**Sinclair Community College**

**Continuous Improvement Annual Update 2017-18**

**Please submit to your Division Assessment Coordinator / Learning Liaison for feedback no later than March 1, 2018**

**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 1, 2018**

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

Year of Last Program Review: FY 2016-2017

Year of Next Program Review: FY 2021-2022

**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| **GOALS** | **Status** | **Progress or Rationale for No Longer Applicable** |
| Develop fully online CRWE.S.AA and ENGE.S.AA programs. Offering our two programs online will enable more students to complete their degrees in a timely manner. | In progress x Completed 🞏No longer applicable 🞏 | The ENGE.S.AA program is fully online as of spring 2018. We will be running the online Literature courses in this program each term in order to support our majors completing. When LIT 2201 became available online, the enrollment in that class per academic year increased from 40 students in 2013-14 to 81 students in 2014-15, and to 106 students in 2015-16. That sort of exponential growth is what we expect to see for the recently converted online LIT courses. The courses in CRWE.S.AA are online with the exception of ENG 2259, Novel Writing. We will be developing that course online in the near future. |
| Continue to revise and develop the Composition I and II OER, making affordable textbooks for our students a priority. | In progress  Completed xNo longer applicable 🞏  | The OER for ENG 1101/1201 was revised during the spring and summer of 2017 by the chair, Lisa Mahle-Grisez. It will be revised again in the spring / summer of 2019. Revisions of the OER are time-intensive and difficult to complete, so it should be a department effort in the future. To document the number of hours it required to revise the OER, I would estimate two full work weeks of 40 hours. So, 80 work hours, total. |
| Address inconsistencies in College Credit Plus instruction in restricted high school locations, including consistency in the assessment and evaluation of student writing. | In progress x Completed 🞏No longer applicable 🞏 | Addressing the inconsistencies in the restricted ENG sections offered at various high schools will remain a work in progress for the next several review cycles. On behalf of our department, Lisa Cook and Lisa Mahle-Grisez have tried different approaches to create consistency in the curriculum and assessment of our high school sections. First, in 2014-15, we offered grade norming sessions for our CCP partners. Second, from 2015 to 2017, we asked CCP partners to submit teaching portfolios at the end of each term. These portfolios included graded essays from students, which indicated how well the high school teachers were adhering to our standards for evaluation of writing. However, despite these efforts, Sinclair’s curriculum was not being delivered and assessment practices were not uniform.In a third effort to address inconsistencies, a standardized CCP ENG 1101 shell was launched in the fall of 2017. It contains assignments and daily activities based on the number of minutes required for the courses. The shell is a turn-key method of delivering ENG 1101. In the spring of 2018, the ENG 1201 shell was released, including all of the components required to successfully teach 1201 in the classroom. No compensation was received for developing these shells, and the work required to maintain and revise them will be significant in the future. The shells were created by Lisa Mahle-Grisez, and maintenance of the shells is handled by the CCP team: Aaron Moyer, Lisa Mahle-Grisez, and Lisa Cook.In an effort to quantify the labor hours needed to create the shells, and considering much of the work was done over the summer and winter break of 2017, an estimate of hours is 120 hours of labor. Since the January of 2018, Aaron Moyer, Lisa Cook, and Lisa Mahle-Grisez have been closely monitoring the use of the ENG 1101/1201 shells and addressing concerns with high school teachers. We have found that even though the shells have been well-constructed, many teachers are still teaching their high school Literature curriculum in our composition courses. We have been working with the CCP office to address this issue, although little progress has been made.Our CCP team of three has met on a bi-weekly basis during spring semester to address issues that arise and handle maintenance of the course shells. We find that it takes each of us at least 10-15 hours of labor a week to manage the CCP workload. Aaron Moyer has spent close to 25 hours each week, including visiting teachers at schools, training teachers on eLearn, and developing guides to help teachers navigate our courses and eLearn. Prof. Moyer has documented his work in a report that will be available at the end of spring 2018. |
| Ensure a positive merger between ENG and DLA by creating community and distributing workload equitably. | In progress 🞏 Completed XNo longer applicable 🞏 | The merger is completed and voices from both departments have been valued. Because all faculty are credentialed to teach across the disciplines in our department (ENG, LIT, ESL, DEV), courses have been distributed equitably to those who are interested. Further, moving forward, the chair has established a queue for faculty requesting courses so that fair course assignment distribution can be made each term.  |
| Track and monitor the progress of ENGE, CRWE, and PRW grads over the next five years to develop a fuller picture of how we can better meet the needs of our graduates. | In progress X Completed 🞏No longer applicable 🞏 | The most recent graduate survey has been distributed, and we will follow up with those students. |
| Pursue professional development for our faculty specifically regarding teaching students in the age ranges of CCP students. In addition, provide help for faculty in addressing students with mental challenges in the classroom. | In progress x Completed 🞏No longer applicable 🞏 | We will be offering teaching discussions regarding teaching CCP students during the 2018-19 academic year. Teaching discussions are one-hour meetings prior to monthly department meetings on specific topics of interest to faculty. Teaching our CCP students has been an ongoing interest for faculty, and we assess the effectiveness of the discussions with surveys.We offered one teaching discussion this spring and one in the fall, led by Gwen Helton and the BIT CARES team, to address the mental health challenges of our students in the classroom.  |

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** |
| First and foremost, there are some best practices that the department has developed that need to be shared with other departments across campus. Wider adoption of these practices could have a real impact on student learning at Sinclair. The work with the OER, assessment, various poetry and writing activities, and the Teaching Discussion meetings may be the most obvious of these best practices, but the department should identify which best practices they feel have had the greatest impact, and then develop relevant workshop offerings to be shared at Fall Faculty Professional Development Day, through the CTL, and through other venues. Other chairs should be made aware of the work with individual faculty members to improve course success rates where needed. The department is strongly encouraged to find ways to share some of the most impactful practices it has developed over the past few years. | In progress X Completed 🞏No longer applicable 🞏 | We will continue to work with marketing to ensure our events are publicized throughout the campus. In addition, we plan to propose sessions for FFPDD and the CTL to spread the word about our best practices. |
| During the meeting with the Review Team, the English department noted that moving LIT 2201 (British Literature I) online resulted in a tremendous increase in enrollment. The department expressed frustration that it has had difficulty moving other literature courses into the online format, which could result in similar enrollment increases. The Review Team encourages the department to work with their dean to help get these courses prioritized for conversion to the online format by Sinclair’s eLearn department. | In progress 🞏 Completed XNo longer applicable 🞏  | See discussion above about this issue. |
| Concern was expressed that the Writing Center no longer involves the department to the extent that it used to, and that there aren’t as many available tutors that have the qualifications they once had. The department is encouraged to explore approaches to increasing tutoring opportunities to students via department support. One suggestion was utilizing faculty office hours to provide drop-in tutoring support for students. The Business Information Systems (BIS) program has developed a highly successful approach that could potentially serve as a model that the English department could emulate. The department is encouraged to reach out to the BIS department to learn of their approach and explore the feasibility of offering their students something similar. In making this recommendation, the Review Team recognizes the tremendous amount of work faculty in the department are already doing outside of class, and would caution that whatever approach is selected should not be too burdensome for faculty. | In progress x Completed 🞏No longer applicable 🞏 | A team of faculty is working on this project and we should have some form of faculty-led English tutoring operational by the next academic year. The new developmental English/at-risk student faculty coordinator for the 2018-19 academic year will be tasked with developing a tutoring model utilizing faculty office hours and finding a space to begin supporting our most fragile students with tutoring. |
| Some faculty in the department have done commendable work incorporating Service Learning into their sections. The Review Team strongly recommends that the department not only continue this practice, but expand it to additional faculty and course sections.  | In progress X Completed 🞏No longer applicable 🞏  | ENG 1199, Textual Editing, is linked with the AJT prison program and students in that class edit their monthly newsletter.The chair is keeping a record of other courses/faculty incorporating service learning into the curriculum to record in future annual updates. In the spring of 2018, we incorporated service learning into three course offerings, and we hope to double that amount in the fall of 2018. |
| During the meeting with the Review Team, some faculty expressed concern that many of the exceptional activities that they have developed are not adequately funded, or in some cases are not funded at all. The *Flights* literary journal was mentioned in particular, but the same may also be true of some of the writing and poetry awards, contests, and activities. The department is strongly encouraged to develop a specific list of activities that require additional funding, along with estimates of the funding required, and work with the dean to develop reasonable amounts that can be budgeted specifically for these activities. Administrators in Instruction wish to express their support for these activities and the value they see in them, and their willingness to help find funding for these activities where possible. | In progress 🞏 Completed XNo longer applicable 🞏  | The ENG department budget has been expanded since merging with Developmental Language Arts. Now there is adequate funding to support special projects. For instance, this spring we were ableo to assist Furaha Henry-Jones with funding special media training for her students going to South Africa on an internationalizing education grant through the International Office. |
| Similarly, concerns were expressed over the loss of the TURNITIN service for identification of plagiarism. There is currently a pilot underway to address the inability to incorporate TURNITIN in eLearn course shells, and it is hoped that will lead to a resolution of the technical barriers. Either way, the department is strongly encouraged to find a way to again use TURNITIN, with or without being embedded in course shells, and to work with the dean on funding for this service. This is an issue that impacts many departments other than English. | In progress 🞏 Completed XNo longer applicable 🞏  | Turnitin has been purchased by eLearning and is incorporated into all composition course shells. Faculty are widely using TII, and TII dropboxes are in all face-to-face master shells, CCP and adjunct. After spring 2018, we should be able to determine the rate of usage of the Turnitin plagiarism detection and the grademark tool. |
| The development of the Professional Writing short-term certificate is without question laudable, but there is a concern that a technical issue may prevent this certificate from being awarded. Registration only runs degree audits for a student’s declared program of study: if students in another program of study pursue and complete the certificate, it might not be awarded unless Registration is aware of it. The Review Team recommends that the department contact Registration and work with them to ensure that this certificate is awarded to students when they earn it regardless of their declared program of study. | In progress X Completed 🞏No longer applicable 🞏 | The coordinator of Business Writing is working with registration to address this concern. |
| The Review Team noted that it appears that many students transfer prior to completing the English or Creative Writing degree programs. The department is encouraged to research which courses appear to be associated with this loss of students prior to graduation, and to identify any factors that might be changed to encourage more students to complete the degree prior to graduation. | In progress X Completed 🞏No longer applicable 🞏 | Through conversations with our majors, we have found that many English majors transfer prior to receiving their AA degree because they don’t see a value in that degree. We have developed targeted communication with our majors within 12 hours of completing their degree/certificate that encourages them to complete. We have also developed an eLearn course shell and populated it with our majors. Those majors receive communication through that medium as well. This spring, we reached out to our ENGE and CRWE grads with a congratulatory card signed by faculty in the department.This issue will take several review cycles to fully address. |
| The department is encouraged to continue their groundbreaking assessment work. Some of the same excellent approaches that have been applied to course outcomes should also be used for program outcomes.  | In progress X Completed 🞏No longer applicable 🞏 | We are shifting the focus of our assessment work to the specific outcomes in our ENG 1101 and 1201 courses. The language of the rubric we had been using did not match our SLOs. Previously, the rubric language was less than specific and may not have captured the information we desired. Therefore, we are working to create a more specific rubric. The new rubric was tested at an all-department in-service on April 13, 2018 (see end of document). We created a Kahoot site and used our cell phones to vote on the categories. We discovered that the faculty are “hugging the curve” on the “Proficient” and “Developing” areas. Meaning, the faculty are generally on the same page as to what is and is not acceptable (or passing). We also discovered some areas in which faculty were not on the same page regarding source documentation and writing techniques to introduce an argument.  |
| Finally, the department’s excellent engagement with and support of CCP is highly praiseworthy, and should be maintained. The department may also want to carefully observe how offering English college courses at the high school level might impact enrollment in sections offered at Sinclair in the future, and closely monitor any trends that emerge in that regard. | In progress 🞏Completed 🞏No longer applicable x | While CCP enrollment will definitely/ has definitely impacted enrollment in non-CCP sections, the reality is that we can do little about that trend other than be aware. We are continuing to support CCP partners and have developed a team of three faculty who meet twice a month to review CCP issues and projects. We are hopeful that we will be granted permanent release hours to continue this work.  |

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

For the FY 2016-17 Annual Update, departments are asked to provide assessment results for **Information Literacy**.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **General Education Outcomes** | Year assessed or to be assessed. | Course identified by the department where this outcome could be assessed | Assessment MethodsUsed | What were the assessment results? (Please provide brief summary data) |
| **THIS YEAR’S ASSESSMENT RESULTS** |  |  |  |  |
| Computer Literacy | **2017-2018** | **ENG 1101** | Faculty were given a rubric and five randomly-selected essays from ENG 1101. Faculty were then asked to evaluate those essays for evidence of computer literacy.  | Of the seven SLO areas, “control over electronic environment” was ranked first in competency level. In fact, since the spring of 2013, this outcome has been first in ranking. |
| **LAST YEAR’S ASSESSMENT RESULTS** |  |  |  |  |
| Information Literacy | **2016-2017** | **ENG 1201** | Faculty were given a rubric and five randomly-selected essays from ENG 1201. Faculty were then asked to evaluate those essays for evidence of information literacy.  | Of the nine SLO areas evaluated, “critical analysis of source material” was ranked fifth. This SLO most closely corresponds to the information literacy Gen Ed outcome. |

Comparison of ENG1101 & ENG1201 Assessments

The following tables compare the ENG1101 and ENG1201 assessment results from the past four 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 SP16, SP15, SP14, SP13, & SP12**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Student Learning Outcome | FA16 Rank | FA16Avg | SP15 Rank | SP15 Avg | SP15 Rank | SP15 Avg | SP14 Rank | SP14 Avg | SP13 Rank | SP13 Avg | SP12 Rank | SP12 Avg |
| #1a: Logical Structure | 4 | 2.89 up | 3 | 2.76 up | 4 | 2.64  | 3 | 2.54  | **5** | **2.73** | **6** | **2.92** |
| #1b: Intended Purpose | 3 | 2.90 up | 2 | 2.86 down | 2 | 2.92  | 2 | 2.79  | 2 | 3.08 | 3 | 3.06 |
| #1c: Audience Awareness | **5** | **2.63 up** | 4 | 2.59 down | 3 | 2.74  | 4 | 2.36  | 4 | 2.8 | 3 | 3.06 |
| #2: Relate to Personal Experience | **6** | **2.47 up** | **6** | **2.43 down** | **6** | **2.51**  | **7** | **2.05**  | **7** | **2.31** | 3 | 3.06 |
| #3a: Control over Conventions\* | **7** | **2.3 up** | **7** | **2.1 down** | **7** | **2.48**  | **6** | **2.26**  | **6** | **2.53** | **7** | **2.4** |
| #3b: Control over Essay Format | 2 | 2.93 up | **5** | **2.5 down** | **5** | **2.55**  | **5** | **2.32**  | 3 | 2.88 | 1 | 3.32 |
| #4: Control of Electronic Environment | 1 | 3.10 up | 1 | 3.05 up | 1 | 3.0  | 1 | 3.0  | 1 | 3.25 | 2 | 3.2 |

Note: SP12 was the pilot assessment. ENG1101 assessment switched to fall in 2017. FA17 assessment has not been initiated because a new rubric is being developed.

**ENG1201 Assessment Comparisons for SP16, FA14 & FA13**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Student Learning Outcomes | SP16 Rank | SP16 Score | FA14 Rank | FA14 Score | FA13 Rank | FA13 Score |
| #1a: Logical Structure | 3 | 2.96 | 5 | 2.97  | 5 | 2.85 |
| #1b: Intended Purpose | 2 | 3.17 | 3 | 3.03  | 2 | 3.02 |
| #1c: Audience Awareness | **8** | **2.73 up** | **8** | **2.67**  | 4 | 2.86 |
| #2: Critical Analysis of Source Material | 5 | 2.79 | 6 | 2.79  | 3 | 2.92 |
| #3a: Control over Conventions\* | **9** | **2.71 down** | **7** | **2.72**  | **7** | **2.75** |
| #3b: Control over MLA Format | 5 | 2.79 | 4 | 3.0 up | 5 | 2.85 |
| #3c: In-text Citations\* | **7** | **2.77 up** | **9** | **2.62**  | **8** | **2.21** |
| #3d: Works Cited Entries | 3 | 2.96 | 2 | 3.05 up | **9** | **1.96** |
| #4: Control of Electronic Environment | 1 | 3.25 | 1 | 3.33 up | 1 | 3.08 |

Note: ENG1201 assessment switched to spring in 2016. SP17 assessment has not been initiated because a new rubric is being developed.

The Program Outcomes for the degrees are listed below. Responses from previous years are provided 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**.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Program Outcomes for** **CRWE.S.AA** | To which course(s) is this program outcome related? | Year assessed or to be assessed. | Assessment MethodsUsed | 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. |
| 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% of faculty use group work and workshops 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 at near 80%. |
| 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. |
| 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. |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Program Outcomes for** **ENGE.S.AA** | **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)** |
| 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. |
| 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.  |
| 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 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. |
| 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. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **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?**  |  |

**OPTIONAL:**

Please use the space below to keep track of any annual data that your department wishes to maintain. This section is completely optional and will not be reviewed by the Division Assessment Coordinators.

**NEW RUBRIC FOR SLO ASSESSMENT – piloted on April 13, 2018**

Paper \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

|  |
| --- |
| **Outcome 1: Rhetorical Knowledge** |
| **Criteria** | **Proficient** | **Developing** | **Weak** |
| Organizes writing according to assigned task |  |  |  |
| Establishes clear purpose for writing: Inform, persuade, entertain |  |  |  |
| Demonstrates audience awareness |  |  |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **Outcome 2: Critical Thinking, Reading, and Writing** |
| **Criteria** | **Proficient** | **Developing** | **Weak** |
| Incorporates ideas from other writers, experts, and observers |  |  |  |
| Accurately interprets evidence and draws conclusions |  |  |  |
| Differentiates between facts and opinions |  |  |  |
| Recognizes and develops alternative perspectives |  |  |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **Outcome 3: Knowledge of Composing Processes** |
| **Question** | **Proficient** | **Developing** | **Weak** |
| Substantially develops ideas through details, reasons, and examples |  |  |  |
| Develops intro., body and conclusions, without relying on five-paragraph essay format |  |  |  |
| Shows evidence of editing for grammar, spelling, mechanics |  |  |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **Outcome 4 (and 5): Conventions (and Electronic Environments)** |
| **Question** | **Proficient** | **Developing** | **Weak** |
| Employs diverse and appropriate word choice and sentence structure throughout. |  |  |  |
| Demonstrates facility with academic discourse |  |  |  |
| Correctly incorporates quotes and paraphrases |  |  |  |
| Demonstrates information literacy by selecting and correctly citing appropriate source material |  |  |  |