21A and only 21A was the distinguishing factor in the high-achieving student's background. In other words, the data suggest that some students who place into English 21A both need and do not need to complete the course in order to succeed in English 1.

However, the department was most troubled to note the inequitable distribution of waivers across ethnicity and grade distribution. In other words, we were concerned that Hispanic and Black students were waived far less often than were White students. The revelation of this inequity stemmed from a puzzling feature of the waivers as distributed according to

21A course grade: only 57% of A-grade students in 21A were waived into English 1, despite the fact that, according to the data, A-grade students waived into English 1 are the most likely to succeed of any group by enrollment status. In other words, with an 84% success rate when waived into English 1, an A student in 21A is the best bet for a waiver to English 1, yet **43%** of A-grade students in 21A did not receive waivers. Virtually speaking, this meant that a student earning an A in 21A might as well compute his or her chances of being waived into English 1 by tossing a coin. This fact was troubling, and it became even more troubling when we disaggregated the A-grade waived students by ethnicity. The data showed that:

- While instructors granted waivers to 68% of White students with A grades in 21A, faculty granted waivers to Hispanic and Black A-grade students at a rate of 51% (for each group).

The revelation of this 17% difference caused an audible reaction in the audience of the department meeting where I shared it. At that point, we decided to convene a small group of faculty to address the inequitable distribution of waivers and to standardize, as much as we could, the policy by which instructors granted waivers. Our thinking was that a clear and standard policy would be one approach to ruling out the potential bias behind the inequitably granted waivers. At the same time, as the small group would discuss, we needed to continue to stress the importance of culturally responsive pedagogy.

Clearly, the results of RB 633 indicated the need for much work to improve the waiver process, maintain steady improvement in the cultural responsiveness of our pedagogy, and clarify the key exit skills that English 21A students should demonstrate before moving on to English 1. The latter point spurred a sequence of department meetings organized around specific examples of student writing, from English 21A and English 1, which we evaluated together in order to strengthen the shared set of values and criteria applied by instructors to our students' writing.

In addition to these department-wide norming sessions, the department convened the aforementioned smaller Equity Work Group, which produced a refined set of guidelines for granting waivers; the group also recommended ongoing conversations about equity concerns in the department as well as ongoing support for professional development in the area of culturally responsive pedagogy. A notable outcome of these conversations and the clarified waiver policy was the doubling, in Fall 2014, of the number of students waived from 21A into English 1 when compared to the number from Fall 2013.

The Department Chair requested that Institutional Research follow up on these waivers to measure the equity of their distribution as well as the success rates of those students who enrolled in English 1. The results, published in August 2015, show that the department's actions had a notably positive impact on waiver rates. "Research Brief 828" shows the department made a 13.5% increase in the number of students waived into English 1 from 21A in the Fall 2014 term as compared to the previous three fall terms (See "Research Brief 828" in Appendix). African American students saw a 4.8% increase and Hispanic students an 11.9% increase in their waiver rates. **More impressive gains were made, however, in the rate at which students of color with an A in 21A were granted a waiver to English 1. While white students with A grades in 21A saw a 6.8% rise in their waiver rate, African American and Hispanic students saw respective gains of 17.5% and 22.4%.** This was a clear case of the department narrowing an equity gap following the publication of meaningful data by our Institutional Researcher Daniel Berumen.

As a last follow-up to the research on equity in the waiver process, the department chair asked OIR to offer an analysis of all waivers granted in English--not just from 21A to 1, but from 20 to 1, 85 to 1, 85 to 21B, etc. This research request seemed warranted given that the department has increasingly used the waiver as a means to removing barriers to success for students showing aptitude for a higher course level. For example, an English 85 instructor, using the results of the C-level common essay exam as well as the totality of a student's work for the term, might enter an English 1 waiver on the

student's behalf. The same could be true for a student in English 20, and so on. The question has been whether English faculty are making accurate assessments of the waived students' readiness for a jump, and whether the distribution of waivers has been equitable or reveals major differences along lines of ethnicity or gender. As "Waiver Rates 2014-2016" and "ENGL Outcomes for Waived Students 2014-2016" reveal, the English faculty waiver behavior is closing some gaps, accelerating students with accuracy, yet revealing some difficult trends that need further attention (See Appendix for the reports):

- For all waivers granted, from English 85, 20, and 21A, the range of success rates in the target course was from 67.7% to 74.5%. Here, "target course" refers to the class *into* which a student was waived. The average success rate for *all* students in the same (target) courses was 70.9%. Thus, the waived students' success rates fell very near the rates for students who enrolled in the target courses via conventional pathways.
- Waivers from 21A instructors are much more common than waivers from English 20 and English 85 instructors, at rates of 41.4%, 28.1%, and 26.4%, respectively, for 2015-16.
- English 21A waivers (to English 1) have increased over the last five years, from a rate of 21.4% between 2011 and 2013, to a rate of 33.2% in 2014-2015 and then 41.4% in 2015-2016.
- For all courses, female students receive waivers at a 5% higher rate than do male students.
- African American and Latino students' waiver rates are more than 15% lower than the rate for White students.
- While 74% of English 21A students who receive a waiver to English 1 enroll in the target course within two years, only 64% of English 20 students with an English 1 waiver enroll in English 1 within the same time period.

English 20

English 20, the B-level accelerated reading and writing course launched in spring 2012, has undergone some improvements since its inception. For a variety of reasons, the lab portion of English 20 has always presented something of a problem to at least one of the constituent groups: students, instructional assistants, or instructors. The *student* concerns are primary, and since, like English 85, English 20 once required two contact hours of lab per week, over time, instructors noted lagging attendance and success rates in lab. One reason for those problems was likely a form of burnout: after English 85, requiring seven weekly contact hours, students then face English 20, also with seven weekly contact hours—and still not at the transfer level. Furthermore, the English 20 lab created a challenge for instructional assistants because, initially, the instructors did not coordinate their lab lessons, resulting in a dizzying array of preparation for instructional assistants. In lab, students could detect when the lesson plan had not been fully absorbed by all instructional personnel. Some students responded to those signs of miscommunication by disengaging lab. At the same time, with classroom space difficult to schedule, the English 85 and 20 labs competed for rooms in Drescher Hall, the home base for instructional assistants, who also work in the Writing and Humanities Tutoring Center in DH 313. Because of the scarcity of rooms, lab times would often need to be staggered, leaving some labs to occur *before* class, and some labs to occur an hour after class. Neither arrangement tended to help lab attendance.

The English 20 faculty responded in two ways to improve the lab experience: First, the lab hours were shorted to one per week, and lab would be held *inside* the regular classroom, as if the last hour of class. The instructional assistants would join the instructor and students in their regular classroom. The second change was rendered in the curriculum for the English 20 lab, a change motivated by the findings of an OIR report on instructor and instructional assistant attitudes and expectations about lab (and one another). "Research Brief 1030," based on OIR interviews of faculty and instructional assistants, revealed that all concerned saw improved student attendance in lab following the shortened lab hours being relocated in the classroom. Student participation and engagement and communication between instructional assistants, students, and instructors also improved. In general, the structural changes to English 20 have been successful. However, the new format did bring one wrinkle: by reducing the number of lab hours to one per week, the instructors effectively

doubled the number of unique labs that an instructional assistant would attend each week. Currently, several of the instructional assistants meet with nine unique sections per week—with many faces and names to learn, and unique lesson plans to facilitate. So, while the new changes to English 20 brought everyone together, physically, it also placed a greater burden on the instructional assistants, essentially asking them to perform a kind of multi-tasking.

To alleviate some of that pressure, the English 20 faculty collaborated on a new lab curriculum “playbook.” With much help from editor-adjunct faculty member Alex Schnitzler, each English 20 instructor submitted at least one activity to the collection. The English 20 playbook is a set of activities, independent of particular source texts, covering a range of skills in reading, composition, and sentence creation and revision. It is designed to simplify the range of lesson plans likely to appear in an English 20 lab, and instructors are meant to select as many of their lab lessons from the book as possible—at least twelve, ideally. New for spring 2017, the playbook is slowly gaining traction with the very faculty who collaboratively made it. English 20 instructors and IAs have met once, in March, to discuss the progress of the new book and recommendations for its improvement; the group will meet again at the end of spring to finalize the next edition of the book, for fall.

The Common Essay

The English Department has maintained a Common Essay exam both in fall and spring semesters. The exam is for all students in B-level courses and is designed to aid in student assessment and generate conversation regarding professional development. Distribution of instructions, guidelines, selected readings, and rubrics are distributed one week prior to the timed essay, and norming of the exams takes place with all participating instructors.

The Common Essay committee has included Jessica Krug, Jean Paik-Schoenberg, Gordon Dossett, Mary Fonseca, Elisa Meyer, Angie Misaghi, Will Lemon, Walker Griffy, Jason Bostick, Sara Kauffman, Kathleen Motoike, David Truby, and Mario Garcia.

Based on the on-going CE dialog, these changes and additions have taken place:

- The English department and the ESL department hold separate Common Essays. While this decision was not an easy one, it has proven to be successful for both departments. The English department CE is more streamlined (fewer prompts and readings, more clarity about the rubric, less confusion about logistics...) and because the meeting is attended by a smaller number of instructors, the norming session pertains to specific issues in the department. Still, the CE committee members from both departments have met to discuss important facets of composition necessary prior to entry in English 1.
- Instructors from A, B, and C levels have met to discuss student work. During these meetings, instructors brought their own students’ essays representing a variety of skills and grades. Instructors did a blind read of these essays and then began a conversation extending in scope from prompt writing and thesis statements to formatting and grammar. This type of meeting was so success amongst the CE-inspired group that a larger discussion took place during a department Flex Day.
- A grading pilot program, led by Gordon Dossett, has been created to help instructors grade and receive blue books in a more timely manner. Participating instructors stay on campus after the norming session and grade one stack of blue books. This stack is then given to the second reader who takes it home and returns the stack to the home instructor the following week. This program is beneficial for students as the exams are returned to then one week earlier than usual. Because of this, these instructors can use the CE exam to help prepare students for their final

writing assignments and to give meaningful feedback.

- Since 2015, the exam has been optional for 21b instructors. After much discussion about the goals and objectives for the CE, it became clear that because 21b students who passed the course would be placed automatically into English 1, the need for their assessment and endorsement into English 1 was not needed. Instructors of 21b seemed pleased with this option. Additionally, with English 20 students taking the CE, the norming session helped instructors see a more specific range of student work.
- The CE norming session has gone paperless. Anchors, rubrics, prompt, readings, memos, etc. are all now available on eCompanion only. This has tremendously cut down on excessive paper use and photocopying.
- The CE archives are complete from 2010 to present.
- The Common Essay takes place during week 12 during both fall and spring semesters. The materials are distributed week 11.
- A “student resources” unit has been created in the CE eCompanion (now Canvas) shell. Sources include a variety of websites to help students prepare for the exam as well as handouts on annotation. This is a growing part of the eCompanion shell.
- In Fall 2012, CE instructors voluntarily completed a survey. In this survey, they were asked to rate the strengths in student writing and areas for improvement. Here are the top 5 results in each category (more details are on “survey results” eCompanion site):
 - Strengths:
 1. Use of support
 2. Conclusion
 3. Introduction
 4. Subject-verb agreement
 5. Addressing the prompt and thesis statement (tied)
 - Areas for improvement:
 1. Thesis statements
 2. Addressing the prompt and sentence construction (tied)
 3. Topic sentences, selection of support, transitions (tied)
- Overall, instructors seem happy with the recent changes to the CE. The meetings run smoothly, and the conversations are more exact and meaningful. The use of eCompanion to implement the CE is up, and choices provided to instructors seem to make the CE a more pertinent part of the coursework.

For future Common Essays, several ideas have surfaced:

- Some instructors have voiced their enthusiasm to create themed cohorts. Doing so would allow these groups to find their own readings and create prompts based on a common theme that would be covered throughout the semester. Instructors believe this would make for a more organic inclusion of the CE as well as help students create more

compelling and sophisticated timed writing.

- All of the instructors who attended the cross-level conversation believed it was a worthwhile experience. Meeting periodically in this way will help keep the conversation going and keep instructors abreast of trends and continuing issues in student writing.
- A few instructors have shown interest in re-tooling the rubric.
- The CE committee leader recommends that the committee be led by more than one person.

Multiple Measures Assessment--New trends in Basic Skills and Developmental English Placement

In the spring of 2016, following guidelines produced by the statewide Multiple Measures Assessment Project (MMAP), SMC began accepting high school GPA as a placement indicator for students enrolling in math and English courses. According to data from SMC's Institutional Research team, the early, conservative, phase of our multiple measures implementation has dramatically increased the number of students eligible for English 1, and decreased the number of students placed into English 85 and English 21A. The new placement metric could potentially scoop all of the department's acceleration work as *the* story about how to improve students' access to college-level courses and transfer timelines. Over the last year, the English department has been watching and discussing the effects of MMAP, and the conversation will continue, particularly because many in the state, and at SMC, would like even greater student access to English 1.

The MMAP conversation began, for English, in the fall of 2015, when OIR introduced English and math faculty to the concept of using high school GPA as a placement indicator. Several faculty and OIR team members attended local information sessions conducted by members of the RP Group, which is responsible for MMAP. Ultimately, OIR representatives Daniel Berumen and Christopher Gibson presented to English faculty two scenarios for enhanced placement criteria using high school grade point average. In one scenario, considered the "aggressive" approach, students with an 11th grade cumulative high school GPA of 2.7 or higher would be placed into English 1, while those with a 2.2 to 2.6 GPA would be placed into English 21A. Any GPA lower than 2.2 would indicate an English 85 placement, and all of these GPA cutoffs would be paired in an either/or relation to a student's Accuplacer score. The OIR team also shared a conservative MMAP model, using 3.1 as the English 1 cutoff and 2.9 for English 21A.

Informal data about the likely shifts in student placement as a function of the two GPA models put many English faculty on alert, as hundreds of English 85 and 21A students were predicted to earn an English 1 placement level on the basis of the more aggressive GPA cutoffs. The department deliberated, asked questions of the OIR team, and, finally, voted to use the more conservative model for the coming year (AY 2016-17). When the MMAP measures were adopted, members of the department expressed concern that we be able to revisit the MMAP model after success and retention data were gathered, *and* with the option to roll back MMAP, to an even more conservative set of GPA cutoffs, if the failure rates of MMAP-placed students looked grim. At the same time, some faculty were also interested in entertaining the more aggressive GPA standards if the success and retention data looked promising—stable, or better, than in pre-MMAP conditions.

The fall 2016 term seems to have proven the conservative model a safe one, though questions linger in the department. Anecdotal stories of students with Accuplacer scores of 80, and diagnosed or undiagnosed learning disabilities with severe consequences, have been reported by English 1 instructors on at least a few occasions. In short, the department has found at least a few cases of students whose apparent success in high school, sometimes with a very high GPA, is entirely inconsistent with the student's reading and writing abilities in a college course. That said, any placement model is

going to produce outliers. Thus, the department would like to find better formulas for identifying students likely to be set up for failure in English 1, or sensible pathways to assist those students once their written work shows narrowing chances of success in English 1. The anecdotal cases, alone, are not sufficient to reason to reject the new MMAP criteria.

Outside of those extreme but potentially rare examples of students wildly misplaced by MMAP, the data from OIR suggests that nothing too radical has happened to enrollment patterns upon the arrival of MMAP. In fact, fall 2016 enrollment data shows that MMAP may have been a factor in the English 1 placement of just 429 students, or 11.3%, out of the 3803 enrolled in English 1. To put that number in perspective, it would amount to roughly two students in each English 1 section (see “MMAP Enrollment Data, Fall 2016” in Appendix). However, of those 429 students, 102 of them would have been placed into English 85 on the basis of Accuplacer alone. This group of students, perceived by many in the department as “English 85 students who were placed into English 1,” were the subject of most concern to skeptical and conscientious English faculty. Even the most proactive, social-justice minded instructors expressed concern that such students would be unfairly penalized in an English 1 classroom where an instructor might not scaffold or show patience to the degree that the student might need. Of course, some of the tougher faculty were simply concerned about the stress of planning for and teaching to the broad range of student skills and preparation that would seem likely to manifest in a classroom with students who, in a sense, “belong” in English 85 and 21A rather than English 1. Of course, virtually all English faculty understand that the very point of MMAP is to show that more students than we have been placing into English 1 actually *do* belong there.

Further data from OIR show that success rates and course GPAs, on the whole, dropped in 2016, but to levels that might be considered tolerable given the bigger picture. Speaking strictly in terms of first-time students, the English 1 success rate in the Fall 2016 term dropped to 70%, the lowest level in five years; however, that rate is identical to the one for continuing English 1 students in the same term. The English 21A trend is more curious: though it also dropped to its lowest level in five years, it was, at 67%, almost ten points higher than the success rate for continuing English 21A students in the same term. The English 85 success rate for fall 2016 followed a similar pattern (see “Enrollments and Success” in Appendix). The bottom line, however, is that *more* students are passing English 1 *in less time* than has ever been the case at SMC. For first-time students, enrollments in English 1 for fall 2016 increased, while enrollments in English 21A and 85 decreased. As a result of this trend, likely caused by MMAP in combination with the English Academy, fall 2016 saw the highest number of successful first-time English 1 students in five years, if not longer. Clearly, on the whole, MMAP is having its intended effect.

The fall 2016 success data is still relatively fresh, so a handful of the department’s questions are still seeking answers, and those answers will need discussion. For example, the department would like to know the success rates specifically of MMAPed students, not just first-time students, for each level. The 102 students who enrolled in English 1 despite an Accuplacer score for English 85 are of particular concern, so the department would like to know more about how those students performed in English 1—what success rate, course GPA, and how many Ws did they receive as compared to all students in English 1, or all first-time students in English 1? These questions have been posed to OIR analysts, and we await their responses. Once the department has the information, we can discuss and debate what the numbers suggest for our next plan of action: to affirm the current, conservative MMAP framework, roll it back, or push forward, to the more aggressive GPA cutoffs. Given the statewide talk of AB 705 and disproportionate impact of current placement measures, the department may have some difficult conversations ahead. Furthermore, the Common Assessment exam remains an unknown variable in this conversation. MMAP and CAI will feature prominently in what the department “looks forward” to address.

The English Academy

Funding from the Equity Committee has twice supported The English Academy, an accelerated two-week intensive reading and writing course, the culminating assessment of which provides students an opportunity place out of the developmental English sequence. In short, the English Academy helps students facing two semesters of remedial English bolster their skills and then start English 1 in the fall semester, skipping at least two terms of developmental English. The goal of the Academy was to narrow gaps in the time-to-transfer rates of African American and Latino students. The results of the Academy, so far, have been strong. Nearly 90% of English Academy students passed the summer intensive course and enrolled in English 1; of those, in the first Academy, of 2015, approximately 84% passed English 1 on their first attempt. The average success rate for all other first-time enrollees in English 1 is 72.4%--a very significant difference that reflects well on the English Academy. It succeeded, heartily, at lowering a barrier to transfer.

For graduates of the second English Academy, in 2016, the English 1 success rate was notably lower, at roughly 62%. However, even the failing students' time to transfer will likely be shorter than the typical timeline for a student who faces English 21A and 21B before enrolling in English 1. The lower English 1 success rates for EA 2016 graduates may have been caused by a few factors: first, the population was larger in 2016, with a class of 304 as compared to roughly 160 in 2015. Second, multiple measures placement sent into English 1 many students who would otherwise have been candidates for the English Academy. Between these two factors, a lower success rate was basically guaranteed. However, two particular points from the results data stand out and show that the second iteration of the English Academy served its purpose quite well. African American and Latino English Academy graduates succeeded in English 1 at rates, respectively, of 67.7% and 59.4%. For African American students, that success rate is actually higher than the rate for all African American first-time students enrolled in English 1. For Latino EA grads, while their success rate was lower than the average for all Latino first-time students in English 1, it differed only by 4.3%--and was nearly identical to the success rate of White students from the same English Academy class. Thus, some very positive results came of the scaled-up English Academy of 2016. Even better, the EA team has revised its curriculum for 2017 and aims for a higher English 1 success rate.

The persistence and apparent time-to-transfer rates of EA 2015 graduates are so impressive, however, that the department retains high hopes for a lasting positive impact even for the 2016 graduates. Work by Daniel Berumen, Senior Research Analyst, shows that English Academy graduates of 2015 not only succeeded in English 1 at a much higher rate than did other first-time students in English 1 (and continuing students, for that matter), but also that EA students enrolled in English 2 more quickly than other first-time English 1 students from Fall 2015, with very solid success rates, above 70%. Clearly, when the college faces declining enrollment, a program that correlates with semester-to-semester persistence is a boon to planners. Just as importantly, the program shows that professors with support *can* positively influence students' long-term academic attitudes and behaviors.

In the next academic year, the college will have accrued enough data to begin analyzing the complete transfer timelines of the first cohort of English Academy graduates--or, at least, the most expedient among them--as well as the English 2 success and retention figures for the second EA cohort.

Equity at All Levels—Basic Skills through Transfer

Given the burst of activity around equitable outcomes at Santa Monica College, this report would be incomplete without documentation of the English department's very intentional support of the campaign to close gaps in achievement for underrepresented student populations. Arguably, MMAP and the waiver initiative in English are directly tied to our concern over disparate success rates for young men of color in all levels of English. However, several additional departmental initiatives to close those gaps have been completed or are afoot:

Equity Workshop and Controversial Disaggregated Data

In the fall of 2015, the department chair attended the 2015 Equity Plan Institute hosted by the USC Center For Urban Education. In addition to personnel from more than twenty community colleges, several SMC faculty and staff attended: Daniel Berumen, Hannah Lawler, Mitra Moassessi, and Sherri Bradford, among others. Eye-opening data about achievement gaps for students of color at SMC, including in the English department, moved the group to seek change. The English department chair volunteered his program to partake in the college equity plan, specifically to aim for improvements in retention and success for African American and Latino students. At the conference, the department chair learned that other colleges had experimented with the distribution of individualized instructor data—student success and retention rates, disaggregated by race and ethnicity. The purpose of the data was to help individual instructors see the equity gap in concrete terms, close to home, as it were. However, the sense among institutional researchers was that SMC should proceed with caution when distributing—or even formulating—instructor-level data. The English department chair believed it a worthy experiment, nonetheless, and the researchers agreed to help. Thus, the chair planned to distribute such data at the spring 2016 departmental flex day.

As that plan took shape, and in consultation with Sherri Bradford and others at the CUE conference, the department chair also decided to plan the spring departmental flex day, from beginning to end, as an Equity Workshop—a meaningful day that would also provide context and direction for the disaggregated data. With Sherri Bradford’s help, the English department chair was introduced to Dr. Karen Gunn, who agreed to conduct the workshop. Dr. Gunn’s workshop, “Creating Excellence in ‘Equitable’ Teaching,” deeply moved the faculty, as feedback showed, and involved many of them in the discussion. Professors Joelle Adams, Wil Doucet, and Jessica Krug participated in a panel discussion featuring members and the President of the Black Collegians Program. Dr. Gunn’s workshop culminated in breakout sessions of small faculty groups whose ideas were recorded in the categories of “Challenges,” “Best Practices,” “Strategic Goals,” and “Resources and Support Required.” Suggested best practices included “diversifying class readings,” “demystify office hours,” “relevant content,” “create opportunities early on,” and “establish sense of belonging by having students interview each other or write a biography.” In several department meetings since then, the faculty have shared ideas about how to accomplish each of those suggestions. As this report details, below, a new English department library of culturally responsive texts, and an initiative to improve syllabi, assignments, and feedback, help us address all of the highlighted suggestions.

Though Dr. Gunn and the workshop, as a whole, were lauded by faculty in feedback gathered via survey after the fact, the distribution of disaggregated data did not go as well as the department chair had planned—but not as badly as he imagined it could have. Of course, the data itself was alarming: it showed that African American and Latino students, as compared to their white counterparts, experience as high as a 19% gap in their overall success rates in English. However, more importantly, success data disaggregated by race and ethnicity for each individual instructor revealed that such gaps could expand or contract, in some cases quite remarkably, depending on the individual instructor. This dynamic the department chair was eager to discuss with his colleagues, so, at the spring 2016 Equity Workshop, following a brief contextualization by research analyst Daniel Berumen, the department chair distributed the data to each English faculty member in attendance. Each data set was shared *only* with the individual instructor, and his or her own percentages were paired with department-wide averages for each class.

However, having planned an ambitious day around Dr. Gunn's agenda, the department chair asked that faculty members privately reflect on the data, perhaps through the lens of the workshop, and save a data-specific discussion for a later date. This move was probably a mistake. Following departmental flex day, a number of faculty grew concerned about the

meaning of the data, both as a reflection of their own teaching practices, but also as a potentially threatening set of data in this day of "value added" evaluations of teachers, and so on. Thus, at a department meeting not long after flex day, the chair facilitated a tense but ultimately productive conversation about the disaggregated data, its potential uses and limitations. The department has not finished its debate about the value of such data as a point of reflection and discussion, or whether disaggregated data should be distributed or even made available by request. Nonetheless, many instructors have been moved to seek more culturally responsive teaching practices on the basis of their own personal data, and the department-wide trends, while other faculty members are still grappling with the implications and potential limitations of such numbers. In either case, a vital conversation has begun in the department around issues of cultural and socio-economic concern. Once again, data from Institutional Research (and support from the Equity Initiative leadership team) has been crucial to the department's plan of action. Several projects are carrying that momentum forward:

Equitable Assessment and Feedback Protocol

After the flex day equity workshop, faculty members were eager to *do* something to improve their teaching practices. A document from the Center for Urban Education showed a pathway to immediate work on equitable and culturally responsive pedagogy. Dr. Estela Bensimon's "Syllabus Review Protocol," a rationale and guide to revising one's syllabus to be more student-centered and bias-free (or bias-aware), proved an ideal initial exercise for faculty. In the spring of 2016, the chair allocated an entire department meeting to a syllabus workshop using the protocol.

Adjunct faculty member Joelle Adams, Chair Jason Beardsley, and Center for Teaching Excellence Director Edna Chavarry saw an opportunity to apply the concept of the "Syllabus Review Protocol" to other significant course documents: assignment prompts and the feedback that instructors write on student essays. Working together, but with Joelle Adams in the lead, the trio developed a protocol for "Assessment and Feedback in the Equitable Classroom." A "protocol," in this case, means a structured sequence of questions to help faculty reflect on their own practice. Professor Adams organized a fall 2016 departmental flex day workshop around the assessment and feedback protocol, with support from the Equity Committee. Roughly seventy faculty members attended, using their own assignment prompts and authentic examples of written feedback as grist for the reflective mill. In a survey of faculty responses to the workshop, the reports were overwhelmingly positive. "Necessary reflective work," one instructor said, while others added, "reminds of the 'power' that faculty have," and "good metacognitive activity." The faculty also asked for more examples, more time, and small groups for the next iteration of the workshop.

In fact, Professor Adams *has* facilitated another, improved version of the workshop, for adjunct faculty at an orientation even sponsored by the Center for Teaching Excellence. Moreover, she has continued research into assessment and feedback practices by teaming up with the Office of Institutional Research to interview men of color about their experiences in the English classroom. Many thanks are owed to OIR Dean Hannah Lawler and Senior Research Analyst Daniel Berumen, who spent hours interviewing and transcribing! The results of the interviews, released in late March, 2017, are still being studied and will soon be shared with the department.

Library of Culturally Responsive Texts

As another response to the best practices and resources suggestions from the spring 2016 workshop with Dr. Gunn, adjunct faculty member Joelle Adams and department chair Jason Beardsley teamed up to seek Margin of Excellence funding to create a library, for instructors and students alike, of culturally responsive class texts. A prime motivation and justification for the proposal was the fact that texts focused on matters of social justice are recommended by well-respected leaders of the nationwide conversation to improve outcomes for students of color in higher education. Fortunately, Adams and Beardsley received the award and have since developed the lending library, currently housed in the department chair's

office and available to anyone with the assistance of the administrative assistant. The library includes such works as *The Other Wes Moore*, *Just Mercy*, *The Madonnas of Echo Park*, and *My Beloved World*, among others. The library of culturally-responsive texts and resources will help faculty create more equitable curricula and learning activities. This, in turn, will benefit SMC students by creating learning experiences that address their backgrounds, needs, and goals. The grant-funded library will help the English Department improve student learning and success by providing faculty members with necessary resources for effective pedagogy. In the long run, a better home for the library is needed, particularly as faculty suggest and donate new titles, including texts on effective teaching strategies.

2. Summarize how the program or service area addressed the recommendations for program strengthening from the executive summary of the previous six-year program review.

Recommendation #1. Documenting the evaluation and assessment of English 85

The tracking and analysis of English 85 has gone smoothly thanks to highly effective leadership by Vice Chair Eleni Hioureas, and the dedicated, organized team of largely full-time faculty teaching English 85, including Elisha Shapiro, George Davison, Kayli Weatherford, Kim James, Laura Campbell (now retired), and veteran part-timers Alex Schnitzler, Dena O'Hara, Nadine Wright, Patti Colton, and Ron Klemp. The group of English 85 faculty are cohesive, goal-oriented, utterly dedicated to student success and social justice, and highly organized. As a result, they meet regularly each term, conduct research with the assistance of OIR, and share curriculum and best practices. Truly, their collective productivity serves as a model for other department cohorts.

Recommendation #2. Strengthening efforts to engage all departments in efforts to implement writing across the curriculum.

In a meaningful twist, the department has spent more time strengthening reading across the curriculum rather than writing, at least overtly, over the last four years. Because evidence suggests that a student's efficacy as a writer is a function of his/her ability to read, understand, and analyze his/her source texts, the English department has dedicated much of its own inward development, and subsequent collaboration with other departments, engaging the ideas promoted by Reading Apprenticeship. Dozens of English faculty have now completed the Reading Apprenticeship online course by WestEd, and several, including Jean Paik-Schoenberg and Kathleen Motoike, have completed the RA Trainer course. In fact, Professors Paik-Schoenberg and Motoike have now shared their Reading Apprenticeship expertise in several contexts outside their own classrooms, including a few Institutional Flex Day breakout sessions, in local meetings with departments in Humanities and Social Sciences, in training sessions for English Instructional Assistants, and in a special adjunct faculty orientation program hosted by the Center for Teaching Excellence.

Recommendation #3. Continuing efforts to share successful teaching methods and strategies with colleagues in other departments

The English department regularly engages members of other departments, primarily in the Humanities and Social Sciences, in discussions of best practices for writing pedagogy. The English department chair attended a 2015 department meeting, hosted by Christine Schultz, to discuss teaching methods and persistent concerns of English instructors. The goal of the English chair's visit was to open lines of communication between the departments and identify common concerns in preparing students to write thesis-driven, evidence-based analytical essays. In 2017, the English department chair invited instructors from Philosophy, Political Science, Psychology, and History to share their own essay prompts and rubrics with members of the English department. The English chair also shared the most recent winner of the English 1 Research Essay Contest, as a concrete example of the student learning outcomes pursued in English 1. In turn, the English chair shared the prompts from across the disciplines with English faculty, who agreed the prompts were compelling, sophisticated, and well aligned with the aims and standards of our English 1 classes. However, given that English 1 is *not* a pre-requisite for

students taking, say, Phil 1, Poli Sci 1, or History 10, the prompts shared from those courses would suggest that B-level instructors should continue to assign college-level readings and writing assignments but with well-designed scaffolding and feedback; a student in 21A is very likely to be concurrently enrolled in Poli Sci 1!

4. Reviewing the efficacy of implementing non-credit modules to support the new accelerated curriculum models

In this moment, the question of non-credit involvement in developmental and basic skills English courses remains open as the college and Faculty Association negotiate issues of noncredit load factor. Since the last major program review, however, the department did engage in an experiment to pair a noncredit support course with English 1. The purpose of this experiment was to facilitate a form of acceleration commonly known as the "Baltimore Model" of concurrent enrollment. In a nutshell, with the support of counselors to recruit the right students for the program, the English department enrolled students with a B-level placement into English 1 on the condition that those students also enroll in a noncredit support course, English 990, that was taught by the instructor of their English 1. In more detail, the model paired two sections of English 1, taught by the same instructor, with a single section of 990. In each English 1 section, roughly ten students with B-level placement scores were enrolled alongside 15 (or 25) other students who enrolled in English 1 via normal enrollment pathways. The ten students with B-level placement in each English 1 would then come together as a group of twenty students in English 990, a two-hour weekly course designed to provide students with workshops and individualized attention from their English 1 instructor. The theory was that those nominally B-level students, surrounded and motivated by a majority of English 1 students, would rise to the expectations of the course; if the students struggled, then they would benefit from additional assigned contact with their English 1 instructor and a peer support network.

Though the English department ran the "Baltimore" pilot for four regular terms, none were entirely successful, often far from the much-touted 80%+ success rates reported by Community College Baltimore County. One chronic problem with the SMC experiment was difficulty identifying and working with a counselor to actively recruit students for the program. Dynamic shifts for part-time counselors and competing priorities of counseling managers often left English 990 with light support and narrow timeframes for recruitment. In the classroom, the English 1/990 instructors reported attendance problems and a lack of morale among the students, who struggled but often failed to take advantage of the resource--their instructor's time and attention--provided in the noncredit support course.

The Baltimore model has been discontinued, for now, but several initiatives have or are likely to surpass the 990 experiment in their ability to advance remedially placed students into English 1. Multiple Measures Assessment and the English Academy stand out as two powerful tools for advancing students into college-level English. However, if and when the college adopts the most aggressive HS GPA cut scores for English 1, the department will need to reconsider concurrent enrollment models of support, like English 990. At that time, the department will insist that the college provide dedicated counseling support and communication to make the model work.

5. Continuing efforts to implement innovative approaches to tutoring and participate in efforts to identify funding sources to do so.

The English department chair also leads the Student Instructional Support Committee (SISC) of the Academic Senate, the charge of which is to make recommendations to the college about how best to support and promote tutoring on campus. Over the last few years, the college has invested in new leadership of Supplemental Instruction and Tutoring, currently directed by Wendi DeMorst, with whom the English chair works closely to schedule Instructional Assistants in English labs. The new Dean of Learning Resources, Fabienne Chauderlot, co-chairs the SISC and is working hard to build a sustainable network of tutoring services on campus, including in English. Through the SISC, in conversations with senior leadership, and in recent listening sessions with the Strategic Planning Task Force, the English department chair has

highlighted the need for greater investment in tutoring resources on campus. The campaign is ongoing.

6. Continuing collaborative efforts with ESL and the Assessment Center to more accurately place ESL students in English courses.

With the near arrival of the Common Assessment test, ESL, Math, and English will soon adjust to an entirely new placement test. Field testing of the new placement tool is ongoing, and English students have participated in hundreds of experimental tests. Precisely how the English and ESL tests will vary remains to be seen, but promises of a writing sample in the test may prove a vital response to the English department's longstanding concerns about the way ESL students are placed into English courses. At the same time, the English department will continue to advertise, to its own students, ESL support courses for non-native English speakers struggling in English composition. The Chair of ESL has been very helpful in sharing course schedules for ESL 14A, 14B, 16A, 16B, 16C, 20A, 20B, and 23, many of which are either late-start or second-eight weeks online courses. To date, the English department has no data on how many English students simultaneously enroll in an ESL support course, but after a few more terms of concerted advertising to and advising of struggling non-native speakers, the department will request a review of the data by OIR.

7. Maintaining the level of self-reflection and documentation evidence in the current report.

3. Describe any changes or activities your program or service area has made that are not addressed in the objectives, identify the factors (e.g., licensure requirements, state or federal requirements, CCCO mandates, regulations, etc.) that triggered the changes, and indicate the expected or anticipated outcomes.

See response to question D1.

4. If your program received one time funding of any kind indicate the source, how the funds were spent and the impact on the program (benefits or challenges).

Each of the projects listed here, identified by funding source, are described in more detail in other areas of the report.

Funding Source: The Equity Committee

English Academy (cf. "Looking Back")

Equity workshop with Dr. Karen Gunn (cf. "Looking Back")

Equitable Assessment and Feedback Protocol (cf. "Looking Back")

Funding Source: The SMC Foundation, Margin of Excellence

Library of Culturally Responsive Texts (cf. "Looking Back")

5. Describe departmental efforts to improve the teaching and learning environment.

Professional Development

Student Essay Portfolio and English 1 Essay Contest

The department chair gathered from faculty samples of student writing from English 21A and 1 to facilitate departmental norming around our standards for passing work in the transfer and pre-transfer levels. The norming took place during our fall 2015 and 2016 department flex days, and the portfolio of student samples, with faculty annotations and rubric scores, is

available on Canvas. The English 1 Essay Contest also serves to boost morale, expectations, and support in the English 1 classroom, and the winning essays reinforce, for faculty and students, course objectives and outcomes. The winning essays are also available in the English Homeroom Canvas shell.

Expository Reading and Writing Curriculum

Nine faculty members completed the four-day ERWC training course as part of an initiative to work more closely with feeder high schools, SMHS in particular, to align remedial course curriculum as a way of speeding students into transferable English courses. The CSUs developed the Expository Reading and Writing Course (ERWC) to strengthen high school students' skills by engaging them in rich, scaffolded reading and writing assignments. In a high school, ERWC is a year-long college-prep course created for twelfth graders to be taught by a teacher trained at a local CSU in the curriculum. Students may be directed to enroll in it when their English scores on an early college assessment test at the end of 11th grade indicate they are not yet transfer-level ready. The ERWC is the high school equivalent of our 21A-21B sequence; students who successfully complete the course may be qualified for freshman composition at a CSU. The purpose of training SMC faculty was to empower the department to make a sound judgement about articulating local high school ERWCs with our own developmental courses.

College leadership, working with local school district leaders, fostered the relationship between the English department and the SMHS English department. As a result, both districts now include faculty trained in the ERWC. The curriculum is stellar--an exemplar of sound pedagogy rooted in scientific understandings of reading and writing skills acquisition. SMC faculty who complete the courses graduated with access to, and possession of, tremendous resources--recommended texts, lesson plans for a range of activities within a well-defined assignment sequence, and bibliographies of research for further education and understanding.

The SMC English chair has met with the instructor at SMHS teaching their first iteration of ERWC. The two plan further collaborations between SMC and SMHS faculty teaching ERWC.

Faculty Book Club

Elisa Meyer and Natalie Meir have been organizing the Faculty Book Club since their participation in the Faculty Summer Institute four years ago. Each semester, faculty read and gather to discuss notable works in pedagogy and educational theory. The list of selected titles includes *Teaching Men of Color in the Community College*, *Redesigning America's Community Colleges*, and *Teaching to Transgress: Education as the Practice of Freedom*. During the discussion, faculty, primarily in English, have participated in strengthening their classroom practice, building community, and preparing for leadership positions on campus.

Faculty Summer Institute and CTE leadership

Roughly thirty members of the English department have attended the Faculty Summer Institute, now approaching its fifth iteration. With a focus on student-centered learning, reading and writing across the curriculum, attending to the affective domain, and maintaining culturally responsive pedagogy, the FSI is the pre-eminent professional development activity on campus. We look forward to sending another strong cohort to the 2017 FSI. FSI 2015 participant Joelle Adams organized and facilitated a panel discussion during our equity-focused spring flex day; she has continued to play a vital role in the new faculty induction pilot, as well as in ongoing equity planning and grant writing. Elisa Meyer and Natalie Meir's book club, Jean Paik-Schoenberg's active sharing of Reading Apprenticeship strategies, and Jason Bostick's CORA training program for student tutors all have roots in the Faculty Summer Institute, a core principle of which is that faculty should

pay forward their learned best practices in order to support good teaching across campus.

Reading Apprenticeship

Thanks to generous support from the Center for Teaching Excellence, tens of English faculty have completed the Reading Apprenticeship online course by WestEd. At least two English faculty completed the advanced, "Campus Coach" course and are certified as Reading Apprenticeship trainers; Jean Paik-Schoenberg and Kathleen Motoike have shared their training with many faculty on campus, as noted elsewhere in this report. In effect, the English department has not only trained its own members in advanced reading pedagogy, but has also trained faculty from across the disciplines. Reading Apprenticeship teaches instructors how to support student subject area learning while improving their literacy skills, how to instill in students a persistent spirit of inquiry and habits of metacognitive awareness. Reading Apprenticeship training in the English department and across campus will only become more important as MMAP--and possible legislative action--allows increasing numbers of students with highly varied literacy skills into college-level courses.

Responsive Curriculum

First Year Experience Courses and the English Academy

Encompassing the English Academy, Summer Bridge, and Summer Jams programs, as well as regular-term programming that offers students extended contact with counselors, the First Year Experience has enjoyed steadfast support from the English department. The English department has participated in all phases of the FYE program, including, at one point, the Summer Bridge program, and currently with English faculty members taking leadership roles in the Summer Jams planning. Our department continues to co-produce, with FYE leaders, the summer English Academy.

With exemplary leadership by Gordon Dossett, Kevin Menton, and Susan Caggiano, and support from Dean Roberto Gonzalez and his dedicated staff, the English Academy has immersed a dozen or more English faculty in highly refined and engaging teaching lessons, which the instructors carry forward, from the summer intensive, into their regular-term classes. In fact, EA alum Jessica Krug has worked with current EA Faculty Curriculum Leader Susan Caggiano to adapt the summer curriculum to a 16-week English 21A; in the future, this curriculum will be offered to all B-level faculty and, along with the material from ERWC, would prove a powerful tool for teaching with improved student progression rates in mind.

Summer Jams

This summer, five English professors will be participating in Summer Jams, a program that helps first-time college students with their transition from high school into college. In addition to receiving individual support in adjusting to the college environment and being introduced to resources on campus, participants will connect with new and continuing students, faculty, and staff. In previous years, Summer Jams students participated in ten days of dynamic activities designed to strengthen reading, writing, math, and study skills as an extended orientation to college-level coursework. This year, however, the program will be reduced to four days since the 2015 session faced a sharp decline in attendance in the second week of the program. The 2017 program will serve approximately 500 students.

The English curriculum is designed to foster community while helping students review basic college-level reading and writing skills, as well as improve study skills specific to English courses. These lessons include reading comprehension and annotation activities, discussions, career research, and summary and writing assignments. The course centers around a career research paper that enables students to work toward meeting the mandate that students claim a major after a certain

number of units; the project gives them a more concrete plan in that after completing the program, they will have identified a potential career path and familiarized themselves with the career resources available through the college. In designing the curriculum, the English professors implemented some of the latest educational research and trends, including pedagogy from the SMC Faculty Summer Institute, Reading Apprenticeship, and OnCourse.

See section D, part 1, for more information about the English Academy.

Financial Literacy

Teaming up with Accounting Professor Ming Lu, Vice Chair of English Eleni Hioureas pioneered the incorporation of financial literacy themes and assignments into an English 85 class. Professor Lu's financial literacy pilot project was awarded the Carol and Bill Ouchi Chair of Excellence Award, and Eleni Hioureas' collaboration ultimately inspired several English faculty, from across levels, to adopt financial literacy texts and create a variety of related writing assignments. Professors Nichole Blackwell, Natalie Meir, and Elisa Meyer adopted the theme in their English 1 classes, while Carol Fuchs developed financial literacy curriculum for English 21B. Each professor has published, on the SMC website, exemplary assignments from their themed courses so that any instructor might review and be inspired by their work.

The Office of Institutional Research reports that the Financial Literacy Pilot project was remarkably positive experience for the students involved. A student from Prof. Hioureas' class declared, "I wish we could stay and work on this subject more in our class. I think every kid especially in English 85 needs to know this so we aren't so ignorant and can really apply [financial literacy skills] to our lives" ("Research Brief #847"). The cohort of English instructors using financial literacy texts are similarly hooked on the subject as a motivator and vehicle for contextualized learning. In fact, the participating instructors' work will prove a model of contextualized assignment design as the department wades into the waters of career and academic pathways, which emphasize contextualized learning and interdisciplinary collaboration.

Themed Classes and Future Pathways

As one element for improving the perceived relevance of English to a new student, the department has developed themed classes that articulate with academic and career pathways. Among those that have emerged are *Media and Technology*, *Ecology and the Environment*, *Food*, and *Business and Society*, *Science and Ethics*, and *Crime and Punishment*. A typical descriptor alerts students to the context: *Media and Technology*. *In this section we will read, write, and think about how media and communication are changing as technology becomes increasingly integrated into our lives, including the blurring of lines between public and private writing*. While instructors have in the past created themes for English classes, our intention is to do so more consciously and collaboratively, so that these might become part of loose inter-disciplinary cohorts that allow students to explore areas of interest that move students toward defining academic and career goals. Instructors in these pathways can work together and across disciplines to reinforce content and skills.

English, primarily with the leadership and hard work of Susan Sterr, has been meeting with Workforce Development, First Year Experience (FYE), and the Dean of Instruction to define some possible “pathways” that can be promoted through the Welcome Center and Schedule of Classes. FYE has been scaling up each fall, offering more than 1800 students scheduling options around their interests. For example, a student interested in media can choose a media-themed English 1, along with a Communications 10, or a student with business interests could choose Business 1 and a business themed English class, in an array of courses. We want to motivate students to move through their English transfer requirements by making them relevant; we believe they will find greatest value when those courses help them with writing skills necessary in their fields of interest. The college's successful new Basic Skills and Student Outcomes Transformation Grant grant includes English

faculty leadership will shortly bring together faculty in English and the disciplines to prepare contextualized assignments and course maps to assist students along one of three pathways: Allied Health, Business Transportation Logistics, and Graphic Design.

The themed course pathways build on the model of the federally supported **LA-HITECH** grant and consortium. Through 2014 and 2015, Susan Sterr worked with the SMC LA-HITECH team to facilitate transfer pathways for students from local area high schools to and through SMC. Though placement results revealed that incoming HI-TECH students often began the English course sequence at the basic skills or developmental level, our English 1 will remain the best--but not the only--vehicle for themes as career pathways for incoming students. The challenge is to build on the momentum of Susan Sterr's collaborative work by prompting all stakeholders, across campus, to share a vision and, ultimately, a room, in order to complete the detail-oriented work of coordinated course schedules and collaborative, contextualized assignment design across disciplines.

STEM English 1 and 2

English faculty Lawrence Driscoll and Shannon Herbert regularly teach a STEM themed English 1 and English 2, respectively. Lawrence completed an incredible sabbatical on the history of science and its interplay with the humanities; his impressive web-based project is will richly serve future STEM-themed English courses, undoubtedly in our future as pathways and contextualized learning become the norm.

6. If there is a tutoring component or other learning support service associated with the program, describe the relationship between the service(s) and the instructional program. If applicable, discuss any data you have compiled regarding student participation and the impact on student success.

Academy of Learning Innovation and Success

Number of Visits to ALIS Spring 2017

Courses	English 1	English 2	English 20	English 21A	English 21B	English 85	Total
Spring 2017*	51	10	5	11	10	1	88
Winter 2017	14	5	0	0	2	3	24
Fall 2016**	35	8	0	2	3		48

* To April 9, 2017 **Data is only from mid-November

Writing and Humanities Tutoring Center Coordinator Joyce Cheney reports the following information and concerns about the WHTC's ability to support English students with their writing skills and to track data.

Spring 2016 Staff: one full-time classified staff coordinator, three classified Instructional Assistants assigned for a total of 10 hours per week; four student tutors; five volunteers, who are retired professionals; one instructor who volunteers on a regular basis; and four instructors who volunteer as part of their required flex time activity.

Subjects in which tutorial assistance is available: English and ESL, writing for any class, reading, economics,

philosophy, logic, psychology, history, and political science. The majority of tutoring goes towards writing, logic and economics.

Recent data on WHTC student usage:

Course	Percentage of tutoring (rounded)
English 1	39%
English 2	12%
English 20	3%
English 21A	7%
English 21B	11%
English 85	2%
ESL Group C	5%
ESL Group B	6%
Economics	2.7%
PS and others	2%
Unidentified	1%

Format: The majority of English and writing tutoring is on a walk-in basis. Appointments are made for social/science and humanities courses. An online system is used to schedule economics tutoring, and the tutoring is done in person. For all subjects, the sessions are 30 minutes. Students may have two sessions per week. The WHTC offers approximately 120 sessions of tutoring per week, as well as drop-in writing tutoring.

Workshops: Each semester the WHTC sponsors workshops, which the WHTC coordinator or volunteer English department instructors lead:

1. Reading College Texts
2. Writing an Effective Thesis Statement, Introduction, and Conclusion
3. Writing the Personal Statement for Transfer Applications
4. Choosing and Integrating Sources into a Paper

Attendance for all the workshops runs approximately 25 students.

Problems needing immediate attention:

- During Spring 2016, the WHTC is closed a few hours a week to allow for meetings of lab classes. During these times, we turn away students seeking tutoring.
- The tutor tracking system needs to be amended to allow all of a student's classes to show. For example, a student coming for help with a paper for a dance class is not able to log in for that class.

During November of every year the WHTC helps many students with personal statements for their transfer applications, and the tracking system does not provide a category to demonstrate the assistance offered.

English 1E and Smarthinking

The English department offers two varieties of online tutoring for student writers. Smarthinking, a service of outside tutors, is available through English Canvas shells and has been an attractive option for many students even as word of the service travels slowly (in part because of concerns over its longevity under current fiscal conditions). The department is not, of course, the source of funding for Smarthinking but, rather, "offers" the service by advertising it to students, etc. Another kind of tutoring option, English 1E, is an asynchronous paper feedback service provided by Professor Hari Vishwanadha. Students who enroll, for free, in English 1E, a noncredit course, may drop off a paper and receive written feedback from Prof. Vishwanadha, often within a matter of hours.

Discuss and summarize conclusions drawn from data, assessments (SLO, UO) or other evaluation measures identified in Section C and indicate responses or programmatic changes planned for the coming year(s) including:

- **how the assessment results are informing program goals and objectives, program planning, and decision-making**
- **specific changes planned or made to the program based on the assessment results**

Moving Forward

MMAP and Remedial Course Sequence Revision

The department has spent a great deal of time and energy scrutinizing its basic skills and developmental course sequence in search of a more equitable and expedient rate of progression for students. The conversation about acceleration will continue, especially given pending changes to assessment tools, such as the Common Assessment and multiple measures.

All of the department's equity-related projects could not have come at a more important moment for the college as it transitions to the use of high school GPA as a placement tool. Recent enrollment trends and fall 2016 success rates suggest that all of our faculty, not just those in the basic skills classroom, may need to think critically about classroom practices and reading selections in order to maximize student success at the end of the term.

California Assembly Bill 705, and a growing body of research produced by the Community College Research Consortium and California Acceleration Project, argue for dramatically shortened remedial course sequences in community colleges. In anxious harmony with that movement, many in the department have wondered if we should not eliminate one of our remedial courses, possibly by reverting to the past and reducing 21A and 21B to a single course, English 21. Faculty members have proposed a variety of more expedient pathways, but the department has not seriously studied the proposals; it needs to.

Responding to Change with Faculty Level Leadership

At this point in the evolution of our remedial course sequence, any further change is likely to register new challenges for faculty—and, reciprocally, students—in the English composition classroom. Thus, any change in the remedial sequence must be met with careful scrutiny of the curriculum. Many professors have expressed concern that reading pedagogy must be consistently strong in English 1 and pre-requisite composition courses, as research shows that many of our students' proficiencies are weaker in reading than in writing. English 1, our most-scheduled course, is officially known as "Reading and Composition 1," and plenty of reading is assigned in such a course. However, those significant college-level reading texts are not universally taught by faculty trained in reading pedagogy. After all, the minimum qualification to teach English composition at a California community college is a master's degree in English Literature. Many English instructors have completed the introductory course in Reading Apprenticeship. Like any good habit, however, that training needs review and repetition. To facilitate a stronger instructor commitment to Reading Apprenticeship strategies—or any proven reading strategy—in the classroom, the department must nourish conversations about the strengths and best practices of teaching reading in the composition classroom. Those conversations need faculty leaders.

In fact, the department would be stronger had it faculty leaders in a variety of areas, much the way it currently enjoys faculty leadership of the Common Essay each term, and at the C level. Moving forward, the department needs to explore ways of organizing itself to share best practices and research among faculty with common interests, which tend to be by level—or along the following lines: English 85, English 20 through 23, English 1, and English 2. With a few designated leaders at each level, the department could better facilitate brown bag discussions and pedagogy workshops, shared exemplary assignments and student work, and the development of research questions for OIR to spot and improve on troubling trends in specific classes (*not* sections).

New Faculty Orientation and Mentorship Program

Along the same lines as a leadership structure for the department, a new faculty mentorship program would be the natural introduction to a department with structure and leadership. Happily, in most fall terms, the department brings on new faculty—full- and part-time. However, while we offer those candidates a welcoming and large family of colleagues, the time has come for us to go one step further by implementing a mentorship program for our newest faculty members. With a faculty handbook to guide them and a busy chair to answer their questions, new hires often find themselves overwhelmed by procedures, forms, and new professional deadlines that leave them with little time to meaningfully pursue the quest of any new teacher: how to get better at the job.

Thus, while the logistics and unusual social conventions inherent in a mentor program are not yet robust in our department, we have made some progress thanks to the concerted efforts of our New Faculty Induction team, a group formed before Fall 2015 to support new instructors, part-time and full, as they adjust to life in the English department at SMC. Led by part-time faculty member, Joelle Adams, the team, including Elisa Meyer, Kathleen Motoike, and Jason Beardsley, met throughout the summer and fall terms to create a thorough FAQ page for the English homepage, a prompt and assignment library, still nascent, for future collaboration among faculty, a mentor program pairing seasoned faculty with new hires, and a midterm roundtable discussion hosted by the Center for Teaching Excellence. Each component of the plan is a work in progress as we gear up for a repeat performance in Fall 2017 despite enrollment trends that would predict few new part-time hires on the horizon. Still, because best practices for orienting new faculty to the department are entirely consonant with best practices for orienting seasoned professors to new trends in the department, the NFI group will keep working on the FAQ, assignment portfolio, and mentor programs for the coming fall term. Moreover, the Adjunct Committee of the Academic Senate is working on a new orientation and mentorship program for *all* part-time faculty on campus. Diane Arieff and Joelle Adams, in English, are leading the Adjunct Committee effort, and we look forward to coordinating the

English department's efforts with whatever they produce.

Pathways

Two-year colleges across California are busy developing their vision of what the college of the future should look like; a chorus of progressive schools, ours among them, are working hard to lessen resistance between entering students and their career or transfer goals. SMC has teamed with local and out-of-state community colleges, as well as Arizona State University, to explore new possibilities of organization and curriculum design. Pathways and meta-majors are still emergent at SMC. Faculty collaboration across disciplines will make the core of any pathway, but the college is still exploring *how* that collaboration should be fostered.

Currently, a number of English faculty members teach themed courses. In fact, now with years of experience teaching reading and writing along themes like Business and Society, Media and Society, STEM, and Ecology, and Food, those English faculty are primed to learn from—and teach—CTE discipline faculty about reading and writing in a particular field. However, between English and CTE pathway faculty, deeper, possibly more technical, collaboration is the logical next step toward the realization of meaningful pathways. Pathways and meta-majors are built on clear goals and strong, collaborative curriculum. The English department has been a leader in conversations about how best to make multi-course structures and the curriculum within them. But we need more voices in the room and institutional support to bring insight and value to the pathways projects afoot.

In the long run, the concrete results of interdisciplinary faculty collaboration would be reading and writing assignments constructed about concepts or problems in a specific CTE discipline. As real pathways are formed at SMC and English courses are layered into those defined pathways, the assignments that English instructors create with their CTE colleagues will be the rubber that meets the road. Some of those assignments would manifest in the CTE course as a well-wrought writing (or reading) assignment; alternatively, some of the assignments would appear in a pathway-themed English course as a discipline-specific essay or writing task.

Whatever form the contextualized curriculum takes, the apparent scale of SMC's ambitions to emerge as a pathways-based campus suggests that we need to begin, now, organizing teams of faculty around themes and meta-majors. To support such collaboration among faculty, we need resources: access to fruitful examples, visits from leaders in the pathways vanguard, and tools, like *supported* access to Google Apps accounts for sharing documents, reassigned time for hours of faculty collaboration, and, of course, new faculty to do the work.

Culturally Responsive Pedagogy and Learning Library

Finally, the department's growing online bibliography and library of recommended texts for an equitable classroom is a core part in the department chair's initiative to preserve course materials for better collaboration and understanding among faculty members. The bibliography was conceived, following the department's spring 2016 conversations about the inequitable outcomes for students of color in English classes, as one possible step toward a more culturally responsive pedagogy. While the department is struggling to have a mature and productive exchange of ideas about tested best practices for an equitable classroom, the bibliography and library of texts that raise issues of race, socio-economic justice, and culture seems an effective way to plant the seeds for a long-term conversation about issues both motivating and hampering the success of students of color in our classes. The department chair asked faculty to share titles, annotations, and related assignments and classroom activities for both full-length and shorter works on issues of race, gender, and socio-economic

class, especially within a local context, because those topics are suggested by recent research to have a greater chance of drawing our students into fuller participation in their class discussions and assignments than would more conventional, general interest written texts. The chair will continue to solicit source texts and related assignments from faculty, and, in the long run, facilitate collaboration among those with interests in similar titles. The Margin of Excellence funding has enable the department to purchase multiple copies of the recommended texts so that faculty may read more than a peer review of the book before making a course text decision. In the long run, the department looks to create a library of recommended course texts, scholarly and popular publications on effective teaching practices, and hardcopies of research briefs produced for the department by the Office of Institutional Research. While a digital library of useful course materials, student writing samples, and archived Common Essays, for example, will always be vital to the department's cohesion and conversations, we need a space in which faculty can share books, scholarly research, and ideas at one and the same time. The Center for Teaching Excellence is an obvious candidate for such a space but is not a good fit for research specific to English curriculum. Thus, we need to find a local space, in Drescher Hall, where a modest set of bookshelves may house our growing library. HSS 261 is an ideal model for such a space, combining a conference room and library.

D2. Objectives (Moving Forward)

Objective #1

Objective:

Arrive at department consensus regarding the next set of revisions, if any, to the sequence of remedial English courses.

Area/ Discipline/ Function Responsible: All

Assessment Data and Other Observations:

- SLO Assessment Data
- TIMS Report Data
- Institutional Research Data
- Other data or observed trends
- Outside research from such organization as CCRC, CAP, and scholarly journals.

External Factors:

Timeline and activities to accomplish the objective: Timeline a function of the department's needs for information, possibly also the California legislature. Activities: form a team of researcher-leaders from across the spectrum; set clear goals for the team; share team's findings with department; meet with department to discuss. Repeat process until a satisfactory course sequence is found.

Describe how objective will be assessed/measured: 1. Briefs written by team of researcher-leaders; 2. record of faculty conversations about the research and proposals; 3. written examples of possible models of revised curriculum; 4. record of a departmental vote.

Comments: Much of this report indicates reasons why the department is compelled to address this objective. Broadly speaking, the College's commitment to a responsive curriculum would seem to entail the conversation described in this objective, especially given state trends in education reform.

Objective #2

Objective:

Create faculty teams to lead professional development and discussion around course-level best practices and reading strategies.

Area/ Discipline/ Function Responsible: All

Assessment Data and Other Observations:

SLO Assessment Data
Institutional Research Data
Other data or observed trends

External Factors:

Program Review Recommendation for Institutional Support

Timeline and activities to accomplish the objective: Recruit teams by midterm of fall 2017; hold first professional development discussions during the spring 2018 departmental flex day. Create leadership succession plans by midterm of spring 2018.

Describe how objective will be assessed/measured: Existence of faculty leaders, schedule of program for spring flex, documented process for leadership succession.

Comments: The department sees this structure as crucial to an effective long-term review and reflection process for the department.

Objective #3

Objective:

Create a well-defined, documented, and permanent orientation and mentorship program for new and recently new faculty, whether full- or part-time.

Area/ Discipline/ Function Responsible: All

Assessment Data and Other Observations:

Other data or observed trends

External Factors:

Timeline and activities to accomplish the objective: By end of spring 2017, draft specific objectives for and identity of faculty mentors; by summer 2017, identify new faculty members and assigned mentors, and specific mentor activities to begin by Institutional and Department day, 2017.

Describe how objective will be assessed/measured: Roster of mentors and new/recent faculty mentor-ed; documentation of recommended activities for mentors; documentation of feedback from mentored faculty about the quality of the program.

Comments: As part of an ongoing effort to develop cohesion and new leadership in the department, and to continue our

strong record of college engagement, this mentor program should be an effective way to more quickly engage new faculty in campus life and reflective teaching practices--which are fundamental to the ILOs.

E. Curriculum Review

To comply with accreditation standards, programs are required to update their curriculum outlines of record (CORs) every six years. Be sure to submit your updated outlines to the Academic Senate Joint Curriculum Committee in time for them to be reviewed prior to or at the Curriculum Committee's last scheduled meeting of the year (check the committee's submittal deadlines at [click here for dates and deadlines](#)). The Program Review annual report will note whether course outlines are up to date.

1. Discuss how the department reviews, revises, and creates new curriculum. Include the following information:

- **The process by which department members participate in the review and revision of curriculum.**
- **How program goals and SLOS are integrated into course design and curriculum planning.**
- **The relationship of program courses to other college programs (cross-listing, overlapping content)**
- **The rationale for any changes to pre-requisites, co-requisites and advisories.**
- **How the department ensures course syllabi are aligned with the course outline of record.**

As part of the program review process, the department chair asked English faculty to complete a review and refresh of the course outlines for all of the classes regularly offered (that were not created less than five years ago). The chair's instructions to faculty were as follows:

The review process will lead to cleaner, more coherent course outlines and, perhaps, substantive conversations about how to improve our course offerings.

Please download and share with your group members the relevant course outline from the English Homeroom shell on Canvas.

Work with your group to update the course outline and return a revised copy, as a Word file, to Jason Beardsley by **June 5th**. Please highlight any changes.

Each course outline revision group should

- update the appropriate textbook recommendations to include at least two significant sources no older than 5 years;
- revise the "Course Content" section to reflect topics and skills rather than assignments; for more context about this point, [click here](#).
- remove redundant SLOs and eliminate any "as assessed by" phrases in the final SLO language;
- send to Jason Beardsley any questions or concerns, raised by your committee during the revision process, that you feel should be addressed by the department or chair

Syllabus Review

The department chair, Vice Chair, and assigned full-time faculty regularly review syllabi of faculty being evaluated each term. Typically, 30-40 faculty members, full- and part-time, are under evaluation each term.

F. Community Engagement

In the prompts that follow, please delineate the partnerships you have with the rest of the SMC community as well as those

you have with external organizations.

1. If applicable, describe how your department staff members engage in institutional efforts such as committees and presentations, and departmental activities.

The English department is widely engaged in the life of the College.

Since 2011, English faculty members, full- and part-time, have organized or served on more than 38 Institutional Day breakout session panels. The cohort of full-time professors includes Nichole Blackwell, Laura Campbell (retired), Daniel Cano (retired), Gordon Dossett, Lawrence Driscoll, Wil Doucet, Shannon Herbert, Eleni Hioureas, Kim James, Siel Ju, Jessica Krug, Ed Markarian, Kevin Menton, Elisa Meyer, Angie Misaghi, Dana Morgan (retired), Jean Paik-Schoenberg, Susan Sterr, Gary Todd, Hari Vishwanadha, and Kayli Weatherford; the part-time cohort of presenters includes Joelle Adams, Jason Bostick, David Burak, Natalie Hansen, Ron Klemp, Natalie Meir, Kathleen Motoike, and Bridgett Robinson (full-time as of 9/17).

Presentations have run the gamut of topics, including differentiated instruction, authentic engagement, lecture strategies, building classroom community, the role of passion in teaching and learning, reading techniques across the disciplines, strategies for teaching mean of color, the organic garden, happiness, Turnitin, being an LGBTQ ally, and several reports from professional development programs such as the Faculty Summer Institute and Great Teachers Seminar.

FACULTY ORGANIZATIONS:

2016 Accreditation Team

Eleni Hioureas, Co-Editor

Kathleen Motoike and Gary Todd, contributors

Academic Senate

Recent senators: Walker Griffy, Eleni Hioureas, Matt Hotsinpiller, Dan Landau, Kevin Menton, Frank Possemato, and Brian Rajski

Senate Committees:

Adjunct: Joelle Adams, Co-Chair, Dian Arieff, Joseph Ferrerosa, and Susan

Caggiano

Curriculum: James Pacchioli

DE: Dana Del George

Environmental Affairs: Angie Misaghi

Equity and Diversity: Angelica Duran

Global Council: Gordon Dossett, Chair

Institutional Effectiveness: Elisa Meyer, Jean Paik-Schoenberg, Alex Schnitzler

Legislative Action: Kevin Menton, Chair, and Matt Hotsinpillar

PDC: Kevin Menton, former Co-Chair

Professional Ethics & Responsibilities: Walker Griffy, Chair; Natalie Hansen,

Brian Rajski

Student Instructional Support: Jason Beardsley, Chair; Eleni Hioureas, Elisa

Meyer, and Gary Todd

Special Programs

Faculty Leader, Scholars Program: Mary Fonseca

Faculty Leaders, The Center for Teaching Excellence: Kevin Menton and Shannon

Herbert

Faculty Association

Officers

Chief Negotiator: Matt Hotsinpillar

Recording Secretary: Kevin Menton

Representatives: Jim Pacchioli, Ed Markarian, Shannon Herbert, Christian Lozada

Committees:

Editorial Board: George Davison, Editor of Faculty Association Bulletin

(also FA representative to DPAC)

Department Efforts and initiatives:

Faculty Summer Institutes 2013-2016: Siel Ju, Matalie Meir, Elisa Meyer, Jean Paik-Schoenberg, Brian Rajski, Angelica Duran, Andrew Espinosa, Marcio Garcia, Alicia Garnica, Ronald Klemp, Jessica Krug, Monique Matthews, Jason Bostick,

Rachel Young, Joelle Adams, Joseph Ferrerosa, Alison Minami, Launa Nelson, Frank Possemato.

English Academy 2015 and 2016: Gordon Dossett and Kevin Menton, Faculty Leaders; Nichole Blackwell, Susan Caggiano, Wil Doucet, Angelica Duran, Mik Hamada, Jessica Krug, Ed Markarian, Angelina Misaghi, Lee Pritchard, Kisha Turner, Erin Nichols, Natalie Hansen, Shannon Herbert, Robert Karron, Angie Misaghi, Bridgette Robinson, Amy Sandoval, and Rachel Young, Instructors.

Art of Reflective Teaching (ART): Jessica Krug, working with The Center for Teaching Excellence to develop peer review/observation for ART

Literary Series and English 1E, online tutoring: Hari Vishwanadha

Common Essay Committee Coordinators B-level, historically: Kevin Menton, Jean Paik-Schoenberg, Nichole Blackwell, Jessica Krug

Common Essay Coordinator C-level: Kayli Weatherford

Media/Film and Special Speaker Events: Dave Burak

Website manager: Lawrence Driscoll

Distance Ed mentors: Judith Remmes, Dana Del George, Tim Cramer

Veterans' Resource Center Tutors: Dawna Kemper, Susan Caggiano, MaryJo Stirling

Full-Time Faculty Hiring Committees: Jason Beardsley, Eleni Hioureas, Judith Remmes, Andrew Espinosa, Lee Pritchard, Wil Doucet, Kayli Weatherford, Kim James, Elisha Shapiro, Ed Markarian, Jean Paik-Schoenberg, Brian Rajski, Matthew Hotsiniller, Stefan Mattessich.

Adjunct Faculty Evaluations: Eleni Hioureas, Coordinator

Basic Skills Labs Liaisons: Jason Beardsley, Eleni Hioureas

2. If applicable, discuss the engagement of program members with the local community, industry, professional groups, etc.)

ERWC

The English department vetted and accepted the ERWC curriculum, thereby allowing students with a record of success in ERWC--at SMHS only, for now--eligibility for English 1. In this way, the English department has engaged the local community by partnering with the K-12 school district to improve their students' readiness for college.

Literary Series

The SMC Literary Series, sponsored by the SMC Associates, has 15 years of momentum and a regular place in community life. English Professor Hari Vishwanadha is the driving force behind it. The Series continues to be well attended (with

some regular attendance now from local SMC Associates) and to provide students, faculty, staff, and community members with at least three activity-hour events each semester, affording opportunities to hear from and interact with authors about the craft of writing and topics of interest in their works. Recent events included:

“Expect the Unexpected: Geoff Dyer Reads from His Work”

“*They Know Everything about You*: Robert Scheer Looks at the National Security State”

“Steph Cha Reads from Her Work”

“Isaac Babel: New Fiction by Stephen Cooper”

“Language as the House of Being: A Reading by Aline Ohanesian”

“AMERICUS: The Historical Novel in the Present Historical Moment: A Reading by Michael Datcher”

“*The Sympathizer*: A Reading by Viet Thanh Nguyen”

“*My BlueSkin Lover*: A Reading by Monona Wali”

Through the determined efforts of English instructor **Dave Burak**, who works tirelessly to land interesting speakers on timely topics in collaboration with Communications/Film department, Adelante Program, Black Collegians and supported largely by Associated Students and SMC Associates, a number of remarkable events came to campus. Dave Burak was instrumental in making contacts that brought the community each of the following special events:

Recent Events

"Reconfiguring The Contexts Of Violence, Fear, and Anger: Challenges and Opportunities."

“SIR REAL & Minerva’s Gatekeeper”

Poetry reading by SMC Profs. Ernesto & Mario Padilla, Wilfred Doucet, & Others.

"Illuminating Inequity: Rosa Moreno's Quest for Justice"

"Chemistry In Art, Art In Chemistry, And The Spiritual Ground They Share"

"Metamorphic Kommunique: A reading of Poetical Works (w/ Burak)"

3. Discuss the relationship among and between full and part-time faculty, involvement of part-time faculty in departmental activities, and part-time faculty access to resources and support.

Despite their 40-to-95 ratio, full- and part-time faculty members form a cohesive group in the department, with many professional relationships and friendships bridging the divide. Indeed, part-time faculty are taking the lead in several areas, like Joelle Adams and Jason Bostick on equity in the classroom, Kathleen Motoike on Reading Apprenticeship, Diane Arieff on adjunct faculty orientation and mentorship, and Alex Schnitzler on the English 20 lab curriculum "playbook." Department flex days and regular meetings are well attended by part-time faculty, though some adjunct faculty miss the meetings because of a conflicting activity-hour class schedule. Had the department greater access to classrooms on campus,

the chair would not schedule any part-time faculty at that time but for reasons of their own preference.

At the same time, part-time faculty struggle to find adequate and comfortable space in which to hold their office hours, and, each term, a significant number of adjunct faculty are scheduled at the Bundy campus, which puts them at risk for class cancellation. While the college has good reasons for building coherent class schedules on each satellite campus, recent enrollment slack puts the most vulnerable faculty, part-timers, at risk when scheduled beyond prime time or off the main campus. At the very least, the department chair tries to rotate part-time faculty through Bundy so that no instructor is repeatedly subject to an afternoon schedule off campus--the greatest risk. That said, a few part-time faculty enjoy the perks of Bundy 414 and 212 and regularly request (morning) schedules in those rooms.

G1. Current Planning and Recommendations

The following items are intended to help programs identify, track, and document unit planning and actions and to assist the institution in broad planning efforts.

1. Identify any issues or needs impacting program effectiveness or efficiency for which institutional support or resources will be requested in the coming year. [This information will be reviewed and considered in institutional planning processes but does not supplant the need to request support or resources through established channels and processes].

- Greater access to computer lab classrooms is necessary to accommodate rising numbers of requests for such technology. As remedial courses increasingly introduce students to the fundamentals of research, the demand on Library 192 has outstripped its supply of useful dates. Moreover, that computer lab is not reservable by faculty and must be hosted by a librarian. The English department needs access to a computer lab on a reservation basis.
- Adequate and accessible classrooms for all students; whiteboards on at least three walls of every English classroom.
- Instructional support: staffing sufficient to guarantee two instructional assistants per lab meeting (or the instructor and two IAs)
- Designated meeting areas or office hour space for adjunct faculty and their students. Unless it is claimed by a food vendor, the Bread Factory space would be the sort that could be converted to a meeting area.
- Continued technology training for faculty and students
- **Semester-by-semester TIMS data for individual faculty members available in their ISIS/mProfessor portals. This would be the single most supportive information that the institution could provide to faculty for improving teaching effectiveness.**

2. If applicable, list additional capital resources (facilities, technology, equipment) that are needed to support the program as it currently exists. [This information will be reviewed and considered in institutional planning processes but does not supplant the need to request resources through established channels and processes].

- Chronic complaints of excessive heat in all classrooms but those in Drescher prove that a cooling solution for LA, HSS, LS, and MC is drastically, if not legally, overdue.
- Adjunct faculty continue to need a dedicated space for their office hours. With as many as fifty percent of our courses taught by part-time faculty in some areas, their lack of a reasonable office space does not scan. Their students also deserve what other students at SMC get: A professor with proper accommodations in which to hold a meaningful conversation about challenging course material and tasks.
- Reassigned time for faculty developing common lab content for English 20 and 85

3. If applicable, list additional human resources (staffing, professional development, staff training) needed to support the program as it currently exists. [This information will be reviewed and considered in institutional planning processes but does not supplant the need to request resources through established channels and processes].

Full-time Faculty Shortage

As outlined in this report, the arrival of HS GPA as a placement tool and improvements to the remedial course sequence have combined to boost the number of students enrolling in English 1--and, not long after, in English 2. Despite a slow-down in enrollment, the fall 2016 semester brought a 10% jump in the number of first-time students enrolling in English 1! With the retirement this academic year of Joe Watts, a veteran professor of English 1 and 2, the department faces a grim ratio of full-time to part-time instructors in English 1 classrooms: 47% of English 1 FTE will be taught by full-time faculty in the next academic year. Given that English 1 is the most sought after course at SMC, the college will be placing quite a bet on freeway flyers, whose excellence and dedication to students, though mighty, competes against freeway miles, demanding schedules, multiple email accounts and learning platforms, and the hurly-burly of academic life without a home.

The sheer number of new students in English 1 tells only part of the story. The new placement tool, essentially high school GPA in combination with Accuplacer (often called "MMAAP"), is built on the understanding that as access to English 1 increases, higher numbers of inconsistently prepared students are to be expected in the classroom. This fact suggests that English 1 instructors need the latest training and innovative pedagogy to support underprepared students aiming for success in English 1. To develop and support new best practices for transfer-level composition in the age of MMAAP, the department needs many hands, and new energy. Struggling students need professors who are available, physically, intellectually, and emotionally, to respond in timely and tailored ways. Full-time faculty, rooted at SMC, are in the best position to successfully teach students who bring a wide variety of preparation to the challenges of writing, critically analyzing, and conducting research on the pathways to transfer and career success.

Classified Instructional Support Staff

The English department continues to need greater support for Instructional Assistant staffing levels in the B and C-level labs. Inconsistent funding and fluctuating hiring processes have frequently left required lab hours to be staffed by one IA--and if that IA has a sick day, then the lab must be cancelled, so students' time on task is lost.

Furthermore, the pressures against steady funding for Instructional Assistants is inconsistent with the competing demands for their time once their shift begins. Whereas an IA's primary role is to support students in required, credit-bearing lab hours, the IAs are also assigned time working with students in the Writing and Humanities Tutoring Center and Academy of Learning Innovation and Success. This arrangement, of IAs working in the tutoring centers, was originally conceived as an assignment that would not interfere with their duties in lab. However, given a general shortage of IAs and student tutors, the IAs are often scheduled back-to-back in a tutoring center and then in a classroom, leaving them little time to arrive in class feeling prepared for the lesson plan established by the instructor.

However, as resources for tutoring have dwindled, the department faces a grim choice: either to eliminate IA support of the tutoring centers in order to prioritize the quality of required lab hours or to continue such support at the expense of the best opportunities for IAs to prepare for the many classrooms or lab rooms they visit each day. Currently, several IAs spend time at home preparing for their lab assignments despite the fact that they are hourly employees.

Classified Administrative Support

Joanne Laurance, the English department's essential support staff, has indicated her intention to retire at the end of this academic year (2016-17). Needless to say, the thought of 140+ English faculty working without such a reliable, knowledgeable administrative assistant is good for a shock. Keys, book orders, office hours, absence reports, payroll, student help, incredible institutional memory--the list of essential support Joanne brings to the department could go on. In

light of the recently announced hiring freeze, the English department chair is deeply concerned that the College and Personnel Commission provide timely support to fill the administrative assistant position as quickly as possible.

G2. Future Planning and Recommendations

The following items are intended to help programs identify, track, and document unit planning and actions and to assist the institution in broad planning efforts.

1. Projecting toward the future, what trends could potentially impact the program? What changes does the program anticipate in 5 years; 10 years? Where does the program want to be? How is the program planning for these changes?

Over the next decade, the English department will likely see profound changes along two lines: assessment and placement trends that may alter our basic skills and developmental course offerings, and the development of career and transfer pathways that call for deep contextualization of English skills and collaboration with diverse departments from across campus. The department would like to maintain its position as a leader in innovating pedagogy in support of broad access to higher education, whether for transfer or career goals.

2. If applicable, list additional capital resources (facilities, technology, equipment) that will be needed to support proposed changes. [This information will be reviewed and considered in institutional planning processes but does not supplant the need to request resources through established channels and processes].

The College is in the digital age, and students at our two-year institution fundamentally need access to the tools of digitally literate professionals. In the English department, that need of access is most effectively met in computer labs, like those in DH 203, 204, and 312, where students can read, compose, and revise in a fashion authentic to their wired and cloud-based future work environment. More importantly, though, too many of our students avoid purchasing laptop computers or tablets, settling, instead, for their mobile smartphones as the tool of their educational trade. Often small, if not cracked, the screens on those mobile phones are inadequate to the task of supporting long hours of reading, critical thinking, and composition required in a college English class. Thus,

Instructor demand for computer-based classrooms (like DH 203) has consistently outstripped supply, and instructors often find that the limited availability of Library 192 leaves them wanting greater access to a computer lab for support students' developing research skills.

3. If applicable, list additional human resources (staffing, professional development, staff training) that will be needed to support proposed changes. [This information will be reviewed and considered in institutional planning processes but does not supplant the need to request resources through established channels and processes].

To fulfill the department's goal of increasing leadership and professional development within the English faculty *while* maintaining its current commitment to campus leadership, the department needs more full-time faculty.

4. If applicable, note particular challenges the program faces including those relating to categorical funding, budget, and staffing.

Clearly, rising costs will continue to threaten the college's budget and apparent power to hire full-time faculty. However, for the college, and for the department, the best bet for continued excellence is an investment in committed faculty--full-time faculty.

5. Summarize any conclusions and long term recommendations for the program resulting from the self evaluation process.

The English department's best interests will be served by teamwork, an intense focus on leadership development, and an open, vigorous, and ongoing conversation about best practices for the English composition and Literature classroom.

6. Please use this field to share any information the program feels is not covered under any other questions.

N/A

Evaluation of Process

Please comment on the effectiveness of the Program Review process in focusing program planning.

The program review process is an excellent tool for reflection, understanding, and planning. That said, I would be glad to learn more about how other departments use teamwork to create an effective program review document.