The purpose of Program Review is to summarize and interpret the data and information collected from the resources listed above, reflecting how your department program(s) have been successful and incorporated the information into improvements, where necessary. As a part of the overall college planning process, a meaningful Program Review will be the primary document CPC and other college committees will rely on for qualitative and quantitative information on a program, informing enrollment management, budgeting (cap outlay, grants), hiring priorities, and accreditation.

The questions below are designed to help you create, primarily, a narrative review (roughly 5-10 pages). Each question includes the “Feedback Rubric Prompts” that will be used by the committee to read, reflect, and provide feedback on your Program Review; please use these to guide the formulation of your responses. Each program (curriculum guide) within your department requires a separate Program Review Document.

Program Review Questions

Name of Program being reviewed: Reading

1– 3. Enrollment, Achievement, and HR Data

Summarize and interpret the data for each of the first three above as they relate to your program.

Enrollment

The Reading Department’s enrollment numbers in 2009-10 and 2010-11 were steady (4309 and 4265 respectively), as was summer enrollment. A decrease in the number of students enrolled during 2011-12 (590 fewer students) was consistent with the decrease in overall enrollment college wide as class sections were cut due to budget concerns. In the 2011-12 semesters, the Reading Department lost 10 sections. The elimination of these sections created an obstacle for students who needed to complete the class or classes that would lead to meeting Long Beach City College’s reading proficiency, or meet the prerequisite for a class or program. In keeping with the College mission of degree attainment and transfer, the decision as to which sections to cut was purposeful. We kept the majority of transfer level courses that meet LBCC reading proficiency as well as the levels in which most students assess, and we cut from the lowest entry levels. Keeping the courses at the higher levels in the reading sequence was in accordance with the current College mission statement and Board of Trustees goals for successful completion and transfer.
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Our classes serve more females than males (approximately 1000 more), as well as more Hispanics. Hispanic/Latino students consistently outnumber the enrollment of the Asian, Black/African American, White, Pacific Islander and American Indian/Alaskan Native reading students. And when class sections were cut in 2011-12, enrollment by each ethnicity decreased proportionately.

Typically enrollment is higher in classes offered at the Liberal Arts Campus than at the Pacific Coast Campus as there are more classrooms available. LAC enrollment is slightly higher in the fall semesters although overall enrollment has declined by approximately 200 students from each fall as sections were cut. This decline in enrollment contrasts with enrollment at PCC which experienced growth in both Spring 2011 and 2012 due to the addition of sections and providing more equitable access to students. Summer session enrollment remained consistent over the three years, and became more equal between campuses when sections were scheduled at PCC.

Each semester Reading classes have waitlists above our cap of 30 students (or 33 students in the case of semesters when we added 10% more students to help with the budget). In particular, READ 82 has long waitlists because it meets the College’s reading proficiency requirement and is a prerequisite for entrance into the Nursing Program. READ 882 and 883 also have significant waitlists because the majority of students place into these levels via the placement test. If sections of these in-demand classes were added, they most likely would fill especially if those sections were scheduled during popular morning times.

In Fall 2012 the college enrolled the first group of Promise Pathways students from incoming Long Beach Unified School District graduates. Taking a Reading course to learn the strategies necessary for comprehending college level text was paramount in helping them succeed. But we were not prepared to meet the needs of the large numbers of students placing at lower levels. Due to budget cuts the department had previously cut back on the number of classes at the lower end of the reading sequence. In 2009-10 we offered 12 sections of our lowest levels, READ 880 and 881. By Spring 2011 those sections were reduced to half. And in 2011-12, the fall sections totaled 8 and the spring sections totaled 2. The influx of Promise Pathways students at these lowest reading levels illustrates that the need for these levels didn't change, but budget constraints precluded us from offering courses to meet the demand. As a result of guaranteeing Promise Pathways students the classes they need to succeed in college, we had to create a way to address this challenge. Our solution was to create a pilot in which the two lowest levels of classes were combined and utilized resources in the Writing and Reading Success Center. We have 5 combined 880-881 classes.

Achievement

The student overall success rates have increased each year from 56% to 59.55% to 68.87% with summer achieving 76-80%. A primary reason for the marked increase was adding an additional unit to the core levels (880, 881,882,883, 82, and 83) in Fall 2011. These 4-unit classes are now aligned with other basic skill/developmental courses at the college and provide the additional student contact time needed for learning and applying the reading strategies that will aid them in their academic and workplace reading. Another reason for the increased success rates was the addition of three Supplemental Learning Activities to the READ 881, 883, 82, and 83 curriculum. Reading faculty wrote Directed Learning Activities and Workshops
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to address the concepts at each level that are more challenging to master. Students complete the work in the Writing and Reading Success Center at LAC or the Success Center at PCC in consultation with a reading instructor or tutor and their completion count as 5% of the overall class grade. The Reading faculty’s universal commitment to the value of these learning activities has led to approximately a 90% completion rate of the SLA requirement. With access to this additional resource, students are achieving better results on their exams.

An effective practice that may have positively influenced student success was the referral of students to the Early Alert System, a Counseling referral program. Through participation in this program, instructors referred students who were experiencing difficulty in class due to poor attendance or low grades on assignments or tests. Counselors contacted these students and advised them of the support services offered by the College in an effort to foster their success.

Both campuses have success rates within 3% of each other and of noteworthy mention is the growth in success rate of PCC students over the spring semesters from 53.43% to 70.75%. By bringing all our courses’ pass rates into alignment with READ 82 at 70%, instructors noted that more students met the criteria. Summer sections achieved the highest success rates likely due to the fact that instruction is provided 3-4 consecutive classes weekly. This is data we need to address and explore the feasibility of offering classes in alternative methods during the 16-week semester.

With the exception of American Indian/Alaskan Native, the figures below indicate the percentage of improvement in each ethnic group from 2009 to 2012.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnic Group</th>
<th>Improvement Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/Latino</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black/African American</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Reading Department success rate fell slightly below the Collegewide overall success rate in 2009-10 and 2010-11 (Reading 56.37% and 59.55%, Collegewide 62.68% and 63.60%), but higher in 2011-12 (Reading 68.87%, Collegewide 65.72%). One explanation for the years with lower percentages might be that in order to earn a Pass (P) in READ 880, 881, 882, and 883, students were required to earn 75%. At the time we implemented a baseline of 75%, we felt that students who earned lower percentages were not at a level of mastery to pass the next courses in the series (READ 82 and 83) which are graded and transferable. After discussion in 2011, we decided to be consistent with the customary pass percentage of 70%. In sum, we attribute our increase in success rate to increasing our unit load, student and faculty participation in Success Center activities, and in bringing our passing rate into alignment with READ 82.

The number of FTES generated by the Department has increased even though the number of sections has decreased. The demand for classes has grown overall at every level with large waitlists each semester and
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summer. If class space were available and we could offer more sections of classes, certainly they would fill. This would necessitate hiring additional faculty both full- and part-time.

Staffing

The Reading Department has 10 full-time faculty and 15 adjunct faculty who teach on both campuses and in the Writing and Reading Success Center. All bring expertise and commitment to their teaching which is reflected in student success rates. To promote uniformity and consistency within the department, Reading faculty presented a workshop for our adjunct faculty to ensure all instructors were aware of what was to be included on the syllabus, requirements for reporting grades, information regarding the Supplemental Learning Activity requirement, and the importance of participating in the SLO assessment process. In addition, full-time faculty act as ongoing mentors for adjunct faculty members.

The Department had a Reading Technician until 2011 when the classified position was eliminated. The loss of our only classified support position has negatively impacted our department’s ability to collect, tabulate, and analyze assessment data. This includes pre- and post-assessments and Student Learning Outcomes. When we switched the format in which we delivered the SLO assessments to computers, we lacked the clerical support to do this easily and efficiently. Instead it greatly impacted faculty working conditions within the department.

Moreover, we lack clerical support which places more demands on our Department Head, faculty, and other School of Language Arts support staff.

Feedback Rubric Prompts:
How has the program explained their data for the columns 1-3 (enrollment, achievement, staffing)?
- Was the content concise yet sufficiently in depth?
- Was there sufficient detail to understand their point?
- Were the data effectively related to trends in student access and performance during the review cycle? If there were anomalies in the data, were they adequately explained?
- Did the review explain how the staffing structure (including full-time to part-time ratio of faculty) has affected, positively or negatively, the program’s ability to fulfill its mission and goals?

4. SLOs

a) Summarize the collected program data

Response:
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Program Level

The Reading Department’s program SLOs are:

1. Analyze and evaluate college-level text.
2. Student will reflect and analyze how applying reading strategies improves their academic and personal literacy.

We originally planned on using the results of a READ 82 DLA to assess how well students were analyzing college-level text. After thinking this through, we decided to use the pass rate in our capstone courses, READ 82 and 83, since students must earn an A, B, C, or Pass in order to meet Long Beach City College’s reading proficiency. Our expected level of achievement for Outcome #1 is 70% of completers will successfully pass the course and meet reading proficiency. Statistics from the Office of Institutional Effectiveness show an 11.44% increase from Spring 2011 to Spring 2012 with an overall success rate of 78.97% for READ 82 students. The READ 83 success rate decreased 8.78% over the same period, but the two levels cannot be compared since READ 82 averages 20 sections a semester, while READ 83 has 2 sections a semester. Combined, however, both courses have a 73% success rate.

We acquired noteworthy responses from the survey we used to assess Outcome #2. Using Survey Gizmo to ask which comprehension strategies students use most often in their reading courses, in their other classes, and in their everyday lives, we learned that using context clues and finding the main idea were the top strategies. And these are our 2 outcomes at every course level! Always of primary concern is the transfer of reading strategies to the students’ other classes, and the survey results confirmed that students are actively marking and annotating their textbooks to aid in their comprehension. The Department will discuss other survey results and reflect on how instruction in these skills and strategies impact students’ academic and personal literacy.

Course Level

In Spring 2011 READ 880, 881, 882, and 883 participated in the assessment process. At the time, each level had two common outcomes that assessed application of vocabulary strategies and identification of the main idea. (These two outcomes later became the sole outcomes for these levels: outcome #1 assesses application of vocabulary strategies, and outcome #2 assesses the identification of main idea.) But in Spring 2011 the assessments at various levels assessed word recognition and recall (880), organization of ideas (881, 882, 883), and relating prior knowledge, formulating questions, and generating answers to evaluate text (882). Briefly summarized the results for the more individualized outcomes for each level are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Outcome Description</th>
<th>Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>READ 880</td>
<td>word recognition, recall specific information</td>
<td>78%, 86 % correct responses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>READ 881, 882, 883</td>
<td>organization of ideas</td>
<td>82%, 94%, 63% correct responses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>READ 882</td>
<td>relating prior knowledge, etc.</td>
<td>82% correct responses</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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According to the data for Spring 2011, at each successive level of coursework the percentage of respondents who passed the assessment increased. At 4 levels below LBCC reading proficiency there was a 63% pass rate and at one level below reading proficiency, a 73% pass rate. The highest percentages overall (71%-99%) were in relation to the questions assessing the use of vocabulary strategies to define unfamiliar words (outcome #1). The percentages for correctly identifying the main idea (outcome #2) were in the low to mid-70 range.

In Fall 2011 with regard to overall pass rates, of interest is that as the text became more challenging at each higher level in the reading sequence, the pass rate dropped in most levels. Students mastered the assessment questions regarding vocabulary strategies (outcome #1), but did not perform as well with questions dealing with identifying the author’s main idea (outcome #2).

In Spring 2012 the overall pass rates for Outcome #1 were well above 70% for all levels indicating that students understand and apply strategies to help determine meanings of unknown words. The successful responses related to Outcome #2 (main idea) were stronger at the lower levels in which the main idea was stated in the passage (literal comprehension). However, as the passages became more complex and students were required to use higher critical thinking skills to infer the main idea, the percentage of students choosing the correct answer was not as high.

In an analysis of the data, the Reading Department is pleased with the students’ mastery of vocabulary strategies. The concept of main idea remains a challenging one for students and we have refined our Supplemental Learning Activities to address this gap in understanding. As our courses come up for Routine Course Review, we will examine our course outlines and make revisions as needed.

Feedback Rubric Prompts:
- *How has the program explained their SLO data (class and program level)?*
- *Were changes and responses made to the courses and/ or program as a result of the data analysis?*

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:**
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As stated in the previous prompt, our Program SLO Outcome #1 assessment changed from an initial discussion of using the results of a READ 82 DLA to using the success rate of our capstone classes. This has proven to be an efficient method to analyze results as the Office of Institutional Effectiveness provides us with the information. To assess Outcome #2 we use a survey on Survey Gizmo to assess how well students are applying reading strategies to aid in their comprehension. Using technology has saved the Department from aggregating the data manually. We plan on reviewing the results as a department at a future department meeting.

Our course SLO process has undergone several changes since we first began. The first change involved the course outcomes themselves. Our initial outcomes were based on the information provided by the ASLO subcommittee that the assessment should focus on a single course outcome for each level. Later we learned from the committee that we actually needed multiple outcomes for each level. After rewriting our original outcomes for each level of classes, we realized that we included too much to assess in one outcome so we narrowed the focus. Then when changing our courses from 3 to 4 units, the Routine Course Review subcommittee suggested we rewrite our outcomes to address broader concepts. The final change involved rewriting our SLOs to be broader, more consistent and indicate the point within the reading sequence of classes when students would meet LBCC’s reading proficiency standard.

The next change involved how we administered the assessments. Some of our instructors included the assessment questions on their finals. Others gave it as a standalone test. Each student had a paper copy of the assessment. With over 1000 students and an average of 15 questions, the paper consumption added up. Upon completion of our first assessment the Reading Technician tabulated the results for each class and for each question which was very helpful. Since losing that position, the SLO officer became responsible for collecting and tabulating the results. Considering paper consumption and the time involved in collecting and tabulating results, we have changed the manner in which the assessment is delivered. We have embraced technology and now the assessment is delivered via Survey Gizmo. Survey Gizmo aggregates the data for us.

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

Response:

We realized after looking at the data in order to get a true indicator of the performance of the department, we need to include adjunct faculty in the SLO assessment process. Originally, assessments were administered by full-time faculty only and we counted the results just of those students who passed the course. One change we are making is to rewrite our assessment tasks and our criteria of expected level of proficiency to include full-and part-time faculty and all students who are enrolled in the fifteenth week.

Upon examining the results of each assessment, we refined our assessments by 1) making the assessments more clear and the answer choices more logical, 2) aligning the assessments to the new SLOs, and 3) reviewing readability to match course level expectations.
• Discuss how each action/change is based on ASLO results and how it will contribute to the improvement of the program.

Response:

The results have galvanized both faculty and student attention to the goal of meeting LBCC’s reading proficiency standard. We are reviewing our course outlines, paying particular attention to how they align with our course outcomes. In addition, the assessment results help us to identify the gaps in student learning at particular levels.

Another improvement we are making is revamping our Student Learning Activities to align with our Student Learning Outcomes. Those activities that do not directly align with an outcome for a course are available in the Success Centers for additional practice for students and new activities are being created to better address the outcome.

Feedback Rubric Prompts:
Do you feel that you have an understanding of how the program has used their SLO data for program improvement?

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 goals of the Reading Department are to instruct students in the strategies that will improve their ability to efficiently, effectively, and critically interact with college-level text and meet Long Beach City College’s reading proficiency. Developing literacy skills increases transfer preparedness and improves personal literacy. Our goals have not changed over the past three years. We continue to be focused in our efforts to explore opportunities that will enhance student success with reading.

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

Response:

As a result of the Student Learning Outcomes process, our department has become more focused. We are pleased the data has shown that students are mastering vocabulary strategies, and are transferring reading strategies to other classes. But we would like to see an increase in the percentage of correct answers
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in determining the author’s point in literal and inferential text. We do have hallway conversations of what practices have worked well, but we need to explore these methods in more depth.

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

Response:

Based on the new data collected, we will continue discussion of the results and strategize steps we will take to increase the literacy of our students. These may include developing new Supplemental Learning Activities, revising the outcomes and assessments, changing the scheduling of how courses are delivered, and developing a new program—Reading Across the Disciplines.

Feedback Rubric Prompts:
Describe what appears to have contributed significantly to the program's plan development for the past three years.

Do they have a vision?

Have the data from questions 1-4 (of the program review template) informed their planning?

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:

Long Beach City College’s Mission Statement declares, “Long Beach City College promotes equitable student learning and achievement, academic excellence, and workforce development by delivering high quality educational programs and support services to our diverse communities.” The Reading Department’s Mission dovetails with the College’s in each of these areas. In order for students to succeed in their classes and as citizens, they must have literacy skills—skills and strategies that are addressed in each level of our reading sequence. Our program focuses on supporting students in their desire to become more effective, critical readers and meet Long Beach City College’s reading proficiency. To promote access to all, classes are offered day and evening, as well as on Saturdays, at LAC and PCC.

Participation in the department planning and program review processes has provided our department with valuable insight into how we might better ensure the College’s and our goal of
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student success and achievement. Our program affords students a valuable experience to create improvement in their academic and personal literacy.

\textit{Feedback Rubric Prompts:}

Do you have a clear idea of how their program supports institutional goals?
- Did they reference the institutional goals and mission?
- How does their Program Review give you a clear idea of how their program fits into the college mission?