**Sinclair Community College**

**Continuous Improvement Annual Update 2015-16**

**Please submit to your Division Assessment Coordinator / Learning Liaison for feedback no later than March 1, 2016**

**After receiving feedback from your Division Assessment Coordinator, please revise accordingly and make the final submission to your dean and the Provost’s Office no later than May 2, 2016**

**Department:** **LCS - 0330 - English**

Year of Last Program Review: FY 2011-2012

Year of Next Program Review: FY 2016-2017

**Section I: Progress Since the Most Recent Review**

Below are the goals from Section IV part E of your last Program Review Self-Study. Describe progress or changes made toward meeting each goal over the last year. Responses from the previous year’s Annual Update are included, if there have been no changes to report then no changes to the response are necessary.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **GOALS** | **Status** | **Progress or Rationale for No Longer Applicable** |
| The department’s goals and rationale for expanding include continuing to offer sections of composition at all locations and at all times (WPAFB, Courseview, Englewood, and Huber Heights Learning Centers, Centerville High School, Prisons, etc.). | In progress  Completed  No longer applicable | At this point, we have met the goal of offering courses at all locations for several consecutive semesters. We are developing and offering a hybrid version of ENG 1101 and 1201 for delivery at CVCC next year in support of an initiative to promote a GBM degree to working adults in the Mason area.  CCP offerings at high schools continue to expand and we are meeting those demands by hiring adjuncts when high schools do not have qualified faculty. We are also acclimating several of our own Sinclair adjuncts to teaching CCP courses both at high schools and online, as they require different skill sets.  ENG/LIT offers more CCP course offerings than any other department, demonstrating our willingness to embrace this program and meet the demands of our campus community. |
| We plan to explore new courses after we convert to semesters, including a class on writing/publishing in the electronic media. | In progress  Completed  No longer applicable | We regret that this plan is really no longer applicable as our program is maxed at 61 credits and we do not have the latitude to propose 2297s or other new courses for consideration at this time.  Given the State mandate to keep programs under 65 credit hours, adding new courses is not prudent. However, should that mandate change or the community need increase, we will ready to meet the challenge of offering new classes. |
| We plan to continue to modernize our curriculum to serve students as they transfer and graduate in greater numbers. | In progress  Completed  No longer applicable | We continue to modernize our curriculum, which will be a task that likely will not reach an end as improvements can always be made to reflect current and innovative writing pedagogies. This summer 2016, we will adopt the Open Educational Resource (OER) as a textbook for the ENG 1101 and 1201 courses. This text will be accompanied by a teacher’s guide and will serve as a free textbook, which decreases the cost of the course for students up to $90 a semester.  So far, through the pilot year of the OER, we saved students over $100,000 in textbook costs.  Developing the OER has given us the opportunity to re-think and re-visit our department mission statement, which has led to a cohesive vision for our writing program. One of the more modern developments of the text has been the addition of the multi-modal composing unit, which we will start teaching this summer. |
| The department is working through the AQIP initiative to build stronger connections with ACA (NOW DLA) and area high schools. | In progress  Completed  No longer applicable | Although not currently part of the AQIP project, the English department is constantly encouraging the DLA department to align writing curricula. As the DLA department has combined their reading course with the writing course, the alignment remains a variable. Seven DLA teachers have taught over the past year for the ENG department in order to make teaching load. This fact alone makes alignment more feasible because the DLA teachers are more familiar with the curriculum of the ENG courses now.  We have built stronger connections with area high schools through the CCP courses that we offer, and also through the Dayton Public Schools (DPS) Alignment Program, which ended this year. In addition, we have partnered with Dayton Public Schools for the last two National Day on Writing Celebrations with the goal of aligning high school and college writing expectations. The results of these collaborations have been encouraging and we plan to continue to strengthen these relationships with area high schools. |
| In the next five years, we plan to establish a stronger assessment program for students and faculty by exploring e-Portfolios and routine assessment norming for faculty. | In progress  Completed  No longer applicable | An assessment program has been instituted and course SLO assessments have been distributed and collected each term. Our assessment coordinator, Aaron Moyer, calculates the results and shares them with the department during a department meeting each term.  Based on the trends of the assessments performed each term since spring 2012, student writing samples demonstrated the weakest control in working with writing conventions, control over essay format, and relating to personal experience. Since last year, student scores have improved in audience awareness.  In ENG 1201, students are weakest in audience awareness, in-text citations, and control over conventions. By running the ENG 1101 and 1201 assessments each semester, we have been able to track and strengths and weaknesses of our program.  During the spring and fall of 2016, we will begin to close the loop by addressing strategies to improve the weakest areas in the assessments. We will then analyze subsequent assessments for improvement results. We had our first meeting to accomplish this work on April 29, 2016. We will continue with grade norming and develop strategies to close gaps in our outcomes.  In addition, the English Department has participated during the last year with piloting a Written Communication Ged Ed Rubric for the college. In the fall of 2015, several online 1101 courses were piloting the rubric. This spring, we have continued that work with a larger number of sections. At our last department meeting, we went over the rubric and discussed how it will be implemented into all sections in the fall of 2016. |
| We plan to take action on the “opportunities” list presented in Section IV A of the FY 2011-12 Program Review. | In progress  Completed  No longer applicable | * We have established an improvement plan for faculty with poor success rates in ENG 1101 and 1201, including the distribution of those rates, the discussion of the factors contributing to the rates, and the mentoring of faculty with low rates. At some point, however, faculty must take responsibility themselves to make changes to their courses to ensure they are student-friendly. * As stated above, we have developed stronger linkages with area K-12 programs and DLA department. * Secretarial and staffing needs have been addressed and completed. * Communication between faculty and departments through the LCS bullets has been accomplished. * Department workload, resources, and communication have been more equitably spread. * An advisory board has been established. * *Musings,* and/or updates regarding department accomplishments, has been published regularly. * The Writing Center is undergoing a study with RAR to institute positive change. * ENG 1131 (business communication) is more closely aligned with other schools as the result of the work of an 1131 coordinator. * Student evaluations are routinely used and will be taken under consideration to inform us of global weaknesses. |

Below are the Recommendations for Action made by the review team. Describe the progress or changes made toward meeting each recommendation over the last year. Responses from the previous year’s Annual Update are included, if there have been no changes to report then no changes to the response are necessary.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **RECOMMENDATIONS** | **Status** | **Progress or Rationale for No Longer Applicable** |
| From the self-study, it was not apparent that there was a lot of feedback being collected from other academic departments regarding how well the English Department is meeting their needs. The department is encouraged to dialogue to a greater extent with other departments at the college for the purpose of seeking feedback. | In progress  Completed  No longer applicable | To address this recommendation, an advisory committee was established in the spring of 2013 to advise the department, and an introductory luncheon was held on May 1, 2013. The advisory committee met again in March 2015, and will meet in April 2016.  The main goals for the workgroups include:   * Review features of program outcomes to meet business, industry, government, and stakeholder needs * Ensure readiness to support dual enrollment offerings * Establish process for soliciting annual feedback from academic departments * Strengthen assessment of Writing Center |
| The department should seriously consider reviewing the Program Outcomes, incorporating a greater focus on outcomes specific to English and the skills and outcomes associated with English courses. | In progress  Completed  No longer applicable | We have considered this recommendation seriously, and we have decided that it is not applicable at this time. Our outcomes, specifically for the composition sequence, are driven by the State of Ohio. At this time, the outcomes both reflect and enact the philosophy of the state and our department as a whole. |
| It appears that there may be room to create more of a climate of expectation with adjuncts in terms of professional development. Adjuncts should be made explicitly aware of the expectations involving workshops, attendance at in-service meetings, etc. | In progress  Completed  No longer applicable | All adjuncts are made aware of expectations and concerns about professional development at the interview during which they are hired. Regular correspondence also informs adjuncts of their responsibilities to the department. Further, through the leadership of an adjunct faculty coordinator, adjunct faculty have a clear and direct contact with the department besides the chair. We have instituted monthly adjunct coffees, as well, that have been well-attended. In addition a fall in-service and spring in-service are provided to adjuncts.. An Adjunct Faculty outreach team comprised of four full-time professors (Charles Freeland, Kay Berg, and Furaha Henry-Jones, Lisa Mahle-Grisez and adjunct Whitney Larson) continues to meet to address adjunct concerns and plan in-services, as well as maintain a shell for dissemination of adjunct information. This work is also vital to the English adjunct community.  The English department nominated Whitney Larson, who received the award for “Adjunct Faculty of the Year” for the LCS division in 2015.  Over the last academic year, our Adjunct coordinator, Dair Arnold, has observed eight adjuncts and provided feedback regarding their teaching. As a department, we continually mentor new adjuncts (4 in 2015-16). In addition, we are developing adjunct awards to showcase the good work done by our adjuncts, and we have instituted a teaching portfolio requirement for adjunct faculty. At the end of the SP 2016 term, they will be submitting their teaching portfolios for the past term, which include a reflective memo on challenges and successes over the tern, as well as syllabi and graded student work. |
| Dual enrollment is being strongly encouraged by the state. Some of the challenges regarding dual enrollment arrangements were discussed in the review meeting, and the department should proactively discuss strategies for dealing with these challenges and overseeing the offering of dual enrollment sections with area high schools. | In progress  Completed  No longer applicable | College Credit Plus (CCP) offerings continue to expand each semester. The ENG department chair has been tasked with developing a Chair’s Toolkit for CCP that contains the expectations and for chairs in staffing and scheduling CCP courses and faculty. This 20-page document will be housed on the Sinclair intranet and used as a guide for all chairs working with CCP.  All ENG faculty have been given a CCP mentee and are providing guidance and support to those high school faculty as needed.  As mentioned above, CCP offerings in ENG and LIT are double or triple those offerings in other departments. |
| The Writing Center appears to be a valuable resource for students, but the benefit to students has not been documented to the extent that it could be. The department is encouraged to find ways to strengthen assessment of the Writing Center, demonstrating how students benefit from using the resources there. This may entail capturing more data than is currently captured from users of the Writing Center. Research, Analytics, and Reporting (RAR) may be a resource the department could use in its efforts to better assess the impact of the Writing Center. | In progress  Completed  No longer applicable | The Writing Center, in conjunction with RAR, has instituted a study to assess its effectiveness. With the help of Research, Analytics and Reporting (RAR), the Writing Center has started looking for more detailed demographic data on the students who visit the Center, how their grades are affected, and if these students persist to the next English class.  In the first phase of the study, we learned that the Writing Center has seen consistent growth since 2009. This growth is especially evident in the fall terms, in which there is a large spike in the number of visits. For example, in fall of 2011, 798 students visited the Writing Center. This does not include the “walk-in student,” who simply used a computer, or asked a quick formatting question.    The first phase of the RAR study also showed that many more English 1101 students than 1201 students visit the Writing Center, sometimes to an almost 2:1 margin.  **Student Success**  In the second phase of the study, students were asked if they were more likely to succeed in an English class if they visited the Writing Center. A total of 681 students were followed, and the data demonstrated a significant, positive association between the number of times that a student visits the Writing Center and the final grade that the student earns in the class.  The study showed that a student could expect to improve his or her grade by .10 for each visit that is made to the Writing Center; thus, a student would need to visit the Writing Center four times to bring his or her grade above the 3.00 threshold necessary to earn a B. For example, a student whose grade is a 2.00 would need to visit the Writing Center ten times to improve his or her grade to a 3.00 (i.e., 2.00 +(.10) 10 = 3.00). Of course, visits to the Writing Center may serve as a proxy for a student’s motivation to do well in a course and/or to seek out additional resources to help them succeed in a class, too.  **Persistence**  Finally, we asked if students who visited the Writing Center were more likely to persist to their next English class. The data suggests that students who have been successful in ENG-1101 in a fall term in which they received assistance at the Writing Center generally persist to attempt the next class in the English sequence. In fall 2009, nearly every Writing Center student (95.5%) who was successful in ENG 111 that term attempted ENG 112.  When successful Writing Center students do attempt either ENG-111 or ENG-1201, they typically do so within two years of the term in which they earned their successful grade in ENG-111. More than 95% of Writing Center students who were successful in a specified fall term attempted ENG-1201 within two years; over 85% of successful Writing Center students do so within one year.    However, the results may be due to the transition from the quarters to semesters “push.” The study will need to be replicated this year in order to find out if these results are reliable.  **The Next Phase**  In the next phase of the study, we will examine individual tutor strategies that lead to effectiveness.  NOTE: The Writing Center, as managed by Tutorial Services, is not under the supervision of the English Department. We are contracted through 14 release hours to provide training and guidance to tutors in the center.  During the 2015-16 academic year, the English Department’s role in the Writing Center has changed dramatically. Because of the lack of management of the Writing Center through Tutorial Services, as well as questionable hiring practices by Tutorial Services, the English Dept. has stepped back from taking an active role in the Writing Center. Because of the reluctance to hire and sustain master tutors, the Writing Center saw a marked decrease in student traffic in FA 2015. |
| Work has been ongoing in the department to find more ways to help students succeed – it is strongly recommended that the department continue and enhance these efforts. The department is encouraged to explore the implementation of an attendance policy to determine whether that might increase student success, and is generally encouraged to generate additional innovative strategies designed to impact success. There are some faculty in the department who have consistently higher success rates than the average - it is recommended that strategies used by these instructors be identified and scaled up for use in other sections of English to increase student success. | In progress  Completed  No longer applicable | A “Success Team” was instituted comprised of the faculty with the consistently highest success rates in the department. These teachers met to determine policies that would encourage student persistence and presented those policies to the department. A suggested attendance policy was established and distributed.  In addition, the tone of syllabi has been reviewed, and faculty have been encouraged to revise their language to encourage student completion. Those faculty with completion rates 20 points lower than the department average have been asked to reconsider their policies, especially, and have written goals on their FPR to increase student completion in their courses. We have scaled up the strategies used by our most successful instructors.  Adjunct faculty success rates and student evaluations continue to be examined to create the best learning environment for students. Adjunct faculty out of line with the rest of the department are considered last for the assignment of courses. |
| While some data is being collected and the Assessment Team has done some initial work Spring 2012, it is recommended that the department increase its work on assessment of student learning. Further development of the assessment approached piloted in Spring 2012 is encouraged, and the department should work to expand any successful efforts to as many sections as possible. The department is strongly encouraged to develop an assessment plan that clearly lays out what they are going to measure, how they are going to do it, who is going to do it, and how they will process, analyze, report, and use the data that is collected. | In progress  Completed  No longer applicable | We have developed an assessment plan, and are revising it continuously. Please see the attached document for this year’s results. |

**Section II: Assessment of General Education & Degree Program Outcomes**

The Program Outcomes for the degrees are listed below. **All program outcomes must be assessed at least once during the 5 year Program Review cycle, and assessment of program outcomes must occur each year**.

**PLEASE NOTE – FOR THE PREVIOUS YEAR AND THIS YEAR, REPORTING OF GENERAL EDUCATION OUTCOME ASSESSMENT HAS BEEN TEMPORARILY POSTPONED. WE WOULD ASK THAT IN THIS ANNUAL UPDATE YOU IDENTIFY AT LEAST ONE COURSE IN YOUR DEGREE PROGRAM(S) WHERE ASSESSEMENT AT THE MASTERY LEVEL WILL OCCUR FOR THE FOLLOWING GENERAL EDUCATION OUTCOME:**

* **Cultural Diversity & Global Citizenship: Apply knowledge of cultural diversity to real world context by acknowledging, understanding, and engaging constructively within the contemporary world.**

**PLEASE RESPOND TO THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS:**

**Do you have a required course in your program curriculum where Cultural Diversity & Global Citizenship could be assessed for mastery?**

**Yes No If yes, please list the course: Literature of Africa, Asia, and Latin America**

**If no, is there an elective course that is listed on your Preferred Program Pathway Template where Cultural Diversity & Global Citizenship could be assessed for mastery?**

**Yes No If yes, please list the course:** Click here to enter text.

**If no, is there another elective course that is an option in your program curriculum where Cultural Diversity & Global Citizenship could be assessed for mastery?**

**Yes No If yes, please list the course:** Click here to enter text.

**If no, where do students master Cultural Diversity & Global Citizenship in your program? Do you need assistance incorporating this General Education outcome into your degree program?**

Click here to enter text.

**NOTE THAT THERE WILL NEED TO BE AT LEAST ONE EXAM / ASSIGNMENT / ACTIVITY IN THIS COURSE THAT CAN BE USED TO ASSESS MASTERY OF THE COMPETENCY.**

**YOU MAY ALSO SUBMIT ASSESSMENT RESULTS FOR THIS GENERAL EDUCATION COMPETENCY IF YOU HAVE THEM, BUT IT WILL BE CONSIDERED OPTIONAL**.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Program Outcomes** | To which course(s) is this program outcome related? | Year assessed or to be assessed. | Assessment Methods  Used | What were the assessment results?  (Please provide brief summary data) |
| Demonstrate ability to think logically and solve problems using analysis, synthesis and evaluation. | ENG 1201 | 2013-14 | Written assignments | Based on the ENG 1201 assessment from AY 2014-2015, the student writing samples demonstrated that students were “proficient” in their critical thinking skills in relation to the critical analysis of source material in their writing. On a Likert Scale of 1-4, this outcome scored a 2.79/4.00. |
| Recognize and articulate an understanding of the increasing interdependence of world cultures and their consequences. | LIT 2234 | 2013-14 | Written assignments | Students are asked to write about their understanding of other cultures and social issues. This requirement forces them to recognize and articulate understanding of interdependence of world cultures. |
| Achieve group goals in a variety of social contexts. | ENG 1101, 1201 | 2013-14 | Written assignments | In a syllabus review of all faculty, it was determined that at least 80 percent of faculty use group work to accomplish classroom and program goals. |
| Demonstrate responsibility and accountability in accomplishing goals. | ALL | 2013-14 | Written assignments | The responsibility for accomplishing goals is perhaps best reflected in the success rate of the courses, which remains consistent. |
| Communicate effectively in a variety of ways with varied audiences through writing skills, oral communication skills, listening skills, reading skills, computer literacy and information literacy. | ENG 1101, 1201, ENG 1131 | 2013-14 | Written assignments | Students are required to communicate within various genres to achieve proficiency in this outcome. On a Likert Scale of 1-4, students scored 2.74/4.00 in the audience awareness area. |
| Identify and discuss major authors and works in American and British literature. | LIT 2211, 2212, 2201, 2202, | 2013-14 | Written assignments | This outcome is targeted by assigning forums and writing assignments regarding major works in British and American Literature. |
| Analyze literary works of American, British and world cultures in terms of major literary themes and devices. | LIT 2211, 2212, 2201, 2202, 2230, 2234 | 2013-14 | Written assignments | The outcome of analysis is achieved through writing assignments pertaining to analyzing the reading material. |
| Demonstrate skills in multiple creative writing genres. i.e.: poetry, script writing, fiction writing. | ENG 2255, 2256, 2259 | 2013-14 | Written assignments | This outcome is achieved through following the course outlines and requiring students to write in a variety of genres. |
| Create works that are polished enough to submit for consideration of publication. | ENG 2255, 2256, 2259 | 2013-14 | Written assignments | This outcome is essential to students in our CRWE program, and assignments are assessed with the goal of eventual publication. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Are changes planned as a result of the assessment of program outcomes? If so, what are those changes?** |  |
| **How will you determine whether those changes had an impact?** |  |

**ATTACHMENT:**

Comparison of ENG1101 & ENG1201 Assessments

The following tables compare the ENG1101 and ENG1201 assessment results from the past three years. The tables show the results in reverse chronology with the movement of the most recent averages noted as “up” or “down” based on the comparison to the prior year. The three lowest rankings for each period are indicated in bold and the asterisk shows SLO’s that were toward the bottom on all assessments. All scores (averages) are based on a Likert Scale of 1-4 with 4 being best.

**ENG1101 Assessment Comparisons for SP15, SP14, SP13, & SP12**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Student Learning Outcome | SP15 Rank | SP15 Score | SP14 Rank | SP14 Score | SP13 Rank | SP13 Score | SP12 Rank | SP12 Score |
| #1a: Logical Structure | 4 | 2.64 up | 3 | 2.54 | 5 | 2.73 | 6 | 2.92 |
| #1b: Intended Purpose | 2 | 2.92 up | 2 | 2.79 | 2 | 3.08 | 3 | 3.06 |
| #1c: Audience Awareness | 3 | 2.74 up | 4 | 2.36 | 4 | 2.8 | 3 | 3.06 |
| #2: Relate to Personal Experience | 6 | 2.51 up | 7 | 2.05 | 7 | 2.31 | 3 | 3.06 |
| #3a: Control over Conventions\* | 7 | 2.48 up | 6 | 2.26 | 6 | 2.53 | 7 | 2.4 |
| #3b: Control over Essay Format | 5 | 2.55 up | 5 | 2.32 | 3 | 2.88 | 1 | 3.32 |
| #4: Control of Electronic Environment | 1 | 3 same | 1 | 3.0 | 1 | 3.25 | 2 | 3.2 |

Note: SP12 was the pilot assessment.

**ENG1201 Assessment Comparisons for FA14 & FA13**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Student Learning Outcomes | FA14 Rank | FA14 Score | FA13 Rank | FA13 Score |
| #1a: Logical Structure | 5 | 2.97 up | 5 | 2.85 |
| #1b: Intended Purpose | 3 | 3.03 up | 2 | 3.02 |
| #1c: Audience Awareness | 8 | 2.67 down | 4 | 2.86 |
| #2: Critical Analysis of Source Material | 6 | 2.79 down | 3 | 2.92 |
| #3a: Control over Conventions\* | 7 | 2.72 down | 7 | 2.75 |
| #3b: Control over MLA Format | 4 | 3.0 up | 5 | 2.85 |
| #3c: In-text Citations\* | 9 | 2.62 up | 8 | 2.21 |
| #3d: Works Cited Entries | 2 | 3.05 up | 9 | 1.96 |
| #4: Control of Electronic Environment | 1 | 3.33 up | 1 | 3.08 |

Note: There have only been two assessment cycles of ENG1201.

**Next Step: Closing the Loop**

Closing the loop means that the weak areas are addressed by dissemination of information and implementing strategies to improve the outcomes. This becomes part of the assessment: note instructional changes and analyze subsequent assessments for improvement in results.