

Table of Contents

- I. Overview
 - A. Description of Program
 - B. Status of Previous Recommendations

- II. Program Statistics
 - A. Demand
 - B. Offerings
 - C. Scheduling
 - D. Retention and Success
 - 1. Retention
 - 2. Success Rate

- III. Curriculum
 - A. Course and Content
 - 1. Courses Not Offered
 - 2. Course Revisions and Additions
 - B. Articulation
 - C. Instruction and Assessment
 - 1. Active Learning
 - 2. Assessment

- IV. Program Requirements
 - A. Instructional Support
 - B. Facilities and Equipment
 - C. Staffing
 - D. Planning

- V. Conclusion
 - A. Prioritize recommendations
 - B. Identify major needs
 - C. Discuss strategies to implement recommendations and needs

1. Overview

A. Description of Program

The current Reading program consists of three courses: English R Introduction to Reading Skills, English 2R Developmental Reading and Writing, and English 7 Speed and Power Reading, with English R and English 2R classes comprising over 95% of the program. The intention of the program is to meet the reading needs of the developmental students at El Camino College and to prepare them for success in the collegiate level courses. Student advance to the next course in the sequence through a combination of course work, standardized tests (DRP, Nelson-Denny, Townsend Press), teacher-created instruments, and teacher evaluations. Students who perform at high levels in English R may be waived from English 2R.

The Reading Program has grown steadily over the past decade since the 1994 Program Review. Currently there are 10 full-time reading instructors with four additional English instructors who teach part of their load in the Reading Department. In addition, each semester there are usually 10 or more part-time instructors who teach one or two courses in the Reading Department. Since the last program review, several of the reading classes have become part of the Learning Community/First Year Experience Program.

In the fall semester of 2005, 63 sections of reading were taught throughout the day and evening. Thirty-three of these sections were English R, twenty-eight sections were English 2R and two sections were English 7. There were slightly fewer sections in the Spring of 2006 (spring is always a bit smaller in enrollment), with twenty-three sections of English R, twenty-seven sections of English 2R and two sections of English 7. During each of these semesters eight of the English R and 2R sections were taught in connection with the Learning Communities/First Year Experience Program where they were linked with at least one other class. In addition to the fall and spring semesters, summer session 2005 offered seven sections of English R and eight sections of English 2R. Winter session 2006 filled five reading sections, two English R and three English 2R.

Because we have changed to a 16-week semester since our previous Program Review, each section of English R and 2R meets twice weekly for two hours and five minutes per session. One hour weekly of the scheduled class time is spent in the reading computer lab in MCS 219A or 219B. These computer labs opened in spring 2001 with 35 individual computers in each lab so that each student in the class can be accommodated. In addition, each lab has a teacher's station comprised of a computer and a video visualizer. Furthermore, a drop-in lab with eighteen computers is available in MCS 218. Students can utilize this drop-in lab outside of regularly scheduled class time to make up assignments or further their reading practice. New computers were installed in the fall of 2005 to replace all three labs' original computers. A variety of reading programs offering speed reading, vocabulary development, and reading comprehension have been purchased and installed to enhance the students' learning experience and reading skills.

B. Status of Previous Recommendations

1. One of the primary recommendations mentioned in the 1994 Program Review was a need for more computers available to the reading program. This concern was met in 2001 with the

installation of the two classroom size labs in MCS 219 A & B, plus the drop-in lab. The new computers installed in fall 2005 are in good working order, and there are now few problems with having adequate computer access.

2. Another concern in the earlier report was the difficulty of maintaining the boxes of individualized reading materials in the reading classrooms. This no longer is much of a concern since most instructors utilize the computer labs for individualized instruction rather than the now outdated boxed materials.
3. In the previous report, there were concerns expressed about the condition of the reading rooms in terms of their equipment and maintenance. Since those classrooms have now been demolished, that is a moot point, but the current bungalows which are a temporary replacement until the new Humanities complex is finished need better maintenance and control of air conditioning and heating. Furthermore, they have been placed next to the Technical Arts painting spray booth, and fumes are noxious in some of the adjacent module classrooms.

However, each of the reading room bungalows has a teacher computer and video visualizer, a great improvement since the last program review. One continual problem, however, is the offering of many reading classes in other classrooms which are not properly equipped. Hopefully in the new Humanities complex, there will be an adequate number of reading classrooms and state-of-the-art technology in a common area.

4. A problem mentioned in the 1994 Program Review was the difficulty of meeting the wide range of learning needs in the current English R class. Efforts taken to resolve this difficulty include streamlining and making the testing center procedures (for the College Placement Test) more clear as well as gathering data on student success/retention based on CPT scores to gain a more objective view of which students were successful and which ones were not being served by the English R curriculum. Utilizing this data, the department has determined that it is necessary to add a cut-off score of 42 as a prerequisite for our current English R course and reactivate the lower level English R-A course to address the needs of students who are reading below the sixth-grade level.

Our plan involves the following actions. In Fall 2006 we will send forth to the College Curriculum Committee to reactivate English RA with Title 5 updates, revise the English R course outline to include a prerequisite, change the Title and Number of English RA, English R and English 2R to English 80, English 82, and English 84, respectively. We will inform Counseling and the Testing Center about the new Advisory Program Sheet recommending that students who score below 42 on the CPT take the lower level course. In fall 2007 we plan to offer the new lower level course, English 80.

II. Program Statistics

A. Demand: FTES by Course/Program

Instructions: Analyze the FTES by Course/Program using 1st census data and answer the following questions. At a minimum, your analysis must include a 3-year cycle comparing like semesters.

Reading Courses	Fall 2003 FTES/ # of sections	Fall 2004 FTES/ # of sections	Fall 2005 FTES/ # of sections
R- Introduction to Reading Skills	160.1 (29)	150.7 (31)	163 (33)
2R- Developmental Reading and Writing	138.9 (25)	133.3 (25)	141 (27)
7- Speed and Power Reading	11.1 (2)	10.7 (2)	8.8 (2)

1. **Given the data, can you recognize any trends in course demand in any of the Program's courses?**

After a drop in FTES in fall of 2004, the number currently exceeds the FTES posted for R and 2R in fall of 2003. One has to question the role of the increase in tuition from \$18/unit to \$26/unit plays in the variability of these numbers. The 29 sections of R in fall of '03 were able to yield an FTES of 160.1, while the 33 sections in fall '05 generated only a 2.9 increase in FTES. Nevertheless, demand for reading courses remains strong. In addition, since seniors graduating from California high schools in June of 2006 are required to pass an exit exam in order to qualify for a diploma, we might reasonably expect to see the demand for reading classes to increase.

The FTES for English 7 shows a decline for the 2 sections of this distance education course; however, this is the first year that the course has not enrolled well, and it might be a reflection of the declining enrollment of the entire college.

2. **What are you doing to respond to trends?**

The reading faculty meets regularly in department meetings and informal "brown bag" discussions in which we explore how to best meet the needs of our students. Several members of the reading faculty, both part-time and full-time, actively participate in the Pre-baccalaureate Task Force, which works together to identify barriers and find solutions to the challenges underprepared students bring to the ECC campus.

3. **Should a recommendation be written addressing the data? Yes No**

- Encourage the college to continue outreach programs to feeder schools, especially targeting the needs of the underprepared.
- Examine ways to advertise and promote English 7 to students who would be best served by this distance education course.

- Gather statistics on the pass and failure rates on the high school exit exam, and project how those numbers might impact the reading program at ECC.
- Examine the challenges of the strictly on-line registration/enrollment process, especially for the underprepared student population.

B. Offerings: Fill Rate*

Instructions: Review and analyze the **fill rate data** (including the fill rate per course for both day and evening), provided by Institutional Research for this program for a three year cycle and answer the following questions:

* Percent of fill of each classes at census.

Average fill rate of courses in program: How does this program compare to:

Reading courses	Fall 2003 Act/ Max	Fall 2004 Act/Max	Fall 2005 Act/Max
Day classes R	920/720= 127.7%	838/750= 112%	919/810=113%
Day classes 2R	798/735= 109%	767/735= 104%	822/805= 102%
Evening classes R	161/150=107.3%	180/186=97%	182/186=98%
Evening classes 2R	140/140=100%	133/140=95%	130/140= 93%
Distance Ed 7	77/70= 110%	74/70= 106%	61/70= 87%
Total	2096/1815=115%	1992/1917=104%	2114/1981=107%

1. Given the data, is the program in a growth mode? X Yes No

The program experienced a dip in fill rate in the fall of 2004, but the actual number of students enrolled in English R and 2R has risen to meet or exceed the 2003 actual totals. Every year the total number of seats available in the program has risen. In fact, R and 2R have always enrolled students over the maximum seats established by the college (30 for R and 35 for 2R). Daytime R classes tend to run in double digits above the maximum. Evening classes do not fill at the same capacity as day classes, yet the numbers are respectable, ranging from a low of 93% to a high of 107.3%. Since R is the portal through which anyone can enter college, it is little wonder that this course is always heavily subscribed.

The fill rate for English 7 appears to be an anomaly that would benefit from an analysis as to why that is the case. The sample is small, 2 sections, so any decrease will negatively impact the fill rate.

2. What adjustments are indicated?

The college should be prepared to add sections of English R and 2R as needed.

3. Should a recommendation be written that addresses the data? X Yes No

- Explore the impact running English R classes with double digit numbers in excess of the maximum number of seats established by the college has on the success of the students enrolled.
- Collect data for the upcoming years to measure the impact of the high school exit exam on the number of students seeking reading courses at ECC
- If this trend continues, ECC should seek to raise the number of full-time reading instructors who have the expertise to work with the rising numbers of students dramatically lacking the reading skills necessary for success in college.
- Expand program review to include data generated by winter session.

C. Scheduling: Student Satisfaction with Scheduling

Instructions: Complete the chart below. Indicate the time when sections of courses in the program are currently scheduled to start. Analyze the data provided by Institutional Research on student satisfaction with scheduling in the program and answer the questions.

Summer and Fall 2002; Winter 2003

Course	During the early morning before 10 am	During the late am/early pm 10am –1:55 pm	During the late afternoon 2 pm -4:25 pm	During the evening 4:30 & later	During the weekend	During the summer	During the winter '03 intercession	Via Online
English R	7	12	5	7		10	1	
English 2R	8	11	4	5		9	1	
English 7								2

Summer and Fall 2003; Winter 2004

Course	During the early morning before 10 am	During the late am/early pm 10am –1:55 pm	During the late afternoon 2 pm -4:25 pm	During the evening 4:30 & later	During the weekend	During the summer	During the winter '04 intercession	Via Online
English R	7	12	5	6		10	cancelled	
English 2R	8	8	5	4		9	cancelled	
English 7								2

Summer and Fall 2004; Winter 2005

Course	During the early morning before 10 am	During the late am/early pm 10am –1:55 pm	During the late afternoon 2 pm -4:25 pm	During the evening 4:30 & later	During the weekend	During the summer	During the winter '05 intercession	Via Online
English R	8	8	5	6		10	2	
English 2R	8	8	5	6		10	2	
English 7								2

Summer and Fall 2005; Winter 2006

Course	During the early morning before 10 am	During the late am/early pm 10am –1:55 pm	During the late afternoon 2 pm -4:25 pm	During the evening 4:30 & later	During the weekend	During the summer	During the winter '06 intercession	Via Online
English R	8	12	6	7		7	2	
English 2R	8	10	5	4		8	2	
English 7								2

1. What (if anything) is indicated by the student satisfaction with scheduling?

The data on student satisfaction with the current schedule is based on a student survey randomly administered to English R and 2R students in fall semester 2005. Approximately 275 students responded (numbers vary from question to question). Students rated their satisfaction on a 1-5 scale with 5 indicating “very satisfied” and 1 indicating “very unsatisfied.” A score of 3 is to be considered neutral.

- **59% were satisfied** with the scheduling of classes offered **before 10 a.m.**
(22% were neutral; 19% were dissatisfied)
- **77% were satisfied** with the scheduling of classes between **10 a.m. to 1:55 p.m.**
(14% were neutral; 9% were dissatisfied)
- **47% were satisfied** with the scheduling of classes offered between **2 – 4:25 p.m.**
(25% were neutral; 28% were dissatisfied)
- **31% were satisfied** with the scheduling of classes offered from **4:30 p.m. and later**
(21% were neutral; 48% were dissatisfied)
- **23% were satisfied** with the scheduling of **weekend classes**
(15% were neutral; 62% were dissatisfied)

Note: It is unclear if the high dissatisfaction response is based on the fact that students do not want to take weekend classes, we do not offer weekend classes or because respondents were unsure of what to say.

- **48% were satisfied** with **summer intersession**
(28% were neutral; 24% were dissatisfied)
- **45% were satisfied** with **winter intersession**
(26% were neutral; 29% were dissatisfied)
- **37% were satisfied** with **On-line instruction**
(30% were neutral; 33% were dissatisfied)

Note: Students may be unfamiliar with our on-line course, English 7.

- **24% were satisfied** with **telecourses**
(31% were neutral; 45% were dissatisfied)

Note: Again, it is unclear if the responses are based on the fact that students do not want to take telecourses, we do not offer telecourses, or because respondents are unsure of what to say.

We should also note that although the student survey was randomly administered to English R and English 2R students throughout the morning, afternoon and evening courses, most of the sections randomly chosen were daytime students. This fact is not surprising because most of our sections are offered in the morning and early afternoon. The respondents expressed dissatisfaction with evening and weekend course availability, but fill rates indicate that evening classes fill below 100%.

2. Are there time periods of high student demand which are not being addressed? ___ Yes
X No

3. Should a recommendation be written addressing this area? X Yes No

- Examine how an orientation could help students understand the schedule of classes and all of the options offered.
- Examine the questions in our Reading Department Student Survey to make sure they reflect the information we want to gather (i.e., on question 22, delete options about weekend and telecourses, and reword question to better determine if students are satisfied with the timing of courses scheduled).

D. Retention and Success

1. Retention

**Comparison of Success and Retention Rates
Selected English Courses
Fall 2002 to Fall 2004**

Course (By Test Score/Time of Day)	Fall 2002		Fall 2003		Fall 2004	
	Success*	Retention	Success	Retention	Success	Retention
English R	70.2%	79.9%	73.2%	79.6%	68.0%	80.0%
> 41	77.7%	83.6%	81.5%	80.5%	78.5%	81.5%
< 42	45.7%	71.3%	58.4%	76.3%	48.4%	77.8%
Day	66.6%	81.3%	72.8%	80.6%	67.9%	78.9%
Evening	81.9%	75.5%	74.8%	75.3%	68.6%	84.5%
English 2R	77.8%	84.2%	75.1%	84.5%	80.9%	81.8%
> 41	81.8%	84.2%	80.1%	86.6%	84.5%	81.0%
< 42	47.7%	86.9%	53.0%	82.7%	70.6%	79.9%
Day	76.6%	85.2%	74.9%	85.2%	81.8%	82.2%
Evening	84.1%	78.8%	76.9%	80.6%	75.5%	79.1%
English 1A	80.9%	77.7%	81.0%	77.6%	80.0%	78.4%
> 80	84.7%	77.4%	82.9%	80.3%	83.4%	79.3%
68 to 80	79.9%	76.3%	83.9%	75.1%	80.5%	77.6%
42 to 67	76.6%	77.9%	78.5%	76.9%	80.6%	77.9%
< 42	70.8%	82.1%	78.8%	75.0%	81.6%	85.0%
Department	79.6%	80.3%	79.1%	79.9%	79.5%	77.6%
Division	81.4%	79.7%	79.1%	81.1%	79.3%	78.9%
El Camino College	80.6%	80.0%	81.2%	80.0%	81.5%	79.8%

Source: Institutional Research, El Camino College

* Ws excluded when calculating success rate. Rates are substantially lower when Ws are included.

Retention: The percentage of students retained in courses out of all students enrolled in the course as of the first census date.

Success: The percentage of students who "succeed" in the course out of all students who receive a grade
Success is a grade of A, B, C, or CR

a. Given the data, what trends are observed?

Retention and success data was gathered from Institutional Research's web data. This analysis is based on evidence from fall of 2002, 2003 and 2004.

English 2R, English R and English 7 retention rates appear to be consistent with the performance of the college (ranging 79%-80%), the Humanities Division (ranging 78.9%-81.1%), and the English Department (ranging 77.6%-80.3%) over the three semesters examined. A closer look at English R reveals a consistent retention rate ranging from 79.6% to 80%. The retention rates of the upper level reading courses, English 2R and English 7, reveal retention rates of up to 4% higher than the college, division, or department in the fall of '02 and '03. In the fall of '04 when retention dropped at all levels (79.8% college, 78.9% division, 77.6% department), English 2R outperformed all of those with a retention of 81.8%, as did English 7 with 82.9%.

While these numbers look good, a more detailed analysis of data generated by English R and 2R yield findings that raise many questions. For this analysis, the program review team asked Institutional Research (IR) to conduct research into the retention rates of students enrolled in English R, English 2R, and English 1A sorted by the initial score on the College Placement Test (CPT) as well as by day or evening enrollment. ECC places students in English classes according to the following breakdown: scores of 81-120 English 1A, scores of 68-80 English 2R, 0-67 English R. Because the range of scores at the R level was so wide, for our analysis the English R range was broken down further into scores 0-41 and 42 to 67.

With the exception of 2002 data, students enrolled in English 2R who initially entered our program with initial CPT score of 42 or higher had retention rates higher than students entering at the lower level (a later examination of success rates may clarify the discrepancy in the 2002 retention rate). Day students in English 2R consistently show higher retention rates than evening students. The differences range from 3.1% to a high of 6.4%.

The data at the English R level demand attention. While the course retention for R students in 2002 was 79.9%, the retention rate for students scoring at and above 42 on the CPT was 83.6%, while students with CPT scores below 42 had a retention rate of 71.3%. The overall retention rate of 79.9% masks the disparity between these two groups. The differences in '03 and '04 were not as dramatic, but they continue: 80.5% vs. 76.3% in '03 and 81.5% vs. 77.8% in '04. Retention for English R students enrolled in day or evening classes reveal no consistent pattern. Day students outperform evening students in '02 and '03, but evening students outperform day students in '04. The difference ranges 5-6% regardless of whether it was day or evening that had the higher retention rate.

In order to assess long-term retention of students who enter the English program at the R and 2R level, Institutional Research looked at retention rates for students who entered the program at the CPT levels of >80 (English 1A), 68-80 (English 2R), 42-67 (English R), and 0-41 (English R). Results are interesting. Overall, former English R and 2R students appear to have retention rates close to the rates for English 1A. When a random sample of students enrolled in English 1A were surveyed and asked, "As a result of taking English R/English 2R, I feel more confident in approaching various kinds of

reading material,” 88% of former English R students strongly agreed or agreed, and 87% of former English 2R students agreed or strongly agreed with the statement.

Another interesting piece of information came when we asked IR to tell us the number of students who were enrolled for the first time in English 2R and R in the fall of ‘02, ‘03, and ‘04. From the data we were able to calculate the percentage of students who “repeat” students. In English 2R the percentage of students repeating the course was 48% in ‘02, 51% in ‘03, and 55% in ‘04. For English R the percent repeating the course was 21% in ‘02, 26% in ‘03, and 23% in ‘04. Therefore, more students need to repeat English 2R in order to meet the exit criteria.

b. Should a recommendation be written addressing the data? Yes

- Explore the feasibility of a reading class more appropriate for the needs of students entering ECC with CPT reading scores below 42.
- Track retention rates for students using the more detailed breakdown used for this analysis.
- Expand data collection to look at retention rates for students who enter English 2R with CPT scores of 68-80. Looking at all scores >41 may hide some differences between retention at the 42-67 and the 68-80 ranges.
- Consider creating an instrument to identify the causes of the high percentage of students repeating English 2R. How many of those students received no credit from a previous English 2R? How many withdrew from English 2R and for what reason(s)?
- Look at the retention rates of students enrolled in First Year Experience program at the R and 2R level. How does the required orientation and student support impact the retention of those students?
- Explore the reasons for English R students moving on to English 2R without the skills necessary to pass 2R.

2. Success Rate

a. What Trends are observed?

The success rates of all three reading courses vary from year to year. Perhaps the best way to examine these rates is to first look at college, division, and department success rates. These rates appear to be more stable with the college ranging from a low of 80.0% in ‘02 to a high of 81.5% in ‘04. The Humanities Division’s success rates varied slightly more: the low was 79.1% in ‘03, while the high was 81.4% in ‘02. The English Department’s success remained fairly stable ranging from 79.1% in ‘03 to 79.6% in ‘02.

While retention rates for English 7 look good (see retention), the success rate for the class ranges from a low of 51.7% to a high of 56.4%. These numbers are significantly lower than the college, division, and department.

English 2R success rates vary by year. Fall '02 had a success rate of 77%, fall '03 dropped to 75.1%, and fall '04 bounced back to a rate of 80.9%. A further analysis of success rates sorted by initial CPT reading placement scores reveals dramatic differences in the success rates of English 2R students. Again, scores were broken down by students who entered the program with a placement score of 42 and above and students who entered the program with a placement score of 41 and below. Students who entered the program below a score of 42 consistently had success rates well below the scores of students entering with scores at or above 42. In fall '02 the difference was 34 points, in fall '03 the difference was 27 points, and in fall '04 the difference was 14 points. If one considers the percentage of students who withdraw from English 2R, which range from 15.5% in '03 to 18.2% in '04, these numbers demand attention.

There is no correlation between day or evening students and success. One year evening students succeeded at a rate of 7.5 points higher than day students; in another year they too were within 2 points of each other, while in the third, day students succeeded at a rate 6.3 points higher than evening students.

The trend of students with higher CPT scores succeeding dramatically over students with lower CPT scores continues in English R. First of all, the overall success rates of students enrolled in English R are significantly lower than the college, division, and department success rates cited in the opening paragraph of this section. In the fall of '02 the success rate of English R students was 70.2%. The fall '03 rate was 73.2%, and the fall '04 rate was 68.0%.

When students are sorted by entering reading CPT scores, a very different picture emerges. In fall '02, students with CPT scores 42 or higher succeeded at a rate of 77.7% while students with CPT scores below 42 succeeded at a rate of 45.7%, a difference of **32** points. The difference in fall '03 was **23** points. (Higher scoring students bested the success rates of the college, division, and department with a success rate of 81.5 %.) This pattern continued in fall '04: higher CPT-score students succeeded at 78.5% while lower CPT-scoring students succeeded at a rate of 48.4%, a difference of **30** points.

When the percent of students who withdraw from English R is considered, the picture is even bleaker. In fall '02 the withdrawal rate was 20.1%, in fall '03 it was 20.4%, and in fall '04 it was 20.0%.

With the exception of fall '02, success rate for English R students is consistent across day and evening students, with a difference of 1 or 2 points in success rates. In fall '02, the difference between day and evening students was 15.3 points with evening students the more successful.

The success rates of English 1A students have been broken down by initial CPT scores. The success rates for all students enrolled in English 1A were 80.9% in '02, 81% in '03, and 80% in '04. Students who score directly into 1A with CPT scores over 80 consistently perform with success rates from 82.8% to 84.7%. Students who enter the English continuum at the 2R level (68-80) succeed at a rate near or even above those entering at the 1A level (80% in '02, 83.9% in '03, and 80.5% in '04). Success rates for students entering 1A at the English R level, broken down by CPT scores 42 and higher and 41 and lower result in fascinating levels of success. In fall '02, students with scores of 42 and higher succeeded

at 76.6% and students with scores below 42 succeeded at 70.8%. In fall '03 the numbers were 78.5% and 78.8% for the higher and lower scoring R students. The difference in success appears insignificant. In fall '04 the numbers are 80.6% for the higher placement score and 81.6% for the lower score. These numbers seem to suggest that English 2R students who subsequently enroll in English 1A can succeed. Additionally, students who enter English 1A after completing the reading sequence can experience success. Perhaps the attrition levels of students enrolled in English R and then English 2R lead to the most motivated making it to 1A. One must also question the validity and reliability of initial CPT placements.

b. Should a recommendation be written addressing the data? Yes.

- Consider the feasibility of a reading course designed to meet the needs of those students entering the College English continuum with scores at and below 41.
- Modify CPT cut scores to better place students in appropriate reading class.
- Gather data on the success rates of students enrolled in English 7.
- Gather data on how students are placed in English 7 to determine if the students who would best benefit from a distance-learning format are the ones enrolled.
- Gather information on the success of students enrolled in vocational programs as well as those on the transfer track.
- Evaluate the impact that a college orientation might have on the success of students enrolled in reading classes

III. Curriculum

A. Course and Content

1. Courses Not Offered

Instructions: Indicate the total number of courses in the program and list all courses in the program that are in the catalog but have not been offered in the last three years. Refer to this list to answer the following questions:

Total Reading Courses	Courses in the Catalog	Not Offered in Last 3 Years
English R—Introduction to Reading Skills	XX	
English 2R—Developmental Reading and Writing	XX	
English 7—Speed and Power Reading	XX	

a. **Given the data, are there courses that should be inactivated?** ___ Yes X No

- b. **If there are courses not offered in the last three years that you do not wish to inactivate, what reasons are there to keep them active?** NA
- c. **Should a recommendation be written addressing the data?** Yes No
(If yes, list)

2. Course Revisions and Additions

Instructions: Utilize the Course Review Chart from the Curriculum Office to answer the questions below:

Course	96-97	97-98	98-99	99-00	01-02	02-03	03-04	04-05
English R			X					
English 2R			X					
English 7				X		X		

- a. **Are there course outlines that should be revised?** Yes No
- English R must be revised to include the prerequisite of a specified CPT score or the successful completion of the new lower level course, English RA. The department is considering a scoring range of 42-67 for English R, but the final cut score decision has not been made at this point.
 - Revisions are being considered for all reading courses to reflect the following title changes: English RA to be English 80; English R to be English 82, and English 2R to be English 84.

- b. **Are there courses inconsistent with current practice in the field?** Yes No

- c. **Should new courses be added to the program?** Yes No

The Reading Department is very concerned about the low academic level of many students entering English R. To address this concern, faculty have worked closely with the Office of Institutional Research to gather research that justifies reactivating English RA as a lower level reading class for students scoring at 41 or below on the College Placement Test (CPT). This reactivated course will be revised to meet Title V requirements and brought before the College Curriculum Committee in fall 2006.

- d. **Are adjustments necessary to the conditions of enrollment (Prerequisite, Co-requisite, Recommended Preparation, and Enrollment Limitations) for specific course to increase student success?** Yes No Uncertain –comment

As mentioned in #3 above, adjustments to the placement cut score are now under consideration. The reactivated course below English R will be recommended for students testing below a certain level on the placement exam, and English R will be revised to include a prerequisite: a specified score on the College Placement Test or the successful completion of the reactivated lower level reading course.

- e. **If the program offers a degree and/or certificate, list them and indicate when the requirements were last reviewed? (if not applicable, skip to #7) NA**
- f. **Are these degree and/or certificate requirements inconsistent with current practice?**
 Yes No
- g. **Is there a need to create or delete a degree and/or certificate? Yes No**
- h. **Should any recommendations be written that address the above responses? Yes No**
 - The lower level reading course should be taken through the Curriculum Committee for course approval.
 - English R and English 2R should be reviewed and taken before the Curriculum Committee in fall '06 for title changes and for a prerequisite to be added to the English R course outline.

B. Articulation

Instructions: Using the California Articulation Number (CAN) Guide, answer the following questions:

- 1) **Should any of your courses not currently included in the CAN Guide be articulated? NA**
- 2) **What problems, if any, are there in articulating courses? NA**
- 3) **Should a recommendation be written addressing above responses? Yes No
NA**

C. Instruction and Assessment

1. Active Learning

- a. **What learning methods are incorporated inside and outside the classroom in the program to promote student success?**

There are various teaching and learning methods frequently used by members of the Reading Department to promote student success. The three most commonly used methods are direct instruction, small group work, and collaborative work with each being used by 93.75% of the faculty, or 15 out of 16 teachers. The next most commonly used teaching strategy is the whole class discussion, used by 87.50% of the department, or 14 out of 16 teachers. Finally, lecture, graphic organizers and diagrams, small group discussion, and independent reading are used by 81.82% of the department, or 13 out of 16 teachers. These methods are used to effectively convey new content to students in written and oral form. Additionally, the collaborative groups allow students to develop their interpersonal skills that are essential for success in their careers as college students and later as they enter the professional work force. Finally, independent reading allows students to follow their own curiosity and fosters academic independence that is critical as students leave the developmental levels and venture into higher-level academics.

Other methods used less often include oral presentations and individual projects that are included in the instructional repertoire of 68.75% of the department, or 11 out of 16 teachers. Group projects are a part of 62.50% of our classes, used by 10 out of 16 teachers. Finally, nine of 16 teachers, or 56.25% offer extra credit as a learning method. These teaching strategies allow students to demonstrate personal responsibility and individual accountability for their education through individual and group presentations in front of the class. Furthermore, giving students the opportunity to complete an extra credit assignment allows them to strategize for success and maximize their personal control over their own grade.

Finally, there are a few other less frequently used teaching and learning methods. Film is incorporated as a learning method in the classrooms of seven out of 16 teachers, or 43.75%. Six of 16 teachers or 37.50% use literature circles while 25% or four of 16 use Socratic seminars. Finally, just two of 16 members of our department or 12.50% use guest speakers. These methods are used less frequently probably because they are typically more difficult to arrange, yet they do expose our students to a certain richness of experience that cannot be conveyed by lecture or direct instruction.

b. Should a recommendation be written addressing above response? _____ Yes X No

2. Assessment

a. How do you evaluate the extent to which the learning objectives, skills, and competencies are being met?

- **Courses**

The Reading Department uses multiple measures to determine how successful our students will be in subsequent transfer level courses. First, we use the DRP or Degrees of Reading Power as an exit exam. All forms of the DRP exams are normed and can be graded on a percentage basis, and every reading teacher administers one of these exams at the end of the semester.

In addition, many teachers use a form of the Townsend Press exam either as a cumulative final exam and/or as an exit exam to measure comprehension. Most students are better able to demonstrate a passing level of reading comprehension on these tests because these tests are not required to be timed.

Two important competencies that we test for are vocabulary development and reading comprehension. Students learn an average of 200 new words and 30-40 Greek and Latin roots in both English R and English 2R. Most teachers in the department test mastery of the new vocabulary through a series of quizzes that culminate in a vocabulary midterm and final. For reading comprehension, students learn strategies for identifying main ideas, vocabulary in context, writing patterns, as well as other skills presented in the reading textbooks, and learning is assessed through quizzes and skill tests during the semester. In order to receive credit for the course, students must both achieve a 70% average on coursework, quizzes, and finals as well as demonstrate on an exit exam that their reading skills have reached the appropriate grade level determined by the department.

Many teachers in the department include the development of reading speed in their curriculum and have adopted the computer software program, Ultimate Speed Reader, in our reading lab to allow students to train their eyes to increase saccadic speed. A final reading lab exam may be administered using the same computer software with each student being tested on an individual computer. Many students are able to double their reading speed during one semester.

Finally, many teachers in the Reading Department incorporate some literature into their classes in the form of poems, short stories, plays, and novels. Each teacher develops his or her own tests or final based on the particular work chosen. Testing may take the form of requiring students to memorize and identify quotes, explicate passages, respond with short answers or essays, create graphic organizers, answer objective questions, or participate in a Socratic discussion to demonstrate an understanding of the work.

- **Program**

The program assessment occurs informally in department meetings and formally through the research and analysis of success and retention statistics. Through these methods, we have determined that our program is not meeting the needs of our lowest functioning students. Therefore, we are reactivating the aforementioned English RA course as a prerequisite to English R in order to allow students reading below the 6th grade level to receive more direct attention and instruction to help improve their decoding skills and their fluency with expressive and receptive language skills.

b. How do you use the results of the above evaluation to improve student learning and the quality of the program?

We have examined the methods used to evaluate students' learning objectives, skills, and competencies and have determined that our standardized procedures for exit exams are

somewhat broad. As a department, we need to reach a consensus on the Townsend Press exit exam passing score for English 2R, and we need to evaluate the Townsend Press test form that would work best for English R. Also, we need to discuss and agree upon the methods used to incorporate reading speed into our curriculum and how to evaluate this skill. Finally, we need to determine if there is a more appropriate form of the DRP for our lower level English courses and reach an agreement on the sequence of practice and final DRP exams at all course levels.

c. **Should a recommendation be written addressing this area?** X Yes _____ No

- Plan staff development to review course objectives, methods and assessment practices in all reading classes.
- Determine if we are using the appropriate levels of Townsend Press textbooks for English R and consider if we should adopt the lower level Langan Building series.

IV. Program Requirements

A. Instructional Support

1. Identify key instructional support areas used by the program.

Libraries & Programs:

x	Library	x	Special Resource Center	x	Basic Skills Study Center	x	Library Orientation
	Music Library	x	Puente Program		Honors Transfer Program		Other (Please list.)
x	Learning Resource Center Media Materials Collection	x	Assessment/Testing Office	x	Counseling		
x	EOP&S/CalWORKS		Transfer Center	x	First Year Experience		
x	Learning Communities	x	Project Success		Honors Transfer Program		

Computer Labs & Tutoring:

x	LMTC Computer Commons	x	SRC High Technology Center	x	Other Computer Lab: Please list.	x	Writing Center
	CAI MAC Lab	x	Writing Lab		Reading labs for classes	x	LRC Tutorial Program
	CAI Windows Lab		Math & Science Lab		Drop-in Reading Lab		Math Tutoring
	TOP Lab		Keyboarding Center			x	SRC Tutorial Program
	Hawthorne BTC					x	EOP&S Tutoring
x	Inglewood Center						

Faculty Support Services:

	Graphic Arts	x	Copy Center	x	Distance Education		Other (Please list.)
	Media Services AV Production	x	Tech Services Help Desk		Teleconferences		
x	Media Services AV Equipment Distribution	x	Support Staff		Webconferences		
	ECC Vehicles		ECC hosted Websites	x	Staff Development		
x	ECC E-mail						

2. Do you have some instructional support needs that are not being met? X Yes ___ No

Need more collaboration with counselors, SRC and administrators; need a drop-in computer lab operating during every class session; need more tech support to keep technology in working order; need DVD players in labs and classrooms; need more young adult literature housed in the library.

3. Should a recommendation be written to address your needs? X Yes ___ No

- The above needs are all recommendations.
- We recommend that the reading and writing labs be joined to increase funding and staffing potentials for both programs.

B. Facilities and Equipment

1. Does the program make effective use of its facilities and equipment?

Both the reading labs and the drop-in reading lab are well utilized; computer technology in the classrooms is effective and is used continually; media services are also utilized when additional equipment is needed.

2. Are adequate facilities, equipment, and supplies available for the program? ___ Yes X No

Technology is slow to be repaired; staffing is hard to find for the drop-in reading lab; funding for new programs is difficult; replacement parts for the technology are not readily available.

3. Are the facilities and equipment adequately maintained? ___ Yes X No

An example of a common problem: a bulb for a computer projector burned out during the first week of school and took eight weeks to replace. This projector is a significant part of classroom instruction.

4. Should a recommendation be written addressing the data? X Yes ___ No

- Have a supply of important computer and other technological parts available on campus
- Have a pool of qualified candidates to staff the computer labs
- Combine the reading and writing labs to improve potential funding for facilities and equipment.

C. Staffing

Instructions: Analyze the data on **FTEF, adjunct FTEF, and the FT/PT ratio** for the most recent fall semester and answer the following questions:

2005

FTEF (full-time equivalent faculty): 15.5

Number of full-time FTEF: 10.0

Number of adjunct FTEF: 5.5

FT/PT load ratio: 65/35

(5.5 divided by 15.5 = 35)

2004

FTEF (full-time equivalent faculty): 14.5

Number of full-time FTEF: 10.3

Number of adjunct FTEF: 4.2

FT/PT load ratio: 71/29

2003

FTEF (full-time equivalent faculty): 13.75

Number of full-time FTEF: 10.5

Number of adjunct FTEF: 3.25

FT/PT load ratio: 76/24

1. How do the program numbers compare to a like semester (Fall to Fall) three years ago or the previous program review?

At the time of our previous program review, the Reading Department faculty totaled ten full-time instructors (with six teaching only reading classes and four teaching a mixed reading and English class

schedule). Additionally, there were six part-time instructors; one was a full-time member of the Special Resource Center who taught part-time for the Reading Department.

Currently, there are more adjunct faculty teaching reading courses. This year, the Reading Department faculty total twelve part-time instructors and ten full-time instructors. However there are an additional four full-time English instructors teaching part-time in the Reading Department, as they teach both reading and writing.

2. What do the program data indicate? Comment on any trends or unusual data.

The trend over the past three years indicates that the department has had to cover the reading classes with more adjunct faculty, resulting in the decrease in the optimal 75/25 ratio. The number of part time instructors has doubled since the last program review, and with the same number of full time faculty we offer sixteen more sections than were offered at the time of our past program review.

3. How does the FT/PT ratio benefit or harm the program?

There is a decrease in consistency between the courses when so many of them are taught by adjunct faculty who do not have the opportunity to attend department meetings, brown bag sessions, or off-campus seminars, as these instructors are frequently employed at a number of colleges and typically are “freeway flyers.” It is difficult for them to participate in face-to-face mentoring programs or flex activities that serve to keep them current in the field and abreast of new information that impacts the effectiveness of our reading courses. Part-time instructors without experience in teaching developmental education classes are being recruited for teaching reading courses.

4. Do you have a faculty-mentoring program? X Yes _____ No

For the past two years our reading faculty have volunteered to mentor part timers and new hires. This year, we had 38 volunteers division-wide to mentor – nearly twice as many as we needed and a true sign of the generosity of our faculty. The Humanities Division as a whole had eighteen new or never mentored faculty this year, and of this total, the Reading Department had five part-timers who were assigned a mentor. In assigning these mentors, Dean Tom Lew and Kristie Daniel-DiGregorio, Faculty Coordinator considered both compatibility and scheduling, (i.e. mentors and *mentees* who currently teach or have in the past taught the same courses).

When Dr. Daniel-DiGregorio set up the program this year, she provided contact information as well as suggestions of activities mentors might consider. Everyone involved received a memo early in the fall and then a reminder as the semester wrapped up. Finally, she surveyed the mentors and *mentees* at the semester end and found that both mentors and *mentees* felt that the program was very effective. There are plans to expand the program next semester to include an early-in-the-semester brown bag for newcomers, mentees and mentors. (Other suggestions, the survey, and survey results are in the appendix of this report).

There is a definite need, however, for a more structured orientation and staff development for part-time instructors stressing procedures regarding curriculum, technology and assessment that are standard in our department.

5. How do faculty maintain currency in their field?

Reading faculty are active in several ways related to areas of reading development, student empowerment, and developmental education. Some conferences faculty have attended include SWADE (Southwest Association for Developmental Education), NADE (National Association for Developmental Education), Learning Communities Workshops, League for Innovation in the Community College, TRLD (Technology, Reading and Learning Difficulties), and *On Course* I and II training (Innovative Strategies for Promoting Student Success Across the Curriculum).

On campus, we regularly hold workshops during the college hour for Best Practices where faculty share teaching tips and curriculum ideas or activities that have worked well in their classrooms, Brown Bags that involve diverse issues related to teaching reading, First Year Experience and Learning Communities meetings. Also, our college offers a wide range of staff development workshops covering areas from curriculum to technology.

6. Fill in the faculty status data below and answer the questions that follow.

Name	Reassigned time (how much in %)	Currently on leave (check)	Retired in last 2 years (check)	FT hired last 3 years (check)	Anticipated to retire in next 3 years (check)
Diane Gross					Spring 2007

a. How does this data impact the program?

With an increasing number of English R and 2R sections and a decreased number of full time faculty, we are risking the integrity of the reading program.

b. Will this data affect the program in the future?

Yes, we will be reduced further in full-time faculty unless the hiring freeze lifts and we can hire another faculty member after the Spring 2007 semester.

7. From this information, can you identify present and future staffing needs? X Yes No

To secure the future of the Reading Department, it would be prudent to continue expanding the full-time faculty, and when there is a retirement, it is recommended that the faculty member be replaced as soon as possible.

Also, with the great number of part time faculty, we have a need for increased staff development for part time faculty.

8. What is the department doing to address any future staffing needs?

Currently, the college is experiencing a hiring freeze, so we will not hire anyone this year, and with the sharp decline in the college's FTES for this 2005-2006 academic year, we cannot expect to hire during the 2006-2007 academic year.

Currently, our reading faculty are planning to implement a more structured orientation and staff development for part time faculty.

9. Should a recommendation be written addressing the data? X Yes No

- More full-time faculty should be hired to achieve the 75/25 ratio.

As per the faculty contract, part time faculty should be reminded that their semester stipend includes participation in professional activities, such as department and division meetings, staff development and the like.

D. Planning

1. Do the program faculty and other personnel have a clear idea of what is happening in the program, where it is headed, what external changes are affecting it, and what changes need to be made in order to enable the program to adapt and continue to be successful?

Yes, the reading program faculty and other personnel have been discussing and researching both the internal and external changes affecting both our program and our student population. First, because the department is encountering a less prepared or 'weaker' student entering the reading sequence, we will reactivate a lower-level reading course to meet these students' educational needs. Currently there is no pre-requisite or placement cut score for our English R class; thus some ECC students enter English R with a reading level lower than 6th grade. We have collected research indicating that students scoring less than a 42 on the College Placement Test have an average success rate of 33% and a retention rate of 28% (this data was run with withdrawal scores).

Because of the absence of a lower level reading class, students scoring below 42 (reading at a level lower than 6th grade) are being enrolled into the only reading class that is available to them – English R. Although this population is only 10 – 15% of our English R students, we could fill four sections of a lower level class in the fall and three sections in the spring with these students. The problem is that counselors (as well as the students themselves) enroll students in English R, not only because they believe this is the best place for them to start their college career, but also because it is the only option available for students at this level. This problem applies not only to the reading area but to the writing and math areas as well. The Math Department has taken action and created a two-semester arithmetic entry class. It is our belief that instituting a lower level reading class will help create a more equitable

English R for students reading at levels between 7th and 9th grade, while providing a safety net for students entering college with a lower level reading and skill base.

At the same time, we have addressed some of the concerns about reactivating this lower level reading class:

- Enough qualified instructors to teach the class
- The composition of the class curriculum
- The matriculation and success of this particular student population in a college level reading and composition course.

We are moving forward with the plan, and to facilitate it and assure that we are moving in the right direction, we have either completed or are involved in the following activities:

- Thoroughly researched the placement scores, retention rates and success rates for students scoring less than 42 on our College Placement Test.
- Currently investigating other colleges with successful developmental reading programs (Vanguard schools)
- Currently developing the curriculum for the new lower-level course
- Currently planning professional development (courses, brown bags, conferences) to integrate skills into the new curriculum and to familiarize newer faculty with these issues.

Second, because the Reading Department is committed to providing a strong coordination of support services for our students, we are increasing articulation with counseling to ensure the correct placement of underprepared students, and we are working directly with both the Special Resource Center (SRC) and the Learning Resource Center's (LRC) tutoring program. These links are important; the Reading Department recognizes that student success is more of a collective responsibility where instructors and support services work together in order to increase student learning and success. Ultimately our department would like to see its underprepared students complete an orientation and meet with a counselor before enrolling in developmental reading courses. However, if this need cannot be met, our objectives include having a counselor attend class sessions during the first week of the semester to explain not only college protocol and support services but also to encourage students to formulate an educational plan. Finally, the department plans on increasing articulation with the SRC and LRC, respectively, in order to have certain students tested for learning disabilities and/or enroll severely underprepared students in a tutoring program.

Furthermore, we also need to integrate the services of the Writing Center and our Reading Lab in order to offer coordination of services for all English students, both reading and writing. This integration would create a larger student base for the Writing Center and synchronize the efforts of two programs that are innately reciprocal in nature. Because writing is a natural extension of reading and vice versa, students would better understand the two processes when receiving support in a combined lab.

Third, the Reading Department is committed to implementing a learning centered curriculum to increase student retention and success by utilizing pedagogy that will produce independent and active learners. The faculty survey indicates that instructors currently use a wide variety of instructional strategies to support student learning and success in the classroom, and the student survey displayed that several classroom activities were helpful in developing reading skills, such as group discussion, group projects and journaling. Based on data from these surveys, faculty have demonstrated that they value taking part in certain activities, such as:

- Attending and facilitating faculty brown bags and conferences on best practices to establish Reading Department core competencies for students
- Training and mentoring adjunct faculty to become more proactive towards a learning centered classroom/curriculum
- Improving the quality of assessments (multiple measures) used in the classroom
- Collaborating as a department to secure and administer pre and post assessments that utilize multiple measures, are cognitive-based and are authentic measures of reading proficiency.

Finally, the faculty survey indicated the need to know more about Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) and how to develop them in order to plan and evaluate classes. The Reading Department is committed to implementing SLOs. Therefore, we will be reviewing research data and creating valid, reliable student learning measures in order to develop curriculum that helps our students meet the literacy demands of postsecondary learning. To better understand this task and begin the process, this summer several of our faculty members will be working with their colleagues, who have become experts in this field.

2. What data, not currently provided, would be needed in order to improve planning for the development of the program?

- Data on success rates of First Year Experience and Learning Community students compared with students who are not part of a special learning community.
- Data on FYE students to ascertain what aspects of the assessment, orientation, support and placement processes were most helpful to them.
- Data on how many underprepared students have met with a counselor and formulated an educational plan.
- Data on the percentage of students entering ECC in the developmental category who are on a vocational, certificate or 2 year-track.
- Data from neighboring community colleges regarding their orientations, courses offered, and success/retention rates. Also, it would be good to get data from Vanguard colleges that have successful developmental education programs.
- Data on the how many English R and 2R students are repeating classes.

- Data on ECC's student completion rate (with a breakdown of students entering either at the transfer level or at the developmental level).
- Data on best practices and learning-centered activities used in successful basic skills programs at other colleges.

3. What major external changes or trends do you expect to be of particular relevance to your discipline in the next five years?

Both the faculty and student surveys show there are an insufficient number of reading courses at the English R level, while the data shows a constant growth in the developmental reading population. Many instructors are expressing frustration at the decreased skills and increased numbers of English R students. The Reading Department expects to see an even greater increase of underprepared students entering the college arena based on information regarding the high school exit exam, immigration and AB540 students. Furthermore, research also indicates there will be a rise in the number of first generation Hispanic and under-represented students enrolling at the community college level.

Because of the expanded English R and 2R enrollment, it is imperative to hire more full-time faculty to meet the demands of our growing student population. According to the faculty survey, the current ratio of full-time to part-time faculty does not best serve the needs of the program. Add an increase in number of underprepared students enrolling in reading classes to a department that is not increasing its full time faculty, and this situation results in hiring part time instructors who don't necessarily understand the underprepared student and may not be best equipped to teach at the (community college) basic skill level. This lack of balance also serves to weaken the effectiveness of the reading program and directly affects retention and success rates of students in these classes. The Reading Department recognizes the importance of hiring more full-time faculty with a reading background, as well as hiring individuals committed to instructing basic skills learners. Objectives include hiring more full-time faculty and having an orientation and mentoring program for new full-time and adjunct faculty.

Another obvious trend involves technology that is becoming increasingly important in the classroom, since developmental education research (Boylan, 2002) shows reading students thrive in a classroom/lab (combination) environment and we need to directly address the new literacies of the Internet. Soon, with the new Humanities Complex scheduled for completion in 2007, every reading classroom will be wired for technology. With this improvement, our department would like to see both full-time and adjunct faculty using the lab portion of the class in the actual lab to familiarize students with a computer key-board, utilize specialized reading software, assign WebQuests and other internet-based learning activities that develop critical thinking skills, and provide practice in the skills necessary to be successful at the post-secondary level. Also, instead of having separate drop-in reading lab and Writing Center, we recommend a combined Reading/Writing Lab in our new Humanities complex.

Distance education is also a current trend, but the only distance education class the Reading Department offers is English 7 (Speed Reading). Because many of our students are coming from a lower socio-economic background, are working over 30 hours a week and taking care of families, the Reading Department would like to include more hybrid reading courses (classes that meet face-to-face once a

week and work on-line for the other class session) to accommodate students who have skills to be successful but find it difficult to attend classes on campus. As mentioned above, the department recognizes the increased role technology will play in the classroom and plans to offer professional development to all reading department faculty in order to increase teaching proficiency in a lab environment and to accommodate faculty interested in teaching hybrid classes.

Another new development that also affects our department involves the statewide Academic Senate's plan to bump up the requirements for vocational students. This change, which requires vocational students to complete a transfer level English course in order to receive their certificates, will potentially increase enrollment at the English R, 2R and 1A levels. Because these vocational students need literacy skills, the Reading Department recognizes the importance of articulating with the Vocational Education Department and helping the vocational instructors to incorporate reading skills into their courses (i.e. doing readability levels on vocational textbooks and offering brown bags and professional development in reading strategies, *On-Course* techniques and study strategies for college success).

Finally, since research shows that, with the proper academic support, developmental students can acquire the skills to be *just as successful at the transfer level* as students that initially placed into the transfer level sequence, the Reading Department recognizes the importance of collaborating with the English department to support developmental reading and writing students, so both departments create strong criteria for advancing these students to the next academic level.

4. What will the implications of these changes or trends be for the program? And how will the program need to respond?

Because we want consistent instruction and adherence to department policy, both full and part time faculty need to be oriented to the standard practices of the Reading Department, such as, multiple measures of assessment and the use of technology in the classroom lab. Therefore a required part-time faculty orientation and mentoring program needs to be implemented immediately and be continued each semester. For full-time faculty, these policies need to be addressed at the first department meeting of each academic year.

Instructors will have to embrace innovative practices in a learning centered curriculum where students 'learn how to learn.' Faculty will attend conferences, brown bags and professional development activities in order to employ innovative pedagogy in the classroom.

Faculty will play a more active role in students' academic choices. Rather than accepting "normal attrition," faculty will provide students with the information and tools necessary to be successful at the post-secondary level. Faculty need to become more familiar with college support and counseling services and to recognize when underprepared students require personal support and intervention.

Faculty will attend professional development conferences (SWADE, NADE, League of Innovation, brown bags, and campus workshops) regarding underprepared students.

Administration and faculty must share the responsibility of addressing the needs of the college's underprepared vocational students. If vocational students are going to be required to take English 1A, this will quite possibly increase the number of students taking developmental English classes. This new

requirement will also increase the need for a mandatory orientation program, so we can flag/catch students early on who need support services, financial aid and other campus resources.

5. Based upon the information above, how would you like the program to evolve within the next five years?

- All reading faculty fully informed of department policies
- Increased collaboration with other departments and campus support services
- A higher ratio of classes taught by full time faculty
- Higher student success and retention rates as a result of a strong department policy and program
- Increased focus on technology and innovative practices in the classroom, such as hybrid classes

6. Should a recommendation be written addressing the data? ____ Yes X No
(If yes, list.)

V. Conclusion

1. Prioritized Recommendations

- Create a lower-level reading course by Fall '07
- Hire more full-time faculty
- Mentor, and provide an orientation program for all faculty
- Combine the reading and writing labs
- Require all students placed into the reading program to attend a college orientation
- Designate a counselor specifically for underprepared students.
- Obtain funding for faculty development in lower-level literacy to better prepare faculty instructing the new reading course

2. Major Needs

- A lower level reading class added to the Fall 2007 class schedule
- Faculty professional development regarding
 - lower-level literacy instruction
 - innovative practices in pedagogy and technology
 - methods and strategies for serving an increasing number of 1st year Hispanic students
- Orientation and mentoring for part-time faculty
- Increased number of full-time faculty
- A specific counselor and orientation for underprepared students
- A Reading/Writing Lab

3. Strategies

- Complete and submit new course outline and changes to English R and 2R course outlines to Division Curriculum Committee and College Curriculum Committee in fall '06
- Apply for grant funding and collaborate with Staff Development to provide professional development
- Address hiring needs with administration
- Fully commit to a mentoring program and a required orientation program for new hires and all part-time faculty
- Lend reading program support to the Pre-Baccalaureate Task Force in order to create a campus-wide awareness of underprepared students' needs and to provide the proper support network
- Collaborate with the Vice-President of Academic Affairs and the Counseling Division regarding new required orientation course for incoming students and the need for a specific counselor to serve this population
- Collaborate with the Writing Center Director, regarding linking the Drop-In Reading Lab and Writing Center