

Solano Community College

2007-2008

*Instructional Program Review:*

# Humanities



## Introduction & Overview

The Instructional Program Review is carried out by the faculty and deans within each academic division; the General Program Review is the responsibility of individual unit managers. Both are integral components of Solano Community College's annual evaluation, planning, and budget development cycle. The outcomes of the Program Review process support the first component (evaluation), which informs the second (planning), which then impacts the third (budget development).

At Solano, the Program Review process includes the ongoing collection of both qualitative and quantitative data and the examination of trends in these data over time. The collection and examination of data then leads to the evaluation of program effectiveness and efficiency. Finally, reviewers develop recommendations for program improvement. These recommendations are assessed by peers and administrators for both feasibility and alignment with the College's Strategic Goals/Objectives and Educational Master Plan. Recommendations that require no new/additional funding can be implemented directly; those dependent on new/additional funds are prioritized and submitted for budgeting. Once implemented, the recommended changes are evaluated in the subsequent round of the Program Review process — and the cycle continues.

The Program Review report contains: 1) a narrative description of the unit and of each program or service offered, including mission, goals, and desired outcomes — student-learning or service-area outcomes (SLOs and SAOs, respectively); 2) both quantitative and qualitative data relative to unit/program performance; 3) an evaluation of the unit/program effectiveness and efficiency; 4) an analysis of trends; 5) recommended changes and expected outcomes; and 6) a description of unit/program needs to implement the recommended changes and achieve the expected outcomes.

Although performed by all units on an annual basis, the Program Review is only published for a specific unit every fourth year, according to a defined schedule. Program Reviews published in the fall 2008 are based on the prior academic year's data (AY 2007-08). Where possible, up to an additional four years of data may be included to demonstrate trends.

Robert J. Simas  
Director, Research & Planning



## **Definitions**

### **FTES**

*Full-time Equivalent Student (FTES)* is the unit of measure based on student attendance patterns used by the State on the formula for apportionment of funds:

525 WSCH = 1 FTES [Source: First Census counts from End of Semester SCC10 report]

### **WSCH**

*Weekly Student Contact Hours (WSCH)* is the number of students in a class multiplied by the number of hours the class meets per week. For example, a class of 32 students that meets 3 hours per week generates 96 WSCH. WSCH is the primary factor used in the formula to calculate FTES. [Source: First Census counts from End of Semester SCC10 report]

### **Enrollment**

*Enrollment* totals are measured as the number of seats filled in classes offered. [Source: NSR report]

### **FTEF**

*Full-time Equivalent Faculty (FTEF)* is the measure that identifies the use of a full-time instructor for implementing an instructional program. Fifteen hours is the base formula hours (lecture-hour equivalents). For example, a three-hour lecture class is valued at .20 FTEF, ( $3/15 = .20$ ). A full-time instructor would teach five, three-hour lecture classes. [Source: First Census counts from End of Semester SCC10 report]

### **Load**

*Load* is a measure of relative performance of a program. Load is calculated by dividing WSCH by FTEF. For example, a class that is worth 0.2 FTEF and generates 96 WSCH will have a Load of 480 (WSCH divided by FTEF). Generally, larger classes generate higher loads. [Source: First Census counts from End of Semester SCC10 Report]

### **Percent Fill**

The percentage of available class seats filled at first census. [Source: SCC30 report.]

## **Percent Retention**

The percentage of seats filled at the end of semester compared to the seats filled at first census. [Source: SCC30 report.]

## **Apportionment Income**

The State funding allocation per FTES multiplied by FTES. (For 2007-2008 one FTES was valued at \$4,367.) [Source: Office of Administrative and Business Services.]

## **Expense**

*Direct Expense* includes salaries (1000, 2000, and 3000 budget codes), materials (4000 and 5000 budget codes), and capital outlay (6000 budget codes) expenditures incurred by the program during the academic year. (Years prior to 1998-1999 do not include materials, capital outlay, or VEA funds as part of their total direct expenses.) [Source: Office of Fiscal Services.]

## **Cost/FTES**

The cost to generate one FTES in the program. (Total Expense divided by FTES).

## **Growth/Decline**

The percent change in a measure from the prior year.

## **Percent Successful**

The *Percent Successful* is the number of “satisfactory” grades recorded (As, Bs, Cs, and CRs, as defined in the *California Code of Regulations*, Title 5, Div. 6, Chap. 6, Subchap. 9, §55758) compared to the total number of grades of record, including Ws and “substandard” grades (Ds, Fs, and NCs, as defined in the *California Code of Regulations*, Title 5, Div. 6, Chap. 6, Subchap. 9, §55761). This statistic measures grades not students. Since students can take more than one course in a specific term, the college-wide total grades are always higher than the number of students enrolled and should not be confused with headcount — the unduplicated count of individuals. At the programmatic level, duplication is less of a factor, but still exists. For example, it is possible that a student is taking two courses within the same program and is successful in both courses or in one course but not the other. This statistic is calculated only for the last academic year included in the report.

# Table of Contents

Humanities Division Overview.....	1
English Department .....	6
Part I    Goals/Objectives .....	6
Part II   Analysis.....	8
Part III  Conclusions and Recommendations .....	10
ESL Department.....	18
Part I    Goals/Objectives .....	18
Part II   Analysis.....	19
Part III  Conclusions and Recommendations .....	20
Foreign Language Department .....	25
Part I    Goals/Objectives .....	25
Part II   Analysis.....	27
Part III  Conclusions and Recommendations .....	33
History Department.....	49
Part I    Goals/Objectives .....	49
Part II   Analysis.....	50
Part III  Conclusions and Recommendations .....	51
Humanities Department .....	55
Part I    Goals/Objectives .....	56
Part II   Analysis.....	57
Part III  Conclusions and Recommendations .....	58
Journalism Department .....	63
Part I    Goals/Objectives .....	63
Part II   Analysis.....	64
Part III  Conclusions and Recommendations .....	65
Philosophy Department.....	70
Part I    Goals/Objectives .....	70
Part II   Analysis.....	70
Part III  Conclusions and Recommendations .....	72
Political Science and International Relations Department.....	77
Part I    Goals/Objectives .....	77
Part II   Analysis.....	78

Part III	Conclusions and Recommendations .....	79
Reading Department .....		84
Part I	Goals/Objectives .....	84
Part II	Analysis.....	85
Part III	Conclusions and Recommendations .....	87

## Humanities Division Overview

The Humanities Division, for the most part, has been a highly stable and productive division within Solano Community College (SCC) since fall 2004 (when the previous program review was published) to the present. Behind that picture of consistent contribution to instruction and student learning, the Division has undergone many noteworthy changes. Between February 2005 and August 2007, the Humanities classrooms and faculty office space in Buildings 700 and 800 and 1860 and 1861 were completely rehabilitated. The new faculty office building (900) was also built and now houses many faculty from the Humanities Division as well as faculty from other divisions.

Since spring 2004, eleven full-time faculty have retired and new faculty hired in their places. In June 2007, the long-standing Dean of Humanities retired and the new Dean was hired that fall. Two more members of the full-time faculty, with long and fruitful careers in the Humanities Division, have announced their retirements as of the end of the present academic year. The secular retirement and renewal of our faculty extends, naturally, to other California community colleges, which expanded so rapidly in the late 1960s and 1970s. The impact of this is felt in the ranks of part-time faculty as well. While our students are well-served by the talented and dedicated cadre of part-time faculty teaching in the Humanities, there is a high degree of turn-over among them as they hone their community college teaching skills and find full-time faculty jobs. In fact, 50 percent of our part-time faculty first began at SCC in fall 2004 or later. Finally, two key classified employees, highly skilled and knowledgeable, are also retiring effective this fall and must be replaced. In the fall of 2007, the new Vallejo Center opened and the Humanities Division has played its part scheduling a range of core courses in the new facility and throughout Solano County. Thus, a hallmark of this program review period is the renewal of facilities and equipment and a renewal of the community of Humanities faculty and staff.

In terms of the institutional effectiveness quantitative analysis, Humanities has shown slight variability within an overall portrait of stability in the context of the College institutional effectiveness numbers. Between the 2004-05 and the 2007-08 academic years, Division full-time equivalent student (FTES) is down 3%; the College is up 3%. The LOAD declined 7% in comparison to the College decline of 8%. Enrollment is down 3% for Humanities and up 1.6% for the College as a whole. The number of sections fluctuated widely during this period, increasing by 77 sections at its peak (517 sections in 2004-05 AY vs. 594 in the 2006-07 AY) before settling back to a modest 1% increase (523 sections in 2007-08 AY). The push to add sections, followed by a return to the *status quo ante*, is evident in the college-wide numbers as well.

During the last three academic years (2005-06 to 2007-08), total Humanities full-time equivalent faculty (FTEF) has remained unchanged while the College FTEF has increased 5%. The Division percent fill has remained a solid 80%, while the College

percent fall slid from 80% to 67%. Percent retention in Humanities rose 3% to 79%, which represents a notable advance from the 74% reported in the prior published Humanities Instructional Program Review. The College retention figure rose from 79% to 81%. Apportionment income in Humanities rose 1.5%, while the College as a whole added 6%.

Starting in spring 2007, the Humanities Division, along with other key College divisions, has been actively engaged in the development of Solano's Basic Skills Initiative (BSI). BSI has helped the College focus attention, advisement, instruction, and resources upon the learning needs of our students. Some 70% of new SCC students are not prepared for college-level courses, but need pre-collegiate, developmental, coursework in literacy and mathematics. The Humanities faculty have developed innovative programs and new trials in the following areas: Supplemental Instruction, Faculty Peer Mentoring, the Reading and Writing Labs, Student Peer Tutoring, Library Research and Information Competency, and First Semester Learning Communities.

Currently, we are working with colleagues from across the College to design and pilot a new Center for Academic Success. Students will come to the Center to participate in study skill and content-based workshops of all kinds and to obtain a variety of support services for learning—tutoring, supplemental instruction, study groups for athletes, for nursing students, and more. The Center for Academic Success will lead to increased student achievement across the entire curriculum. The Basic Skills Initiative, in short, is a work-in-progress that holds great promise for making significant improvement in learning outcomes, retention, persistence, and achievement for the majority of Solano Community College's students.

The Humanities Division continues to explore new ways of offering all our students the courses they will need to reach their vision of success in higher education. Maintaining and expanding high quality instruction at all levels and in all aspects of the Humanities curriculum will require additional faculty and facilities. The additional resources, however, will be supported by the additional apportionment (FTES) that come from enrollment growth, retention, and student success. As you read the program reviews for the nine individual departments, you will get a more in-depth and refined perspective on the achievements, innovations, and goals of the Humanities Division.

Program Review Data for 2007-08  
 Humanities  
 DIVISION TOTALS

Division 16

		03-04	04-05	05-06	06-07	07-08
FTES GENERATED	Summer	127.58	121.62	130.26	142.69	141.41
	Fall	686.52	697.54	673.45	660.39	662.53
	Spring	667.39	646.11	646.79	636.95	618.87
	<b>TOTAL</b>	1481.49	1465.27	1450.50	1440.03	1422.81
Growth/Decline $[(Yr2-Yr1)/Yr1]$		3%	-1%	-1%	-1%	-1%
LOAD (WSCH/FTE)	Summer	504	426	437	415	386
	<b>Growth/Decline</b>	-5%	-15%	3%	-5%	-7%
	Fall	432	403	392	377	378
	Spring	412	393	368	361	360
<b>AVERAGE, Fall &amp; Spring</b>		422	398	380	369	369
Growth/Decline $[(Yr2-Yr1)/Yr1]$		5%	-6%	-5%	-3%	0%
ENROLLMENT	Summer	1265	1224	1304	1458	1457
	Fall	7332	7286	7087	6933	6967
	Spring	7059	6758	6803	6593	6401
	<b>TOTAL</b>	15656	15268	15194	14984	14825
Growth/Decline $[(Yr2-Yr1)/Yr1]$		4%	-2%	0%	-1%	-1%
NUMBER OF SECTIONS	Summer	43	50	54	62	60
	Fall	225	243	254	267	235
	Spring	229	224	263	265	228
	<b>TOTAL</b>	497	517	571	594	523
Growth/Decline $[(Yr2-Yr1)/Yr1]$		1%	4%	10%	4%	-12%
FTEF	Summer	7.600	8.567	8.933	10.322	10.978
	Fall	47.684	51.921	51.600	52.567	52.511
	Spring	48.556	49.368	52.669	52.864	51.531
	<b>AVERAGE, Fall &amp; Spring</b>	48.120	50.645	52.135	52.716	52.021
PERCENT FILL (1st cen/max enroll)	Summer	92%	82%	80%	101%	76%
	Fall	90%	85%	82%	79%	80%
	Spring	86%	82%	77%	76%	79%
	<b>AVERAGE, Fall &amp; Spring</b>	88%	84%	80%	78%	80%
PERCENT RETENTION (EOS/1st cen)	Summer	77%	81%	80%	84%	85%
	Fall	77%	78%	77%	78%	80%
	Spring	75%	73%	73%	77%	77%
	<b>AVERAGE, Fall &amp; Spring</b>	76%	76%	75%	78%	79%
APPORTIONMENT INCOME (FTES * Annual Factor)		\$5,177,808	\$5,105,001	\$6,124,011	\$6,288,611	\$6,213,411
EXPENSE	Salaries	\$3,321,864	\$3,663,382	\$3,819,014	\$3,293,915	\$0
	Materials	\$6,917	\$9,480	\$8,854	\$13,775	\$0
	Capital Outlay	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$6,548	\$0
	<b>Total Direct</b>	\$3,328,781	\$3,672,862	\$3,827,868	\$3,314,239	\$0
	Indirect (Direct * .40)	\$1,331,513	\$1,469,145	\$1,531,147	\$1,325,696	\$0
<b>TOTAL</b>	\$4,660,294	\$5,142,007	\$5,359,015	\$4,639,935	\$0	
ANNUAL COST/FTES		\$3,146	\$3,509	\$3,695	\$3,222	\$0

Program Review Data for 2007-08  
 Humanities  
 DIVISION TOTALS

Division 16  
 Year: 2007-08

<u>Summer</u>		White, non-Hispanic	African- American	Hispanic	Filipino	Other, non-white	Total #
Grades *	A	129	24	24	55	62	294
	B	127	44	55	86	66	378
	C	50	45	32	44	43	214
	D	20	19	10	9	14	72
	F	36	30	20	13	24	123
	CR	29	20	14	16	31	110
	NC	2	6	6	4	12	30
	W	47	28	20	17	19	131
	TOTAL #	440	216	181	244	271	1352
% Successful *		76%	62%	69%	82%	75%	74%
<u>Fall</u>		White, non-Hispanic	African- American	Hispanic	Filipino	Other, non-white	Total #
Grades *	A	427	81	119	106	169	902
	B	499	109	184	130	177	1099
	C	306	117	166	136	103	828
	D	102	45	43	38	37	265
	F	183	98	81	55	80	497
	CR	449	239	309	181	244	1422
	NC	120	103	77	48	53	401
	W	303	217	158	86	131	895
	TOTAL #	2389	1009	1137	780	994	6309
% Successful *		70%	54%	68%	71%	70%	67%
<u>Spring</u>		White, non-Hispanic	African- American	Hispanic	Filipino	Other, non-white	Total #
Grades *	A	425	60	156	87	169	897
	B	424	125	178	119	160	1006
	C	302	112	159	122	143	838
	D	111	30	46	31	35	253
	F	178	96	81	52	69	476
	CR	299	246	219	133	170	1067
	NC	108	137	90	65	39	439
	W	290	210	168	113	127	908
	TOTAL #	2137	1016	1097	722	912	5884
% Successful *		68%	53%	65%	64%	70%	65%

\*Includes duplicate counts.

8/29/2008

Solano: Research and Planning

Program Review Data for 2007-08  
 Humanities  
 DIVISION TOTALS

Division 16  
 Year: 2007-08

<u>Summer</u>		<u>F</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>U</u>	<u>ESL</u>	<u>Non-ESL</u>	<u>U</u>
Grades *	A	187	107	0	16	278	0
	B	236	142	0	21	357	0
	C	112	102	0	10	204	0
	D	41	31	0	6	66	0
	F	57	66	0	4	119	0
	CR	65	45	0	13	97	0
	NC	12	18	0	6	24	0
	W	78	53	0	6	125	0
	TOTAL #	788	564	0	82	1270	0
% Successful *		76%	70%	0%	73%	74%	0%
<u>Fall</u>		<u>F</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>U</u>	<u>ESL</u>	<u>Non-ESL</u>	<u>U</u>
Grades *	A	566	336	0	65	836	1
	B	667	432	0	81	1018	0
	C	434	394	0	56	772	0
	D	140	125	0	14	251	0
	F	292	205	0	21	476	0
	CR	828	594	0	214	1207	1
	NC	206	195	0	53	347	1
	W	513	382	0	47	848	0
	TOTAL #	3646	2663	0	551	5755	3
% Successful *		68%	66%	0%	75%	67%	67%
<u>Spring</u>		<u>F</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>U</u>	<u>ESL</u>	<u>Non-ESL</u>	<u>U</u>
Grades *	A	545	352	0	71	826	0
	B	585	421	0	79	927	0
	C	441	397	0	64	773	1
	D	126	127	0	16	237	0
	F	253	223	0	25	451	0
	CR	609	458	0	154	912	1
	NC	242	197	0	64	375	0
	W	500	408	0	72	836	0
	TOTAL #	3301	2583	0	545	5337	2
% Successful *		66%	63%	0%	68%	64%	100%

\*Includes duplicate counts.

8/29/2008

Solano: Research and Planning

Program Name: English  
TOPs Code: 1501.00  
Prepared by: E. Blair  
Faculty: E. Blair, B. Clark, Q. Duval,  
E. Farmer, A. Hairston,  
C. McBride, J. Schouten,  
T. Schneider, J. Stein, S. Stever

## English Department

### Part I Goals/Objectives

#### 1. What are the goals/objectives of the program? (State in terms of student learning outcomes — SLOs.)

##### **Successful completion of this program enables a student to:**

- Demonstrate competency in the SCC “Core Four” competencies, including Communication, Critical Thinking and Information Competency, Global Awareness, and Personal Responsibility and Professional Development.
  - Demonstrate an understanding of the relevance of reading and writing skills to success in other fields of study and in professional and personal life, i.e., writing or eloquence as means to start an enterprise, influence a public decision, change public events, and/or develop self-understanding.
  - Demonstrate the reading, writing, and analytical skills necessary to succeed in college, to transfer to four-year institutions, and to increase career and professional opportunities.
  - Demonstrate an understanding of the importance and influence of literature.
  - Demonstrate comprehension of cultural diversity through literature from a variety of cultural or ethnic backgrounds and sexual orientations to complicate students' assumptions about these groups and social categories such, that they are better prepared to embrace the realities of various human conditions.
  - Explore and demonstrate creative writing potential.
  - Understand potential careers in English and in professional fields for which the study of literature provides analytical training; understand transfer options.
- #### 2. List appropriate indicators of program success (i.e., measures of goals/objectives stated above). Include both quantitative and qualitative measures.

##### *Quantitative:*

- English instructors require students to participate in classroom discussions, debates, and presentations to demonstrate their understanding of literature and diversity.
- English instructors require students to write sentence-level exercises, paragraphs, summaries, reports, responses, and examinations, including

the Composition Mastery Examination (CME), to demonstrate their critical thinking, reading, and writing skills.

- English instructors require students to write formal essays (5-10 pages) both in and out of class to demonstrate their critical thinking, reading, and writing skills; some papers require research to demonstrate students' intellectual curiosity and Modern Language Association style citation practices to demonstrate students' information competency.
- All discussions, papers, and exercises demonstrate students' personal responsibility and development for the workplace.
- English faculty monitor the impact of class size on student success and persistence.
- English faculty keep track of English majors and/or transfer students in transfer programs; often faculty invite students who have succeeded in transfer programs and in earning advanced degrees to share their experiences with currently enrolled students.
- With the assistance of the Institutional Researcher and with other appropriate measures, English faculty track students who are enrolled in ENGL 305: *Introductory Reading and Writing Skills*, ENGL 355: *Reading and Writing Skills*, ENGL 370: *English Fundamentals*, and ENGL 001: *College Composition* at first census and compare to those students who also complete these courses.
- English faculty track all students who complete ENGL 001 and correlate their grades with their means of meeting the eligibility for ENGL 001. The annualized data continue to suggest that of all the pathways into ENGL 001, our prerequisite courses provide the highest likelihood of success in ENGL 001. For the 2008-09 school year, the success rate in ENGL 001 (received a grade of A, B, C) was 67% for those students who pass a prerequisite course at Solano; 64.8% for those who students who tested directly into ENGL 001 on our assessment test; 66.5% for those students who passed an equivalent prerequisite at another institution; and 65% for those who entered via teacher or counselor approval. A concern is that on a semester basis, while the scores of students from prerequisite classes have been considerably higher in the spring semester, these students the past two fall semesters have had a slightly lower success rate in ENGL 001 than the rates of other students. Possible causes are different student demographics in ENGL 001 for the fall and spring semesters or the lengthy period between taking a spring prerequisite and a fall ENGL 001. If the latter is the case, additional review in the beginning of fall ENGL 001 courses might be helpful.
- English faculty continue to track grade distribution in ENGL 002: *Critical Thinking and Writing About Literature* and ENGL 004: *Composition and Critical Thinking: Language in Context*, comparing it with grade distribution in ENGL 001 and ENGL 370. There are a number of data sets

that can be examined when looking at grade distribution: first-census numbers and start-of-class numbers, for example, yield different results.

- ◇ Based on the first census class numbers, we can see that ENGL 370 students were successful (received a grade of “Credit”) in the fall of 2007 at a 57.8% rate and 49.2% rate in spring 2008. ENGL 001 students were successful (received a grade of A, B, C) in the fall of 2007 at a 67% rate and in the spring of 2008 at a 66.4% rate. ENGL 002 students were successful (received a grade of A, B, C) in the fall of 2007 at a 73% rate and in the spring of 2008 at a 73.1% rate. For ENGL 004, the fall 2007 and spring 2008 success rates were 69% and 76% respectively.
- ◇ Based on class start numbers, we have learned that success rates in ENGL 001 are higher in the spring semester than in the fall semester. There are a number of factors that might contribute to these rates: students’ preparation in ENGL 370; students’ ability to continue working with the same instructor; students’ familiarity with SCC; etc.

*Qualitative:*

- English faculty have prepared, discussed, and analyzed their Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) at regular division meetings.
- English faculty measure students’ writing skills by studying grade distribution reports, pass rate of the CME, and matriculation patterns.
- English faculty offer a variety of courses beyond ENGL 001 level and measure success by examining enrollment and retention patterns in these composition and literature courses.
- English maintains an 80% retention rate and makes every effort to improve upon it.

## Part II Analysis

### 1. Identify and explain the trends in:

**Enrollment** — Enrollments have increased 5% in the last two years. The Division Dean adds as many more sections of composition classes as staffing and room availability allow.

**Retention** — Retention remains fairly consistent, improving 2% in the past two years.

- Because ENGL 001 is a gatekeeper course and a requirement for graduation, we are concerned about the disparity in success rates in individual sections. For example, using first-census class sizes in spring 2008 in ENGL 001, the least successful ten sections of ENGL 001 averaged 9.2 passing students while the most successful ten sections averaged 23.7 passing students, with passing percentage rates of 43.16%

and 83.87%, respectively. This wide variation requires closer scrutiny of retention by section.

- Another concern is the large number of students who apparently withdrew before the first census. The average class size for ENGL 001 sections at first census in spring 2008 was 24.4. If these classes all began with 30 students, this represents an 18.7% drop. While these numbers, too, vary widely among individual sections of ENGL 001, this drop does represent an unsuccessful experience for a large number of students and a significant loss of income for the College.

**Fill rate** — Fill rate is in the process of making a comeback from 2006-07; it is up by 8%.

**Other Factors** — FTES increased 4% in summer, fall, and spring semesters.

**Qualitative Factors** — Space considerations, College remodeling, and lack of staffing continue to adversely affect our ability to meet student demand, especially in ENGL 370. Decreased enrollments across campus in 2006-07 affected English.

## 2. How do the above trends relate to the program goals identified during the last review?

The primary goal of English is to provide instruction that helps students develop the skills in reading, writing, and critical thinking necessary to succeed in college, to transfer to four-year institutions, and to increase career and professional opportunities in English and in other fields. In addition, English faculty are eager for students to understand and appreciate the transformative power of literature and its ability to take us out of ourselves and connect us to other people through the world of the imagination. As the above trends show, we have been successful in these goals regardless of enrollment fluctuations and the challenges of decreasing resources with an ever increasing number of students who need work at the basic skills level.

In addition to providing basic skills and college level writing instruction, English faculty have continued to offer courses in British, American, multi-ethnic, and world literatures, training students to transfer to high quality four-year colleges and universities. The English department continues to publish the *Suisun Valley Review* and to promote creative writing on the campus and in the region. English faculty must continue to work with the Humanities Dean to ensure that the College offers English major courses regularly and without interruption.

Our courses are successful and our retention is high because of dedicated, regular and adjunct faculty, who provide challenging, thought provoking, and enjoyable learning experiences.

English faculty remain concerned about student preparation for ENGL 001 and beyond. SLO rubric preparation and assessment at the Division meetings has begun to encourage an exchange of ideas and assignments along with an increased commitment to and an awareness of how faculty benefit from formalized, integrated collaboration.

Through the Basic Skills Initiative (BSI) and faculty work, level meetings and wiki sites have begun to pull curriculum together to ensure that SLOs and approved course outline guidelines, while taught in a range of styles, are being met. To this end, faculty have made revisions in the CME exam and in its grading. As covered below in Part III, the Reading and Writing Labs Committee, faculty, and staff have worked tirelessly to make extensive revisions to the ENGL 350: *Writing and Reading Skills for ESL Students*, ENGL 355 and 370 assignments to improve student readiness for ENGL 001. Additionally, English faculty must continue working with counselors to make certain students are placed in composition classes appropriate to their needs and skills.

### Part III Conclusions and Recommendations

#### 1. What are the major accomplishments of the program during the past two years?

- Writing Lab:
  - ◇ English faculty have continued the revision and update of the ENGL 350 and 355 three-part assignments — approximately half are completed.
  - ◇ English faculty revised and updated the ENGL 370 three-part assignments — approximately half are completed.
  - ◇ Through BSI, English faculty working as BSI Coordinators have combined “level meetings” (discussions of best and effective practices and fine-tuning of logistics) for Lab staff and Basic Skills instructors. These meetings began in fall 2007, have continued throughout 2008, and are planned to continue into 2009 and beyond. Faculty have created Boardster forum discussions at [boardster.net/sccenglish](http://boardster.net/sccenglish) and created lab orientation videos for use by both students and new staff to aid in the improvement of lab instruction and compartment.
  - ◇ Lab staffing has increased to backfill for increased lab load caused by revised lab assignments with increased time-to-completion for students.
  - ◇ The Writing Lab has increased the number of computers for student use from six to nineteen.
- Computer classroom (Room 743) — Faculty continue to use the lab classroom for morning classes from 8am to 12noon most days of the week; the lab classroom is sometimes used for brief periods in the afternoon or evenings on certain days.
- SCC Guest Lecture Series — English faculty have continued to support (through payroll deduction and individual contributions) and organize the SCC Guest Lecture Series, free to the SCC community and the community at large.

- The *Suisun Valley Review* — English department faculty have continued to mentor students in the creation, publication, and presentation of the *Suisun Valley Review*.
- New Hires — The English Department has hired two full-time faculty to replace retiring faculty, adding new energy, fresh approaches, and current pedagogy to the Department.
- Centers — The English Department has continued to offer courses at the Vacaville Center, the Vallejo Center, and Travis Air Force Base, with solid enrollments in varied scheduling configurations.
- English Department faculty, both regular and adjunct, continue to be active members of their profession, publishing in both creative writing and literary scholarship.

**2. Based on the trend analysis above, are there any changes needed in order to meet program goals or to improve program effectiveness? Explain.**

- Faculty propose expanding developmental course awareness across disciplines and offering more targeted sections of writing courses so that students will do better in all courses in other fields of study.
  - ◇ To achieve this expansion, faculty have suggested a multi-pronged approach that includes sending a department representative(s) to the Academic Senate to present a rationale for the necessity of basic skills work that goes across campus; promoting and creating a FlexCal program for writing across the disciplines; and promoting better contact with other divisions and disciplines to establish ENGL 001 as a prerequisite. For example, English could invite faculty from Nursing and Business to explain the importance of ENGL 001 as a writing prerequisite to their courses. To this end, the English faculty would like to explore reviving ENGL 051: *Technical Writing* — at the ENGL 001 level for students who do not plan to continue at a four-year college. Faculty would also like to explore the possibility of offering different “flavors” of ENGL 001 in addition to technical writing.
  - ◇ In conjunction with Journalism faculty, English faculty would like to establish an ENGL 001 prerequisite for JOUR 001: *Newswriting and Reporting*.
  - ◇ Faculty will analyze lower retention rates in online English composition courses — ENGL 001, 002 and 004 — to understand enrollment and retention disparity between these sections and face-to-face sections. We will make consequent recommendations to the English Department, Online Committee, Online Coordinator, and/or Academic Senate, as deemed appropriate, in an effort to serve online students while increasing success rates.

- The English Department needs to recognize the continuity and integrity of our literature major and program offerings; faculty suggest a class cancellation policy. With regard to encouraging and maintaining enrollments in literature and creative writing courses, the Department should have a reasonable time period during which the Department can collaborate with the Director, Public Relations, Marketing and Communication and other institutional and community contacts so that the courses are advertised in all available areas on campus, in area media outlets such as newspapers, radio stations, and local magazines, as well as community centers and institutions. This effort should take place no later than three weeks before registration begins. To further encourage and maintain enrollments in literature and creative writing courses, a more concerted effort should be made between and among English instructors, the Humanities Division, Counseling, and other departments and divisions so that information about the courses is strategically emphasized (i.e., highlighting minor and major requirements, electives, etc.) to the student population. Faculty propose that the Division and College fund a certain number of literature classes and rotate the low-enrollment classes, allowing them the chance to “make” and establish “word-of-mouth” for future fill.
- Writing Lab — English faculty continue to be concerned about the inability of our program to successfully serve the number of basic skills students that enter and/or continue at SCC. Due to limited lab space and staffing, we are currently unable to enroll all of the students who need developmental courses, and we feel that the quality of our instruction is suffering as well. Depending on the metric used, we currently are impacted by up to 300 students at the ENGL 350 and 355 level each semester and by up to 700 students at the ENGL 370 level; there are hundreds of students who cannot enroll in the courses they need each semester. In order to provide our most educationally needy student population with quality instruction in the Writing Lab, following the best practices outlined in the *Basic Skills Review of Literature*, the English Department needs to consider ways to restructure the labs so that they can be run more effectively and more efficiently. Increased lab staffing must take place regardless of any decisions made about lab logistics — some students wait for instructor help up to sixty minutes.
  - ◇ The English faculty need to continue to improve existing ENGL 370, 350 and 355 lab assignments, and create new assignments involving current and relevant issues.
    - In an attempt to increase the number of developmental students we can enroll, the Lab Working Group has written and revised assignments for ENGL 350, 355 and 370 students and proposed detailed plan for restructuring the Lab that would allow more students to be assisted effectively and efficiently. These plans include re-instating a drop-in Reading and Writing Lab that would help English achieve one of its primary goals, i.e., helping students succeed in disciplines across the campus and in professional life.

Proposals for these changes in the labs have gone out to the English faculty with an expected vote on future plans in early in fall 2008.

- The lab needs increased staffing; data collected over the last eighteen months suggests that ENGL 350 and 355-level students need staffing levels equivalent to 6-8 students per staff member per hour; ENGL 370-level students need staffing levels equivalent to 10-12 students per staff member per hour. These numbers are dramatically impacted by the current mixed nature of the Labs — the lower numbers of each range are all that can be accommodated because the heterogeneous nature of the tasks that students perform and the variability of their individual skill levels have a direct impact on instructors' ability to move them through the assignments. For precisely this reason, the Lab Working Group is proposing separate labs to accommodate each course level as mentioned above. This change would make for smoother lab logistics and mechanics, as well as increasing student success.
  - We continue to plan for a larger lab space and to hire and train more lab tutors and technicians. Student evaluations and comments confirm that while the skills and knowledge students gain is valuable, the crowded conditions and long waits frustrate them and diminish the quality of learning.
- The English Department needs to take the lead in creating a drop-in Tutoring Center. Several faculty who attended the BSI Conference at Sierra College in June of 2008 were impressed by the Butte College Center for Academic Success. A drop-in writing lab in afternoons and evenings is a possibility that has been suggested several times at Department meetings — it would allow the maximum use of a currently semi-unused room (Room 743) and serve the cross-campus demand for both a drop-in writing lab and access to computers. Such a lab will require increased staffing.
  - While BSI and English faculty working as BSI Coordinators have created level meetings, the English Department needs to institute regular training and meetings for lab staff and faculty. According to student evaluations and comments as well as faculty and staff observations, lab instruction would be improved by training of all staff and instructors in best practices. Regular lab training will require compensation alternatives for adjunct faculty.
  - Computer Classroom (Room 743): We need to gather faculty input to optimize the use of the computer classroom, increasing the days that the lab is available.
  - Creative Writing — English faculty specializing in creative writing are refining a three-course series in creative writing: suggestions include plans for

ENGL 006: *Creative Writing I*, as a general course touching on feature writing, the screenplay, the short story, the poem, and the novel; ENGL 007: *Creative Writing II*, as a “genre” course that allows students to focus on one form of creative writing and work with an instructor in that area; and ENGL 058: *Creative Writing: The Literary Magazine*, as a capstone course. Creative writing faculty are also exploring the opportunities to link ENGL 058 with JOUR 002: *Introduction to Feature and Magazine Writing*.

- ◇ Creative writing faculty are researching other community college creative writing programs that offer an AA degree in Creative Writing, with an eye to devising a similar AA degree at SCC.
- ◇ Faculty plan to enhance the connection between creative writing courses and the Humanities Guest Lecture Series; faculty have proposed that poets & fiction/creative non-fiction writers could visit creative writing courses (ENGL 006, 007, and 058), ENGL 021: *Introduction to Poetry*, and ENGL 024: *Introduction to the Short Story* classes before the formal readings in the lecture series; these class visits will require additional funding (see below).
- Humanities Guest Lecture Series — We plan to continue presenting the SCC staff-funded Guest Lecture Series, free to the SCC community and the community at large. Faculty are exploring ways to enhance the connection between the college experience and life after college via readings and discussions related to topics in the Humanities. Growing the Humanities speaker series in this way, will require gathering support for the lecture series beyond faculty contributions. Faculty agree that we will need to pursue advertising and grants; this will include meeting with Ross Beck, SCC’s new Director of Public Relations, Marketing and Communication.
- Centers — Based on recommendations in the Educational Master Plan (EMP) and the Student Equity Plan (SEP), we are not serving populations at the Vacaville Center, the Vallejo Center, and Travis Air Force Base as fully as we might. English needs to increase its course offerings at the sites in consultation with faculty on scheduling.
- New Hires — English needs to hire full-time faculty beyond retirement replacements to serve the growing needs of the college in basic skills work.
- Retention — In order to improve our enrollment, retention, and success rate for ENGL 002 and ENGL 004, English needs to offer more support for the students having difficulty with the transition between ENGL 001 and these courses. Supplemental instruction through BSI, peer tutoring, and a drop-in lab center as described above could meet this need.

Program Review Data for 2007-08  
 ENGLISH (General)  
 TOPs: 1501.00+0607.00

Humanities  
 Division 16

		03-04	04-05	05-06	06-07	07-08
FTES GENERATED	Summer	58.14	62.59	64.06	57.61	60.62
	Fall	303.88	310.76	300.60	296.25	322.92
	Spring	292.55	290.58	285.70	288.40	298.43
	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>654.57</b>	<b>663.93</b>	<b>650.36</b>	<b>642.26</b>	<b>681.97</b>
Growth/Decline [(Yr2-Yr1)/Yr1]		5%	1%	-2%	-1%	6%
LOAD (WSCH/FTE)	Summer	429	378	374	351	326
	Growth/Decline	-9%	-12%	-1%	-6%	-7%
	Fall	401	373	362	345	374
	Spring	386	373	347	339	347
<b>AVERAGE, Fall &amp; Spring</b>		<b>394</b>	<b>373</b>	<b>355</b>	<b>342</b>	<b>361</b>
Growth/Decline [(Yr2-Yr1)/Yr1]		6%	-5%	-5%	-4%	5%
ENROLLMENT	Summer	613	659	678	632	660
	Fall	3460	3417	3316	3247	3492
	Spring	3244	3171	3169	3144	3261
	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>7317</b>	<b>7247</b>	<b>7163</b>	<b>7023</b>	<b>7413</b>
Growth/Decline [(Yr2-Yr1)/Yr1]		6%	-1%	-1%	-2%	6%
NUMBER OF SECTIONS	Summer	25	31	34	32	33
	Fall	109	118	124	130	122
	Spring	106	110	126	129	119
	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>240</b>	<b>259</b>	<b>284</b>	<b>291</b>	<b>274</b>
Growth/Decline [(Yr2-Yr1)/Yr1]		2%	8%	10%	2%	-6%
FTEF	Summer	4.067	4.967	5.133	4.922	5.578
	Fall	22.733	25.011	24.911	25.789	25.933
	Spring	22.711	23.356	24.722	25.544	25.789
PERCENT FILL (1st cen/max enroll)	Summer	90%	83%	79%	72%	79%
	Fall	97%	93%	91%	85%	90%
	Spring	96%	90%	86%	77%	88%
	<b>AVERAGE, Fall &amp; Spring</b>	<b>97%</b>	<b>92%</b>	<b>89%</b>	<b>81%</b>	<b>89%</b>
PERCENT RETENTION (EOS/1st cen)	Summer	77%	81%	78%	80%	84%
	Fall	78%	78%	78%	78%	79%
	Spring	75%	72%	71%	84%	77%
	<b>AVERAGE, Fall &amp; Spring</b>	<b>77%</b>	<b>75%</b>	<b>75%</b>	<b>81%</b>	<b>78%</b>
APPORTIONMENT INCOME (FTES * Annual Factor)		\$2,287,722	\$2,313,132	\$2,745,820	\$2,804,749	\$2,978,163
EXPENSE	Salaries	\$1,627,125	\$1,893,205	\$2,184,172	\$1,910,227	
	Materials	\$2,668	\$3,130	\$1,068	\$2,983	
	Capital Outlay	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	
	<b>Total Direct</b>	<b>\$1,629,793</b>	<b>\$1,896,335</b>	<b>\$2,185,241</b>	<b>\$1,913,210</b>	<b>\$0</b>
	Indirect (Direct * .40)	\$651,917	\$758,534	\$874,096	\$765,284	\$0
	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$2,281,710</b>	<b>\$2,654,869</b>	<b>\$3,059,337</b>	<b>\$2,678,494</b>	<b>\$0</b>
ANNUAL COST/FTES		\$3,486	\$3,999	\$4,704	\$4,170	\$0
Growth/Decline [(Yr2-Yr1)/Yr1]		-8%	15%	18%	-11%	-100%

Prior to AY98-99 expense does not include capital outlay or VEA funds.

8/29/2008

Solano: Research and Planning

Program Review Data for 2007-08  
 ENGLISH (General)  
 TOPs: 1501.00+0607.00

Humanities  
 Division 16  
 Year: 2007-08

<u>Summer</u>		White, non-Hispanic	African- American	Hispanic	Filipino	Other, non-white	Total #
Grades *	A	42	10	9	12	16	89
	B	53	17	26	38	26	160
	C	18	20	15	24	17	94
	D	7	5	2	3	1	18
	F	15	12	11	5	10	53
	CR	27	20	14	15	28	104
	NC	1	6	6	4	8	25
	W	14	13	10	6	7	50
	TOTAL #	177	103	93	107	113	593
% Successful *		79%	65%	69%	83%	77%	75%
<u>Fall</u>		White, non-Hispanic	African- American	Hispanic	Filipino	Other, non-white	Total #
Grades *	A	169	31	50	49	61	360
	B	232	47	85	61	76	501
	C	114	47	56	68	41	326
	D	33	9	17	18	13	90
	F	80	28	34	18	36	196
	CR	312	165	199	131	164	971
	NC	87	71	51	36	35	280
	W	164	115	59	41	59	438
	TOTAL #	1191	513	551	422	485	3162
% Successful *		69%	57%	71%	73%	71%	68%
<u>Spring</u>		White, non-Hispanic	African- American	Hispanic	Filipino	Other, non-white	Total #
Grades *	A	183	24	65	44	62	378
	B	181	57	74	58	85	455
	C	110	49	66	50	52	327
	D	25	11	16	14	6	72
	F	72	39	31	24	25	191
	CR	228	178	150	108	124	788
	NC	89	108	68	52	30	347
	W	126	104	87	57	60	434
	TOTAL #	1014	570	557	407	444	2992
% Successful *		69%	54%	64%	64%	73%	65%

\*Includes duplicate counts.

8/29/2008

Solano: Research and Planning

Program Review Data for 2007-08  
 ENGLISH (General)  
 TOPs: 1501.00+0607.00

Humanities  
 Division 16  
 Year: 2007-08

<u>Summer</u>		<u>F</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>U</u>	<u>ESL</u>	<u>Non-ESL</u>	<u>U</u>
Grades *	A	52	37		6	83	
	B	99	61		9	151	
	C	48	46		5	89	
	D	11	7		1	17	
	F	29	24		2	51	
	CR	64	40		13	91	
	NC	11	14		6	19	
	W	23	27		1	49	
	TOTAL #	337	256	0	43	550	0
% Successful *		78%	72%	0%	77%	75%	0%

  

<u>Fall</u>		<u>F</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>U</u>	<u>ESL</u>	<u>Non-ESL</u>	<u>U</u>
Grades *	A	234	126		13	347	0
	B	305	196		23	478	0
	C	174	152		14	312	0
	D	39	51		2	88	0
	F	102	94		6	190	0
	CR	549	422		120	850	1
	NC	144	136		24	256	0
	W	241	197		16	422	0
	TOTAL #	1788	1374	0	218	2943	1
% Successful *		71%	65%	0%	78%	68%	100%

  

<u>Spring</u>		<u>F</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>U</u>	<u>ESL</u>	<u>Non-ESL</u>	<u>U</u>
Grades *	A	230	148		14	364	
	B	270	185		26	429	
	C	159	168		19	308	
	D	38	34		4	68	
	F	92	99		5	186	
	CR	435	353		98	690	
	NC	188	159		42	305	
	W	251	183		32	402	
	TOTAL #	1663	1329	0	240	2752	0
% Successful *		66%	64%	0%	65%	65%	0%

\*Includes duplicate counts.

8/29/2008

Solano: Research and Planning

## ESL Department

### Part I Goals/Objectives

#### 1. What are the goals/objectives of the program? (State in terms of student learning outcomes — SLOs.)

- The primary goal of this program is to provide active, ongoing practice in all skills needed to reach proficiency in speaking, reading, writing, understanding, and thinking in American English so that non-native English speakers may succeed in both the College and the community. For example, our program works to prepare these non-native speakers to transition to the English reading and composition course sequence at Solano.

#### **Successful completion of this program enables students to:**

- Determine the next step to pursue mainstream programs and use student support services such as Counseling, Financial Aid, and Job Placement, while continuing to build on their fluency and accuracy in standard spoken and written English.
- Develop more cultural awareness than they otherwise could have, so that they can choose the appropriate language for specific situations, reducing misunderstanding.
- Increase their confidence in their ability to participate more effectively in their community.

#### 2. List appropriate indicators of program success (i.e., measures of goals/objectives stated above). Include both quantitative and qualitative measures.

##### *Quantitative:*

- Retention rates: 85%-90% 2006-08 (see Part II. 1.)
- Class fill: approximately 50% 2005-08 (see Part II. 1.)
- Number of students taking the Composition Mastery Exam (CME)
- Number of students enrolling in non-ESL classes across the curriculum

##### *Qualitative:*

- Students recommending our courses to friends and family
- Students' anecdotal reports of improved success in the workplace and in other classes

## Part II Analysis

### 1. Identify and explain the trends in:

**Enrollment** — Our program showed steady growth from 2003-04 through 2006-07, but enrollments declined in 2007-08. Perhaps these students, who are often on the edge of the economy and the culture, are harbingers of the economic downturn, foregoing education for more work hours. Aside from this decline, our enrollments show overall stability, no small accomplishment as this at-risk population is generally under-prepared for college-level work due to the complex nature of the language-learning process.

**Retention** — Over the past three years, our retention has consistently been 85% or higher. We attribute this high retention to the fact that when ESL students are correctly placed in ESL classes, they stay because they feel they are accomplishing their goals and need what we offer. Both ESL full-time faculty members offer extensive counseling for ESL students as this is a difficult area for counselors, with whom we work as closely as possible in ESL orientations.

**Fill rate** — With the exception of spring 2008, fill rate has hovered around 50% for the past three years. This may be due to the fact that ESL classes are not required; we are researching the possibility that many ESL students enroll in the regular English course sequence, skipping ESL in hopes of progressing more quickly. In addition, our ESL program offers an open sequence, meaning that students can progress to the next level without completing the full sequence, even if they may need to. Finally, ESL courses currently cap at 30 students compared to 25 in other developmental courses; thus, the same number of students per section equals a lower fill rate.

#### **Other Factors** —

1. The line between ESL courses and the English course sequence leading to ENGL 001 (ENGL 305, 350, 355, 370) has become blurred. Incoming Solano students who opt to take the English rather than the ESL assessment may place into ENGL 350 based on reading skills alone, while their writing may reveal significant gaps in their knowledge of English grammar and vocabulary. ESL students who take the Composition Mastery Exam after only one semester in ESL 006: *ESL Composition Skills*, or even a mid-level ESL course (ESL 077: *Conversation/Pronunciation Skills*, ESL 078: *Intermediate ESL Reading*, ESL 079: *Intermediate Sentence Structure: Spoken English*) can pass into the English sequence with a low score of 4, and they often do. We feel this discourages many students from trying or continuing in ESL courses in which they might receive instruction more relevant to their needs.
2. Our colleagues in the English Department can inherit our students too soon because of the fuzzy line between ESL and English courses; the students who cross that line too soon often become the ones who negatively impact the retention and fill rates of English classes. We are

working to better inform the English faculty about the content of our courses so that they may funnel ESL-needy students in their classes to more appropriate ESL classes. For example in fall 2008, we are offering an ESL-only ENGL 350 class, which, in addition to reading and writing instruction, can better focus on the vocabulary and grammar needs of English-language learners.

3. Each individual ESL student comes to the learning of English with a different set of learning tools from every other student. There is so much variation among levels of proficiency and previous educational experiences in any one ESL classroom that we **must** individualize as much as possible for the benefit of the student.

**Qualitative Factors** — We have recently created a survey and are in the process of administering it to all of our students to identify the qualitative factors that influence students' decisions to enroll in our courses. These include students' personal, professional and educational goals, as well as course times and locations. We are also trying to understand how students find out about our program; anecdotally, we are led to believe from current students that it is often by word of mouth. Once we have this information, we will work with the campus Director of Public Relations, Marketing and Communication to design and promote course offerings tailored to these needs.

## **2. How do the above trends relate to the program goals identified during the last review?**

If the primary goal is to provide active student involvement in improving all skills so that the student can succeed in mastering English within our College and community, then the above trends show that this is happening regardless of fluctuations in enrollment and percent of fill. Our retention is good because students enjoy the challenges of learning in our College environment.

## **Part III Conclusions and Recommendations**

### **1. What are the major accomplishments of the program during the past two years?**

- The course recommendation and advisement process and form continue to inform students how best to progress through the institution. Counselors are grateful for this assistance.
- In spring 2008, we piloted a process for flagging CME papers in which non-passing scores resulted, in part, from the presence of ESL errors. We plan to continue to refine and implement this practice in order to collect data about the presence and progress of ESL students in our developmental reading and composition courses.
- The Curriculum Committee has recently approved the first in a sequence of courses for health occupations professionals, to address the needs of the many foreign-born, ESL-needy health professionals in our community.

- We are meeting with faculty in other divisions to discuss developing ESL curriculum for specific target populations, such as Early Childhood Education.
- We have begun collaborating with the Basic Skills Initiative group, looking at ways to better dovetail the ESL sequence with the English composition sequence. As part of that, we are offering a stand-alone ENGL 350 class for ESL students, and developing curriculum for an advanced grammar and editing class.

**2. Based on the trend analysis above, are there any changes needed in order to meet program goals or to improve program effectiveness? Explain.**

- We believe strongly in the effectiveness of our existing program, and are seeking ways to improve community awareness of our offerings in order to improve fill rates. Our spring 2008 meeting with Solano's new Director of Public Relations, Marketing and Communication, Ross Beck, gave direction to our outreach efforts and we will soon survey our current student population to gain insight into any trends in their needs and goals. These results should guide our future planning in a range of ways, from when to schedule our courses to make them most accessible, to how to market our program in ways that will speak to potential students' goals.
- For our goal of growing the program to succeed, though, we will need additional resources, especially new part-time faculty. Currently, we cannot even offer one section each of every course in our program at any given time due to short staffing. This, in turn, inconveniences students trying to move through the program and also causes them to advance prematurely between levels if the higher class is at the better time.
- We will also require administrative patience with trial offerings, such that new courses or sections offered at new times or in new locations are kept open at least through the first week and/or are allowed to run with small numbers. So far, we have had little success with evening offerings at the Vacaville and Vallejo centers, but we know the target populations are there. Allowing under-enrolled sections to run at these locations may hurt our fill rate statistics in the short term, but may nevertheless be the best way to generate word-of-mouth advertising to bring in more students. Cancelling sections semester after semester has just the opposite effect.
- Finally, as described above, we have begun considering ways in which we might develop new curriculum to appeal to ESL-needy students enrolled in other campus programs. These efforts include the aforementioned course for health care professionals (to debut in spring 2009), the possibility of a course for Early Childhood Education majors, and the new section of ENGL 350 specifically for ESL students. We believe these courses will entice students who have otherwise eschewed the ESL program, as they will see such courses as directly related to their more immediate collegiate and career goals. Of course, these offerings will only be possible with additional staffing.

Program Review Data for 2007-08  
 ENGLISH AS A SECOND LANGUAGE  
 TOPs: 4930.81+4930.82

Humanities  
 Division 16

		03-04	04-05	05-06	06-07	07-08
FTES GENERATED	Summer	1.07	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
	Fall	19.27	18.55	21.10	23.76	16.54
	Spring	14.39	15.84	18.21	18.95	16.55
	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>34.73</b>	<b>34.39</b>	<b>39.31</b>	<b>42.71</b>	<b>33.09</b>
<b>Growth/Decline [(Yr2-Yr1)/Yr1]</b>		<b>-15%</b>	<b>-1%</b>	<b>14%</b>	<b>9%</b>	<b>-23%</b>
LOAD (WSCH/FTE)	Summer	161	0	0	0	0
	<b>Growth/Decline</b>	<b>-53%</b>	<b>-100%</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>N/A</b>
	Fall	280	288	306	300	228
	Spring	216	238	270	278	243
<b>AVERAGE, Fall &amp; Spring</b>		<b>248</b>	<b>263</b>	<b>288</b>	<b>289</b>	<b>236</b>
<b>Growth/Decline [(Yr2-Yr1)/Yr1]</b>		<b>-5%</b>	<b>6%</b>	<b>10%</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>-19%</b>
ENROLLMENT	Summer	22	0	0	0	0
	Fall	201	211	238	241	194
	Spring	164	185	198	211	166
	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>387</b>	<b>396</b>	<b>436</b>	<b>452</b>	<b>360</b>
<b>Growth/Decline [(Yr2-Yr1)/Yr1]</b>		<b>-19%</b>	<b>2%</b>	<b>10%</b>	<b>4%</b>	<b>-20%</b>
NUMBER OF SECTIONS	Summer	1	0	0	0	0
	Fall	15	14	13	15	13
	Spring	14	14	14	16	15
	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>28</b>
<b>Growth/Decline [(Yr2-Yr1)/Yr1]</b>		<b>7%</b>	<b>-7%</b>	<b>-4%</b>	<b>15%</b>	<b>-10%</b>
FTEF	Summer	0.200	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
	Fall	2.067	1.933	2.067	2.378	2.178
	Spring	2.000	2.000	2.022	2.044	2.044
PERCENT FILL * (1st cen/max enroll)	Summer				0%	0%
	Fall	42%	46%	55%	53%	51%
	Spring	36%	39%	44%	47%	38%
	<b>AVERAGE, Fall &amp; Spring</b>	<b>39%</b>	<b>43%</b>	<b>50%</b>	<b>50%</b>	<b>45%</b>
PERCENT RETENTION ** (EOS/1st cen)	Summer				0%	0%
	Fall	81%	81%	86%	86%	86%
	Spring	84%	82%	89%	94%	84%
	<b>AVERAGE, Fall &amp; Spring</b>	<b>83%</b>	<b>82%</b>	<b>88%</b>	<b>90%</b>	<b>85%</b>
APPORTIONMENT INCOME (FTES * Annual Factor)		\$121,381	\$119,815	\$165,967	\$186,515	\$144,504
EXPENSE	Salaries	\$141,614	\$101,965	\$0	\$0	
	Materials	\$0	\$76	\$0	\$0	
	Capital Outlay	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	
	<b>Total Direct</b>	<b>\$141,614</b>	<b>\$102,041</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>
	Indirect (Direct * .40)	\$56,646	\$40,816	\$0	\$0	\$0
	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$198,260</b>	<b>\$142,857</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>
ANNUAL COST/FTES		\$5,709	\$4,154	\$0	\$0	\$0
<b>Growth/Decline [(Yr2-Yr1)/Yr1]</b>		<b>-1%</b>	<b>-27%</b>	<b>-100%</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>N/A</b>

Prior to AY98-99 expense does not include capital outlay or VEA funds.

\* Percent fill based solely on open entry/open exit courses reported at 0%.

\*\* Percent retention based solely on open entry/open exit courses reported at 0%.

8/29/2008

Solano: Research and Planning

Program Review Data for 2007-08  
 ENGLISH AS A SECOND LANGUAGE  
 TOPs: 4930.81+4930.82

Humanities  
 Division 16  
 Year: 2007-08

<u>Summer</u>		White, non-Hispanic	African- American	Hispanic	Filipino	Other, non-white	Total #
Grades *	A	0	0	0	0	0	0
	B	0	0	0	0	0	0
	C	0	0	0	0	0	0
	D	0	0	0	0	0	0
	F	0	0	0	0	0	0
	CR	0	0	0	0	0	0
	NC	0	0	0	0	0	0
	W	0	0	0	0	0	0
	TOTAL #	0	0	0	0	0	0
% Successful *		0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
<u>Fall</u>		White, non-Hispanic	African- American	Hispanic	Filipino	Other, non-white	Total #
Grades *	A	2	0	9	2	12	25
	B	0	2	20	3	8	33
	C	0	0	12	3	3	18
	D	0	0	0	0	4	4
	F	0	0	6	0	2	8
	CR	3	2	22	6	15	48
	NC	2	0	13	0	9	24
	W	0	2	6	0	5	13
	TOTAL #	7	6	88	14	58	173
% Successful *		71%	67%	72%	100%	66%	72%
<u>Spring</u>		White, non-Hispanic	African- American	Hispanic	Filipino	Other, non-white	Total #
Grades *	A	3	0	12	0	14	29
	B	0	2	17	0	5	24
	C	0	1	11	1	6	19
	D	0	0	3	0	2	5
	F	0	2	5	0	5	12
	CR	6	3	18	0	6	33
	NC	1	2	9	1	3	16
	W	1	1	10	0	4	16
	TOTAL #	11	11	85	2	45	154
% Successful *		82%	55%	68%	50%	69%	68%

\*Includes duplicate counts.

8/29/2008

Solano: Research and Planning

Program Review Data for 2007-08  
 ENGLISH AS A SECOND LANGUAGE  
 TOPs: 4930.81+4930.82

Humanities  
 Division 16  
 Year: 2007-08

<u>Summer</u>		<u>F</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>U</u>	<u>ESL</u>	<u>Non-ESL</u>	<u>U</u>
Grades *	A	0	0		0	0	
	B	0	0		0	0	
	C	0	0		0	0	
	D	0	0		0	0	
	F	0	0		0	0	
	CR	0	0		0	0	
	NC	0	0		0	0	
	W	0	0		0	0	
	TOTAL #	0	0	0	0	0	0
% Successful *		0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

  

<u>Fall</u>		<u>F</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>U</u>	<u>ESL</u>	<u>Non-ESL</u>	<u>U</u>
Grades *	A	21	4		25	0	
	B	25	8		33	0	
	C	11	7		17	1	
	D	2	2		4	0	
	F	6	2		8	0	
	CR	41	7		43	5	
	NC	16	8		22	2	
	W	7	6		9	4	
	TOTAL #	129	44	0	161	12	0
% Successful *		76%	59%	0%	73%	50%	0%

  

<u>Spring</u>		<u>F</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>U</u>	<u>ESL</u>	<u>Non-ESL</u>	<u>U</u>
Grades *	A	23	6		27	2	
	B	21	3		23	1	
	C	16	3		19	0	
	D	4	1		5	0	
	F	8	4		12	0	
	CR	20	13		23	10	
	NC	10	6		12	4	
	W	9	7		14	2	
	TOTAL #	111	43	0	135	19	0
% Successful *		72%	58%	0%	68%	68%	0%

\*Includes duplicate counts.

8/29/2008

Solano: Research and Planning

Program Name: Foreign Language  
TOP Code: 1101.00  
Prepared by: Faculty listed  
below:  
Faculty: Margaret Abel-Quintero,  
Isaías Jacobo,  
Gail Kropp,  
Jeffrey Lamb,  
Lorna Marlow-Muñoz,  
Laura Pirott

## Foreign Language Department

### Part I Goals/Objectives

#### 1. What are the goals/objectives of the program? (State in terms of student learning outcomes — SLOs.)

**Successful completion of this program enables a student to:**

- Gain knowledge and awareness of other cultures by comparison and contrast of American and French, Spanish, or German language, customs, societies, institutions, etc.
- Complete high-school foreign language requirements necessary for transfer to a four-year institution.
- Fulfill a foreign language graduation requirement that exists at some four-year institutions.
- Become life-long learners of foreign languages and culture.
- Compete in an increasingly diverse global workforce.

#### 2. List appropriate indicators of program success (i.e., measures of goals/objectives stated above). Include both quantitative and qualitative measures.

*Quantitative:*

- Our core retention figures range between 75% and 89%.

*Qualitative*

- Students develop communicative competence and language proficiency, that is, the ability to use language creatively and in culturally appropriate ways for authentic tasks in real-world settings, in accordance with the most recent ACTFL guidelines (American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages). This is accomplished by a faculty who maintain a general level of comparability among languages. Spanish teaches a relative content to that of German, and evaluates students' proficiency in five areas: listening, speaking, reading, writing, and culture. Students from all ages and backgrounds become more fluent in the target language and increase their understanding and appreciation of the new cultures to which

they are exposed. Informally, many students have verbally expressed to instructors their clear understanding of the value that this exposure affords: increased marketability in the workplace, acquisition of "soft skills" in cross-cultural communication that opens doors to management positions, health care services, and other professional arenas. Additionally, many students use their newfound proficiency in foreign languages and cultures to enhance their personal ties to friends and family. These cross-cultural and cross-discipline connections are gratifying outcomes that result from an important course-level SLOs for all foreign language courses—that of teaching and developing cultural competency so that students can better function in increasingly globalized environments. In the academic context, there is concrete proof of the success of the SCC's Foreign Language faculty's approach: consistent placement of SCC foreign language students in summer work programs abroad, increased student participation in prestigious full-year study abroad programs, as well as successful placement of SCC students in upper division foreign language courses upon transfer to four-year institutions.

- Our courses are carefully articulated with four-year institutions and have passed rigorous acceptance criteria. Our courses are regularly cited as exemplary by our evaluating transfer institutions. Feedback from student surveys and information sheets tell us that we are, indeed, allowing students to meet their entrance foreign-language requirements and also to fulfill their foreign language graduation requirement at four-year transfer institutions. Similarly, feedback from transfer institutions and work/study abroad programs consistently praise the preparation of Solano College foreign language students.
- The quality of our graduates is very high. Consistently positive feedback from our transfer institutions, the SCC Counseling Department, current students and graduates of our program is a clear indication of the quality and success of our Foreign Language Department, as a whole. Mary Cueva, Nellie Bailey, Elly Sturm, and John Psathas are just a few of our former students who are now teaching or have taught foreign languages at Solano County schools and colleges. After participating in the cross-age teaching program for French, SCC student Shawna Pogue now teaches French in an elementary school in Davis. SCC graduates Monica Burgos (French) and Saida Reyes (French/ German) received scholarships from the French government to teach English in France for a year (2006-07). Saida Reyes now works for the French company *Saint Gobain* in Fairfield. SCC French graduate Precious Brown has just (fall 2008) been accepted to Paris III- La Sorbonne Nouvelle to complete her master's degree in cinematography. MESA student Christina Garza-Feramisco, who majored in Spanish and Biological Sciences, won a full scholarship to UC Berkeley and has now become a medical doctor. SCC German major Sarah Rogers transferred to UC Davis in fall 2002 and was selected for the prestigious Carl Duisberg Society-American Association of Teachers of German-

Goethe Institut sponsored Work Immersion Study Program in Germany during the summer of 2002. Both Ms. Rogers and Ms. Reyes, who completed a double major in French and German at UC Berkeley, studied at the Georg-August Universität in Göttingen, Germany, under the auspices of the UC Education Abroad Program in 2003. In fall semester 2007, Brenna Daugherty (SCC 2006-07) transferred to UC Davis as a German major and is currently studying in Göttingen, the tenth SCC German major transfer student to do so.

## Part II Analysis

French—Lorna Marlow-Muñoz

### 1. Identify and explain the trends in:

**Enrollment** — Enrollment decreased from 174 to 127 students from 2004-05 to 2007-08 partly due to leave of absence by adjunct faculty. Even though enrollment has dropped, retention has improved.

**Retention** — Retention increased from 80% to 89%. French classes have the highest percentage of retention in the Humanities Division.

**Fill rate** — Our percent fill decreased from 70% to 65%. The decline is due to offering higher level classes, which typically fill at a lower rate.

**Other Factors** — FTES surged by 200 % in 2004-05 due to the full restoration of the French program. Then, the numbers tapered off. In 2007-08, we had a slight decrease 20% in FTES due to leave of absence of our adjunct faculty member.

**Qualitative Factors** — We are proud of the excellence of the Foreign Language Department as the end product clearly demonstrates. The accomplishments and/or achievements of so many of our former students speak well for the quality of the program, as a whole. Our connections at Sacramento State College and UC Davis have told us that our students are doing very well. In fact, many of our students have distinguished themselves not only at other institutions, but also in the workplace. (See Part I).

### 2. How do the above trends relate to the program goals identified during the last review?

Subprogram Name French:

**Growth trend** — The enrollment did decrease slightly from 152 to 127 due to leave of absence of adjunct faculty. Full-time French instructor, Lorna Marlow-Munoz, continues to teach overloads in order to offer appropriate sections for her continuing students.

**Percent fill** — Decreased by 8% in 2006-07 and then increased by 9 % in 2007-08.

**Retention** — Increased 9% because of the quality of instruction.

### **Other factors —**

- The French Department is pleased that the ethnic diversity of our College is reflected to a good degree in French classes. French classes usually have between 1/3 to 1/2 of the student population represented by African-American, Latino, Filipino and Asian students. We are able to work closely with the Tutoring Center, so that students who might have learning difficulties can be successful in French classes.
- The French Club continues to provide a number of interesting activities for its members and for the campus at large (e.g., plays, films, guest speakers, fund-raisers, dinners in a French restaurant). French students and members of the community have the opportunity to participate in a monthly French-conversation hour on campus or at a local café. A monthly calendar of events is created by the Club officers and distributed to all interested people. Attendance and participation in Francophone cultural activities is an integral part of the French program at SCC.
- The French instructor has led four groups of students abroad for French language study in France (summers of 2001, 2003, 2005, 2008). In 2008, eleven students participated in the two-week trip, nine SCC students and two SCC alumni attending S.F state and Mills College. Students were immersed in French twenty-four hours a day. Students stayed with French families and visited Paris, Mont Saint-Michel, and Chartres. All of the activities were organized by the French instructor, Lorna Marlow-Munoz, which allowed the students the opportunity to travel to France for two weeks at the low cost of \$2,500. Numerous students who participated in the two-week program were then selected by the UC/CSU Education Abroad Programs to spend a year abroad: Patty Gudino (San Francisco State), Precious Brown ( UC Berkeley), Shawna Pogue( CSU Sacramento), Maria Arauco, (UC Davis).
- The French instructor continues to collaborate with high school teachers to stage a yearly French Immersion Day hosted at SCC. The Immersion Day is in its sixth year and has an average of a hundred students in attendance from local high schools. The day is full of communicative activities, song, food and dance.

### **German**

NOTE: During the period under review, 2004-08, the sole faculty member in German, Gail Kropp, was on 40% reassigned time while serving as SCC Academic Senate President. Currently, she is on sabbatical leave, investigating the pedagogical suitability of emerging technologies for the foreign language classroom. Ms. Kropp looks forward to returning to the German program full time in spring 2009.

#### **1. Identify and explain the trends in:**

**Enrollment** — Enrollment increased consistently from 2003-04 to 2006-07, from 61 to 83, but dropped sharply (to 56) in 2007-08. The 2007-08 decrease is

attributable in large part to a decision made jointly by Dean Rosengren and Professor Kropp to resume offering German classes in the evening, which had not been done since spring 2003. The evening section of GRMN 031: *First Semester German Part 1*, in fall 2007 had modest enrollment, but it was not sufficient to sustain the spring 2008 section of GRMN 032: *First Semester German Part 2*, which was cancelled for low enrollment. As a result, in spring 2008 the Department offered a single section of GRMN 002: *Second Semester German*, and a one-student section of GRMN 049: *German Honors*. By contrast, in the three preceding years, which showed steady enrollment growth, the Department offered a section of GRMN 001: *First Semester German* or GRMN 031 both fall and spring semesters.

**Retention** — Retention remained consistent, 84% in 2003-04 and 85% in 2007-08, varying between 76% and 83% in the intervening years.

**Fill rate** — Percent of fill is strongest in 2005-06 and 2006-07, 85% and 70% respectively, but dropped to 43% in 2007-08. In the two years showing strong percent of fill, the Department offered introductory courses (GRMN 001 or 031) both fall and spring, while in 2007-08 a single section of GRMN 001 was offered fall semester. This scheduling choice for 2007-08 was linked to our decision to resume offering evening classes after a four-year hiatus.

**Other factors** — FTES and load show a sustained, three-year increase from 2003-04 to 2006-07 but decreased sharply in 2007-08. The upward trend in FTES from 9.22 to 13.70 represents a 50% increase; likewise, the upward trend in load from 302 to 386 represents a 28% increase. The abrupt decreases in FTES and in load in 2007-08 are consistent with the trends in enrollment and percent fill discussed above and, like these factors, were adversely impacted by our scheduling of only one introductory level course over the entire academic year. The figures for expense and annual cost/FTES show a 43% decrease in expense and 62% decrease in annual cost/FTES from 2003-04 to 2006-07, the most recent year for which these figures are available.

**Qualitative factors** —

- While her duties as Academic Senate President have precluded Ms. Kropp from serving as German Club advisor over the last four years, she has continued to provide cultural enrichment for SCC German students beyond the classroom, facilitating students' attendance at plays, films (e.g., annual *Berlin and Beyond Festival* in San Francisco), concerts, museum exhibits, lectures as well as organizing class meals for her students each semester. Attendance and participation in cultural activities related to the German-speaking world is an integral part of the German program at SCC.
- Evidence of the determination of the Department to ensure the quality and efficiency of the German program is the range of courses in German and in the Humanities Division taught by Ms. Kropp: GRMN 001: *First Semester German*, GRMN 002: *Second Semester German*, GRMN 003: *Third Semester German*, GRMN 004: *Fourth Semester German*,

GRMN 011: *Conversational German*, GRMN 012: *Intermediate German Conversation*, GRMN 049: *German Honors*, GRMN 031: *First Semester German Part 1*, GRMN 032: *First Semester German Part 2*, GRMN 033: *Second Semester German Part 1*, and GRMN 034: *Second Semester German Part 2*; ENGL 310: *Writing Skills Lab*, ENGL 001: *College Composition*, ENGL 002: *Critical Thinking and Writing About Literature*; HUMN 001: *What It Means To Be Human*. Over the last four years, Ms. Kropp has taught 12 of the 15 courses listed above. Moreover, she interviews, counsels, and, as appropriate, administers exams to students who wish to obtain transfer credit in German via credit-by-examination. During academic year 2007-08, she assisted three students (Adrian Johnson, Katja Minetenko, and Ryan Swann) in this capacity. In addition, in spring 2008 she honored a late request by Disability Services Program (DSP) to help a special needs student earn his AA in German by creating and teaching a special section of GRMN 049, which allowed him to fulfill his last required course in the major.

- Ms. Kropp continues to mentor and assist SCC German graduates after they have left Solano, providing career advice, helping them to arrange internships and seek employment with German companies, and writing letters of recommendation for scholarships, fellowships, and graduate and professional school. A recent example includes counseling and letters of recommendation for Brenna Daugherty (2007) who transferred as a German major to UCD in 2007 and is currently studying in Göttingen, Germany.
- In 2007, the UC Davis German Department, the primary transfer goal of SCC German students, was ranked fifth in the nation by the *Chronicle of Higher Education*.

## 2. How do the above trends relate to the program goals identified during the last review?

**Growth trend** — In three of the four years under review, enrollment increased steadily and significantly, 36% from 2003-04 to 2006-07; however, it decreased abruptly in 2007-08 (by 33%, returning to 2003-04 levels) due to unanticipated weakness in evening enrollments and scheduling of only one introductory-level course over the entire academic year.

**Percent fill** — Increased steadily and significantly, 14% from 2003-04 to 2006-07, three of the four years under review, reaching a high of 85% in 2005-06, but dropped sharply in 2007-08 (to 43%) due to unanticipated weakness in evening enrollments and scheduling of only one introductory-level course over the entire academic year.

**Retention** — Retention has remained consistently high in German, currently 85%.

## Spanish

### 1. Identify and explain the trends in:

**Enrollment** — Enrollment decreased from 1,377 to 1,170 students from 2004-05 to 2007-08.

**Retention** — Retention increased 2% from 77% to 79%.

**Fill rate** — Percent fill decreased from 79% to 73%.

**Other factors** — The Spanish program is on the path to “recovery” from the 9% decrease (182) between 2003-04 and 2004-05 and is now at -4% in 2007-08 (151) in FTES.

**Qualitative factors** — For the first time in recent memory, the Spanish language program is seeing a dip in its numbers. There are many possible anecdotal reasons why this might happen: shifts in the economy, statewide low enrollment, five day-a-week scheduling, gas prices, or even the resurgence of our own French and German language programs in addition to a growth in Italian and the addition of Japanese language offerings. For these reasons, the Foreign Language Department decided to take actions to remedy this issue, actions that are in the process of bearing fruit. Specifically, we requested a campus-specific persistence and retention survey that Rob Simas, Director, Research & Planning, completed. This data helped us better understand enrollment patterns; we created an entrance/exit survey as an informational and marketing tool for our courses; we resurrected the Spanish Club and created a new course SPAN 048A: *Spanish Cinema for Conversation*. In order to facilitate the transition between one language level and the next, our colleague in Spanish, Dr. Margaret Abel-Quintero, conducted an informal study, analyzing national trends, to devise a new distribution of content and pacing to improve retention and persistence. Her study led us to rethink the numbers of chapters and content students complete in each semester. Additionally, our colleague in German has received a sabbatical to explore the viability of online courses in foreign languages. The results of her findings will allow us to make decisions about our online/hybrid offerings. We are hopeful that these changes will improve our numbers in Spanish by increasing student success. While we have not yet seen an immediate significant growth in FTES, we have slowed the tide. As is well known, it is easy for students to walk away from the campus, but very hard to get them back. One very positive result of these challenges is that the foreign language faculty now regularly meet and have found that this has created a better sense of connection, dialogue, and idea sharing.

### 2. How do the above trends relate to the program goals identified during the last review?

**Growth Trend** — Enrollment is currently flat at 0%, yet has been on a steady increase from our negative growth numbers in 2004-05. As the program review

data clears indicates, we were at -13% in 2004-05, then -8% in 2005-06, -7% in 2006-07 and now at 0% in 2007-08.

**Percent fill** — Overall we are down 6%, starting in 2004-05 at 79% then at 75% from 2005-07 and now at 73% in 2007-08.

**Retention** — Retention remained good. It fluctuated slightly (2004-05 at 77%, 2005-06 at 76%, 2006-07 at 84%, and 2007-08 at 79%), but overall increased 2% over the three year period.

## **Foreign Language — Other**

### **1. Identify and explain the trends in:**

**Enrollment** — In 2004-05, enrollment in our Conversational Japanese, Italian, Portuguese and Latin courses was down 3% from the previous year with 177 students. Then we experienced a slight increase to 180 in 2005-06. In 2006-07, there was a surge in our number of students by 53% to 276. In 2007-08, although the numbers normalized by 27%, dropping to 202, this still represents an increase over the yearly average from 2004-06.

**Retention** — There was a 4% increase in retention to from 75% in 2004-05 to 79% in 2007-08.

**Fill Rate** — Percent fill has seen a decrease from 80% down to 59%.

**Qualitative Factors** — Our Dean, who manages the adjunct faculty who teach the less-commonly-taught languages, mentioned that these languages are more often than not taken for personal growth, and as such, their numbers can fluctuate greatly. The stark contrasts of the percentages can be attributed to the overall low number of students enrolled in these classes. When classes are offered in other languages, even though they are not full programs, they fill well. Dips and rises are primarily due to the availability of instructors to teach them. In this way, for example, when our Portuguese instructor declined to teach a few semesters ago, the percentage of students served drops significantly. Furthermore, Tagalog had to be suspended because we could not find an instructor who spoke Tagalog that fit the minimum qualifications.

### **2. How do the above trends relate to the program goals identified during the last review?**

**Growth trend** — Went from 177 in 2004-05 to 202 in 2007-08.

**Percent fill** — Went down from 80% to 59%.

**Retention** — Remained good. It was 75% in 2004-05 to 79% in 2007-08.

## Part III Conclusions and Recommendations

### 1. What are the major accomplishments of the program during the past two years?

- Replaced one retirement position.
- Created a new course (SPAN 048A) in conversation on Spanish cinema that was fully enrolled and quite popular. Several students asked if they could repeat it. It was not filled this semester because of a scheduling error that had it listed as 6:30 a.m. instead of 6:30 p.m. This course not only brought in adult learners from the community, but also students who had fulfilled the entire sequence of grammar classes and were looking for a way to complete an AA degree in Spanish, as well. It made us cognizant of the fact that students need more courses after SPAN 004: *Fourth Semester Spanish*, to expand on their Spanish skills. Also, we are looking into creating other offerings of a similar nature or to see if this course could be offered in a two-semester sequence.
- The Spanish Department agreed to realign the sequencing of material and content of first-year courses and to shift to teaching our third semester to devote more to the cultural aspect of language (an SLO recently identified as a priority) and to address the very real need to get students in SPAN 003: *Third Semester Spanish* through the full sequence of tenses that were not presented in the traditional second-year texts until what would be SPAN 004. This move, we are hoping, will enable students to acquire the skills and confidence to continue on to SPAN 004, where they will reinforce the full range of grammatical concepts rather than continue the grammatical fundamentals.
- Ongoing support for diverse foreign language offerings. In addition to its comprehensive programs in French, German and Spanish, the Department continues to offer conversational Italian, Portuguese, Japanese as well as Latin in our evening program.
- Resurrected our Spanish Club. Dr. Jeff Lamb is the advisor and the Club has been gaining momentum.
- As a way to create a connection with our local high school teachers, the Department hosted two academic partnerships in which we discussed best practices in foreign language instruction.
- The number and frequency of the events sponsored by the Student Organization for Latinos (SOL) has varied; however, last semester the students and the Club's advisor, Isaías Jacobo, worked with the Ethnic Studies Program to coordinate a Cinco de Mayo celebration.
- We have had the ongoing ability to attract the highest quality of adjunct faculty. Student, peer, and management evaluations all confirm resoundingly the professionalism, dedication, and commitment to excellence of our adjunct faculty. In turn, these faculty members express repeatedly their pleasure at teaching in this department, citing the unusual camaraderie, personal and professional support, and inclusiveness of our group.

- In an effort to meet department goals, foster dialogue and collegiality, the Foreign Language Department has been meeting formally on a semi-regular basis. We believe that these meetings, outside of Division meeting times, have helped the Department greatly.
- The Foreign Language Department is in compliance with all Student Learning Outcomes and Student Learning Outcome goals for the Humanities Division and the College.
- We are immensely proud of the success of the French Immersion Day that is organized and run by Lorna Marlow-Muñoz. Evaluations have consistently mentioned that this event is of great benefit to those who participate in it.
- Spanish is now offered not only at night, but also during the day at the Vallejo Center.
- The Department created and administered entrance/exit surveys to learn more about the needs of our students.
- Participated in training from McGraw Hill on QUIA the online workbook and lab manual for Puntos de Partida.
- Received funding for all foreign language full-time faculty and went to the Digistream Conference at CSU Monterey Bay to learn more about technology and foreign language instruction.
- French and German instructors Lorna Marlow-Muñoz and Gail Kropp continue the Cross-Age Tutoring program (now in its seventh year) in which SCC French and German students provide one-hour weekly instruction in French and German in local elementary school classrooms. Students are able to use their foreign language skills to bring language and cultural enrichment into Solano County elementary classrooms. This program has been received enthusiastically by students, parents, teachers, and administrators at Tolenas, B. Gale Wilson, and Holy Spirit elementary schools. The Accreditation Team praised the Cross-Age Teaching Program as an innovative program in their report. In May of 2006, The Cross-Age Program hosted its first foreign language performance for parents, siblings and community members where students from twelve classes sang in French or German, which was met with great enthusiasm.

**2. Based on the trend analysis above, are there any changes needed in order to meet program goals or to improve program effectiveness? Explain.**

- After discussing and implementing various Student Learning Outcomes and Learning Outcome Assessment tools, the Department has come to realize that it relies heavily on American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages (ACTFL) guidelines for gauging student's progress. To this end, we are in urgent need of Oral Proficiency Interview (OPI) training that will refine our skills in this area.

- Based on the success of the French Immersion Day, it is time to request funding for this event to expand what it does well. This might include the creation of a Foreign Language Immersion Day.
- Because the Educational Master Plan indicates a 17% growth in the Latino population, and because it is one of the stated goals of the Vice President of Student Services and the Director of Public Relations, Marketing and Communications that Solano recruit these students actively, we feel that we need to increase students' understanding of foreign language offerings at the College, especially our heritage speaker classes.
  - ◇ We need to do outreach to high schools.
  - ◇ We need to discuss a marketing plan with Ross Beck, Director of Public Relations, Marketing and Communication.
- We are presently meeting many of our program goals although we feel we can improve sequential retention. To this end we need to:
  - ◇ Encourage second-year participation in the program.
  - ◇ Continue to conduct student surveys to determine student preferences for times and days when the more advanced courses should be offered.
  - ◇ Work together to place the students at a higher initial placement whenever possible.
  - ◇ Maintain an ongoing communication with the Counseling Department to keep the counselors informed about changes in course requirements.
  - ◇ Make the counselors more aware of the value of foreign languages so that they can encourage students to enroll in more advanced courses once their basic requirement has been fulfilled.
  - ◇ Appoint a Foreign Language Department liaison with the Counseling Department to promote and encourage foreign language majors.
- We should discuss scheduling and class cancellation criteria with the Division Dean.
- We should communicate better with adjunct faculty.
- We would like to expand our foreign language offerings on our satellite campuses, including offering French at the Vallejo Center.
- Faculty will need ongoing training in technological application in the classroom.
  - ◇ Best practices wiki, Department webpage, eCompanions; Zoomerang; YackPack, SharedTalk.com
  - ◇ Faculty would like to consider creating a foreign language website through the MySolano application to keep students and the community informed of local community and college-wide events,

projects, and events organized by the foreign language clubs, foreign language electronic periodicals, and other resources, etc.

- Discuss more fully retention and persistence data.
- Formalize information gathering on students and their needs via surveys and other means.
- Foster a community of foreign language learning.
  - ◇ Foreign language performance day
  - ◇ Movie night
  - ◇ International festivals
- Create a plan for offering a Translation Certificate based on a community needs assessment.
- Faculty want to prioritize keeping track of majors and graduates by establishing a Faculty Liaison, who will be the contact person for foreign language majors, keep full-time and adjunct faculty apprised of cultural events and developments in foreign language courses, promote foreign languages to academic advisors so that they, in turn, can encourage students to continue taking foreign languages, and implement a survey tracking system, email lists (and other methods such as Facebook) to stay connected to students and obtain feedback from former students and alumni regarding course offerings and applicability/success of their acquired foreign language in their day-to-day lives.
- Our colleague in German, Gail Kropp, has received a sabbatical to evaluate the pedagogical suitability of emerging technologies for use in the foreign language classroom and to explore the viability of online courses in foreign languages. The results of her findings will allow us to make informed decisions about online/hybrid offerings.

Program Review Data for 2007-08  
**FRENCH**  
 TOPs: 1102.00

Humanities  
 Division 16

		03-04	04-05	05-06	06-07	07-08
<b>FTES GENERATED</b>	Summer	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
	Fall	1.53	12.65	11.83	10.21	10.31
	Spring	7.57	10.07	9.75	13.44	10.50
	<b>TOTAL</b>	9.10	22.72	21.58	23.65	20.81
<b>Growth/Decline [(Yr2-Yr1)/Yr1]</b>		-48%	150%	-5%	10%	-12%
<b>LOAD (WSCH/FTE)</b>	Summer	0	0	0	0	0
	<b>Growth/Decline</b>	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Fall	172	335	355	255	290
	Spring	378	348	274	288	263
<b>AVERAGE, Fall &amp; Spring</b>		275	342	315	272	277
<b>Growth/Decline [(Yr2-Yr1)/Yr1]</b>		1%	24%	-8%	-14%	2%
<b>ENROLLMENT</b>	Summer	0	0	0	0	0
	Fall	16	105	69	66	60
	Spring	74	69	70	86	67
	<b>TOTAL</b>	90	174	139	152	127
<b>Growth/Decline [(Yr2-Yr1)/Yr1]</b>		-43%	93%	-20%	9%	-16%
<b>NUMBER OF SECTIONS</b>	Summer	0	0	0	1	0
	Fall	2	5	4	4	4
	Spring	4	4	5	6	4
	<b>TOTAL</b>	6	9	9	11	8
<b>Growth/Decline [(Yr2-Yr1)/Yr1]</b>		-40%	50%	0%	22%	-27%
<b>FTEF</b>	Summer	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
	Fall	0.267	1.133	1.000	1.200	1.067
	Spring	0.600	0.867	1.067	1.400	1.200
<b>PERCENT FILL (1st cen/max enroll)</b>	Summer	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
	Fall	50%	70%	77%	55%	73%
	Spring	80%	70%	58%	57%	56%
	<b>AVERAGE, Fall &amp; Spring</b>	65%	70%	68%	56%	65%
<b>PERCENT RETENTION (EOS/1st cen)</b>	Summer	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
	Fall	88%	82%	90%	85%	88%
	Spring	86%	77%	79%	83%	90%
	<b>AVERAGE, Fall &amp; Spring</b>	87%	80%	85%	84%	89%
<b>APPORTIONMENT INCOME (FTES * Annual Factor)</b>		\$31,805	\$79,156	\$91,111	\$103,280	\$90,877
<b>EXPENSE</b>	Salaries	\$93,086	\$103,541	\$115,661	\$104,557	
	Materials	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	
	Capital Outlay	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	
	<b>Total Direct</b>	\$93,086	\$103,541	\$115,661	\$104,557	\$0
	Indirect (Direct * .40)	\$37,234	\$41,417	\$46,264	\$41,823	\$0
	<b>TOTAL</b>	\$130,320	\$144,958	\$161,925	\$146,379	\$0
<b>ANNUAL COST/FTES</b>		\$14,321	\$6,380	\$7,503	\$6,189	\$0
<b>Growth/Decline [(Yr2-Yr1)/Yr1]</b>		104%	-55%	18%	-18%	-100%

Prior to AY98-99 expense does not include capital outlay or VEA funds.

8/29/2008

Solano: Research and Planning

Program Review Data for 2007-08  
 FRENCH  
 TOPs: 1102.00

Humanities  
 Division 16  
 Year: 2007-08

<u>Summer</u>		White, non-Hispanic	African- American	Hispanic	Filipino	Other, non-white	Total #
Grades *	A	0	0	0	0	0	0
	B	0	0	0	0	0	0
	C	0	0	0	0	0	0
	D	0	0	0	0	0	0
	F	0	0	0	0	0	0
	CR	0	0	0	0	0	0
	NC	0	0	0	0	0	0
	W	0	0	0	0	0	0
	TOTAL #	0	0	0	0	0	0
% Successful *		0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
<u>Fall</u>		White, non-Hispanic	African- American	Hispanic	Filipino	Other, non-white	Total #
Grades *	A	7	1	4	2	5	19
	B	6	1	1	1	6	15
	C	4	2	1	0	2	9
	D	1	0	1	0		2
	F	1	1	0	0		2
	CR	1	0	0	0		1
	NC	0	0	0	0		0
	W	0	2	1	0	2	5
	TOTAL #	20	7	8	3	15	53
% Successful *		90%	57%	75%	100%	87%	83%
<u>Spring</u>		White, non-Hispanic	African- American	Hispanic	Filipino	Other, non-white	Total #
Grades *	A	8	1	8	3	4	24
	B	8	0	3	5	7	23
	C	1	0	2	0	2	5
	D	3	0	0	0	1	4
	F	2	0	1	0		3
	CR	0	0	0	0		0
	NC	0	0	1	0		1
	W	1	1	1	1		4
	TOTAL #	23	2	16	9	14	64
% Successful *		74%	50%	81%	89%	93%	81%

\*Includes duplicate counts.

8/29/2008

Solano: Research and Planning

Program Review Data for 2007-08  
 FRENCH  
 TOPs: 1102.00

Humanities  
 Division 16  
 Year: 2007-08

<u>Summer</u>		<u>F</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>U</u>	<u>ESL</u>	<u>Non-ESL</u>	<u>U</u>
Grades *	A	0	0		0	0	
	B	0	0		0	0	
	C	0	0		0	0	
	D	0	0		0	0	
	F	0	0		0	0	
	CR	0	0		0	0	
	NC	0	0		0	0	
	W	0	0		0	0	
	TOTAL #	0	0	0	0	0	0
% Successful *		0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

  

<u>Fall</u>		<u>F</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>U</u>	<u>ESL</u>	<u>Non-ESL</u>	<u>U</u>
Grades *	A	13	6		1	18	
	B	11	4		1	14	
	C	6	3		0	9	
	D	2	0		1	1	
	F	2	0		0	2	
	CR	0	1		0	1	
	NC	0	0		0	0	
	W	3	2		0	5	
	TOTAL #	37	16	0	3	50	0
% Successful *		81%	88%	0%	67%	84%	0%

  

<u>Spring</u>		<u>F</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>U</u>	<u>ESL</u>	<u>Non-ESL</u>	<u>U</u>
Grades *	A	18	6		2	22	
	B	12	11		2	21	
	C	4	1		1	4	
	D	3	1		0	4	
	F	2	1		1	2	
	CR	0	0		0	0	
	NC	0	1		1	0	
	W	4	0		1	3	
	TOTAL #	43	21	0	8	56	0
% Successful *		79%	33%	0%	63%	84%	0%

\*Includes duplicate counts.

8/29/2008

Solano: Research and Planning

		03-04	04-05	05-06	06-07	07-08
FTES GENERATED	Summer	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
	Fall	2.50	6.14	5.51	7.88	5.90
	Spring	6.72	3.77	5.60	5.82	2.31
	<b>TOTAL</b>	9.22	9.91	11.11	13.70	8.21
<b>Growth/Decline [(Yr2-Yr1)/Yr1]</b>		-42%	7%	12%	23%	-40%
LOAD (WSCH/FTE)	Summer	0	0	0	0	0
	<b>Growth/Decline</b>	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Fall	225	346	496	444	190
	Spring	379	212	315	327	208
<b>AVERAGE, Fall &amp; Spring</b>		302	279	406	386	199
<b>Growth/Decline [(Yr2-Yr1)/Yr1]</b>		31%	-8%	45%	-5%	-48%
ENROLLMENT	Summer	0	0	0	0	0
	Fall	15	47	29	49	43
	Spring	46	29	44	34	13
	<b>TOTAL</b>	61	76	73	83	56
<b>Growth/Decline [(Yr2-Yr1)/Yr1]</b>		-54%	25%	-4%	14%	-33%
NUMBER OF SECTIONS	Summer	0	0	0	0	0
	Fall	1	2	3	4	4
	Spring	4	2	3	3	2
	<b>TOTAL</b>	5	4	6	7	6
<b>Growth/Decline [(Yr2-Yr1)/Yr1]</b>		-50%	-20%	50%	17%	-14%
FTEF	Summer	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
	Fall	0.333	0.533	0.333	0.533	0.933
	Spring	0.533	0.533	0.533	0.533	0.333
PERCENT FILL (1st cen/max enroll)	Summer	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
	Fall	50%	78%	97%	82%	48%
	Spring	70%	48%	73%	57%	37%
	<b>AVERAGE, Fall &amp; Spring</b>	60%	63%	85%	70%	43%
PERCENT RETENTION (EOS/1st cen)	Summer				0%	0%
	Fall	80%	72%	83%	84%	78%
	Spring	87%	79%	82%	68%	92%
	<b>AVERAGE, Fall &amp; Spring</b>	84%	76%	83%	76%	85%
APPORTIONMENT INCOME (FTES * Annual Factor)		\$32,224	\$34,526	\$46,906	\$59,828	\$35,853
EXPENSE	Salaries	\$79,456	\$48,373	\$52,489	\$45,392	
	Materials	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	
	Capital Outlay	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	
	<b>Total Direct</b>	\$79,456	\$48,373	\$52,489	\$45,392	\$0
	Indirect (Direct * .40)	\$31,782	\$19,349	\$20,995	\$18,157	\$0
	<b>TOTAL</b>	\$111,238	\$67,722	\$73,484	\$63,549	\$0
ANNUAL COST/FTES		\$12,065	\$6,834	\$6,614	\$4,639	\$0
<b>Growth/Decline [(Yr2-Yr1)/Yr1]</b>		71%	-43%	-3%	-30%	-100%

Prior to AY98-99 expense does not include capital outlay or VEA funds.

Program Review Data for 2007-08  
GERMAN  
TOPs: 1103.00

Humanities  
Division 16  
Year: 2007-08

<u>Summer</u>		White, non-Hispanic	African- American	Hispanic	Filipino	Other, non-white	Total #
Grades *	A	0	0	0	0	0	0
	B	0	0	0	0	0	0
	C	0	0	0	0	0	0
	D	0	0	0	0	0	0
	F	0	0	0	0	0	0
	CR	0	0	0	0	0	0
	NC	0	0	0	0	0	0
	W	0	0	0	0	0	0
	TOTAL #	0	0	0	0	0	0
% Successful *		0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
<u>Fall</u>		White, non-Hispanic	African- American	Hispanic	Filipino	Other, non-white	Total #
Grades *	A	7	0	0	1		8
	B	7	0	1	0	2	10
	C	4	0	0	2		6
	D	2	1	0	0		3
	F	1	1	1	0		3
	CR	0	0	0	0		0
	NC	0	0	0	0		0
	W	8	1	1	0	3	13
	TOTAL #	29	3	3	3	5	43
% Successful *		62%	0%	33%	100%	40%	56%
<u>Spring</u>		White, non-Hispanic	African- American	Hispanic	Filipino	Other, non-white	Total #
Grades *	A	4	1	0	0		5
	B	3	0	0	0	1	4
	C	2	0	0	0		2
	D	0	0	0	0		0
	F	0	0	0	0		0
	CR	0	0	0	0		0
	NC	0	0	0	0		0
	W	0	0	0	0	1	1
	TOTAL #	9	1	0	0	2	12
% Successful *		100%	100%	0%	0%	50%	92%

\*Includes duplicate counts.

8/29/2008

Solano: Research and Planning

<u>Summer</u>		<u>F</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>U</u>	<u>ESL</u>	<u>Non-ESL</u>	<u>U</u>
Grades *	A	0	0		0	0	
	B	0	0		0	0	
	C	0	0		0	0	
	D	0	0		0	0	
	F	0	0		0	0	
	CR	0	0		0	0	
	NC	0	0		0	0	
	W	0	0		0	0	
	TOTAL #	0	0	0	0	0	0
% Successful *		0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

  

<u>Fall</u>		<u>F</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>U</u>	<u>ESL</u>	<u>Non-ESL</u>	<u>U</u>
Grades *	A	5	3		0	8	
	B	7	3		0	10	
	C	1	5		0	6	
	D	1	2		0	3	
	F	2	1		0	3	
	CR	0	0		0	0	
	NC	0	0		0	0	
	W	5	8		1	12	
	TOTAL #	21	22	0	1	42	0
% Successful *		62%	50%	0%	0%	57%	0%

  

<u>Spring</u>		<u>F</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>U</u>	<u>ESL</u>	<u>Non-ESL</u>	<u>U</u>
Grades *	A	3	2		0	5	
	B	2	2		0	4	
	C	0	2		0	2	
	D	0	0		0	0	
	F	0	0		0	0	
	CR	0	0		0	0	
	NC	0	0		0	0	
	W	1	0		0	1	
	TOTAL #	6	6	0	0	12	0
% Successful *		83%	100%	0%	0%	92%	0%

\*Includes duplicate counts.

8/29/2008

Solano: Research and Planning

Program Review Data for 2007-08  
 SPANISH  
 TOPs: 1105.00+1202.00

Humanities  
 Division 16

		03-04	04-05	05-06	06-07	07-08
FTES GENERATED	Summer	21.92	16.29	17.19	15.90	17.00
	Fall	90.89	86.30	73.48	69.21	67.39
	Spring	87.16	79.75	74.96	72.83	67.35
	<b>TOTAL</b>	199.97	182.34	165.63	157.94	151.74
<b>Growth/Decline [(Yr2-Yr1)/Yr1]</b>		6%	-9%	-9%	-5%	-4%
LOAD (WSCH/FTE)	Summer	548	407	368	341	364
	<b>Growth/Decline</b>	14%	-26%	-10%	-7%	7%
	Fall	390	384	359	371	341
	Spring	388	370	355	352	338
<b>AVERAGE, Fall &amp; Spring</b>		389	377	357	362	340
<b>Growth/Decline [(Yr2-Yr1)/Yr1]</b>		-4%	-3%	-5%	1%	-6%
ENROLLMENT	Summer	201	155	161	150	167
	Fall	711	637	547	499	498
	Spring	666	585	557	525	505
	<b>TOTAL</b>	1578	1377	1265	1174	1170
<b>Growth/Decline [(Yr2-Yr1)/Yr1]</b>		11%	-13%	-8%	-7%	0%
NUMBER OF SECTIONS	Summer	6	6	7	8	7
	Fall	30	32	28	26	23
	Spring	29	25	30	27	24
	<b>TOTAL</b>	65	63	65	61	54
<b>Growth/Decline [(Yr2-Yr1)/Yr1]</b>		12%	-3%	3%	-6%	-11%
FTEF	Summer	1.200	1.200	1.400	1.400	1.400
	Fall	7.000	6.733	6.133	5.600	5.933
	Spring	6.733	6.467	6.333	6.200	5.978
PERCENT FILL (1st cen/max enroll)	Summer	112%	86%	77%	71%	79%
	Fall	84%	79%	76%	76%	72%
	Spring	82%	78%	74%	73%	74%
	<b>AVERAGE, Fall &amp; Spring</b>	83%	79%	75%	75%	73%
PERCENT RETENTION (EOS/1st cen)	Summer	80%	87%	84%	81%	88%
	Fall	76%	79%	78%	81%	81%
	Spring	79%	74%	73%	86%	77%
	<b>AVERAGE, Fall &amp; Spring</b>	78%	77%	76%	84%	79%
APPORTIONMENT INCOME (FTES * Annual Factor)		\$698,895	\$635,273	\$699,290	\$689,724	\$662,649
EXPENSE	Salaries	\$378,088	\$467,116	\$527,270	\$422,841	
	Materials	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	
	Capital Outlay	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	
	<b>Total Direct</b>	\$378,088	\$467,116	\$527,270	\$422,841	\$0
	Indirect (Direct * .40)	\$151,235	\$186,846	\$210,908	\$169,136	\$0
	<b>TOTAL</b>	\$529,323	\$653,963	\$738,177	\$591,977	\$0
ANNUAL COST/FTES		\$2,647	\$3,587	\$4,457	\$3,748	\$0
<b>Growth/Decline [(Yr2-Yr1)/Yr1]</b>		-2%	35%	24%	-16%	-100%

Prior to AY98-99 expense does not include capital outlay or VEA funds.

8/29/2008

Solano: Research and Planning

Program Review Data for 2007-08  
 SPANISH  
 TOPs: 1105.00+1202.00

Humanities  
 Division 16  
 Year: 2007-08

<u>Summer</u>		White, non-Hispanic	African- American	Hispanic	Filipino	Other, non-white	Total #
Grades *	A	25	7	2	11	10	55
	B	14	6	4	5	7	36
	C	5	5	2	2	2	16
	D	1	6	1	0	3	11
	F	8	6	3	0	7	24
	CR	2	0	0	0		2
	NC	1	0	0	0	3	4
	W	6	4	0	0		10
	TOTAL #	62	34	12	18	32	158
% Successful *		74%	53%	67%	100%	59%	69%
<u>Fall</u>		White, non-Hispanic	African- American	Hispanic	Filipino	Other, non-white	Total #
Grades *	A	70	15	27	15	26	153
	B	57	10	21	9	15	112
	C	32	12	13	2	3	62
	D	7	7	3	0	2	19
	F	12	13	5	5	6	41
	CR	5	0	0	0		5
	NC	2	2	0	0		4
	W	17	12	8	5	9	51
	TOTAL #	202	71	77	36	61	447
% Successful *		81%	52%	79%	72%	72%	74%
<u>Spring</u>		White, non-Hispanic	African- American	Hispanic	Filipino	Other, non-white	Total #
Grades *	A	69	9	30	13	22	143
	B	46	12	23	8	13	102
	C	35	6	10	7	10	68
	D	16	2	3	4	4	29
	F	12	12	5	2	4	35
	CR	4	2	1	0		7
	NC	1	1	0	0		2
	W	29	18	11	3	8	69
	TOTAL #	212	62	83	37	61	455
% Successful *		73%	47%	77%	76%	74%	70%

\*Includes duplicate counts.

8/29/2008

Solano: Research and Planning

Program Review Data for 2007-08  
 SPANISH  
 TOPs: 1105.00+1202.00

Humanities  
 Division 16  
 Year: 2007-08

<u>Summer</u>		<u>F</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>U</u>	<u>ESL</u>	<u>Non-ESL</u>	<u>U</u>
Grades *	A	43	12		4	51	
	B	17	19		0	36	
	C	11	5		0	16	
	D	6	5		0	11	
	F	11	13		0	24	
	CR	0	2		0	2	
	NC	1	3		0	4	
	W	7	3		0	10	
	TOTAL #	96	62	0	4	154	0
% Successful *		74%	61%	0%	100%	68%	0%
<u>Fall</u>		<u>F</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>U</u>	<u>ESL</u>	<u>Non-ESL</u>	<u>U</u>
Grades *	A	116	37		10	143	
	B	74	38		4	108	
	C	42	20		1	61	
	D	10	9		0	19	
	F	27	14		0	41	
	CR	3	2		0	5	
	NC	1	3		0	4	
	W	32	19		1	50	
	TOTAL #	305	142	0	16	431	0
% Successful *		77%	68%	0%	94%	74%	0%
<u>Spring</u>		<u>F</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>U</u>	<u>ESL</u>	<u>Non-ESL</u>	<u>U</u>
Grades *	A	97	46		10	133	
	B	59	43		6	96	
	C	44	24		3	65	
	D	14	15		0	29	
	F	16	19		0	35	
	CR	6	1		0	7	
	NC	0	2		0	2	
	W	37	32		1	68	
	TOTAL #	273	182	0	20	435	0
% Successful *		75%	63%	0%	95%	69%	0%

\*Includes duplicate counts.

8/29/2008

Solano: Research and Planning

Program Review Data for 2007-08  
 FOREIGN LANGUAGE (OTHER)  
 TOPs: 1101.00

Humanities  
 Division 16

		03-04	04-05	05-06	06-07	07-08
FTES GENERATED	Summer	2.45	3.30	1.92	4.68	4.75
	Fall	8.42	10.56	8.36	13.50	7.85
	Spring	8.02	5.08	9.21	11.08	8.03
	<b>TOTAL</b>	18.89	18.94	19.49	29.26	20.63
<b>Growth/Decline [(Yr2-Yr1)/Yr1]</b>		-11%	0%	3%	50%	-29%
LOAD (WSCH/FTE)	Summer	368	495	288	351	356
	<b>Growth/Decline</b>	-2%	35%	-42%	22%	1%
	Fall	421	396	314	380	294
	Spring	401	381	319	332	301
<b>AVERAGE, Fall &amp; Spring</b>		411	389	317	356	298
<b>Growth/Decline [(Yr2-Yr1)/Yr1]</b>		2%	-5%	-19%	12%	-16%
ENROLLMENT	Summer	23	33	18	44	46
	Fall	79	96	79	129	77
	Spring	81	48	83	103	79
	<b>TOTAL</b>	183	177	180	276	202
<b>Growth/Decline [(Yr2-Yr1)/Yr1]</b>		-10%	-3%	2%	53%	-27%
NUMBER OF SECTIONS	Summer	1	1	1	2	2
	Fall	5	6	6	8	5
	Spring	5	2	8	7	4
	<b>TOTAL</b>	11	9	15	17	11
<b>Growth/Decline [(Yr2-Yr1)/Yr1]</b>		-8%	-18%	67%	13%	-35%
FTEF	Summer	0.200	0.200	0.200	0.400	0.400
	Fall	0.600	0.800	0.800	1.067	0.800
	Spring	0.600	0.400	0.867	1.000	0.800
PERCENT FILL (1st cen/max enroll)	Summer	77%	110%	60%	73%	77%
	Fall	86%	80%	66%	86%	52%
	Spring	88%	80%	74%	68%	66%
	<b>AVERAGE, Fall &amp; Spring</b>	87%	80%	70%	77%	59%
PERCENT RETENTION (EOS/1st cen)	Summer	74%	73%	72%	73%	83%
	Fall	81%	79%	73%	80%	85%
	Spring	83%	71%	82%	73%	72%
	<b>AVERAGE, Fall &amp; Spring</b>	82%	75%	78%	77%	79%
APPORTIONMENT INCOME (FTES * Annual Factor)		\$66,021	\$65,987	\$82,287	\$127,778	\$90,091
EXPENSE	Salaries	\$21,017	\$19,438	\$28,805	\$32,557	
	Materials	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	
	Capital Outlay	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	
	<b>Total Direct</b>	\$21,017	\$19,438	\$28,805	\$32,557	\$0
	Indirect (Direct * .40)	\$8,407	\$7,775	\$11,522	\$13,023	\$0
<b>TOTAL</b>	\$29,424	\$27,213	\$40,327	\$45,580	\$0	
ANNUAL COST/FTES		\$1,558	\$1,437	\$2,069	\$1,558	\$0
<b>Growth/Decline [(Yr2-Yr1)/Yr1]</b>		-7%	-8%	44%	-25%	-100%

Prior to AY98-99 expense does not include capital outlay or VEA funds.

8/29/2008

Solano: Research and Planning

Program Review Data for 2007-08  
 FOREIGN LANGUAGE (OTHER)  
 TOPs: 1101.00

Humanities  
 Division 16  
 Year: 2007-08

<u>Summer</u>		White, non-Hispanic	African- American	Hispanic	Filipino	Other, non-white	Total #
Grades *	A	4	0	0	3	2	9
	B	3	0	0	3	1	7
	C	0	1	0	0	2	3
	D	0	1	2	0	4	7
	F	3	2	0	2		7
	CR	0	0	0	1	3	4
	NC	0	0	0	0	1	1
	W	1	0	0	0		1
	TOTAL #	11	4	2	9	13	39
% Successful *		64%	25%	0%	78%	62%	59%
<u>Fall</u>		White, non-Hispanic	African- American	Hispanic	Filipino	Other, non-white	Total #
Grades *	A	10	4	1	1	4	20
	B	4	1	2	3	4	14
	C	4	0	2	0	1	7
	D	0	0	1	0		1
	F	0	1	3	2		6
	CR	3	0	1	0	3	7
	NC	1	0	1	0		2
	W	6	0	3	1	2	12
	TOTAL #	28	6	14	7	14	69
% Successful *		75%	83%	43%	57%	86%	70%
<u>Spring</u>		White, non-Hispanic	African- American	Hispanic	Filipino	Other, non-white	Total #
Grades *	A	8	1	5	0	3	17
	B	6	1	3	4		14
	C	4	0	0	0	1	5
	D	1	0	0	0	1	2
	F	5	1	3	2	1	12
	CR	1	0	3	2	1	7
	NC	0	0	0	0		0
	W	4	0	1	3	2	10
	TOTAL #	29	3	15	11	9	67
% Successful *		66%	67%	73%	55%	56%	64%

\*Includes duplicate counts.

8/29/2008

Solano: Research and Planning

Program Review Data for 2007-08  
 FOREIGN LANGUAGE (OTHER)  
 TOPs: 1101.00

Humanities  
 Division 16  
 Year: 2007-08

<u>Summer</u>		<u>F</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>U</u>	<u>ESL</u>	<u>Non-ESL</u>	<u>U</u>
Grades *	A	5	4		0	9	
	B	3	4		0	7	
	C	0	3		0	3	
	D	4	3		1	6	
	F	1	6		1	6	
	CR	1	3		0	4	
	NC	0	1		0	1	
	W	1	0		0	1	
	TOTAL #	15	24	0	2	37	0
% Successful *		60%	58%	0%	0%	62%	0%

  

<u>Fall</u>		<u>F</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>U</u>	<u>ESL</u>	<u>Non-ESL</u>	<u>U</u>
Grades *	A	10	10		0	20	
	B	7	7		2	12	
	C	3	4		0	7	
	D	1	0		0	1	
	F	5	1		1	5	
	CR	6	1		0	7	
	NC	2	0		1	1	
	W	8	4		0	12	
	TOTAL #	42	27	0	4	65	0
% Successful *		62%	81%	0%	50%	71%	0%

  

<u>Spring</u>		<u>F</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>U</u>	<u>ESL</u>	<u>Non-ESL</u>	<u>U</u>
Grades *	A	7	10		6	11	
	B	9	5		2	12	
	C	3	2		0	5	
	D	0	2		0	2	
	F	10	2		1	11	
	CR	6	1		1	6	
	NC	0	0		0	0	
	W	7	3		1	9	
	TOTAL #	42	25	0	11	56	0
% Successful *		60%	72%	0%	82%	61%	0%

\*Includes duplicate counts.

8/29/2008

Solano: Research and Planning

Program Name: History  
TOP Code: 2205.00  
Prepared by: D. White, D. Crandall-Bear  
Faculty: D. White, D. Crandall-Bear,  
S. Codina, M. Arce

## History Department

### Part I Goals/Objectives

#### 1. What are the goals/objectives of the program? (State in terms of student learning outcomes — SLOs.)

##### **Successful completion of this program enables a student to:**

- Grasp an understanding of the chronology of human history and the influence of history on the contemporary world.
- Be aware of the economic, social, political, and cultural contributions made by a wide variety of ethnic and cultural groups to the developments in human history.
- Learn how to analyze complex historical forces that have shaped our world, rather than merely memorize events.
- Develop critical thinking, reading, writing, and oral communications skills.
- Understand information about transfer, and potential careers in the field.
- Complete American Institutions Requirements for A.A./A.S. degree.

#### 2. List appropriate indicators of program success (i.e., measures of goals/objectives stated above). Include both quantitative and qualitative measures.

##### *Quantitative:*

- History faculty require students to write essays as part of their exams.
- Faculty require some kind of additional writing to be completed outside of class, including article and book reviews, short essays (3-5 typed pages), and research papers.
- Exams test students' knowledge of both lectures and readings.

##### *Qualitative*

- SCC history instructors assign on average 23-30 pages of student writing per course.
- SCC history instructors include regular assignments using secondary and primary historical sources, plus occasional works of fiction, articles from professional journals or other essays.

- During the 2000-01 academic year, of 18,697 who enrolled in at least ½ unit of credit, 1,056 students had successfully satisfied the American Institutions requirement via a history course with a grade of C or better. An additional 1,093 students of 19,459 completed the American Institutions requirement during the 2001-02 academic year.

## Part II Analysis

### 1. Identify and explain the trends in:

**Enrollment** — Enrollments over the past three years are stable, varying by around 1%.

**Retention** — Retention has increased slightly; now stands at 79%.

**Fill rate** — Fill rate remained consistent throughout the last three-year period.

**Other Factor** — WSCH/FTE has remained high, averaging 570, well above the Division and campus averages. This is because history courses have large class max numbers (most at 50, some at 40), plus the Department has a very high fill rate of 80%.

#### **Qualitative Factors** —

- Faculty are requiring students to become more critical readers, writers, and thinkers. Thus, the consensus among the full-time faculty is to move away from asking students merely to regurgitate knowledge, but to synthesize a variety of materials in an effort to analyze historical events. This may very well be related to enrollment and retention figures because as less prepared students face the academic challenges associated with our course requirements they tend to withdraw when they realize that they will very likely not succeed.
- Class size and staffing needs for reader/mentors to assist faculty remain an issue for our department. Faculty struggle to implement more rigorous academic requirements, yet simply cannot assist students in these more challenging activities teaching five class loads with 40 to 50 students maximum in each class. Thus, significant numbers of students may be reluctant to even enroll in a history course that they have learned is going to require greater commitment of their time and energy than may have been the case in past years. Overall, many students, especially those with a lack of leaning skills, probably drop these courses rather than fail. Nevertheless, the History Department maintains a high retention rate of 79%. Dropping our standards is not a viable option. In the final analysis, the College must decide where real student success and high quality teaching and learning figure in its priorities. We address these concerns again and propose solutions in Part III of this report.
- In the recent accreditation reports visiting teams have noted a lack of comprehensive planning across the campus. Enrollment figures for the

History Department as well as others are likely impacted by a lack of enrollment planning at upper administration levels. This problem is exacerbated by an apparent reluctance of upper administration to encourage and support division deans in efforts to work collaboratively with the faculty on class scheduling. Thus we are being asked to account for enrollment trends over which we, as faculty, have little control.

**2. How do the above trends relate to the program goals identified during the last review?**

History offerings remain very popular and serve the needs of students working toward A.A./A.S. degrees as well as those intending to transfer.

The involvement and outstanding efforts of our adjunct staff continue to help us in our efforts toward building a high quality department. Particularly, the contributions of talented adjunct instructors have allowed us an opportunity to improve the quality of our teaching.

**Part III Conclusions and Recommendations**

**1. What are the major accomplishments of the program during the past two years?**

- Faculty continue to serve on a number of campus committees and are involved in various campus organizations.
- The History Department is centrally involved in a collaborative effort with the Solano County Office of Education and the University of California at Davis in the Teaching American History Grant Project. This project assists middle school and high school teachers in developing creative and rigorous approaches to teaching American history, which may serve to ultimately better prepare students from local feeder schools for course work here at Solano Community College.
- History faculty are active in the Learning Communities program, both at SCC and statewide.
- The History Department continues to offer its online and hybrid courses.
- The History Department has piloted a Supplemental Instruction Program.

**2. Based on the trend analysis above, are there any changes needed in order to meet program goals or to improve program effectiveness? Explain.**

- We must continue to vigorously pursue the issue of class size and the need for reader/mentor funding.
- We will continue to evaluate the effectiveness of online history courses.
- We must develop more linked and adjunct Learning Community courses with English and Reading Department in order to provide under-prepared students with the support they need to successfully complete our courses and prepare themselves for success at four-year institutions.

Program Review Data for 2007-08  
**HISTORY**  
TOPs: 2205.00

Humanities  
Division 16

		03-04	04-05	05-06	06-07	07-08
FTES GENERATED	Summer	27.45	20.29	30.24	35.81	32.66
	Fall	115.99	116.68	126.14	108.93	113.18
	Spring	126.12	110.77	113.71	104.82	89.28
	<b>TOTAL</b>	269.56	247.74	270.09	249.56	235.12
<b>Growth/Decline [(Yr2-Yr1)/Yr1]</b>		10%	-8%	9%	-8%	-6%
LOAD (WSCH/FTE)	Summer	727	609	648	537	490
	<b>Growth/Decline</b>	-2%	-16%	6%	-17%	-9%
	Fall	644	583	610	563	585
	Spring	631	615	533	562	558
<b>AVERAGE, Fall &amp; Spring</b>		638	599	572	563	572
<b>Growth/Decline [(Yr2-Yr1)/Yr1]</b>		-3%	-6%	-5%	-2%	2%
ENROLLMENT	Summer	255	201	292	352	327
	Fall	1112	1124	1222	1068	1106
	Spring	1220	1073	1108	1018	863
	<b>TOTAL</b>	2587	2398	2622	2438	2296
<b>Growth/Decline [(Yr2-Yr1)/Yr1]</b>		11%	-7%	9%	-7%	-6%
NUMBER OF SECTIONS	Summer	6	6	7	11	10
	Fall	25	28	32	34	29
	Spring	30	27	33	32	22
	<b>TOTAL</b>	61	61	72	77	61
<b>Growth/Decline [(Yr2-Yr1)/Yr1]</b>		9%	0%	18%	7%	-21%
FTEF	Summer	1.133	1.000	1.400	2.000	2.000
	Fall	5.400	6.000	6.200	5.800	5.800
	Spring	6.000	5.400	6.400	5.600	4.800
PERCENT FILL (1st cen/max enroll)	Summer	88%	80%	83%	72%	66%
	Fall	93%	84%	84%	77%	81%
	Spring	85%	84%	76%	76%	82%
	<b>AVERAGE, Fall &amp; Spring</b>	89%	84%	80%	77%	82%
PERCENT RETENTION (EOS/1st cen)	Summer	71%	70%	77%	81%	83%
	Fall	77%	78%	75%	76%	80%
	Spring	75%	77%	73%	74%	78%
	<b>AVERAGE, Fall &amp; Spring</b>	76%	78%	74%	75%	79%
APPORTIONMENT INCOME (FTES * Annual Factor)		\$942,112	\$863,126	\$1,140,320	\$1,089,829	\$1,026,769
EXPENSE	Salaries	\$342,693	\$404,969	\$479,574	\$402,606	
	Materials	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	
	Capital Outlay	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	
	<b>Total Direct</b>	\$342,693	\$404,969	\$479,574	\$402,606	\$0
	Indirect (Direct * .40)	\$137,077	\$161,988	\$191,830	\$161,042	\$0
<b>TOTAL</b>	\$479,770	\$566,957	\$671,404	\$563,648	\$0	
ANNUAL COST/FTES		\$1,780	\$2,289	\$2,486	\$2,259	\$0
<b>Growth/Decline [(Yr2-Yr1)/Yr1]</b>		-3%	29%	9%	-9%	-100%

Prior to AY98-99 expense does not include capital outlay or VEA funds.

Program Review Data for 2007-08  
 HISTORY  
 TOPs: 2205.00

Humanities  
 Division 16  
 Year: 2007-08

<u>Summer</u>		White, non-Hispanic	African- American	Hispanic	Filipino	Other, non-white	Total #
Grades *	A	35	3	5	15	19	77
	B	30	8	14	20	20	92
	C	15	8	10	9	10	52
	D	7	3	3	3	2	18
	F	6	6	6	2	6	26
	CR	0	0	0	0		0
	NC	0	0	0	0		0
	W	18	6	7	5	8	44
	TOTAL #	111	34	45	54	65	309
% Successful *		72%	56%	64%	81%	75%	72%
<u>Fall</u>		White, non-Hispanic	African- American	Hispanic	Filipino	Other, non-white	Total #
Grades *	A	77	17	12	12	19	137
	B	120	31	30	25	35	241
	C	100	31	52	36	34	253
	D	42	19	10	11	11	93
	F	49	43	21	16	20	149
	CR	0	0	0	0	1	1
	NC	0	0	0	0		0
	W	49	27	29	14	21	140
	TOTAL #	437	168	154	114	141	1014
% Successful *		68%	47%	61%	64%	63%	62%
<u>Spring</u>		White, non-Hispanic	African- American	Hispanic	Filipino	Other, non-white	Total #
Grades *	A	51	9	9	10	18	97
	B	78	31	24	17	16	166
	C	77	32	29	31	34	203
	D	37	10	15	8	12	82
	F	42	24	26	15	16	123
	CR	0	0	0	0		0
	NC	0	0	0	0		0
	W	52	29	22	19	14	136
	TOTAL #	337	135	125	100	110	807
% Successful *		61%	53%	50%	58%	62%	58%

\*Includes duplicate counts.

8/29/2008

Solano: Research and Planning

Program Review Data for 2007-08  
 HISTORY  
 TOPs: 2205.00

Humanities  
 Division 16  
 Year: 2007-08

<u>Summer</u>		<u>F</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>U</u>	<u>ESL</u>	<u>Non-ESL</u>	<u>U</u>
Grades *	A	49	28		3	74	
	B	62	30		7	85	
	C	31	21		3	49	
	D	9	9		2	16	
	F	10	16		1	25	
	CR	0	0		0	0	
	NC	0	0		0	0	
	W	30	14		2	42	
	TOTAL #	191	118	0	18	291	0
% Successful *		74%	67%	0%	72%	71%	0%

  

<u>Fall</u>		<u>F</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>U</u>	<u>ESL</u>	<u>Non-ESL</u>	<u>U</u>
Grades *	A	81	56		7	130	
	B	140	101		11	230	
	C	129	124		13	240	
	D	55	38		4	89	
	F	93	56		2	147	
	CR	0	1		0	1	
	NC	0	0		0	0	
	W	93	47		9	131	
	TOTAL #	591	423	0	46	968	0
% Successful *		59%	67%	0%	67%	62%	0%

  

<u>Spring</u>		<u>F</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>U</u>	<u>ESL</u>	<u>Non-ESL</u>	<u>U</u>
Grades *	A	53	44		4	93	
	B	88	78		6	160	
	C	107	96		9	194	
	D	41	41		5	77	
	F	73	50		4	119	
	CR	0	0		0	0	
	NC	0	0		0	0	
	W	70	66		10	126	
	TOTAL #	432	375	0	38	769	0
% Successful *		57%	58%	0%	50%	58%	0%

\*Includes duplicate counts.

8/29/2008

Solano: Research and Planning

Program Name: Humanities  
TOPs Code: 4903.00  
Prepared by: L. Cobene  
Faculty: G. Kropp, L. Cobene

## Humanities Department

### **Program Narrative: X-Raying Cultures and Weaving Worlds**

Contemporary students, in the compartmentalization of disciplinary curricula, frequently complain that no coherent, understandable thread of use and significance links all the academic subjects and courses they are required to take to attain certification, degree, or transfer academic goals. Indeed, with the breaking of human knowledge into discrete areas of specialization and the general lack of a strong interdisciplinary aesthetic in college and university programs, the learning institution itself is partially responsible for many students' inabilities to connect knowledge and the application of what they know across the disciplines. To redress this unfortunate gap of formal knowing, the SCC Humanities Division offers a cluster of interdisciplinary courses primarily aimed to synthesize overlapping and disparate fields of knowledge and to present students with a sustained, systematic, and productive experience that will encourage maturity, comprehension, the courage to explore, experiment, and develop.

The current humanities courses are a sequential cluster of interdisciplinary courses. The sequence begins with a general survey of the ways humans produce culture, HUMN 001: *What It Means To Be Human*. The second course in the sequence, HUMN 002: *Humans as Creators: The Media of Creativity*, investigates how we create in the broad domains of art, science/technology, and service. The last of the current courses, HUMN 003: *Journey in a Multicultural Landscape*, investigates how we configure our lives as a braid of various kinds of culture, and how this 'braiding' is constrained by history and enabled by emergent social trends and experiences.

A further series of courses — intended to address such areas of interest and concern as how globalized digital systems of communication and social interaction are reshaping the experience of culture and how traditional and emerging systems of representation are enabling a more 'customizable self' — is in the design stage. The next in the sequence will be HUMN 004: *Possible and Impossible Worlds — Multiplicities of Cultures in Games, Sims, and Virtual Worlds*. The second new course will be HUMN 005: *Wireless Nomadology and Portable, Parallel Cultures* and will investigate how new and emergent technologies and social practices enable people to customize themselves and their interactions in ways undreamt of by traditional cultures. The final course in the new sequence will be HUMN 006: *American Mythologies and 'Other' Worlds in Global Film*. This course will investigate the proliferation and mutation of US mythologies and realities in films that circulate in the global economy, as well as film created outside 'America' which engages with US society and culture in surprising ways.

## Part I          Goals/Objectives

### 1. What are the goals/objectives of the program? (State in terms of student learning outcomes — SLOs.)

#### **Successful completion of this program enables a student to:**

- Gain an awareness of some of the essential characteristics and capabilities of human beings in cultural settings.
- Identify the basic forces which form, influence, texture, degrade, and destroy human cultures.
- Deepen awareness of how individual humans, as well as clusters or teams of people, contribute to the development of cultures as historical, dynamic wholes, and thus understand the unique productions of those cultures in human history and experience.
- Cultivate increased and nuanced awareness of how diversity forms and functions within a culture, and between and among cultures existing in one neighborhood, organization, and/or event.
- Think critically about the study and analysis of some of the shaping determinants of human cultures and a variety of cultural creations.
- Think creatively and apply skills through the study, analysis, and application of creative processes and styles, which at once are illustrations of cultural processes and productions and also the very means by which culture is remade and innovated.
- Apply systematic, multi-modal research and progressively sophisticated writing skills.
- Gain awareness of the scholarly and professional use of multi-media texts and knowledge systems.
- The first four bulleted items meet the requirements of Part III of the SCC Core Competencies document. The last four bulleted items meet Part I and II and portions of Part III of that document.

### 2. List appropriate indicators of program success (i.e., measures of goals/objectives stated above). Include both quantitative and qualitative measures.

#### *Quantitative:*

- Other aspects of the program in general which will indicate student interest, access, and possibility of success include the following measures:
  - ◇ Enrollment is at or near class maximums each semester.
  - ◇ More than one humanities class is offered each semester.
  - ◇ Student retention remains high throughout the semester.

- ◇ Ratio of student success to student failure is high.
- ◇ Number of students taking more than one humanities course increases.
- ◇ Use of online resources as adjunct to humanities courses increases.

*Qualitative:*

- Pedagogical objects that will enable the faculty to evaluate the success of individual courses as well as the overall program will be a mixture of the following:
  - ◇ Formal journals, in which students explore and describe personal and historical experience of cultures, as well as record and analyze direct observation of specific cultural special events and processes.
  - ◇ Essays in which students will identify and critique the basic forces that make and unmake cultures; essays in which students will map and detail the dynamic forces and forms of social functions and the ways such functions create the texture and pathways of a given culture; essays in which students will define and explain through application of critical models and methods various structures and phenomenon of a given set of cultures' responses to basic human activities and issues (such as, but not limited to, family, marriage, education, work, leisure, worship, governance, prosperity, and war).
  - ◇ Text and/or multimedia projects that illustrate students' growing critical and creative appreciation of cultural forms of representation, expression, and critique, as well as the evidence of students' growing facility with new media technologies in the construction and transmission of knowledge.
  - ◇ Solo and team presentations that encourage and enable formal, professional sharing of information, research findings, and direct observation of historical forces and daily structures of making and unmaking culture that characterize and shape the lived experience of modern populations.
  - ◇ Exams in which students critically evaluate theoretical models, analyze representative texts, and formally map personal experience into systematic case studies of the production, tending, and innovations of cultures.

## Part II      Analysis

### 1. Identify and explain the trends in:

**Enrollment** — Enrollment is consistently at or near the class maximum in HUMN 001, 002, and 003. HUMN 003 has remained at the class maximum, a fact which is especially important since before its revision, its enrollment was low. A revised HUMN 002 was first offered in fall 2003, and has generally been

offered concurrently with HUMN 001 and HUMN 003 every semester since, with increasing enrollments and strong retention.

**Retention** — The retention rates in HUMN 001, 002, and 003 are solid, remaining in the high 70 and low 80 % since 1999, and attaining in 2006-07 an 83% retention rate. The number of students taking more than one of the three courses before graduation or transfer has increased.

**Fill rate** — The fill-rate has been exceptionally high in HUMN 001, 002, and 003. The humanities courses are currently well advertised and have very good student-to-student advertisement. In the last five years, the fill-rate has been generally in the low to mid 90% range—with a 96% fill-rate in 2007-08.

**Other factors** — These humanities classes offer one of the few possibilities for students to get alternative teaching techniques. The courses also fold in emerging trends in social relationships, emergent technologies, and a broad spectrum of traditional and non-traditional art, providing a practical respect for past human accomplishments and a critical frame for recent and emerging practices, many of which have not yet been ‘theorized’ and, thus, entered into the canons of existing knowledge-discipline courses.

**Qualitative factors** — The courses continue to improve as the instructors become more integrated into the sequence of course modules; the thematic threads that tie together the individual units and instructors have become increasingly strong. Faculty commitment to the HUMN 001 team-taught course, as a whole, as well as to individual segments, continues to increase as new faculty seek to be part of the courses.

## **2. How do the above trends relate to the program goals identified during the last review?**

Goals have been reached. Courses are continually reexamined for both improvement and conceptual extension of subject matter content and inclusion of teaching staff.

## **Part III Conclusions and Recommendations**

### **1. What are the major accomplishments of the program during the past two years?**

- HUMN 001 remains a popular course with students and new faculty continue to cycle in as part of the team-teaching paradigm for the course.
- HUMN 003 has been offered at near full enrollment with good retention.
- HUMN 002 maintains a consistently high enrollment.
- Both HUMN 002 and HUMN 003 have served as successful bridges to the Dancing Fire Kiln.

- Project in the SCC Art department (with Professor Marc Lancet and Guest Professor Kusakabe Masakazu). This ‘bridge’ has encouraged students to enroll in art classes and served as a practical study of the links between art, craft, technology, science, and community service.
- The current sequence of courses has integrated the ‘core-four’ areas of student general education (GE) competency, under the advisory plan adopted by the SCC Academic Senate on March 12, 2007.
- Additionally, the SLO’s for these courses have been defined and are being tested and refined with each semester’s offerings.

**2. Based on the trend analysis above, are there any changes needed in order to meet program goals or to improve program effectiveness? Explain.**

- In order to increase the reach of these successful courses and build a wider community for the new classes to come, we want to offer HUMN 002 and HUMN 003 at the Vacaville Center and the Vallejo Center in order to give a wider range of SCC’s community access to courses that focus on humans as creators and users of contemporary culture.
- To offer full online and hybrid versions of HUMN 002 and 003 through SCC’s online program, thereby extending student access to the course, as well as bolstering the GE offerings of the online degree program.
- Use of Internet sources and multimedia resources needs to be systematized to continue ensuring student success and high retention rates.
- Core teaching faculty need additional training and development time to incorporate new digital technologies into the day-to-day operations of the courses, technologies such as web-creation software, social networking applications and portals, and digital documentation programs (web-delivered audio and video archives).
- Add new courses in the thematic sequence to meet additional areas of student interest. The following courses are in the planning stages: HUMN 004: *Possible and Impossible Worlds — Multiplicities of Cultures in Games, Sims, and Virtual Worlds*, a course devoted to exploring how ‘virtual worlds’ (game worlds, online social networks, digital world simulations, and multi-user domains such as *Second Life*) function in cultural terms; HUMN 005: *Wireless Nomadology and Portable, Parallel Cultures*, a course investigating how new and emergent technologies and social practices enable people to customize themselves and their interactions in ways undreamt of by traditional cultures; and HUMN 005: *American Mythologies and ‘Other’ Worlds in Global Film*, an investigation of the proliferation and mutation of US mythologies and realities in films that circulate in the global economy.

Program Review Data for 2007-08  
HUMANITIES (& Gen. Liberal Arts)  
TOPs: 4901.00+4903.00

Humanities  
Division 16

		03-04	04-05	05-06	06-07	07-08
FTES GENERATED	Summer	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
	Fall	12.06	8.20	9.00	9.60	6.60
	Spring	12.71	6.90	8.49	8.40	12.20
	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>24.77</b>	<b>15.10</b>	<b>17.49</b>	<b>18.00</b>	<b>18.80</b>
<b>Growth/Decline [(Yr2-Yr1)/Yr1]</b>		40%	-39%	16%	3%	4%
LOAD (WSCH/FTE)	Summer	0	0	0	0	0
	<b>Growth/Decline</b>	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Fall	557	615	450	480	495
	Spring	528	397	466	506	524
<b>AVERAGE, Fall &amp; Spring</b>		<b>543</b>	<b>506</b>	<b>458</b>	<b>493</b>	<b>510</b>
<b>Growth/Decline [(Yr2-Yr1)/Yr1]</b>		-4%	-7%	-9%	8%	3%
ENROLLMENT	Summer	0	0	0	0	0
	Fall	116	82	90	96	66
	Spring	125	69	83	84	122
	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>241</b>	<b>151</b>	<b>173</b>	<b>180</b>	<b>188</b>
<b>Growth/Decline [(Yr2-Yr1)/Yr1]</b>		43%	-37%	15%	4%	4%
NUMBER OF SECTIONS	Summer	0	0	0	0	0
	Fall	3	2	3	3	2
	Spring	3	2	2	2	3
	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Growth/Decline [(Yr2-Yr1)/Yr1]</b>		50%	-33%	25%	0%	0%
FTEF	Summer	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
	Fall	0.649	0.400	0.600	0.600	0.400
	Spring	0.722	0.522	0.547	0.498	0.698
PERCENT FILL (1st cen/max enroll)	Summer				0%	0%
	Fall	89%	117%	86%	91%	94%
	Spring	96%	73%	87%	88%	97%
	<b>AVERAGE, Fall &amp; Spring</b>	<b>93%</b>	<b>95%</b>	<b>87%</b>	<b>90%</b>	<b>96%</b>
PERCENT RETENTION (EOS/1st cen)	Summer				0%	0%
	Fall	76%	74%	71%	77%	77%
	Spring	76%	83%	82%	89%	85%
	<b>AVERAGE, Fall &amp; Spring</b>	<b>76%</b>	<b>79%</b>	<b>77%</b>	<b>83%</b>	<b>81%</b>
APPORTIONMENT INCOME (FTES * Annual Factor)		\$86,571	\$52,608	\$73,843	\$78,606	\$82,100
EXPENSE	Salaries	\$7,511	\$8,163	\$10,276	\$8,223	
	Materials	\$0	\$28	\$4,125	\$6,004	
	Capital Outlay	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$6,548	
	<b>Total Direct</b>	<b>\$7,511</b>	<b>\$8,191</b>	<b>\$14,401</b>	<b>\$20,775</b>	<b>\$0</b>
	Indirect (Direct * .40)	\$3,004	\$3,276	\$5,760	\$8,310	\$0
	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$10,515</b>	<b>\$11,468</b>	<b>\$20,162</b>	<b>\$29,085</b>	<b>\$0</b>
ANNUAL COST/FTES		\$425	\$759	\$1,153	\$1,616	\$0
<b>Growth/Decline [(Yr2-Yr1)/Yr1]</b>		-58%	79%	52%	40%	-100%

Prior to AY98-99 expense does not include capital outlay or VEA funds.

8/29/2008

Solano: Research and Planning

Program Review Data for 2007-08  
HUMANITIES (& Gen. Liberal Arts)  
TOPs: 4901.00+4903.00

Humanities  
Division 16  
Year: 2007-08

<u>Summer</u>		White, non-Hispanic	African- American	Hispanic	Filipino	Other, non-white	Total #
Grades *	A	0	0	0	0	0	0
	B	0	0	0	0	0	0
	C	0	0	0	0	0	0
	D	0	0	0	0	0	0
	F	0	0	0	0	0	0
	CR	0	0	0	0	0	0
	NC	0	0	0	0	0	0
	W	0	0	0	0	0	0
	TOTAL #	0	0	0	0	0	0
% Successful *		0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
<u>Fall</u>		White, non-Hispanic	African- American	Hispanic	Filipino	Other, non-white	Total #
Grades *	A	2	0	0	3	2	7
	B	6	1	1	3	2	13
	C	4	1	3	4	1	13
	D	2	0	0	0	1	3
	F	6	1	3	2	2	14
	CR	0	0	0	0	0	0
	NC	0	0	0	0	0	0
	W	2	2	3	3	0	10
	TOTAL #	22	5	10	15	8	60
% Successful *		55%	40%	40%	67%	63%	55%
<u>Spring</u>		White, non-Hispanic	African- American	Hispanic	Filipino	Other, non-white	Total #
Grades *	A	9	1	3	4	2	19
	B	11	0	4	6	6	27
	C	8	2	5	4	4	23
	D	1	2	1	2	2	8
	F	12	5	2	3	5	27
	CR	0	0	0	0	0	0
	NC	0	0	0	0	0	0
	W	3	3	2	5	2	15
	TOTAL #	44	13	17	24	21	119
% Successful *		64%	23%	71%	58%	57%	58%

\*Includes duplicate counts.

8/29/2008

Solano: Research and Planning

Program Review Data for 2007-08  
HUMANITIES (& Gen. Liberal Arts)  
TOPs: 4901.00+4903.00

Humanities  
Division 16  
Year: 2007-08

<u>Summer</u>		<u>F</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>U</u>	<u>ESL</u>	<u>Non-ESL</u>	<u>U</u>
Grades *	A	0	0		0	0	
	B	0	0		0	0	
	C	0	0		0	0	
	D	0	0		0	0	
	F	0	0		0	0	
	CR	0	0		0	0	
	NC	0	0		0	0	
	W	0	0		0	0	
	TOTAL #	0	0	0	0	0	0
% Successful *		0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
<u>Fall</u>		<u>F</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>U</u>	<u>ESL</u>	<u>Non-ESL</u>	<u>U</u>
Grades *	A	5	2		0	7	
	B	7	6		1	12	
	C	3	10		1	12	
	D	1	2		0	3	
	F	4	10		0	14	
	CR	0	0		0	0	
	NC	0	0		0	0	
	W	3	7		0	10	
	TOTAL #	23	37	0	2	58	0
% Successful *		65%	49%	0%	100%	53%	0%
<u>Spring</u>		<u>F</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>U</u>	<u>ESL</u>	<u>Non-ESL</u>	<u>U</u>
Grades *	A	13	6		1	18	
	B	13	14		0	27	
	C	13	10		0	23	
	D	3	5		0	8	
	F	16	11		0	27	
	CR	0	0		0	0	
	NC	0	0		0	0	
	W	7	8		0	15	
	TOTAL #	65	54	0	1	118	0
% Successful *		60%	56%	0%	100%	58%	0%

\*Includes duplicate counts.

8/29/2008

Solano: Research and Planning

## Journalism Department

### Part I Goals/Objectives

#### 1. What are the goals/objectives of the program? (State in terms of student learning outcomes — SLOs.)

##### **Successful completion of this program enables a student to:**

- Write a basic news or feature story, using Associated Press style and libel guidelines.
- Interpret and apply professional and ethical standards.
- Summarize the history of the media and analyze current trends and controversies.
- Be able to explain how the media influence culture and society.
- Design and produce a news product in cooperation with others (for example, *The Tempest* and its associated Web site).
- Be prepared for transfer to a four-year program or for employment in journalism or allied fields.

#### 2. List appropriate indicators of program success (i.e., measures of goals/objectives stated above). Include both quantitative and qualitative measures.

##### *Quantitative:*

- Students' results on tests, graded exercises and essays, and articles submitted for publication to *The Tempest*.
- Student success and persistence.
- Awards and scholarships from organizations such as the Journalism Association of Community Colleges (JACC).
- Numbers of students who transfer or take jobs in the field.

##### *Qualitative*

- Evaluation of student-produced news products by JACC colleagues as well as professional judges in regional and state-wide competitions.
- Feedback from students, transfer institutions and local employers regarding the students' preparation.

## Part II Analysis

### 1. Identify and explain the trends in:

**Enrollment** — Declined 21% between 2005-06 and 2006-07; more or less stabilized in 2007-08. The three-year drop sounds larger than it really is due to the relatively small class sizes: The program went from 135 to 102 students between 2005-06 and 2007-08 and FTES went from 15.64 to 12.16. These small classes should also be kept in mind when looking at other statistics regarding the program: A loss or gain of a few students can look more significant when expressed as a percent.

**Retention** — Has been relatively stable during this period, ranging from 82% to 86%.

**Fill rate** — Went from 63% in 2005-06 to 40% in 2007-08.

**Other Factors** — FTES in the Humanities Division also fell during this review period. The full-time faculty member in this Department was forced to reduce her load to part-time during 2006, and this may have affected trends in enrollment. There has also been a widely publicized downturn in the industry that has led to layoffs at several Bay Area newspapers and a reduction in publication frequency at papers like the *Daily Californian* at UC Berkeley.

If we look at enrollment trends at other community colleges in California, we see that our numbers, if not ideal, are not atypical either. The Journalism Association of Community Colleges' 2007 survey found that nearly half the responding schools had 15 or fewer students enrolled in newspaper production classes (our JOUR 060: *Publications Laboratory*) each semester. Half of the responding schools only offer one section of newswriting (our JOUR 001: *Newswriting and Reporting*) per semester, and 42% said they had 20 or fewer students in that class. Thirty-nine percent of the schools offer one section per semester of the mass media survey class (our JOUR 011: *Introduction to Mass Communication*), and 42% have 21 to 30 students in that class.

**Qualitative Factors** — See III.1., “major accomplishments,” for a summary of awards, transfer, and job placement.

### 2. How do the above trends relate to the program goals identified during the last review?

Although the quality of students' work has been consistent, dropping enrollment is a serious concern. We have modernized the newsroom, contracted with a content management company for our Web site and purchased new multimedia equipment. But we urgently need to look for ways to make the program more relevant to students in a changing media environment.

## Part III Conclusions and Recommendations

### 1. What are the major accomplishments of the program during the past two years?

- *The Tempest* won online and print General Excellence awards from the Journalism Association of Community Colleges in 2007. Students won 19 individual awards during the two-year program review period. Dawn Bonner and Kim Hannon won JACC scholarships. The Don Siegel Memorial Scholarship for journalism students was created at SCC and Dawn Bonner and LaTasha Monique Warmesley were the first winners. Former Humanities Dean Kathy Rosengren received a First Amendment award from JACC for her support of the program.
- *The Tempest's* partnership with College Publisher for content management of [www.solanotempest.net](http://www.solanotempest.net) has allowed us to shift the production lab to a “Web first” publishing model. This is allowing students to work under deadlines that are closer to what they would experience in the industry.
- Program participants successfully transferred to Sacramento State, San Francisco State, San José State and Long Beach State during this review period. Journalism program alumni that we have tracked for the past five years have found jobs at the *Vacaville Reporter* (Melissa Murphy), *Fairfield Daily Republic* (Emmanuel Lopez), *Wired.com* (Danny Dumas and Terrence Russell), the *Northern California PGA* (CarlaJoy Bengco), the *Amador Ledger-Dispatch* (Mayra Jimenez), the *Valencia Signal* (Stephanie Cary), the *Newseum* in Washington, D.C. (Capricia Williams), and the *Courier-Post* in New Jersey (Alan Schuster). One program alumnus, Rene Villalta, started his own magazine, *La Voz*.

### 2. Based on the trend analysis above, are there any changes needed in order to meet program goals or to improve program effectiveness? Explain.

- While the new facilities in Room 1861 are truly superior to the old ones, they are remote from the center of campus and from departments and programs that have traditionally provided synergy (English, ASSC). This demands additional effort to direct students to journalism classes.
- Recruitment is critical; the enrollment trend has changed from 2003-04. Some of the solutions we might consider are developing promotional materials for *The Tempest*, hosting a High School Journalism Day, having faculty or students visit local high schools, increasing student-to-student recruiting efforts, purchasing new newsstands to improve visibility on campus and repainting old ones. The 2007 JACC survey suggests that other schools have found word-of-mouth to be the best recruiting technique, with advisers and students talking to counselors, non-journalism classes, and high school classes.

- We still need to better track where students are going and what kind of success they are having in order to have more accurate quantitative proof of our program's viability. Also, equipment purchased in 2007 will begin to be obsolete in 2010, so we must continue to upgrade on a regular basis.

Program Review Data for 2007-08  
**JOURNALISM**  
 TOPs: 0602.00

Humanities  
 Division 16

		03-04	04-05	05-06	06-07	07-08
FTES GENERATED	Summer	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
	Fall	7.81	7.91	7.91	5.64	5.34
	Spring	8.55	7.89	7.73	6.62	6.82
	<b>TOTAL</b>	16.36	15.80	15.64	12.26	12.16
<b>Growth/Decline [(Yr2-Yr1)/Yr1]</b>		9%	-3%	-1%	-22%	-1%
LOAD (WSCH/FTE)	Summer	0	0	0	0	0
	<b>Growth/Decline</b>	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Fall	272	264	264	188	178
	Spring	242	215	211	181	186
<b>AVERAGE, Fall &amp; Spring</b>		257	240	238	185	182
<b>Growth/Decline [(Yr2-Yr1)/Yr1]</b>		9%	-7%	-1%	-22%	-1%
ENROLLMENT	Summer	0	0	0	0	0
	Fall	64	61	71	50	43
	Spring	73	67	64	56	59
	<b>TOTAL</b>	137	128	135	106	102
<b>Growth/Decline [(Yr2-Yr1)/Yr1]</b>		8%	-7%	5%	-21%	-4%
NUMBER OF SECTIONS	Summer	0	0	0	0	0
	Fall	4	4	4	4	4
	Spring	5	5	5	5	4
	<b>TOTAL</b>	9	9	9	9	8
<b>Growth/Decline [(Yr2-Yr1)/Yr1]</b>		13%	0%	0%	0%	-11%
FTEF	Summer	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
	Fall	0.860	0.900	0.900	0.900	0.900
	Spring	1.060	1.100	1.100	1.100	1.100
PERCENT FILL (1st cen/max enroll)	Summer	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
	Fall	67%	65%	75%	53%	33%
	Spring	58%	54%	51%	46%	47%
	<b>AVERAGE, Fall &amp; Spring</b>	63%	60%	63%	50%	40%
PERCENT RETENTION (EOS/1st cen)	Summer	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
	Fall	83%	76%	89%	86%	90%
	Spring	84%	76%	84%	77%	81%
	<b>AVERAGE, Fall &amp; Spring</b>	84%	76%	87%	82%	86%
APPORTIONMENT INCOME (FTES * Annual Factor)		\$57,178	\$55,047	\$66,032	\$53,539	\$53,103
EXPENSE	Salaries	\$48,754	\$52,701	\$60,481	\$56,634	
	Materials	\$4,249	\$6,079	\$3,661	\$4,788	
	Capital Outlay	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	
	<b>Total Direct</b>	\$53,003	\$58,780	\$64,142	\$61,422	\$0
	Indirect (Direct * .40)	\$21,201	\$23,512	\$25,657	\$24,569	\$0
	<b>TOTAL</b>	\$74,204	\$82,292	\$89,799	\$85,990	\$0
ANNUAL COST/FTES		\$4,536	\$5,208	\$5,742	\$7,014	\$0
<b>Growth/Decline [(Yr2-Yr1)/Yr1]</b>		-8%	15%	10%	22%	-100%

Prior to AY98-99 expense does not include capital outlay or VEA funds.

8/29/2008

Solano: Research and Planning

Program Review Data for 2007-08  
**JOURNALISM**  
TOPs: 0602.00

Humanities  
Division 16  
Year: 2007-08

<u>Summer</u>		White, non-Hispanic	African- American	Hispanic	Filipino	Other, non-white	Total #
Grades *	A	0	0	0	0	0	0
	B	0	0	0	0	0	0
	C	0	0	0	0	0	0
	D	0	0	0	0	0	0
	F	0	0	0	0	0	0
	CR	0	0	0	0	0	0
	NC	0	0	0	0	0	0
	W	0	0	0	0	0	0
	TOTAL #	0	0	0	0	0	0
% Successful *		0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
<u>Fall</u>		White, non-Hispanic	African- American	Hispanic	Filipino	Other, non-white	Total #
Grades *	A	6	1	1	3	2	13
	B	5	1	2	0	3	11
	C	1	1	3	0	1	6
	D	1	0	0	0	0	1
	F	2	2	0	0	0	4
	CR	0	0	0	0	0	0
	NC	0	0	0	0	0	0
	W	2	0	0	1	0	3
	TOTAL #	17	5	6	4	6	38
% Successful *		71%	60%	100%	75%	100%	79%
<u>Spring</u>		White, non-Hispanic	African- American	Hispanic	Filipino	Other, non-white	Total #
Grades *	A	7	2	1	1	5	16
	B	2	3	1	0	2	8
	C	5	0	1	1	1	8
	D	2	1	0	1	1	5
	F	2	1	1	1	4	9
	CR	0	0	0	0	0	0
	NC	0	0	0	0	0	0
	W	3	0	0	0	0	3
	TOTAL #	21	7	4	4	13	49
% Successful *		67%	71%	75%	50%	62%	65%

\*Includes duplicate counts.

\*\* Used TOPs 0601.00 Communications for major code.

8/29/2008

Solano: Research and Planning

Program Review Data for 2007-08  
**JOURNALISM**  
 TOPs: 0602.00

Humanities  
 Division 16  
 Year: 2007-08

<u>Summer</u>		<u>F</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>U</u>	<u>ESL</u>	<u>Non-ESL</u>	<u>U</u>
Grades *	A	0	0		0	0	
	B	0	0		0	0	
	C	0	0		0	0	
	D	0	0		0	0	
	F	0	0		0	0	
	CR	0	0		0	0	
	NC	0	0		0	0	
	W	0	0		0	0	
	TOTAL #	0	0	0	0	0	0
% Successful *		0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

  

<u>Fall</u>		<u>F</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>U</u>	<u>ESL</u>	<u>Non-ESL</u>	<u>U</u>
Grades *	A	6	7		0	13	
	B	8	3		0	11	
	C	1	5		0	6	
	D	1	0		0	1	
	F	4	0		0	4	
	CR	0	0		0	0	
	NC	0	0		0	0	
	W	3	0		0	3	
	TOTAL #	23	15	0	0	38	0
% Successful *		65%	100%	0%	0%	#REF!	0%

  

<u>Spring</u>		<u>F</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>U</u>	<u>ESL</u>	<u>Non-ESL</u>	<u>U</u>
Grades *	A	11	5		0	16	
	B	6	2		0	8	
	C	5	3		0	8	
	D	0	5		0	5	
	F	6	3		0	9	
	CR	0	0		0	0	
	NC	0	0		0	0	
	W	1	2		0	3	
	TOTAL #	29	20	0	0	49	0
% Successful *		76%	50%	0%	0%	65%	0%

\*Includes duplicate counts.

8/29/2008

Solano: Research and Planning

Program Name: Philosophy  
TOP Code: 1509.00  
Prepared by: T. H. Warren  
Faculty: T. H. Warren

## Philosophy Department

### Part I Goals/Objectives

#### 1. What are the goals/objectives of the program? (State in terms of student learning outcomes — SLOs.)

##### Successful completion of this program enables a student to:

- Comprehend the several central and enduring problems in the history of philosophy.
- Comprehend the basic methods in philosophical inquiry.
- Develop skills and aptitudes in critical thinking and critical reading and writing in order to ignite intellectual curiosity.

#### 2. List appropriate indicators of program success (i.e., measures of goals/objectives stated above). Include both quantitative and qualitative measures.

##### *Quantitative:*

- Regular daily quizzes and essays on reading homework.

##### *Qualitative:*

- The writing of numerous, brief essays in response to reading assignments is the best indicator of students' competencies in the critical reading and writing of philosophy.

### Part II Analysis

#### 1. Identify and explain the trends in:

**Enrollment** — Overall student enrollment has increased 13% (the last time enrollment increased 13% was 2003-04). With the exception of PHIL 005: *Critical Thinking: The Philosophic Grounds of Literacy*, all other philosophy courses have had fairly good enrollment. PHIL 005 has not increased its enrollment (in some sections), despite its status as an Intersegmental General Education Transfer Curriculum (IGETC) approved critical thinking (CT) course. Low enrollment may be, in part, attributed to the following:

- ENGL 004: *Critical Thinking and Composition: Language in Context* was Solano Community College's initial IGETC approved CT course: thus, students are used to thinking that ENGL 004 is the only option (many students do not seem aware of the PHIL 005 option).
- There are many more sections of ENGL 004 compared to PHIL 005.
- Lack of counselor awareness of PHIL 005 as the IGETC equivalent of ENGL 004. (Many counselors may not be referring students to PHIL 005. The same applies to PHIL 001: *Introduction to Critical Thinking and Reasoning*.)
- With the addition of ENGL 002: *Critical Thinking and Writing About Literature* as an IGETC approved CT course, I am concerned that PHIL 005 was even further adversely impacted. Again, students seem more aware of courses available to them in English, but not philosophy.
- I wonder about the comparative academic rigor between PHIL 005 and some ENGL 002 and ENGL 004 classes, and the possibility that some students find the latter discipline easier to pass than the former. The Dean should inquire into this possible inequity. IGETC English and philosophy critical thinking courses should have common practiced standards.

**Retention** — Retention in philosophy is 78% and has remained relatively stable.

- A significant number of students demonstrate unpreparedness in the basic skills of reading and writing.
- Given the inherent intellectual difficulty of philosophy, a significant number of students who take philosophy courses do not have the college-level competencies to stay the course. Unhappy with poor grades, many drop out (at least 50% in most sections).

**Fill rate** — Fill rate is 72% and could perhaps be improved by involving full-time faculty in scheduling classes.

Philosophy, by its nature, cannot be popular in a community college in that the required readings appear alien as well as intellectually daunting to many students. Philosophy requires that students read critically. Many of the students simply cannot read philosophical texts (let alone read critically), i.e., students have great difficulty grasping abstractions. Fill rates in the more difficult college-level courses, such as philosophy, cannot be high given the largely remedial population of the CCCs. Nevertheless, owing to SCC's mission to provide a general education, it is expected that Solano Community College must continue to offer a range of courses in all academic disciplines, even those impacted by lower enrollments. Since none of the philosophy courses are remedial, fill rates should be similar to other complex subjects such as calculus, analytical geometry, physics, and chemistry.

**Other Factors** — At Solano Community College, the Philosophy Department is staffed by only one full-time faculty; thus, the major burden of any and all work is done by that instructor. A one-person department needs substantial administrative

support, especially with regard to promoting the program within and outside the Division. For example, educating the counselors; the special advertising of philosophy in various Solano Community College publications; the deliberate downsizing and/or rescheduling of ENGL 002 and ENGL 004 in favor of PHIL 005; educating the Curriculum Committee in the need to lower class maximums for philosophy courses.

Grading standards and other performance objectives are not consistently comparable for full-time and adjunct faculty. As a result, ambiguous fill rates and irregular retention patterns emerge.

**Qualitative Factors** — On the whole, the quality of students' work in the reading and writing of philosophy, including basic logical analysis, is mediocre.

**2. How do the above trends relate to the program goals identified during the last review?**

The trends are compatible (on average) with the program goals of the last review.

### Part III Conclusions and Recommendations

**1. What are the major accomplishments of the program during the past two years?**

- We continue to maintain a fairly diverse philosophy program of seven courses (diverse for a two-year college). We have maintained high quality adjunct faculty.
- Significant effort has been spent to encourage students to enroll in philosophy (primarily flyers and word of mouth). FTES has increased 11% (compared to -6% in 2006-07) and enrollment has increased 13% (compared to -6% in 2006-07). Load has increased 2%.
- Enrollments in PHIL 003: *Introduction to Philosophy*, PHIL 004: *Introduction to Moral Philosophy*, and PLSC 006: *Basic Concepts in Political Thought*, have reached their highest levels since 1985.

**2. Based on the trend analysis above, are there any changes needed in order to meet program goals or to improve program effectiveness? Explain.**

- While the formal advertising of PHIL 005 by Dr. Thomas Warren has not conclusively helped enrollment, it is, nevertheless, likely that advertising helps, as enrollments are up in other philosophy courses.
- Certain prerequisites, i.e., ENGL 001 and/or ENGL 062: *Analytical Reading*, obviously ought to be conditions for enrollment in all philosophy courses. However, if ENGL 001 and ENGL 062 were adopted as prerequisites, enrollments in philosophy would likely be reduced.
- Philosophy courses need to establish realistic (lower) class maximums.

- The College (and Division) might actively encourage more students to take PHIL 001 instead of ENGL 002, ENGL 004, or PHIL 005 as sufficient to fulfill the CSU Area A “Communication.” In other words, students who are not transferring to UC do not need (technically) ENGL 002 or ENGL 004 or PHIL 005.
- Although increasing philosophy course offerings may not increase enrollment overall, it may be worthwhile to investigate the possibility of establishing a new course, such as *Philosophy of Science*. Also, some research has been done to date to establish a bioethics course. Another possibility is the establishment of a philosophy course Learning Community with ENGL 062.
- Dr. Warren visited Merced College (spring 2008), a community college with demographics similar to SCC. He learned that their philosophy major program has apparently had positive effects in boosting philosophy enrollments. Merced also has four full-time philosophy faculty. They argue that the presence of several full-time philosophers has significantly enhanced enrollment. Perhaps the SCC Philosophy Department should hire at least one additional full-time philosopher on the rationale that increased enrollment will be generated by additional faculty. Three courses that SCC does not offer (that Merced College does offer) are *History of Philosophy*, *Formal Logic*, and *Bio-Ethics*. Offering one or two of these new courses would justify the hiring of at least one (and possibly two) new full-time philosophy faculty.
- The Division must consult with the full-time (lead) philosophy instructor in scheduling courses for each semester.

Program Review Data for 2007-08  
**PHILOSOPHY**  
 TOPs: 1509.00

Humanities  
 Division 16

		03-04	04-05	05-06	06-07	07-08
FTES GENERATED	Summer	4.34	2.96	7.01	7.67	7.34
	Fall	29.17	23.67	25.02	24.24	25.20
	Spring	20.45	24.19	25.62	22.52	28.12
	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>53.96</b>	<b>50.82</b>	<b>57.65</b>	<b>54.43</b>	<b>60.66</b>
<b>Growth/Decline [(Yr2-Yr1)/Yr1]</b>		12%	-6%	13%	-6%	11%
LOAD (WSCH/FTE)	Summer	651	444	526	575	550
	<b>Growth/Decline</b>	<b>-19%</b>	<b>-32%</b>	<b>18%</b>	<b>9%</b>	<b>-4%</b>
	Fall	486	444	417	455	378
	Spring	383	454	480	375	469
<b>AVERAGE, Fall &amp; Spring</b>		<b>435</b>	<b>449</b>	<b>449</b>	<b>415</b>	<b>424</b>
<b>Growth/Decline [(Yr2-Yr1)/Yr1]</b>		2%	3%	0%	-7%	2%
ENROLLMENT	Summer	38	27	64	70	67
	Fall	281	226	243	234	243
	Spring	200	235	243	213	274
	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>519</b>	<b>488</b>	<b>550</b>	<b>517</b>	<b>584</b>
<b>Growth/Decline [(Yr2-Yr1)/Yr1]</b>		13%	-6%	13%	-6%	13%
NUMBER OF SECTIONS	Summer	1	1	2	2	2
	Fall	9	8	9	10	10
	Spring	8	8	8	9	9
	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>21</b>
<b>Growth/Decline [(Yr2-Yr1)/Yr1]</b>		13%	-6%	12%	11%	0%
FTEF	Summer	0.200	0.200	0.400	0.400	0.400
	Fall	1.800	1.600	1.800	1.600	2.000
	Spring	1.600	1.600	1.600	1.800	1.800
PERCENT FILL (1st cen/max enroll)	Summer	95%	68%	80%	88%	84%
	Fall	86%	77%	73%	77%	63%
	Spring	74%	80%	82%	65%	80%
	<b>AVERAGE, Fall &amp; Spring</b>	<b>80%</b>	<b>79%</b>	<b>78%</b>	<b>71%</b>	<b>72%</b>
PERCENT RETENTION (EOS/1st cen)	Summer	89%	81%	88%	94%	97%
	Fall	62%	74%	77%	76%	80%
	Spring	71%	76%	72%	79%	75%
	<b>AVERAGE, Fall &amp; Spring</b>	<b>67%</b>	<b>75%</b>	<b>75%</b>	<b>78%</b>	<b>78%</b>
APPORTIONMENT INCOME (FTES * Annual Factor)		\$188,590	\$177,057	\$243,398	\$237,696	\$264,902
EXPENSE	Salaries	\$128,116	\$130,416	\$151,591	\$125,562	
	Materials	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	
	Capital Outlay	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	
	<b>Total Direct</b>	<b>\$128,116</b>	<b>\$130,416</b>	<b>\$151,591</b>	<b>\$125,562</b>	<b>\$0</b>
	Indirect (Direct * .40)	\$51,246	\$52,166	\$60,636	\$50,225	\$0
	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$179,362</b>	<b>\$182,582</b>	<b>\$212,227</b>	<b>\$175,787</b>	<b>\$0</b>
ANNUAL COST/FTES		\$3,324	\$3,593	\$3,681	\$3,230	\$0
<b>Growth/Decline [(Yr2-Yr1)/Yr1]</b>		-6%	8%	2%	-12%	-100%

Prior to AY98-99 expense does not include capital outlay or VEA funds.

8/29/2008

Solano: Research and Planning

Program Review Data for 2007-08  
 PHILOSOPHY  
 TOPs: 1509.00

Humanities  
 Division 16  
 Year: 2007-08

<u>Summer</u>		White, non-Hispanic	African- American	Hispanic	Filipino	Other, non-white	Total #
Grades *	A	7	3	2	9	5	26
	B	7	2	4	6	3	22
	C	2	2	2	1	3	10
	D	1	1	0	1	1	4
	F	2	0	0	0	0	2
	CR	0	0	0	0	0	0
	NC	0	0	0	0	0	0
	W	1	1	0	0	1	3
	TOTAL #	20	9	8	17	13	67
% Successful *		80%	78%	100%	94%	85%	87%
<u>Fall</u>		White, non-Hispanic	African- American	Hispanic	Filipino	Other, non-white	Total #
Grades *	A	22	1	3	5	15	46
	B	23	2	3	3	6	37
	C	16	12	9	8	7	52
	D	8	6	4	6	4	28
	F	9	2	1	6	4	22
	CR	0	0	0	0	0	0
	NC	0	0	0	0	0	0
	W	12	6	9	5	6	38
	TOTAL #	90	29	29	33	42	223
% Successful *		68%	52%	52%	48%	67%	61%
<u>Spring</u>		White, non-Hispanic	African- American	Hispanic	Filipino	Other, non-white	Total #
Grades *	A	18	3	4	1	9	35
	B	30	3	4	4	10	51
	C	27	7	15	14	12	75
	D	16	1	2	1	3	23
	F	10	4	1	1	4	20
	CR	0	0	0	0	0	0
	NC	0	0	0	0	0	0
	W	24	8	4	7	5	48
	TOTAL #	125	26	30	28	43	252
% Successful *		60%	50%	77%	68%	72%	64%

\*Includes duplicate counts.

8/29/2008

Solano: Research and Planning

Program Review Data for 2007-08  
 PHILOSOPHY  
 TOPs: 1509.00

Humanities  
 Division 16  
 Year: 2007-08

<u>Summer</u>		<u>F</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>U</u>	<u>ESL</u>	<u>Non-ESL</u>	<u>U</u>
Grades *	A	14	12		1	25	
	B	14	8		0	22	
	C	8	2		1	9	
	D	1	3		1	3	
	F	1	1		0	2	
	CR	0	0		0	0	
	NC	0	0		0	0	
	W	2	1		0	3	
	TOTAL #	40	27	0	3	64	0
% Successful *		90%	81%	0%	67%	88%	0%

  

<u>Fall</u>		<u>F</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>U</u>	<u>ESL</u>	<u>Non-ESL</u>	<u>U</u>
Grades *	A	24	22		3	43	
	B	20	17		2	35	
	C	29	23		2	50	
	D	15	13		1	27	
	F	9	13		0	22	
	CR	0	0		0	0	
	NC	0	0		0	0	
	W	22	16		2	36	
	TOTAL #	119	104	0	10	213	0
% Successful *		61%	60%	0%	70%	60%	0%

  

<u>Spring</u>		<u>F</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>U</u>	<u>ESL</u>	<u>Non-ESL</u>	<u>U</u>
Grades *	A	19	16		1	34	
	B	27	24		5	46	
	C	34	41		4	71	
	D	10	13		1	22	
	F	10	10		0	20	
	CR	0	0		0	0	
	NC	0	0		0	0	
	W	21	27		0	48	
	TOTAL #	121	131	0	11	241	0
% Successful *		66%	62%	0%	91%	63%	0%

\*Includes duplicate counts.

8/29/2008

Solano: Research and Planning

Program Name: Political Science &  
International Relations  
TOP Code: 2207.00  
Prepared by: T Bundenthal  
Faculty: S. Wright,  
T. Warren, D. Pyle,  
J Powell

## Political Science and International Relations Department

### Part I Goals/Objectives

#### 1. What are the goals/objectives of the program? (State in terms of student learning outcomes — SLOs.)

##### **Successful completion of this program enables a student to:**

- Demonstrate competency in the SCC “Core Four” competencies, including:
  - ◇ Communication
  - ◇ Critical thinking and information competency
  - ◇ Global awareness
  - ◇ Personal responsibility and professional development
- Acquire an understanding of basic citizenship skills.
- Become more aware of cultural, social, political, environmental, and economic forces within the world.
- Arrive at a higher level of understanding of cultural and political diversity.
- Increase intellectual curiosity and political awareness.
- Apply political science skills to critically analyze world governments.
- Expand knowledge of governments and world politics.

#### 2. List appropriate indicators of program success (i.e., measures of goals/objectives stated above). Include both quantitative and qualitative measures.

##### *Quantitative:*

- Essays, research papers and power point projects will evaluate students’ critical thinking, reading, and writing skills as measured by SLO-based rubrics.
- Discussions and test questions will measure students’ improved awareness of current cultural, political, and economic issues and evaluate competency on Intersegmental General Education Transfer Curriculum (IGETC) requirements.

- Students will use charts, diagrams, and computer skills in political science statistical analysis.

### *Qualitative*

- Students will participate in campaigns and voter registrations and will discuss the experience.
- During class discussions, students will demonstrate their understanding of diversity.
- Students demonstrate intellectual curiosity by choosing a current research topic in political science.
- Students will discuss current world events and governance.

## Part II Analysis

### 1. Identify and explain the trends in:

**Enrollment** — Enrollment has fluctuated within a consistent range that varies with the number of sections offered. A decrease of 16% for 2007-08 coincided with a 21% decrease in number of sections.

**Retention** — Retention rates have risen slightly. From 2003-04 through 2005-06 political science slightly trailed department averages. In 2006-07 and 2007-08 retention figured paralleled department figures.

**Fill rate** — Fill rate has decreased as more sections were offered from 2003-04 through 2005-06. Rates began to rise again in 2006-07. Fill rate in PLSC 001: *Introduction to American Government and Politics* — the primary course in the discipline — has been very strong. Percent fill is calculated as a simple percentage of class maximum so it is difficult to compare to other humanities courses. A max 50 political science course with 35 students shows as 70% full whereas another course with 20 students but a 25 maximum will be recorded as 80% full. Essential, but more specialized political science classes with 40 max and 20 enrolled are recorded as 50% full and are, thereby, in danger of cancellation. Annual cost/FTES for political science is \$1,000 less than the department-wide cost. This should allow Solano to support essential courses that may have a lower enrollment or percentage fill due to higher course maximums but still are well-enrolled.

#### **Other Factors** —

- We have high enrollment in PLSC 001 in both face-to-face and online offerings.
- PLSC 005: *Constitutional Rights in a Multicultural Society* fulfills the College's graduation and IGETC requirements for multicultural studies and American institutions, and has been well received by students. It will

now be offered alternating with PLSC 016: *The American Legal System* to provide a natural sequence and a higher fill rate.

- Our adjunct faculty are extremely cooperative in providing the required flexibility for the program and in participating in College affairs.

**Qualitative Factors** — Political Science is a strong major. It is both an academic transfer and general education discipline and well received by students. The Political Science Department has recently established an international relations major.

**2. How do the above trends relate to the program goals identified during the last review?**

Political science maintains consistent fill and retention rates, which indicate a need to maintain courses in these areas. Political science courses serve the students who are either entering the business world, government, political science activity, or continuing on to their upper division educational endeavors.

### Part III Conclusions and Recommendations

**1. What are the major accomplishments of the program during the past two years?**

*Political Science*

- An online component was added for PLSC 001 offering six sections per scholastic year.
- Political science/ethnic studies has provided a strong and improving speaker program.
- Enrollments have grown in PLSC 002: *Introduction to Comparative Government*, PLSC 005, and PLSC 016.

*International Relations*

- The new international relations course replaced PLSC 003 to reduce redundancy and was certified to meet IGETC standards. Program expansion may be accomplished by refocusing PLSC 003 with a US-centric foreign policy perspective and IR 001: *Global Interdependence*, as a dedicated globalization course.
- Counselors need to be aware of the program — in general, the program needs a stronger marketing effort by the College. Typical transfer schools for Solano students in the area have strong international relations programs. There is an obligation to prepare students for the options they will have.

**2. Based on the trend analysis above, are there any changes needed in order to meet program goals or to improve program effectiveness? Explain.**

- It is imperative for growth that Solano hire a dedicated political science instructor to replace a retirement loss. This position should be available for five sections rather than a split with ethnic studies.
- Political science courses will require smaller class sizes to meet the additional demands on instructional time and to increase retention.
- Utilize the SCC reading and writing specialist staffs to assist in the improvement of reading and writing skills of our students.
- Encourage peer involvement within the disciplines to work on innovative techniques, optional peer review, and teaching method.
- Encourage students to become active in area political organizations, such as the World Affairs Council program for college students, including an annual conference at Asilomar, SaveDarfur.Org, serving as interns for area congressmen, and various political parties.
- Fully utilize adjunct faculty as a resource to expand program offerings in terms of courses, campuses, and increased online capability.

Program Review Data for 2007-08  
 POLITICAL SCIENCE & INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS  
 TOPs: 2207.00 + 2299.00

Humanities  
 Division 16

		03-04	04-05	05-06	06-07	07-08
FTES GENERATED	Summer	9.70	12.36	9.84	18.46	17.21
	Fall	58.01	57.36	46.72	52.67	36.95
	Spring	44.38	58.06	50.58	51.20	47.98
	<b>TOTAL</b>	112.09	127.78	107.14	122.33	102.14
<b>Growth/Decline [(Yr2-Yr1)/Yr1]</b>		-11%	14%	-16%	14%	-17%
LOAD (WSCH/FTE)	Summer	728	618	738	554	516
	<b>Growth/Decline</b>	-6%	-15%	19%	-25%	-7%
	Fall	682	622	472	533	468
	Spring	566	550	451	485	520
<b>AVERAGE, Fall &amp; Spring</b>		624	586	462	509	494
<b>Growth/Decline [(Yr2-Yr1)/Yr1]</b>		7%	-6%	-21%	10%	-3%
ENROLLMENT	Summer	91	114	91	182	170
	Fall	567	555	456	519	366
	Spring	443	566	497	502	477
	<b>TOTAL</b>	1101	1235	1044	1203	1013
<b>Growth/Decline [(Yr2-Yr1)/Yr1]</b>		-9%	12%	-15%	15%	-16%
NUMBER OF SECTIONS	Summer	2	3	2	5	5
	Fall	13	14	17	17	12
	Spring	12	16	18	17	14
	<b>TOTAL</b>	27	33	37	39	31
<b>Growth/Decline [(Yr2-Yr1)/Yr1]</b>		-16%	22%	12%	5%	-21%
FTEF	Summer	0.400	0.600	0.400	1.000	1.000
	Fall	2.553	2.767	2.967	2.967	2.367
	Spring	2.353	3.167	3.367	3.167	2.767
PERCENT FILL (1st cen/max enroll)	Summer	91%	81%	91%	73%	68%
	Fall	91%	83%	65%	74%	64%
	Spring	80%	76%	63%	67%	72%
	<b>AVERAGE, Fall &amp; Spring</b>	86%	80%	64%	71%	68%
PERCENT RETENTION (EOS/1st cen)	Summer	84%	91%	86%	77%	88%
	Fall	78%	77%	71%	75%	77%
	Spring	69%	70%	71%	84%	78%
	<b>AVERAGE, Fall &amp; Spring</b>	74%	74%	71%	80%	78%
APPORTIONMENT INCOME (FTES * Annual Factor)		\$391,755	\$445,186	\$452,345	\$534,215	\$446,045
EXPENSE	Salaries	\$213,258	\$208,751	\$208,695	\$185,317	
	Materials	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	
	Capital Outlay	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	
	<b>Total Direct</b>	\$213,258	\$208,751	\$208,695	\$185,317	\$0
	Indirect (Direct * .40)	\$85,303	\$83,500	\$83,478	\$74,127	\$0
	<b>TOTAL</b>	\$298,561	\$292,251	\$292,173	\$259,444	\$0
ANNUAL COST/FTES		\$2,664	\$2,287	\$2,727	\$2,121	\$0
<b>Growth/Decline [(Yr2-Yr1)/Yr1]</b>		6%	-14%	19%	-22%	-100%

Prior to AY98-99 expense does not include capital outlay or VEA funds.

8/29/2008

Solano: Research and Planning

Program Review Data for 2007-08  
 POLITICAL SCIENCE & INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS  
 TOPs: 2207.00 + 2299.00

Humanities  
 Division 16  
 Year: 2007-08

<b>Summer</b>		White, non-Hispanic	African- American	Hispanic	Filipino	Other, non-white	Total #
Grades *	A	16	1	6	4	10	37
	B	18	10	7	12	9	56
	C	8	6	1	7	7	29
	D	4	3	1	2	3	13
	F	2	3	0	4	1	10
	CR	0	0	0	0		0
	NC	0	0	0	0		0
	W	7	3	2	6	3	21
	TOTAL #	55	26	17	35	33	166
% Successful *		76%	65%	82%	66%	79%	73%
<b>Fall</b>		White, non-Hispanic	African- American	Hispanic	Filipino	Other, non-white	Total #
Grades *	A	53	9	10	10	21	103
	B	30	12	9	13	17	81
	C	18	5	5	10	7	45
	D	2	0	4	0	1	7
	F	22	4	6	5	9	46
	CR	0	0	0	0		0
	NC	0	1	0	0		1
	W	9	12	9	4	6	40
	TOTAL #	134	43	43	42	61	323
% Successful *		75%	60%	56%	79%	74%	71%
<b>Spring</b>		White, non-Hispanic	African- American	Hispanic	Filipino	Other, non-white	Total #
Grades *	A	59	8	16	10	26	119
	B	51	10	21	10	13	105
	C	29	9	17	11	19	85
	D	9	3	6	1	3	22
	F	19	5	5	4	5	38
	CR	0	1	0	0		1
	NC	0	0	0	0		0
	W	24	8	15	11	14	72
	TOTAL #	191	44	80	47	80	442
% Successful *		73%	64%	68%	66%	73%	70%

\*Includes duplicate counts.

8/29/2008

Solano: Research and Planning

Program Review Data for 2007-08  
 POLITICAL SCIENCE & INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS  
 TOPs: 2207.00 + 2299.00

Humanities  
 Division 16  
 Year: 2007-08

<u>Summer</u>		<u>F</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>U</u>	<u>ESL</u>	<u>Non-ESL</u>	<u>U</u>
Grades *	A	24	13		2	35	
	B	38	18		4	52	
	C	9	20		1	28	
	D	9	4		0	13	
	F	4	6		0	10	
	CR	0	0		0	0	
	NC	0	0		0	0	
	W	14	7		2	19	
	TOTAL #	98	68	0	9	157	0
% Successful *		72%	75%	0%	78%	73%	0%
<u>Fall</u>		<u>F</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>U</u>	<u>ESL</u>	<u>Non-ESL</u>	<u>U</u>
Grades *	A	44	59		5	97	1
	B	42	39		0	81	0
	C	15	30		1	44	0
	D	3	4		0	7	0
	F	32	14		4	42	0
	CR	0	0		0	0	0
	NC	0	1		0	1	0
	W	22	18		2	38	0
	TOTAL #	158	165		12	310	1
% Successful *		64%	78%	0%	50%	72%	100%
<u>Spring</u>		<u>F</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>U</u>	<u>ESL</u>	<u>Non-ESL</u>	<u>U</u>
Grades *	A	60	59		4	115	0
	B	58	47		5	100	0
	C	46	39		6	78	1
	D	12	10		1	21	0
	F	15	23		2	36	0
	CR	0	1		0	1	0
	NC	0	0		0	0	0
	W	31	41		4	68	0
	TOTAL #	222	220	0	22	419	1
% Successful *		74%	66%	0%	68%	70%	100%

\*Includes duplicate counts.

8/29/2008

Solano: Research and Planning

Program Name: Reading  
TOP Code: 4930.70  
Prepared by: A. Dambrosio  
Faculty: A. Dambrosio,  
T. Boerner, J. Scott

## Reading Department

### Part I Goals/Objectives

#### 1. What are the goals/objectives of the program? (State in terms of student learning outcomes — SLOs.)

##### **Successful completion of this program enables a student to:**

- Develop and utilize developmental reading skills and strategies.
- Develop and utilize college-level reading strategies and critical reading competencies that satisfy Solano Community College's reading requirement.
- Identify ongoing reading needs and enroll in .5 or 1 unit of independent study in reading, as needed.

#### 2. List appropriate indicators of program success (i.e., measures of goals/objectives stated above). Include both quantitative and qualitative measures.

##### *Quantitative:*

- Measure adequacy of student access to the reading program by comparing the number of students who have below college-level skills (as documented by institutional assessment) to the number of spaces available in the Reading Lab and developmental reading courses.
- Measure adequacy of student access to college-level reading courses by comparing number of students who need to meet the reading requirement (as documented by institutional assessment) to spaces available in college-level reading courses.

##### *Qualitative:*

- Improvement of students' developmental and/or college-level reading skills as shown by the following measures: pre and post standardized test scores and teacher-made measures for students enrolled in the Reading Lab and/or reading classes and faculty evaluation of students' ability to read, as documented through oral and written responses to text.

## Part II Analysis

### 1. Identify and explain the trends in:

**Enrollment** — According to institutional research data, overall reading enrollment has increased especially because ENGL 320: *Reading Improvement Lab* enrollment is included in our reading program data, i.e., FTES generated has increased 5%, compared to -5% in 2003-04. FTES is 4.222; however, we have only two full-time reading instructors and one full-time faculty member whose load includes up to 50% reading instruction.

**Retention** — Given that most of our student population is considered “high-risk,” our retention average is 79%, an unexpected retention rate for this high-risk population. It should be noted that most reading courses are not required. Reading has only one course (ENGL 062: *Analytical Reading*) that is required for a small population of students who have not already tested out of the course; the course pre-requisite is a writing course without the inclusion of a prerequisite reading course. As a result of an inadequate course prerequisite, many students who take ENGL 062 are poorly placed. Furthermore, students place themselves in ENGL 331: *Vocabulary Strategies for Reading Comprehension*, and ENGL 353: *Textbook Reading Strategies* (neither course is a required course) and are not necessarily ready for either course. ENGL 320 is not included in retention data (See “Enrollment”).

**Fill rate** — Our percent of fill is 91% and we are concerned that the courses do not have enough institutional support given the data that the majority of our students need instruction in reading scheduling. It should be noted that ENGL 320 is not included in our fill rate. Fill rate has historically improved when reading faculty collaborate with the Division Dean to schedule classes.

**Other Factors** — As we have mentioned in past years, traditionally, a large population of underrepresented students enroll in remedial reading classes. These students are typically high-risk students and often do not have the necessary skills to succeed in our courses. Many students enroll in ENGL 062 as they attempt to finish their degree, only to realize that they cannot read at college-level, despite the fact that they have completed other college-level courses. Because many students overload themselves, the reading class is typically dropped because it is not viewed as the more important course (students often comment that they are banking on “passing” the College’s assessment test and do not take ENGL 062 seriously).

We continue to observe that eligibility for ENGL 370: *English Fundamentals* (a pre-college level composition class), the major pre-requisite for ENGL 062 (a college-level reading class), is not usually effective in predicting success in reading. Also, we have observed that college-wide grade inflation contributes, in part, to the ineffectiveness of prerequisite courses for reading

We are concerned that students in ENGL 370, ENGL 350: *Writing and Reading Skills for ESL Students*, and ENGL 355: *Writing and Reading Skills*, are still not getting the necessary reading instruction that they need.

We are very concerned that we are restricting access to our students who wish to enroll in the Reading Lab and are not ENGL 370 or ENGL 355 students. We have little space for “independent” students, therefore only English Department students are being served at SCC. We are currently revising the Reading Lab’s structure to make more room for students from all disciplines on campus.

Finally, using the College’s reading assessment as one measure of the need for scheduling additional reading instruction (over 85% of students of those who take the assessment test score below college-level in reading), it is clear that we are not adequately serving the reading needs of our student population. Unfortunately, the College has not hired additional (new) reading instructors since 1985. Subsequent to 1985, all full-time reading hires have been replacement hires. From 1985 through 2007, the Reading Department was staffed with one full-time reading teacher, the exception being approximately four years where two full-time faculty taught only reading. Currently, the Reading Department is largely understaffed to meet the growing remedial reader population.

**Qualitative Factors** — The Reading Lab faculty and staff have continued to work with Counseling Department faculty, the Bookstore, the Assessment Center, and other Student Services. We continually work with various agencies on campus to better serve our students.

Reading faculty continue to work closely with other faculty to promote awareness of reading. Much time is spent on personal notes, flyers, and discussion of the reading program in various division meetings. ENGL 320: *Reading Improvement Lab* program is under constant revision to improve our curriculum. Much time has been spent to improve the ENGL 320 curriculum for ENGL 355 and ENGL 370 (linked classes).

## **2. How do the above trends relate to the program goals identified during the last review?**

We continue to serve more students in our reading program, but we do not have enough faculty, nor do we offer ENGL 320 on Saturdays, nor at our off-campus centers (ENGL 310: *Writing Skills Lab*, offers Saturdays and off-campus instruction). Fill rate in our courses has been good when faculty are involved in scheduling. The Reading Department faculty must create a pro-forma schedule to assist the Dean in scheduling reading courses and staffing the Reading Lab.

Because we ask all students to evaluate our Reading Lab, we see that students like the program, but are often frustrated when they must wait for assistance. Our students who persist in the Reading Lab generally improve their test scores (we monitor pre- and post-test scores). We also observe that students want to spend more time in the Lab but cannot attend because of lack of space.

We have had some success with heavily advertising our courses and working with the counselors. Nevertheless, students often do not recognize their reading needs. Reading is not given the same priority as writing with regard to a comprehensive curriculum in that the College has not yet required a sequence of reading courses.

## Part III Conclusions and Recommendations

### 1. What are the major accomplishments of the program during the past two years?

- In fall 2007, we hired one new, full-time reading teacher to replace a 2002 full-time hire. Additionally, we hired another faculty member to replace one faculty member who taught a full-time combination load of English and reading classes. We have also held workshops on reading during FlexCal, offered Learning Communities with reading courses. A sabbatical leave report will produce a plan to improve awareness of our reading classes and align our reading curriculum with that of the writing curriculum.
- Our students continue to demonstrate improved reading skills (comparison of pre- and post-scores in the Reading Lab and reading classes reveals much improvement for only one semester of reading study). We have also participated in the development of Reading Lab curricula for ENGL 370 and ENGL 355 by suggesting what reading skills are necessary for student success and are now revising the curriculum. Student evaluations continue to be extremely favorable. Many students enrolled in reading classes report that they wish they had been advised to enroll in reading at the beginning of their college careers because reading courses could have helped them succeed in their other college courses. Many students report that they were not aware of the availability of independent study in ENGL 320: *Reading Improvement Lab*, for example. The majority of students enrolled in ENGL 062 report that they were not aware of the reading requirement. Again, after taking ENGL 062, they report that the class could have helped them in college-level courses.
- We have spent considerable time working with Research & Planning to attempt to validate new prerequisites for our reading classes and to validate cut-off scores for the new assessment test that has been adopted by the College. Additionally, we continue to work with Research & Planning to document evidence of student success (pre- and post-reading scores have shown improvement over time, but data collection methods have not been consistent).
- Finally, we continue to refine reading advisories for English composition classes and have worked with the Assessment Center staff and counselors to encourage students to enroll in the appropriate reading classes.

### 2. Based on the trend analysis above, are there any changes needed in order to meet program goals or to improve program effectiveness? Explain.

- The reading faculty need to convince the College community that college-level reading competencies are imperative for student success. We believe that the institution, as a whole, needs to understand the importance of directing students to improve their reading competencies (especially early in their academic careers) as a necessary prerequisite to earning a degree.

- We must review the current prerequisites for ENGL 062 and create prerequisites that are adequate. Our retention (and enrollment) can be improved, but we believe that institutional support is necessary to assist us in solving the problem of inappropriate prerequisites and to make students aware that formal instruction in reading is necessary for success in college. In fall 2008, we plan to begin work on a new reading course to align the reading course offerings with those of writing (parallel structure). We intend that this new course will serve as a prerequisite course for ENGL 062. We will also reexamine the “test score” equivalent of the ENGL 062 course because the test score (95) is below college-level.
- We offer Learning Communities, when possible, with various courses on campus in an attempt to establish reading across the curriculum. Past experience, however, has shown us that it is very difficult for such Learning Communities to attract sufficient enrollment because a reading course alone takes much time and preparation for a community college student.
- We intend to involve full-time reading faculty in recruiting new hires, e.g., more comprehensive searches, improved opportunities for teaching demonstrations, and revision of interview questions.
- We will continue to closely monitor the scheduling of classes (monitor enrollment patterns) and evaluate student retention.
- We intend to more closely examine department-wide standards for our reading courses: ENGL 331, ENGL 353, and ENGL 062.
- We intend to continue to monitor the quality of our instruction in all reading courses and the Reading Lab, e.g., peer evaluation, mentoring of new faculty, and improving curriculum.
- We wish to continue to hire full-time faculty to replace adjunct faculty when possible (AB 1725 mandates a 75% full-time to 25% part-time ratio). Currently the reading lab program in particular suffers from lack of consistent instruction, and program growth is inhibited because few faculty are able to participate in program improvement. We wish that we had full-time faculty devoted to program improvement. It is difficult to hold meetings, for example, when the majority of the reading faculty are adjunct and are unable to attend.
- We intend to investigate ways to open enrollment to more independent students in the Reading Lab. Currently, the Reading Lab is serving ENGL 350, ENGL 355, and ENGL 370 students primarily (we have as little as twenty to twenty-five spaces available for students who wish to work independently). We plan to recruit more independent students to the Lab in hopes of providing the necessary data needed to document the need to expand access to the program.
- We should investigate a means of creating an institutional database for ongoing data in reading.

		03-04	04-05	05-06	06-07	07-08
FTES GENERATED	Summer	2.51	3.83	0.00	2.56	1.83
	Fall	36.99	38.76	37.78	38.50	44.35
	Spring	38.77	33.21	37.23	32.87	31.30
	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>78.27</b>	<b>75.80</b>	<b>75.01</b>	<b>73.93</b>	<b>77.48</b>
<b>Growth/Decline [(Yr2-Yr1)/Yr1]</b>		-5%	-3%	-1%	-1%	5%
LOAD (WSCH/FTE)	Summer	377	288	0	384	274
	<b>Growth/Decline</b>	N/A	-24%	-100%	N/A	-29%
	Fall	324	283	291	279	317
	Spring	319	252	272	248	222
<b>AVERAGE, Fall &amp; Spring</b>		<b>322</b>	<b>268</b>	<b>282</b>	<b>264</b>	<b>270</b>
<b>Growth/Decline [(Yr2-Yr1)/Yr1]</b>		13%	-17%	5%	-6%	2%
ENROLLMENT	Summer	22	35	0	28	20
	Fall	710	725	727	735	779
	Spring	723	661	687	617	515
	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>1455</b>	<b>1421</b>	<b>1414</b>	<b>1380</b>	<b>1314</b>
<b>Growth/Decline [(Yr2-Yr1)/Yr1]</b>		-1%	-2%	0%	-2%	-5%
NUMBER OF SECTIONS	Summer	1	2	1	1	1
	Fall	9	10	11	12	11
	Spring	9	9	11	12	8
	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>20</b>
<b>Growth/Decline [(Yr2-Yr1)/Yr1]</b>		-21%	11%	10%	9%	-20%
FTEF	Summer	0.200	0.400	0.000	0.200	0.200
	Fall	3.422	4.111	3.889	4.133	4.200
	Spring	3.644	3.956	4.111	3.978	4.222
PERCENT FILL (1st cen/max enroll)	Summer	88%	70%	0%	112%	80%
	Fall	109%	92%	102%	85%	93%
	Spring	110%	93%	92%	83%	88%
	<b>AVERAGE, Fall &amp; Spring</b>	<b>110%</b>	<b>93%</b>	<b>97%</b>	<b>84%</b>	<b>91%</b>
PERCENT RETENTION (EOS/1st cen)	Summer	86%	70%	0%	93%	90%
	Fall	75%	71%	78%	72%	74%
	Spring	72%	69%	72%	89%	72%
	<b>AVERAGE, Fall &amp; Spring</b>	<b>74%</b>	<b>70%</b>	<b>75%</b>	<b>81%</b>	<b>73%</b>
APPORTIONMENT INCOME (FTES * Annual Factor)		\$273,554	\$264,087	\$316,692	\$322,852	\$338,355
EXPENSE	Salaries	\$241,146	\$224,743	\$0	\$0	
	Materials	\$0	\$167	\$0	\$0	
	Capital Outlay	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	
	<b>Total Direct</b>	<b>\$241,146</b>	<b>\$224,910</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>
	Indirect (Direct * .40)	\$96,458	\$89,964	\$0	\$0	\$0
	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$337,604</b>	<b>\$314,874</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>
ANNUAL COST/FTES		\$4,313	\$4,154	\$0	\$0	\$0
<b>Growth/Decline [(Yr2-Yr1)/Yr1]</b>		-20%	-4%	-100%	0%	N/A

Prior to AY98-99 expense does not include capital outlay or VEA funds.

Program Review Data for 2007-08  
 READING  
 TOPs: 4930.70 + 4930.71

Humanities  
 Division 16  
 Year: 2007-08

<u>Summer</u>		White, non-Hispanic	African- American	Hispanic	Filipino	Other, non-white	Total #
Grades *	A	0	0	0	1		1
	B	2	1	0	2		5
	C	2	3	2	1	2	10
	D	0	0	1	0		1
	F	0	1	0	0		1
	CR	0	0	0	0		0
	NC	0	0	0	0		0
	W	0	1	1	0		2
	TOTAL #	4	6	4	4	2	20
% Successful *		100%	67%	50%	100%	100%	80%
<u>Fall</u>		White, non-Hispanic	African- American	Hispanic	Filipino	Other, non-white	Total #
Grades *	A	2	2	2	3	2	11
	B	9	1	9	9	3	31
	C	9	6	10	3	3	31
	D	4	3	3	3	1	14
	F	1	2	1	1	1	6
	CR	125	72	87	44	61	389
	NC	28	29	12	12	9	90
	W	34	38	30	12	18	132
	TOTAL #	212	153	154	87	98	704
% Successful *		68%	53%	70%	68%	70%	66%
<u>Spring</u>		White, non-Hispanic	African- American	Hispanic	Filipino	Other, non-white	Total #
Grades *	A	6	1	3	1	4	15
	B	8	6	4	7	2	27
	C	4	6	3	3	2	18
	D	1	0	0	0		1
	F	2	3	1	0		6
	CR	60	62	47	23	39	231
	NC	17	26	12	12	6	73
	W	23	38	15	7	17	100
	TOTAL #	121	142	85	53	70	471
% Successful *		64%	53%	67%	64%	67%	62%

\*Includes duplicate counts.

8/29/2008

Solano: Research and Planning

Program Review Data for 2007-08  
 READING  
 TOPs: 4930.70 + 4930.71

Humanities  
 Division 16  
 Year: 2007-08

<u>Summer</u>		<u>F</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>U</u>	<u>ESL</u>	<u>Non-ESL</u>	<u>U</u>
Grades *	A	0	1		0	1	
	B	3	2		1	4	
	C	5	5		0	10	
	D	1	0		1	0	
	F	1	0		0	1	
	CR	0	0		0	0	
	NC	0	0		0	0	
	W	1	1		1	1	
	TOTAL #	11	9	0	3	17	0
% Successful *		73%	89%	0%	33%	88%	0%

  

<u>Fall</u>		<u>F</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>U</u>	<u>ESL</u>	<u>Non-ESL</u>	<u>U</u>
Grades *	A	7	4		1	10	0
	B	21	10		4	27	0
	C	20	11		7	24	0
	D	10	4		2	12	0
	F	6	0		0	6	0
	CR	229	160		51	338	0
	NC	43	47		6	83	1
	W	74	58		7	125	0
	TOTAL #	410	294	0	78	625	1
% Successful *		68%	63%	0%	81%	64%	0%

  

<u>Spring</u>		<u>F</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>U</u>	<u>ESL</u>	<u>Non-ESL</u>	<u>U</u>
Grades *	A	11	4		2	13	0
	B	20	7		4	23	0
	C	10	8		3	15	0
	D	1	0		0	1	0
	F	5	1		0	6	0
	CR	142	89		32	198	1
	NC	44	29		9	64	0
	W	61	39		9	91	0
	TOTAL #	294	177	0	59	411	1
% Successful *		62%	61%	0%	69%	61%	100%

\*Includes duplicate counts.

8/29/2008

Solano: Research and Planning