1– 3. Enrollment, Achievement, and HR Data

Response:

1. Enrollment

Student Overall Annual Enrollment in English Department coursework saw a 9% decrease from 2009-10 to 2010-11 due principally to course reduction, while there was also a slight reduction of 1% from 2010-11 to 2011-12 when course reductions were less drastic. A comparison of Overall Enrollment by term reveals an interesting detail: the 2009 fall enrollment to spring 2010 enrollment decreased 3%, but in the two subsequent years’ fall-to-spring term comparisons, spring enrollment increased beyond fall by between 4-4.5%. This increase may have been due to a combination of the work on behalf of the English Department Head and English Department committee work to keep track of wait lists—previous to Peoplesoft’s recent waitlist tracking—and to then lobby for more English composition sections to meet student need and increase access for spring semesters. (It is important to point out here that Wait List figures still point to a tremendously increasing non-access-to-English courses problem: from fall 2009 to spring 2012, Wait Lists for English courses increased on average from 20% to 27% per semester.) An additional factor that will be of importance in Enrollment patterns in English coursework relates to Ethnicity: there was an increase in the Hispanic/Latino student population that jumped 14% from 2009-10 to 2011-12 while there was close to a 23% decrease in White students populating English courses. Black/African American students decreased somewhat less than Whites: 16%. Other ethnicities’ Enrollment numbers saw some but less significant variations. These Enrollment numbers will be important for the English Department faculty to track and also consider regarding various diversity issues, namely, in hiring faculty to mirror the ethnicity of the student population as well as to consider curricular issues related to theme, content, and subject matter in our discipline.

Two other factors we will need to observe and monitor relate to Distance Learning and to the probable increase in students taking English coursework at the PCC campus versus the LAC campus. First, Enrollment numbers in Distance Learning (DL) courses were inconsistent in pattern—there was no consistent increase or decrease across years or terms—probably mostly due to instructor availability to teach those courses in given semesters, to a pilot program of teaching English 105—which has increased since the pilot—and also, with some circumspection on the Composition Committee’s part, about the effectiveness of Distance Learning for our students’ success on a broad scale. The English Department is continuing discussions on DL: training, effective practices, and enrollment. Despite this seeming inconsistent pattern, the DL program in English has reached a fairly consistent core teaching faculty and process.

Finally, because the Educational Master Plan and the PCC Educational Master Plan have identified the importance of the changing demographics surrounding the PCC campus and the need to offer more—and more variety of—English courses, we realize Enrollment numbers at PCC will most likely increase in the near future and in the longer future as well. Enrollment numbers between PCC and LAC from 2009-2012 intimate this change: while both campuses show yearly concomitant reductions and increases, these percentages’ rates at the two campuses differ. PCC reductions were usually 50% less than at LAC while PCC increases were usually twice that of LAC. In sum, the ratio of students enrolling in English courses at PCC versus at LAC
constantly rose in favor of PCC students. While this difference can partially be read as a difference based on the ratio of students taking courses at LAC versus PCC—meaning that more students taking courses at LAC is going to mean more students not getting those courses in reduced-offerings years—nonetheless, when making reductions and increases in these years, the bottom line seems to be to increase access for English courses at PCC.

2. Achievement
The English Department’s work to create access in course-reduction years, to attend to diversity issues, to pilot and monitor DL coursework, and to increase access at PCC can be related to efforts that are resulting, equally, in greater student success. (As an important side note, these numbers of increased success could also be due to less access to students who previously were able to register for English courses but who were less prepared to pass them. This would be a result of enrollment pressures creating more difficulties for less prepared students to enroll). Overall, student success in English coursework increased from 67.24% in 2009-10 to 69.44% in 2011-12. As discussed earlier, work on behalf of the Department Head and the various committees to pilot, observe, monitor, and revise the work of instruction has contributed to Overall student achievement. Some things we will want to monitor will be such things as the following: why is the Overall Success Rate by Term consistently higher in fall than in spring? (This has been the case over the past three years: 2%, 3.7%, and then almost 5% respectively from 2009-10, 2010-11, and 2011-2012. There may be factors outside of our control: the nature of the student population in fall may be more predisposed to success than overall in spring; students in basic skills courses in fall who move up but may not succeed in the next course in spring; or, possibly, students are generally more successful in fall semesters than in spring.)

Success Rate by Gender has reached relative evenness in 2011-12. Both Females and Males are now passing English courses at a 69% rate. Success Rates by Ethnicity show that Whites have maintained a seemingly even rate of success around 72-73% while our greatest set of student populators—Hispanic/Latino—has increased from 66% to 69%. The Success Rate by Location provides some extreme variations between what has been happening at PCC versus LAC. One of these anomalies relates to the Overall Success Rate by Term, that the spring term is consistently weaker in terms of student success. The PCC campus shows somewhat severe differences between fall and spring term success rates. For example, fall 2011 had a 4% higher success rate than spring 2012; 2010-11 fall-to-spring was flat; but, fall 2011 was 12% higher in success than was spring 2012. Some of the LAC numbers in this regard are close to PCC, but PCC remains distinct in this respect. It may be of a concern for us to monitor and investigate why such divergences in success occurred at PCC from fall to spring. Also, as discussed above, we need to continue to look at the success in DL courses compared with regular lecture courses. In most semesters including summer sessions, lecture courses had higher success rates from between 10-17% than the DL courses in that same semester or session. Some of these numbers will likely change to more even levels when we are able to educate students more about what online courses consist of and also advertising to more students what online courses are. Many students end up taking these courses either not understanding what they have signed up for nor what the demands are, but also needing the course and not being able to get into a lecture course. So they remain in the DL course when they are not adequately prepared for the online knowledge base and commitment.
3. Staffing
Staffing in the English Department consists of full-time and part-time lecture faculty as well as faculty in the Writing and Reading Success Center; classified staff working in the English Department office (2 half time classified), Journalism Program (1 10-month classified), and the Writing and Reading Success Center (1 eleven-month classified and 1, 35% classified); and tutors teaching in the Writing and Reading Success Center. Because of the present organization and budgetary situations, not all of these entities are aligned under the same Department. Nonetheless, it is important to see their instructional purposes as working in concert. Therefore, when considering FTES, all of the instructional entities—lecture faculty and WRSC faculty—work together to generate FTES for the English Department. These faculty helped to generate a fairly constant FTES, in fall terms (2010 and 2011) around 650 and in spring terms 2009, 2010, and 2011 between 678-681. The majority of these were generated by lecture faculty who generated a median 633 FTES in spring 2010 with an average of approximately 626 FTES from fall 2009 to spring 2012. The WRSC faculty generated, on average, 21 FTES in the same period and DL instruction generated the other 24 FTES on average per semester.

It is important to consider that the lecture faculty have been generating these FTES—as most Departments and programs on campus have been as well—with frighteningly decreasing numbers. Since 2006, when even then the full-time faculty to part-time faculty ratio was below the required amount determined by AB1725, and despite the hiring of four full-time faculty members since 2008 (Rodney Rodriguez—originally hired as WRSC Instructional Specialist but presently full-time in the English Department--Geneva Chao, Jennifer Nellis, and Darya Myers), we have lost twice this number to retirements, resignations, and early passings (Richard Jennings, Ron DiCostanza, Nancy Redmond, Bonnie Brinkman, Frank Gaspar, and Wendy Greenstein all retired while Kenny Spears recently resigned, and Shannon Runningbear sadly passed away). In the WRSC, in its inception and through its first three years of existence while being funded through grant monies, it is now institutionalized but has experienced severe cuts to faculty and staffing hours even though all of the composition sequence classes—English 801, 105, and 1—have maintained the same SLA requirement of accomplishing 3 activities at the WRSC. The Journalism program also incurred a severe cut from a 12-month to a 10-month position of its classified staff lab coordinator. All of these cuts do need to be addressed in some way in order to sustain the positive numbers that have been accruing in student achievement. This is especially so if demand is increased in English courses by an increase in the second year of Promise Pathway student numbers, and more so—if this program is to grow beyond being a pilot as our Superintendent President has been promoting—for all incoming students admitted to Long Beach City College who will be tracked into core coursework. An especially challenging problem experienced this fall 2012 semester was the need to hire 18 adjuncts to be able to staff the additional sections added late in spring 2012 to accommodate the incoming Promise Pathways students. Such a hiring session created a great deal of work for the Department and for Human Resources. With the many contingencies this work added, it will be very important for all impacted groups to work together to plan better for such eventualities.

In all, more staffing, tutor monies, and faculty representation will be needed to improve learning and service to an already impossible number of students going to the WRSC for Supplemental Learning Assistance and
tutoring. We will also continue to work as a Department with the WRSC faculty and staff to improve the instructional model in which individual, one-on-one instruction—while it will be a necessary component—may become less funded in favor of small group and workshop models in order to meet with the increasing numbers of students going to the Center; we will also work with the Journalism program in order to find ways to maintain the level of excellence it has attained in student achievement and enrollment, but as well to help it meet its goals of maintaining currency in the instruction and preparation of its students in an ever evolving business of media production; and as an English Department faculty on both the PCC and LAC campuses, we are developing and will continue to develop processes to orient, train, and professionalize the part-time faculty that is increasing in numbers each semester (SLO, pedagogical, and assessment training are topics we have begun to broach just this fall, 2012); and finally, we are very interested in seeking to increase the full-time contingent of English instruction with collegial, professional, and intelligent faculty. An increase in English full-time instructor positions is truly vital at this point in the college’s student success agenda. If done in a well-planned and methodical manner over time, an invigorated English faculty contingent will go a long way toward the all of the college’s programs’ success rates. This last desire is certainly a difficult one to put forth considering that we are also engaged in a process of Reduction in Force at Long Beach City College. In whatever mode and time that such an increase might take place, we do hope we can engage with it in a thoughtful and productive manner, one in which respect will be shown for both faculty, present and past, and as well for the success of students now and to come.

4. SLOs

Response:
The English Department faculty recognize the importance of SLOs on various counts: first, the need to accomplish them as a priority of the college; second, the importance of constant use of and references to SLOs in instruction and assessment as a focus of student success and, thus, accreditation; and third, as a way to justify the use of taxpayer dollars in the education and later graduations of students into the workforce. Thus, the SLO process is recognized in the English Department as a vital institutional procedure that draws data from the assessment of individual students in order to make changes to our courses and programs overall.

The SLOs below constitute the English Departments three main SLOs:

1. Write academic prose with a clear purpose and effective logical, relevant support from sources.
2. Develop and sustain a coherent interpretation of literature that acknowledges historical and cultural contexts.
3. Compose poems and short works of fiction using various forms and techniques.

At this point in the SLO assessment and review process, the English Department has collected data for English 105—the basic skill course feeds directly into English 1—and its most important transfer level English 1 course. To exemplify the work done on last year’s review cycle with both English 105 and English 1, an example below—and continuing in section b.—will take us through, in microcosm, how our process proceeded last year.
To begin, English 1’s SLOs are the following:

1. **Read and analyze college-level texts.**
2. **Write academic prose with a clear purpose and effective, logical, relevant support from sources.**
3. **Locate, evaluate, organize, and synthesize research material from a variety of sources.**
4. **Compose essays that demonstrate consistent control of academic discourse and rhetoric.**

One of our present SLO training modules has outlined the importance of SLO to faculty participation. We are working with faculty to instill in them the importance of the process to instruction, assessment, accreditation, and student success. We are also trying to dispel certain myths associated with SLO enforcement, that is, that faculty evaluation in complying with carrying out SLO processes in their teaching and assessment is not intended to differentiate ineffective faculty member, but rather to instill in faculty the use of SLOs to learn to become more effective in their classroom practices and pedagogy that will then lead to greater student achievements.

b) **Based on analysis of course and program SLO assessment:**

- **How are program-level and course-level SLOs being implemented, assessed, and used for program improvement?**

**Response:**
We are involved in an ongoing assessment, as well, of our course SLOs that is based on the review cycle of the college. These are linked to the program outcome assessment as well as the GEO assessment process. As a Department, we have 54 English classes, all of which are apportioned equally to be assessed on a 6-year cycle. We have collected data in our first cycle year—last year—for English 1 using the final paper of the semester—the most important writing artifact of the class—to assess. We used an online survey for instructors teaching English 1. There were seven questions on the survey, four of which included the degree to which students attained the level of success connected to the rubrics included on each of the four SLOs for English 1 on their final term research essay. An example follows:

**#3. SLO #1: Read and analyze college-level texts.**

1. Writing reflects LIMITED understanding...
2. Writing reflects PROFICIENT UNDERSTANDING...
3. Writing reflects CLEAR understanding...

What we found so far is that our SLOs for English 1 seem to have conveyed similar outcomes to what our achievement data say about our courses overall, which is that English 1 has a success rate around the 67% area, with approximately between 15-20% being very high achievement in the SLOs with the majority 70% achieving proficiency.

- **Summarize how the program has responded to SLO assessment results.**

**Response:**
We are in the process of preparing for this year’s assessment of English 3, the advanced level composition course in the English Department. Our SLO Officer, Dr. Jeff Wheeler, is actively involved in training and
coordinating training sessions for all English Department faculty. His approach has been to create a holistic approach and understanding of the process that makes the process comprehensible and reliable. Simply including in his trainings such items as ensuring that SLOs are on all course syllabi, that instructors continually explain to students how SLOs are incorporated into the course and using them in daily pedagogy, and being able to explain to others outside of the classroom—administration and community members alike—how SLOs are used in assessment is beginning to have important effects in the thinking about SLOs for all faculty and students in the English Department. Most effective in Dr. Wheeler’s approach to this training is his module on translating how we have all assessed—albeit in our own unique languages—into the same language, that is, the language of our SLOs. This important theme—that we have always been assessing, but now we simply need to use the same language and terms so that our students will have a more unified access to the benefits of a unified assessment project—is an important and practical approach in Dr. Wheeler’s training.

- Discuss how each action/change is based on ASLO results and how it will contribute to the improvement of the program.

Response:
So far, SLO assessment has not produced any results that were surprising. For that matter, SLO results have not shown any deficiencies in the courses studied. The most important action taken at this point is an increased effort to involve all faculty in discussions concerning SLO assessment. The goal is to develop a consensus within the department about the meanings of the standards that we are assessing. We are making efforts to include all faculty, especially adjuncts, in these discussions so that we can continue to standardize expectations across the English curriculum. This is especially challenging in a department whose outcomes are measured skills rather than specific content and which must rely upon adjunct faculty whose varied schedules do not allow them to participate in such discussions on any regular basis.

Interestingly, the most significant change to the department this semester did not take into account any outcome assessment. In fact, rather than rely upon the assessment of specific outcomes that had been the hallmark of the department’s assessment process, the department agreed to accept the college’s recommendation that such outcome data would be ignored in favor of high school grades for students participating in the Promise Pathway program during the fall semester. It remains to be seen whether this experiment will be successful.

5. Goals

a) Based on the data from questions 1 – 4 and any other relevant internal or external data your department has collected, how have your department and program goals developed and changed over the past three years?

Response:
The English Department has consolidated and unified its goals in the past three years. While many of our initiatives of the past were worthy and exemplary—including desires to increase student achievement through successful Learning Communities, to provide more release time to instructors to work on important projects for Distance Learning, to develop a more informational and even pedagogically based English Department Website, and to increase professionalization of faculty through more conference funding and attendance—and while many of our program and course goals were multifaceted and ambitious, we have summarily concretized and simplified our plans and goals to meet the changing financial realities of the student success agenda.

b) Discuss the steps you have taken to address each goal. What have been the results of these efforts?

Response:
Each of our Department Committees (Assessment, Building Renovation, Composition, Creative Writing, English Majors and Minors, Essay Contest, Flex, Journalism, Literature, and Policy) has taken steps to become more involved in the areas in which they have been respectively affected by changes in the college’s budgetary necessities, as well as in the evolution of the Educational Master Plan. Literature has been and is involved in doing important course review in the past two years, constantly reviewing course outcomes and reviewing necessary alignment with UC and CSU courses. Creative Writing has done the same with courses under their purview, especially most recently revising some of their courses to become compliant with repeatability standards coming out of Sacramento. Our Policy Committee updated the English Department’s policy document as of last year in order to delete non-applicable regulations as well as to provide additional new items of import. And our Assessment committee is getting into the truly vital work of creating a sensible mode of assessing the Promise Pathways pilot placement program that is placing students in their English classes based on their grade from a high school Senior English class.

On the presentational side of our goals, the English Majors and Minors committee is deeply involved in continuing many of its successful projects: book sales, field trips, student application to UC/CSU assistance, and in promoting student professionalization through conference participation. Journalism continues to develop its students’ professional competency through application to and attendance at learning symposiums as well as college journalism program contests. Journalism continues to amass numerous individual and group awards for its productions. Creative Writing is again involved in bringing highly acclaimed poets and writers to its Baum Poetry Center, and we have hopes to continue using existing funding as well as increasing funding to make the Center a nationally recognized and dedicated poetry center. And, finally, the Composition Committee is taking steps to improve the coordination of curriculum and classroom practices in its composition sequence: English 801, 105, and 1. A proposal has been crafted in our Department Plan to provide release time for a pilot program the will guide the coordination of the teaching efforts of all English 1 instructors.

c) Based on the new data collected (4), what are your plans for change in the future?

Response:
The most important plan for change in the future involves faculty participation. What this means is that, as a faculty, we want to—and as a mandate must—be involved in the process of creation of college programming
from the beginning of any new program that is brought to the fore in the college plan. While we laud the
goals and efforts of those involved in the Promise Pathways program, for instance, it has been a very difficult
process for the faculty to be able to understand and accept when we are left out of initial idea creation and,
then, planning based on idea creation. Two examples of being brought in to the planning stage late are both
examples we continue to struggle with to date: the alternative placement of Promise Pathways students
through their high school senior English class and, this past summer, the raising of a concern about this
placement that then necessitated not only a reassessment of these students’ performance in their LBCC
English class, but also an early alert plan to assist students who had been placed beyond their actual skills.

Again, we want to emphasize that we support the themes and goals of access and success of such plans as
Promise Pathways. But the principal goal we must achieve that the outcomes thus far are teaching us is that
administration and faculty together, in a thoughtful and considered process--one in which smaller pilots and
more controlled processes that have been thought out more fully with all necessary parties--will create a more
collegial, respectful, and effective process for students and all of the college community.

Thus, as a department, we will continue to argue for and create access to English classes at a high level despite
the cuts levied in the past three years; we will seek to create and develop new uses of and pedagogies in the
Writing and Reading Success Center; our Committees will continue to work to improve routine course review
in practical and required ways; we will continue to attend to issues regarding ethnicity, diversity, and
technological currency; and, we will coordinate all of these committees and processes through the process of
increased faculty participation, training, and practice.

---

6. College Wide

Discuss how the program SLOs as well as the department goals integrate, articulate, and complement the
institutional goals and initiatives. (How does your department fit into the big picture?)

**Response:**
The English Department’s Student Learning Outcomes and goals support students in reaching many of Long
Beach City College’s General Education Outcomes (GEO). One of the greatest achievements for students
accomplishing English Department learning outcomes is accessed in the Critical Thinking category. The GEO
for this includes the goal of having “The ability to analyze and evaluate a spectrum of ideas that are
represented by theories, images, and concepts.” Equally, in the Aesthetics and Creativity category, the GEO
includes the “ability to appreciate a range of cultural expression, including art, music, dance, theater,
literature, and film, as well as the ability to generate useful and original ideas.” Finally, in a similarly related
category, the GEO under Communication will see successful students with an “ability to effectively read, write, listen, speak, and/or sign.” Each of these GEOs will be enhanced by students who have successfully achieved abilities in English coursework based on our Department SLOs to, in our SLO #1, “Write academic prose with a clear purpose and effective logical, relevant support from sources,” as well as, in our SLO #2, to “develop and sustain a coherent interpretation of literature that acknowledges historical and cultural contexts.” Being able to write effectively using logic and relevancy is an important skill that conveys one’s ability to participate in social and community processes, to communicate clearly and effectively with others, and to show comprehension of texts and communications in a media-conscious world. To be able to use literature as a way into interpreting the world and relating to it, as in our SLO #2, is both a creative as well as crucial learning outcome. Those who attain this skill can be viewed apart from those who have not in the way they can manage, understand, and manipulate a wide variety of linguistic articulations and texts both written, verbal, and imagistic. Finally, our SLO #3—being able to “Compose poems and short works of fiction using various forms and techniques”—may seem to many a disconnected learning outcome with regard to the GEOs, but in reality, it very much articulates with section c. under Communication in which students will “Find, use, manage, evaluate, and convey information efficiently and effectively,” and also with section b. under the category of Civic Engagement: “Appreciate and promote respect of individual differences that embraces the complex ways people integrate into their societies, cultures, and subcultures in order to participate in both our society and in diverse groups activities.” The emphasis here is that our SLO #3, as it develops student creativity in language, as it exposes students to varieties of language use and creation, and as it requires students to access and understand how language and communication is based on formal and structural processes in whatever mode it arises—that is, in creative, argumentative, informational, or analytical modes to name only a few—the English Department’s SLO #3 supports the enrichment and progress of students on their way to attaining the skills necessary to achieving the GEO sub-goals of Cultural Sensitivity/Diversity and Information Competency.

All in all, we are pleased how our English Department SLOs at the program and course level are working in a unified and comprehensive manner to support the GEOs of the college. We will continue to assess their applicability and attainability in the review years to come as our student demographics and college processes evolve and, in so doing, hope to make these goals living and vital goals in the process of student learning.