

Program Review for English

Submitted for Review Fall 2016

Lead Faculty:

Debra Breckheimer

Rose Ann Cerofeci

Kevin Degnan

Scott Kushigemachi

Table of Contents

| | |
|-------------------------------------|-----------|
| Overview of the Program | 3 |
| Analysis of Research Data | 9 |
| Curriculum | 17 |
| Assessment and SLOs and PLOs | 20 |
| Analysis of Student Feedback | 23 |
| Facilities and Equipment | 25 |
| Technology and Software | 26 |
| Staffing | 29 |
| Future Direction and Vision | 31 |
| Prioritized Recommendations | 34 |
| Appendix A | 36 |
| Appendix B | 50 |

Overview of the Program

A. Provide a brief narrative description of the current program, including the program's mission statement and the students it serves.

The English faculty recognizes its vital role in the realizing El Camino College's mission of "[promoting] student learning and success in collaboration with our diverse communities." The ECC English Department's mission is to provide students a solid foundation of analytic reading, academic and creative writing, critical thinking, literary analysis, and research skills needed for success in college and in the workplace. We offer courses for all skill levels, from foundational to honors-level courses.

Courses in the English Department are integral to most students' matriculation, certificate, and transfer goals. Reading and writing courses serve as prerequisites or recommended preparations for courses in programs campus wide, ranging from CTE to nursing to philosophy. English courses are also a vital component of campus learning communities, including First Year Experience (FYE), Puente, KEAS, and The South Bay Promise, which addresses **Strategic Initiative B**, which is to **"strengthen quality educational and support services to promote and empower student success..."**

The English Department is the largest department on the El Camino campus. English courses serve the majority of ECC's students, regardless of major, with an average yearly enrollment of 10,241 for transfer courses and 8,119 for pre-collegiate courses over the past four years. The department has 46 (41 English and 5 reading) full-time and 73 (53 English and 20 reading) adjunct faculty. It is under the purview of the Dean and Associate Dean of Humanities.

The department has two program levels: pre-collegiate and transfer. The pre-collegiate courses include foundational basic skills courses in reading and writing. The transfer courses include over 40 courses in composition, literature, and creative writing. These include honors-level composition courses: ENGL 1AH, 1BH, and 1CH, which were added to our program in 2014.

As the largest department on campus, we offer our students a great deal. Not only do we boast the largest number of FYE courses and learning communities, but we also offer many honors-level first and second semester courses. Through the honors program, we mentor students as they prepare for both UC and private research conferences. At these conferences, our students showcase their research projects, which inevitably shines a bright light on ECC. Moreover, our department is the creator of the award-winning Myriad Magazine. Most recently, Myriad was in the top ten for "best of show" at the National College Media Convention. The Myriad program provides students with writing, editing, production, marketing, and budget experience. Our department also continuously works on curriculum so that we can offer our students course sequences that allow them to progress expediently.

With an average enrollment of approximately 18,000 students, we have an extremely large program to manage. As such, our department needs a department chair. For a more

comprehensive description outlining the duties of the chair, see “Staffing.” A chair position is imperative to the integrity of our department.

B. Describe the degrees and/or certificates offered by the program.

- The program offers two degrees: the AA and the AA-T in English. The English program develops a student’s ability to read both prose and poetry with understanding and discernment. Students acquire competence in writing college-level expository essays and applying research strategies. Students also develop interpretive and analytical skills through exposure to a wide range of literature. Completion of our program prepares an English major for any profession or industry requiring strong communication skills, as well as for transfer. In 2014-2015, the department conferred the largest number of degrees in its history: 46 degrees. In 2012-2013, 45 degrees were awarded, and in 2013-2014, 38 degrees were awarded. To compare, in 2010-2011, we conferred 24 degrees. Thus, the department has witnessed a dramatic increase in the number of degrees awarded to students.

C. Explain how the program fulfills the college’s mission and aligns with the strategic initiatives.

Our program aligns itself with ECC’s mission to “promote student learning and success in collaboration with our diverse communities.” To accomplish this, our program offers a range of courses in order to meet the needs of our diverse population. That is, we offer three levels of foundational, pre-collegiate reading courses: ENGL 80, 82, and 84. We offer two pre-collegiate writing courses, ENGL B and A, and RWA, a 5-unit course allowing students who place into both ENGL 84 and A to take one course in lieu of two. Furthermore, these courses allow students to build their skills, preparing them for success in the target transfer-level course, ENGL 1A. This is the core of our English program; it satisfies the English composition requirement for the AA/AS degree, and it is required for transfer by both the CSU and the UC systems. It is also a prerequisite for several courses throughout campus, as well as for two additional composition courses, ENGL 1C and 1B, both second semester composition courses.

STRATEGIC INITIATIVES for 2015-2020

- **STUDENT LEARNING:** Our courses are designed to promote student learning, and our instructors employ creative instructional methods. For example, instructors in our reading and composition courses are encouraged to base their courses on relevant learning theories and pedagogical innovations.
- **STUDENT SUCCESS & SUPPORT:** Student support is built into our curricular sequences. For example, basic skills courses feature a lab component, which includes an embedded tutoring program for one-on-one learning assistance. The one-on-one assistance not only provides students with the support they need, but it allows students to become comfortable articulating their areas of struggle with course content.
- **COLLABORATION:** Our faculty are active throughout ECC and collaborate with all areas on campus in order to promote student success. For instance, English faculty are

a vital component of collaborative programs such as FYE, Puente, KEAS, and The South Bay Promise.

- **COMMUNITY RESPONSIVENESS:** Our program is highly responsive to community needs. For example, we prioritize the transfer needs of our students, which requires us to be responsive to our transfer institutions. For example, ENGL 1A is required for transfer by both the CSU and the UC systems. ENGL 1C: Critical Thinking and Composition fulfills the critical thinking CSU GE transfer requirements, as well as the 1B Critical Thinking and Composition requirement. ENGL 1B, Literature and Composition, fulfills IGETC and CSU GE Humanities transfer requirements.
- **INSTITUTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS:** One very visible way that we promote institutional effectiveness is through our program's use of SLOs. We engage in a continuous process of data collection, analysis, self-reflection, and instructional improvement to ensure our program uses the assessment process to improve our effectiveness and inform resources allocation decisions.
- **MODERNIZATION:** We use technology to effectively support our students. For example, there are an estimated 400 computers in our building, which support basic skills reading and writing courses, allowing students to utilize modern technologies in support of their learning.

D. Discuss the status of recommendations from your previous program review.

Our last program review emphasized the California budget crisis, the struggling economy, and the high unemployment rate that sent many displaced workers back to school. Unemployment is now a less-pressing issue, particularly in California; hence, our previous concern of too many students and too few seats is not currently an issue. In fact, now our concern is a decrease in enrollment and a larger population of students struggling to meet academic standards required to maintain eligibility for continued enrollment.

Also, the elimination of winter session negatively impacted graduation rates during the last program review process. This will no longer be an issue since Winter 2017 will mark the return of winter session, which will ideally positively impact enrollment.

In addition, the status of our prioritized recommendations are as follows:

| Previous Recommendation | Status | Additional Comments |
|--|---------------------|---|
| Recommendation #1: The department will establish a new committee structure to address current needs. Committees will have designated chairs to schedule meetings, set agendas, and report to English Department meetings. | In progress/ongoing | This committee structure was established, but committees will function in a more active and organized fashion once a department chair is able to provide more structure and leadership. |

| | | |
|---|---------------------|---|
| <p>Recommendation #2: The department, in conjunction with Compton faculty, will conduct a series of multiple-semester-long consistency projects to evaluate the consistency and rigor of our core composition courses, beginning with English 1A and including 1B, 1C, B, and A. Project coordinators will organize workshops designed to solicit faculty input in the creation of common prompts for assessment, rubrics for assessment, and recommendations for improvement in consistency and rigor. In addition, the coordinators will train faculty in best norming practices and lead norming workshops.</p> | Completed | |
| <p>Recommendation #3: The department, in recognition of the fact that reading and English are both essentially one program, will combine both departments into one English Department. All faculty members will meet together for regularly scheduled department meetings. Those instructors teaching reading courses will meet as a committee to address reading-specific issues as they arise.</p> | Completed: | |
| <p>Recommendation #4: The department will secure an ongoing commitment from the college to restore Writing Center funding to the 2011-12 level of \$123,000 from the general fund in order to guarantee competitive salaries for tutors and maintain hours of operation that serve all students (day and evening).</p> | Completed | |
| <p>Recommendation #5: The department will secure on-going funding for a second tutor in English A and English B labs in order to ensure compliance with requirements for one-on-one conferencing as specified in the course outline.</p> | In progress/ongoing | This recommendation will be funded through the Basis Skills and Student Outcomes Transformation Grant until 2019, but we hope to secure a more permanent source of funding. |

| | | |
|---|----------------------------|---|
| <p>Recommendation #6: The department will establish a taskforce to examine student success and improvement in non-transfer-level reading and writing courses and to work in consultation with Compton faculty to examine alternatives to the current basic skills offerings of credit, non-degree applicable courses two or more levels below transfer, with a focus on English 80 and English C (the latter currently offered at Compton but not Torrance).</p> | <p>In progress/ongoing</p> | <p>We have had success in integrating basic skills reading and writing, and redesigning/combining some parts of the basic skills curriculum. There has not been much discussion of the ENGL 80/C levels, though there are informal plans to create enhanced non-credit options for students placing into these courses.</p> |
| <p>Recommendation #7: The department will establish a taskforce to evaluate current experimental accelerated/compressed non-transferable ECC English courses, explore alternative models for acceleration, and investigate the impact of accelerated/compressed courses on other issues, such as faculty schedules, room availability, accessibility to part-time students, etc. The taskforce will report to the department on relevant student success data for piloted courses and make recommendations about increasing the numbers and variety of accelerated courses at the non-transfer level to improve student success.</p> | <p>In progress/ongoing</p> | <p>The work of this taskforce led to the creation of ENGL RWA. A new course, ENGL RWE, is currently being proposed to further expand accelerated options for students.</p> |
| <p>Recommendation #8: The department will establish a technology taskforce to assess the condition of the equipment, to evaluate requests for replacement and new equipment and software, and to collaborate with ITS to develop a prioritized replacement schedule. In addition, the taskforce will schedule faculty training for existing and new equipment and software as needed.</p> | <p>Completed</p> | |

| | | |
|--|---------------------|---|
| Recommendation #9: The department will designate a liaison to the Reading Success Center to meet regularly with the Learning Resource Center Coordinator to promote usage of the RSC for improving student success in reading and writing classes. | In progress/ongoing | There has been increased collaboration with the Reading Success Center (RSC), though there is not currently a designated liaison. As there have been recent staffing changes at the RSC, we hope to facilitate even more communication and collaboration with the RSC moving forward. |
| Recommendation #10: The department will request a casual, hourly position to input scores and collect data on student outcomes as measured by standardized Parscore exams used in all levels of the reading course sequence at a cost of \$20/hour for 20 hours/semester for an annual cost of \$800. | In progress/ongoing | This is currently funded through BSI, but we hope to secure a more permanent source of funding. |
| Recommendation #11: The department will replace retiring faculty and pursue new full-time positions to achieve a full-time/part-time faculty ratio of 75/25 at a cost of approximately \$90,000/ instructor annually, beginning with 3 positions in 2013-14 for a cost of \$270,000. | Completed | |

E. Describe highlights of the program's previous success and future vision.

Highlights from programs previous success:

- Revised Course Outlines of Record for ENGL 1A, 1B, 1C, A, B, 84, and 82
- Consistency Project Workshops promoting increased COR alignment, revisions to SLOs, refined assessment tools and methods, and collegial communication, all of which address **Strategic Initiative C: "Advance an effective process of collaboration and collegial consultation conducted with integrity and respect."**
- To focus attention on the advantages of our degrees, and to clarify the transfer requirements for local universities, graduate programs, and possible careers, the department continues to hold an annual English Majors Workshop. The success of these workshops, along with our faculty and deans' promotion of the value of an English degree, is apparent in the increased degrees conferred by the department. That is, in 2010-2011 we conferred 24 degrees; however, in 2014-2015, the department conferred the largest number of degrees in its history: 46 degrees. The second most productive year was 2012-2013 when 45 degrees were awarded, and the third most productive year was 2013-2014 when 38 degrees were awarded.

- Our Myriad Magazine program continues to thrive. The 2014 edition of Myriad, in fact, received the Pinnacle Award (second place) from the College Media Association in the two-year literary magazine of the year category. The College Media Association is the largest college media organization in the United States.
- Future Vision: Our department will partner with the Student Equity Program in addressing the needs of our students with the largest equity gaps. Along with this, we will develop new and innovative ways of supporting our least academically-prepared students, and we will work with programs that have a proven track record of student success, such as FYE and South Bay Promise. In addition, we will continue to support students in meeting their transfer- and career-related goals, such as in Myriad and in our robust honors offerings.

Analysis of Institutional Research and Planning Data

Pre-Collegiate Program

A. Head count of students in the program

Between 2011-2015, the average annual enrollment in pre-collegiate English courses was 8,119 students. Apart from an enrollment of 7,606 in 2012-2013, numbers have ranged between 8,000-8,300.

B. Course grade distribution

In Fall 2014, the overall success rate in the program was 63.8%, with similar numbers since 2011. Because all pre-collegiate English classes are P/NP, grade distributions mirror these patterns, with 2,860 Ps, 879 NPs, and 752 Ws in Fall 2014.

C. Success rates (Discuss your program's rates, demographic success characteristics and set a success standard for your program)

Overall, our preliminary success standard was 62.3%, and our five-year success average was 62.9%. Therefore, it is encouraging that in Fall 2014, the overall success rate in the program was 63.8%.

One course where success rates are one standard deviation below the mean is ENGL 80. In one more extreme example, the course saw a 33.7% success rate in Fall 2013. In other semesters, this number is not as low, but there is a clear trend of low levels of success, again warranting future discussion as to the future of this curricular component.

In addition, Latino and African American students are more likely to enroll in pre-collegiate English courses. This is especially true of Latino students, who, in Fall 2014, made up 49.5% of the general student population but 62.6% of students in these courses. Thus, their success rates being lower than the reference group in Fall 2014 is cause for concern even though this disproportionate impact is lower than that experienced by other targeted demographic groups. In Fall 2014, African American students experienced the lowest rates of success at 49.4%, closely followed by Pacific Islander students at 55%.

D. Retention rates (if applicable, include retention based on placement method)

In Fall 2014, the overall retention rate was 83.3%, with similar numbers since 2011. The numbers are, as is to be expected, generally lower in the spring—in Spring 2015 there was a 77.1% retention rate.

E. A comparison of success and retention rates in face-to-face classes with distance education classes

During the period under review, the only distance education course offered was ENGL 84. Unfortunately, these DE courses repeatedly saw lower numbers than face-to-face courses. For example, in Spring 2012, the DE version experienced a 30% lower retention rate (60.4%), and in Fall 2014, success rates were approximately 36.2% lower than in face-to-face courses. To put this number in context, please note that very few sections of this course are offered, so the variations in success rates may not be as statistically significant as they appear. However, this concerning trend warrants future discussion.

F. Enrollment statistics with section and seat counts and fill rates

Between 2011 and 2015, the number of sections of pre-collegiate English have ranged from 224-263. However, we have seen a decrease in section fill rates, starting at 106.9% in the fall of 2011 and reaching 95.3% in the fall of 2014.

G. Scheduling of courses (day vs. night, days offered, and sequence)

Many sections of every course in the basic skills sequence are scheduled each semester, especially ENGL 82, ENGL 84, and ENGL A, and enrollment by time of day remained constant throughout 2011-2014, with about 88% during the day during the fall, about 11% at night, and a little over 1% on the weekend.

H. Improvement rates (if applicable)

At the pre-transfer level, even more important than individual course success data is success data in transfer-level English among students who begin in the basic skills sequence. Indeed, this is the basis for the basic skills analysis on the Chancellor's Office's Student Success Scorecard, where we can see that 51.5% of credit students tracked for six years through 2014-2015 who first enrolled in a course below transfer level completed college-level English somewhere in the California Community College system. While the 51.5% success rate for students first enrolled in basic skills English might appear modest, the rate is reflective of the challenges encountered by basic skills English programs throughout the Los Angeles area. The success rate for students at Santa Monica College for the same time period, for example, is 46.6%. Both colleges have roughly the same percentage of unprepared students, 70% for El Camino and 69% for Santa Monica. The Student Success Scorecard, further, lists a success rate of 41.5% for Long Beach City College, 41.9% for Los Angeles Harbor College, 34.4% for West Los Angeles College, and 29.2% for Los Angeles Southwest College. The success rate for El Camino students initially identified as unprepared, in fact, is the highest in this group.

While these comparisons put our students' success in context, we also wanted to understand where we as a department could improve our performance. To this end, Institutional Research

has broken down this Scorecard figure by course (though only tracking transfer-level completion at ECC, not the whole CCC system), yielding significant findings.

For one, within the reading sequence, ENGL 80 continues to see low rates of completion, with only 6% passing ENGL 1A within six years. ENGL 82 fares better at 23%, but this is still a concerning number. 56% of ENGL 84 students pass ENGL 1A in six years, and the highest rates of attrition occur because students never pass the course: almost 30% of ENGL 84 students never successfully complete the course.

In the basic skills writing sequence, only 15% of ENGL B students complete ENGL 1A in six years, a very disappointing number. About 50% of ENGL A students complete 1A. This sounds like a significant improvement compared to ENGL B, but it is less encouraging when one factors in how many students take ENGL A. In this cohort, there were 1,673 students, compared to 307 in ENGL B, and a 50% transfer-level completion rate for 1,673 students translates into a very large number of students.

We also have reason to be concerned about the equity gaps in the basic skills sequence. For example, African American ENGL 82 students experienced a 10% lower success rate in ENGL 1A when compared to the average among all students (which was already quite low), a 19% lower success rate when starting at ENGL 84, and a 16% lower success rate when starting in ENGL A. Using the same metrics, Pacific Islander students also experienced lower rates of success, 16% lower for ENGL 84 students and 10% lower in ENGL B. Regarding this ENGL B percentage, while Pacific Islander students made up 5% of ENGL B students (approximately 15 students total), none of them completed ENGL 1A in six years.

One promising lead is in ENGL 50 RWA (now ENGL RWA), which combines ENGL A and ENGL 84 into one five-unit course. We do not have long-term progression data on this recent addition to the curriculum, but we do know that 12% more students in an FYE pilot course passed ENGL 1A in two semesters compared to students concurrently enrolled in ENGL A and ENGL 84. Since the additional student support included in the FYE program makes it difficult to determine how much of this success was attributable to the curricular innovation, we were also able to determine that a non-FYE cohort saw a 10% higher success rate in ENGL 50 RWA (progression data forthcoming).

I. Additional data compiled by faculty

N/A

Transfer Program

A. Head count of students in the program

Enrollment trends have been fairly steady; however, they have declined slightly since the 2011-2012 academic year. That is, in 2011-2012 we enrolled 10,488 students, whereas in

2014-2015 we enrolled 10,012 students in our transfer-level courses. That represents an approximate 4.4% decrease in enrollment.

B. Course grade distribution

In our transfer-level courses, our grade distribution has remained consistent for the four years being studied. Focusing on the fall semesters, the breakdown is as follows:

- In 2011 we enrolled 4,380 students in our transfer-level courses. Of those students, 2,388 earned either an A or B, 777 earned a C, and 495 earned a D or F.
- In 2012 we enrolled 4,482 students. Of those, 2,361 earned an A or B, 826 earned a C, 532 earned a D or F.
- In 2013 we enrolled 4,493 students. Of those, 2,256 earned either an A or B, 816 earned a C, 565 earned a D or F.
- In 2014 we enrolled 4,474 students. Of those, 2,207 earned either an A or B, 800 earned a C, 570 earned a D or F.

Please see “Success rates” for more on how we are addressing some of the problem areas reflected in these grade distributions. However, it is noteworthy that the number of students earning an A or B outweighs the number of students earning a C or a non-passing grade.

C. Success rates (Discuss your program’s rates, demographic success characteristics and set a success standard for your program.)

In our transfer-level program, our preliminary success standard is 68.8%. Our five-year success minimum is 67.3%. Hence, our five-year success average of 70.4% shows that we have surpassed our standard by 1.6% and surpassed our minimum by 3.1%. Clearly, we would like to see our numbers improve; nonetheless, meeting our standards is acceptable.

That said, however, when we look at our demographic success characteristics, we see even more room for improvement. Focusing on four demographic areas, Asian Americans, White students, African Americans, and Latinos, exposes a success gap with African Americans suffering the lowest success rates as indicated below; our Latino population suffers the second lowest success rates also indicated below: (the period covers 2011-2014 for our transfer-level courses)

- We enrolled an average of 671 White students, who succeeded at an average rate of 78.6%.
- We enrolled an average of 782 Asian American students, who succeeded at an average rate of 79.5 %.
- We enrolled an average of 2,131 Latino students, who succeeded at an average rate of 65.9%.
- We enrolled an average of 583 African American students, who succeeded at an average rate of 59.72%.

These numbers clearly reveal a different picture when measured against our success standard of 67.3%. These success gaps require our attention.

In Spring 2016, faculty from ENGL RWA and ENGL A met to work on our Consistency Project. During this workshop, we discussed equity and related ideas for the classroom. Our focus was on understanding the difference between equality and equity and on the ideas behind Tara Yosso's Cultural Capital Wealth Theory.

This fall, we have invited two speakers, Melissa Fujiwara and Kenjus Watson, to help us understand how we can improve student success for our SEP-targeted student populations. Fujiwara will discuss "Why Race in the Classroom Matters," and Watson will discuss and share best practices on "Equity in the Classroom." As a follow up to this workshop, Watson will also put on an additional workshop on microaggressions. The goals of these workshops is to increase faculty awareness, to provide faculty with more knowledge and tools, and to ultimately help us close the success gap for our SEP-targeted populations. English, reading, ESL, and journalism faculty have been invited and must attend a minimum of one workshop. In addition, starting in Fall 2017, our program is partnering with the Behavioral and Social Sciences Division to create the first ever learning community focused on AAPI students, and we hope this project will reduce the equity gaps experienced by our Pacific Islander students. If we can continue to strategically and increasingly utilize SEP funds to pilot and expand these kinds of projects, we will better address the equity gaps in our program.

Additionally, this fall, Professor Debra Breckheimer is running a pilot program titled ENGL A, RWA, and 1A Extend. The program consists of a series of workshops throughout the fall, which provide assistance to students who have been referred because they are struggling in class. The topics of the workshops cover student success strategies, grammar, and various types of writing strategies, in addition to one-on-one tutoring. As a part of this pilot, Professor Breckheimer also holds a minimum of two office hours a week that are dedicated to the students who have been referred to the program. The idea behind this program is to provide our target populations with more support while taking our core composition courses and to provide these students with an additional contact person within the English Department.

We have future plans as well. Studies across the state show that many students represented in our target populations do not progress through the basic skills course sequence in a timely fashion. In fact, as our numbers reveal, many do not succeed at all. After analyzing the success gaps, researchers posit that a major roadblock for these students is that they are faced with too many "exit points" (opportunities for students to drop out of a course sequence or out of college), which exist because they are required to take too many pre-collegiate courses. Hence, our department is currently working on reducing the number of pre-collegiate courses students are required to take prior to entering transfer-level English. We are working on a new sequence that will require fewer courses, but with extra time in the classroom so faculty can provide students with more support.

D. Retention rates

Our transfer program retention rates are positive; however, the rates from 2011-2014 reveal a slight, albeit slow, downward trend. In 2011 we retained 84%, in 2012 84.3%, in 2013 82.1%,

and in 2014 80.8%. The almost 4% increase in attrition is something the department must watch.

E. A comparison of success and retention rates in face-to-face classes with distance education

Our transfer-level program only offers two of our courses, ENGL 1A and ENGL 1C, online. A comparison of the success rates in those two courses reveals that our students are more successful in our face-to-face courses. For ENGL 1A our average student success rate for 2011-2014 is 69.9% face-to-face, compared to 54% for the online course. For ENGL 1C our average student success rate for the same period is 71.8% face-to-face, compared to 63.2% for the online course. As the numbers reveal, the students in the online 1C do better than the 1A online students. Perhaps this speaks to the students' academic maturity and growth as students.

A comparison of the retention numbers for the same timeframe reveals a different result. The average retention rate in ENGL 1A face-to-face is 83.8%, compared to 79.8% online (which includes an odd increase in attrition in 2013, when retention dipped from 88.6% the previous year to 68.2%. The numbers did, however, rebound in 2014). The average retention rate for ENGL 1C face-to-face is 81.9%, compared to 75.9% online. While different, the differences in retention rates are not as significant as the differences in success rates. Clearly, the students tend to stay enrolled in the online course, but that does not translate into higher success rates.

F. Enrollment statistics with section and seat counts and fill rates

In the 2011-2012 academic year, we enrolled 10,488 students in our transfer-level courses, in 2012-2013 we enrolled 10,405, in 2013-2014 we enrolled 10,057, and in 2014-2015 we enrolled 10,012. As discussed in section 2A, our numbers have only slightly declined. Our fill rates follow the trend to some degree, with a fill rate of 108.4% in Fall 2011 and a fill rate of 89.4% in Fall 2014, which represents a 19% drop in fill rate.

G. Scheduling of courses (day vs. night, days offered, and sequence)

For transfer-level courses we offer the majority of our courses during the day. For the four years being studied, we offered an average of 80.4% of our courses during the day, 14.8% during the night, and 4.8% on the weekend. The percentage of English classes scheduled in the day and evening is very consistent with the general trend at the college. The 2014 Accreditation Self Study notes that for fall 2013, 80.6% of all college classes were scheduled in the day, whereas 15.4% of classes were scheduled in the evening, with 2.8% identified as irregular or distance education.

H. Improvement rates (course success by placement method, if applicable)

As discussed in C, our five year average of 70.4% exceeds our minimum standard of 68.8%. Our placement methods are currently under review, as discussed in 9A.

I. Additional data compiled by faculty

N/A

J. List any related recommendations (Pre-Collegiate and Transfer-Level English)

- **Research Student Needs:** more qualitative research should be done to understand why students are not succeeding in the basic skills sequence, especially in lower courses such as ENGL B. Findings from this research should inform curricular innovations and strategies to increase support for students in these courses.
- **Revise English 80/Explore Non-Credit Basic Skills Certificate:** We should also explore the viability, benefits, and costs of making changes to ENGL 80, for example, by offering it as a non-credit course, a more attractive option after funding for this category of basic skills course, known as enhanced noncredit, was increased in 2015 to the same level as funding for credit courses. Under SB 860, noncredit courses that provide preparation for either career development or college preparation (CDCP) and that lead to a certificate of completion are eligible. The department should explore whether to develop such a certificate to address the needs of students placing at the lowest levels of the basic skills sequence. The advantages of noncredit courses for these students are many: noncredit courses have no limits on repeatability, charge no fees, require no prerequisites, impose no penalties for dropping or withdrawing, and improve preparedness of students as they transition into credit from noncredit.
- **Expand Integrated Reading and Writing:** Based on the success of ENGL 50 RWA, the department may want to explore scaling up ENGL RWA, though logistical and administrative challenges have made this unrealistic thus far. In addition, there are currently plans to pilot a similar course for students placing two levels below transfer in both reading and writing. The development of this course—ENGL 50 RWB—will be funded by the newly-awarded Basic Skills and Student Outcomes Transformation (BSSOT) grant.
 - Cost: approximately \$25,000 over three years, primarily funded by the BSSOT grant
- **Expand Summer Bridge Reading and Writing Program:** In the summer of 2016, the department piloted the Summer Bridge Reading and Writing Program, where students who have scored into Basic Skills receive two weeks of intense instruction and practice; they are then given the opportunity to retake the assessment test and place higher in the English sequence. This program was piloted using Student Equity Program funds, and it will be augmented in future years using BSSOT grant money. Results of the initial Summer Bridge program were promising. 38 of 40 students completed the two-week session, and of those completing the program, 84% improved their original placement scores and became eligible for a higher-level course. Based on this program's outcomes, the department may wish to institutionalize this program by proposing it as a non-credit course.

- Cost: approximately \$130,000 over three years, primarily funded by the BSSOT grant
- **Increase Online/Hybrid Offerings and Increase Faculty and Student Support:**
While the success rates in our online courses certainly need improvement, in light of the growing number of courses being offered online at other community colleges, in order to compete and to increase enrollment, we must allocate the resources needed to grow and improve our online courses. Moreover, since increasing our online program is a goal of our enrollment management plan, we must improve our faculty training and add an online tutorial support component to our program. We might also consider adding hybrid courses to our curriculum.
- **Institutionalize Second Embedded Tutor in Basic Skills Composition Courses:**
Students in our basic skills writing sequences need student support services, and the primary support offered in our pre-transfer writing program is through the embedded tutoring program. Surveys in these classes have shown that students believe this feature is vital to their success. However, due to the large size of these courses, with a cap of 35 students, having a productive meeting with each student can be challenging, if not impossible, with one tutor. While the BSSOT grant will guarantee funding for a second tutor until 2019, since this is only a temporary funding source, additional long-term planning is needed to institutionalize this program following the termination of the grant.
 - Cost: approximately \$60,000/year, funded by the BSSOT grant from Fall 2016-Spring 2019
- **Increase Communication and Collaboration with Feeder High Schools:** By working more closely with local high schools, we can help to better align our curricula, which will result in greater success in our courses and less need for remediation.
 - Cost: approximately \$10,000/year
- **Increase Professional Development for Instructors in Best Practices in Basic Skills Instruction:** While our faculty generally has a high level of training and competency in basic skills pedagogies, we want to create more systematic ways of facilitating faculty engagement with emerging research and best practices in the field, especially among adjunct faculty.
 - Cost: approximately \$15,000/year (various programs may be able to provide funding for such training, such as the Basic Skills Initiative)

Curriculum

A. Provide the curriculum course review timeline to ensure all courses are reviewed at least once every 6 years.

| Course | YEAR 1 | | YEAR 2 | | YEAR 3 | | YEAR 4 | | YEAR 5 | | YEAR 6 | |
|----------|--------|-------|--------|-------|--------|-------|--------|-------|--------|-------|--------|-------|
| | FA 16 | SP 17 | FA 17 | SP 18 | FA 18 | SP 19 | FA 19 | SP 20 | FA 20 | SP 21 | FA 21 | SP 22 |
| ENGL 12 | | | | | | | | | | | X | |
| ENGL 15A | | | | | | | | | X | | | |
| ENGL 15B | | | | | | | | | X | | | |
| ENGL 1A | | | | | | | X | | | | | |
| ENGL 1AH | | | | | | | X | | | | | |
| ENGL 1B | | | | | | | X | | | | | |
| ENGL 1BH | | | | | | | X | | | | | |
| ENGL 1C | | | | | | | X | | | | | |
| ENGL 1CH | | | | | | | X | | | | | |
| ENGL 20 | | | | | | | | | | X | | |
| ENGL 21 | | | | | | | | | | X | | |
| ENGL 24A | | | | | | | | X | | | | |
| ENGL 25A | | | | | | | | X | | | | |
| ENGL 27 | | | | | | | | | X | | | |
| ENGL 28 | | | | | | | | | | | X | |
| ENGL 30 | | | | | | | | X | | | | |
| ENGL 31 | | | | | | | | | X | | | |
| ENGL 32 | | | | | | | X | | | | | |
| ENGL 34 | | | | | | | | | | | X | |
| ENGL 35 | | | | | | | | | X | | | |
| ENGL 36 | | | | | | | | | X | | | |
| ENGL 39 | | | | | | | | | | X | | |
| ENGL 40A | | | | | | | X | | | | | |
| ENGL 40B | | | | | | | X | | | | | |
| ENGL 41B | | | | | | | | X | | | | |
| ENGL 42 | | | | | | | | | X | | | |
| ENGL 43 | | X | | | | | | | | | | |
| ENGL 44 | | X | | | | | | | | | | |
| ENGL 48 | | | | | | | X | | | | | |
| ENGL 78 | X | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ENGL 80 | | | X | | | | | | | | | |
| ENGL 82 | | | X | | | | | | | | | |
| ENGL 84 | | | X | | | | | | | | | |
| ENGL 98 | | | | | | | | | | | | X |
| ENGL 99 | | | | | | | | | | | | X |
| ENGL A | | | | | | | | | X | | | |
| ENGL B | | | | | | | | | X | | | |
| ENGL C | | | | X | | | | | | | | |
| ENGL RWA | | | | | | | | | | | X | |

B. Explain any course additions to current course offerings.

The department piloted ENGL 50 RR and ENGL 50 WW, which attempted to independently accelerate the basic skills reading and writing sequences. This led to the conclusion that integrating reading and writing was a more effective curricular redesign, resulting in ENGL RWA (formerly 50 RWA). The department developed, piloted, and institutionalized this five-unit integrated reading and writing course for students who place one level below transfer-level English in both reading and writing. Approximately 6 sections of this course (ENGL RWA) are

offered each semester, both through our FYE program and to the general student population, with promising results (see Analysis of Institutional Research and Planning Data). We hope to build on this success by piloting ENGL 50 RWB (2 levels below transfer), initially through our FYE program.

In addition, honors courses were developed to parallel the program's core composition courses, resulting in ENGL 1AH, ENGL 1BH, and ENGL 1CH. Prior to this addition to the curriculum, these core courses were taught within the Honors Transfer Program, but they were taught using the regular courses, with instructors making honors-specific additions to their assignments and curricula. However, creating honors-specific courses allows students in the Honors Transfer Program to reap the benefits of taking those courses when they apply to transfer (as the honors courses and titles will appear on assist.org and on the online UC application), helps non-HTP students avoid mistakenly registering for an honors course (something that used to happen frequently), makes our college's curriculum consistent with best practices recommended by the Honors Transfer Council of California, and will increase our college's transfer rates, especially to prestigious universities like those in the UC system.

C. Explain any course deletions and inactivations from current course offerings.

A number of courses have been inactivated because they were not taught in recent years, and there was little expectation they would be offered in the near future. The department recognized it would not be possible to analyze these courses' Student Learning Outcomes as part of the course assessment process. These inactivated courses include: ENGL 18, ENGL 23, ENGL 26, ENGL 33, ENGL 41A, and ENGL 47. The department also inactivated ENGL 4 and ENGL 7 for similar reasons, also recognizing that these courses contained redundancies with the existing basis skills curriculum. ENGL 100 was also briefly inactivated because it had not been recently offered, but after careful review, faculty reactivated this course, recognizing it could generate noncredit FTES while providing tutoring services in reading and writing. Lastly, ENGL 41B was briefly inactivated for similar reasons, but student interest later made the course viable, contingent upon funding availability, as a complement to other English courses offered in film, such as ENGL 39 and ENGL 78.

ENGL 32abc was also initially inactivated for the same reasons, but we later decided it remains a valuable component of the Creative Writing curriculum, though the course was amended so it would no longer be repeatable, so it was renamed ENGL 32. This removal of repeatability was based on changes in Title 5 (Section 55041) that narrowed the criteria for repeatability. This is also why 38ab was changed to ENGL 78.

ENGL AX was inactivated as well. Since this was a writing class designed for ESL students, the ESL department moved to officially offer the course within the ESL department and discipline, as part of the ESL 53 series. Therefore, ENGL AX was inactivated, and ESL 53C was created.

**D. Describe the courses and number of sections offered in distance education.
(Distance education includes hybrid courses.)**

During Fall 2014-Spring 2015, the department offered 4 sections of ENGL 84, 8 sections of ENGL 1A, and 10 sections of ENGL 1C.

E. Discuss how well the courses, degrees, or certificates are meeting students' transfer or career training needs:

1. Have all courses that are required for your program's degrees and certificates been offered during the last two years? If not, has the program established a course offering cycle?

We ensure that the courses required for our degrees are offered biennially at the least, with almost every core course being offered annually, and many offered every semester.

2. Are there any concerns regarding program courses and their articulation?

Our courses are well articulated with transfer institutions.

3. How many students earn degrees and/or certificates in your program? Do students take licensure exams? If so, what is the pass rate? If few students receive degrees or certificates or if few students pass the licensure exam, should the program's criteria or courses be re-examined? Set an attainable, measurable goal for future degrees, certificates, and/or licensure pass rates.

The department continues to offer the AA degree in English and the new AA-T degree in English. The latter was developed in 2013 to comply with the requirements of SB 1440, which facilitated the transfer of community college students to the California State University system. In 2014-2015, we awarded the largest number of degrees in our history, 46. The second most productive year was 2012-2013 when 45 degrees were awarded, and the third was 2013-2014, with 38 degrees. Therefore, the last three years have seen the largest number of degrees awarded in the program's history. Furthermore, of the 46 degrees in English awarded in 2014-2015, 54% were AA-T degrees, double the percentage of AA-T and AS-T degrees (relative to all degrees) awarded by the college as a whole. This means more than half of the students receiving a degree that year anticipated enrollment at a CSU or UC. This increase in degrees is a result of large-scale attempts to market degree completion in the department, educating students in the classroom, through workshops, and using promotional materials.

F. List any related recommendations.

- **Revise ENGL 80/Explore Non-Credit Basic Skills Certificate** (see recommendations under Analysis of Institutional Research and Planning Data)
- **Propose and Pilot ENGL 50 RWB** (see recommendations under Analysis of Institutional Research and Planning Data)

- **Research and Institutionalize Summer Bridge Reading and Writing Program** (see recommendations under Analysis of Institutional Research and Planning Data)
- **Cross-List Academic Strategies Courses in the English Program:** This will allow Academic Strategies courses relevant to the English program (for example, those which target specific writing skills) to be offered under the English umbrella, facilitating increased integration with the English department and improving their marketability to students seeking academic support courses in English (English faculty are already eligible to teach most AS courses).

Assessment and Student and Program Learning Outcomes (SLOs & PLOs)

A. Provide a copy of your alignment grid, which shows how course, program, and institutional learning outcomes are aligned.

Please see Appendix A.

B. Provide a timeline for course and program level SLO assessments.

| ENGL SLO Assessment Schedule | |
|-------------------------------------|--|
| 12 | Assessed when offered: scheduled for Fall 2016 |
| 15A | Assessed annually |
| 15B | Assessed annually |
| 1A | Assessed annually |
| 1AH | Assessed annually |
| 1B | Assessed annually |
| 1BH | Assessed annually: inaugural assessment written during Fall 2016 |
| 1C | Assessed annually |
| 1CH | Assessed annually: inaugural assessment written during Fall 2016 |
| 20 | Assessed annually |
| 21 | Assessed when offered |
| 24A | Assessed annually |
| 25A | Assessed annually |
| 27 | Assessed when offered |
| 28 | Assessed when offered |
| 30 | Assessed annually |
| 31 | Assessed annually |
| 32 | Assessed when offered: scheduled for Spring 2017 |
| 34 | Assessed when offered |
| 35 | Assessed annually |
| 36 | Assessed when offered |
| 39 | Assessed annually |
| 40A | Assessed when offered |
| 40B | Assessed annually |
| 41B | Assessed when offered |
| 42 | Assessed when offered |

| | |
|------------|-----------------------|
| 43 | Assessed when offered |
| 44 | Assessed when offered |
| 48 | Assessed when offered |
| RWA | Assessed annually |
| 78 | Assessed annually |
| 80 | Assessed annually |
| 82 | Assessed annually |
| 84 | Assessed annually |
| 98 | Assessed annually |
| A | Assessed annually |
| B | Assessed annually |

Please see Appendix B for the PLO assessment timeline.

C. State the percent of course and program SLO statements that have been assessed.

English is on schedule with all SLO results. 100% of courses offered have been assessed. ENGL 12, 27, 32, 34, 41B, 42, 43, and 48 have never been assessed, but they also have never been offered when they were scheduled to be assessed. They are all literature courses that are infrequently offered. The department should consider deactivating these courses, encouraging faculty to teach them, and/or adjusting the assessment timeline so that courses are more consistently scheduled to be assessed when they are offered.

D. Summarize the SLO and PLO assessment results over the past four years and describe how those results led to improved student learning. Analyze and describe those changes. Provide specific examples.

English is on schedule with the PLO assessment timeline, with three of five PLOs assessed and the remaining two scheduled for Fall 2016 assessment. The assessment of each of the PLOs assessed (pre-transfer reading, pre-transfer composition, and transfer-level composition) have all led to substantive department-level discussions of changes and improvement to teaching methods and curriculum. Moreover, the consistent and full assessment of our course SLOs have led to valuable and meaningful PLO assessments and ultimately positive discussion and change at the course level. For instance, when assessing PLO 3 and reviewing the SLO data for ENGL 1A, 1B, and 1C, we found that students were succeeding at a higher rate on grammar and mechanics SLOs in ENGL 1A than 1C, so faculty discussed this and agreed to curriculum changes to make 1A more rigorous across all sections to better prepare students for 1C's requirements.

E. Describe how you have improved your SLO process and engaged in dialogue about assessment results.

Our SLO and PLO processes, like all those at ECC, underwent massive changes in the 2013-2014 academic year, and we have continued to refine and improve the process every semester since. Our initial and continued approach is to assess each SLO for a given course whenever the course is assessed. This has fit most English courses very well, as the SLOs are

generally components of a whole that can be measured with a single assessment method, such as a final paper or exam. Most changes to our assessment process have had to do with our collection and distribution of data. While all data was previously entirely anonymous and not attached to student names or IDs, we now distribute SLO data collection forms to faculty that contain names from each section's rosters. This potentially enables the tracking of student equity data in correlation to SLO data, but such correlation would be an intense manual process looking at hundreds of sections. We have discussed and deeply desire the SLO data collection process to be digital, to have a way for faculty to enter SLO data online for each of their students. This information would then be connected to information on student subpopulations so we can be in fuller compliance with newer ACCJC equity requirements regarding tracking different student subpopulations in SLO success rates. However, it is as yet unclear if this is currently technically possible with the system the college currently uses, TracDat.

As mentioned in sections C and D, we have had discussions about each multi-section course in department meetings and consistency project meetings to ultimately improve student learning, especially in core courses like ENGL A, 1A, and 1C. Admittedly, for single-section courses, the discussions are generally informal and take place as conversations between one faculty teaching the course one semester and another faculty teaching the course the following semester or year. For instance, in teaching ENGL 39, in looking at the SLO statements and results, one faculty member felt that analysis of texts should be framed by literary theory, and that element was added to the SLOs and COR. On a larger scale, upon reviewing the accumulated SLO data for A, 1A and 1C, this led to a department-wide discussion on both the number of essays assigned in 1A and 1C and the potential need to focus on more common grammar problems in 1A so that students who pass through that course are even more fully prepared to succeed in 1C. Departmental discussions of SLOs and at the Consistency Project for ENGL A have led to a pilot program currently running in Fall 2016 and involving approximately 10-15 instructors. This pilot seeks to build and refine a common assessment to make grading/scoring processes more consistent and hopefully further reveal any areas to improve in teaching and curriculum.

F. Discuss any findings from SLO/PLO assessments that help to justify recommendations.

Success rates in literature courses tend to be the highest, often in the 80-100% range. This is to be expected because students at ECC who take literature courses are often already reasonably prepared and motivated, and the faculty teaching literature courses are often themselves very motivated and particularly well equipped to teach in that subject area.

Success rates in reading courses have hovered in the 60-80% range. There has been consistent, active discussion among reading faculty about the issues to address in the reading courses. Some of their actions include reinstating special department meetings for reading faculty and extensive discussion and re-evaluation of their principle assessment tools. Reading faculty face substantial challenges in helping their students succeed in developmental reading courses and are actively working to address these issues.

Success rates in transfer-level composition are generally high and in the 80-90% range (and higher in the case of the honors courses), though there are cases where success rates for 1C have been in the 70-80% range. These discrepancies have been the center of recent department-level discussions about the consistency and rigor of both ENGL 1A and 1C, mostly leading to changes to the 1A course outline to ensure that students are writing enough distinct, separate essays to give them sufficient practice to be prepared for 1B and 1C.

Success rates in developmental composition courses, ENGL A and B, vary significantly from 60-90%. ENGL A more consistently has lower success rates, though B is not dramatically more successful—it is often in the 80% range, while ENGL A often ranges from 60-79%. The SLO reports offer a variety of explanations for this, and faculty continue to work on improving curriculum, assessment, and teaching practices to improve student success. The ENGL A Consistency Project has recently brought faculty to agree to use one common essay for the SLO assessment tool to foster an ongoing conversation about effective teaching practices. The recently-approved ENGL RWA has been generally successful, with three of four SLOs having success rates well above 80%. SLO 4 had the lowest success rate but was still at 73%, and the SLO's wording was changed for future assessments.

G. List any related recommendations

- **Address the Lack of Assessments for English 12, 27, 32, 34, 41B, 42, 43, and 48:** The department should consider deactivating these classes, very strongly encouraging faculty to teach a section and assess it to keep the course active, and/or change the assessment timeline so that the course is scheduled to be assessed when it is offered. However, it is also important to note that only two courses in this list (42 and 43) are required for major preparation at CSU, so the popularity of those courses lacking assessments is not as high as those literature and creative writing courses scheduled on a semesterly basis to accommodate English majors.
- **Digitize SLO Data Collection:** we hope faculty can eventually enter SLO data online for each of their students. This information would then be connected to information on student subpopulations so we can be in fuller compliance with newer ACCJC equity requirements regarding tracking different student subpopulations in SLO success rates.
- **Develop Strategic Plans to Address Lower Success Rates in Developmental Reading and Writing Courses:** Building on the existing discussions outlined above, and throughout this program review document, we hope to more strategically bolster student success in our basic skills sequences.

Analysis of Student Feedback

A. Describe the results of the student survey in each of the following areas:

The student survey was released to the campus via email in spring 2016. It included 15 questions addressing instruction, facilities, community, and personal achievements. A total of 79 students participated in the survey. Overall, the department received favorable responses to all of the questions. It is important to note, however, that this survey may not be completely representative, as the population was small and the survey was not mandatory.

Student support:

Four of the questions asked students to provide feedback on their instructors. The department received very positive feedback. Close to 90% of the students felt that their instructors helped them to achieve their academic goals, while just slightly fewer agreed that their instructors helped them to stay on track. Over 90% agreed that they were provided opportunities to participate during class, and 86% agreed that they felt valued by their instructors.

The survey also revealed that the resources in the library are adequately supporting student success. 86% of the students agreed that the library resources helped them to succeed in the program. Less than 2% disagreed, while 12% were ambivalent.

Curriculum:

The students felt that the courses in the program helped them to meet their academic goals. Over 89% agreed that the courses aligned with their goals. Schedules and course offerings were also ranked in the survey. The majority of the students felt satisfied with the class schedule. The area that ranked the lowest was in relation to the variety of courses offered by the department.

Facilities, equipment, and technology:

Students were also asked about their satisfaction with the facilities and classroom equipment. Most students agreed that the buildings, classrooms and the technology in the classrooms were satisfactory. Less than 2% felt that the buildings were not satisfactory, while only 8% felt that the computers and software could be improved.

Program objectives:

Over 93% of the students agreed that they understood the program objectives. The majority claimed that they were aware of what they were expected to learn and what skills they should possess after completing their course work in the English department.

B. Discuss the implications of the survey results for the program.

One interesting observation is that the two questions that received the highest amount of ambivalence were about the students' connection to the campus. Although close to 75% agreed that they felt some sense of community, 20% were ambivalent. Furthermore, only 60% were satisfied with the amount of extracurricular activities offered, and 35% were ambivalent. This may be due to the nature of the community college, where students are not as connected to their peers. Research shows that students who feel like they are part of a community are more likely to succeed. The department may want to create more opportunities and programs to help students feel more connected to the campus, which in turn may help to raise retention rates.

Overall, the results of the survey were extremely positive. An insignificant number of students expressed any type of dissatisfaction. This implies an overall satisfaction with instruction, facilities, and opportunities for personal growth.

C. List any related recommendations.

- Create more opportunities and programs to help students feel connected to the campus, which in turn may help to raise retention rates.

Facilities and Equipment

A. Describe and assess the existing program facilities and equipment.

Currently, our program's facilities and equipment are generally able to support our large number of courses. This entails regular maintenance of classrooms, whose technological features also require ongoing facilities maintenance, as well as regular attention to our labs, which undergo stress during their regular usage.

B. Explain the immediate (1-2 years) needs related to facilities and equipment. Provide a cost estimate for each need and explain how it will help the program better meet its goals.

- Broken furniture in classrooms and labs, including podiums, desks, and chairs, needs replacement; some classroom furniture arrangements need to be improved to increase screen visibility; movable furniture options should be explored.
 - Justification: Fully functioning furniture makes for a safer learning environment.
 - Time Frame: Immediate
 - Cost: \$200-\$3,000/class

C. Explain the long-range (2-4+ years) needs related to facilities and equipment. Provide a cost estimate for each need and explain how it will help the program better meet its goals.

- Computer lab keyboard shelves are missing or are missing parts.
 - Justification: Fixing the shelving will make it easier for students to type and prevent potential carpal tunnel syndrome.
 - Time Frame: As needed
 - Cost: \$120-220/keyboard shelf
- Some window shades are not functioning or are no longer in place.
 - Justification: Fixing the shades will make it easier for students to see the LCD projection on the screen.
 - Time Frame: As needed
 - Cost: \$600/class

- Projection screens are getting worn thin in areas where storyboard clips along the top of the whiteboards have created friction wear.
 - Justification: After the clip issue is corrected, some screens will need replacement.
 - Time Frame: As needed
 - Cost: \$350/screen

D. List any related recommendations.

- Replace broken furniture in classrooms and labs, including podiums, desks, and chairs; improve classroom furniture arrangements to increase screen visibility
 - Justification: Fully functioning furniture makes for a safer learning environment.
 - Time Frame: Immediate
 - Cost: Approximately \$10,000-\$20,000/year

Technology and Software

A. Describe and assess the adequacy and currency of the technology and software used by the program.

Because classroom computers and instructor laptops are so essential to the daily responsibilities of our faculty, our program has many technology and software needs. While the school has generously addressed many of our technology needs, there is still a need for regular maintenance and increased capabilities.

B. Explain the immediate (1-2 years) needs related to technology and software. Provide a cost estimate for each need and explain how it will help the program better meet its goals.

- Bulbs for ceiling mounting projectors need replacement; also, the department should consider moving to wireless projectors.
 - Justification: Instructors rely on projection of document cameras and computers as part of their daily classroom practice.
 - Time Frame: Immediate
 - Cost: \$400/bulb
- Wi-Fi should be readily available throughout the Humanities Building.
 - Justification: Wi-Fi is necessary for cloud-based technologies to fully function. This include Chromebooks, which are provided to students in select department programs. Also, many instructors utilize cloud-based software in the classroom using laptops and/or smart devices.
 - Time Frame: Immediate
 - Cost: TBD
- Faculty should have easy access to fully-functional printers.
 - Justification: Printing capability is necessary for all instructors' daily practice. Currently, printers can be unreliable.
 - Time Frame: Immediate

- Cost: Approximately \$1,000
- Due to scheduling needs, classes are regularly held outside of the department building, often in rooms with fewer technological capabilities; therefore, supplemental classroom space should have the same technology standards as classrooms in the Humanities Building. However, because the Humanities division does not enjoy scheduling control of classrooms outside its jurisdiction, the list of outside classrooms used each year varies, so we understand that maintaining a consistent level of technological capabilities is difficult and requires cooperation from the area providing the classroom.
 - Justification: We wish for a consistently high-quality learning environment for all of our students.
 - Time Frame: Immediate
 - Cost: TBD
- We have a variety of software being used in multiple departments. Reading software includes the following free and fee-based computer programs: TownsendPress.com, Ultimate Speed Reading, "RFU Lab," Inspiration, Clipread, Wisesoft, Reading Strategies, Quantum Reading Series, Total Reader. Writing software is MS Office. Windows Operating Systems in computer labs will need to be upgraded periodically to be current, as will NetOp, which also needs to be correctly configured.
 - Justification: Software and operating systems need to be replaced when necessary due to updates, compatibility issues, and availability of new products
 - Time Frame: As Needed
 - Cost: To be assumed by ITS
- ENGL 98 and Myriad recently began using Submittable, a publishing industry standard software.
 - Justification: Submittable allows students to easily submit their short stories, poems, and artwork to Myriad, while also giving them experience with software they will use to submit their work to professional national magazines. In the classroom, Submittable allows editors to efficiently read and rate each submission blindly (they cannot see who the authors or artists are). This allows the editors to be more judicious in their critique of each work.
 - Time Frame: This program is currently in use and paid for by the Myriad printing budget, but the department should consider institutionalizing payment for the annual fee.
 - Cost: \$374/year
- There are a number of technological devices that may need to be replaced or maintained in order for SMART classrooms and labs to be fully operational; they are itemized below.
 - Justification: Occasionally, some of these items stop functioning properly. These items should be replaced as needed when they break down. In addition, they should be upgraded when better technologies come along.
 - Time Frame: As Needed
 - DVD players (Cost: approximately \$300/player)
 - Document Cameras (Cost: approximately \$1,525/camera)
 - Printers in Reading and Writing Computer Labs (Cost: approximately \$1,500/printer)
 - Parscore Machine (Cost: approximately \$8,000/machine)

- Scantron Machines (Cost: approximately \$1,500/scanner)
 - SmartTablets (Cost: approximately \$330/unit)
 - Video Visualizers (Cost: approximately \$3,000/visualizer)
- We need continued technological support for the computer lab classrooms and Writing Center computer lab.
 - Justification: When they arise, we need to address technological challenges as quickly as possible.
 - Time Frame: Ongoing
 - Cost: To be assumed by ITS

C. Explain the long-range (2-4+ years) needs related to technology and software. Provide a cost estimate for each need and explain how it will help the program better meet its goals.

- We have an estimated 400 computers in the building, and though they were replaced quite recently, it is vital that they be replaced promptly when they no longer function satisfactorily, as they have become essential to daily classroom routines.
 - Justification: Computers are an integral part of program.
 - Time Frame: Long-range
 - Cost: If replacement of all computers took place today, the approximate cost would be between \$400,000 and \$450,000.
- Though they were replaced quite recently, it is vital that faculty laptops be replaced promptly when they no longer function satisfactorily, as last time, they were replaced after many had ceased operating adequately.
 - Justification: Faculty rely on laptops to respond to student emails, to prepare materials for use in classrooms, to utilize class team sites and the ECC gradebook, to grade student papers, and to access CMS for online and traditional courses. Furthermore, all college correspondence is conducted via email, and submission of grades requires computer access.
 - Time Frame: Long-range
 - Cost: Approximately \$1,000/laptop
- The department should explore expanding the use of Chromebooks as a way of meeting the technological needs of students.
 - Justification: We have seen a high level of success in pilot programs that made Chromebooks available to students through the South Bay Promise program. Instructors have found that Chromebooks are more conducive to the classroom environment than desktop computers.
 - Time Frame: TBD
 - Cost: Approximately \$200/Chromebook and \$700/storage cart

D. List any related recommendations.

- Maintain and update technological devices that may need to be replaced or repaired in order for SMART classrooms and labs to be fully operational, especially DVD players, document cameras, projector bulbs, and printers
 - Cost: Approximately \$10,000/year

Staffing

A. Describe the program's current staffing, including faculty, administration, and classified staff.

Currently, the English program is served by a dean, an associate dean, 46 full-time faculty, 73 adjunct faculty, 3 full-time classified staff, and several part-time classified and casual staff.

Since 2008, the English Department has been in a hiring cycle to replace full-time faculty who've retired, been reassigned, and resigned in the past 10 years, with a resultant steady increase in the FT to PT ratio: 58%/42% (Fall 2009), 63%/37% (Fall 2010), 64%/36% (Fall 2011), and 67%/33% in Fall 2012, the semester during which the department reached its highest ratio of full-time to part-time faculty.

In fall 2015, the department's ratio was 64% FT and 36% PT, with two full-time faculty members retiring at the end of the academic year. Only one replacement was authorized for 2016-2017, and the department anticipates that two to three additional full-time faculty members will retire at the end of 2016-2017. As the college's largest department, serving approximately 9,000 students last fall semester, English continues to need full-time faculty in order to reach the 75%/25% ratio established for colleges by AB 1725.

B. Explain and justify the program's staffing needs in the immediate (1-2 years) and long-term (2-4+ years). Provide cost estimates and explain how the position/s will help the program better meet its goals.

Department Chair: While it has not been an ECC philosophy to have department chairs, in a division as large as the Humanities division, where the dean and associate dean are in charge of 6 programs, 64 full-time faculty, and 109 adjunct faculty, it is imperative that the English department have a chair. The English department alone consists of 46 full-time faculty and 73 adjunct faculty, who all require some degree of management. Each semester approximately 50 faculty must be evaluated. Student and faculty concerns must be addressed; adjuncts find opportunities elsewhere and must be replaced. This just covers the immediate duties. The list of duties and responsibilities for the department, division, and campus is infinite and ever evolving. An English department chair could relieve some of the workload. The chair of the English Department would assume duties such as the following for a recommended 75% reassigned time.

- Act as mentor and facilitator of department faculty
- Evaluate course syllabi for consistency with the department's course outlines of record, a major undertaking given the 119 individuals teaching the core courses
- Promote academic quality of the department and discipline
- Evaluate faculty
- Coordinate faculty development
- Serve as liaison to the Associate Dean and Dean on student and faculty issues
- Respond to student petitions, complaints, and requests
- Represent the department on committees

- Monitor SLO assessments

Faculty: Future hiring needs will likely be affected in the next few years by retirements. Seven FT instructors were hired during the 1980s, and one English instructor hired in 1990 is currently in pre-retirement. It is expected that there will be at least 5 retirements in the next 4 years. Replacing 5 retirees would cost approximately \$450,000 (including benefits); however, this amount will actually represent a savings, as it is significantly lower than the salaries and benefits paid to the long-time faculty members who are now near the top of the pay scale. In addition, adjunct instructors are frequently needed due to scheduling changes and in response to previous adjunct faculty finding permanent positions at other colleges (cost TBD). Fourteen adjuncts were added to the department faculty this fall, and this number reflects the amount of paper screening, interviewing, and administrative support required in order to provide classes for students.

Embedded Tutors: Each English A and B course utilizes a tutor in the classroom during the lab session (about 2 hours weekly). The tutor, along with the instructor, conferences with students one-on-one to work on their writing assignments as specified in the course outline. Professional tutoring and the use of Writing Centers have been identified as effective practices for basic skills development as a foundation for student success by the Center for Student Success (California Community Colleges System Office). Surveys in the writing classes have shown that students feel this feature is by far the most valuable aspect of the course in terms of helping them succeed. Due to the large size of these courses, with a cap of 35 students, having a productive meeting with each student can be challenging if not impossible. Through the BSSOT grant, two tutors will be assigned to each class for the duration of the grant, until 2019. After that, we will need to seek ongoing funding. Funding for an additional tutor for each section of English A and B costs approximately \$60,000/year.

Writing Center: Although the tutors who work at the Writing Center are not required by the English Department curriculum per se, they serve the entire campus and are an essential student support service. Before Spring 2009, the Writing Center was open until 8 PM Monday through Thursday. Beginning in Spring 2009, the Writing Center began to close at 6 PM due to budget cuts. Evening students who worked during the day had lost this valuable opportunity for tutoring help and access to reading and writing computer programs. The college should keep the Writing Center open until 8 PM on at least two nights a week, possibly Tuesday and Wednesday. In Fall 2012, Title V funds were used to restore the evening hours. However, this was a one-time use of monies. The college needs to fund the Writing Center as an ongoing budget item to maintain consistent staffing and hours of operation. The estimated cost of adding two hours for two tutors to staff the additional four hours for one semester is \$3,000.

Related Budget Considerations: The department's embedded tutors and Writing Center tutors (paraprofessionals) are paid from the same division account, an account used by the college to fund casual and non-certificated part-time employees. During times of financial challenge, the division accounts for casual employees are among the first items to be reduced. The increase in the state minimum wage to \$10 an hour in January 2016 and the scheduled increases to \$10.50 in January 2017 and \$11 an hour in 2018 will place an additional burden on the division budget. The minimum wage will also increase by \$1 an hour annually thereafter

until the rate of \$15 an hour is reached in 2022. While the college meets its legal obligation in regards to the minimum wage, no augmentations have been made to individual area budgets. The department recommends that funding be provided to its casual and student worker budgets to keep pace with minimum wage increases so that services to students are not curtailed.

It should also be noted that the tutors who serve the department in English A and B classrooms, as well as in the Writing Center, have not had a raise in nearly a decade, aside from a brief period of time during which state equity funds were available to augment division funding. This year, tutors receive rates of \$20, \$17, and \$15 an hour based on length of service to the department. The department recommends that funding for the division be increased so that all tutors receive a uniform rate of \$20 an hour. This salary would be equal to the rate paid to tutors in the Math Lab, the other large program-related tutoring center on campus. Tutors in math all have the bachelor's degree as the minimum level of academic preparation, as do English department tutors. Teacher associates in the English program at the Compton Center, moreover, receive rates of \$20 an hour and \$22.80 an hour. Teacher associates holding bachelor's degrees are paid at the \$20 an hour rate, so a uniform rate of \$20 an hour would establish parity in these areas.

C. List any related recommendations.

- Continue to regularly hire full-time faculty in order to reach the 75%/25% ratio established for colleges by AB 1725
 - Cost: replacing 5 retirees would cost approximately \$450,000 (including benefits)
- Secure ongoing funding to support the second embedded writing tutor in basic skills writing courses
 - Cost: approximately \$60,000/year
- Support the Writing Center by increasing service hours, adjusting wages in response to minimum wage increases, and moving towards wage parity with other similar programs on campus
 - Cost: approximately \$38,000/year
- Provide funding for a department chair position, as described above, with 75% reassigned time
 - Cost: approximately \$48,000/year

Future Direction and Vision

A. Describe relevant changes within the academic field/industry. How will these changes impact the program in the next four years?

Currently underway is the Common Assessment Initiative, aka the Common Assessment System, sponsored by the Chancellor's Office, which is designed to satisfy a mandate of the Student Success Act of 2012. The new assessment and placement process will replace Accuplacer, which the department has used since the late 1980s. The focus of the new assessment system will be on the use of multiple measures to place students into English

courses. The department is scheduled to implement the system in spring 2017 for placement of students into courses the following fall semester.

Moreover, within the field of developmental education/basic skills, remedial programs throughout the nation have undergone a great deal of scrutiny and criticism for the generally low rates at which basic skills students successfully meet their academic goals. Policymakers, think tanks, and researchers have advocated for various ways of redesigning and reforming developmental education. Some recommendations are justified and necessary, while others are overly prescriptive and simplistic. Overall, the main thrust of these efforts is to streamline the remediation process and allow for greater curricular efficiency for students. The department should engage thoughtfully with this research so that it can incorporate appropriate changes in an informed manner, and reject harmful reforms if necessary.

B. Explain the direction and vision of the program and how you plan to achieve it.

- While the Chancellor's Office has not released information on all components of the system, the department's initial assessment of the new system has resulted in a preliminary endorsement of the Chancellor's instrument, which is designed to link the department's developmental writing and reading curriculum to reading and English competency maps created by a statewide panel consisting of community college English instructors. The new instrument will include a writing sample, which is a promising element. Additional outcomes, such as high school GPA, may be used to refine student placement. Because about 14,000 students take the English placement test each year, accurate assessment of reading and writing is crucial. The English department is consequently eager to address the challenges of adopting a new assessment process during 2016-2017 and developing a placement model that prepares students for success in courses requiring college-level reading and writing proficiency. The placement test changes will more than likely result in changes to our reading and writing programs.
- We will develop an ongoing workshop series to consistently assess course outcomes in an effort to increase student success as students progress through our sequence of courses.
- We will develop an ongoing workshop series for faculty on cultural awareness, equity, and awareness of cultural capital in a continued effort to close the success gap of our Student Equity Plan (SEP) target populations.
- We will increase efforts to provide our SEP target populations with additional support services within our department.
- The department will pilot an early alert and retention program called English Composition Extend. This will mainly capture students in our SEP target populations. Ideally, this will eventually work in conjunction with the Starfish Early Alert program. This program has a few goals in mind. One, the program will ideally provide students greater access to faculty (during the pilot phase, this will be only one faculty member) who will be afforded the time to serve not only as teacher(s) but as mentor(s). Many of our struggling students not only face educational challenges, but they also tend to have more reasons to be off campus than on campus. The Extend program will aim at providing a center of gravity for students within the department. Furthermore, as the

campus transitions to multiple measures course placement, we anticipate more students will begin their coursework in ENGL 1A rather than one or more of the developmental courses. More than likely, this will translate to more students who will need additional help in order to successfully pass the transfer-level course. The Extend program can be a vehicle to bolster student success.

- The English department partnered with FYE and put on its first Summer Bridge Program, offering students an opportunity to increase their placement scores for reading and writing. This program was nothing short of a resounding success. Hence, we plan to grow the program in the future.
- We will continue investing in Myriad, El Camino's Creative Arts Journal, which was first published in 1962 (then under the name Impressions). Since the 1970s, Myriad has been publishing the short stories, poems, and artwork of El Camino College students yearly. The magazine is edited, designed, and published by students in ENGL 98: College Literary Magazine Editing and Publishing. Since 2006, Myriad partnered with a graphic design class, Art 143 taught by Joyce Dallal. Her students began to design the cover and layout for Myriad. Then in 2014, ECC journalism professor Kate McLaughlin entered Myriad into the College Media Association's contest for two-year colleges' literary magazine of the year. Myriad was awarded second place.
- With the creation of ENGL 1AH, ENGL 1BH, and ENGL 1CH (see Curriculum), the department will continue to support the curricular needs of our Honors Transfer Program students. In doing so, we wish to be a vital asset in helping these committed students reach their transfer goals.

C. List any related recommendations.

- Expand Integrated Reading and Writing (see recommendations under Analysis of Institutional Research and Planning Data)
- Expand Summer Bridge Reading and Writing Program (see recommendations under Analysis of Institutional Research and Planning Data)
- Increase Professional Development for Instructors in Best Practices in Basic Skills Instruction (see recommendations under Analysis of Institutional Research and Planning Data)
- Support English Composition Extend, analyze the benefits of the program, and explore the most effective approaches to scaling up and institutionalizing the support offered through the program
 - Cost: approximately \$5,000/year
- Implement the Common Assessment for reading and writing placement, and ensure that placement methods promote student success in English basic skills (reading and composition) and transfer-level composition courses.
 - Cost: approximately \$4,000 during the first year of research, analysis, and planning

Prioritized Recommendations

Provide a single, prioritized list of recommendations and needs for your program/department (drawn from your recommendations in sections 2-8). Include cost estimates and list the college strategic initiative that supports each recommendation (see Appendix A). Use the following chart format to organize your recommendations.

| Prioritized Recommendations | | Approximate Cost | S.I. |
|------------------------------------|--|-------------------------|-------------|
| 1 | Create Department Chair Position (See Staffing) | \$48,000 annually | A |
| 2 | Expand Integrated Reading and Writing Courses (see Analysis of IR and Planning Data) | \$25,000 over 3 yrs. | B |
| 3 | Increase Professional Development for Instructors in Best Practices in Basic Skills Instruction (see Analysis of IR and Planning Data) | \$15,000 annually | A |
| 4 | Expand Summer Bridge Reading and Writing Program (see Analysis of IR and Planning Data) | \$130,000 over 3 yrs. | B |
| 5 | Maintain and Update SMART Classrooms Devices (see Technology and Software) | \$10,000 annually | F |
| 6 | Institutionalize Second Embedded Tutor in Basic Skills Composition Courses (see Analysis of IR and Planning Data) | \$60,000 annually | B |

| | | | |
|----|--|---------------------------|---|
| 7 | Further Support the Writing Center (see Staffing) | \$38,000 annually | B |
| 8 | Continue to Regularly Hire Full-time Faculty (see Staffing) | \$450,000 for 5 new hires | A |
| 9 | Revise English 80/Explore Non-Credit Basic Skills Certificate (see Analysis of IR and Planning Data) | None | B |
| 10 | Increase Online/Hybrid Offerings and Increase Faculty and Student Support (see Analysis of IR and Planning Data) | \$7,000 annually | F |
| 11 | Support English Composition Extend (see Future Direction and Vision) | \$5,000 annually | B |
| 12 | Increase Communication with Feeder High Schools (see Analysis of IR and Planning Data) | \$10,000 annually | D |

This list was prioritized based on what would best serve students and what would best support faculty. It was also informed by feasibility, where the momentum and enthusiasm exists in our department, and availability of existing resources.

Appendix A: English SLO Alignment Grid

| HUMANITIES Institutional (ILO), Program (PLO), and Course (SLO) Alignment | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|--|--|---|--|--|--|--|---|---|---|
| Program: English | | | Number of Courses: 37 | | Date Updated: 01.13.2015 | | Submitted by: Kevin Degnan, ext. 3355 | | | |
| ILOs | 1. Critical Thinking <i>Students apply critical, creative and analytical skills to identify and solve problems, analyze information, synthesize and evaluate ideas, and transform existing ideas into new forms.</i> | | 2. Communication <i>Students effectively communicate with and respond to varied audiences in written, spoken or signed, and artistic forms.</i> | | 3. Community and Personal Development <i>Students are productive and engaged members of society, demonstrating personal responsibility, and community and social awareness through their engagement in campus programs and services.</i> | | 4. Information Literacy <i>Students determine an information need and use various media and formats to develop a research strategy and locate, evaluate, document, and use information to accomplish a specific purpose. Students demonstrate an understanding of the legal, social, and ethical aspects related to information use.</i> | | | |
| | SLO-PLO-ILO ALIGNMENT NOTES: <i>Mark boxes with an ‘X’ if: SLO/PLO is a major focus or an important part of the course/program; direct instruction or some direct instruction is provided; students are evaluated multiple times (and possibly in various ways) throughout the course or are evaluated on the concepts once or twice within the course.</i> <i>DO NOT mark with an ‘X’ if: SLO/PLO is a minor focus of the course/program and some instruction is given in the area but students are not formally evaluated on the concepts; or if the SLO/PLO is minimally or not at all part of the course/program.</i> | | | | | | | | | |
| PLOs | | | | | | | PLO to ILO Alignment <i>(Mark with an X)</i> | | | |
| | | | | | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| PLO #1 Composition Writing Students will demonstrate readiness for transfer-level composition courses by composing an appropriately developed expository essay that integrates and documents sources. The essay should include an introduction with a thesis, body paragraphs with topic sentences, a conclusion and a Works Cited page, and be relatively free of errors in grammar and mechanics. | | | | | | | X | X | | X |
| PLO #2 Literary Knowledge Students will demonstrate knowledge of literary elements, and familiarity with authors and cultural contexts of representative works. | | | | | | | X | | | |
| PLO #3 MLA Formatting Students will create a thesis-driven, coherent, unified, and well-developed essay in MLA format that demonstrates reading and writing competence at the transfer level. | | | | | | | X | X | | X |

| | | | | |
|--|---|---|--|---|
| PLO #4 Creative Writing Process Students will demonstrate knowledge of the creative writing process, an understanding of a variety of creative writing conventions, the ability to critique the work of others, and the ability to produce and revise their own written work within a specific creative genre. | X | X | | |
| PLO #5 Analysis and Comprehension Skills Students will give evidence of preparedness for transfer-level composition courses by successfully comprehending and analyzing essaylength non-fiction texts written for college-bound readers at both literal and critical levels of meaning. | X | | | X |

| SLOs | SLO to PLO Alignment (Mark with an X) | | | | | COURSE to ILO Alignment (Mark with an X) | | | |
|--|--|----|----|----|----|---|---|---|---|
| | P1 | P2 | P3 | P4 | P5 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| ENGL 12 Introduction to Fiction: SLO #1 Examine short stories and novels analytically and interpretively, to identify and analyze literary elements like plot, character, setting, tone, point of view, theme, style, symbol, metaphor, and image. | | X | | | | X | | | X |
| ENGL 12 Introduction to Fiction: SLO #2 Compare and contrast authors' treatments of theme, character, and subject matter, as well as synthesize diverse critical studies of a given author or particular short stories or novels. | | X | | | | | | | |
| ENGL 12 Introduction to Fiction: SLO #3 Trace the historical development of the short story and the novel by examining selected representational works. | | X | | | | | | | |
| ENGL 15A Survey of British Literature: SLO #1 Upon completion of the course, students will identify representative works of major British authors from the Medieval, Early Modern, Restoration, and 18th Century periods, and examine their literary genres, devices, conventions, and poetic elements. | | X | | | | X | | | X |
| ENGL 15A Survey of British Literature: SLO #2 Upon completion of the course, students will perform literary analysis on representative works from the periods covered by the course, interpreting linguistic or formal features, and displaying awareness of relevant cultural and historical backgrounds. | | X | | | | | | | |
| ENGL 15A Survey of British Literature: SLO #3 Upon completion of the course, students will research, evaluate, and synthesize secondary material, and incorporate that material into a term paper that interprets a work of British literature from the Anglo-Saxon period through the 18th century. | | X | | | | | | | |
| ENGL 15B Survey of British Literature: SLO #1 Upon completion of the course, students will identify representative works of major British authors from the Romantic, Victorian, Modern, and Postmodern (post-1945) periods and their literary forms, elements, styles, and concerns. | | X | | | | X | | | X |

| | | | | | | | | | |
|---|--|---|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| ENGL 15B Survey of British Literature: SLO #2 Upon completion of the course, students will analyze representative works from the periods covered by the course in terms of relevant cultural and historical backgrounds and literary, linguistic, and formal features. | | X | | | | | | | |
| ENGL 15B Survey of British Literature: SLO #3 Upon completion of the course, students will research, evaluate, and synthesize secondary sources, and incorporate these sources into a term paper that interprets a work of British literature from the late 18th century through the present. | | X | | | | | | | |

| SLOs | SLO to PLO Alignment (Mark with an X) | | | | | COURSE to ILO Alignment (Mark with an X) | | | |
|---|--|----|----|----|----|---|---|---|---|
| | P1 | P2 | P3 | P4 | P5 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| ENGL 1A Reading and Composition: SLO #1 Complete a research-based essay that has been written out of class and undergone revision. It should demonstrate the student's ability to thoughtfully support a single thesis using analysis and synthesis. | | | X | | | | | | |
| ENGL 1A Reading and Composition: SLO #2 Integrate multiple sources, including a book-length work and a variety of academic databases, peer-reviewed journals, and scholarly websites. Citations must be in MLA format and include a Works Cited page. | | | X | | | X | X | | X |
| ENGL 1A Reading and Composition: SLO #3 Demonstrate logical paragraph composition and sentence structure. The essay should have correct grammar, spelling, and word use. | | | X | | | | | | |
| ENGL 1B Literature and Composition: SLO #1 Write an out-of-class, thesis-driven essay that identifies and analyzes the literary elements of a primary text (plot, theme, setting, point of view, character, style, symbol, etc.). | | X | X | | | | | | |
| ENGL 1B Literature and Composition: SLO #2 Effectively incorporate quotations from a primary text. | | | X | | | X | X | | X |
| ENGL 1B Literature and Composition: SLO #3 Effectively utilize scholarly sources as secondary support. | | | X | | | | | | |
| ENGL 1C Critical Thinking and Composition: SLO #1 Compose an argumentative essay that shows an ability to support a claim using analysis, elements of argumentation, and integration of primary and secondary sources. | | | X | | | | | | |
| ENGL 1C Critical Thinking and Composition: SLO #2 Identify and assess bias, credibility, and relevance in their own arguments and in the arguments of others, including primary and secondary outside sources. | | | X | | | X | X | | X |

| | | | | | | | | | |
|--|--|---|---|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| ENGL 1C Critical Thinking and Composition: SLO #3 Write an essay that is correct in MLA format, paragraph composition, sentence structure, grammar, spelling, and usage. | | | X | | | | | | |
| ENGL 20 Shakespeare's Plays - Tragedies and Romances: SLO #1 Analyze representative Shakespearean tragedies and romances in terms of the language, characters, and themes. | | X | | | | | | | |
| ENGL 20 Shakespeare's Plays - Tragedies and Romances: SLO #2 Demonstrate knowledge of Elizabethan history and culture. | | X | | | | | | | |
| ENGL 20 Shakespeare's Plays - Tragedies and Romances: SLO #3 Identify, and illustrate with examples, the elements of classical tragedy. | | X | | | | | | | |
| ENGL 20 Shakespeare's Plays - Tragedies and Romances: SLO #4 Demonstrate an ability to read, summarize, and evaluate critical analysis of Shakespeare's work. | | X | | | | | | | |

| SLOs | SLO to PLO Alignment (Mark with an X) | | | | | COURSE to ILO Alignment (Mark with an X) | | | |
|---|--|----|----|----|----|---|---|---|---|
| | P1 | P2 | P3 | P4 | P5 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| ENGL 21 Shakespeare's Plays - Comedies and Histories: SLO #1 Analyze representative Shakespearean comedies and histories in terms of the language, characters, and themes. | | X | | | | | | | |
| ENGL 21 Shakespeare's Plays - Comedies and Histories: SLO #2 Demonstrate knowledge of Elizabethan history and culture. | | X | | | | | | | |
| ENGL 21 Shakespeare's Plays - Comedies and Histories: SLO #3 Identify, and illustrate with examples, the elements of classical comedy. | | X | | | | | | | |
| ENGL 21 Shakespeare's Plays - Comedies and Histories: SLO #4 Demonstrate ability to read, summarize, and evaluate critical analysis of Shakespeare's works. | | X | | | | | | | |
| ENGL 24A Creative Writing: Introduction to Poetry: SLO #1 Compose, revise, discuss and critique their own poems and the poems of others incorporating knowledge of poetic terms and techniques, conventions, and forms. | | | | X | | | | | |
| ENGL 24A Creative Writing: Introduction to Poetry: SLO #2 Recognize, define, and identify poetic terms and genres. | | | | X | | | | | |
| ENGL 24A Creative Writing: Introduction to Poetry: SLO #3 Identify common poetic meters and rhyme schemes and apply them to their writing. | | | | X | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|--|---|--|---|--|---|---|--|--|--|--|
| ENGL 25A Creative Writing: Introduction to the Craft of Fiction: SLO #1 Identify and utilize specific strategies for creating character, setting, dialogue, and plot in short fiction. | | | | X | | X | X | | | | |
| ENGL 25A Creative Writing: Introduction to the Craft of Fiction: SLO #2 Compose a 12-20 page short story demonstrating their competency with those elements of fiction. | | | | X | | | | | | | |
| ENGL 25A Creative Writing: Introduction to the Craft of Fiction: SLO #3 Respond to the evaluations of their short stories given by their peers. | | | | X | | | | | | | |
| ENGL 27 Children’s Literature: SLO #1 Demonstrate an understanding and appreciation of prevalent archetypal themes, plots and characters in children’s literature. | | X | | | | X | | | | | |
| ENGL 27 Children’s Literature: SLO #2 Analyze literary elements of children’s literature in a specific story or in a series of interrelated stories using specific evidence from the story/stories. | | X | | | | | | | | | |
| ENGL 27 Children’s Literature: SLO #3 Compare and evaluate classic and contemporary works of children's literature, using various literary criticisms such as psychological and feminist criticisms. | | X | | | | | | | | | |

| SLOs | SLO to PLO Alignment <i>(Mark with an X)</i> | | | | | COURSE to ILO Alignment <i>(Mark with an X)</i> | | | |
|--|---|----|----|----|----|--|---|---|---|
| | P1 | P2 | P3 | P4 | P5 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| ENGL 28 Images of Women in Literature: SLO #1 inactivating? Upon completion of the course, successful students will identify female archetypes, women’s roles, and women’s themes in a variety of literary forms by both male and female writers from diverse historical, cultural, regional and ethnic backgrounds. | | X | | | | X | X | | |
| ENGL 28 Images of Women in Literature: SLO #2 Upon successful completion of the course, students will demonstrate how literary elements, such as plot, point of view, character, theme, symbolism, irony, and style, contribute to the portrayal of women in literary works. | | X | | | | | | | |
| ENGL 28 Images of Women in Literature: SLO #3 Upon successful completion of the course, students will compose a college-level essay analyzing a literary work or works in terms of literary elements, women’s themes, women’s roles, and female archetypes. | | X | X | | | | | | |
| ENGL 30 English Bible as Literature: SLO #1 WRONG SLO Identify and analyze representative works of the Hebrew Scriptures and the New Testament in terms of literary genres, tone, fundamental themes, historical and cultural ideologies, and biblical scholarship. | | X | | | | X | | | |

| | | | | | | | | | |
|---|--|---|--|--|--|--|---|--|--|
| ENGL 30 English Bible as Literature: SLO #2WRONG SLO Demonstrate knowledge of the principle divisions of the Bible and will recall and identify major names and characters found in the Bible. | | X | | | | | | | |
| ENGL 30 English Bible as Literature: SLO #3 WRONG SLO Recognize and discuss symbolism and figurative language used throughout the Bible as well as describe and explain background information pertaining to the ancient Middle East. | | X | | | | | | | |
| ENGL 31 Mythology and Folklore: SLO #1 Show understanding of representative myths and folktales in terms of fundamental themes, archetypal images, symbolism, historical and cultural contexts, and critical analysis. | | X | | | | | | | |
| ENGL 31 Mythology and Folklore: SLO #2 Identify the differences between myth and folklore as well as recognize names, symbols, creatures, and heroes in various myths and folktales. | | X | | | | | | | |
| ENGL 31 Mythology and Folklore: SLO #3 Identify and assess cultural differences as seen in the styles, subject matter, and level of sophistication of various mythological writings. | | X | | | | | X | | |
| ENGL 31 Mythology and Folklore: SLO #4 Identify mythological allusions found in diverse literatures and assess representative myths in terms of their effectiveness in expressing the relationship of individuals to society and humankind's understanding of the cosmos. | | X | | | | | | | |

| SLOs | SLO to PLO Alignment (Mark with an X) | | | | | COURSE to ILO Alignment (Mark with an X) | | | |
|--|---|----|----|----|----|--|---|---|---|
| | P1 | P2 | P3 | P4 | P5 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| ENGL 32 Creative Writing: A workshop in Fiction: SLO #1 Utilize specific strategies for creating character, setting, dialogue, and plot in their own short fiction. | | | | X | | | | | |
| ENGL 32 Creative Writing: A workshop in Fiction: SLO #2 Compose two 12-20 page short stories demonstrating their competency with those elements of fiction. | | | | X | | | | | |
| ENGL 32 Creative Writing: A workshop in Fiction: SLO #3 Respond to the evaluations of their short stories given by their peers in the revision of their two short stories. | | | | X | | X | X | | |
| ENGL 34 The Short Story: SLO #1 Explore, analyze, and evaluate representative work(s) in the short story genre from a variety of perspectives or theories, such as feminist, psychoanalytical, queer and postcolonial. | | X | | | | | | | |
| ENGL 34 The Short Story: SLO #2 Assess short story narratives through traditional literary elements such as character, plot, setting, theme, | | X | | | | X | | | |

| | | | | | | | | | |
|--|--|---|---|--|--|--|---|--|--|
| narrative voice and symbolic patterns. | | | | | | | | | |
| ENGL 34 The Short Story: SLO #3 Understand and critique short story narratives from more universally significant perspectives and contexts, such as social-historical, gender, ethnic, sexual orientation, socio-economic and religious. | | X | | | | | | | |
| ENGL 35 World Literature, 3500 BCE to 1650 CE: SLO #1 Demonstrate an understanding of literary elements such as plot, point of view, character, theme, symbolism, irony, and style in representative works of African, Asian/Pacific Islander, European, Latin American, and Middle Eastern cultures written before 1650 CE. | | X | | | | | | | |
| ENGL 35 World Literature, 3500 BCE to 1650 CE: SLO #2 Analyze representative texts of African, Asian/Pacific Islander, European, Latin American, and Middle Eastern cultures written before 1650 CE in terms of literary elements, cultural contexts, genre, and/or authors. | | X | | | | | X | | |
| ENGL 35 World Literature, 3500 BCE to 1650 CE: SLO #3 Develop a thesis regarding representative texts of African, Asian/Pacific Islander, European, Latin American, or Middle Eastern cultures written since 1650 CE by employing organized, unified, coherent points that are supported by appropriate quotations from and references to the texts, using vocabulary appropriate to the subject, exhibiting correct sentence structure, and following MLA format for citations. | | X | X | | | | | | |

| SLOs | SLO to PLO Alignment (Mark with an X) | | | | | COURSE to ILO Alignment (Mark with an X) | | | |
|---|--|----|----|----|----|---|---|---|---|
| | P1 | P2 | P3 | P4 | P5 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| ENGL 36 World Literature, 1650 CE to Present: SLO #1 Demonstrate an understanding of literary elements such as plot, point of view, character, theme, symbolism, irony, and style in representative works of African, Asian/Pacific Islander, European, Latin American, and Middle Eastern cultures written since 1650 CE. | | X | | | | | | | |
| ENGL 36 World Literature, 1650 CE to Present: SLO #2 Analyze representative texts of African, Asian/Pacific Islander, European, Latin American, and Middle Eastern cultures written since 1650 CE in terms of literary elements, cultural contexts, genre, and/or authors. | | X | | | | X | | | |
| ENGL 36 World Literature, 1650 CE to Present: SLO #3 Develop a thesis regarding representative texts of African, Asian/Pacific Islander, European, Latin American, or Middle Eastern cultures written since 1650 CE by employing organized, unified, coherent points that are supported by appropriate quotations from and references to the texts, using vocabulary appropriate to the subject, exhibiting correct sentence structure, and following MLA format for citations. | | X | X | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|--|---|--|--|--|---|--|--|--|--|
| ENGL 39 Literature and Film: SLO #1 Analyze selected novels, plays, and short stories and compare them with corresponding film adaptations. | | X | | | | X | | | | |
| ENGL 39 Literature and Film: SLO #2 Evaluate the strengths and weaknesses of adapted works in comparison with the original printed versions. | | X | | | | | | | | |
| ENGL 39 Literature and Film: SLO #3 Demonstrate an ability to analyze basic techniques employed by screenwriters, filmmakers, and writers of fiction and/or drama. | | X | | | | | | | | |
| ENGL 40A American Literature: SLO #1 Students will be able to identify representative works of American literature from its beginnings through the Civil War. | | X | | | | X | | | | |
| ENGL 40A American Literature: SLO #2 Students will be able to analyze representative works of American literature from its beginnings through the Civil War. | | X | | | | | | | | |
| ENGL 40A American Literature: SLO #3 Students will be able to recognize social, historical, and ethnic influences in representative works of American literature from its beginnings through the Civil War. | | X | | | | | | | | |

| SLOs | SLO to PLO Alignment (Mark with an X) | | | | | COURSE to ILO Alignment (Mark with an X) | | | |
|--|---|----|----|----|----|--|---|---|---|
| | P1 | P2 | P3 | P4 | P5 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| ENGL 40B American Literature: SLO #1 Students will be able to identify representative works of American literature from the post-Civil War period until the present. | | X | | | | X | | | |
| ENGL 40B American Literature: SLO #2 Students will be able to analyze representative works of American literature from the post-Civil War period until the present. | | X | | | | | | | |
| ENGL 40B American Literature: SLO #3 Students will be able to recognize social, historical, and ethnic influences in representative works of American literature from the post-Civil War period until the present. | | X | | | | | | | |
| ENGL 41B Survey of Film: 1950 to the Present: SLO #1 Identify values and aesthetics such as film genres, people and pivotal events of post-1950s narrative films on an objective test. | | X | | | | X | X | | |
| ENGL 41B Survey of Film: 1950 to the Present: SLO #2 Compose an essay evaluating values, aesthetics, technical aspects such as plot, character, tone, point of view and imagery, and the cultural significance of films and in the post 1950s. | | X | | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | | | |
|--|--|---|---|--|--|---|---|--|---|
| ENGL 41B Survey of Film: 1950 to the Present: SLO #3 Compose an essay evaluating films from the 1950s era to present incorporating secondary sources such as film criticism and/or theory. | | X | | | | | | | |
| ENGL 42 Chicano and Latino Literature: SLO #1 Identify and analyze representative works of literature in terms of historical and cultural backgrounds, regional and ethnic experiences, and unifying themes and motifs that reflect the Chicano/Latino experience. | | X | | | | | | | |
| ENGL 42 Chicano and Latino Literature: SLO #2 Present a clear thesis that makes an interpretative argument about Chicano/Latino texts and that is developed through appropriate identification of representative cultural themes. | | X | | | | X | X | | X |
| ENGL 42 Chicano and Latino Literature: SLO #3 Support a thesis by including relevant quotations from primary and multiple secondary texts throughout the paper as well as detailed interpretation of these quotations. | | | | | | | | | |
| ENGL 42 Chicano and Latino Literature: SLO #4 Use correct MLA documentation methods as well as correct grammar, spelling and punctuation. | | X | X | | | | | | |

| SLOs | SLO to PLO Alignment (Mark with an X) | | | | | COURSE to ILO Alignment (Mark with an X) | | | |
|--|---|----|----|----|----|--|---|---|---|
| | P1 | P2 | P3 | P4 | P5 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| ENGL 43 African American Literature: SLO #1 Analyze representative works of African American literature in terms of its historical progression. | | X | | | | | | | |
| ENGL 43 African American Literature: SLO #2 Analyze representative works of African American literature in terms of cultural, regional, and ethnic considerations. | | X | | | | | | | |
| ENGL 43 African American Literature: SLO #3 Analyze representative works of African American literature in terms of unifying themes and motifs. | | X | | | | X | | | |
| ENGL 43 African American Literature: SLO #4 Assess how African-American literature relates to society as a whole and/or how it relates to other literature of the dominant culture. | | X | | | | | | | |
| ENGL 44 The Literature of American Ethnic Groups: SLO #1 Students will be able to identify and analyze representative works by authors of major ethnic groups in America, both by chronology and by theme. | | X | | | | | | | |
| ENGL 44 The Literature of American Ethnic Groups: SLO #2 Students will analyze representative works by contemporary authors of major ethnic groups in America, both by chronology and by theme. | | X | | | | X | | | |

| | | | | | | | | | |
|---|--|---|---|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| ENGL 44 The Literature of American Ethnic Groups: SLO #3 Students will develop a thesis regarding how a representative work by an author of a major ethnic group in America uses themes consistent to the genre. The writing will employ organized, unified, coherent points that are supported by appropriate quotations from and references to the text. It will also use vocabulary appropriate to the subject, exhibit correct sentence structure, and follow MLA format for citations. | | X | X | | | | | | |
| ENGL 48 Modern Literature of Latin America: SLO #1 Identify representative works of the modern literature of Latin America in terms of the historical, political and cultural backgrounds, literary movements such as modernism, postmodernism and surrealism, and unifying themes and styles reflected in the literature. | | X | | | | | | | |
| ENGL 48 Modern Literature of Latin America: SLO #2 Analyze representative works of the modern literature of Latin America in terms of the historical, political and cultural backgrounds, literary movements such as modernism, postmodernism and surrealism, and unifying themes and styles reflected in the literature. | | X | | | | | | | |
| ENGL 48 Modern Literature of Latin America: SLO #3 Identify literary aspects such as symbols, themes, characters, point of view, mood, tone, setting, plot, and style as found in the selected works of the authors surveyed. | | X | | | | | | | |
| ENGL 48 Modern Literature of Latin America: SLO #4 Analyze literary aspects such as symbols, themes, characters, point of view, mood, tone, setting, plot, and style as found in the selected works of the authors surveyed. | | X | | | | | | | |

| SLOs | SLO to PLO Alignment (Mark with an X) | | | | | COURSE to ILO Alignment (Mark with an X) | | | |
|--|--|----|----|----|----|---|---|---|---|
| | P1 | P2 | P3 | P4 | P5 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| ENGL 50RWA Integrated Reading and Writing: SLO #1 Demonstrate literal and inferential comprehension of non-fiction works. | | | | | X | | | | |
| ENGL 50RWA Integrated Reading and Writing: SLO #2 Read a college-level text and develop an analytical response that demonstrates college-readiness. | | | | | X | | | | |
| ENGL 50RWA Integrated Reading and Writing: SLO #3 Write a multi-paragraph thesis-driven expository essay that has undergone revision and demonstrates readiness for college-level writing. | X | | | | | X | X | | |
| ENGL 50RWA Integrated Reading and Writing: SLO #4 Demonstrate familiarity with MLA formatting, MLA source-documentation, and basic research techniques. | X | | | | | | | | |
| ENGL 78 Creative Writing: Screenwriting: SLO #1 Develop a film story with a first, second, and third act, and the scenes written for that story will adhere to proper screenplay format by including headings, scene descriptions, and dialogue. | | | | X | | | X | | |

| | | | | | | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|---|---|---|--|--|--|
| ENGL 78 Creative Writing: Screenwriting: SLO #2 Demonstrate the ability to create a 3-act story that must include scenes from their story's first, second, and third acts. | | | | X | | | | | |
| ENGL 78 Creative Writing: Screenwriting: SLO #3 Demonstrate the ability to develop a story for film that includes at least 20 pages of scenes written for his/her film story. | | | | X | | | | | |
| ENGL 80 Basic Language Skills: SLO #1 Students will demonstrate their ability to recognize context clues that assist with vocabulary acquisition necessary to comprehend paragraph-length non-fiction texts written at the 5th-8th grade level (a Lexile range of 800-960). | | | | | X | | | | |
| ENGL 80 Basic Language Skills: SLO #2 Students will demonstrate their ability to employ fluency strategies necessary to comprehend paragraphlength non-fiction texts written at the 5th-8th grade level (a Lexile range of 800-960). | | | | | X | X | | | |
| ENGL 80 Basic Language Skills: SLO #3 Students will demonstrate their ability to apply study skills necessary to comprehend paragraph-length non-fiction texts written at the 5th-8th grade level (a Lexile range of 800-960). | | | | | X | | | | |

| SLOs | SLO to PLO Alignment (Mark with an X) | | | | | COURSE to ILO Alignment (Mark with an X) | | | |
|--|--|----|----|----|----|---|---|---|---|
| | P1 | P2 | P3 | P4 | P5 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| ENGL 82 Introduction to Reading Skills: SLO #1 Students will demonstrate their ability to recognize context clues that assist with vocabulary acquisition necessary to comprehend and analyze multi-paragraph non-fiction texts written at the 9th-12th grade level (a Lexile range of 1000-1200). | | | | | X | | | | |
| ENGL 82 Introduction to Reading Skills: SLO #2 Students will demonstrate their ability to employ comprehension strategies necessary to comprehend multi-paragraph non-fiction texts written at the 9th-12th grade level (a Lexile range of 1000-1200). | | | | | X | X | | | |
| ENGL 82 Introduction to Reading Skills: SLO #3 Students will demonstrate their ability to analyze multi-paragraph non-fiction texts written at the 9th-12th grade level (a Lexile range of 1000-1200). | | | | | X | | | | |
| ENGL 84 Developmental Reading and Writing: SLO #1 Students will demonstrate their ability to recognize context clues that assist with vocabulary acquisition necessary to comprehend and analyze non-fiction texts written at the college freshman level (a Lexile range of 1250-1300). | | | | | X | X | | | |

| | | | | | | | | | |
|--|---|--|--|---|---|---|---|--|--|
| ENGL 84 Developmental Reading and Writing: SLO #2 Students will demonstrate their ability to employ comprehension strategies necessary to comprehend nonfiction texts written at the college freshman level (a Lexile range of 1250-1300). | | | | | X | | | | |
| ENGL 84 Developmental Reading and Writing: SLO #3 Students will demonstrate their ability to analyze nonfiction texts written at the college freshman level (a Lexile range of 1250-1300). | | | | | X | | | | |
| ENGL 98abcd College Literary Magazine Editing and Publishing: SLO #1 Employ effective methods for publicizing, collecting and organizing submissions for literary journals. | | | | X | | | | | |
| ENGL 98abcd College Literary Magazine Editing and Publishing: SLO #2 Fairly evaluate creative works for inclusion in a literary journal. | | | | X | | | | | |
| ENGL 98abcd College Literary Magazine Editing and Publishing: SLO #3 Use computer software to compose the layout and publish a literary journal in a manner consistent with other college literary journals. | | | | X | | X | X | | |
| ENGL A Writing the College Essay: SLO #1 Compose a coherent, unified multi-paragraph expository essay that has undergone revision and relates to a text discussed in class. | X | | | | | X | X | | |

| SLOs | SLO to PLO Alignment (Mark with an X) | | | | | COURSE to ILO Alignment (Mark with an X) | | | |
|--|--|----|----|----|----|---|---|---|---|
| | P1 | P2 | P3 | P4 | P5 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| ENGL A Writing the College Essay: SLO #2 Compose introductory paragraphs with a thesis, body paragraphs with topic sentences, and concluding paragraphs. | X | | | | | | | | |
| ENGL A Writing the College Essay: SLO #3 Demonstrate the ability to incorporate and document material from outside sources. | X | | | | | | | | |
| ENGL A Writing the College Essay: SLO #4 Use basic rules of grammar, spelling, usage, and punctuation so that the ideas are clear. | X | | | | | | | | |
| ENGL A Writing the College Essay: SLO #5 Utilize MLA style for formatting and documentation. | X | | | | | | | | |

| SLOs | SLO to PLO Alignment (Mark with an X) | | | | | COURSE to ILO Alignment (Mark with an X) | | | |
|---|--|----|----|----|----|---|---|---|---|
| | P1 | P2 | P3 | P4 | P5 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| ENGL B Introduction to College Writing: SLO #1 Apply appropriate strategies in the writing process including prewriting, composing, revising, and editing techniques. | | | | | X | X | | | |
| ENGL B Introduction to College Writing: SLO #2 Write paragraphs based on personal experience and observations that have undergone multiple revisions and respond to a text discussed in class. | | | | | X | | | | |
| ENGL B Introduction to College Writing: SLO #3 Compose logically organized and focused paragraphs that include a clear topic sentence and provide specific supporting details. | | | | | X | | | | |
| ENGL B Introduction to College Writing: SLO #4 Use basic rules of grammar, spelling, usage, and punctuation so that the ideas are clear, and follow MLA guidelines to format a document (heading, indentation, spacing, font, centered title). | | | | | X | | | | |
| HUMA 1 An Introduction to the Humanities: SLO #1 Students will demonstrate their understanding of the humanities by composing college level essays that describe significant works of film, drama, music, literature, painting, sculpture, and architecture. | | X | | | | X | | | |
| HUMA 1 An Introduction to the Humanities: SLO #2 Students will demonstrate their understanding of the humanities by composing college level essays that analyze and interpret significant works of film, drama, music, literature, painting, sculpture, and architecture. | | X | | | | | | | |
| HUMA 1 An Introduction to the Humanities: SLO #3 Students will demonstrate their understanding of the humanities by composing college-level essays that connect these works to the historical eras in which these works were produced, the concepts that define them and the artists who produced them. | | X | X | | | | | | |
| *TUTR 200 Theory and Practice of Tutoring: SLO #1 Students/prospective tutors will understand how to assess the tutee's learning needs. | | | | | | | | | |
| *TUTR 200 Theory and Practice of Tutoring: SLO #2 Students/prospective tutors will understand how to apply tutoring methods, strategies and learning theories to a tutoring session. | | | | | | | | | |
| *TUTR 200 Theory and Practice of Tutoring: SLO #3 Students/prospective tutors will understand how to effectively communicate with a diverse student population. | | | | | | | | | |

*Unique standalone course outside regular English curriculum. It is fully assessed on a regular timeline but does not align with Program-Level Outcomes.

| SLOs | SLO to PLO Alignment (Mark with an X) | | | | | COURSE to ILO Alignment (Mark with an X) | | | |
|--|---|----|----|----|----|--|---|---|---|
| | P1 | P2 | P3 | P4 | P5 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| (Compton-Only Course) ENGL C Basic English Skills: SLO #1 Write a paragraph using personal narrative or description with a topic sentence, supporting details, and a concluding sentence. The paragraph should use basic rules of grammar, usage, spelling, and punctuation. | | | | | X | X | | | |
| ENGL C Basic English Skills: SLO #2 Demonstrate understanding of sentence structure, punctuation, spelling and capitalization. | | | | | X | | | | |
| ENGL C Basic English Skills: SLO #3 Identify mains ideas, supporting details in a short reading passage. | | | | | X | | | | |

Appendix B: English PLO Statements, Associated Courses, & Timeline

| PLO Number | PLO Statement | Associated Courses |
|---------------|--|---|
| English PLO 1 | Students will comprehend non-fiction essays written at the 12th grade level for analytic meaning. | ENGL 80, 82, 84 |
| English PLO 2 | Students will demonstrate readiness for transfer-level composition courses by composing an appropriately developed expository essay that integrates and documents sources. The essay should include an introduction with a thesis, body paragraphs with topic sentences, a conclusion and a Works Cited page, and be relatively free of errors in grammar and mechanics. | ENGL C, B, A |
| English PLO 3 | Students will demonstrate readiness for transfer-level composition courses by composing an appropriately developed expository essay that integrates and documents sources. The essay should include an introduction with a thesis, body paragraphs with topic sentences, a conclusion and a Works Cited page, and be relatively free of errors in grammar and mechanics. | ENGL 1A, 1B, 1C |
| English PLO 4 | Students will demonstrate knowledge of literary elements and familiarity with authors and cultural contexts of representative works. | ENGL 12, 15A, 15B, 20, 21, 26, 27, 30, 35, 36, 39, 40A, 40B, 42, 43, 48 |
| English PLO 5 | Students will demonstrate knowledge of the creative writing process, an understanding of a variety of creative writing conventions, the ability to critique the work of others, and the ability to produce and revise their own written work within a specific creative genre. | ENGL 24AB, 25A, 78, 98ABCD |

English PLO Assessment Timeline

Year 1: (beginning in Fall 2014) PLOs 1 and 5

Year 2: (beginning in Fall 2015) PLO 3

Year 3: (beginning in Fall 2016) PLOs 2 and 4

This three-year cycle will repeat in Fall 2017 and every third year after that.