**Instructional Program Review  
English, Humanities, and Languages**

This document addresses the following SACSCOC requirements: CR 2.5, CS 3.3.1, CS 3.5, and FR 4.1.

Purpose

Amarillo College instructional programs consistently review data and strive for improvement.

The purpose of this review is to demonstrate how AC instructional areas support AC’s mission by “*enriching the lives of our students and our community*.”

On an annual basis the Program Review process will capture a holistic view of a department’s/program’s strengths, weaknesses, and improvement plans based on institutional data and assessment information.

The information collected on this form will also serve to help your division complete the information required by SACSCOC for Amarillo College’s continued reaffirmation efforts.

**Response Length Suggestion: Most responses should be 2-3 sentences.   
 If available, you may also provide a link/reference to other documentation that answers each question.**

I: Identification

1. **Department or Program Title(s)** (Department Chairs List Dept.; Coordinators List Program)**:**

|  |
| --- |
| English, Humanities, and Languages |

1. **Department and/or Program(s) Purpose Statement:**

|  |
| --- |
| **Educate students in writing and literature to enhance their academic, professional, and personal growth.** |

1. **Program Review Year (i.e. Most Recent Academic Year)**

|  |
| --- |
| 2014-2015 |

1. **Date of Submission:**

|  |
| --- |
|  |

1. **Lead Person Responsible for this Program Review:**

|  |
| --- |
| Name: Frank Sobey  Title: Department Chair  E-mail: fesobey@actx.edu  Phone Number: (806) 371-5472 |

1. **Additional Individuals (Name and Title) Responsible for Completing this Program Review:**

|  |
| --- |
| None |

II: Program Enrollment and Success Data

Use baseline data that will enable you to determine the status of your program (compare the most recent data to previous year data, compare your program to any existing state standards, or consider any other relevant factors). Please use Firefox or Chrome browser to open links.

1. **Based on the most recent reported data, please evaluate your program(s).**

***A .Overall Program Data*** (Complete this section if your dept. produces any certificate and/or terminal degree.)**(Place an ‘X’ in each text box that corresponds to your evaluation.)**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Student Data Reported/Collected** | **Needs Improvement** | **Meets Standards** | **Exceeds Standards** | **Not Applicable** |
| a. Employment Rates/Wages  ([EMSI](https://actx.emsicareercoach.com/), [College Measures,](http://esm.collegemeasures.org/esm/texas/) [CREWS](http://reports.thecb.state.tx.us/approot/thecb_tcr_ews/figure2.htm), [Perkins](http://www.thecb.state.tx.us/apps/Perkins/perkdata.cfm)) |  |  |  | X |
| b. [Completion](https://iresearch.actx.edu/html/databook/dbtbl4g.html) | X |  |  |  |
| c. [Licensure Pass Rates](http://www.txhighereddata.org/reports/performance/ctclbb/licensure.cfm) |  |  |  | X |
| d. Retention ([FA-SP](https://iresearch.actx.edu/html/databook/dbtbl2ke.html)) and ([FA-FA](https://iresearch.actx.edu/html/databook/dbtbl2ke-f.html)) |  |  |  | X |
| e. [Grades A-C](https://iresearch.actx.edu/html/databook/dbtbl2ge.html) | X |  |  |  |
| f. [Annual Enrollment](https://iresearch.actx.edu/html/databook/dbtbl3a.html) |  |  |  | X |
| g. [Survey, Focus Group, & Related Data](http://www.actx.edu/iea/index.php?module=article&id=61) |  |  |  | X |

**Based on the data in Part A, respond to the following two questions:**

1. Identify one area in which your program(s) excel.

|  |
| --- |
| Historically, FA-SP persistence for our majors has been high, but the data I have available are for 2013, not 2014. |

1. Identify one area in which your program(s) need to most focus for the next few years.

|  |
| --- |
| Completion: We typically have around 30+ majors. According to data, 8 of our majors completed in 2015. Completion needs to be a point of emphasis, and to that end, we hope to work more closely with WTAMU. We have, in fact, retooled our degree plan to make it work more seamlessly with the existing GE and English degree plans. Also, we are going to discuss the idea of reverse transfer with WT. |

***B. Course-Specific Data*** (Complete this section to evaluate the courses that fall under your dept./program.) **(Place an ‘X’ in each text box that corresponds to your evaluation.)**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Student Data Reported/Collected** | **Needs Improvement** | **Meets Standards** | **Exceeds Standards** |
| a. Grades A-C (IDS - Race/Ethnicity) | X |  |  |
| b. Grades A-C (IDS – Age) | X |  |  |
| c. Grades A-C (IDS – Gender) | X |  |  |
| d. Grades A-C (IDS – First Generation) | X |  |  |
| e. Grades A-C (IDS – Pell) | X |  |  |
| f. Grades A-C (IDS – Full/Part-Time) |  |  |  |
| g. Course-level Enrollment (IDS) |  |  |  |
| h. Survey, Focus Group, & Related Data |  |  |  |

**Based on the data in Part B, respond to the following two questions:**

1. Identify two courses that are doing well.

|  |
| --- |
| 1302 and 2311 are doing quite well. |

1. Identify two courses in which your dept./program(s) needs to most focus for the next few years.

|  |
| --- |
| 1301 and 1301/0302. Now, the combo class is doing well in the sense that students are just as likely to be successful in the combo as students in a regular 1301. However, the success rate across all categories for 1301 students is below 70%. If we can get the number higher, no doubt we could do the same for the combo class. |

III: Institutional Initiatives

PART A – No Excuses:

Each department/program is expected to support student success initiatives.

**List 1 or more ways your program(s) most focus on any of the** [**No Excuses goals/initiatives**](http://www.actx.edu/iea/index.php?module=article&id=83) **and how you have helped AC fulfill its No Excuses goal.**

|  |
| --- |
| 1. The department has invested a great deal of time in redesigning our gatekeeper courses (Comp I and II) to improve persistence and successful completion with a grade of “C” or higher by focusing on learner-centered pedagogy, active learning strategies, leveraging technology, eliminating course drift, internal assessment of student artifacts across course sections, and tutoring. Recent data show that Comp I and II students are succeeding at a higher rate than they ever have before.  2. Similarly, the department has redesigned its remedial English offerings by focusing on learner-centered pedagogy, active learning strategies, leveraging technology, eliminating course drift, internal assessment of student artifacts across course sections, and tutoring. The department offers a co-req “combo” course (1301/0302) designed to fast track students in a single semester toward earning college credit for Comp I. Also, the department offers an integrated reading and writing course that prepares students for Comp I. The department will be piloting an 8-week version of the 0303 IRW course in the fall that will be paired with an 8-week 1301, with the goal of fast tracking students toward college credit in a single semester. The developmental redesign, however, is recent, and we are still analyzing data from fall 2014 and spring 2015. |

PART B – Strategic Planning:  
 Each department/program is expected to support [**AC’s Strategic Planning**](http://www.actx.edu/iea/index.php?module=article&id=10) initiatives.

1. **Identify at least one strategy or task from the Strategic Plan your area(s) currently addresses/evaluates.**

|  |
| --- |
| In an effort to expand student success, which is Goal 1 for the strategic plan through 2015, the department uses institutional data to determine how students in our courses are performing. The department has used this data to make a number of decisions, specifically by expanding Writers’ Corner and redesigning Comp I and II, as well as developmental courses. Also, individual faculty analyze success rates in their courses during faculty performance review, for example, and set goals accordingly. |

1. **(If applicable) What additional item(s) should AC’s Strategic Plan address?**

|  |
| --- |
| NA |

PART C– General Education Objectives   
SACSCOC requires that the College prove attainment of general education competencies by all students. AC has adopted the below objectives for our core curriculum assessment, but you may add additional objectives you teach. Additionally, AC expects that learning objectives are present and are being evaluated in all courses.

1. **Provide a listing of which courses in your department/program(s) teach these general education objectives. For assistance in identifying educational objectives in non-core courses, refer to the** [**ACGM**](http://www.thecb.state.tx.us/AAR/UndergraduateEd/WorkforceEd/acgm.htm)**/**[**WECM**](http://www.thecb.state.tx.us/AAR/UndergraduateEd/WorkforceEd/wecm/)**.**(List individual course prefix, state “all courses”, state “N/A” for an objective, etc.):

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Objective** | **Course(s)** |
| Communication Skills | ENGL 1301, 1302, 2311, 2322, 2326, 2328, 2331, 2332, 2333, 2341 |
| Critical Thinking Skills | ENGL 1301, 1302, 2311, 2322, 2326, 2328, 2331, 2332, 2333, 2341 |
| Empirical & Quantitative Skills | NA |
| Teamwork | ENGL 1301, 1302, 2311 |
| Personal Responsibility | ENGL 1301, 1302, 2311, 2322, 2326, 2328, 2331, 2332, 2333, 2341 |
| Social Responsibility | ENGL 2322, 2326, 2328, 2331, 2332, 2333, 2341 |
| Note: May Insert other Objective(s) |  |

1. **Briefly explain how your department/program(s) have recently (i.e. past year) identified and ensured that these general education objectives are taught throughout each course section.**

|  |
| --- |
| For developmental, composition, and sophomore level literature classes, common artifacts that implicate each core objective are collected by department committees for assessment purposes. |

1. **What method(s) are your faculty using to assess the required objectives in your courses?**(List individual course prefix, state “all courses”, state “N/A” for each method, etc.):

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Method** | **Course(s)** |
| Capstone Project/Exam | **NA** |
| Embedded Questions | NA |
| Licensure Exam | NA |
| Portfolios | NA |
| Projects/Essays | ENGL 1301, 1302, 2311, 2322, 2326, 2328, 2331, 2332, 2333, 2341 |
| Testing (i.e. course-based testing; finals) | NA |
| Note: May Insert other Method |  |

1. **Briefly address any improvements made in your department/program(s) based on your data findings.**

|  |
| --- |
| To implicate personal responsibility in the researched argumentative essay for Comp I, the department now requires instructors to use peer review in the writing process. Consequently, the department populated its learning object repository with numerous examples of peer review assignments for part-time and full time faculty to use and/or adapt in class during the writing process. We also have created trainings for part- and full time faculty, based on our findings, where we noticed problems with not meeting benchmarks. |

1. **In which course(s) have you implemented critical reading and thinking strategies? What strategies did you use? How would you evaluate your success in implementing these strategies? Are there strategies you discovered that you would like to share with your colleagues? Do you feel that your department/program could benefit from more professional development in this area?**

|  |
| --- |
| All courses implement critical reading and thinking strategies. Faculty use reading strategies like SQ3R, charting, 3-2-1 reports, annotation, etc. Faculty teach the principles of analysis and interpretation and the rhetorical situation and appeals to understand (and engage with) a variety of texts. Nearly everything we do in English, Humanities, and Languages is rooted in the importance of critical reading and thinking, so much so that many of the strategies we use we have shared with the college, most recently at the spring 2015 general assembly and over the course of the spring semester in a series of critical thinking and reading workshops. Having said that, we could always benefit from more professional development in this area. |

PART D: Core Curriculum Assessment – Program Outcomes  
Complete this Section ONLY for Programs Directly Responsible for Core Curriculum Courses  
The Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board (THECB) has identified 3-4 core objectives (competencies) that each core curriculum course is required to teach and assess.

**You may either collect data and information from all core curriculum courses in your program/department or you may attach a separate document for each course/area in your department/program that answers the questions below.**

1. Do you certify that your courses annually assess and collect data on the core objectives as required by the THECB?

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Yes** | **No** |
| X |  |

1. Do you certify that each course section is equitable in their assessment of the collection of data and assessment required by the THECB?

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Yes** | **No** |
| X |  |

1. Do you certify that the work assessed has an equal chance (i.e. you did not “cherry pick”   
   the best student work) for assessment?

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Yes** | **No** |
| X |  |

1. Briefly describe the internal and external data you used to form your assessment benchmarks. Note: The THECB requires external data (e.g. [CCSSE](http://www.actx.edu/iea/index.php?module=article&id=61)) be used to create your benchmarks.

|  |
| --- |
| CCSSE surveys revealed that a significant percentage of students did not believe they were using critical thinking and reading skills. That, coupled with an incredibly high attrition rate in our gateway classes, led the department to create an internal assessment using a qualitative rubric to determine whether or not students were actually meeting SLOs and core objectives (because data that showed student success (A-C) and attrition were not enough). |

1. The “[Call for Course Proposals for Inclusion](https://www.actx.edu/courseproposal/)” contains a description of each assignment/activity, direct assessment method, etc. for each of your department’s/program’s courses in the core curriculum.

For each course approved for core curriculum inclusion, provide the following information:

1. Provide a link to or copy of your data results and/or a summation of your results for each required competency for each core curriculum course in your program.

|  |
| --- |
|  |
|  |

1. Did you meet your benchmark/target in each course? If not, do you need to adjust your benchmark or adjust the instruction to meet the benchmark?

|  |
| --- |
| We met our benchmark in each course. |

1. Provide information on your data collection strategy (e.g. each faculty member collected data, sampling of student work collected across sections used, etc.):

|  |
| --- |
| For Comp I, Comp II, and sophomore literature courses, a sampling of student work was collected across all sections. Instructors were asked to provide each committee with a number of final student writing projects. |

1. Please explain how your results were evaluated (e.g. a team evaluated the data,   
   data was collected from every student in the course via Blackboard, etc.):

|  |
| --- |
| The assessment committee for each one randomly selected artifacts from the sampling and used a rubric to grade norm and then score the artifacts. All data were compiled in Excel spreadsheets. |

1. How do you ensure your results are not biased and are reliable (i.e. inter-rater reliability)?

|  |
| --- |
| All identifying information was taken off the artifacts by the committee chair before delivering the artifacts to the rest of the committee for assessment. A grade norming session ensured that the committee was uniformly applying the evaluative categories in the rubric. |

1. Please list the facts you feel contributed to your results (Analysis):

|  |
| --- |
| Since we met our benchmark in each course, going forward, I would like to visit with each assessment committee to see if we need to raise our benchmark from 70% to 75%. Also, the Comp II and Sophomore Lit committees may need to make the rubric more robust like the Comp I rubric. |

1. How have you or will you improve student learning in each course based on the   
   most recent assessment results?

|  |
| --- |
| We emphasized active learning and reading strategies, heavily promoted our tutoring facility, eliminated course drift through redesign, vertically aligned our course sequence, created a Learning Object Repository to assist part- and full time faculty, and made instructors more accountable through faculty performance review. |

6. For each core curriculum course and each core objective, please include a copy of the assessment instrument and five randomly selected, evaluated assessment samples with this form. Some examples of things you may include with your submission are as follows:

* + **Embedded Questions** – Copy of possible question bank and copy of five student work samples that include questions from the question bank
  + **Juried Assessment** – List of members on juried panel and copy of five panel evaluations. If student performance, picture or work, etc. is available, include that with your submission as well.
  + **Pre-Post Test** – Copy of pre-test/post-test questions and five samples of student work from pre-test and five samples of same students’ work from post test
  + **Rubric** – Copy of rubric and copy of five student work samples
  + **Other Types of Assessment** –Use the above bullets as a reference point for what you may wish to provide. Please contact the Director of Institutional Effectiveness with specific questions.

Also, if it is not clear, please identify on your student work the portions of the student work that address the required THECB objective/s.

1301:



1302:



All Sophomore Literature:



2311: The Tech writing rubric is still in development.

IV: Conclusions

1. **How have you or your staff adjusted your pedagogy (method and practice of teaching) to   
   improve your academic quality and/or aid in some other area related to student success?**

|  |
| --- |
| We are much more learned-centered now in the way that we engage students with active learning strategies, which is a result of more faculty collaboration and sharing of ideas and materials, professional development, and utilization of institutional resources such as the Writers’ Corner. |

1. **What program improvement opportunities are available to your staff (e.g. external curriculum committees, trainings, etc.)?**

|  |
| --- |
| We encourage our faculty to take advantage of professional development opportunities through the college (e.g., Blackboard training, learning how to utilize different technologies), as well as at the state and national level. Faculty have attended Achieving the Dream, TADE, NADE, 4C’s conferences, and we plan to continue to support that activity. |

1. **What is the biggest issue/obstacle that your program currently faces?**   
   **Please explain the issue, point to evidence supporting why your issue is important (addressed in this document or elsewhere), explain how you would like to fix the issue, and explain any budgetary constraints.**

|  |
| --- |
| 1. Our tutoring facility, Writers’ Corner, is limited by space, personnel, hours of operation, and method of tutoring largely due to a lack of funding. Since it opened in 2010, the WC has grown considerably in the number of students it serves, as well as the number of tutoring sessions. We have had to turn students away, at times, due to the above-mentioned problems. This is a problem because we know that tutoring works.  2. Ordway’s SMART classrooms are outdated, poorly designed, and not equipped with computers, which is problematic for all of the writing-intensive classes we teach. We have just two writing labs, which primarily serve our developmental classes, leaving composition and sophomore classes scrambling to find labs elsewhere on campus. We need more collaborative classrooms. This type of classroom would make the lack of writing lab space a nonissue and would give students an opportunity to work on writing projects in class. But, obviously, we don’t have funds for that, and all of the money for laptop carts, etc., seems to be going to other departments and areas. |

1. **Additional Comments Pertinent to this Review (Not Required):**

|  |
| --- |
|  |