



▼ Dept - (LA) English

**Program Mission Statement:** The English department at De Anza College offers students the opportunity to study language, literature, creative writing, basic skills writing and transfer-level composition while deepening critical thinking, research, communication skills and aesthetic awareness. In connection with campus-wide programs such as LinC, Puente, First Year Experience and Sankofa the English department continues to assess, improve and devise new strategies to assist all students, but particularly underrepresented and academically at risk groups, in developing the written communication and analytical skills needed to achieve their academic, professional and personal goals. Our Program Learning Outcome is: Students demonstrate critical thinking, reading, research, and writing skills in order to effectively analyze texts from myriad disciplines and cultural perspectives. Our Program Learning Outcomes relate to our college Institutional Core Competencies as success in achieving those outcomes lead to development of students' writing, reading, and critical thinking skills, which in turn help them achieve our Institutional Core Competencies.

**I.A.1 What is the Primary Focus of Your Program?:** Basic skills

**I.A.2 Choose a Secondary Focus of Your Program?:** Transfer

**I.B.1 Number Certificates of Achievement Awarded:**

**I.B.2 Number Certif of Achievement-Advanced Awarded:**

**I.B.3 #ADTs (Associate Degrees for Transfer) Awarded: 6**

**I.B.4 # AA and/or AS Degrees Awarded: 26**

**I.C.1. CTE Programs: Impact of External Trends:**

**I.C.2 CTE Programs: Advisory Board Input:**

**I.D.1 Academic Services & Learning Resources: #Faculty served:**

**I.D.2 Academic Services & Learning Resources: #Students served:**

**I.D.3 Academic Services & Learning Resources: #Staff Served:**

**I.E.1 Full time faculty (FTEF): 59.7**

**I.E.2 #Student Employees:**

**I.E.3 % Full-time :** From 2014-15 to 2015-6, the % FT faculty decreased 3% and the % PT faculty increased 2.7%. As a department, we are at 28.1% FT faculty, and 61.2% PT faculty, which is even more short of the CCC goal of 75% FT to 25% PT faculty than we were last yea.

**I.E.4 #Staff Employees:**

**I.E.5 Changes in Employees/Resources:** We were able to hire 2 new FT faculty who started in Fall 2016. However, we were down 3.5 FT faculty due to retirements, reassignments, and resignations. So, we are still down 1 FT faculty. The increase has been helpful in enabling us to staff basic skills and student success programs.

**II.A Enrollment Trends:** Our enrollment increased from 12,899 in 2014-14 to 13,556 in 2014-15 and then fell slightly to 13,216 in 2015-16. That represents a 3% decrease in enrollment.

**II.B.1 Overall Success Rate:** Overall success rates have been stable over the 3 year period, between 78% from 2013-2016, which we know to be higher, and in some cases significantly higher, than the state reported average for California Community Colleges. In fact, we were commended by Governor Jerry Brown for our basic skills course success rates in his 2016 Budget Report. The California Community

Colleges Statewide Scorecard reports 45.4% success statewide in Remedial English in 2015-16 (see <http://scorecard.cccco.edu/scorecardrates.aspx?CollegeID=000#home>), versus our 79% (see [http://datamart.cccco.edu/Outcomes/BasicSkills\\_Cohort\\_Tracker.aspx](http://datamart.cccco.edu/Outcomes/BasicSkills_Cohort_Tracker.aspx)) of success for EWRT 211 and 87% success for EWRT 200.

### **II.B.2 Plan if Success Rate of Program is Below 60%:**

**II.C Changes Imposed by Internal/External Regulations:** We developed an ADT degree, which was approved by the state Chancellor's office in 2014. In 2015-16, we awarded 6 ADT degrees in English.

In addition, our enrollment in our ELIT 21 (Women In Literature) experienced a marked decrease in enrollment in Fall 2015. This was the outcome of an internal administrative effort from the Office of Instruction to eliminate cross-listings for courses. ELIT 21 was previously cross-listed with WMST 21 for many years and usually reached the cap enrollment (before Fall 2015 the cap was 45; since Fall 2015 the cap has been raised to 50) through robust enrollments for both the ELIT and WMST listings. The first quarter that ELIT 21 was de-crosslisted, the enrollment dropped by nearly 50%. In Winter 2016 and Spring 2016, the enrollments recovered after faculty made efforts above and beyond their job duties to recruit students by visiting classes to make announcements, posting flyers, and sending mass emails to English majors and faculty colleagues. After Language Arts, Social Sciences and Humanities, and Intercultural/International Studies faculty successfully mobilized action to Academic Senate to cease and desist the un-crosslisting efforts, and allow re-crosslisting, administrator-instigated un-cross-listing of courses stopped, and a process for re-crosslisting has been created. We worked with WMST and Curriculum to re-crosslist ELIT 21 and WMST 21 and hope that the past patterns of this course easily filling will resume when the cross-listing returns in Fall 2017. In Fall 2016, the enrollment for ELIT 21 (uncrosslisted from WMST 21) was 34.

**III.A Growth and Decline of Targeted Student Populations:** In our EWRT courses (which enroll the largest number of students):

African American: The 3 year trend in enrollment from 2013-14 to 2014-15 to 2015-16 is as follows: 520 students (4% of all EWRT students) to 555 (4%) to 523 (4%).

Latinx: The 3 year trend in enrollment from 2013-14 to 2014-15 to 2015-16 is as follows: 3,442 (27% of all EWRT students) to 3,804 (29%) to 3,879 (30%); so, the 3-year trend shows slight 1-2% increase each year during the past 3 years.

Filipino: The 3 year trend in enrollment from 2013-14 to 2014-15 to 2015-16 is as follows: 905 (7% of all EWRT students) to 1,073 (8%) to 1,083 (8%); the 3-year trend shows slight 1% increase each year during the past 3 years.

Pacific Islander: The 3 year trend in enrollment from 2013-14 to 2014-15 to 2015-16 is as follows: 78 (1% of all EWRT students) to 107 (1%) to 92 (1%); the 3-year trend remained flat/unchanged.

In our ELIT courses (which went from 882 to 804 to 840 students over the past 3 years):

African American: The 3 year trend in enrollment from 2013-14 to 2014-15 to 2015-16 is as follows: 56 (4% of all ELIT students) to 61 (5%) to 70 (6%).

Latinx: The 3 year trend in enrollment from 2013-14 to 2014-15 to 2015-16 is as follows: 301 (24% of all ELIT students enrolled) to 314 (26%) to 367 (29%)

Filipino: The 3 year trend in enrollment from 2013-14 to 2014-15 to 2015-16 is as follows: 75 (6%) to 95 (8%) to 82 (7%).

Pacific Islander: The 3 year trend in enrollment from 2013-14 to 2014-15 to 2015-16 is as follows: 10 (1%)



to 13 (1%) to 15 (1%)

In our Creative Writing courses (which went from 208 to 241 to 213 students over the past 3 years):

African American: The 3 year trend in enrollment from 2013-14 to 2014-15 to 2015-16 is as follows: 15 (6%) to 14 (5%) to 11 (5%)

Filipino: The 3 year trend in enrollment from 2013-14 to 2014-15 to 2015-16 is as follows: 5% to 6% to 8%

Latino/a: The 3 year trend in enrollment from 2013-14 to 2014-15 to 2015-16 is as follows: 19% to 24% to 28% (significant increase and numbers represent greater percentage than the % of Latino/a students at De Anza, which is around )

Pacific Islander: 1% to 1% to 0%

DA Collegewide demographics:

African American: 4%

Filipino: 7%

Latino/a: 26%

Pacific Islander: 0.8%

In most of our EWRT composition, ELIT and EWRT Creative Writing courses, the representation of targeted students is at or above the level they represent in our Collegewide student population.

**III.B Closing the Student Equity Gap:** In 2015-16, our course success in English writing (EWRT) for targeted populations:

African American: 75%

Latinx: 71%

Filipino: 78%

Pacific Islander: 76%

Asian: 83%

White: 80%

Thus, there is a 5% success gap between White and African American; a 9% success gap between White and Latinx; a 4% success gap between White and Pacific Islander. The gap is slightly higher when comparing the targeted groups to Asian as an aggregate group.

The success rate 3-year trend from 2013-2016:

African American: 73% to 70% to 75% ; so, 2015-16 represented the highest success rate (5% increase in the past year)

The number of African American students remained relatively stable from 392 to 401 to 401. The Umoja program was revitalized in 2015, and the REACH program also began in 2015 and FYE grew to have a second cohort, which likely helped close the equity gap for African American students.

Latinx: 69% to 70% to 71%. During this 3 year period, the enrollment of Latinx students also grew more dramatically than other other targeted groups (from 3,487 to 3,870 to 3,945 while all other targeted groups remained fairly steady: African American students from 535 to 569 to 534 and Filipino students from 916 to 1,089 to 1,103 and PI students from 80 to 111 to 92), but student success also increased 1% each year. No doubt student success cohorts such as Puente, FYE, LEAD, and student success programs such as EOPS helped, in addition to a campus culture that publicly supports Latinx students, such as the administration's support of HEFAS to support AB 540 students, the hiring of more Latinx counselors and instructors, and more coordinated efforts to recognize Latinx students such as a robust culture of Latinx graduation celebrations and dedicated SSRS space where Latinx students feel welcome to do homework, get specialized academic tutoring, and peer mentor support.

Filipino: 80% to 79% to 78%. During the past 3 year period, Filipino student success has been very close

to the average 83% of the highest non-targeted "Asian" group.

Pacific Islander: 78% to 79% to 76%. During the past 3 year period, Pacific Islander student success has been close to the Filipino success rate. This is also the smallest in number of the targeted groups so probably these students already represent some of the more highly successful students in their ethnic group in the Bay area. Many benefit from the camaraderie of the strong PI student community in athletics programs and in certain classes such ICS 21, which was linked to an EWRT 1A class in Fall 2012 and Fall 2013 through the IMPACT AAPI student cohort, although it certainly should not be assumed that all the Pacific Islander students are athletes.

Although our equity gap remains lower than the campus average and more than achieves statewide goals for targeted groups, we feel that the loss of the lab classes that used to be attached to all basic skills classes has had a negative impact on the success of vulnerable students. We have adopted several strategies to compensate as much as possible for that substantial loss of resources and student support:

1. We have prioritized assigning full-time faculty to Basic Skills courses (46% of basic skills courses are taught by full time faculty while our writing program as a whole has only 26% full time FTEF).

2. We have developed Customized Academic Support that is imbedded in our lowest level class, EWRT 200, as a required adjunct to instruction—tailoring tutorial assistance to the needs of the most vulnerable students. As a result, success in EWRT 200 is now just as strong as the higher level, EWRT 211, even though these students have greater obstacles.

3. Student Cohort Programs like Puente, Sankofa, FYE and the LART courses are also producing excellent results.

Here are additional student success data from 2015-16:

\*New for 2016-17\*:

UMOJA:

The new Umoja program began offering its first READ 211, EWRT 211, and LART 78 courses. Out of 31 students enrolled, 25 passed and 6 did not pass, which represents an 83% success rate.

FYE COHORT 1:

30 students enrolled in READ 200 and EWRT 200, LART 78, and READ 70. Out of these 30, 27 passed, which represents a 90% success rate.

FYE COHORT 2:

28 students enrolled in READ 211, EWRT 211, LART 78, and READ 79. Out of these 28, 26 passed READ 211 which represents a 93% success rate; 24 of 28 passed EWRT 211, which represents a 86% success rate.

PUENTE:

30 students enrolled in READ 211 and EWRT 211. Out of these 30, 1 Withdrew and 29 passed both EWRT 211 and READ 211, representing a 100% success rate.

REACH:

Also, an equity-funded cohort, REACH-Reading,

English, Athletics, Counseling and Humanities started a first pilot

started in Winter 2016. From the Athletics Department Program Review ([http://www.deanza.edu/gov/IPBT/pdf/s16apru\\_pe\\_athletics.pdf](http://www.deanza.edu/gov/IPBT/pdf/s16apru_pe_athletics.pdf)): "Basic Skills Reading and Basic Skills Writing

yielded amazing results for a first year cohort. Lydia Hearn

wrote: "This Winter we began the REACH program with 24

student-athletes taking a LART211 (READ/EWRT) class, the

majority of whom come from underserved populations. We had





a 100% retention rate with a 96% success rate. With the students' work evaluated through the English department portfolio process, we had affirmation from English department faculty external to the program that the students who passed the portfolio were writing and reading at a level to be ready for EWRT1A. These are amazing numbers not only for this special population but for ANY class! It was challenging, but by the end of the quarter, the students pulled through and began to see themselves as scholars in addition to being athletes. Some of them even commented in their portfolios that they enjoyed being in a class where they were not stereotyped as "dumb jocks" and were encouraged to see themselves as intelligent students. . . .

We will continue the program into the Spring 2016 quarter as students take an EWRT1A with me and a HUM11 class with Sal Breiter' "

The Spring 2016 EWRT 1A cohort of REACH performed as follows, according to Lydia Hearn:  
26 students enrolled

Retention = 96% (25/26 students)

Success = 81% (21/26 students, it might be higher since there were 2 incompletes yet to be completed)

Of the 26 students, 19 were targeted populations

Retention = 95% (18/19 students)

Success = 74% (14/19 students)

4. \*New for 2016-17\*: Two of our FT faculty, Amy Leonard and Sarah Lisha, participated in a new DARE initiative called Jumpstart, in which 2 levels below transfer EWRT 200 students take and complete a summer intensive workshop in order to be placed into EWRT 211, which is 1 level below transfer. The DARE Jumpstart PPT presentation (available at: [http://www.deanza.edu/dare/pdf/JumpStart\\_PresentationforDARE.pdf](http://www.deanza.edu/dare/pdf/JumpStart_PresentationforDARE.pdf)) Overview lists these details:

#### OVERVIEW OF PROGRAM

\* Summer-bridge type program that would include counseling curriculum, academic advising and content prep in English writing.

\* Emphasis on community building.

\* Seats reserved for jumpstart participants in appropriate developmental courses with the instructors who delivered Jumpstart.

\* Advisor and Counselor supported students to complete orientation and for registration for Fall classes.

\* Advisor and Counselor track and support students through end of Fall quarter.

\* iPads were issued to students to support instruction

Jumpstart instructor Amy Leonard reports: "all the Jumpstart students successfully completed my EWRT 211 and all but one completed the LART successfully since a small co-hort went into that class, and 4 out of 5 students that took me for 1A this Winter should successfully complete the class."

EWRT 200:

Course success for Not Targeted Groups:

2013-14: 79%

2014-15: 81%

2015-16: 83%

Course success for Targeted Groups:

2013-14: 73%

2014-15: 70%

2015-16: 75%

Student success gap between Targeted & Non-Targeted groups:

2013-14: 6%

2014-15: 11%

2015-16: 8%

We see a significant fluctuation in the student success gap between targeted and nontargeted student groups in the EWRT 200 level. This might be anticipated since this is the bottom level of our EWRT composition courses and there is wide variance in the skills of students who are placed into this level; the level of learning disabilities and other challenges to student success tend to be much higher at this level. Nevertheless, of course we would like to see smaller gaps in student success between the targeted and non-targeted students. Students at this level need more concrete one-on-one grammar and sentence-level skills and studenthood skills support than they currently can access through the WRC, counseling, and other support services. Students at this level also probably could benefit greatly from even smaller class size than the current cap of 25. The fact that the FYE Cohort 1 had a 90% student success rate for their students placed into EWRT 200, READ 200, and also enrolled in LART 78, and READ 70, shows that more support results in much higher student success at this vulnerable level.

EWRT 211:

Course success for Not Targeted Groups:

2013-14: 77%

2014-15: 80%

2015-16: 79%

Course success for Targeted Groups:

2013-14: 67%

2014-15: 66%

2015-16: 67%

Student success gap between Targeted & Non-Targeted groups:

2013-14: 10%

2014-15: 14%

2015-16: 12%

In EWRT 211, we have seen an increase in the achievement gap from 10% to 14% and then 12%. This is definitely an area we will work to improve upon. When we further disaggregate the success rates for each targeted group, we see some distinct gaps between groups as well--in the past 3 years, African Americans succeeded at rates between 68 to 73%; for Filipinos, the mostly highly successful of targeted groups, their success rates were between 75-80%, which is as high as the highest non-targeted group (Asian) at around 78-80%; Latinx students also had success rates between 64-65% while Pacific Islanders also had fairly dramatic shifts in success rates at 67 to 81% (but generally the numbers of Pacific Islander students are much smaller--14, 22, and 22 students respectively across the past 3 years).



#### EWRT 1A:

##### Course success for Not Targeted Groups:

2013-14: 84%

2014-15: 83%

2015-16: 85%

##### Course success for Targeted Groups:

2013-14: 72%

2014-15: 72%

2015-16: 74%

##### Student success gap between Targeted & Non-Targeted groups:

2013-14: 12%

2014-15: 11%

2015-16: 11%

For EWRT 1A, we have had a relatively unchanged achievement gap between targeted and nontargeted groups of 11-12% over the past three years. Disaggregated, we see African American student success rates stay at 71% for the first two years and then increase to 77% in 2015-16. Filipino students' success rates have remained fairly constant at 79-81% over the past 3 years. Latinx students' success rates have increased slightly steadily over the past three years, from 69% to 70% to 72%. Pacific Islander students' success rates dipped and then rose again (probably also due to small total numbers) from 84% to 74% and then to 80%. The most successful non-targeted group, "Asian," shows much higher success rates over the same 3 year period: 87% to 84% to 88%. We will also work to better understand and further close the success gaps between targeted groups and the nontargeted Asian group.

#### EWRT 1B:

##### Course success for Not Targeted Groups:

2013-14: 80%

2014-15: 79%

2015-16: 74%

##### Course success for Targeted Groups:

2013-14: 73%

2014-15: 75%

2015-16: 72%

##### Student success gap between Targeted & Non-Targeted groups:

2013-14: 7%

2014-15: 4%

2015-16: 2%

In EWRT 1B, we dramatically closed the achievement gap between targeted and non-targeted groups from 7% to 4% and then 2% over the past 3 years.

#### EWRT 2:

##### Course success for Not Targeted Groups:

2013-14: 84%

2014-15: 85%

2015-16: 84%



Course success for Targeted Groups:

2013-14: 74%  
2014-15: 80%  
2015-16: 77%

Student success gap between Targeted & Non-Targeted groups:

2013-14: 10%  
2014-15: 5%  
2015-16: 7%

In EWRT 2, we saw dramatic closing of achievement gap between targeted and non-targeted groups across the past 3 years, from 10% to 5% and then 7%.

ELIT Courses:

Course success for Not Targeted Groups:

2013-14: 81%  
2014-15: 78%  
2015-16: 79%

Course success for Targeted Groups:

2013-14: 66%  
2014-15: 73%  
2015-16: 71%

Student success gap between Targeted & Non-Targeted groups:

2013-14: 15%  
2014-15: 5%  
2015-16: 8%

ELIT 46 Series (Core British Literature courses For English Majors):

Course success for Not Targeted Groups:

2013-14: 86%  
2014-15: 78%  
2015-16: 75%

Course success for Targeted Groups:

2013-14: 76%  
2014-15: 81%  
2015-16: 73%

Student success gap between Targeted & Non-Targeted groups:

2013-14: 10%  
2014-15: -3%  
2015-16: 2%

ELIT 48 Series (Core American Literature Courses for English Majors)

Course success for Not Targeted Groups:

2013-14: 87%  
2014-15: 76%  
2015-16: 81%

Course success for Targeted Groups:



2013-14: 70%  
2014-15: 84%  
2015-16: 87%

Student success gap between Targeted & Non-Targeted groups:

2013-14: 17%  
2014-15: -8%  
2015-16: -6%

Across all our ELIT courses, we have significantly closed the achievement gap between targeted and non-targeted groups, from 15% 3 years ago, to 5% the following year, and then a slight increase to 8% in 2015-16. Even more dramatically in the ELIT 48 Series, we saw remarkable progress in not only closing the achievement gap between non-targeted and targeted student success, but we have seen targeted students have success rates that are 8% and 6% higher than non-targeted students in the past two years! In the ELIT 46 series, we also saw a dramatic closing of the achievement gap between targeted and non-targeted groups, from a 10% gap to -3% and 2% in the two following years.

CREATIVE WRITING (EWRT 30, 40, 41, 42, 65 series, 68 series, 77):

Course success for Not Targeted Groups:

2013-14: 83%  
2014-15: 80%  
2015-16: 83%

Course success for Targeted Groups:

2013-14: 79%  
2014-15: 77%  
2015-16: 84%

Student success gap between Targeted & Non-Targeted groups:

2013-14: 4%  
2014-15: 3%  
2015-16: 1%

We have made significant gains in reducing the student success gap between Targeted and Non-Targeted groups over the past 3 years, from 4% gap to 3% and finally only 1% last year.

CONCLUSIONS/INTERPRETATIONS:

\*ALL of our Student Success Cohorts have shown higher student success rates for targeted students than our non-targeted students. All of our students, including targeted and non-targeted students, show higher success rates than the general student success rates across campus.

We must hire at least 1 additional faculty to maintain the strength of our basic skills success and address the equity gaps in the literature program. Student success in English also needs support through re-hiring some of the many positions that were cut from the Writing Center so that we can expand the successful model of small group tutorial instruction as a part of Basic Skills courses."

We continue to prioritize staffing Basic Skills courses with FT faculty, tailoring tutorial assistance to the needs of the most vulnerable students. Some of our most outstanding and dedicated faculty teach EWRT courses for programs such as Puente, FYE, IMPACT AAPI, REACH, and Umoja as well as LART classes, which we offer multiple sections of at the 200 and 211 level every quarter. We hired two faculty in Fall 2014 who had prior experience teaching in student success cohort programs (FYE, IMPACT AAPI, and LEAD) and who continue to teach in those programs as FT tenure-track faculty. We hired two more



faculty who started in Fall 2016 who also have experience with teaching in cohort programs and basic skills; one of these faculty has already been very involved in LEAD since 2015. Currently, we have a FT joint Reading-English position open that we have been trying to fill since Spring 2016, and the search has been extended twice due to lack of qualified diverse candidates in the pool. We also have two FT English faculty who are participated in DARE's development of a "Word Jam" initiative to boost student success rates in developmental pathways and provide support to students who do not have wraparound services such as those provided in Puente, FYE, and IMPACT AAPI. The first Jam took place in Summer 2016 with a very small cohort of about 22 students.

Overall, the goals of equity work in Language Arts are: retention and success of target populations; collegial participation that actively includes part-time faculty; creating an environment of inclusion, inspiration and possibility; inspiring open discussions about successful pedagogical methodologies within departments, the Language Arts Division and, hopefully, with other divisions; collegial discussions about exit-entry alignment; metacognitive methodologies for students and instructors for successful course, program and degree completion. We may be doing a division-wide student survey in the 2016-2017 academic year and if we do that, then hopefully by Fall 2017 we will have data analysis of the survey results. That would then be the foundation of more targetted equity efforts going forward as we more clearly identify student needs.

**III.C Plan if Success Rate of Targeted Group(s) is Below 60%:** We are NOT below 60%. Our department's EWRT success rates for targeted groups are as follows:

African American: 75%

Latinx: 71%

Filipino: 78%

Pacific Islander: 76%

ELIT success rates:

African American: 74% (versus 64% last year), with 52 students versus 43 students last year

Latino/a: 71% (versus 73% last year), with 262 students versus 249 students last year

Filipino: 73% (versus 77% last year), with 61 students this year versus 79 students last year

Pacific Islander: 67% (versus 85% last year, but with a small N of 10 versus 11 students total)

However, although our success rates for targeted groups are 4-19% higher than 60%, we are always striving to improve and to do things such as continue to foster a departmental culture that strongly values cultural inclusivity and diversity in our course content for EWRT and our general education ELIT courses.

Unfortunately our new African American literature and Ethnic Literature of the U.S. ELIT course offerings did not fill, but we are working on more strategic quarter offerings and more targetted marketing and recruitment efforts when we offer these courses again. Ethnic Literatures of the U.S. will be offered Winter 2017 quarter and we will recruit aggressively from ICS/IIS ethnic studies courses and WMST courses as well as from ELIT courses in the Spring 2017 and Fall 2017 quarter.

**III.D Departmental Equity Planning and Progress:** Our Department 2014-15 Equity Plan was to assess and respond to student needs expressed in a student survey that was conducted in 2014. When we discovered that students feel the literature program does not offer enough diversity of perspectives and global awareness, we wrote and submitted new curriculum to enhance the diversity of our offerings: African American Literature and Ethnic Literature of the United States. We offered our first sections of the new African American Literature and Ethnic Literature courses this academic year (2015-16). We are working on writing a three-course World Literature sequence, another area where students expressed great interest. We have now written the first of the three-course sequence and plan to offer the course during the 2016-17 academic year.

REPORT OUT FROM Spring 2017 SLO CONVOCATION ENGLISH DEPARTMENT BRAINSTORMING: How to bring success rates up even more – and then ask for resources.

A. SCALED UP SUPPORT SYSTEMS

i. DEDICATED COUNSELING SUPPORT. Our LA Division may be approved to have another dedicated counselor in addition to Monica.

ii. Mentoring (peer)

iii. Tutoring

1. ONLINE TUTORING as well

iv. More robust equity office

B. SUPPORT & COMPENSATION FOR BASIC SKILLS 200 AND 211 COORDINATION

i. Create online resources

ii. pedagogical materials to share

iii. more online and hybrid possibilities

C. PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT for more engaged and inspired teaching of underrepresented students and other at-risk, vulnerable students (e.g. those with financial issues, student parents, learning disabilities, physical disabilities, mental health issues; homeless students; food insecure students; returning/older students; students with PTSD and other trauma survivors)

D. CREATIVE WAYS TO DELIVER CONTENT & TEACH for those instructors with Qualifications to teach in BOTH READING & ENGLISH

E. MORE STUDY ABROAD SCHOLARSHIPS FOR UNDERREPRESENTED STUDENTS

F. MORE STUDENT INTERNSHIPS

G. DEVELOP/ARCHIVE ONLINE GRAMMAR INSTRUCTION UNITS/VIDEOS, ACTIVITIES AND QUIZZES TO USE IN PLACE OF PURCHASED GRAMMAR TEXTBOOKS

H. PODS – TO DEVELOP AND SHARE CURRICULUM TOGETHER. PERHAPS TEACH A COMMON TEXT, WHICH PERHAPS MIGHT BE OER (ONLINE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCE THAT IS EITHER VERY LOW COST OR FREE TO STUDENTS AND THERE IS \$\$ AVAILABLE TO SUPPORT OER INITIATIVES) AND INVITE AUTHORS TO CAMPUS TO READ/WORKSHOP/Q&A

I. REACH PROGRAM – ATHLETES (LYDIA)

J. DEVELOP AN INTERNAL “COHORT” PROGRAM WHERE INSTRUCTORS WHO PARTICIPATE AGREE TO TEACH A COURSE SEQUENCE FROM FALL TO SPRING WHERE STUDENTS WOULD MOVE THROUGH THE SEQUENCE WITH THE SAME INSTRUCTOR AND COHORT/CLASSMATES. THIS WOULD LIKELY BE 200-211-1A OR 211-1A-2 SEQUENCE. LYDIA AND KIM EXPRESSED INTEREST. KIM HAS A PROPOSAL DEVELOPED. KAREN WILL PURSUE THIS FURTHER WITH BOTH. [UPDATE FROM KAREN: THOMAS SHARED THAT HE AND CHRISTINA ALSO INDEPENDENTLY DISCUSSED THIS IDEA, SO THERE IS ADMINISTRATOR INTEREST AND SUPPORT, SINCE THIS WILL LIKELY NOT REQUIRE ADDITIONAL, OR AT MOST MINIMAL, COLLEGE FUNDING/RESOURCES TO DO)

K. DEVELOP AN EASY “I UNDERSTAND THAT BY CLICKING, I ASSUME RESPONSIBILITY FOR NOT HAVING MET ADVISORY REQUISITE” “BUTTON” FOR STUDENTS TO OVERRIDE “PREREQUISITE NOT MET” BANNER BARRIER/MESSAGE TO REGISTER FOR CREATIVE WRITING (KEN)

L. REQUEST ADDITIONAL INFORMATION ABOUT THE REPORTED 10,000 STUDENTS WHO HAVE SHOWED INTEREST IN REGISTERING ONLINE BUT DO NOT ENROLL IN CLASSES TO SEE HOW WE CAN INCENTIVIZE THEM TO REGISTER

With Creative Writing, Ken Weisner reports the following about their equity success efforts:

1. Creative writing is specialty instruction. A good teacher creates a home in the classroom—a supportive, powerful, vibrant multicultural community.

2. in general, these are small classes and there are many pathways to success, which helps (but as you know, except for EWRT 30—our GE course—these are also "pure electives"— so the first thing students may drop when they get swamped).

3. We teach more of the GE course now and less of the specialty courses. So our annual course selection (not just teacher assignments) I think are serving students better in general.



4. We expanded to online last summer, that may have helped.

5. We've brought a lot of writers to campus recently (in the past few years). We need more money for that!

6. I hope that with our new five unit courses we can maintain this performance you describe here. It's a true unknown.

You write in your note that "white students, make up slightly more (31%) of Creative Writing students than they do of general student body (20%)"—I'll list the white students in my class this quarter below first, so maybe you can also get a sense of the kinds of "white students" who end up in creative writing—often or even usually the ones at risk. We aim to work with these kinds of marginalized students from all ethnicities and are reaching out that way. I'd like to reach out more through counseling and DSS.

7. We need an expansion of what we consider to be vulnerable students in our "targeted" population. For example, each of the students in my current EWRT 41 (this is the whole class,below)—they all love and need poetry and will pass (maybe one won't):

white in wheelchair

white re-entry student with chronic pain and an auto-immune disease

white with speech difficulty and psychological difficulty due to life changing sports injury

white struggling hard with past & chronic heroin addiction

white struggling with depression

white struggling with depression and a mysterious immune response problem

white transgender man (who struggles with his appearance which is highly female, and his family's ostracism)

white older retired re-entry Israeli Jew with significant ESL difficulties and some sort of spectrum disorder around engaging emotions

Chinese American reentry mother with successful career who deals with mid-life depression—has two children, one on spectrum still at home in twenties

Chinese America young woman who is painfully introspective and lonely

Korean American introspect who can't get out of his left brain very well, don't know why yet, but he's working on it

Mexican American who is brilliant, I believe gay, has suffered with manic-depression and a kind of ADD

Mexican American who is mentally healthy and is a very talented and culturally sophisticated writer and performer of his work

Mixed race student who dealt with child sexual abuse (she is part Philipino, and I believe part black as well as part white; I don't know how she box-checks, but she rolls her eyes about box-checking and has written about the absurdity of it).

Indian-American student who is quite masculinist & open—but highly healthy and engaged and supportive of others.

#### WHAT STUDENTS NEED TO THRIVE:

We need small classes with good teachers! that helps create success in our target groups. Stop killing small classes—is what those stats tell me.

We also have lifelong learners in many of these classes and the crossing of ages and backgrounds we think helps with community cohesion and thereby retention and success. Maybe Mallory knows our percent of lifelong or re-entry learners. (\*Therefore, we need that "prerequisite not met" screen antidote that Foothill has instituted. These are wonderful, motivated students who are turned away by the application and Banner obfuscations and obstacles. We need those students who are being steered away & discouraged by our flawed application and registration apparatus for lifelong learners to keep our successful creative writing communities strong.

Also instructors apply to teach creative writing courses and are passionate about them. These are



"electives" for both students and instructors. Passions merge and free choice helps. We need healthy electives in the arts. it's good for target groups and the whole institution.

it's not an either/ or issue here— in the sense that we can do BOTH things at once: a) show why we do well with target groups in small diverse classes that have very motivated teachers & allow for a variety of pathways to success and b) show why also are moved by how we serve other at risk target groups who are simply not yet called target groups. Administrators need to be followed by us and at times be LED by us. It's a "yes yes," sort of thing. YES the equity figures and targets matte a lot. And we're proud we're doing OK in equity stats and trends. AND IN ADDITION... yes, the equity figures and targets also leave out important stuff that we ALSO DO. Yes BOTH MATTER. FACULTY AND IPBT COMMITTEE / ADMINISTRATORS NEED TO HEAR AND TALK ABOUT BOTH.

**IV.A Cycle 2 PLOAC Summary (since June 30, 2014):** 0%. We are in the process of and will fulfill a full assessment cycle of our 5 PLO statements by Fall 2017.

**IV.B Cycle 2 SLOAC Summary (since June 30, 2014):** 29%. We are in the process of and will fulfill a full assessment cycle of at least 50% of our 93 course SLOs by Fall 2017.

**V.A Budget Trends:** We lost all materials fees budgets so we must replace that fund with a reliable budget allocation for this critical resource.

Over the last few years, the college has replaced only about half of the English faculty who have left or retired.

As with much of the campus, we could use more classrooms. Current un-served waitlists are due mainly to a lack of available classrooms at high demand times. If the English department were given control of more rooms, we could add 6-8 sections most quarters (180-200 students per quarter).

**V.B Funding Impact on Enrollment Trends:**

**V.C.1 Faculty Position(s) Needed:** Replace due to vacancy

**V.C.2 Justification for Faculty Position(s):** Replace 1 FT faculty due to Vacancy/Retirement. We also are requesting 1 FT faculty Growth position. We are grateful to IPBT for approving 2 FT faculty hires in Fall 2015, as well as for the opportunity to hire 2 FT faculty in Fall 2015. However, we are still at only 28.1% FT faculty in our department. In addition, we have difficulty recruiting and retaining a broad pool of quality PT faculty to staff the sections that our FT faculty cannot cover.

We served 14,466 students in 2015-16. That is an increase of 5.7% from the previous year. Our student success rates are consistently around 72% and we are a leading department in terms of faculty who are leaders and active advocates and consultants for equity issues and initiatives and work with the Office of Equity. Such experience/leadership has been a preferred qualification in our position announcements for the last several FT position hires.

We have one FT faculty who is only at 20% in our English department, and 70% in Women's Studies who may be reclassifying her FTE to 100% in Women's Studies. If that happens, then we will have need to hire another Replacement position.

We will have to add more classes to implement Student Success and Support Program, particularly at the Basic Skills level, but also to capture the large student waitlists in EWRT 2 and EWRT 1A. We do not currently have enough faculty to maintain the high concentration of full time faculty in Basic Skills instruction that is one of the keys to our outstanding success in moving students from Basic Skills to transfer level. I addition, the college's prestige and our ability to attract students from outside our district and outside the country depend on our high transfer rates. Students cannot transfer if inadequate course offerings prevent them from enrolling in EWRT 2 or EWRT 1B, the last required composition courses. We must support the whole pipeline of English coursework so that student transfer goals are achievable.



We also need more expertise in Ethnic and World Literature in order to support our goals for narrowing the equity gap in this area and to continue the enrollment expansion we have achieved. In addition, our PLO work (English AA PLO statement #2) indicates that students do not feel that our offerings provide enough diversity and global perspectives. We do not currently have adequate faculty expertise in all areas of World Literature, so this is a hiring priority. In addition, our Literature student survey indicates that course variety and instructor quality are the top two reasons why students choose to major in English at De Anza rather than another college. Without full-time hiring in this area, we will be unable to continue to attract students to our high quality program.

**V.D.1 Staff Position(s) Needed:** None needed unless vacancy

**V.D.2 Justification for Staff Position(s)::**

**V.E.1 Equipment Requests:** Over \$1,000

**V.E.2 Equipment Title, Description, and Quantity:** White boards for all L-quad classes where we now have chalk boards. This would technically be a “replacement” as the current chalkboards can simply be covered over with whiteboard laminate paper that can be stuck on over the cleaned chalkboards.

No, this request did not emanate from a SLOAC or PLOAC process, although it should be obvious that chalkboard is old classroom technology that is clearly inferior to whiteboards and this is also an ADA issue since visually impaired students frequently have a harder time reading chalk on chalkboards than the bright colors that whiteboard markers make on whiteboards.

This request does not require new or renovated infrastructure.

**V.E.3 Equipment Justification:** All faculty and students in classrooms would use this equipment.

Leaving these ancient chalkboards in classrooms undermines our investment in technology because chalk dust causes malfunction and increases repair costs. Ultimately, this can become an equity issue, because our basic skills courses are often assigned to classrooms with these chalkboard relics. When equipment breaks down and weeks pass before it can be repaired, English basic skills courses (and the under-served students that make up the majority population in these courses) are relegated to sub-standard, unequal classrooms. In addition, visual learners benefit from the colors that are possible on a whiteboard.

We do not have SLO/PLO assessment data to justify this specific request, but again, whiteboards are the newer and increasingly the expected resource in face to face classrooms.

**V.F.1 Facility Request:** More classrooms dedicated to English.

New: classrooms. Since our ELIT class enrollment caps have been raised this year from 45 to 50, we need classrooms that can accommodate 50 students.

Associated structures needed: student desks, smart technology instructional counter (with computer, overhead projector, DVD player, connections for laptops, etc), podium, whiteboards, high stool for instructor to sit on, desk to accommodate students with disabilities.

Renovation: White boards in L-quad classrooms. Updates (including software updates) or replacement for any technology that no longer works

**V.F.2 Facility Justification:** All faculty and students in classrooms would use this equipment. Leaving these ancient chalkboards in classrooms undermines our investment in technology because chalk dust causes malfunction and increases repair costs. We need white boards for all L-quad classes where we now have chalkboards. Chalk dust can also trigger allergies.

Ultimately, this can become an equity issue, because our basic skills courses are often assigned to classrooms with these chalkboard relics. When equipment breaks down and weeks pass before it can be repaired, English basic skills courses (and the under-served students that make up the majority population in these courses) are relegated to sub-standard, inequitable classrooms. In addition, visual learners benefit from the colors that are possible on a whiteboard.

Current un-served waitlists are due mainly to a lack of available classrooms at high demand times. If the

English department were given control of more rooms, we could add 6-8 sections most quarters (180-200 students per quarter).

We do not have SLO/PLO assessment data to justify this request, but again, whiteboards are the newer and increasingly the expected resource in face to face classrooms.

**V.G Equity Planning and Support:** We need to develop a more robust, and user-intuitive English website with sample essay assignments, essays, and explanations about the standards for each level of composition we offer (from two levels below transfer to our three transfer levels) as well as the ELIT courses we offer. This would help not only students, particularly our underserved targeted students, but also instructors better understand the distinctions between the courses. It would help students understand which course more appropriately accommodates their skill level, and also help build a community of evaluation practices within the department. As a department, faculty have worked for several years on clarifying and coming up with clear models for essay assignments, essays, and explanations of standards for our 200 and 211 (basic skills levels) through those levels' portfolio review process. As a department, we are now working on doing such clarification and coming up with models in our transfer level composition courses (1A, 1B, 2, and 1C). We would like to have assistance from a professional website builder with improving the visual layout, site organization, and user-intuitivity. ETS is supposed to provide this kind of support but currently is understaffed.

**V.H.1 Other Needed Resources:** We are looking forward to having a full-time dedicated counselor for our division, a position which is supposed to be hired/filled in Spring 2016 quarter.

**V.H.2 Other Needed Resources Justification:** Reinstate the Campus Abroad program during the Fall, Winter, and Spring quarters. From one of our SLO assessments for ELIT46B:

SLO: Acquire knowledge of the historical and cultural period, major writers, and key texts of NeoClassical and Romantic British Literature.

SLO Assessment: Student's Historical and Cultural Presentations.

SLO Result: 11 A, 11 B's, 7 C's, 2 D's (NOTE: C and D grades are almost 29% of the total grades earned)

SLO Reflection and Analysis: The students did the best they could with the knowledge they had access to online and in texts. But much of the information researched and shared seemed removed and impersonal. I can not stress how much more connected to the history and the authors the students would be if they actually got to see the places and experienced British culture in person. The Campus Abroad program would be such a transformative learning experience for them. The London campus abroad, even for a summer 3 weeks session, would make the learning so much more impactful.

**V.J. "B" Budget Augmentation:** 1. In order to promote equity and serve students, especially in Basic Skills courses, we must have additional B-budget to cover printing costs. We would need approximately 1/3 additional B-budget for printing (\$8,000).

Our Program Learning Outcome is: Students demonstrate critical thinking, reading, research, and writing skills in order to effectively analyze texts from myriad disciplines and cultural perspectives. Reflections on this PLO means acknowledging the national research that students succeed when they can handwrite notes on handouts (see <http://www.wsj.com/articles/SB10001424052748704631504575531932754922518>) and also when certain important resources can be referred to as a physical paper handout rather than having to be electronically retrieved by students every time they use them. Also, some in-class quizzes and tests need to be given as paper handouts.

2. We need to write a more robust English placement website with sample essays and explanation about the process and standards for each level. Writing this website must be done by discipline area experts, and should involve feedback from across the department. This could be accomplished with a grant of about \$3000.

The CCCC, which is the Conference on College Composition and Communication and is a nationally respected representative organization for College Composition and Communication disciplines, has issued this statement about the importance of making such information easily accessible to students: <http://www.ncte.org/cccc/resources/positions/writingassessment>





3. We need additional B-budget for ongoing faculty training to support our goals for equity and Basic Skills success. We would like stipends for part-time faculty to attend a retreat and norming sessions each quarter, approximately \$2500.

4. We would like to expand the highly successful pilot of student mentors in EWRT classes. Initial results show that 100% of the students in the class with mentors passed the class and 100% of students said they were more likely to see a mentor than go to a tutor because the mentor was in the class and could be accessed immediately. 100% of students recommended continuing the program. To expand this model, we would need \$1800 for small stipends so that six additional faculty could train and supervise mentors.

**V.K.1 Staff Development Needs:** Since we are a large department, we must have funding for retreats and ongoing staff development to norm our grading and promote best practices in teaching basic skills, transfer level composition and literature, as well as support for mentorship of new part time instructors. Most of our SLO and PLO work could not have happened without retreat funding and financial support for department leadership.

We also need support for English Department faculty to develop instructor websites.

**V.K.2 Staff Development Needs Justification:**

**V.L Closing the Loop:** We plan to reassess the outcomes by surveying students in our classrooms about how helpful they feel those new developments have been to their success in their English and other courses.

**Submitted by:** Karen Chow (Dept. Chair) and Roseanne Quinn (Spring 2016 and Spring 2017 Interim Dept. Chair while Karen Chow is on PDL)

**Last Updated:** 03/21/2017

**APRU Complete for 2016-17:** Yes

**#SLO STATEMENTS Archived from ECMS:**