

English Discipline Program Review 2001-2002

Topic I. Where Are We Now?

A. Purpose and Goals

Integral to the academic foundation of a student's education at RCC are the institutional mission, vision, and goals. The instructional philosophy of the English Discipline remains consistent with the combined statement of the RCC Mission Statement and the 1998 Program review draft, which reads as follows:

We continue to discuss how best to serve the needs of both remedial and transfer students to ensure that our courses, prerequisites, and graduation requirements are in line with the practice of other community colleges and correspond to the college's mission of "paralleling the first two years of university offerings," "prepar[ing] students for intellectual and cultural awareness, critical and independent thought," and "enhanc[ing]" the quality of life and the internal harmony of the communities [we] serve.

The English Discipline continues to align itself with the institutional mission, vision, and strategic goals by offering an array of classes and resources to meet the needs of all of our students:

- Developmental, remedial, transfer-level composition classes, along with critical-thinking and literature courses, and sophomore-level survey and general interest literature courses provide transfer programs paralleling the first two years of university offerings.
- Pre-college, tutorial, and supplemental instruction demands are met for under-prepared students through course offerings, the Writing and Reading Center (WRC), and peer tutor program.
- The Discipline continues to work in partnership with other educational institutions through a variety of student-centered programs.
- Classes are provided at a great range of times, on weekends, and through online and hybrid formats.
- The Discipline strives to improve student retention and success by providing an effective learning environment for students, centering on the District values of student centeredness and teaching excellence.

The English Discipline's course offerings currently consist of 45 courses as listed in the college catalog. Multiple sections of all of our composition courses are offered each semester on all three campuses. At least one to two sections of our eleven core literature courses are offered each academic year, primarily on the Riverside campus.

According to recent data collected for 1998-2001, 34.4% of the students taking English courses indicated an educational goal of a BA with an AA degree; 26.9% are undecided; 7.1% seek a BA without an AA degree; 6.2% seek an AA degree without transfer; and 3.0% seek new career preparation. The English discipline meets the needs of these students in several different ways.

- Preparation in the basic skills of writing, reading, and grammar are achieved through the remediation courses of English 60A (Basic Writing and Grammar) and English 60B (Intermediate Writing and Grammar).
- Graduation requirement and/or AA degree is achieved through English 50 (Basic English Composition).
- Transfer to a four-year institution is achieved through English 1A (English Composition) and English 1B (Critical Thinking and Writing).
- Literature courses meet a variety of transfer-level requirements, including Humanities, Ethnic Studies, etc.

B. Curriculum and Programs

Composition Curriculum

Since the previous program review in 1998, Faculty Discipline Days, as well as many other meetings have been devoted to discussion of composition courses, and have resulted in revision to align them with current enrollment trends and student needs. The English 60 series was changed from a three-course offering (English 60ABC) to English 60AB. English 50B (Basic Literature and Composition) was revised and renumbered as English 57. English 1A has been reworded for accuracy and to include assessment in the course outline, and English 1B is still under discussion for possible revision.

The literature course offerings are richly varied in topics and genre. Several new courses were added to the curriculum during the previous program review, providing a total of 27 literature courses offered.

- 16 of the 27 meet IGETC qualifications.
- Several courses are offered on a regular basis and meet enrollment requirements each semester

-English 6, 7	British Literature
-English 14, 15	American Literature
-English 40, 41	World Literature
-English 30	Children's Literature
-English 11	Creative Writing
- New courses offered in Fall 2002 are

English 16—Introduction to Language and
English 48—Modern Literature: Short Story and Novel

Writing and Reading Center

District-wide, the Writing and Reading Centers (WRC) on all three campuses continue to develop and expand to meet the needs of our students. A WRC Committee has been organized

to research and review topics such as online tutoring, additional CAI (Computer Assisted Instruction) programs, increase in the Tutoring Program, videotaping of workshops for CD or online access, and development of 1 unit “mini-courses” focused on writing across the curriculum.

- Writing and Reading Center Concerns
 1. Space for each center continues to be an ongoing problem, indicating an increase in the number of composition courses offered, and, therefore, an increase in the number of students using the WRCs. Perhaps even more importantly, this issue also acknowledges students’ increased awareness of the validity and usefulness of the WRCs resources.
 2. The original WRC plan included the expansion of services of the WRC to all disciplines to serve the students in cross-curricular writing assignments. However, none of the three centers has enough physical space to continue serving students in the English discipline plus open up the centers to the entire campus.

Discussion on how to address these concerns is ongoing.

Curricular Concerns: Course Outlines

- Revision of Course Outlines
The English discipline has continued to work on revising and updating course outlines since 1998. Of the 45 courses offered, 37 have been revised. English 18 and 37 are near completion. Needing revision are English 17, 18, 20, 35, 42, 44, 45, 48.
- Advisories on Course Outlines
A review of the course outlines indicates inconsistencies in the wording of advisories in literature courses:
 - “English 1A and 1B strongly recommended” = English 6, 7, 14, 15, 21, 22
 - “English 1A strongly recommended” = English 8, 25, 40, 41
 - “English 1B recommended” = English 9
 - “English 1A recommended” = English 10, 12, 18, 23, 26, 30, 35
 - “qualification for English 1A recommended” = English 16, 20

These inconsistencies will be remedied in the coming year.

Programs

The English Discipline also participates in several programs that encompass other disciplines and serve a variety of students within the college and the community.

1. Vocational Outreach: Ford Asset, General Motors, Toyota T
The Ford Asset and General Motors programs are two-year programs that meet AA degree requirements for those students pursuing automotive engineering. The Toyota T Program is a one- year program that meets certificate requirements. Enrollment for all

three programs is typically 15-20 students. English 50 is the discipline course offered using an open enrollment policy with space reserved for program students.

2. Study Abroad Program

English 1B, 30, 11, 10 have been part of the District's Study Abroad Program.

3. Puente Program

The Puente program is one of the most successful programs in the state's history for bringing Latinos into the post-secondary educational system at the community college level. The program's aims are three-fold: retention, transfer, and completion of a bachelor's degree at a four-year college or university.

Given the program's recognized success it is important to note the key role RCC has played:

- RCC was the first community college in the Inland Empire to offer the program.
- RCC's Puente program has been in continuous operation for over 12 years.
- RCC's program is used statewide as a model for other colleges to emulate.
- In the 2001-02 academic year RCC's program was expanded to include the Norco and Moreno Valley campuses—making it the first multi-campus program within a single community college district in the state.
- RCC's program was the first in the state to create a “mentor council”—a group of community leaders who provide advice and counsel to the program and serve as a resource for the program's students.
- Based upon data collected in the past three academic years, retention for the students in the program indicates a 72% completion rate (i.e., passing the courses of the second-semester courses).

Puente Program Concerns

- No line item budget to cover ordinary expenses, field trips, and special events.
- A need for better coordination and sharing of resources now that the program is district-wide.
- A misconception that the program is a “Latino only” program. The program is open to all students.
- A misconception that the curriculum has been “dumbed down.” The English 50/1A curriculum is identical to the standard offerings, the only difference being that Chicano/Latino based writings are used rather than the traditional English canon.
- A misconception on the part of faculty, staff, and administrators that the Puente English instructor and Guidance Counselor have a “lighter” work load because they get .2667 and .2 reassigned time to administer and coordinate the program.
- ACCUPLACER test may cause change in number of students eligible for English 50.

4. First Year Experience (FYE)

A learning community program in its third year of implementation, FYE serves first year college students. The program's goal is recruitment, retention, and transfer. This year long program places students in a cohort of English and Guidance courses with the instructors from both disciplines teaching in partnership. The 2000-2001 program consisted of three cohorts on the Riverside campus (English 60A/50; English 50/1A; English 1A/1B) and one

cohort on the Moreno Valley campus (English 50/1A). The 2001-2002 program consists of three cohorts again on the Riverside campus (2 sections of English 50/1A and 1 section of English 1A/1B), one cohort on the Norco campus (English 50/1A), and one cohort on the Moreno Valley campus (English 50/1A). Thus, the program has grown to encompass the English cohorts on all three campuses.

The FYE program has experienced successes—assessment data at this point are mostly anecdotal (the program has continued to be refined to better meet the needs of the students and of the college from the first year to the second year, and this inconsistency makes the collection of data difficult to obtain and "read"). The program has also faced some obstacles. The recruitment process for both years has been delayed, causing less advertising and lower enrollment; the English 98 course (Academic Excellence Seminar) will be dropped from the program beginning in 2002-2003. The course is only for .5 unit credit and the students and instructors alike did not find overall effectiveness in the additional course. To replace instruction time for the English 98 course, the English instructors will attend the guidance courses assigned to their FYE cohort, to help ensure more consistency in the partner teaching.

5. Online and Hybrid Courses

The English discipline has recently offered English 1B either as an online course or as a hybrid course: Spring 2001—hybrid; Fall 2001—online, Spring 2002—online. The English Discipline is still in the initial stages of developing more online courses. Several instructors have participated in the Online Academy and continuing work on their proposed online courses.

6. New Visions Program

In its fifth year of existence this program works in conjunction with Workforce Preparation whereby English 60A classes at the Riverside campus are comprised of welfare recipients referred to RCC by the Riverside County Department of Social Services.

7. Internship Academy

This program, now in its third year, works closely with Public Safety Education and Training with English 60A classes taught at the Ben Clark Training Center for high school juniors and seniors interested in police and fire careers.

ENROLLMENT TRENDS

Class Size and Teacher Workload

The English Discipline concurs with the recommendations of the National Council for the Teachers of English (NCTE) regarding class size and teacher workload. Excerpts from the document are presented below:

- “English faculty members should never be assigned more than 12 hours a week of classroom teaching. In fact, the teaching load should be less, to provide adequate time for reading and responding to students’ writing.
- No more than 20 students should be permitted in any writing class. Ideally, classes should be limited to 15.
- Remedial or developmental sections should be limited to a maximum of 15 students. It is essential to provide these students extra teaching if they are to acquire the extra reading and writing skills they need in college.
- No more than 25 students should be permitted in discussion courses in literature or language. Classes larger than 25 do not give students and teachers the opportunity to engage literary texts through questions, discussion, and writing.”
(Statement on Class Size and Teacher Workload: College, 1987)

Recent statistical data on average enrollment for Fall 1998 to Spring 2001 indicate the following class size and teacher workloads:

	English 1A	English 1B	English 50	English 60
Moreno Valley	28.75	29.09	34.54	24.67
Norco	30.85	33.90	28.59	28.85
Riverside	31.20	33.28	29.46	28.55

Concerns

- Currently, enrollment cap for most Composition courses is 30 students; for English 1B, it is 35. This is nearly twice the number recommended by NCTE.
- Each semester, instructors face an additional 15-30 students attempting to enroll in their courses.

C. Student Outcomes Assessment

Assessment has traditionally been understood to mean (1) assessment of student entrance skills in a particular discipline and placement into appropriate classes as a result of that assessment, and (2) grading practices. Most contemporary assessment theorists argue that grades often have little to do with measuring accurately the degree to which students have achieved the learning outcomes for a particular course. And yet we think that grades, and the grading practices of a discipline viewed over time, do provide one indirect clue as to whether and to what degree students are learning. As for placement, we in English see this also as a matter germane to any discussion of assessment, since it reflects the entrance competencies for our core composition courses, English 50 and English 1A. So we begin with a brief discussion of grades and placement.

Grading

The English Discipline notices a dramatic trend when we examine data from the fall of 1998 to the fall of 2001: the grade “B” has clearly replaced the grade “C” as the most commonly-assigned mark for English classes at R.C.C.

1998	“B”	28.5%	“C”	31.8%
------	-----	-------	-----	-------

2001	“B”	32.1%	“C”	30.9%
------	-----	-------	-----	-------

The trend toward more “B’s” and few “C’s” was particularly true of the Moreno Valley campus:

1998	“B”	26.3%	“C”	35.9%
------	-----	-------	-----	-------

2001	“B”	35.9%	“C”	29.2%
------	-----	-------	-----	-------

There has also been a significant decrease in the number of failing grades (“D” and “F”)

1998	“F”	26.4%
------	-----	-------

2001	“F”	21.2%
------	-----	-------

The grade “A” has also become more common

1998	“A”	13.4%
------	-----	-------

2001	“A”	15.8%
------	-----	-------

The trends are true of all three campuses, though most so at Moreno Valley and least so at the Riverside campus.

While several benign or even positive explanations might be offered for this trend (we may simply be teaching, and/or students learning, more effectively than before; our placement methods might be more reliable than they used to be, etc.), grade inflation is probably at least part of the cause. This may, in part, be due to our excessive reliance on part-time faculty to teach composition courses, as addressed elsewhere in this document. The preliminary data do suggest some correlation between higher course GPA’s and part-time status of the course instructor. We should point out, too, that we disagree internally about the seriousness of the problem (we all agree a problem exists) and about what aspect of the problem is most serious. Some of us see the upward trend of course GPA’s as especially worrisome (the mean grade in English courses has risen from 2.12 to 2.23 over this three-year period, much of it due to the rise at Moreno Valley from 1.95 to 2.25). Others would argue that the drop in percentage of failing grades is of greater concern, suggesting perhaps that more students than ever before are being allowed to pass on into the next level of composition without adequate preparation. There may be no significant long-term consequence if a student receives a “B” when she or he should have received a “C.” But the potential for a student’s academic success is significantly affected if she gets a “C” in an English 50 when she should have gotten a “D.” We cannot honestly say that we know exactly why this trend exists, nor can we say unequivocally that the trend necessarily represents a failure in our assessment methods rather than a success in teaching and learning.

Placement

As recently as 10 years ago, R.C.C. had only a loose form of “advisory” placement for English composition courses, and many—perhaps most—students simply placed themselves in the course they thought would be most compatible with their needs and self-perceived skill level. In validating and instituting mandatory placement, we went a long way toward making student learning in our discipline possible. This was, however, in spite of our reliance (which continues to this day) on multiple-choice examinations testing usage, grammar, reading comprehension, and the like to place our students appropriately in writing classes. Our national professional association, the National Council of the Teachers of English, has long been on record as opposing this kind of examination for directing students to remedial writing courses. The evidence suggests that, despite the cost, a holistically-scored writing sample from students allows us to place them far more accurately. Nevertheless, our various objective measures provide us with a reasonably valid measure of student writing ability.

In July 2001, we adopted ACCUPLACER, an online multiple choice assessment instrument. Because the English discipline believed that the previous exam was too generous in its placement advice (20% of the score on that exam was derived from the student’s answer to the question “what grade did you receive in the last English class you completed?”), we worked to develop accurate cut scores for the exam. We decided to weight the test scores differently from the way we had in the past, employing a formula that consists of two times the Reading score plus the English score (2R + E). By comparison, ACCUPLACER has proven to provide significantly different placement results:

<u>Previous exam (Fall 2000)</u>		<u>ACCUPLACER (Jul 2001 – Mar 2002)</u>	
English 60A	27.7%	English 60A	51.1%
English 50	36.3%	English 50	32.3%
English 1A	36.0%	English 1A	16.6%

Viewed another way, we are now directing toward English 50 roughly 40% of the students we used to place into English 1A, and we are now holding for English 60A a great majority of the students we used to place in English 50.

Validation of ACCUPLACER

In fall 2001, we asked all instructors in English 50 and 1A courses to assess the degree to which they found their students prepared for the classes, and we compared those instructor ratings to the placement measures for students who had taken the ACCUPLACER exam. As the report indicates, we “have far exceeded” the state minimum requirement of correspondence between the two ratings. The preliminary report notes, however, that for English 50 in particular, our placement measure is still a bit too “forgiving”; 11.6% of the students taking the exam and directed to 50 are thought unprepared by the course by their instructors. (Simply raising the cut score for 50, however, would lead to an unacceptably higher number of students adequately prepared for 50 being directed to 60A.) We will have to scrutinize the test, the formula, and the cut scores very carefully over the coming years to see whether this preliminary analysis holds true and work to refine our measures further.

We also continue to see significant numbers of students requiring ESL instruction in English 60A. We need to determine what the cause of this problem is—whether with the counseling department, the ESL placement examination, or some other source—and work to correct it.

Assessment as a Means to Improving Teaching and Learning

Assessment has come to mean something very different from grades and placement, however. If grading is primarily evaluative, a method of classifying students, assessment is primarily ameliorative, a method of understanding and improving teaching and learning. Despite the misunderstandings and fears that many instructors have about the assessment movement, some of us in English believe that we will have to find ways of embracing it and turning it to our (and our students') advantage—if for no other reason than that the new accreditation standards for community colleges make assessment a critical component of institutional self-study.

In order to effectively use assessment as a means to improving teaching and learning, the English Discipline must (1) work to define more clearly than we ever have before what the desired learning outcomes of our courses really are, and (2) develop methods of determining to what extent those outcomes are achieved by our students. And we will have to begin to do this more systematically than we have ever even thought of doing before.

Discipline Efforts Toward Assessment

1. Learning Outcomes and Course Objectives

Since assessment begins with the clear definition of desired learning outcomes, we can point to the fact that the course outlines for all composition courses except English 1B have been revised in recent years. But the sections we devote to what we call “learning objectives” will need further review and refinement. We can be clearer and more specific in defining the exit competencies associated with each of our courses. There is, for example, no reference to knowledge of MLA format methodology in our English 1A learning outcomes, no reference to awareness of writing as a process, no reference to control over surface features like syntax, grammar, punctuation, and spelling.

2. Holistic Scoring/Norming Sessions

We have also periodically conducted holistic scoring sessions of student essays in which we try to norm ourselves against a common rubric but also see whether our students seem to be learning the skills we are trying to teach them. We have also occasionally discussed instituting a common midterm or final exam for our English 50 class.

3. Classroom Based Assessment Projects

Three English instructors are participating in the new assessment project at R.C.C., developing classroom-based assessment techniques for English 1A and the Writing Center. The Writing Center project, conducted by Tammy DiBenedetto, will work to assess the effect of peer tutoring on student learning; the 1A project, undertaken by Arend Flick and Sheryl Tschetter, will work to define learning outcomes in the course and bring them into line with the national Writing Programs Association outcomes. The 1A project will also include several local, classroom-based assessment components as well. With both assessment projects, we expect

the facilitators to report their findings to the discipline as a whole, in an effort to begin meaningful dialogue about assessment of teaching and learning in English.

These are efforts that respond to the requirement that we evaluate the extent to which the learning objectives of our courses are being met.

4. Measuring Student Retention and Success Rates

The retention and success rates for our English classes suggest a pattern of significant student learning, indirect as this evidence might seem to be. We have been able to retain around 85% of our students in our classes between 1999 and 2001, and we have been able to give passing grades to more than 60%. There are a few interesting anomalies in this data worth exploring further. For example, our students consistently have greater success in fall semester than in spring, and there may be things that we can control that might increase the spring success rates in particular. We have also done a little worse each year during this period with student success in English 1A and a little better in English 60A. After a year or so of using ACCUPLACER, we may hope to see greater success rates in the 60A and 50 courses that have historically experienced our lowest rates; in any case, we should study this carefully when we have gathered enough data to make that possible.

Assessment Concerns

1. As a discipline, however, we cannot honestly say that we systematically evaluate student learning, that we use evaluation of student learning to improve the quality of our teaching except in scattered and isolated ways, or that we have defined expected career/occupational outcomes for our students (except that we do talk about English 50 as serving the needs of two very different clienteles, those who wish a terminal A.A. degree and those who wish to proceed to university transfer-level composition).
2. The English Discipline has not developed an approved assessment plan. Our core problem in doing that is simply that we lack knowledge, as a discipline, about what assessment is and how to go about developing a truly comprehensive discipline-based plan of assessment.
3. Some of us are perhaps understandably suspicious of a movement that can sometimes sound more like “accountability” than an (unambiguously positive) effort to improve student learning.
4. Among English instructors, too, there is no doubt the widespread sentiment that much of what they teach to students cannot be measured, or at least measured quantitatively. The “value added” to students in writing classes is, many of us believe, incalculably diffusive. Some studies suggest, in fact, that improvement in writing skills shows up in many student writers on a delayed basis, months and perhaps even years after the course ends.

In order to embrace assessment fully and embrace it as a way of improving learning and teaching in our discipline, we will need to learn how it can benefit us and our students, and we will need to develop systematic methodologies that seem not to exist anywhere else in higher education today. As professional development monies evaporate, shared governance duties obtrude, and institutional strategic planning requires more and more of our attention, this is a daunting prospect. It is made even more daunting by the fact that our very large discipline, consisting of 31 full-time instructors spread across three campuses, has seen its identity as a coherent and

unified academic entity erode over the past few years, as individual instructors define themselves increasingly as members of campus-based departments rather than as teachers of a particular discipline. If we are going to assess learning in English effectively in the future, we will have to find new strategies for defining ourselves first and foremost as English instructors at an institution in which there are no English departments.

D. Collaboration with Other Units

In an effort to better serve the student population, the English Discipline continues to work with a number of different disciplines:

- Counseling – Puente and FYE programs
- Automotive Technology – Ford Asset, Toyota T, General Motors Programs
- Mathematics – FYE
- Public Safety, Education, and Training – Internship Academy
- Workforce Preparation – New Visions Program
- Humanities – Learning Communities (World Religion, Anthropology)
- Faculty Participation in several district and campus committees: matriculation, assessment, technology among other areas.

Assessment of the different collaboration efforts has been positive and effective in most cases for the students by allowing them insight into other disciplines as well as the transference and application of their education in various areas. The discipline continues to see a need for better communication with the Counseling Discipline to ensure accurate and useful placement of the students in their courses (e.g., English 60 to be taken simultaneously with a reading course). The development of more learning communities is of continuing interest among the discipline faculty. Some faculty members also see the need for more online/hybrid courses.

E. Outreach

Recognizing that the study of English provides an important foundation of communication for students in all areas of their education, the English Discipline continues to move beyond the boundaries of the college and into the surrounding community. Through the Puente Program a mentor council is created with community leaders to provide role modeling and advice to the students. The discipline also works closely with the surrounding high schools through the FYE Program, Middle College, and the new pilot project with the Jurupa High School District (Jurupa Unified School District Inter-agency Cooperation Agreement). Welfare recipients within the community are aided through the New Visions program in conjunction with Riverside County Department of Social Services. High School students from throughout the county are served by the Internship Academy.

F. Resources

In spring 1998, the English discipline completed a draft of the “new” program-review process. At that time, however, the discipline was defined as Reading, ESL, English, and Speech

Communication. The actual document was never finished because sufficient data were not available and because the District again abandoned the “new” process. Nevertheless, the English discipline came to following conclusion after a significant amount of work:

[T]he greatest weakness of the discipline is relying too heavily on adjunct faculty to serve RCC’s student population. There is an obvious need to redistribute the FTEs to improve the ratio of full-time to part-time faculty teaching hours. Since contract faculty must also continue to function in leadership roles, which cannot be filled by adjunct or temporary full-time faculty, increasing the number of contract faculty is mandatory to maintain the strength of the discipline. In addition, the college’s current emphasis on remediation is better served by contract faculty who could provide the time and commitment needed to focus on student needs in this area.

As of spring 2002, the English Discipline believes that this problem continues to exist and that the statement from the last program-review draft continues to be true. In fact, the situation is worse. AB 1725 established, as a community college system-wide goal, a 75:25 ratio of full-time faculty to part-time faculty. In principle, the discipline continues to use this goal as one factor in its rationale for increasing the number of full-time English faculty in the District. In fact, as the District continues to grow, the English discipline’s ability to serve the student population has deteriorated in a number of areas. For example, the District FTES increased 39.25% from Fall 1998 to Fall 2001, but the change in the English discipline FTES during the same period is only 23.33%. This disparity suggests that growth in the discipline has not kept pace with the growth in the District. Clearly, this trend has significant staffing implications.

From 1999-2000 to 2001-02, the actual headcount of full-time faculty has increased to accommodate growth, from 23 to 31. The total English faculty, including part-time, increased from 83 to 103.5. It is clear from the figures that most of the growth has occurred in the part-time faculty ranks. The increase in the actual number of faculty at the Norco and Moreno Valley campuses occurred because much of the growth in the District has taken place at the two campuses. At the Riverside Campus, the actual increase in faculty in the classroom since 1990 is, in fact, one (1) faculty member. Riverside had 17 full-time faculty in 1990. In 2001-2002 Riverside had 21 full-time faculty members, but if the 2.7499 FTE faculty on reassigned time is subtracted from the total, the actual number of faculty in the classroom is only 18. Clearly, the discipline has not kept pace with the growth in student numbers. The amount of reassigned time has increased significantly in the English discipline. For example, in Fall 2001, the total amount of reassigned time in the discipline is 4.1833 FTE (2.7499 at Riverside, .7667 at Norco, and .6667 at Moreno Valley). The number of teaching faculty performing other duties presents a problem for the discipline, especially in light of the information below.

The ratio of full-time faculty to part-time faculty suggests that the discipline has not made much progress toward the 75:25 goal. In fact, according to MIS data, full-time faculty taught less than half (44.48% District-wide) of the courses in the English discipline. During the Fall 2001, for instance, full-time faculty taught only 37.7% of the English courses at Norco, 25.5% at Moreno Valley, and 57% at Riverside. However, some of the courses were overloads, which makes the

ratio of full-time to part-time even more significant. Although the District has increased the number of English faculty (23 to 31 from 1999 to 2001), the increase has not significantly reduced the ratio. In fact, the discipline is regressing in the number of full-time faculty actually teaching in the classroom, especially in the critical composition courses that account for the greatest FTES in the discipline. For example, in the Fall 2001, only 1 of 15 sections of English 1A was taught by a full-time faculty member at the Moreno Valley Campus, only 4 of 17 sections at Norco, and only 14 of 35 sections at Riverside. In addition, full-time faculty taught 2 of 12 sections of English 50 at the Moreno Valley Campus, 5 of 16 sections at Norco, and only 15 of 31 sections at Riverside. This means that full-time faculty teach only 41 of 126 sections (32.5%) of the most critical courses in the discipline. (Again, some of these courses are overload assignments. What would the percentage be if full-time faculty did not teach as part-time faculty?) Even with the addition of new full-time faculty, the percentage of full-time faculty teaching the critical composition courses (the heart and soul of the discipline) has decreased since 1996, when 56% of the 1A and 50 course were taught by full-time faculty. If the District continues to grow as projected (over 17% WSCH from 2001-2005), then the English discipline will require a significant increase in the number of full-time faculty to reverse the direction of the trends discussed above.

The District and many state and federal agencies suggest that the ethnic and gender composition of the faculty should parallel the population it serves. In other words, ratio of under-represented groups in the faculty ranks should reflected the same ratio as the population. The Board of Trustees has adopted this Equal Opportunity Employment goal. The breakdown of the gender and ethnicity during the Fall 2001 semester are as follows: 60.4% of the English faculty are female (51.7% at Norco, 63.8 % at Riverside, and 61.5% at Moreno Valley); 5.4% are Asian, 1.8% Black, 7.2% Hispanic, and 85.6% White. (See the Appendix for the specific figures for all three campuses.) The District totals are as follows: 43.3% female; 4.8% Asian, 6.6% Black, .3% Filipino, 11.9% Hispanic, 1.3% American Indian, and 75.0% White. It is very clear that the discipline does not reflect the District figures nor the general population

Classified Staffing:

Currently the discipline shares three IDS's—one on each of the three campuses—with other disciplines in the various departments. During the Fall 2002 semester, a full-time clerk was hired to assist the Riverside IDS. The Writing/Reading Center has one Instructional Support Specialist (ISS) and two reading paraprofessionals in addition to a number of student aides and tutors. In Spring 2001, the District hired two Instructional Support Specialist—one at Norco and one at Moreno Valley—but they work part-time in the WRC. Also, a reading paraprofessional has been hired to work half her time at Norco and half at Moreno Valley to serve the reading classes.

G. Facilities

The Discipline of English, still constrained by a need for adequate classroom space, continues to share classroom and program space with other disciplines in a number of facilities throughout the district. The Discipline has collected data on the number of sections offered and the scheduling times of these sections (see Appendix A). In an effort to continue addressing the issue of inadequate space at all three campuses, data need to also be collected that will reveal how well classes fill at particular times.

H. Overall Assessment of Discipline Performance

As a way of fostering discussion about its own strengths and weaknesses as a discipline, English instructors first reviewed the Program Committee guidelines for self-assessment and then we met as a body to sketch out our own response. Although we did not find ourselves able to assign a letter grade for our performance, we did agree about a range of areas where we think we're effective. We also agreed that we need to improve in a number of areas.

Since our last completed program review almost ten years ago, we can point to the following significant improvements. All of these areas are, in our judgment, strengths of the Discipline:

- The Writing and Reading Centers on all three campuses have been expanded and improved, moving into newer better facilities. We have updated hardware and software; we have taken over the training and deployment of peer tutors in English; we have developed workshops and online components as well. Our Centers have served as a model for other community colleges, including Pasadena CC, Grossmont CC, and Crafton Hills CC.
- We have developed a number of new courses to serve the needs of our students, including Latino Literature. We have a thriving Puente program now on all three campuses, and we have been instrumental in the creation of a First Year Experience strand that includes English. We've also been involved in interdisciplinary learning communities (e.g. Philosophy of Religion/English 1A on the city campus) and expect to do more in coming years.
- We have revisited our course descriptions and significantly altered some courses to make them more pedagogically sound. We have now a two-semester sequence in basic writing (60AB), a critical thinking and literature course (1B) that has also been imitated by other colleges, and a remedial English course (50) that now focuses much more than formerly on writing analytically about texts. All composition courses have been changed from three to four units to allow for more substantial instruction in writing and more contact hours with students.
- We have created workshops for part-time instructors as well as a part-time faculty handbook with sample syllabi, assignments, and graded papers.
- We have been involved—prudently—in distance education, with a hybrid English 1B and current plans to do a hybrid 1A and creative writing course.
- We have conducted holistic grading sessions and given over discipline days to discussion of such topics as writing assignments and motivating students.

We agree, however, that as a discipline we need to do better in some of the following areas:

- We need to do further review of our course descriptions, partly as a function of assessment, partly because some are simply in need of updating. English 1B in particular now needs revision.
- We need to find ways to devote more of our attention to genuine professional development. The teaching of English composition has been undergoing profound—even revolutionary—change in the last 10 to 20 years. There is little consensus about how writing ought to be taught. The debate has become so vociferous, in fact, that it is sometimes referred to as the “composition wars.” It is very difficult for us to stay current in the debate (and in the new theories of teaching in general)—much less participate in it.
- We increasingly find it difficult to see ourselves as a discipline. As one of us noted at a recent meeting, “we don’t think of ourselves as a program.” Our identities, as noted elsewhere in this document, are increasingly department- and campus-specific. We have tried to hold longer discipline meetings this semester for which instructors have been expected to cancel classes or find substitute teachers, and while these have been attended by approximately 75% of the faculty, we are concerned that significant numbers of us don’t participate, or participate only superficially.
- We do not do a particularly good job of coordinating with counselors to ensure that students get the best possible advice about English classes.
- We do not do a particularly good job of communicating with other disciplines that require writing (and according to ed code, that should be all other disciplines).
- We could be doing much better than we are in communicating expectations to (and assisting) part-time faculty—who teach significantly more than half of our composition courses.

Topic II. Where do we want to be?

A. Environmental Scan

In his Environmental Scan report prepared for RCCD, Chuck McIntyre presents several distinctive features relevant for the discipline of English over the next seven to ten years. First, the service area of the district, like the rest of Riverside County and the state, will continue to grow in population (3). In fact, the population in the Inland Empire will grow at twice the rate of the state (3-4). This population in Riverside County, including the college’s service area, will be distinguished by its increasing diversity. Hispanics, for example, will continue to be the largest and fastest growing segment of the population, followed by Asians, Pacific Islanders, African Americans, and other ethnic groups. Unlike other areas of the state, the number of whites will continue to increase in the Riverside region (6). Corollary with this growth in population and increased diversity is the increase in the number of high school graduates, although the graduation rate will continue to decline (10).

Second, McIntyre’s report addresses labor trends that are significant for the RCCD. Like other regions of the state and the nation, projected job growth will be in industry employment service and goods-producing industries, such as construction and manufacturing. These jobs, including

health care and information technology, will require less than a bachelor's degree but certainly at least an associate's degree. An essential requirement for individuals holding these jobs will be critical thinking, computer application, and technical skills.

Third, during the next seven to ten years, resources will continue to be reduced. The state will reduce its financial support for growth in student enrollment. The California State University system will reduce significantly its programs in remedial instruction. As a result, the district must continue to find alternative means of funding programs.

The implications of McIntyre's report for the English Discipline may be noted in several areas. One is increased accountability. With the continued population growth and shift in demographics, the English Discipline must continue to review and revise the college's writing programs to meet the collegiate and pre-collegiate needs of students. Because of the continued, projected decline in the high school graduation rate and the implementation of the High School Exit examination in 2004, the English Discipline will need to review and address how to educate an increased number of unprepared and "under-prepared" eighteen year olds enrolling in college. Further, the Discipline must examine even closer learning paradigms and their appropriateness in addressing the needs of a "digital generation" of students and indeed a "wave" of students with linguistic and cultural differences.

Another implication is the extent to which the English Discipline is relevant to job growth. In the high demand job market for computer applications and technology, health, and other technical areas, courses in English provide the requisite skills needed for critical thinking. As a result, the discipline must continue and even increase its collaboration with other disciplines taught at the college, especially those disciplines that prepare students to earn certificates and associate degrees to enter the job market.

Finally, the English Discipline must be at the core of the college's plan in setting priorities to meet the educational needs of a continually growing and diverse student enrollment. Despite the prediction that resources from the state will continue to decrease, the future of the workforce in the western section of Riverside County and other areas of the county depend upon the literacy of the residents. Collaboration between English faculty and faculty of other disciplines at the college, as well as between English faculty and business and industry, will be insufficient to meet the critical thinking and writing needs of a changing workforce. Relevant and quality instruction in English with sufficient faculty, staff, facilities, and professional development will be the hallmark of the college's commitment to a growing and changing population over the next seven to ten years.

B. Internal Review

Staffing

The English discipline must hire a significant number of full-time faculty over the next few years to accommodate growth and to correct the full-time to part-time ratio. The goal of 75:25 is not in range at this point. The District has reported that, in 2000, 55.7% of the courses in the RCCD were taught by full-time faculty. In 2001, the District reported that only 51.5% of the courses were taught by full-time faculty. The Chancellor's Office has reported that the statewide averages were 63.2% in Fall 2000 and 63.1% in Fall 2001. Perhaps these should become target figures for the discipline. As one of the largest and most critical disciplines of the college, at a minimum, English should have more than 60% of its course offerings and, more important, at least 50% of the critical composition courses taught by full-time faculty. Because the discipline's full-time to part-time ratios fall far below even the District's average, reaching this minimum goal is one of the highest priorities for the discipline. The Discipline believes that more coordination with part-time faculty is needed. Also, professional development activities for both full-time and part-time faculty need to be created. Also, the number of tutors and WRC aides needs to increase significantly to serve the needs of the students as the District continues to grow. (See the statistics in Appendix.) Moreover, the discipline should consider gender and ethnic statistics as it seeks new faculty.

Program Assessment

As noted earlier, systematic student outcomes assessment in English is in its infancy at Riverside Community College. The discipline will need to consider a variety of methods for assessing learning in the coming years, among them

- Review of all course outlines, with particular emphasis on the "learning objectives" section to bring as much specificity and rigor to our outcomes statements as we possibly can. So as not to be overwhelmed by the magnitude of this process, we have begun with one particular course—English 1A—as a pilot program.
- Exploration of assessment methods once these learning objectives have been defined. The discipline obligates itself to have a systematic assessment process in place by the time of its next program review.
- Continuation of validation studies of ACCUPLACER, the placement measures, and the cut scores. We commit ourselves to trying to develop a cut score to make direct placement into 60B possible.
- Further analysis of grading trends in the discipline to determine whether (in fact) grade inflation is a reality, what the sources of the problem might be, and how to solve the problem if it exists.

Curriculum

Course Offerings:

Of primary concern to the English Discipline is continuing to be “student-centered” in course offerings. An increase of course sections needs to be proportional to the district student proportional growth. Currently, enrollment cap for composition courses is 30 students. Often, instructors will “over enroll” their section to accommodate the long line of students attempting to add the course. This procedure undermines the intent to decrease enrollment cap. We need, instead, to lower the enrollment cap, to fill more full-time positions, and to add more course sections. A possible short term solution is the implementation of a “waiting list” through Admissions during student registration. A pilot program involving English 1A, 1B, 50, 60AB could be developed to establish the effectiveness.

Course revision needs to continue on the remaining eight courses (literature) and may be accomplished by assigning revision of these courses to faculty members with interest or expertise in the particular field of study with a timeline for completion. The Discipline also needs to renew the advisories for course outlines to achieve consistency throughout them.

A review must also be done of the numbers of sections offered in the critical courses (English 1A, 1B, 50, 60AB) district-wide to determine student enrollment patterns and to arrive at a balance between remedial courses and transfer level courses in order to best serve the student population.

More careful alignment of course objectives, content, and methods of evaluation needs to be achieved. Past practice has been to simply list methods of evaluation without any careful consideration of and narrative about how these methods are appropriate for measuring achievement of stated course objectives.

One area of concern for the literature courses involves courses offered but not taught on a regular basis. In order to remedy this situation, the Discipline needs to design a two-year course offering rotation list for literature courses (i.e., English 6—fall semester; English 7—spring semester; English 25—spring semester, odd years; English 35—fall semester, even years, etc.). This type of scheduling would benefit faculty by promoting expertise in genres other than composition, and it would benefit students by providing a more consistent, publicized course offering list to help them in their class scheduling and transfer requirements.

Remediation continues to be an important issue that requires continual discussion and research in order to meet student needs and enrollment trends.

Discussion needs to continue in the area of online and hybrid courses within the English Discipline in order to offer more courses as well as study the student evaluation process for online courses.

Learning Communities offer another approach to student-centered programs. The Discipline has offered one learning community cohort during Spring 2001 (English 1A/World Religion) with a second cohort to be offered Spring 2002 (English 50/Anthropology). The FYE program is also

in the initial stages of redesign to offer academic cohorts of English and one other cross-discipline course in the Spring semester of this year-long program.

Topic III. What do we need to do to get there?

Upon review of the information and data collected for the Program Review document and, more importantly, upon continued dialogue within the Discipline, the faculty members have chosen to design five standing committees whose purpose will be to reflect the priority focus areas determined by the Discipline, to involve all Discipline members to help meet those goals, and to set a timeline to achieve those goals. The standing committees and the “proposed” areas of concentration are as follows

- Assessment: review course outlines to realign “learning objectives,” explore assessing the attainment of the objectives, and review grading trends
- Curriculum: review enrollment trends and cut scores for English 60B, revise advisories, complete course revisions, research online-hybrid courses
- WRC: review and research current trends, issues, concerns for the WRC
- Coordination/Collaboration: review position of Discipline coordinator, coordinate communication between full-time and part-time faculty, collaborate with other disciplines for learning communities, counseling
- Professional Development: research and review pedagogical issues within the Discipline and find ways to open dialogue and discussions to share information

IV. What evidence do we need to track our progress?

Each of the standing committees will determine evidence needed to complete their agendas and consult with the Office of Institutional Effectiveness in this process. Much of the evidence we are likely to need has been implied in statements made elsewhere in the document, e.g., in Topic III.

V. How Can the Self-Study Process Be Improved?

The English discipline self-study has been the work of four collaborators representing all three of the campuses. One of the team members withdrew early in the process and was replaced. The team met frequently with the Program Review co-chairs (both of whom deserve our great thanks for their extraordinary competence and professionalism) and twice with the committee itself. It conferred with the full discipline on three occasions and by e-mail continually. It requested data of various kinds from Institutional Research, much of which had to be gathered on an ad hoc basis. (We echo the sentiments of other disciplines undergoing review that institutional data gathering, storage, and retrieval simply has to improve if we are going to be expected to do meaningful self-studies.) This is all by way of saying that the four-month period allotted for the process was not sufficient for us to meet the target deadline. Our task was simply too complicated. For English, the self-study has taken nearly a full year. We recommend, then, that disciplines undergoing Program Review be identified early enough in fall semester to begin the training process (and we highly recommend a training process) well before the semester ends.

With larger departments in particular, a single semester is not enough time to complete the review.

Activities for Academic Year 2002-3

Fall Semester:

- Complete Program Review.
- Establish Standing Committees (see Topic III), appoint chairs, define agendas and timelines.

Spring Semester:

- At the first discipline meeting of the spring, we will refine agendas and timelines within the standing committees.
- At the second (and final) discipline meeting of the spring, we will report on progress. We expect, at a minimum, the following outcomes by late spring 2003:
 - The English 1A course assessment project will be completed, with learning outcomes for the course revisited and perhaps modified. We will have reached agreement about a more systematic approach to assessing student achievement of at least some of those outcomes. We expect this to be a model for assessment in other English composition courses. And we expect that it will provide a foundation for an assessment plan for the discipline.
 - We will have reviewed the placement methods and cut scores currently being employed to place students into composition courses, and we will determine whether we can refine the process to make placement into 60B possible.
 - We will update the course descriptions that need to be updated and make decisions about eliminating some courses from the catalogue that have not been taught in years. We will bring consistency to the advisory prerequisites for the literature course.
 - The National Writing Center Association argues that “a Writing Center should be considered a support service for the entire institution rather than simply for a single department.” We will continue to discuss and work toward the goal of broadening access to the Writing and Reading Center resources to all students at RCC. Because of lack of physical space to accommodate all students with writing assignments, the Writing and Reading Center Committee also plans to develop and submit to the discipline for approval a variety of one-unit “mini-courses” designed to address student need and demand for assistance in writing across the curriculum.

Appendix A

Distribution of Courses: Fall 2001

<u>Riverside Campus 110 Sections</u>		
English 1A	35 sections	31.8%
English 1B	9	8.1%
English 50	32	29.0%
English 60	13	11.8%
English 60B	5	4.5%
Non-Comp	16	14.5%

<u>Moreno Valley 42 Sections</u>		
English 1A	15	35.7%
English 1B	4	10.5%
English 50	12	28.0%
English 60AB	8	19.0%
Non-Comp	3	7.14%

<u>Norco Campus 51 Sections</u>		
English 1A	17	33.0%
English 1B	6	11.7%
English 50	17	33.0%
English 60AB	5	9.8%
Non-Comp	6	11.7%

Distribution of Courses – Times Scheduled

<u>Riverside Campus – 110 Sections</u>		
7	6.6%	6:50 a.m.
21	19.0%	8:00 a.m.
11	10.0%	9:00 a.m.
5	4.5%	10:00 a.m.
9	8.0%	11:00 a.m.
5	4.5%	12:00 p.m.
15	13.0%	2:00 p.m.
3	2.7%	3:00 p.m.
15	13.0%	4:00 p.m.
19	17.0%	6:00 p.m.

<u>Moreno Valley Campus – 42 Sections</u>		
2	4.7%	6:50 a.m.
9	21.0%	8:00 a.m.

4	9.5%	9:00 a.m.
4	9.5%	10:00 a.m.
3	7.14%	11:00 a.m.
8	19.0%	2:00 p.m.
2	4.7%	4:00 p.m.
5	12.0%	5:00 p.m.
5	12.0%	6:00 p.m.

Norco Campus – 51 Sections

4	7.0%	6:50 a.m.
11	21.0%	8:00 a.m.
2	4.0%	9:00 a.m.
7	13.0%	10:00 a.m.
3	5.8%	11:00 a.m.
1	2.0%	12:00 p.m.
8	15.0%	2:00 p.m.
1	2.0%	3:00 p.m.
2	4.0%	4:00 p.m.
5	9.8%	5:00 p.m.
4	7.0%	6:00 p.m.
3	5.8%	7:00 p.m.

Appendix B

Listing of Course Sequences

English 1A UC/CSU	English Composition	Degree Credit	
English 1B	Critical Thinking and Writing	“	“
English 4	Writing Tutor Training	“	CSU
English 6	English Literature I	“	UC/CSU
English 7	English Literature II	“	“
English 8	Introduction to Mythology	“	HUM 8
English 9	Introduction to Shakespeare	“	UC/CSU
English 10	Special Studies in Literature	“	“
English 11	Creative Writing	“	“
English 12	Special Studies in Creative Writing	“	CSU
English 14	American Literature I	“	UC/CSU
English 15	American Literature II	“	“
English 16	Introduction to Language	“	---
English 17	Literary Magazine Production	“	CSU
English 18	Literature of the Native American	“	UC/CSU
English 20	Adv. English Grammar, Usage, & Style	“	CSU
English 21	African-American Literature I	“	UC/CSU
English 22	African-American Literature II	“	“
English 23	The Bible as Literature	“	“
English 25	Latino Literature of the United States	“	UC/CSU
English 26	Literature of Mysticism, Meditation, Madness	“	“
English 30	Children’s Literature	“	CSU
English 35	Women in Literature	“	UC/CSU
English 37	Film Appreciation	“	“
English 40	World Literature I	“	“
English 41	World Literature II	“	“
English 42	Far and Near: Literature of the East	“	UC/CSU
English 44	Discovery of Modern Poetry	“	“
English 45	Discovery of Modern Drama	“	“
English 48	Modern Literature Short Story and Novel	“	“
English 50A	Basic English Composition	“	-----
English 57	Basic Literature and Composition	“	
English 60A	Basic Writing and Grammar	Nondegree	
English 60B	Intermediate Writing and Grammar	“	
English 90A	Special Topics in English – Vocabulary	“	
English 90B	Special Topics in English: Research Paper	“	
English 90C	Special Topics in English – Writing under Pressure		
English 96	Writing and Reading Center Practicum	“	
English 97	Writing and Reading Center Practicum	“	

English 98	Academic Excellence Seminar	“
English 106	Basic Skills Workshop	Not for Credit
English 60 A1	Basic Writing and Grammar: Structure & Spelling	
English 60 A2	“ Usage	
English 60 A3	“ Mechanics	
English 60 A4	Basic Writing and Grammar: Construction and Development	