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Department Information

Global Departmental Goals

- To improve student achievement across all of our gateway classes through the consistent delivery and assessment of our curriculum across all English classes, supporting the GRCC Completion Agenda. (If students don’t get through English classes, they often drop out).
  - Goal ongoing, but improvement seen across the board; in some cases substantial improvement is seen. (Please see data included below).

- To improve student achievement in all of our English courses, but particularly in our gateway courses, by better understanding ourselves and our students: EN097/100/101/102/RD097/098. Goal is on-going.
  - We experienced a rich, full year of events with our PRG group: our October Learning Day and our reading and applying the book *Teaching the Unprepared Student*. We did not meet all of the sessions as planned due to weather and the bomb scare. We will continue this exploration next year when we continue our PRG group.

- To get all CARPs updated and on-schedule. (We were several years behind).
  - We are mostly caught up. A few are still in process.

- To plan the TYCA conference, to be hosted in fall 2014
  - This committee has worked hard this past year, and substantial planning has been completed. We may have the rich opportunity of two important presenters: Bonnie Jo Campbell and Jack Ridle. We are delighted!

- To participate in the Who Cares? Why bother? Writing conference
  - Our department-wide participation in this extraordinary conference has increased with more full-time and adjunct English faculty included. We’d like to continue that trend.
Specific Program Goals

- **Composition Program:** To improve student achievement by addressing the weakest area of student writing performance based on our Composition Exit Outcomes Rubric. Maintain Bb site with strategies for teaching English conventions. To address weak proofreading/editing skills in students, make EN120 a required co-requisite based on Sentence Skills Test of ACCUPLACER. Goal met. Pilot begins fall 2013 for EN101 and summer 2014 for CJ259 (Report Writing).

- To improve completion and retention of high scoring developmental writing students, our department is participating in a state-wide initiative called A-COMP, where certain students enroll in EN0-97 and EN101 in the same semester. Initial phase completed. Pilot begins fall 2013. National data on this model shows high levels of success. We look forward to this initiative.

- **Reading Program:** To revise the reading curriculum to be based on Reading Apprenticeship principles and embedded assessments. Goal met. Common assessments begin fall 2013.

- To design and implement RD095 for those low readers presently in RD097 and failing at an alarming rate. Goal met. Pilot begins fall 2013.

- To continue the Literacy Empowerment Program to assist our reluctant readers in reading aloud. Goal met. Program ongoing, although it may be changed with the implementation of RD095, which we believe will benefit this population of students more completely. See Reading Program Review for further analysis.

- To complete extensive Program Review for our reading program and include all reading faculty in this work. Goal met.

- **Literature Program:** To create an exit outcomes rubric and pilot it with EN262 final essays. Goal met.

- **ESL Program:** To create an exit outcomes rubric and pilot it with ES144 final essays. Goal met.
Goals for next year

- Work continuously on improving student achievement in all our courses, but particularly our gateway courses.
- Monitor and evaluate our three new initiatives: RD095, A-COMP, and EN120. Revise as needed.
- Monitor and evaluate our EN100 AtD pilot. Revise as needed
- Continue PRG with focus on improving student achievement through understanding ourselves and our students better.
- Foster development of Bb site specifically for online/hybrid delivery of our composition curriculum
- Continue our off-campus Learning Day with a visit to the Jim Crow Museum at Ferris State University (rescheduled from this past spring).
- Continue all assessment projects for all programs: composition, reading, ESL, and literature.
- Participate more fully as a department with the Who Cares? Why Bother writing conference.
- Make connections to our major transfer institutions: Grand Valley, Western, Davenport, Central, Michigan State
- Make connections to our feeder KISD high schools.
- Participate with the National Writing Project to evaluate our writing program through the Analytic Writing Continuum. We look forward to exploring this process.
- Participate with the AFP Learning Day in inviting Alfred Tatum to our campus to lead an in-service about success of our minority male students.
- Continue planning the TYCA conference. Bonnie Jo Campbell -yay!!!!!
Investigate a pre-transfer major program for English Majors for transfer institutions.

Internal collaborations and partnerships
Reading 095 Cohort with PY097 and CO001 piloted fall 2013

EN120 with CJ 259 (report writing) planned pilot summer 2014

External collaborations and partnerships
NA

Departmental needs for support from other departments within the college
NA

Program accreditation Updates
The on-going NADE certification process has been complicated, tedious, and slow. (NADE is slow to respond and changed the process and expectations in the middle of our application process). NADE recently returned the math application for insufficient data. Consequently, we are changing slightly our reading project and are waiting until fall of 2014 to submit our application for reading certification, after we’ve accumulated one year’s worth of data on the RD095 class.

The developmental writing application is also on hold. We will have sufficient data from our Learning Outcomes Assessment this year to include in our application next year. It has also been suggested that we use A-COMP instead. Either way, we won’t submit this application until fall 2014.

We are working toward one project for AtD, NADE, and Program Review for all of our developmental and gateway courses. We believe this is the most comprehensive and meaningful way to do these kinds of improvement projects and reports.

Description of departmental advising plan and outcomes
Individual instructors in the department advised students in various fields (English major, reading, ESL, etc) and programs whenever approached by students or when the department head sent along an email requesting advising. This could be before, during, or after class, during office hours, over email, or on
the phone. Faculty are aware of how our courses satisfy requirements for our degree programs and the MAACRO at our transfer institutions.

What follows is an incomplete but rich list of advising, both informal and formal, completed by individual English faculty.

Vikki Cooper: I advised at least 7-10 students this semester, three of them were education students and the rest were students with questions about developmental classes and English courses.

David Cope: I advised 25 students informally (career choices, choice of transfer school, etc.), but none whatsoever in formal advising for GRCC classes.

Linda Spoelman: I probably advised about 20 students, 8 ESL and about 12 random people who either called or stopped in. Mostly the advising dealt with first year developmental classes.

Colleen Becker: As for advising, I did not formally advise anyone on a major, but spoke with numerous ESL students about which ESL and composition courses they need, and how the ESL program works.

Christina McElwee: Here are my notes on academic advising this year.

Mia Mahaney
9/26/12 - Discussed possibility of a double major in Liberal Arts and Business Administration. Talked about wanting to go to NYU after GRCC. Looked at what classes would need to be completed for an Associate's degree in Business Administration. Also talked about needing a Faculty Advisor for a student organization.

Katrina Melendy
9/26/12 - Discussed future academic goals. Had questions about degree audit and graduating in December. Was advised to double check on audit. I will double check on program requirements for graduation. Mentioned being interested in business administration. Wanted to start a daycare. Talked about applying to CMU and possible scholarship opportunities. Will touch base in March to talk about scholarships.

Jayme Stein
11/6/12 - Student emailed about taking another PS course to cover Science requirement. After looking at Degree Works, I emailed the student back and told him that the PS course that he is taking now will cover his Social Science requirement, but he still needs to take a Natural Science. Sent out several emails to other students on my advising list throughout the semester. The emails encouraged students to set up appointments for academic advising.

Megan Coakley: I advised a dozen or so students before, during, and after class on whether to take EN 100 or 101.

Tony VanderArk: I met with about 80 students to talk about their work in class, and I also answered countless emails about course issues, including questions about adding/withdrawing/etc.

p.s. In fact, I answered a question about my hybrid class in the fall just a few hours ago, from yet another confused student by the way hybrids show up in the catalog.

Joan Gearns: I did lots of unofficial advising. Kellie and I did during our conferences with a few students who had no idea about Creative Writing and Writing for Publ. classes. A former student recently sent me an e-mail asking for advice because he has decided to major in English, so we met and discussed career possibilities and how he should get started with classes and of course I had him enroll in the HN EN 240 for fall. So lots of unofficial all the time. what about letters for scholarships and transfer colleges. I write a dozen of those a year.

Kim Wyngarden: I advised two students this past semester who are considering a major in English.

Jan Chapman: In EN250 I discussed English and Education majors with the class.

Heida Meister: I have advised four students regarding their probation and current GPA for this semester. Goal’s to get off probation. I have advised two education students.

Susan Mowers: Here are my advising efforts this year:

· Posted announcements on Bb and brought in copies of Display to each of my five classes to encourage students to submit their work (both fall and winter)
· Did one-on-one work with Nate Driesenga and Garry Larkin to ready their pieces for submission to Display. (Nate was published.)
· Six other of my students were also published in Display: Michael Zone, Jean Williams, Linsey Faber, Thomas Koron, Dan Silverthorne and Luke Dennison
Thomas Koron has also published a number of sonnets he wrote for Brit Lit and after, and at the Conservatory where he is pursuing his PhD is writing a musical score for a 1-act play he wrote in Brit Lit

- Posted announcements on Bb and encouraged my students in five classes to apply for English Department scholarships
- Wrote letters of recommendation for GRCC scholarships: Esther Thorpe, Eirann Betka, Tanveer Mangat (Esther and Eirann received scholarships)
- Wrote letter of recommendation for Cate Tremblay for a scholarship in her local community
- Former student Dan Silverthorne has published his first book; he wrote to tell me I was named in his Acknowledgements as one of the people who encouraged his writing!
- Solicited the participation of Ron Orent, student, as a presenter in the Fall 2013 Who Cares? Why Bother? conference
- Advised student Mark Spohn on professors to seek out at GVSU as he pursues his English major there in the Fall 2013 semester
- Advised Maggie Nye re: her approach to and organization of her personal statement for her application to MSU's School of Ed
- Wrote college and grad school letters of recommendation for: Michael VandenBerg (U of M); Brittany Pickleseimer (5 letters, both MA and PhD programs); Thomas Koron (GVSU MA)
- Wrote letter of rec for Ryan Collins for a Phi Theta Kappa scholarship
- Wrote letter of recommendation for Edita Milanovic, former student (for whom I have written letters for her undergrad at Aquinas; MSW at GVSU) for her PHD in Social Work at MSU (she was accepted)
- Await with great expectation news from former student Tom Terrill the results of his bar exam
- Wrote a letter of recommendation for Holly Kaupa, former student, seeking an adjunct position at GRCC in the English Dept.

Janice Balyeat – I individually advised 18 students about their next English class, whether to take EN100, EN101, or repeat EN097. I also advised a CJ student about English conventions and the Report Writing class. This was at the request of Jodi Richert.

Fred van Hartesveldt: I advised between 90 to 100 students, half in EN 101 in the Fall 2012 and half in EN 102 in the Winter 2013. I advise them during class time to help them enroll in the next semester's classes. I also advised about a dozen students individually in conferences.
Student Achievements & Awards

Winning poems and prose pieces (fiction and nonfiction) were selected from student work published throughout the year, in both the Fall and Winter issues of Display (Maryann Lesert.).

Poetry Awards:
1st Prize: Elyse Wild, "You Must"
2nd Prize: Katie Lockwood, "In the Middle of Winter"
3rd Prize: Noel Fleming, "Paradise"

Prose Awards:
1st Prize: Elyse Wild, "Sonia and Eve"
2nd Prize: Luke Dennison, "Pine Needles"
3rd Prize: Ryan Collins, "A Muted Cause for Explanation"

Scholarships (Andrew Lussky)

English Department Scholarship
Alexandria Graff - $300
Alyssa Adamovich - $500
Brianna Thorp - $600
Clare Kolenda - $600
David DeSmyter - $500
Jean Williams - $500
Maggie Lancaster - $600
Rachel Alberta - $250

Barb & Helen Scholarship
Eriann Betka - $600
Luke Dennison - $600

Van Haitsma Scholarship
Rachel Alberta - $500

Other department updates

We are the best department on campus!
Space Planning

The English department is the gateway for almost all of our GRCC students, making us the department with the highest student enrollment and one of the highest levels of faculty-student contact. We bring into the college the most tuition money, and we are the cheapest to run.

Beginning fall 2013 with the renovation of Cook Hall our classrooms, the Reading-Writing lab, and computer lab in this building will be new. Student space has been added throughout the building, which we are happy about, and we are grateful for the two new computer classrooms available for our department’s use. For the first time in years we expect to have a real “drop-in” computer lab, with the lab available most of the time for students to use. (In the past years the lab has been signed out over 90% of the time by English faculty needing computer lab time with their students. Students would get frustrated by the many times they were asked to leave the lab because a class was coming in). These are all positive changes.

However, there are negative consequences of this renovation as well. We will have fewer classrooms in Cook Hall than we have now for freshman composition classes, and we will have inflexible classrooms that do not support our curriculum delivery that other people – none of whom are educators - have decided is what we really need.

Additionally, we are made the least efficient department, most assigned offices in CPP that are the farthest point away from absolutely everything on GRCC’s main campus, through stairways and hallways that are dark, narrow and cannot have more than two students walking side by side, with small elevators, making it inefficient and difficult for student and faculty interaction. These offices are 10 – 15 minutes away from our classrooms. Five faculty remain in the Main Building, far away from the rest of us, so we will see them less often. Students will have three places to go to find their instructor. We will increase the traffic significantly through the Math Department’s open area on 1st floor Cook for those faculty and students who must move between these two buildings.

Consequently, the English Department in many ways is worse off now than we were before this renovation.

We believe the value and importance of our department’s work warrants more equitable allocation of college resources. Our department deeply regrets these demeaning and demoralizing consequences to the college’s Space Planning process.

Faculty & Staff

Departmental Professional Development Activities (Contractual Obligations for Departmental Faculty Development/6 hours)
Reading Apprenticeship: 12 hours of training for all reading faculty

Outcome: curriculum shift to RA with embedded assessments

English Department Learning Day: Teaching the unprepared student.

Outcome: Better understanding of ourselves and our students (open to all English faculty) October 19, 2012 8:30 – 12:00

Exit Outcomes Rubric Training: September 13, 2012 from 5 -8:30 pm, and January 12, 2013 from 8 – 12:30 pm, open to all composition faculty

Outcome: better understanding of exit outcomes for all comp faculty to improve consistency in the delivery and assessment of our composition curricula

ESL Exit Outcomes Rubric Training: open to all ESL faculty

Outcome: better understanding of exit outcomes for ES114 for all ESL faculty to improve consistency in the delivery and assessment of our curriculum

ESL Assessment through technology: October 30, 2012 from 4- 7 pm, open to all ESL faculty

Outcome: better understanding and use of technology to assess student learning


Outcome: Deeper understanding and implementation of RA principles into class assignments and activities.

Professional Reading Group – English Department: Teaching the Unprepared Student. October 19, November 9, January 18, February 8, March 15, April 12 (all English faculty). Each session 3 hours.

Outcome: More understanding of teaching strategies and attitudes to help the unprepared student.

Faculty Professional Development Activities- Year End Summary

[Professional development in which individual faculty and staff participated this year. Identify those that are specifically related to curriculum development or improvement. Please indicate how the professional development activities affected the work within the department.]
Michigan Developmental Education Consortium Conference (March 29-30, 2013) attended by Megan Coakley, Andrew Lusskey, Sheryl York, Linda Spoelman, Heida Meister, Camille Holmes, Christina McElwee, Jan Chapman, Vikki Cooper, Aimee Pawloski, Lisa Palczewski,

To learn and share new strategies and techniques for use in our developmental classes. This is part of our on-going initiative to improve student achievement in our gateway classes. All of our developmental classes are AtD gateway classes.


To assist in developing curriculum for our new initiative, A-COMP, accelerated composition. This is important work to our department because we are participating in a state-wide initiative through the College Success Department. Pilot begins fall 2013.

Lake Michigan Writing Project Summer Institute (June-July 2012) led by Susan Mowers and attended by various English faculty, full-time and adjunct

To practice writing as a teaching practitioner, bringing that richness into the classroom. Sponsored by the National Writing Project.


To assist in using technology in our developmental classrooms to improve student achievement. We are excited to have our new computer classrooms to use beginning this fall.

Reading Apprenticeship Advanced Training – June 2012 attended by Jan Chapman.

To assist in training others in Reading Apprenticeship. This increases our ability to assist our faculty and other departments in implementing RA into their curricula. (Previously, only Vikki Cooper and Linda Spoelman was trained to do this).
Faculty Development Plans for Upcoming Year

English Department Professional Development Plans

- Composition rubric training, held once each semester, for all composition faculty: EN097, EN100, EN101, EN102
- ESL rubric training, held once each academic year for all ESL faculty
- Off-campus Learning Day (tentatively scheduled at FSU)
- PRG, continuing our exploration of ourselves and our students.
- Academic Foundations Learning Day (for developmental reading and composition faculty as well as math and psychology faculty)
- Reading Training, held before fall semester (for all reading faculty)

EOL/Release Time Work

[Documentation of the work accomplished through EOL/Release time in the department this year. Please indicate and describe how the EOL/Release time is associated with the programs and their outcomes within the department. Please indicate how the EOL/Release time activities affected the work within the department.]

Composition coordinators: Megan Coakley (EN097 and EN100), Susan Mowers and Katie Kalisz (EN101/102)

As part of our departmental goal to improve student achievement in all of our classes through the consistent delivery and assessment of our curriculum, we have instituted several changes throughout these past several years that is on-going. For example, Fall semester 2012 we had 100 different people teaching English composition in our department. With that many different composition sections, it is imperative that we have strong training, professional development, organization and accountability to have consistent delivery and assessment of our curriculum. The coordinators make this work possible.

Their work is primary to our student improvement that we have seen across the board in our comp classes (see data below). They do bi-annual syllabi review for the requirements of our department, they lead rubric training for all composition faculty and Learning Outcomes Assessment Training, they pick new textbooks, they plan author visits, they answer countless phone calls, emails, and in-person questions related to our courses and department. They meet individually with faculty to align their syllabus and their teaching with our curriculum. We could not accomplish this work without them.
Vikki Cooper and Jan Chapman were the reading coordinators for our department, and had a large responsibility in the development and implementation of reading curriculum and support for reading instructors. The work that the reading coordinators do every year is important not only to the reading program, but also to the entire college. This will increase when reading is mandatory beginning winter 2014.

Jan and Vikki supported the reading instructors with curriculum development and best practice teaching strategies. They led Reading Apprenticeship training, met with Criminal Justice to embed RA into their curriculum, evaluated textbooks for two other departments for readability level (time consuming), organized and disseminated all Nelson-Denny materials and Reading Embedded Assessments to all instructors. They met with individual faculty as needed to align their syllabus and their teaching with the new reading curriculum. Vikki and Jan together designed and implemented RD095 to address our lowest readers in RD097 and connect them to PY and CO classes to improve student achievement. They helped plan AFP Learning Day, helped plan as well as lead our department-wide PRG, and Jan led a workshop at MDEC on Making Thinking Visible.

Linda Spoelman supported the work of all developmental faculty as well as this college in her role as Director of Developmental Instruction. She led developmental coordinator meetings to facilitate and monitor our improvement initiatives, she spent countless hours with Megan and Vikki on the NADE certification applications, she helped plan and led AFP Learning Day, she represents the college and developmental education at the state level.

The work our coordinators do is primary to the student success improvements we've seen in our English classes.

Maryann Lesert is another English faculty whose advising duties for Display have enriched our students. Maryann leads student editors to prepare an outstanding student literary magazine each semester. She organizes all necessary parts of this production process.

**Faculty & Staff Accomplishments/Awards**

The English Department faculty distinguishes itself professionally by contributing to the ongoing conversation about writing, reading, and teaching at the local, state, national, and international level. This list represents a fraction of the hours, effort, and expertise of the faculty of the English Department:
Susan Mowers
Co-director, Lake Michigan Writing Project Summer Institute (June-July 2012)
Co-director, Lake Michigan Writing Project (2001-present)

John Davidson
Institute for Healing Racism (sponsored by Woodrick Diversity Learning Center)
Attended 2-day Conference

Margaret Malenka
Presented at the Michigan Academy of Science & Arts & Letters (March 22) with Dr. Libby Knepper-Mueller. (Best Practice Across Varied Settings - Hope College in Holland, MI.) Attended other presentations at this conference.

Megan Coakley
Michigan Developmental Education Consortium Conference (March 29-30, 2013)
Accelerated Learning Program Implementation Institute (January 24-25, 2013)

Shavval Fleming
Led EN 100 Pilot (consisted of meetings, research, and presenting at Dean’s Council)
Taught EN 100 Pilot Classes
Provided Support/Research for Achieving the Dream
Completed Reading Apprenticeship Training
Completed English Department Rubric Training
Participant in English Department Reading Group (Read Teaching Underprepared Students)
English Department Learning Day
Diversity Studies Advocate

Christina McElwee
Inter-Institutional Teacher Education Council of West Michigan: Fire-Up Conference
(Presented on Improving Reading in Content Areas at GVSU - September 19, 2012
Attended MDEC March 2012
Completed Online/Hybrid Certification Course May 2012

Sheryl York
Developed and Continue to Create Tutorials for Developmental Students.
Presented “Engaging Students in the Classroom: Teaching with the Tactile/Kinesthetic Learner in Mind” at Michigan Developmental Education Consortium Conference March 30, 2012
Summer Fellow at 2012 Lake Michigan Writing Project. Earned Credentials as National Writing Project Teacher Consultant.
Presented “Writing Coherently: Making Use of Parallel Structure” at Lake Michigan Writing Project July 6, 2012
Currently Serve as Secretary for Michigan Developmental Education Consortium
Developing Plans to Implement the Accelerated Learning Program, Fall 2013

Colleen Becker
Took Graduate Class June 2012 (Motivating and Engaging Students.)
Received IIPD to Attend TESOL (Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages) Convention in Philadelphia March 2012

Aimee Pawlowski
Presented “Revision for All Levels of the Composition Classroom” at Michigan Developmental Education Consortium March 30, 2012

Tom Mulder
NADE Digest Accepted article (SSD 5-4-3: A Dialogical Writing Warm-up) for Spring 2013 publication.

Faculty & Staff Community Service

Susan Mowers - co-Director of the Lake Michigan Writing Project

Gail Brown - Has served on the board of Baxter Neighborhood Association since 2007.

Linda Spoelman - is on the NADE International Committee, the MDEC board as immediate past president, and on the Michigan Community College Association's faculty professional development advisory group. She is also an active member of the Adult Learning Providers of West Michigan.

Joan Gearns and Kellie Roblin – Service Learning is granted in our HN EN 240 Consulting with Writers. Students receive SL credit for their time working in the Lab.

Joan Gearns - Student Grievance Committee and the Honors Program Committee.
Christina McElwee - raised money for the Make-A-Wish Foundation and the Kid's Food Basket

Mursalata Muhammad -
1. ABO/English 100 One Book, One City for Kids (OBOC) Service-learning project. About 18 ABO students and two English 100 students completed three service projects in connection with the Grand Rapids Public Library's OBOC for Kids program at Martin Luther King Jr. Academy.
   a. Project One - Literacy Corps, where GRCC students read with 56 4th graders
   b. Project Two - Literacy moments Video
   c. Project Three - Fundraiser, where GRCC students raised over $400 in one day for the GRPL OBOC for Kids program.

Maryann Lesert - Service Learning - with The Rapidian - www.therapidian.org

Students in EN 246, since Fall of 2009, have been writing articles for The Rapidian, one of our GRCC service learning partners.

Community Service:

From April, 2012 - the present, I have spoken at over 30 events regarding Fracking in Michigan, related to research on fracking I've completed while working on a novel in progress. Communities / Organizations I have given presentations to and/or have participated as a panelist include: Townships in Allegan and Barry counties, Kent County organizations such as Kent County Water Conservation and Citizens for Responsible Resource Management, Westminster Presbyterian Church of Grand Rapids, Conferences such as the November 2012 International Conference on Sustainability, sponsored by Local Future, and academic audiences such as the University of Michigan's Environmental Journalism class.

Curriculum

Course Document (CARP) Updates completed this year
[Please identify which Course Documents went through the Course Review and Revision process this year.]

EN233
EN235
EN237
EN242
Also, RD095 and EN120 were approved as new courses.

**New Courses/Course Improvement Projects**

RD095 Cohort - selected in response to data that the lowest readers are not succeeding in RD097

EN120 co-requisite for EN101 (based on Sentence Skills test score - in response to our Learning Outcomes Assessment data that English conventions was our lowest scoring criteria as well as across-the-college Program Review concerns about the editing and proofreading skills of our students in other academic classes that require writing

EN097 A-COMP (accelerated composition) - in response to national data and a state initiative to increase retention of developmental students by accelerating their completion of certain developmental classes.

Assessment of Student Learning

**Program Learning Outcome(s) assessed this year - Composition**

*Please list the Program Learning Outcome(s) that you assessed this year.*

**EN 097 Learning Outcomes**

Upon completing the Developmental Writing Program, students will be able to:

1. Students will be prepared for freshman level academic writing courses in the GRCC curriculum upon completion of the class.
2. Students will demonstrate writing proficiency in a variety of ways, including description, narration, exposition, and thesis support primarily in the form of essays, but also possibly including journals and letters.
3. Using MLA standards, students will summarize and respond in an essay to an assigned reading, including 1-2 direct quotes (no more) and a Works Cited page.

4. Students will learn to think critically about writing and reading. This will include, but not be limited to analyzing through annotating text; analyzing through peer review, revision, and editing; analyzing through evaluating sources; analyzing through thinking critically about an issue or topic by reading and writing on various aspects and different perspectives of the subject; and analyzing through self-assessment.

5. Students will demonstrate the following qualities of writing: Establish and maintain focus; Organize thoughts into unified, coherent paragraphs and essays, including introduction, body, and conclusion; Develop support for a thesis statement using concrete examples, reasons, and illustrations; Follow the conventions of grammar and usage; Identify and compose for the intended audience.

6. Students will understand and produce varied sentence structure in their own writing.

EN097 Learning Outcomes: Demonstrate improved competency in ideas/development, organization, style, and English conventions. (Communications ILO)

EN 100/101 Learning Outcomes:
1. Through active engagement with the writing process (drafting, revising, finalizing, self-reflection, and self-assessment) students will learn to:
   a. Write in a variety of forms/genres/rhetorical strategies (e.g., freewriting, journals, poems, personal, responsive, and analytical essays, scripts, etc.)
   b. Maintain a consistent focus
   c. Communicate purpose with clarity
   d. Make intentional structural choices that enhance meaning
   e. Select and utilize the appropriate voice (tone/style) and conventions (grammar, usage, mechanics) for the intended audience
   f. Use a variety of sentence structures to enhance readability
   g. Build meaning with sufficient depth of development

EN 102 Learning Outcomes
1. Through active engagement with the writing process (drafting, revising, finalizing, self-reflection, and self-assessment) students will learn to:
   a. Write in a variety of forms/genres (e.g., academic, interdisciplinary research papers, argumentation, literary criticism, etc.)
   b. Select and maintain an appropriate focus (implicit/explicit) for the intended audience
c. Select and utilize the appropriate voice (tone/style) and conventions (grammar, usage, mechanics) for the intended audience

d. Build meaning with substantive depth of development

e. Make intentional structural choices that enhance meaning

f. Implement objective writing that takes into account a variety of perspectives.

Measures of Student Learning - Exit Outcomes Rubric

[Please list the measures of student learning that were used this year (student work/measurement instrument)]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Entering EN097 students are expected to meet all or most of the following criteria in polished essays.</th>
<th>Entering EN100/101 students are expected to meet all or most of the following criteria in polished essays.</th>
<th>Entering EN102 students are expected to meet all or most of the following criteria in polished essays.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ideas / Content</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To what extent does the essay meet the following criteria?</td>
<td>• an identifiable focus (though it may wander) • purpose present, but may waver • limited development</td>
<td>• generally clear in focus • generally clear purpose • sufficient depth of development</td>
<td>• consistent in focus (whether implicit or explicit) • clear purpose • substantive development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purpose</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organization</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To what extent does the essay meet the following criteria?</td>
<td>• recognizable structure, often in three parts (introduction, multiparagraph body, and conclusion) • basic use of transitions • sense of paragraphing</td>
<td>• clear structure (beginning, middle, end) • adequate transitions • clear paragraphing</td>
<td>• logical structural choices • effective transitions • effective paragraphing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transitions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paraphrasing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Style</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the essay use the following in ways that are appropriate for intended purpose and audience?</td>
<td>• proficient, but possibly simplistic diction • writer’s voice identifiable • some variety in sentences • adequate vocabulary choices</td>
<td>• relatively fluent use of diction • generally appropriate voice • generally adequate sentence variety • varied vocabulary choices</td>
<td>• purposeful diction • appropriate voice • command of sentence variety • effective vocabulary choices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sentence variety</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocabulary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Conventions</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To what extent does the essay reflect conventions in the following areas?</td>
<td>• control of English grammar although errors may be present • control of English mechanics although errors may be present • basic implementation of conventions of research</td>
<td>• control of English grammar; errors do not impede understanding • control of English mechanics; errors do not impede understanding • generally accurate implementation of conventions of research</td>
<td>• infrequent grammar errors • infrequent errors in mechanics • accurate implementation of conventions of research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grammar and usage (e.g., complete sentences, appropriate verb tense, agreement)</td>
<td>• control of English grammar although errors may be present • control of English mechanics although errors may be present • basic implementation of conventions of research</td>
<td>• control of English grammar; errors do not impede understanding • control of English mechanics; errors do not impede understanding • generally accurate implementation of conventions of research</td>
<td>• infrequent grammar errors • infrequent errors in mechanics • accurate implementation of conventions of research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechanics (e.g., spelling, punctuation)</td>
<td>• control of English grammar although errors may be present • control of English mechanics although errors may be present • basic implementation of conventions of research</td>
<td>• control of English grammar; errors do not impede understanding • control of English mechanics; errors do not impede understanding • generally accurate implementation of conventions of research</td>
<td>• infrequent grammar errors • infrequent errors in mechanics • accurate implementation of conventions of research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research (use of MLA guidelines)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Initial Data and Findings

[Summarize the data and findings from the measurement of student learning. Add the detailed data to the appendices]
In summer 2011 we did our first round of Learning Outcomes Assessment, where 300+ essays from EN097, EN100 and EN101 were assessed by trained readers. From that initial assessment, we realized our weakest area for EN07 was English conventions, and our weakest area for EN100/101 was ideas and content.

From that data, we initiated a Bb site of successful teaching strategies for both of these weakest areas. (We tried to keep data from faculty concerning the use of each strategy, but it proved too cumbersome and not particularly useful information).

After consulting with Heath Chelsevig in IR, we changed two things on our Exit Outcomes rubric: we went to smaller assessments done at various times, and we refined our rubric to have four levels of achievement (strong, acceptable, weak, and unacceptable) for each of our four criteria (ideas/content, organization, style, and conventions).

Last year we did our second round of Learning Outcomes Assessment, but with our refined rubric. Because of the way the data was collected and because we changed our rubric, we were unable to compare the first two years of LOA. However, this summer we are doing a second round with our refined rubric, and we will be able to compare these past two academic years when the data becomes available.

Last year’s assessment was our first time assessing the exit outcomes for EN102. 79% of Exiting EN102 students failed the learning assessment. The data was so shocking and dismal we believed it had to be the rubric itself; we revised our rubric to be more reflective of the skills and abilities we expect an exiting freshman writer to exhibit. We look forward to our new baseline data based on this revised rubric.

One of the most frustrating and challenging parts of this past year has been the difficulties getting data in a form that makes sense to us, and in a timely manner. We need to meet with Heath again to truly understand what the data is telling us. Unfortunately, the data was so recently available, we haven’t had time to process it. We will send an addendum to this report with that analyzed data.

We do have AtD grade analysis data to report.

**Data and Findings for EN097:**
- Success rates (defined as a final grade of A through C-) for all students taking EN 097 were 54% in 2011
- Students less than 20 years old showed the best overall pass rates in 2011, at 58%
- Students 20-24 years old showed the poorest overall pass rates in 2011, at 49%
• Success rates for black, non-Hispanic students in 2011 were a disturbing 35%
• Success rates for females were higher (60%) than for males (48%) in 2011
• Success rates were higher for No Pell (64%) than for Pell recipients (49%)

*Data from GRCC IR (English Dept. Learning Outcomes Assessment)
**Data from Achieving the Dream Community Colleges Count

Data and Findings for EN100:
• Success rates (defined as a final grade of A through C-) for all students taking EN 100 were 59% in 2011
• Students less than 20 years old showed the best overall pass rates in 2011, at 63%
• Students 20-24 years old showed the poorest overall pass rates in 2011, at 50%
• Success rates for black, non-Hispanic students in 2011 were a disturbing 36%
• Success rates for females were higher (63%) than for males (56%) in 2011
• Success rates were higher for No Pell (70%) than for Pell recipients (52%)

Data and Findings for EN 101:
• Success rates (defined as a final grade of A through C-) for all students taking EN 101 were 71% in 2011
• Students less than 20 years old showed the best overall pass rates in 2011, at 76%
• Students 20-24 years old showed the poorest overall pass rates in 2011, at 60%
• Success rates for black, non-Hispanic students in 2011 were 55%
• Success rates for females was 74% compared to 68% for males
• Success rates for No Pell students were 74% compared to 67% for Pell Grant recipients

Data and Findings for EN 102:
• Success rates (defined as a final grade of A through C-) for all students taking EN 102 were 70% in 2011
• Students less than 20 years old showed the best overall pass rates in 2011, at 74%
• Students 20-24 years old showed the poorest overall pass rates in 2011, at 65%
• Success rates for black, non-Hispanic students in 2011 were 58%
• Success rates for females was higher (75%) than for males (65%)
• Success rates for No Pell students was higher (71%) than for Pell Grant recipients (69%) – but markedly less different than any other composition class
Data and Findings for online/hybrid EN101 and EN 102

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hybrid</td>
<td>Online</td>
<td>Face-to-face</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EN 101</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EN 102</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Measure of success for our Developmental Composition Program

For the past several years we have measured the success of our developmental composition program with data related to this research question:

*Do students who successfully complete EN097 (C- or higher) successfully complete EN100 equal to or greater than those students who test directly into EN100?*

The data from fall 2011 confirms that students consistently have a higher achievement in English 100 or 101 if they have successfully completed (receiving a grade of C- or higher) the English 097 course. The students who took EN 097 were 7% more likely to be successful than students who enrolled in EN 100/101 without previously taking EN 097 – 67% to 60% respectively. Consequently, EN 097 better prepares students for success in EN 100/101.*

The assessment methods (grades and Learning Outcomes Assessment) support the conclusion. Since beginning our assessment and projects, we have seen a 6% increase in success. In fall 2011, 54% of students were succeeding in EN 097 (A – C-). Fall 2012 shows that 60% of students are succeeding.

We speculate that the acknowledgement of the weaknesses in English conventions and implementation of targeted instruction strategies may be one of the likely contributors to the 6% increase in success. Our departmental Bb site has supported this effort.
We have also standardized the delivery and assessment of our curriculum in all of our composition classes to count as 70% of the student’s final grade in the course. We believe this likely has contributed as well.

**Measure of success for our Freshman Composition Program**

For eight years we have measured the success of our composition program with data related to this research question:

*Students who successfully complete freshman composition (EN100/101 and EN102) will have higher achievement in 200 level writing intensive courses than those students who take these courses before completing the composition program: BI121, BI122, PY231, PY232, SO251, SO252, EN247, EN248).*

Data from fall 2009 through fall 2011 confirms that students consistently have a higher achievement in SO 251 and SO 254 if they’ve successfully completed the freshman composition sequence first. They were 4-13% more likely to be successful.

Exceptions are PY 232 and BI 121. Students who enrolled in PY 232 without the composition sequence were as likely to be successful as students who enrolled after successfully completing the composition sequences.

Data from 4 of the 6 semesters (Winter 2009 through fall 2011) shows that students who successfully completed the composition sequence before they enrolled in PY 231 were 4-12% more successful than students who enrolled in those courses without the successful completion of the composition sequence.

Data from 3 of the 6 semesters (Winter 2009 through fall 2011) shows that students who successfully completed the composition sequence before they enrolled in BI 122 were 9-16% more successful than students who enrolled in those courses without the successful completion of the composition sequence.

Fall 2009 data ironically shows that students in BI 122 were more successful if they did not successfully complete the composition sequence (by a 17% margin). We do not know how to explain this outlier in our data. Our 2009 Program Review Report shows a similar data point.

Data from 2 of the 6 semesters (Winter 2009 through fall 2011) shows that students who successfully completed the composition sequence before they enrolled in BI 121...
were 8-10% more successful than students who enrolled in those courses without the successful completion of the composition sequence.

Overall, the data demonstrates that students who successfully complete the freshman composition sequence will have higher achievement in other 200-level writing-intensive courses than those students who take those 200-level courses before completing the composition program. PY 232 and BI 122 may be exceptions to this correlation.

*(See the attached data report from IRP entitled “Successful Students in Follow-up Courses after Success in EN 100 or EN 101 with EN 102”).*

**Curricular or Pedagogical Changes Implemented**

*Briefly describe the curricular or pedagogical changes are planned or were made as a result of what you learned from the measurement of Program Learning Outcomes.*

The English Department has continued to make a concerted effort to improve student achievement by the consistent delivery and assessment of our composition curriculum in these ways:

- Twice-annual rubric training sessions required for all faculty, during which we read and assess student writing based on our departmental exit rubric
- New textbooks for EN 100/101 and EN 102 adjunct faculty closely align with our curricular goals and improve consistency in delivery from our 100+ adjunct faculty
- Workshops presented by the authors of the new textbooks offered faculty ways to implement new assignments and teaching methods that support the Composition curriculum and our departmental Composition Outcomes
- New text chosen for EN097 beginning fall 2013; workshop planned by the author in fall 2013 to help faculty implement this change and offer support.
- The English 097 faculty have revised the CARP to reflect the change in outcomes: summary and response instead of research; a focus on sentence combining; annotating and analysis have also been included in the outcomes.
- EN 097 is moving to a common exit assignment that will ideally lead to more consistent scoring in our Learning Outcomes Assessment project.
- Bi-annual review of all composition faculty syllabi ensures each faculty member requires 4 essays meeting the Composition Curriculum Guidelines, and that each faculty member calculates final grades using a minimum of 70% based on writing
- English Department Learning Day in October 2012 focused on improving our department’s understanding of our lowest-performing students, African-American males, through a panel discussion led by 10 African-American professionals who described the benefits and impediments to their learning and
success while in high school and college. The results of this Learning Day will be seen in the coming year(s).

- The focus and study of the English Department Professional Reading Group in 2012-2013, *Teaching Unprepared Students*, heightened awareness and allowed faculty to share successful approaches to teaching our least-prepared students. Led brilliantly by Jan Chapman, Megan Coakley, Lisa Palczewski, Vikki Cooper, and Christina McElwee as well as Kathleen Owen from the Diversity Center, the results of this group study will be seen in the coming year(s).

- A website has been established as a resource for teaching and assessment ideas for those using technology in the classroom in a variety of ways. (The page can be found here: https://docs.google.com/document/d/1zG6_7j1bHPvN_TXA6qkJys2q6bIjt0gVNT4xRTqM/edit?usp=sharing).

- English faculty who teach online and hybrid courses have shared ideas and resources in various ways in recent years. A group of those faculty members also plan to collaborate more fully during the 2013-14 academic year.

**Data and Findings (post improvement/change)**

*Summarize the data and findings from the measurement of student learning after the improvements/changes were made. Add the detailed data to the appendices*

**Data and Findings for EN097**

- Success rates (defined as a final grade of A through C-) for all students taking EN097 increased from 54% in 2011 to 60% in 2012.
- Students less than 20 years old showed the best overall pass rates, which increased from 58% to 65%.
- Success rates for students 20 – 24 years old improved from 2011 – 2012 49% to 60%
- Students over 25 for the first time were the lowest achieving age group, with 51% achievement, slightly increased from 50% in 2011. (This was in response to the significant improvement for students 20-24 years old).
- Success rates for black, non-Hispanic students increased dramatically from 2011 to 2012, from 36% to 50% (but still lousy)
- Success rates for females increased from 2011 (60%) to 2012 (65%); women continue to perform better than males
- Success rates for males also increased their success from 2011 (48%) to 2012 (57%)
- Success rates for No Pell students increased from 2011 (64%) to 2012 (67%); success rates for Pell Grant recipients increased from 49% in 2011 to 57% in 2012
Data and Findings for EN 100:
- Success rates (defined as a final grade of A through C-) for all students taking EN100 increased from 59% in 2011 to 64% in 2012
- Students less than 20 years old showed the best overall pass rates, which increased between 2011 and 2012 from 63% to 68%
- Students 20 – 24 years old continued to show the poorest overall pass rates, although the overall pass rate for this group improved slightly from 2011 – 2012 from 50% to 52%
  - Success rates for black, non-Hispanic students increased dramatically from 2011 to 2012, from 36% to 50% (but still lousy)
- Success rates for females increased from 2011 (63%) to 2012 (69%); women continue to perform better than males,
- Success rates for males increased their success from 2011 (56%) to 2012 (59%)
- Success rates for No Pell students dropped from 2011 (70%) to 2012 (68%);
  - success rates for Pell Grant recipients increased from 52% in 2011 to 61% in 2012

Data and Findings for EN 101:
- Success rates (defined as a final grade of A through C-) for all students taking EN 101 increased from 71% in 2011 to 75% in 2012
- Students less than 20 years old showed the best overall pass rates, which increased between 2011 and 2012 from 76% to 79%
- Students 20-24 years old continued to show the poorest overall pass rates, although the overall pass rate for this group improved from 2011-2012 from 60% to 65%
- Success rates for black, non-Hispanic students increased dramatically from 2011 to 2012, from 55% to 68%

Data and Findings for EN 102:
- Success rates (defined as a final grade of A through C-) for all students taking EN 102 increased from 70% in 2011 to 75% in 2012
- Students less than 20 years old continued to show the best overall pass rates, which increased between 2011 and 2012 from 74% to 76%
- Students 20-24 years old showed the most improved overall pass rates from 2011 to 2012, from 65% to 72%
- Success rates for black, non-Hispanic students increased dramatically from 2011 to 2012, from 58% to 68%
Data and Findings for online/hybrid EN101 and EN 102

In our last Program Review report, we noted the lower success rates for students in online and hybrid versions of EN101 and EN102, and we determined that some action was needed to monitor and evaluate those course offerings. One of our stated goals was to continue to monitor success rates in online and hybrid courses, and we have recently obtained data showing student success over the past three years (see appendix for detailed report).

That data shows some improvement in the success rates for online as well as hybrid sections of EN101 and EN102. The data for 2010 (see earlier table) showed a marked contrast with the success rates in face-to-face sections of these courses. By contrast, the data for 2012 shows much less disparity between online/hybrid and face-to-face sections:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Hybrid</th>
<th>Online</th>
<th>Face-to-face</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EN 101</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EN 102</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Additionally, the data suggests that a certain amount of the disparity in these outcomes is related to the number of students who withdraw early or are no-shows, a percentage that is consistently higher in both hybrid and online courses than in face-to-face courses.

The low number for online EN 101 sections in particular is still troubling, and as a department we will continue our efforts to increase success in these courses:

- Monitor success rates and look for ways we can “close the gap”
- Encourage distance-education faculty to collaborate on strategies to increase student persistence and completion
- Encourage the college to put in place better systems for preparing and/or vetting students who are least likely to succeed in online/hybrid courses
Program Learning Outcome(s) assessed this year - ESL

1.1 Students will produce quality academic essays that demonstrate standard conventions of writing.

Measures of Student Learning
[Please list the measures of student learning that were used this year (student work/measurement instrument]

ES 114 Outcomes Rubric:

In the fall of 2012, the following rubric was developed to assess ESL student writing:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ideas / Content</th>
<th>Identification focus, relevant to original writing assignment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Focus (Controlling idea)</td>
<td>Purpose present in thesis statement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purpose</td>
<td>Adequate development of ideas through specific examples relevant to topic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Logical, clear structure with introduction, body paragraphs, and conclusion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Structure</td>
<td>Appropriate use of transitions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transitions</td>
<td>Well-structured paragraphing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paragraphing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language Use</th>
<th>Adequate sentence variety including complex sentences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sentence variety</td>
<td>Appropriate vocabulary choices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocabulary</td>
<td>Formal tone appropriate for academic writing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tone</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conventions of Writing</th>
<th>Some grammar errors may be present, but do not impede understanding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grammar and usage</td>
<td>Some mechanical errors may be present, but do not impede understanding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Such as but not limited to the following:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complete sentences</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verb tenses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agreement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechanics</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Such as but not limited to the following:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Punctuation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spelling</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This rubric was used for rubric training in the fall of 2012, as well as a writing assessment pilot in the winter of 2013.
**Institutional Data:**
Data was collected to evaluate student success after exiting the ESL program. Data included student success in EN 100 and EN 101 after successfully completing ES 114.

**Initial Data and Findings**
A pilot of our writing assessment was conducted in April of 2013. Twenty one essays were assessed using the new rubric. Out of our four areas of assessment, the lowest area scored was ideas and content, followed by conventions. Organization and language use were the highest of the four areas. 67% of the essays passed our evaluation. (See attached pilot report)

Data was also collected to evaluate student success after exiting the ESL program. More data has been requested, but initial numbers show ESL student achievement after successfully completing ES 114 to be 77% in EN 100 and 61% in EN 101. This compares to a success rate of 59% for all students in EN 100 and a 71% for all students in EN 101.

**Curricular or Pedagogical Changes Implemented**
A rubric was developed in the fall of 2012 to assist in creating continuity across the curriculum and aid in program assessment. We also held a professional development meeting focusing on software and web resources for ESL classes in the fall of 2012, and held our first rubric training using the new rubric in the winter of 2013

**Planned changes:**
To address low content/idea scores found in our pilot, we plan to create minimum writing requirements for our upper three levels of writing and grammar classes and add them to the minimum textbook requirements already created for these classes. Our hope is that this will improve consistency across the curriculum and strengthen the ability of our students in that area.

To address low conventions scores we plan to explore possible grammar support options for our ESL students.
**Data and Findings (post improvement/change)**

We piloted our assessment for the first time this spring, so no data has been collected post change.

**Program Learning Outcome(s) assessed this year - Literature**

1. The Literature Studies Program will enable students to fulfill the requirements for appropriate College Associate Degree programs.

2. The Literature Studies Program will provide students with credit that fulfills the MACRAO transfer agreement.

3. The Literature Studies Program will promote literary awareness and critical thinking among students, which allow them to assess their social and political environments through the lens of both canonical and non-canonical American and international texts.

4. The Literature Studies Program will provide students with the potential for a life-long learning experience that will enhance both their personal lives and their understanding of the importance of positive citizenship within our communities.

Additionally, here find Student Learning Outcomes at the Program Level and Associated ILOs:

1. Upon completion of any segment or segments of the program students will demonstrate effective communication skills. (Communication ILO)

2. upon completion of any segment or segments of the program students will, through active involvement with the reading / writing process:

   A. Discuss elements of literary texts such as voice, mood, atmosphere, cultural context, and genre.

   B. Evaluate and support the interpretation of literature. (ILOs: Communication, Critical Thinking.)

**Measures of Student Learning**

A trial measurement tool was implemented based on student writings in a typical American Literature (EN 262) class. Essays were collected from the class and
distributed to four current literature professors, who scored the essays on a scale of 5 to
1, with 5 representing “most effective,” and 1 representing “least effective.” The
following categories made up the rubric:

1. The student has demonstrated an awareness of the author’s voice, mood, and
   atmosphere.

2. The student has demonstrated an awareness of the cultural context and genre of the
   source text.

3. The student has provided a viable and clearly supported interpretation of the source
   text.

4. The student has, overall, conformed to standard practices (MLA format) of writing
   about literature.

**Initial Data and Findings**

**Data:**

As noted above, four professors evaluated 5-6 of 23 student essays according to the
above rubric. The results were as follows, with the score followed by the number of
papers achieving that score. Thus, in Category 1, a score of 5 was achieved by five of
the papers, and so on.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Category 1:</td>
<td>5 - 5</td>
<td>4 - 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category 2:</td>
<td>5 - 8</td>
<td>4 - 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category 3:</td>
<td>5 - 4</td>
<td>4 - 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category 4:</td>
<td>5 - 3</td>
<td>4 - 3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings:**

At this point, the nature of the writing assignment assessed in this case precludes the
validity of statistics in Category 4. Thus, concerning Categories 1-3:

A. Student performance in Category 2 was by far the strongest.
B. Performance in Categories 1 and 3 was similar, with Category 3 (Viable and Clearly Supported Interpretation) indicating a slightly higher need for attention in the program, though the sample size here is small. See below.

**Curricular or Pedagogical Changes Implemented**

As of now, the end of the 2012/2013 cycle of the Program Review for Literature, all facets of the program shown above are in the embryonic stage and will require review and expansion (especially the data-gathering element) during the 2013/2014 cycle, when specific curricular and/or pedagogical changes can be recommended.

**Data and Findings (post improvement/change)**

N/A
# ESL Program Review Results, April 2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Essay #</th>
<th>Rater</th>
<th>Ideas/content</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Language use</th>
<th>Conventions</th>
<th>Pass/Fail</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Pass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Pass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Pass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Pass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Fail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Pass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Pass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Pass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Pass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 *</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Pass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 *</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Fail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Fail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Pass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Pass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Pass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Fail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Pass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>FAIL **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Fail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Fail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Fail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Pass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>FAIL **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Pass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Pass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Fail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Fail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Pass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Pass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Pass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Pass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Pass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Pass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Results (without scores of 3rd reading)</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>67% passing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*1=unacceptable  2=weak  3= acceptable  4= strong