2017-2018
Annual Program Review

English & Humanities
(English, Humanities, Reading)

Table of Contents

Section 1: Program Planning: English

Internal Analysis

ENROLLMENT AND FTES:
The number of enrollments in <u>English</u> courses in 2015-2016 showed **a slight increase (1.0% to 4.9%)** from 2014-2015 and **a slight increase (1.0% to 4.9%)** in comparison with the number of enrollments in 2013-2014.

The FTES in <u>English</u> credit courses in 2015-2016 showed **a moderate increase (5.0% to 9.9%)** from 2014-2015 and **a moderate increase (5.0% to 9.9%)** in with in comparison with FTES in 2013-2014.

EFFICIENCY (NUMBER OF SECTIONS, FILL RATE, FTEF/30, WSCH/FTEF):
The number of sections in <u>English</u> courses in 2015-2016 showed **a moderate increase (5.0% to 9.9%)** from 2014-2015 and **a substantial decrease (>= -10.0%)** in comparison with the number of sections in 2013-2014.

The fill rate in <u>English</u> courses in 2015-2016 showed **a slight increase (1.0% to 4.9%)** from 2014-2015 and **a substantial increase (>= 10.0%)** in comparison with the fill rate in 2013-2014.

The FTEF/30 ratio in <u>English</u> courses in 2015-2016 showed **a moderate increase (5.0% to 9.9%)** from 2014-2015 and **minimal to no difference** in comparison with the FTEF/30 ratio in 2013-2014.

The WSCH/FTEF ratio in <u>English</u> courses in 2015-2016 showed **a slight decrease (-1.0% to -4.9%)** from 2014-2015 and **a moderate increase (5.0% to 9.9%)** in comparison with the WSCH/FTEF ratio in 2013-2014.

COURSE SUCCESS RATE:
The course success rate in <u>English</u> courses in 2015-2016 showed **minimal to no difference** from 2014-2015 and **minimal to no difference** in comparison with the course success rate in 2013-2014. The course success rate from 2015-2016 showed **a moderately higher rate (5.0% to 9.9%)** than the college success average* (*66.6%*) and showed **a substantially higher rate (>= 10.0%)** than the institutional-set standard* (*56.6%*) for credit course success.

TERM RETENTION RATE:
The term retention rate in <u>English</u> courses in 2015-2016 showed **a slight increase (1.0% to 4.9%)** from 2014-2015 and **minimal to no difference** in comparison with the term retention rate in 2013-2014. The term retention rate from 2015-2016 showed **minimal to no rate difference** than the college retention average* (*83.3%*) and showed **a substantially higher rate (>= 10.0%)** than the institutional-set standard* term retention (*70.8%*) for credit courses.

AWARDS (DEGREES AND CERTIFICATES):
The number of degrees in <u>English</u> in 2015-2016 showed **a substantial decrease (>= -10.0%)** from 2014-2015 and showed **minimal to no difference** in comparison with the number of degrees awarded in 2013-2014.

The number of certificates in <u>English</u> in 2015-2016 showed **no previous data** from 2014-2015 and showed **no previous data** in comparison with the number of certificates awarded in 2013-2014.

MODALITY:
In 2015-2016 **none (0%)** of the **English** courses were offered as **cable** courses, while **close to half (25% to 50%)** of the courses were offered in **correspondence**, **none (0%)** of the courses offered were **hybrid**, **more than half**

(50% to 74%) of the courses offered were **online**, **none (0%)** of the courses offered were **self-paced**, **none (0%)** of the courses offered were **telecourse**, and **less than a quarter (1% to 24%)** of the courses were offered in **traditional in-person** setting.

GENDER

In 2015-16 there **was NOT a disproportional impact** in <u>English</u> course success rates for *female students*; and there **was NOT a disproportional impact** in <u>English</u> course success rates for *male students*.

AGE GROUPS

In 2015-2016 there **was NOT a disproportional impact** in <u>English</u> course success rates for students *less than 20 years old*; there **was NOT a disproportional impact** in <u>English</u> course success rates for students *20 to 24 years old*; there **was NOT a disproportional impact** in <u>English</u> course success rates for students *25 to 29 years old*; there **was NOT a disproportional impact** in <u>English</u> course success rates for students *30 to 34 years old*; there **was NOT a disproportional impact** in <u>English</u> course success rates for students *35 to 39 years old*; there **was NOT a disproportional impact** in <u>English</u> course success rates for students *40 to 49 years old*; there **was NOT a disproportional impact** in <u>English</u> course success rates for students *50+ years old*.

RACE/ETHNICITY

In 2015-2016 there **was NOT a disproportional impact** in <u>English</u> course success rates for *African American* students; there **was NOT a disproportional impact** in <u>English</u> course success rates for *American Indian* students; there **was NOT a disproportional impact** in <u>English</u> course success rates for *Asian/Pacific Islander* students; there **was NOT a disproportional impact** in <u>English</u> course success rates for *Hispanic/Latino* students; there **was NOT a disproportional impact** in <u>English</u> course success rates for *White/Non-Hispanic* students; there **was NOT a disproportional impact** in <u>English</u> course success rates for *Multi-race* students; there **was NOT a disproportional impact** in <u>English</u> course success rates for students who have *declined to state their race/ethnic identity*.

Note: Disproportional Impact is calculated via the Proportionality Index Method with an 80% threshold for negative impact. This method is a measure of representational equity of each subgroup to its initial proportionality at the beginning of the term. Proportionality Index Method compares the demographic characteristics of those who successfully completed the course to the demographics characteristics of the same group that enrolled in the course at the beginning of the term. Proportions of less than 80% are flagged as experiencing disproportional impact.

Implications of Change

Provide a summation of perspective around the implications associated with shift in the program performance trends

Note:

The three main changes from 2016-2017 to 2017-2018 are the suspension of English C097, formerly the first course of our composition sequence, which was determined to overlap with ESL course offerings and potentially to slow students' progress toward college-level English C100; the separation of a Philosophy Department from the English & Hums Program; and the hiring of two new full-time English faculty members. All three changes take effect Fall '17.

Summary of English data:

The number of English sections increased moderately (5 to 9%) over the past year. The fill rate increased slightly (1 to 4.9%) from 2014-2015 and significantly (more than 10%) from 2013-2014. The WSCH/FTEF productivity showed a moderate increase compared to 2013-2014. Course success rates (73%) surpass the college standard. Term retention rates (83%) for English credit sections plateaued but at were again higher than the college standard. Most English sections were online, while around a quarter were correspondence. No disproportionate impact registered among age, gender, and ethnicity sub-groups.

The percentage of Asian students has decreased somewhat (38 to 28%), while the number of Latino students has increased (20% to 27%). The other racial / ethnic groups are largely unchanged. Student age seemed to be positively correlated with success, as the lower ages (20 to 24) had only a 63% success rate, a rate that increased with each age tier up to an 84% success rate for students of 50+.

Although our data isn't currently broken out thus, it would be worthwhile to tabulate which modalities (online, onsite, correspondence) served which demographic groups (races, ages) best, if such were the case.

Conclusions:

Interestingly, from 2013-14 to 2015-16 the number of sections dropped from 163 to 138, while conversely the fill rate increased from 63% to 82%. The FTES also increased from 317 to 343. This suggests that the English department's narrower scheduling, particularly its increase in online (up to 52%) and decrease of onsite (down to 18%) offerings, resulted in many more students per section than before. In short, the English department's online sections have a far higher fill rate than do onsite sections, and scheduling should continue to reflect this student preference.

English innovations for the upcoming academic year:

- Evaluate the merits of multiple measures (GPA, highest grade in highest level of English) placement. Note that English has updated its cut scores on the English Placement Test and has introduced a one-year MMAP pilot.
- Introduce an 099/100 accelerated course on a small scale (one section, perhaps hybrid). Students would enroll in 100 (3 units) and take a co-requisite course (perhaps 1 unit) with supplemental instruction and tutoring.
- The English and Humanities discipline meeting will become a venue for our instructors to report back, share best practices, conduct demos, and lead discussions stemming from professional development conferences and workshops they've attended.
- CSLOs and PSLOs need to be collected regularly and assessed meaningfully. Currently the college has no established mechanism for collecting and assessing SLOs.
- An online English C100 Master Course built on a zero-cost (OER) textbook has been discussed. However, given the rapid adoption of OERs by the current English C100 online instructors, there is no current need to develop an OER-based master course at this level.

Academic Year	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16
CENSUS Enrollment	3,701	3,724	3,880
FTES	317.0	320.0	343.0
FTEF30	13.1	11.9	13.1
WSCH/FTEF	397	442	430
Sections	163.0	127.0	138.0
Fill Rate	63.1%	78.5%	81.6%
DEGREES AND CERTIFICATES			
Associate Degrees	2	5	2
Certificates	0	0	0
STUDENT DEMOGRAPHICS			
GRADED Enrollment*	3,737	3,777	3,906
GENDER			
Female	52.4%	46.2%	46.8%
Male	46.4%	52.8%	51.9%
Unknown	1.1%	1.1%	1.3%
AGE at TERM			
Less than 19	11.9%	11.2%	13.1%
20 to 24	22.7%	22.1%	23.6%
25 to 29	13.3%	16.0%	15.3%
30 to 34	11.1%	12.8%	11.2%
35 to 39	8.7%	10.1%	9.8%
40 to 49	15.4%	15.2%	14.4%
50 and Older	16.9%	12.7%	12.6%
RACE/ETHNICITY			
African American	7.9%	10.1%	9.5%
American Indian	0.4%	0.3%	0.6%
Asian/Pacific Islander	37.7%	27.3%	27.7%
Hispanic/Latino	19.8%	25.7%	27.3%
2 or More Race	3.2%	3.4%	4.3%
White	28.2%	30.7%	29.2%
Unknown	2.9%	2.4%	1.5%
INSTRUCTIONAL MODALITY			
Cable	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Correspondence	19.3%	31.0%	29.4%
Hybrid	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Online	41.9%	50.6%	52.3%
Self-Paced	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Telecourse	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Traditional	38.7%	18.3%	18.3%
SUCCESS & RETENTION			
Course Success (A, B, C, P)	72.4%	72.1%	72.7%
Course Retention (A-F, P, NP)	83.5%	81.1%	83.4%

*Note: GRADED ENROLLMENTS excludes Zero Unit Lab enrollments since there is only 1 Grade issued across 2 or more CRNs.

Academic Year	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16
GRADED ENROLLMENT	3,737	3,779	3,905
-Overall Success Rate	72.4%	72.6%	72.7%
-Overall Retention Rate	83.5%	81.4%	83.4%

STUDENT DEMOGRAPHICS			
GENDER			
Female	1,960	1,744	1,826
Male	1,735	1,995	2,028
Unknown	42	40	51

Success Rate			
- Female	70.9%	70.7%	71.5%
- Male	73.9%	74.0%	73.7%
- Unknown	78.6%	80.0%	74.5%

Retention Rate			
- Female	82.9%	80.2%	82.3%
- Male	84.1%	82.3%	84.5%
- Unknown	85.7%	85.0%	80.4%

Academic Year	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16
GRADED ENROLLMENT	3,737	3,779	3,905
-Overall Success Rate	72.4%	72.6%	72.7%
-Overall Retention Rate	83.5%	81.4%	83.4%

AGE at TERM			
Less than 19	443	422	510
20 to 24	847	833	920
25 to 29	498	607	599
30 to 34	416	482	436
35 to 39	326	382	382
40 to 49	576	574	564
50 and Older	631	479	494

Success Rate

Less than 19	72.2%	76.3%	74.1%
20 to 24	66.0%	64.2%	63.0%
25 to 29	68.1%	66.9%	70.1%
30 to 34	73.8%	76.3%	72.7%
35 to 39	77.9%	81.4%	75.1%
40 to 49	77.8%	74.0%	78.4%
50 and Older	75.8%	78.3%	83.8%

Retention Rate

Less than 19	84.9%	86.0%	87.3%
20 to 24	79.7%	76.1%	75.5%
25 to 29	80.3%	75.3%	82.6%
30 to 34	83.9%	83.0%	82.3%
35 to 39	86.2%	88.0%	86.6%
40 to 49	85.8%	81.2%	86.3%
50 and Older	86.5%	87.5%	90.3%

Academic Year	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16
GRADED ENROLLMENT	3,737	3,779	3,905
-Overall Success Rate	72.4%	72.6%	72.7%
-Overall Retention Rate	83.5%	81.4%	83.4%

RACE/ETHNICITY			
African American	740	971	1,062
American Indian	1,407	1,033	1,083
Asian	295	382	372
Hispanic/Latino	120	131	169
Pacific Islander	100	87	57
White	1,060	1,162	1,140
Unknown	15	13	22

Success Rate

African American	70.7%	69.8%	66.9%
American Indian	72.9%	78.6%	78.9%
Asian	69.2%	64.7%	71.0%
Hispanic/Latino	60.8%	63.4%	67.5%
Pacific Islander	66.0%	78.2%	66.7%
White	75.5%	72.8%	73.9%
Unknown	93.3%	61.5%	68.2%

Retention Rate

African American	83.0%	78.7%	80.7%
American Indian	84.2%	87.7%	87.8%
Asian	83.1%	75.1%	83.9%
Hispanic/Latino	80.8%	76.3%	79.3%
Pacific Islander	80.0%	82.8%	77.2%
White	83.7%	80.6%	82.6%
Unknown	93.3%	76.9%	81.8%

Academic Year	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16
GRADED ENROLLMENT	3,737	3,779	3,905
-Overall Success Rate	72.4%	72.6%	72.7%
-Overall Retention Rate	83.5%	81.4%	83.4%

INSTRUCTIONAL MODALITY			
Cable	0	0	0
Correspondence	723	1,172	1,147
Hybrid	0	0	0
Online	1,566	1,911	2,043
Self-Paced	0	0	0
Telecourse	0	0	0
Traditional	1,448	696	715

Success Rate

Cable			
Correspondence	80.9%	76.7%	78.9%
Hybrid			
Online	69.5%	67.2%	67.9%
Self-Paced			
Telecourse			
Traditional	71.2%	80.2%	76.2%

Retention Rate

Cable			
Correspondence	89.1%	83.8%	89.0%
Hybrid			
Online	79.4%	76.0%	77.5%
Self-Paced			
Telecourse			
Traditional	85.2%	92.0%	91.5%

Program Planning: Humanities

Internal Analysis

<u>ENROLLMENT AND FTES:</u>
The number of enrollments in <u>Humanities</u> courses in 2015-2016 showed **a substantial increase (>= 10.0%)** from 2014-2015 and **a substantial increase (>= 10.0%)** in comparison with the number of enrollments in 2013-2014.

The FTES in <u>Humanities</u> credit courses in 2015-2016 showed **a substantial increase (>= 10.0%)** from 2014-2015 and **a substantial increase (>= 10.0%)** in with in comparison with FTES in 2013-2014.

<u>EFFICIENCY (NUMBER OF SECTIONS, FILL RATE, FTEF/30, WSCH/FTEF):</u>
The number of sections in <u>Humanities</u> courses in 2015-2016 showed **a slight decrease (-1.0% to -4.9%)** from 2014-2015 and **a substantial increase (>= 10.0%)** in comparison with the number of sections in 2013-2014.

The fill rate in <u>Humanities</u> courses in 2015-2016 showed **a substantial decrease (>= -10.0%)** from 2014-2015 and **a slight increase (1.0% to 4.9%)** in comparison with the fill rate in 2013-2014.

The FTEF/30 ratio in <u>Humanities</u> courses in 2015-2016 showed **a substantial increase (>= 10.0%)** from 2014-2015 and **a substantial increase (>= 10.0%)** in comparison with the FTEF/30 ratio in 2013-2014.

The WSCH/FTEF ratio in <u>Humanities</u> courses in 2015-2016 showed **a moderate increase (5.0% to 9.9%)** from 2014-2015 and **a moderate increase (5.0% to 9.9%)** in comparison with the WSCH/FTEF ratio in 2013-2014.

<u>COURSE SUCCESS RATE:</u>
The course success rate in <u>Humanities</u> courses in 2015-2016 showed **a slight increase (1.0% to 4.9%)** from 2014-2015 and **a moderate increase (5.0% to 9.9%)** in comparison with the course success rate in 2013-2014. The course success rate from 2015-2016 showed **a slightly lower rate (-1.0% to -4.9%)** than the college success average* (*66.6%*) and showed **a moderately higher rate (5.0% to 9.9%)** than the institutional-set standard* (*56.6%*) for credit course success.

<u>TERM RETENTION RATE:</u>
The term retention rate in <u>Humanities</u> courses in 2015-2016 showed **a moderate increase (5.0% to 9.9%)** from 2014-2015 and **a slight increase (1.0% to 4.9%)** in comparison with the term retention rate in 2013-2014. The term retention rate from 2015-2016 showed **a slightly lower rate (-1.0% to -4.9%)** than the college retention average* (*83.3%*) and showed **a substantially higher rate (>= 10.0%)** than the institutional-set standard* term retention (*70.8%*) for credit courses.

<u>AWARDS (DEGREES AND CERTIFICATES):</u>
The number of degrees in <u>Humanities</u> in 2015-2016 showed **a moderate decrease (-5.0% to -9.9%)** from 2014-2015 and showed **a substantial increase (>= 10.0%)** in comparison with the number of degrees awarded in 2013-2014.

The number of certificates in <u>Humanities</u> in 2015-2016 showed **no previous data** from 2014-2015 and showed **no previous data** in comparison with the number of certificates awarded in 2013-2014.

MODALITY:

In 2015-2016 **none (0%)** of the **Humanities** courses were offered as **cable** courses, while **none (0%)** of the courses were offered in **correspondence**, **none (0%)** of the courses offered were **hybrid**, **close to half (25% to 50%)** of the courses offered were **online**, **none (0%)** of the courses offered were **self-paced**, **more than half (50% to 74%)** of the courses offered were **telecourse**, and **less than a quarter (1% to 24%)** of the courses were offered in **traditional in-person** setting.

GENDER

In 2015-16 there **was NOT a disproportional impact** in <u>Humanities</u> course success rates for *female students*; and there **was NOT a disproportional impact** in <u>Humanities</u> course success rates for *male students*.

AGE GROUPS

In 2015-2016 there **was NOT a disproportional impact** in <u>Humanities</u> course success rates for students *less than 20 years old*; there **was NOT a disproportional impact** in <u>Humanities</u> course success rates for students *20 to 24 years old*; there **was NOT a disproportional impact** in <u>Humanities</u> course success rates for students *25 to 29 years old*; there **was NOT a disproportional impact** in <u>Humanities</u> course success rates for students *30 to 34 years old*; there **was NOT a disproportional impact** in <u>Humanities</u> course success rates for students *35 to 39 years old*; there **was NOT a disproportional impact** in <u>Humanities</u> course success rates for students *40 to 49 years old*; there **was NOT a disproportional impact** in <u>Humanities</u> course success rates for students *50+ years old*.

RACE/ETHNICITY

In 2015-2016 there **was NOT a disproportional impact** in <u>Humanities</u> course success rates for *African American* students; there **was a disproportional impact** in <u>Humanities</u> course success rates for *American Indian* students; there **was NOT a disproportional impact** in <u>Humanities</u> course success rates for *Asian/Pacific Islander* students; there **was NOT a disproportional impact** in <u>Humanities</u> course success rates for *Hispanic/Latino* students; there **was NOT a disproportional impact** in <u>Humanities</u> course success rates for *White/Non-Hispanic* students; there **was NOT a disproportional impact** in <u>Humanities</u> course success rates for *Multi-race* students; there **was NOT a disproportional impact** in <u>Humanities</u> course success rates for students who have *declined to state their race/ethnic identity*.

Note: Disproportional Impact is calculated via the Proportionality Index Method with an 80% threshold for negative impact. This method is a measure of representational equity of each subgroup to its initial proportionality at the beginning of the term. Proportionality Index Method compares the demographic characteristics of those who successfully completed the course to the demographics characteristics of the same group that enrolled in the course at the beginning of the term. Proportions of less than 80% are flagged as experiencing disproportional impact.

Implications of Change

Provide a summation of perspective around the implications associated with shift in the program performance trends

Summary of Humanities data:

Humanities enrollments, FTEF/30, and FTES increased substantially (more than 10%) from 2014-2015 to 2015-2016, while the fill rate dipped slightly. FTES increased from 65 to 93 over the past two years, while the number of sections increased from 8 to 11 per year, which explains the increase in FTES and the slight decrease in fill rates.

Unlike most other community college disciplines, our Hums courses are two-thirds male (66%), likely due to incarcerated enrollments in Hums telecourses: 53% of students were enrolled in this modality. Hums showed no disproportionate impact toward a gender, age group, or race/ethnicity.

Conclusions:

The Hums overall success rate (64%) has improved over the past two years, but it needs to go up another 9% to reach the level of English. Instructor-level strategies to improve students' completion rates (particularly in the onsite Hums course, which unexpectedly had only a 57% success rate) need to be implemented.   Onsite Humanities 135 will continue to be offered at the Early College High School; however, Humanities 100, which was offered in STAR during the past year, will no longer be offered in STAR or offered onsite.

Humanities innovations for the upcoming academic year:

- Increase faculty awareness about the low success rates of Humanities students
- Begin regular dialogue with Hums instructors as well as the college DL department about best practices for improving incarcerated success rates
- Goals
  - Raise the online success rate from 66% to 70%
  - Raise the telecourse success rate from 63% to 67%
  - Raise the onsite success rate from 57% to 75%

Academic Year	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16
CENSUS Enrollment	708	803	1,020
FTES	65.0	74.0	93.7
FTEF30	1.0	1.2	1.4
WSCH/FTEF	1,028	1,017	1,113
Sections	8.0	11.0	10.5
Fill Rate	74.9%	87.5%	77.9%
DEGREES AND CERTIFICATES			
Associate Degrees	57	77	72
Certificates	0	0	0
STUDENT DEMOGRAPHICS			
GRADED Enrollment*	730	812	1,039
GENDER			
Female	38.9%	35.3%	32.8%
Male	59.9%	64.0%	66.3%
Unknown	1.2%	0.6%	0.9%
AGE at TERM			
Less than 19	8.1%	13.9%	11.8%
20 to 24	22.1%	18.2%	16.7%
25 to 29	16.6%	14.8%	15.9%
30 to 34	14.1%	13.7%	14.5%
35 to 39	12.1%	11.7%	12.0%
40 to 49	14.8%	17.7%	17.8%
50 and Older	12.3%	10.0%	11.2%
RACE/ETHNICITY			
African American	12.7%	13.2%	15.3%
American Indian	1.8%	0.9%	0.7%
Asian/Pacific Islander	13.6%	11.0%	11.9%
Hispanic/Latino	27.7%	32.1%	31.7%
2 or More Race	3.6%	3.8%	4.6%
White	38.4%	37.4%	34.3%
Unknown	2.3%	1.6%	2.0%
INSTRUCTIONAL MODALITY			
Cable	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Correspondence	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Hybrid	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Online	53.0%	40.4%	43.1%
Self-Paced	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Telecourse	47.0%	51.1%	53.1%
Traditional	0.0%	8.5%	3.8%
SUCCESS & RETENTION			
Course Success (A, B, C, P)	58.8%	62.1%	63.7%
Course Retention (A-F, P, NP)	78.8%	76.5%	81.9%

Note: GRADED ENROLLMENTS excludes Zero Unit Lab enrollments since there is only 1 Grade issued across 2 or more CRNs.

Academic Year	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16
GRADED ENROLLMENT	729	812	1,038
-Overall Success Rate	59.0%	62.9%	63.7%
-Overall Retention Rate	78.9%	76.5%	81.9%

STUDENT DEMOGRAPHICS			
GENDER			
Female	283	287	341
Male	437	520	689
Unknown	9	5	8

Success Rate			
- Female	57.6%	67.2%	63.0%
- Male	59.5%	60.8%	63.6%
- Unknown	77.8%	40.0%	100.0%

Retention Rate			
- Female	78.8%	78.0%	79.2%
- Male	78.7%	76.0%	83.0%
- Unknown	88.9%	40.0%	100.0%

Academic Year	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16
GRADED ENROLLMENT	729	812	1,038
-Overall Success Rate	59.0%	62.9%	63.7%
-Overall Retention Rate	78.9%	76.5%	81.9%

AGE at TERM			
Less than 19	59	113	123
20 to 24	161	148	173
25 to 29	121	120	165
30 to 34	102	111	151
35 to 39	88	95	125
40 to 49	108	144	185
50 and Older	90	81	116

Success Rate

Less than 19	62.7%	74.3%	68.3%
20 to 24	56.5%	54.7%	61.3%
25 to 29	51.2%	60.0%	54.5%
30 to 34	60.8%	59.5%	61.6%
35 to 39	60.2%	64.2%	71.2%
40 to 49	65.7%	65.3%	67.6%
50 and Older	60.0%	65.4%	63.8%

Retention Rate

Less than 19	81.4%	91.2%	87.0%
20 to 24	77.0%	70.3%	80.3%
25 to 29	73.6%	74.2%	73.3%
30 to 34	80.4%	73.9%	78.1%
35 to 39	85.2%	74.7%	87.2%
40 to 49	79.6%	75.7%	85.9%
50 and Older	78.9%	77.8%	83.6%

Academic Year	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16
GRADED ENROLLMENT	729	812	1,038
-Overall Success Rate	59.0%	62.9%	63.7%
-Overall Retention Rate	78.9%	76.5%	81.9%

RACE/ETHNICITY			
African American	203	262	328
American Indian	99	88	121
Asian	94	106	158
Hispanic/Latino	24	34	52
Pacific Islander	17	13	16
White	279	302	356
Unknown	13	7	7

Success Rate

African American	53.2%	62.6%	61.9%
American Indian	71.7%	69.3%	72.7%
Asian	48.9%	52.8%	53.8%
Hispanic/Latino	54.2%	58.8%	55.8%
Pacific Islander	64.7%	53.8%	87.5%
White	62.7%	66.6%	67.1%
Unknown	46.2%	28.6%	42.9%

Retention Rate

African American	76.4%	77.9%	77.4%
American Indian	81.8%	81.8%	91.7%
Asian	73.4%	67.0%	81.0%
Hispanic/Latino	70.8%	70.6%	78.8%
Pacific Islander	82.4%	69.2%	93.8%
White	81.7%	77.8%	83.1%
Unknown	84.6%	85.7%	71.4%

Academic Year	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16
GRADED ENROLLMENT	729	812	1,038
-Overall Success Rate	59.0%	62.9%	63.7%
-Overall Retention Rate	78.9%	76.5%	81.9%

INSTRUCTIONAL MODALITY			
Cable	0	0	0
Correspondence	0	0	0
Hybrid	0	0	0
Online	387	328	448
Self-Paced	0	0	0
Telecourse	342	415	551
Traditional	0	69	39

Success Rate

Cable			
Correspondence			
Hybrid			
Online	61.2%	64.9%	65.6%
Self-Paced			
Telecourse	56.4%	57.3%	62.6%
Traditional		87.0%	56.4%

Retention Rate

Cable			
Correspondence			
Hybrid			
Online	78.6%	76.2%	79.9%
Self-Paced			
Telecourse	79.2%	73.5%	82.9%
Traditional		95.7%	89.7%

Program Planning: Reading

Internal Analysis

ENROLLMENT AND FTES:

The number of enrollments in <u>Reading</u> courses in 2015-2016 showed **a substantial decrease (>= -10.0%)** from 2014-2015 and **no previous data** in comparison with the number of enrollments in 2013-2014.

The FTES in <u>Reading</u> credit courses in 2015-2016 showed **a substantial decrease (>= -10.0%)** from 2014-2015 and **no previous data** in with in comparison with FTES in 2013-2014.

EFFICIENCY (NUMBER OF SECTIONS, FILL RATE, FTEF/30, WSCH/FTEF):

The number of sections in <u>Reading</u> courses in 2015-2016 showed **a substantial decrease (>= -10.0%)** from 2014-2015 and **no previous data** in comparison with the number of sections in 2013-2014.

The fill rate in <u>Reading</u> courses in 2015-2016 showed **a substantial decrease (>= -10.0%)** from 2014-2015 and **no previous data** in comparison with the fill rate in 2013-2014.

The FTEF/30 ratio in <u>Reading</u> courses in 2015-2016 showed **a substantial decrease (>= -10.0%)** from 2014-2015 and **no previous data** in comparison with the FTEF/30 ratio in 2013-2014.

The WSCH/FTEF ratio in <u>Reading</u> courses in 2015-2016 showed **a slight decrease (-1.0% to -4.9%)** from 2014-2015 and **no previous data** in comparison with the WSCH/FTEF ratio in 2013-2014.

COURSE SUCCESS RATE:

The course success rate in <u>Reading</u> courses in 2015-2016 showed **a substantial decrease (>= -10.0%)** from 2014-2015 and **no previous data** in comparison with the course success rate in 2013-2014. The course success rate from 2015-2016 showed **a substantially lower rate (>= -10.0%)** than the college success average* (*66.6%*) and showed **a slightly lower rate (-1.0% to -4.9%)** than the institutional-set standard* (*56.6%*) for credit course success.

TERM RETENTION RATE:

The term retention rate in <u>Reading</u> courses in 2015-2016 showed **a substantial decrease (>= -10.0%)** from 2014-2015 and **no previous data** in comparison with the term retention rate in 2013-2014. The term retention rate from 2015-2016 showed **a substantially lower rate (>= -10.0%)** than the college retention average* (*83.3%*) and showed **a moderately lower rate (-5.0% to -9.9%)** than the institutional-set standard* term retention (*70.8%*) for credit courses.

AWARDS (DEGREES AND CERTIFICATES):

The number of degrees in <u>Reading</u> in 2015-2016 showed **no previous data** from 2014-2015 and showed **no previous data** in comparison with the number of degrees awarded in 2013-2014.

The number of certificates in <u>Reading</u> in 2015-2016 showed **no previous data** from 2014-2015 and showed **no previous data** in comparison with the number of certificates awarded in 2013-2014.

MODALITY:
In 2015-2016 **none (0%)** of the **Reading** courses were offered as **cable** courses, while **none (0%)** of the courses were offered in **correspondence**, **none (0%)** of the courses offered were **hybrid**, **All (100%)** of the courses offered were **online**, **none (0%)** of the courses offered were **self-paced**, **none (0%)** of the courses offered were **telecourse**, and **none (0%)** of the courses were offered in **traditional in-person** setting.

GENDER
In 2015-16 there **was NOT a disproportional impact** in Reading course success rates for *female students*; and there **was NOT a disproportional impact** in Reading course success rates for *male students*.

AGE GROUPS
In 2015-2016 there **was NOT a disproportional impact** in Reading course success rates for students *less than 20 years old*; there **was NOT a disproportional impact** in Reading course success rates for students *20 to 24 years old*; there **was NOT a disproportional impact** in Reading course success rates for students *25 to 29 years old*; there **was NOT a disproportional impact** in Reading course success rates for students *30 to 34 years old*; there **was a disproportional impact** in Reading course success rates for students *35 to 39 years old*; there **was a disproportional impact** in Reading course success rates for students *40 to 49 years old*; there **was NOT a disproportional impact** in Reading course success rates for students *50+ years old*.

RACE/ETHNICITY
In 2015-2016 there **was a disproportional impact** in Reading course success rates for *African American* students; there **there was no or incomplete data** in Reading course success rates for *American Indian* students; there **was NOT a disproportional impact** in Reading course success rates for *Asian/Pacific Islander* students; there **was NOT a disproportional impact** in Reading course success rates for *Hispanic/Latino* students; there **was NOT a disproportional impact** in Reading course success rates for *White/Non-Hispanic* students; there **there was no or incomplete data** in Reading course success rates for *Multi-race* students; there **there was no or incomplete data** in Reading course success rates for students who have *declined to state their race/ethnic identity*.

Note: Disproportional Impact is calculated via the Proportionality Index Method with an 80% threshold for negative impact. This method is a measure of representational equity of each subgroup to its initial proportionality at the beginning of the term. Proportionality Index Method compares the demographic characteristics of those who successfully completed the course to the demographics characteristics of the same group that enrolled in the course at the beginning of the term. Proportions of less than 80% are flagged as experiencing disproportional impact.

Implications of Change

Provide a summation of perspective around the implications associated with shift in the program performance trends

Note that this data applies only to the Reading C100 courses found under the Reading section of the class schedule; they're listed under READ. Data for basic skills reading courses appear in the English PR section and are scheduled as ENGL.

Summary of Reading data:

Reading enrollments, fill rates, success rates, retention rates, and FTEF/30 dropped substantially (more than 10%) from 2014-15 to 2015-16, as did FTES (from 2 to 1.6) and sections (3 to 2). Success dropped from 69% to 56%, and retention dropped from 85% to 61%. Reading courses were majority female (72%) and largely Asian (44%).   100% of reading courses were offered online.   Age, race/ethnicity, and gender showed no disproportionate impact.

READ C102 was submitted to the CSU state office for consideration for A3 critical thinking approval; it was initially rejected. It was resubmitted in late fall 2016. The college has not yet heard back.

Conclusions:

The Reading department is only two years old; still, the fill rates of 22% (2014-15) and 19% (2015-16) must be addressed.

Reading innovations for the upcoming academic year:

- Determine role and purpose of reading classes within the Humanities Program.
- Evaluate whether reading should be taught discretely or formally integrated into, and added to the Course Outline of, regular English classes.

Academic Year	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16
CENSUS Enrollment	0	26	17
FTES	0.0	2.0	1.6
FTEF30	0.0	0.3	0.2
WSCH/FTEF	0	132	127
Sections	0.0	3.0	2.0
Fill Rate	0.0	21.7%	18.9%
DEGREES AND CERTIFICATES			
Associate Degrees	0	0	0
Certificates	1	6	0
STUDENT DEMOGRAPHICS			
GRADED Enrollment*	0	26	18
GENDER			
Female	0.0%	73.1%	72.2%
Male	0.0%	26.9%	27.8%
Unknown	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
AGE at TERM			
Less than 19	0.0%	7.7%	5.6%
20 to 24	0.0%	19.2%	5.6%
25 to 29	0.0%	11.5%	11.1%
30 to 34	0.0%	11.5%	22.2%
35 to 39	0.0%	15.4%	5.6%
40 to 49	0.0%	15.4%	27.8%
50 and Older	0.0%	19.2%	22.2%
RACE/ETHNICITY			
African American	0.0%	0.0%	16.7%
American Indian	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Asian/Pacific Islander	0.0%	23.1%	44.4%
Hispanic/Latino	0.0%	42.3%	22.2%
2 or More Race	0.0%	3.8%	0.0%
White	0.0%	23.1%	16.7%
Unknown	0.0%	7.7%	0.0%
INSTRUCTIONAL MODALITY			
Cable	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Correspondence	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Hybrid	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Online	0.0%	88.5%	100.0%
Self-Paced	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Telecourse	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Traditional	0.0%	11.5%	0.0%
SUCCESS & RETENTION			
Course Success (A, B, C, P)	0.0%	69.2%	55.6%
Course Retention (A-F, P, NP)	0.0%	84.6%	61.1%

Note: GRADED ENROLLMENTS excludes Zero Unit Lab enrollments since there is only 1 Grade issued across 2 or more CRNs.

Academic Year	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16
GRADED ENROLLMENT	0	26	18
-Overall Success Rate	0.0%	69.2%	55.6%
-Overall Retention Rate	0.0%	84.6%	61.1%

AGE at TERM			
Less than 19	0	2	1
20 to 24	0	5	1
25 to 29	0	3	2
30 to 34	0	3	4
35 to 39	0	4	1
40 to 49	0	4	5
50 and Older	0	5	4

Success Rate

Less than 19	0.0%	50.0%	100.0%
20 to 24	0.0%	60.0%	100.0%
25 to 29	0.0%	66.7%	50.0%
30 to 34	0.0%	33.3%	50.0%
35 to 39	0.0%	75.0%	0.0%
40 to 49	0.0%	100.0%	40.0%
50 and Older	0.0%	80.0%	75.0%

Retention Rate

Less than 19	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%
20 to 24	0.0%	80.0%	100.0%
25 to 29	0.0%	100.0%	50.0%
30 to 34	0.0%	33.3%	50.0%
35 to 39	0.0%	75.0%	100.0%
40 to 49	0.0%	100.0%	40.0%
50 and Older	0.0%	100.0%	75.0%

Academic Year	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16
GRADED ENROLLMENT	0	26	18
-Overall Success Rate	0.0%	69.2%	55.6%
-Overall Retention Rate	0.0%	84.6%	61.1%

RACE/ETHNICITY			
African American	0	11	4
American Indian	0	6	8
Asian	0	0	3
Hispanic/Latino	0	1	0
Pacific Islander	0	2	0
White	0	6	3
Unknown	0	0	0

Success Rate

African American	0.0%	63.6%	50.0%
American Indian	0.0%	83.3%	62.5%
Asian	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Hispanic/Latino	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%
Pacific Islander	0.0%	50.0%	0.0%
White	0.0%	66.7%	100.0%
Unknown	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%

Retention Rate

African American	0.0%	81.8%	50.0%
American Indian	0.0%	83.3%	62.5%
Asian	0.0%	0.0%	33.3%
Hispanic/Latino	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%
Pacific Islander	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%
White	0.0%	83.3%	100.0%
Unknown	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%

Academic Year	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16
GRADED ENROLLMENT	0	26	18
-Overall Success Rate	0.0%	69.2%	55.6%
-Overall Retention Rate	0.0%	84.6%	61.1%

INSTRUCTIONAL MODALITY			
Cable			
Correspondence			
Hybrid			
Online		23	18
Self-Paced			
Telecourse			
Traditional		3	

Success Rate

Cable			
Correspondence			
Hybrid			
Online		69.6%	55.6%
Self-Paced			
Telecourse			
Traditional		66.7%	

Retention Rate

Cable			
Correspondence			
Hybrid			
Online		87.0%	61.1%
Self-Paced			
Telecourse			
Traditional		66.7%	

Student (SLOs) and Program Student Learning Outcome (PSLOs)

Summarize SLOs, PSLO findings, dialog, and Include SLO and PSLO data if available

During the transition to Canvas from Seaport, the native SLO collection tool was lost. English 099/100/100 SLOs and English 100 PSLOs had been discussed at each discipline meeting, though without data those discussions are no longer possible.

One of the English co-chairs met with the college's SLO Coordinator and began collecting English 100 SLOs on his own, though this process has not been institutionalized within the department or college: there is currently no formal or finalized policy or guide (videos, screen grabs, etc.) showing instructors how to collect SLOs at Coastline.

Curriculum Review

Summarize curriculum activities in the past year, providing dates of revisions, new course adoptions, and/or course deletions. Present a list of current degree(s)/certificate(s) and write a summary on new any degree or certificate discontinued over the past year.

Table Curriculum Review

Course	Date Reviewed	Status
ENGL C097 (suspended) ENGL C022 (suspended) ENGL C131 (suspended) ENGL C147 (suspended) ENGL C163 (suspended)	Fall 2016 April 24th, 2017 April 24th, 2017 April 24th, 2017 April 24th, 2017	These four courses appeared in the course catalog but had not been offered for two years (if ever), so they were formally suspended by the Curriculum Committee.

Progress on Initiative(s)

Table Progress on Forward Strategy Initiatives

Initiative(s)	Status	Progress Status Description	Outcome(s)
In collaboration with the Student Success Center, the Counseling Department, the ESL Department, and the English Department, implement an initiative with the outcome that, by 2020, at least 50% of the students who pass ESL C160 will persist to English C099 in the subsequent semester.	Underway	At the All College and beyond, English 099 instructors will forge a plan to create pathways with ESL C160 instructors, thus ensuring students' persistence.	TBD in 2020
By 2021, improve Coastline's performance on the Student Success Scorecard by 5% in the percentage of students who begin in remedial	Underway	The number of students who begin at 098 (two levels below 100), without having taken any basic	TBD in 2021

English courses and progress to English C100.		skills courses, is negligible. The most recent scorecard already shows a substantial increase in remedial to college progression.	
By spring 2021, hire at least one new full-time English instructor.	COMPLETED	Starting in Fall '16, the English department will be requesting two new full-time English faculty members OR one new full-time English faculty members + one new Humanities (with dual FSA) full-time faculty member.	Two new f.t. English instructors have been hired for the Fall '17 semester.

Response to Program/Department Committee Recommendation(s)

Table Progress on Recommendations

Recommendation(s)	Status	Response Summary
Build more awareness around the discipline-specific majors.	Underway	Humanities will build student awareness about majors via internal promotion (instructors communicating future class and major options with their current students) and external marketing.

Program Planning and Communication Strategies

Describe the communication methods and interaction strategies used by your program faculty to discuss programmatic-level planning, SLO/PSLO data, institutional performance data, and curriculum and programmatic development.

The English & Humanities leadership discusses SLO data collection and assessment at each discipline meeting. Instructors at each composition level (098, 099, 100, 102) also meet on an ad hoc basis to evaluate courses' SLOs and their efficacy in measuring student outcomes and in guiding instruction.

As mentioned above, one of the English co-chairs met with the college SLO Coordinator and began collecting English 100 SLOs, though this process has not been institutionalized within the department or the college: there is currently no formal or finalized guide (videos, screen grabs, etc.) showing instructors how to collect SLOs at Coastline.

We will increase outreach to instructors regarding possible new courses and partnerships with other disciplines, e.g., an English/CTE technical writing course.

Section 2: Human Capital Planning

Staffing

Table 2.1 Staffing Plan

Year	Administrator	Management	F/T Faculty	P/T Faculty	Classified	Hourly
Previous year 2016-17	n/a	n/a	2 f.t.-ers	Approx.. 30 p.t.-ers	n/a	n/a
Current year 2017-18			4 f.t.ers	Approx 25 p.t.-ers		
1 year 2018-19			4 f.t.ers	Approx 25 p.t.-ers		
2 years 2019-2020			4 f.t.ers	Approx 25 p.t.-ers		
3 years 2020-2021			5 f.t.-ers	Approx 20 p.t.-ers		

Provide a description of the staffing for the program. Include a description of the previous, current, and year of staffing estimates. Support the projection with evidence and specify how position growth or reduction relates to College plans. Additionally, for full-time positions, include a Coast District approved job description.

> English and Humanities, having hired two new full-timers for Fall '17, will have no new staffing needs for the next several years.

Professional Development

Provide a description of the program's staff professional development participation over the past year. Include evidence that supports program constituents participating in new opportunities to meet the professional development needs of the program.

Table 2.2 Professional Development

Name (Title)	Professional Development	Outcome
M.B.	Year two of dissertation research/ completion for EdD at Pepperdine U in the Educational Leadership, Administration and Policy Program	
C.P.	CSI: Rubrics as Evidence	
M.R.	Keenan Safe Colleges	
M.D.	Online Teaching Conference 2016, Coastline Summer Institute 2016, WCET 28th Annual Meeting, Canvas training, Online Teaching Conference 2017	
K.L.	California Teachers of English (CATE) Conference, @One Training: Creating Accessible Course Content, FSC 50/100	
K.N.	Peter Taylor fellowship in fiction at the Kenyon Writer's Workshop, Kenyon College, Gambier, OH, Summer 2016; Story and Soul Writer's Retreat, Ojai, CA, October 2016;	

	currently taking a class called "Story Structure for the Novel" (online) with Caroline Leavitt through the UCLA Extension Writer's Program (April-June 2017)	
S.D.	California Acceleration Project training (Modesto); various OER seminars in SoCal and online; RSI workshop at the Summer BBQ	
C.A.	*Writing with Power* by Peter Elbow *Rhetorical Traditions and the Teaching of Writing* by Knoblauch & Brannon *Reading Student Writing* by Lad Tobin	
M.F.	Academic Senate for California Community Colleges (ASCCC) Fall 2016 Plenary Session, 2016 Summer Institute attendee and presenter on how to take meeting minutes effectively	Marilyn Fry said that she was impressed with the discussion panel at one of the General Sessions on pathways. The emphasis was that it has to be a faculty-driven process, not a top-down process. At Mount San Antonio College, a flex day was used to bring all the faculty together where each discipline had a table for its faculty to discuss among themselves and with a counselor which General Education courses would be best suited for completing a major in that discipline. From that discussion, she brought back to the Coastline Academic Senate the idea that the Senate organize a similar event during the faculty portion of the Spring 2017 All-College Meeting. She worked with A.S. President Stephen Barnes to plan this event, which was quite successful in determining road maps for various majors.
D.O.	Advanced Manufacturing - Massachusetts Institute of Technology (EdX), 3D Printing - University of Illinois (Coursera), Faculty Institute, LAOC Regional Consortia - Netlab+ User Group Webinar & Doing What Matters for the Jobs and the Economy: Strong Faculty Strong Workforce, At-Risk Training for Faculty and Staff - Student mental health awareness training, Program Mapping	

	Project (High School CTE / Non Credit / Credit AS-T), ACCE - Leadership Development for Continuing Education, CCCAOE - Spring Conference: Equity and Access, CCCAOE - More and Better CTE Forum, IEPI Pathways Conference, American Institutes for Research (AIR) - Curriculum Planning Retreat	
A.W.	Completed Canvas Training with Student Success Center for Humanities 110 and 135; Attended Summer Technical Institute; Competed RSI course with Student Success Center; Participated in faculty training session during the annual Spring Barbecue; published my book: *Get Off the Hamster Wheel*; Community Service: Board of Directors: Newport Beach Public Library Foundation; Chair: Michigan Professionals (Business Network); President: University of Michigan Orange County Alumni Association	
T.T.	Canvas Boot Camp during spring break, 2017, at Orange Coast College; Accreditation seminar at Orange Coast College in January; Accreditation evaluations for the hiring of faculty in the English department at Coastline; attended "CSI" workshop, Garden Grove Center, to learn more about Rubrics; registered to take the Canvas training in June-July, 2017 to develop Humanities 100; All College conferences at start of fall 2016 and spring 2017 semesters.	

Section 3: Facilities Planning

Facility Assessment

Provide a description of the program facilities and specify any changes over the past year as it relates to the comprehensive forward strategy and overall College planning. Provide evidence of emerging needs for modifications or additions to the program facilities.

English and Humanities has no new facilities needs beyond ensuring that classrooms and computer labs can be scheduled at LJC.

Section 4: Technology Planning

Technology Assessment

Provide a description of the program's utilization of technology and specify any changes over the past years as it relates to the comprehensive forward strategy and overall College planning. Provide evidence of emerging needs for modifications or additions to the program technology.

> All online instructors have been trained to use the Canvas LMS and to engage in RSI and REC. Onsite instructors may benefit from greater Canvas instruction, particularly those wishing to transition to the hybrid modality. Updated computers and projectors at the learning centers have made onsite technology easier to use.

Section 5: New Initiatives

<u>Initiative:</u> Provide a short description of the initiative.

> English has updated its cut scores on the English Placement Test and has introduced a pilot to evaluate the merits of multiple measures (GPA, highest grade in highest level of English) placement.
> In addition, English will explore acceleration options, including an 099/100 course wherein students enroll in 100 but take a co-requisite course that provides supplemental instruction and tutoring.

Describe how the initiative supports the college mission:
Provide an explanation of how the initiative supports the College mission.

What college goal does the initiative support? Select one
X Student Success, Completion, and Achievement
X Instructional and Programmatic Excellence
X Access and Student Support
X Student Retention and Persistence
☐ Culture of Evidence, Planning, Innovation, and Change
☐ Partnerships and Community Engagement
☐ Fiscal Stewardship, Scalability, and Sustainability

What Educational Master Plan objective does the initiative support? Select all that apply
X Increase student success, retention, and persistence across all instructional delivery modalities with emphasis in distance education.
☐ Provide universal access to student service and support programs.
☐ Strengthen post-Coastline outcomes (e.g., transfer, job placement).
☐ Explore and enter new fields of study (e.g., new programs, bachelor's degrees).
☐ Foster and sustain industry connections and expand external funding sources (e.g., grants, contracts, and business development opportunities) to facilitate programmatic advancement.
☐ Strengthen community engagement (e.g., student life, alumni relations, industry and academic alliances).
X Maintain the College's Asian American and Native American Pacific Islander Serving Institution (AANAPISI) designation and pursue becoming a designated Hispanic Serving Institution (HSI).

What evidence supports this initiative? Select all that apply
☐ Learning Outcome (SLO/PSLO) assessment
X Internal Research (Student achievement, program performance)
X External Research (Academic literature, market assessment, audit findings, compliance mandates)

Describe how the evidence supports this initiative.

The California Acceleration Project and substantial research from The RP Group, among other educational research organizations, show that acceleration (and the elimination of remediation) benefits students across all demographic groups.

Recommended resource(s) needed for initiative achievement:

Faculty time, training, and willingness are all that are required.

What is the anticipated outcome of completing the initiative?

We anticipate preparing students more thoroughly and more quickly for completion of degrees and for transfer. Writing of curriculum for this initiative will begin in Spring 2018.

Section 6: Prioritization

List and prioritize resource requests that emerge from the initiatives.

Initiative	Resource(s)	Est. Cost	Funding Type	Health, Safety Compliance	Evidence	College Goal	To be Completed by	Priority
n/a								

List and prioritize staffing requests. For full-time positions, include a Coast District approved job description.

Initiative	Resource(s)	Est. Cost	Funding Type	Health, Safety Compliance	Evidence	College Goal	To be Completed by	Priority
n/a								

Prioritization Glossary

Initiative:	Provide a short description of the plan
Resource(s):	Describe the resource(s) needed to support the completion of the initiative
Est. Cost:	Estimated financial cost of the resource(s)
Funding Type:	Specify if the resource request is one-time or ongoing
Health, Safety Compliance:	Specify if the request relates to health or safety compliance issue(s)
Evidence:	Specify what data type(s) supported the initiative (Internal research, external research, or learning outcomes)
College Goal:	Specify what College goal the initiative aligns with
To be completed by:	Specify year of anticipated completion
Priority:	Specify a numerical rank to the initiative

Data Glossary

Enrolled (Census): The official enrollment count based on attendance at the census point of the course.

FTES: Total <u>full-time equivalent students</u> (FTES) based on enrollment of resident and non-resident students. Calculations based on census enrollment or number of hours attended based on the type of Attendance Accounting Method assigned to a section.

FTEF30: A measure of productivity that measures the number of **full-time faculty** loaded for the entire year at 30 Lecture Hour Equivalents (15 LHEs per fall and spring terms). This measure provides an estimate of full-time positions required to teach the instruction load for the subject for the academic year.

WSCH/FTEF (595): A measure of productivity that measures the weekly student contact hours compared to full-time equivalent faculty. When calculated for a 16 week schedule, the productivity benchmark is 595. When calculated for an 18 week schedule, the benchmark is 525.

Success Rate: The number of passing grades (A, B, C, P) compared to all valid grades awarded.

Retention Rate: The number of retention grades (A, B, C, P, D, F, NP, I*) compared to all valid grades awarded.

Fall-to-Spring Persistence: The number of students who completed the course in the fall term and re-enrolled (persisted) in the same subject the subsequent spring semester.

F2S Percent: The number of students who completed a course in the fall term and re-enrolled in the same subject the subsequent spring semester divided by the total number of students enrolled in the fall in the subject.