Bakersfield College

Comprehensive Program Review

**I. Program Information:**

Program Name: English (ENGL)

Program Type: X Instructional  Non-Instructional

Program Mission Statement:

* The English department’s mission is to serve a diverse population by providing excellent instruction at all levels of the composition sequence: from two levels below transfer to the transfer level and in advanced composition courses.
* In addition, the department strives to fulfill the need for courses in imaginative literature: British literature, American literature, African-American literature, World literature, Latino/a literature, Classical Mythology, and other survey courses.
* The mission in all these courses is to provide students with oral and written communication skills, critical thinking skills, and the ability to succeed in higher education and the workplace.

Program Description: Describe how the program supports the Bakersfield College Mission.

* The English department supports the mission of the college by meeting the needs of a culturally, economically, and educationally diverse community; these students range from recent high school graduates to re-entry or re-training adults, and they pursue various goals: earning a degree, transferring to a four-year institution of higher learning, or completing a vocational/technological certificate program. Since critical thinking, effective communication of ideas and information, and oral and written competence are critical to education and life skills, the English department is vital to the college community.

Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs)/Administrative Unit Outcomes (AUOs)—please list:

The following are proposed Program Learning Outcomes for the English department, which are meant to facilitate the mapping of Institution Learning Outcomes, Program Learning Outcomes, and Student Learning Outcomes.

Students will be able to:

1. Read and think critically:

* Recognize thesis statements and supporting arguments and/or examples in reading materials;
* Determine the organization of reading materials;
* Note points of view, logical fallacies, and biases in reading materials, as well as anticipate and deal fairly with opposing views.

1. Communicate clearly and effectively in multiple modes of writing:

* Establish a viable thesis that is relevant to the topic or subject;
* Offer supporting arguments and examples;
* Summarize, quote, and synthesize sources.

1. Demonstrate knowledge and awareness of college level proficiency in English:

* Demonstrate acceptable control of grammar, punctuation, and graphics;
* Demonstrate awareness of acceptable academic tone and diction;
* Demonstrate mastery of MLA citation and format.

1. Understand the importance of literacy and critical thinking in civic responsibilities:

* Explain how literacy and critical thinking are related to cultural and ethical dimensions of life.

***Instructional Programs only:***

1. List the degrees and Certificates of Achievement the program offers.
2. If your program offers both an A.A. and an A.S. degree in the same subject, please explain the rationale for offering both.
3. If your program offers a local degree in addition to the ADT degree, please explain the rationale for offering both.

A. **AD-T Associate Degree for Transfer** (approved 2014)

N.B. AA degree has been dropped.

**II. Program Assessment:**

1. How did your outcomes assessment results during the past three years inform your program planning?

* The English 60 SLO assessment of 2012 led the department to abolish the Final Essay Examination and to bring the English 60 SLOs into alignment with the other courses in the composition sequence, as well as to align them with the California Community Colleges’ Basic Skills Initiative (CB21).
* The English 50 SLO assessment of 2014 confirmed that the changes made to the English 50 SLOs helped students become better prepared for English 1A, especially with regard to quoting, synthesizing, and citing sources.
* The department is now preparing to assess English 53 to see if it is a viable alternative to some of our sequenced composition courses.

1. How did your outcomes assessment results during the past three years inform your resource requests this year?

* The outcomes assessments confirmed the English department’s need for updated technology in Humanities Building classrooms. Technology such as projectors, updated computers, and document cameras facilitates the sharing of students’ documents, common errors, and strategies for successful writing. Requests for this technology were made, and all but two of the classrooms regularly used by the English department have been updated.

1. Describe how the program monitors and evaluates its effectiveness.

* In the last few years, the English department has completed 17 curriculum reviews, and ten courses have been approved for C-ID course descriptors.
* The assessment process has proved valuable for the composition courses, but literature courses need to be assessed more regularly as well.
* Each of the courses in the composition sequence has regular meetings to evaluate and discuss student writing; these meetings will now become formal assessment opportunities.

1. Describe how the program engages all unit members in the self-evaluation dialogue and process.

* All full-time instructors and adjuncts are urged to attend meetings to evaluate sample student writing for the courses they regularly teach. English 60 instructors, for instance, are now required to attend a norming session and formal assessment in the sixth week of the semester.
* Plans are in development to offer special Friday evening sessions for adjuncts who are unable to attend daytime meetings.

1. Provide recent data on the measurement of the PLOs/AUOs, as well as a brief summary of findings.

* New Program Learning Outcomes are being developed and edited so as to connect with Student Learning Outcomes and Institutional Learning Outcomes. The SLOs for all our composition sequence course have been transformed to increase student success. In particular, the SLOs for English 1A had to be changed to accommodate the change from 4 units to 3. This change to our transfer-level course affected our PLOs as well. Significant data using these revised PLOs will not be available until the spring of 2016.

1. What have the program’s PLOs/ AUOs revealed or confirmed in the last three years?

* Since the English department’s SLOs have been changed, we have learned that we must be flexible with our PLOs. The changes in the SLOs have confirmed for us that our new Program Learning Outcomes cannot be usefully assessed until we have had time to collect data. However, the degrading of English 1A from 4 units to 3 will certainly impact our ability to meet our new PLOs.

1. *If applicable*, list other information, data feedback or metrics to assess the program’s effectiveness (e.g., surveys, job placement, transfer rates, output measurements).

* Three of five recently hired adjunct English faculty are graduates of Bakersfield College, where they either majored in or focused their studies on English.

1. Discuss the strengths of your program.

* Over the last three years, the greatest strengths of the English department have been its flexibility and its willingness to accept change. All three of the traditional courses in the composition sequence have undergone significant transformations, and the success and retention rates for each have improved.
* English 60 Success Rate increased from 43.6 to 55.2 and retention rose from 79.6 to 84.1; English 50 success improved from 46.5 to 60 and retention went from 78.3 to 82.8; English 1A success rose from 56.4 to 63.3 and retention improved from73.6 to 82.3. In addition, accelerated and compressed courses have been developed and offered to expedite student success.

1. Discuss areas for improvement in your program.

* The English department must begin to assess SLOs on a more regular basis.
* The weaknesses in classroom technology have been satisfactorily addressed, although some training and computer adapters (for MAC computers) are still needed.

1. *If applicable*, describe any unplanned events that impacted your program.

* The most significant unplanned event has been the degrading of English 1A from 4 units to 3. This has obliged the department not only to change radically the SLOs for the course, but also to alter every aspect of the teaching of English 1A: from syllabus to requirements to time blocks to length and breadth of written assignments.
* The pedagogical impact of this change has yet to be fully determined, but first indicators are not promising. The effect on the English department’s FTES is also worrisome.

**III. Resource Analysis:**

1. Human Resources
2. If you are requesting any additional positions, explain briefly how the additional positions will contribute to increased student success. (Faculty Request form attached)

* We are requesting two (2) full-time tenure-track positions for the fall of 2015. At least two of the full-time English faculty will retire in the next year or two. The number of sections of English 1A, which is predominantly taught by full-time faculty, has grown significantly, and, because English 1A has been degraded from a 4 unit to a 3 unit course, the one and half hour time blocks allow for more sections to be added.
* In addition, the senior faculty whose retirement is imminent are key figures in the English department’s knowledge base and institutional memory; they are also among the most significant liaisons between the English department and the administration. Replacing these full-time faculty will be crucial to the continued success of the program.

1. Professional Development
2. Describe briefly the effectiveness of the professional development your program has been engaged with (either providing or attending) during the last cycle, focusing on how it contributed to student success.

The English department faculty have participated in the following professional development activities:

* KCCD Leadership Academy
* CATE conference on Common Core (BC)
* Conference on Writing Program Administration (Illinois)
* League of Innovation (Anaheim)
* Adjunct Orientation (BC)
* Data Conference (BC)
* Acceleration Conference (BC)
* Conference on Global Climate Change (Iceland)
* Building Bridges Conference (with CSUB, KCCD colleges, and local high schools)
* Online Moodle training, SLO workshops, SARS training, Habits of Mind, and FLEX workshops.

Nearly all of the above have made the English department faculty better acquainted with innovative means for improving, tracking, and assessing student success.

1. Provide rationale for future professional development opportunities and contributions that your program can make.

The BC English department makes the following requests with regard to professional development opportunities:

* The department will co-host the annual Building Bridges Conference with CSUB’s English department next spring. This conference keeps our faculty abreast of the latest pedagogical techniques, best practices, textbooks, and software; it also serves to strengthen the ties and connections between BC, CSUB, our sister colleges, and local high schools. Since the grant that funded this conference has expired, BC has continued to support Building Bridges with $1,500.00 anually from a different source.
* Several English department faculty have requested professional development dealing specifically with online teaching and the use of Moodle. This training would help instructors meet the strategic goals of student success.
* English department faculty have also requested training for the new short-throw projectors in the Humanities classrooms; this training will also help the department meet the strategic goals of student success.

1. Facilities (M&O requests can be submitted by completing the [M&O Request form](https://committees.kccd.edu/sites/committees.kccd.edu/files/Copy%20of%2012%20M%26O%20Needs%20Workbook%2012-13%20APR.xlsx) attached)
   1. Assess the effectiveness of the facilities used by your program in meeting college strategic goals.

* Many of the chairs and desks in the Humanities Building classrooms are unsuitable for disabled, special needs, and large/tall students.
* Many of the classrooms used by the English department in the Humanities Building have recently been updated with short-throw projectors; however, the use of these projectors has been hindered by the lack of curtains in some rooms.
  1. Justify your facilities and M & O request.
* The combination desk/chair in most of the Humanities classrooms is outdated. Many students and faculty cannot sit comfortably in these combinations because of their body shapes and sizes, special needs, or physical disabilities. Most classrooms have one or two separate desks and chairs, but all of the desks and chairs should be separate. This is a request that has been made many times.
* Window curtains in many of the Humanities classrooms are non-functioning, torn, or missing altogether. During the building refurbishing two years ago, all curtains were taken down, but many were never replaced. The brightness and glare of natural light through the classroom windows makes viewing short-throw projections on a screen very difficult.

1. Technology (Technology requests can be made by filling out the [ISIT Request form](http://www.bakersfieldcollege.edu/irp/Annual%20Program%20Reviews/2012-13/13%20ISIT%20Priority%20Workbook%2012-13.xlsx) attached)
2. Has your program received new or repurposed technology in this 3-year cycle?
   1. If yes, discuss the assessment of its effectiveness as it relates to student, program, or administrative outcomes.

* Most of the classrooms that the English department regularly uses have been equipped with short-throw projectors; these projectors have been helpful in remedying the non-ergonomic placement of computers and monitors in the Humanities classrooms. The short-throw projectors enable professors to project samples of student writing, excerpts with common errors, and examples of effective writing. The use of projection helps to keep students engaged, which increases student retention and success.
* Humanities Building Rooms 2 and 7 have not been equipped with updated technology. Most of the computer cabinets in the Humanities Building classroom are insufficiently ventilated.
* The computer in the English adjunct office is outdated and insufficient for the needs of 31 adjuncts.
* Some instructors have received new or newer computers in their offices, which helps them prepare materials that promote student success, including the use of Moodle. More new or newer computers would be most welcome.
  1. If no, what technology could play a contributing factor in future student success and outcomes for your program? How would you evaluate the effectiveness of this technology?
* The new computers and short-throw projectors in most of the Humanities classrooms have proved very effective with visual learners. Instructors report that they are able to convey concepts more efficiently, as well as project student documents for the purpose of discussing common errors and examples of successful writing. The English department is in the process of developing a short survey about this technology to be filled out by both students and faculty.

1. Discuss the effectiveness of technology used in your area to meet [college strategic goals](http://www.bakersfieldcollege.edu/collegecouncil/BAKERSFIELD%20COLLEGE%20STRATEGIC%20FOCUS%202013-14.pdf).

* The primary technologies used in Humanities Building classrooms are computers with monitors and short-throw projectors. These computers and projectors help instructors meet the college’s strategic goals of communication and student success by allowing instructors to interact with students in ways that are increasingly familiar to and appropriate for students in the 21st century.

1. Does your program need new or repurposed technology to support student success? Justify your ISIT Technology Request and your vision for meeting student, program, or administrative unit outcomes for this next 3-year cycle.

The English department requests the following additional and new technology. The following are priority requests

* If possible, the technology in Humanities Rooms 2 and 7 should be updated so that all students have the same availability.
* Cables to connect equipment to short-throw projectors, including cables used for Mac computers, HDMI, and mini-HDMI cables, at the very least. Some Bluetooth or wireless connectors would be ideal.
* Power Point clickers that instructors can use while lecturing.

The following are ongoing requests of lower priority for future consideration:

* Updated computer hardware for faculty with older machines.
* Ongoing replacement of computers and monitors in Humanities classrooms, with replacement occurring on a regular cycle.
* Turnitin.com access for all English faculty, including adjuncts, to prevent plagiarism.

1. Budget.

If you are requesting any additional funding, explain briefly how it will contribute to increased student success.

* The requests for all of the above are justified because they will contribute to communication, retention, and student success. The separate desks and chairs will make classrooms ergonomic and students more physically comfortable and ready to learn. Window curtains in classrooms will allow faculty to use the new short-throw projectors effectively. All of the technological needs will help the English department maintain an environment consistent with that of higher education nationwide. This technology helps faculty engage students in the learning process.

**IV. Trend Data Analysis:**

Review the data provided by Institutional Research. Provide an analysis of program data throughout the last three years, including:

* 1. Changes in student demographics (gender, age and ethnicity).
* In the last three years, the ratio of female to male students has remained about the same: 60% female to 40% male.
* The age distribution has not changed significantly either: the two largest populations remain students 19 and younger and students 20-29.
* The number of Hispanic students has continued to grow from 59% to 68%. The number of White students has declined from 28% to 20%.
  1. Changes in enrollment (headcount, sections, course enrollment, and productivity).
* Enrollment in English courses as a percentage of the college-wide headcount has grown from 21.3% to 24.2%. However, the number of total students is still less than three years ago (6,394 vs. 6,190). The overall drop in students in 2011-2012 mirrored college-wide trends following budget cuts.
* The number of sections offered has increased since 2010-2011 (287 to 297). This increase follows a steep decline in 2011-2012 (253). This decline likewise reflects budget cuts. The average of students per section remains the same at 26, slightly lower than the college-wide average of 31.
* The number of first day waitlisted students has declined for traditional course from 2,851 to 1,481 (no doubt as a result of changes in waitlist procedures).
* FTEF has increased from 85.6 to 92. All other productivity measures show little to no change.
  1. Success and retention for face-to-face as well as online/distance courses.
* The success and retention rates for both face-to-face and distance education (DE) courses have increased. Face-to-face success rates have grown from 52% to 62%; retention for face-to-face has gone from 78% to 83%. For DE courses, the growth in success has been 48% to 57% and retention has grown from 67% to 71%. The growth in face-to-face success and retention may be a result of changes in course SLOs and the advent of accelerated and compressed courses. The growth in DE success/retention may be a result of the online taskforce’s efforts.
* Nevertheless, DE courses still continue to lag somewhat behind face-to-face courses, especially in retention, because of student expectations and poor computer skills.
  1. Degrees and certificates awarded (three-year trend data for each degree and/or certificate awarded).
* The number of AA degrees awarded went from 15 in 2010-2011 to 5 in 2012-2013, but the number has rebounded somewhat to 11 in 2013-2014, no doubt as a result of efforts by the department to recruit English majors.
  1. Other program-specific data (please specify or attach).
* English B1A data 2010-11 to 2013-14: grew from 37% to 48% of all English sections offered

Sections grew from 107 to 142 Success Rate from 56 % to 63% Retention 73% to 82%

* English B50 data 2010-11 to 2013-14: fell from 26% to 21% of all English sections offered

Sections fell from 76 to 63 Success Rate grew from 47% to 60% Retention 78% to 83%

* English B60 data 2010-11 to 2013-14: fell from 20% to 14.5% of all English sections offered

Sections fell from 58 to 42 Success Rate grew from 44% to 55% Retention 80% to 84%

* Totals for English Composition Sequence: Consistently at 83% to 84% of all English sections offered

Sections grew slightly from 241 to 247 Success Rate: 49% to 60% Retention: 77% to 83%

* Observations and Analysis: The number of English 1A sections has grown significantly while 50 and 60 sections have declined. Success and Retention rates are up for the entire composition sequence; 1A has become the most successful with an almost 10 percent increase in both measurements.
  1. List degrees and certificates awarded (three-year trend data for each degree and certificate awarded). Include targets (goal numbers) for the next three years.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Degree or Certificate** | **2011-2012** | **2012-**  **2013** | **2013-**  **2014** | **2014-**  **2015** | **2015-**  **2016** | **2016-**  **2017** |
| Associate in Arts | 10 | 5 | 11 |  |  |  |
| Associate Degree for Transfer |  |  |  | 13 | 15 | 17 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

**V. Progress on Previously Established Program Goals, Future Goals and Action Plans:**

1. List the program’s goals from the previous Program Review. For each goal, please discuss progress and changes. If the program is addressing more than two (2) goals, please duplicate this section.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Previously Established Goal** *(state goal)* | **Which institutional goals from the Bakersfield College Strategic Plan will be advanced upon completion of this goal?**  **(select all that apply)** | **Progress on goal achievement**  **(Choose one)** | **Comments**  **(if applicable)** |
| 1. 2012-13 GOAL: increase number of students successfully advancing through departmental pre-requisite courses. | X 1: Student Success  2: Communication  3: Facilities & Infrastructure  4: Oversight & Accountability  5: Integration  6: Professional Development | Completed: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ (Date)  Revised: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ (Date)  *(*state revised goal) | Accelerated courses, particularly English 510 appear to have helped with success, but data is limited. This is an ongoing pursuit. |
| 1. 2012-2013 GOAL: Continue addressing SLO alignment between sequence courses. | X 1: Student Success  2: Communication  3: Facilities & Infrastructure  4: Oversight & Accountability  5: Integration  6: Professional Development | X Completed: 5/5/2014 (Date)  Revised: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ (Date)  *(*state revised goal) | All the SLOs in the composition sequence now account for the introduction, development, and mastery of writing essays that use outside sources and MLA citation. |
| 1. 2012-2013 GOAL: Increase number of English majors; support campus increase in transfers. | X 1: Student Success  2: Communication  3: Facilities & Infrastructure  4: Oversight & Accountability  5: Integration  6: Professional Development | X Completed: Spring 2014 (Date)  Revised: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ (Date)  *(*state revised goal) | English AD-T degree was approved to support increase in transfers; English majors have rebounded. |
| 1. 2012-13 GOAL: Outreach to other departments on campus to support student learning. | X 1: Student Success  2: Communication  3: Facilities & Infrastructure  4: Oversight & Accountability  5: Integration  6: Professional Development | X Completed: 9/20/2013 (Date)  Revised: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ (Date)  *(*state revised goal) | See #8 below—  “2013 Previously Established Goal 4” |
| 1. 2013 Revised GOAL 1: The department will expand B53 and Writing Express offerings to the Delano campus to provide all students with equal opportunity. The department will collect data on all composition sequence courses to evaluate their comparative success rates. | X 1: Student Success  2: Communication  3: Facilities & Infrastructure  4: Oversight & Accountability  5: Integration  6: Professional Development | Completed: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ (Date)  Revised: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ (Date)  *(*state revised goal) | Early data is promising but too limited to allow for evaluation. Process is ongoing. |
| 1. 2013 Revised Goal 2: The English dept. will compare course SLOs with CB21. The English dept. will align SLOs of the composition sequence of courses. | X 1: Student Success  2: Communication  3: Facilities & Infrastructure  4: Oversight & Accountability  X 5: Integration  6: Professional Development | X Completed: Spring 2014 (Date)  Revised: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ (Date)  *(*state revised goal) | English 60 and English 1A SLOs were rewritten. English 1A SLOs approved for C-ID. |
| 1. 2013 Revised GOAL 3: The dept. will begin the process for state approval of English transfer degree. | 1: Student Success  2: Communication  3: Facilities & Infrastructure  4: Oversight & Accountability  5: Integration  6: Professional Development | X Completed: Spring 2014 (Date)  Revised: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ (Date)  *(*state revised goal) | AD-T approved. |
| 1. 2013 Previously Established Goal 4: Outreach to other departments to support student learning. | X 1: Student Success X 2: Communication  3: Facilities & Infrastructure  4: Oversight & Accountability  5: Integration  6: Professional Development | X Completed: 9/20/2013 (Date)  Revised: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ (Date)  *(*state revised goal) | Creation of Writing Rubric Think Tank; working with Writing Center and adjunct faculty; aligning courses with Academic Development; publishing Roughneck Review; promoting accelerated and compressed courses. |
| 1. 2013 GOAL: Continuation of goal 4: work on C6 Common Assessment, multiple measures, Roughneck Review, Writing Rubric Think Tank; collaborate with Writing Center, CSUB through Building Bridges, and local high schools through RIAP. | X 1: Student Success X 2: Communication  3: Facilities & Infrastructure  4: Oversight & Accountability  X 5: Integration  6: Professional Development | Completed: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ (Date)  Revised: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ (Date)  *(*state revised goal) | All ongoing successfully. Accuplacer adopted for placement and multiple measures created with help from high schools.  Building Bridges in 20th year and still expanding. RIAP continuing. |
| 1. 2013 GOAL: Use data to research success of students in accelerated and compressed courses. | X 1: Student Success  2: Communication  3: Facilities & Infrastructure X 4: Oversight & Accountability  5: Integration  6: Professional Development | Completed: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ (Date)  Revised: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ (Date)  *(*state revised goal) | Established and ongoing. Data not sufficient to determine persistent success. |

1. List the program’s goals for the next three years. Ensure that stated goals are specific and measurable. State how each program goal supports the College’s strategic goals. Each program goal must include an action plan.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Future Goal** | **Action Plan** | **Lead person for this goal** | **Timeline for Completion:** |
| **1. Assess effects of degrading English 1A (transfer level course) from 4 to 3 unit course. Major departmental concern.** | **Assess English 1A SLOs and English Program Level Learning Outcomes by means of evaluating English 1A research papers.** | **Cynthia Powell** | **Begin Spring 2015.**  **End Spring 2016.** |
| **Which institutional goals from the Bakersfield College Strategic Plan will be advanced upon completion of this goal? (select all that apply)** | | | |
| **X 1: Student Success  2: Communication  3: Facilities & Infrastructure**  **X 4: Oversight & Accountability  5: Integration  6: Professional Development** | | | |
| **Future Goal** | **Action Plan** | **Lead person for this goal** | **Timeline for Completion:** |
| **2.Assess all courses in English program and, particularly, the effectiveness of accelerated and compressed courses.**  **To complete earlier goal.** | **Work with individual course level faculty to move forward with rotation of SLO assessment; these course-level faculty will set goals and dates for each semester. Gather data for this semester and the next three semesters.** | **Scott Wayland** | **End Spring 2016.** |
| **Which institutional goals from the Bakersfield College Strategic Plan will be advanced upon completion of this goal? (select all that apply)** | | | |
| **X 1: Student Success  2: Communication  3: Facilities & Infrastructure**  **X 4: Oversight & Accountability  5: Integration  6: Professional Development** | | | |

**VI. Curricular Revisions *(Instructional Programs only):***

1. Review of Course Information:

* Column A list all of the courses associated with the degree.
* Column B list the Fall term the review process will be started for ongoing compliance.
* Column C list the compliance due date.
* Column D list any changes to courses with regard to distance education.
* Column E list corresponding C-ID descriptors if available. <http://www.c-id.net/>

**\*\*Dates listed should reflect a five year cycle allowing for one year of review**

**to maintain ongoing compliance.\*\***

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **A. Course** | **B. Fall Term Review will be Submitted** | **C. Compliance Due Date** | **D. Distance Education Changes** | **E. C-ID Descriptors Available** |
| English B5a | Reviewed 2013 | 2019-2020 | N/A | Yes: approved 2014 |
| English B5b | Reviewed 2013 | 2019-2020 | N/A | Yes: approved 2014 |
| English B10 | Reviewed 2012 | 2018-2019 | N/A | Not eligible for C-ID |
| English B20a | Reviewed 2013 | 2019-2020 | N/A | Yes: approved 2014 |
| English B24 | Reviewed 2012 | 2018-2019 | N/A | Not eligible |
| English B27 | Reviewed 2012 | 2018-2019 | N/A | Not eligible |
| English B28 | Reviewed 2013 | 2019-2020 | N/A | Not eligible |
| English 30a | Reviewed 2013 | 2019-2020 | N/A | Yes: approved 2014 |
| English 30b | Reviewed 2014  (approval pending) | 2020-2021 | N/A | Yes: approved 2014 |
| English 41a | N/A | 2016-2017 | N/A | Yes: approved 2014 |
| English B1a | N/A | 2017-2018 | Currently offered online | Yes: approved 2014 |
| English B1b | Reviewed 2014 | 2019-2020 | N/A | Yes: approved 2014 |
| English B2 | Reviewed 2014 | 2019-2020 | N/A | Yes: approved 2014 |
| English B3 | Approved 2013 | 2018-2019 | N/A | Yes: approved 2013 |
| English B50 | Reviewed 2012 | 2018-2019 | N/A | Yes: approved 2013 |
| English B53 | Approved 2012 | 2018-2019 | N/A | Not eligible |
| English B60 | Reviewed 2013 | 2019-2020 | N/A | Not eligible |

1. Review of Program Information:

Is the program information housed in CurricUNET accurate? (Considerations: changes in course(s) names and/or suffixes as well as additions/deletions of courses). If not, then a program modification needs to be started in CurricUNET to reflect the necessary changes. Explain the requested changes below.

* The program information for English in CurricUNET is accurate, except for the Prerequisite on the COR for English B28, which should be “ENGL B50.”

Is the program and course listing information in the current catalog accurate? If not, list the requested

changes below. Catalog information should reflect what is in CurricUNET.

* All course information is catalog information is correct with the exception of the course description for English B50, which should read, “Prepares students for English B1A,” not “Prepares transfer students for English B1A”

1. Student Education Plan (SEP) Pathway(s) uploaded to “Attached Files” in CurricUNET.

If applicable, SEP Pathway with CSU Breadth indicated? **Yes** or No

If applicable, SEP Pathway with IGETC indicated? **Yes** or No

If applicable, SEP Pathway with BC General Education indicated? Yes or **No**

**\*\*Please ensure that the information housed in CurricUNET and the current catalog match. \*\***

1. If applicable, provide a description of the program’s future adoption of C-ID descriptors and Associate Degree for Transfer (ADT) or Model Curricula.

* All English courses without C-ID descriptors are ineligible for C-ID. English program has been approved (2014) for AD-T.

**VII. Faculty and Staff Engagement:**

1. Discuss how program members have engaged in institutional efforts such as committees, presentations, and departmental activities.

English department faculty continue to take an active role in institutional efforts.

* Over the past three years, English faculty have served on the following committees and participated in the following programs: Academic Senate, Accreditation Midterm Report, Accreditation Steering Committee/Accreditation & Institutional Quality Committee, African-American Success through Excellence and Persistence, AIQ Committee, Assessment Committee, Building Bridges Program, C6 Common Assessment Project, CCA Executive Board, College Council, Computer Science Hiring Committee, Critical Thinking Think Tank, Curriculum Committee, Equivalency Committee, General Education Committee, Habits of Mind, ILO Conference Planning Committee, Leadership Academy, Making It Happen, Online Education Initiative Task Force, Placement/Matriculation Committee, Program Review Committee, Reading Apprenticeship Think Tank, Reorganization Task Force, Scholarship Committee, Staff Development Coordinating Council, Student Discipline Committee, Student Hearing and Complaint Committee, Writing Rubrics Think Tank.
* In addition, department members have presented at the following venues: Bakersfield College Acceleration Conference, Building Bridges Conference, Critical Academic Skills (CAS) workshops, CSUB Graduate Student workshops, FLEX seminars, Roughneck Review events.
* English department faculty regularly participate in the following departmental activities: Adjunct Hiring Committees, Assessment of Student Learning Outcomes, department meetings, development of new Student Learning Outcomes, FLEX activities, student essay norming sessions, Curriculum Reviews, Roughneck Review editorial board, Literature Course Rotation Committee, Video Presentation for library research, Rural Education Plan for English Courses.
* In the last three years, English department faculty organized and sponsored BC’s Acceleration Conference for KCCD, participated in the Reading Institute for Academic Preparation (RIAP) to collaborate with local high schools and CSUB, represented BC’s Innovations Team at the League of Innovations Conference in Anaheim, and attended the Acceleration in Context Learning Institute at Chabot College.

1. *Instruction Only*: Discuss how adjunct faculty are included in departmental training, discussions and decision-making.

* In the past three years, English department adjunct faculty were involved in training, discussions, and decision-making.
* English department adjuncts attended new adjunct faculty orientations, division meetings, department meetings, and Building Bridges Conferences; taught a range of courses, including composition and literature courses; participated in norming sessions and Student Learning Outcomes assessments; served as BC representatives at RIAP and with Habits of Mind; served on numerous committees including the current departmental Program Review Committee.

**VIII. Program Funding Sources:**

Identify any non-KCCD general fund sources

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Title of Account/Grant/Categorical Funding** | **Start Date** | **End Date** | **Percentage of Program Budget Covered** | **Positions funded wholly or in part** |
| Foundation Accounts | N/A |  |  |  |  |
| Grants | N/A |  |  |  |  |
| Categorical Funding | N/A |  |  |  |  |

**IX. Conclusions and Findings:**

Present any conclusions and findings about the program.

In the course of this comprehensive review, the English department has reached a number of conclusions and wishes to emphasize a number of findings:

* The English department (with one of the largest programs, including 29 full-time, tenured or tenure-track, and 31 adjunct members, who serve nearly 25% of all BC students each semester) continues to support the mission of Bakersfield College. We serve students in their efforts to achieve the general education requirements of critical thinking and written communication. Data supports the conclusion that the English department is productive and is achieving gains in student retention and success.
* English department faculty regularly meet to share ideas and have begun to use such meetings for the purpose of formal assessments.
* The English department is currently revising its Program Learning Outcomes to align them with BC’s Institutional Level Learning Outcomes, as well as our course SLOs.
* The English department works to increase student success by examining, changing, and updating traditional course offerings in the composition sequence, as well as experimenting with accelerated and compressed courses that are designed to help students progress through the sequence more rapidly.
* The accelerated and compressed courses must be assessed within the next two years to determine their efficacy and their impact on student success.
* The need for English 1A sections continues to increase, while the demand for English 60 and English 50 sections has declined; the department is concerned that the degrading of English 1A from 4 to 3 units will negatively impact this important transfer-level course and may leave students less prepared for the rigors of university-level research work. This reduction also adversely impacts the course SLOs in that it is difficult to meet these outcomes with reduced student contact hours.
* The department has increased the number of online sections of English 1A offered from five to eight this coming spring; we are working to improve online retention rates so that we may offer even more sections; the success rates for students in online sections who are retained are very promising.
* The department must continue to re-evaluate and re-invent our offerings and opportunities for students, but some crucial resources are needed so that we may continue to increase student retention and success.
* With the imminent retirement of two senior full-time faculty, the English department will need two new full-time positions.
* The Humanities Building classrooms require separate desks and chairs to replace desk/chair combinations that are outdated and inhibit the comfort and attention of disabled, special needs, and large/tall students and faculty.
* Some accessory technological equipment and training is needed for the newly updated Humanities classrooms.

**VII. Attachments (place a checkmark beside the forms listed below that are attached):**

X [Faculty Request Form](http://committees.kccd.edu/bc/committee/programreview)  [Classified Request Form](http://committees.kccd.edu/bc/committee/programreview)  [Budget Change Request Form](http://committees.kccd.edu/bc/committee/programreview)

X Professional Development X [ISIT Form](http://committees.kccd.edu/bc/committee/programreview) X [M & O Form](http://committees.kccd.edu/bc/committee/programreview)

X [Best Practices Form](http://committees.kccd.edu/bc/committee/programreview) **(Required)**  Other: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_