

PROGRAM REVIEW

Instructional Program Reviev Template

Year: Plan Type: 2020-2021 Annual		•	Program English	: Composition			~	Save My Wo	ork
2020-2021	Alliuai		Liigiisii (Composition				Garo my 110	
					Last e	edited on 11/20/2	2020 by R-EUR	EKA\Stephanie-B	3urr€
					Ç	Submitted on 10)/30/2020 by R	-EUREKA\Angelin	ıa-H
					Revi	ewed on 11/20/2	2020 by R-EUR	EKA\Stephanie-B	₃urr€
Program Information	Data Analysis	Critical Reflect Assessment Ac		Evaluation of Previous Plans	Planning	Resource Requests	Author Feedback	PRC Response	

Curriculum & Assessment Data

Assessment (click here to go to the assessment planning page)

Upcoming Assessments (plan)

		Last								
Course	Outcome	Assessed	2020F	2021S	2021F	2022\$	2022F	2023\$	2023F	2024\$
ENGL-1A	1	2019F		✓						
ENGL-1A	2	2019F		✓						
ENGL-1A	3	2019F		✓						
ENGL-1B	1	2019S	/							
ENGL-1B	2	2019S	V							

ENGL-1S	1	2020F	✓				
ENGL-1S	2	2020F	~				
ENGL-1S	3	2020F	V				
READ-260	1	2019S			~		
READ-260	2	2018F			~		
READ-260	3	2019F			~		
READ-260	4	2019S			V		

What courses, if any, are not on track with regard to a 4-year assessment cycle? Explain if this is a consequence of how often the course is offered or other mitigating factors such as outcome updates that may have changed the assessment cycle.

Associate Dean Mark Renner is leading efforts to assist faculty in creating assessment plans for the next 4-year cycle and with completing assessments in the fall 2020 semester that are scheduled to take place. The college's first multi-section assessment through the eLumen software program has already been created by Professor Peter Blakemore for fall 2020 ENGL 1B sections.

of course SLO reports submitted during 2019-2020. 4

of degree/cert PLO reports submitted during 2019-2020.

Curriculum

2 of 11

	Course Outline of Record		Online		Interactive TV	
Course	Approval Date	Status	Approval Date	Status	Approval Date	Status
ENGL-1A	10/12/2018	Current	10/23/2020	Current	10/23/2020	Current
ENGL-1B	10/13/2017	One Year Remaining	10/23/2020	Current	10/23/2020	Current
ENGL-1S	10/12/2018	Current	9/11/2020	Current	9/11/2020	Current
READ-260	10/28/2016	Out of Date	11/13/2020	Current	11/13/2020	Current

50.0 % of Course Outlines of Record up to date.

Explain any mitigating circumstances.

Indicate if you have submitted updated Course Outlines of Record this fall.

Did the Program Advisory Committee meet in the last year? N/A

If there is no plan for updating outdated curriculum, when will you inactivate?

At this time, there is no curriculum in this program that is out of date.

3.1 What changes have been made to the program based on assessment findings? You may include

~

3 of 11 8/12/21, 16:18

results from your closing the loop reports that map to your program.

4 of 11 8/12/21, 16:18

All faculty had to modify their classes in spring 2020 due to the emergence of COVID-19 and the necessity of transitioning to online and correspondence teaching. Here are a few stories from ONLINE transitioning that are representative of the kinds of program changes that were made to ensure that students met course learning outcomes:

One faculty member already assigned to teach online had to eliminate one week of classwork, in order to ensure that students met the course-level outcomes, she streamlined assignments, reducing the number of "formal" discussions, making some required readings optional, and modifying the length of the final assignment. She also became much more flexible regarding deadlines to meet student needs.

Another faculty member provided a one-week "buffer zone" at the beginning of the change to "remote" and at the end of the semester. In an effort to retain students during the transition, the faculty member maintained constant contact with all of the students. These relationships allowed for better retention and completion.

Yet another faculty member, in an effort to achieve the same kind of effective contact, looked up students' phone numbers and spent the first five days after the switch calling all of them. She stated, "It was... extremely weird, for all of us, but I think some of them would have dropped if I hadn't done that."

An instructor reported postponing the grading of all assignments after "remote" instruction began in order not to deter students working without internet connections or with poor connections. This faculty member found that many students were continuing to work on assignments even if they weren't handing anything in. In one case, a student had an entire notebook full of the assigned work. Another student had off-line files saved. The students were appreciative, explaining that all the 'incompletes' and 'X's on Canvas could be very discouraging when students were only able to log on once or twice a week.

Here are a few examples from CORRESPONDENCE transitioning that are representative of the kinds of program changes that were made to ensure that students met course learning outcomes:

Additionally, to develop scholarly research abilities - how to use and document print, digital, library, internet, or database research tools and incorporate primary and secondary sources successfully - our students at Pelican Bay used a revised "Ask-a-Librarian form," which was developed and drafted by CR library staff, PB humanities faculty (English and history), as well as the PB Scholars Program Coordinator. This more thorough form allowed students to meaningfully engage with a typical research process in a correspondence modality. Though the research process was longer than usual due to staffing changes and correspondence limitations, students were able to develop transfer-level research skills and abilities, as well as fulfill English 1A Student Learning Outcomes.

English 1B also needed research support via correspondence. Similar to our English 1A students, our English 1B students at Pelican Bay utilized that more thorough "Ask-a-Librarian form" to engage with a typical research process - investigating literary concepts, as well as the context or historical happenings surrounding a text. Through this process, students were able to develop transfer-level research skills and abilities, as well as develop their ability to use literature as a basis for critical thinking and composition.

To meet the English 1A Required Assessment Tasks, instructors held to the 6,000-word minimum of formal writing, encompassing at least three essays that demonstrated flexible strategies for writing expository and argumentative college-level essays. English 1B has a similar Required Assessment Task of completing a minimum of three source-based argumentative/analytical essays totaling 6,000 words. However, what was challenging was facilitating the amount of writing in a correspondence modality - for both English 1A and English 1B. Though students appeared capable of meeting course reading and writing expectations, as demonstrated by their work, many reported feeling overwhelmed due to the amount of work, all while coping with the impacts of rapid change in a carceral setting. As a result, instructors elected to remove some of the informal writing assignments outlined in

Despite the shift in modality, English 1S students were directed to still produce process-oriented assignments such as "Drafting Portfolios" for each formal essay in English 1A. These Drafting Portfolios contained materials such as reading notes or annotations, handouts, brainstorms, outlines, and rough drafts, along with a reflective cover letter. This cover letter asked students to respond to the following questions: How did your drafting process go? What worked well for you during this process? What was the most helpful or fruitful drafting-support item for you? What did not work well? What do you need more support or help with? The cover letters helped the instructor assess how the class was going and assess how to best move the class in a beneficial direction, despite having no physical presence in a classroom. Ultimately, these mailed Drafting Portfolios demonstrated an understanding of English 1A concepts, ideas, and processes and also gave them another means of practicing the hands-on and reflective skills necessary for success in transfer-level reading and writing.

Still, without holding face-to-face or synchronous classes, instructors found it challenging to facilitate collaborative learning activities; however, because the first couple of months were face-to-face, students had already created that larger learning community and, therefore, many students reported in their letters that they still sought help from their peers and worked in groups when they could to engage with the English 1A material.

To program faculty, this is representative of how many faculty members continued to practice regular, effective contact between

3.2 Describe assessment findings/observations that may require further research or institutional support.

8 of 11 8/12/21, 16:18

Recent data strongly suggests there is further research and institutional support needed in regard to English 1S. The 2019-20AY was the first full year of implementation and the data from 1S is inconsistent, but also concerning. Recent IR data (AY 19-20) shows a higher success rate for students enrolled in 1A standalone (not supported) at several GPA bands than for students enrolled in 1A + 1S (supported). The overall success rate gap in Fall 19 was -3% for supported. The overall success rate gap in SP 20 was -7% for supported. In other words, students taking English 1A standalone had higher success rates than students taking 1A with 1S at several different GPA bands.

The success rate gaps by GPA microband were inconsistent at many bands when comparing Fall 19 and Spring 20. More research is needed to determine trends over time. Two microbands with consistent success rate gaps were at the far ends of the range (>2.0 and 3.7-4.0) and relatively small sample sizes. The third microband with a consistent gap was 2.7-3.0. Two of these three bands are above the Chancellor's Office recommended GPA range for concurrent support. In other words, where the data is most consistent that 1A + 1S enrolled students were less successful than 1A standalone are primarily GPA bands where students are not recommended to take 1S in the first place. In both semesters, students with no reported GPA had higher success rates in supported and unsupported sections than those with reported GPA. In other words, students with a reported GPA (roughly 40% of our student population) were less likely to be successful in 1A overall and higher percentages of this group were unsuccessful if they enrolled in 1A + 1S.

The lower success rates for students enrolling in a concurrent support class (1S) is anomalous at Redwoods. In both mathematics courses with concurrent support options (Math 15 and Math 30), student success was higher with concurrent support than without in Fall 2019.

When the English 1A and1S success data is disaggregated by race and ethnicity, the success rate gaps between 1A standalone and 1A + 1S are most consistently connected to Latinx students and most consistently present at the Eureka campus. The GPA band below 2.7 where the success rate gap was widest for Latinx students at Eureka was 2.0-2.3 (C). The overall GPA band where the success rate gap was widest for Latinx students at Eureka overall was 2.7-3.0 (B). In other words, Latinx students at the Eureka campus with a known cumulative B average from high school who chose to take English 1S had the lowest success rate in

students' likelihood of success, when compared to their student colleagues of the same demographics who chose to take English

1A as a standalone course.

Additionally, recent experiences and anecdotal highlights from CR faculty currently teaching in a correspondence modality suggest that further support and training may be needed, especially since courses for our correctional facility programs will need to remain in correspondence for Spring 2021. Though we do not currently have numerical or quantitative data to illustrate the absolute need for further support and training, our current Fall 2020 faculty both at Pelican Bay State Prison (PBSP) and the Humboldt County Correctional Facility (HCCF) have found CE support and training beneficial in developing course adaptations to be compliant with local and state policies (such as ADA compliance and Regular and Effective Contact), in addition to building teaching practices that are as engaging and responsive as possible for students learning in a CE modality (such as collaborative assignments and the utilization of TV Broadcasting). This past summer and fall, collaboration and support among CE faculty allowed for a space to make our CE programs as robust as possible within a limited timeframe. Currently, CE faculty are supported with a structured training and support module on Keep Teaching, CR's remote learning Canvas website, which aims to prepare faculty to teach correspondence courses effectively and meaningfully. This space will remain available to CE faculty and will be updated as policies shift and as faculty share and discuss fall "classroom" experiences. The current CE Faculty Lead will also remain available for support.

Summary of Section 3
How will your assessment findings impact planning for the next year?

In response to student success gap findings in English 1S, the department should plan to engage in the following areas of research and design over the next year:

- 1. Gather and analyze 1S student success, self-placement, and course experience data, disaggregated by demographics. This data could be quantitative and qualitative.
- 2. Partner with counseling and advising to review the existing 1S data and enrollment/self-placement materials to identify opportunities for revision.
- 3. Evaluate 1S curriculum and determine next steps based on local and statewide research.
- 4. Support continued professional learning, especially in the areas of reading apprenticeship and culturally responsive teaching practices.