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## 1. Program Description

The English department offers two accelerated learning programs: English 102/21, College Reading/Introduction to College Reading, and English 100/22, Composition I/Introduction to Composition. We also offer English 20, Reading and Writing Essentials, which combines reading and writing instruction for students who do not place into the English 102/21 and English 100/22 ALP courses.

Course Learning Outcomes (CLOs) for English 21:

1. Effectively use entry-level college vocabulary;
2. Comprehend various types of entry-level written and visual college material;
3. Demonstrate application of varied reading strategies to entry-level college texts.

Course Learning Outcomes (CLOs) for English 102:

1. Apply reading and study skills for success in college-level courses;
2. Demonstrate increased vocabulary, as well as skills in decoding unknown words through context clues, word construction, and origin;
3. Distinguish between stated or implied main ideas and supporting details as well as locate specific information;
4. Analyze, organize, evaluate, and synthesize ideas from textbooks, periodicals, literature, and Internet sources;
5. Recognize different literary elements in both fiction and nonfiction works;
6. Demonstrate increased proficiency (speed and comprehension) in reading collegelevel materials across a range of genres and disciplines;
7. Effectively access library resources and appropriately cite these materials when writing accurate paraphrases and summaries.

Course Learning Outcomes (CLOs) for English 22:

1. Effectively use a multi-step writing process that includes drafting, revising, and editing; respond constructively to written and oral feedback
2. Write compositions that have a main point and supporting ideas developed with specific, logically organized details
3. Integrate source material according to academic conventions
4. Proofread for effective grammar, word choice, punctuation, and spelling

Course Learning Outcomes (CLOs) for English 100:

1. Compose college-level writing with a clear purpose, in a form appropriate to intended audiences;
2. Demonstrate critical thinking in the process of writing;
3. Document credible sources in accordance with an appropriate style guide.

## 2. Analysis of the Program

Strengths and weaknesses in terms of demand, efficiency, and effectiveness based on an analysis of the Quantitative Indicators. CTE programs must include an analysis of Perkins Core indicators for which the program did not meet the performance level. Include Significant Program Actions (new certificates, stop outs, gain/loss of positions, results of prior year's action plan).

| Table 1. Percent of New Students Attempting English in their First Year |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Fall <br> Semester | New Students $\mathbf{1}$ | Enrolled in <br> Any English | \% Enrolled | Did Not Enroll | \% Not <br> Enrolled |
| Fall 2016 | 487 | 278 | $57 \%$ | 209 | $43 \%$ |
| Fall 2017 | 482 | 276 | $57 \%$ | 206 | $43 \%$ |
| Fall 2018 | 411 | 249 | $61 \%$ | 162 | $39 \%$ |

${ }^{1}$ Entering fall as first-time freshmen or first-time at campus transfers, no prior English courses, classified, degree-seeking only.

Table 1 (above) shows that in Fall 2018, the number of students taking English in the first year increased; however, since the data only includes writing courses, this number would be higher if reading courses were also included as many students take reading courses before writing courses. Also, we do not currently have a policy that requires students to enroll into English courses within their first year, and students are not always advised to take English in the first year.

Table 2. Strategic Directions: College-Level English Completion by Placement, New Students ${ }^{1}$

| English <br> Placement | AY 2016-17 |  |  | AY 2017-18 |  |  | AY 2018-19 |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | Enrolled | Completed <br> 2 | \% <br> Completed <br> College <br> Level | Enrolled | Completed <br> 2 | Completed <br> College <br> Level | Enrolled | Completed\% <br> 2 <br> Completed <br> College <br> Level |  |
| College | 290 | 164 | $57 \%$ | 296 | 163 | $55 \%$ | 209 | 117 | $56 \%$ |
| 1-level | 97 | 36 | $37 \%$ | 69 | 19 | $28 \%$ | 37 | 18 | $49 \%$ |
| 2+ levels | 46 | 7 | $15 \%$ | 58 | 25 | $43 \%$ | 11 | 0 | $0 \%$ |
| No <br> Placeme <br> nt | 6 | 4 | $67 \%$ | 19 | 9 | $47 \%$ | 15 | 10 | $67 \%$ |
| TOTAL | 439 | 211 | $48 \%$ | 442 | 216 | $49 \%$ | 272 | 145 | $53 \%$ |

${ }^{1}$ First-time attempters/enrolled in English; no prior subject history; classified, degree-seeking only.
${ }^{2}$ Completed within one semester for College and 1-level, within two semesters for 2+ and no placement levels.

The data in Table 2 suggests that we need to reexamine our placement options to ensure that students are correctly placed. For example, the number of students completing college-level English with no placement is higher in AY 2016-2017 and in 2018-2019 than students who did place into college-level English. Many factors may affect the data for placement shown above, so we need to carefully examine all placement options for accuracy.

| Table 3. English Course Completion Rates, All Students |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| English <br> Course | AY 2016-17 |  |  | AY 2017-18 |  |  | AY 2018-19 |  |  |
|  | Enrolled | Completed | \% <br> Completed | Enrolled | Completed | $\%$ <br> Completed | Enrolled | Completed | $\%$ <br> Completed |
| 100 | 871 | 545 | $63 \%$ | 793 | 452 | $57 \%$ | 733 | 436 | $59 \%$ |
| 20 W | 84 | 57 | $68 \%$ | 25 | 15 | $60 \%$ | 13 | 4 | $31 \%$ |
| 22 | 201 | 109 | $54 \%$ | 135 | 83 | $61 \%$ | 105 | 67 | $64 \%$ |
| 97 | - | - | - | 31 | 19 | $61 \%$ | 18 | 14 | $78 \%$ |

Table 3 shows English course completion rates for all students. Again, this data only contains information for writing courses and excludes reading courses. It is unclear from the data provided why the success rates were higher overall in AY 16-17 than AY 17-18. It may be due, in part, to new faculty who were teaching these courses for the first time. We also have an unfilled English position, which has not been filled for two years, and we have had to use lecturers to teach some of these courses. We recently lost two long-time lecturers, too, who were experienced in teaching writing courses.

## 3. Program Student Learning Outcomes

Co-Requisite ENG assessments are reported in the Liberal Arts Annual Program Review.

## 4. Action Plan

1. Begin collecting data on the PD Strategy and its effect on student success.
2. Work with our Pathway Coordinator and STAR builders to be sure English is in the first year of a student's Pathway.
3. Work with the Student Success Coordinator, Academic Affairs and Counseling on English Placement cut scores to be sure that they are accurate.

## 5. Resource Implications

Though not Health and Safety, we need continued funding for lecturer costs for reassigned time. Since we have a position to fill, we are relying on lecturers to teach our ALP courses (ENG 100/22 and ENG 102/21).

