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## Section 1: Overview of the Program

## Program Description

The English department is a valuable and culturally inclusive and responsive program offering a wide variety of classes ranging from developmental composition to upper division literature courses. In 2019, Compton College (the "College") separated from El Camino College and reorganized its division structure from three divisions to five. The English department is now grouped with other arts and humanities courses. According to the annual factbook (20182019), the majority of our students are under 24 and are Latinx ( $61 \%$ are 24 and under and $61 \%$ are Latinx). However, a substantial minority of our students are over 24 and non-Latinx (adults 25 and over comprise $39 \%$ and non-Latinx are approximately $32 \%$ of the student population.)

The department currently has 10 full time faculty, including the chair. There are plans to hire a full-time faculty in Journalism/English to begin in the Fall semester 2021. However, because of the COVID-19 pandemic, this should be put on hold until enrollment stabilizes and increases. This new faculty member would divide his or her time between teaching in the journalism department and overseeing the production of a student-run newspaper/newsletter (either in print or digitally), teaching in the English department and writing curriculum for a new social media program in conjunction with Jared Gordon, the new film/video hire. The chair manages the day-to-day operations of the department and division and reports to Dr. Rebekah Blonshine, the Dean of Student Success.

The biggest change in the department's offerings have occurred because of AB705 (2017). This legislation mandates that a "community college district or college [will] maximize the probability that the student will enter and complete transfer-level coursework in English and mathematics within a one-year timeframe. Although not specified by the legislation, most community colleges have reduced or eliminated their below transfer level coursework and Compton College has followed suit. A key mandate of the bill is that no community college can require a "student to enroll in remedial English [...] unless placement research [...] shows that those students are highly unlikely to succeed in transfer-level coursework." However, a college can "require students to enroll in additional concurrent support."

In response to this legislation, in Spring 2019 the English department eliminated English A, B, C, $80,82,84$ and only offers 1-3 sections of English RWA (reading writing accelerated). The department has also created a co-requisite support class, English 101S. Certain English 101 sections are designated to have the required co-requisite class. This co-requisite is designated a lecture class instead of a lab (unlike RWA which has a lab support) and is 2 units. This is taught by the same instructor class for a total of 6 units. The English department chose this model as it has been shown to be one of the most effective methods for helping students who otherwise would have been placed into a developmental English course.

The creation of program maps along with a consistent rotation of literature offerings ensures that our students are guaranteed a diverse array of courses such as Chicano and Latino
literature, African American literature, Ethnic Literature, Images of Women in Literature, Children's literature, Film and Literature, and Creative Writing for general interest and for transfer.

One result of the pandemic is that all of our composition classes and the majority of our literature classes are approved to be taught online. More than half of our instructors were already certified to teach online but after the pandemic, even more have gotten their online certification. We are offering more online and hybrid modalities for all of our classes. While this online (both synchronous and asynchronous) modality is currently required, we anticipate that we will continue to offer many online and hybrid options to ensure equitable access for all of our students who cannot always come to campus in person.

Another result of the challenging 2020-2021 year is that the California Chancellor for Community College's office had a "Call to Action" for all community colleges to diversify their course offerings. The English department incorporated the diversity, equity, and inclusivity initiatives into the newly created Community of Practice pilot, as well as in course offerings, in order to improve pedagogy and to help increase student success rates through purposeful professional development.

## Degree Offerings

The program offers one degree, the English AA-T (Associate of Arts in English for Transfer). This degree fulfills the transfer requirements for both CSUs and UCs. The department is also important in the General Studies AA degrees with an emphasis in either Arts and Humanities or Culture and Communications.

Since the last program review, the department has moved toward its goal to add a more diverse selection of transfer level courses. The department has also increased its participation of adjuncts in general department business with increased participation in division meetings, SLO collection, and Community of Practice involvement.

The English program is integral in the Compton College Vision for Success and 2024 Strategic Plan. The program is also a key part of the new student centered funding formula that focuses on student success in transfer level English and math courses. Our program offers an affordable alternative for students to fulfill their IGETC requirements in our fully articulated English program.

We offer one level of non-transferable English composition - RWA (Reading Writing Accelerated). This 5 unit class incorporates a approximately 2 hours of lab time/week in addition to lecture. This class is offered for students who have chosen to place themselves into this level. We ensure that this class is offered in conjunction with Educational Development 37: Increased Learning Performance: English. We work closely with SRC counselors to receive extra support for this class. This interdepartmental work is crucial since
we have discovered that many of our students who choose to place themselves in this class are also registered with the SRC.

## College Mission Statement

Compton College is a welcoming environment where the diversity of our students is supported to pursue and attain academic and professional excellence. Compton College promotes solutions to challenges, utilizes the latest techniques for preparing the workforce and provides clear pathways for transfer, completion, and lifelong learning.

## Program Objectives

Students responded positively to the program helping them meet their goals. Although there was a very small sample size (only 17 respondents), $88 \%$ of them Strongly Agreed or Agreed that the program helped them to meet their goals and having an appropriate range of course offerings. Perhaps most importantly, students have overwhelmingly (between 85-90\%) strongly agree or agree that instructors have helped them to achieve and participate in courses to create a sense of community. [please see appendices for full survey results]

## Status of Recommendations from previous review

There were 10 major prioritized recommendations from the 2016/2017 program review. Most of the recommendations, such as continuing to support the Author Talks series, the Voices of Compton publication, and to continue offering a diverse array of literature offerings have continued to receive support from the college. An improvement in classroom technology and facilities has also been fulfilled as part of the general building and improvements campuswide with the new Instructional Buildings $1 \& 2$, both due to be completed in 2021.

We do need to continue to work on recommendations 3 "Improve writing assessment" and 6 "improve data gathering in writing lab to improve services and student use. Both of these recommendations are currently being addressed through the community of practice shared assignments and assessments and with the creation of the instructional specialist position working with the Student Success Center, we hope that recommendation 6 will continue to be a priority.

Recommendation 10, "provide 5 in-class tutors for English 1 A " has not been met and is no longer a recommendation.

Recommendation 11, "maintain robust basic skills offering and offer appropriate counseling" is no longer a valid recommendation due to the passage of AB705. However, appropriate counseling is still a valid recommendation. To this end, during the summer of 2021, there will be a retreat with the counseling faculty and the English and math departments in order to
ensure that there is a consistent understanding and promotion of the appropriate level of class especially the 101S co-requisite.
Most of the general recommendations in the 2017 Program Review have been met either through continued departmental efforts or through institution level changes. For example, one previous recommendation was to "maintain records on success and retention in feeder schools alongside statewide statistics for accurate assessment of the English program" has been addressed through a change in the collection and reporting by Institutional Effectiveness. Another general recommendation was to "consider developing other intervention programs to address longstanding community issues like working-poor conditions and substandard schools [...]" which is outside of the ability of the English department, no matter how well-intentioned. However, with CRM Advise's early alert system which Dr. Blonshine and Dr. Cesar Jimenez lead, we are able to alert counselors to the need for a holistic intervention when appropriate.

Another recommendation was to help to defray the cost of textbooks for students. With the campus-wide initiative to utilize OER resources and with the help of the OER committee led by Dr. Katherine Marsh, the English department has been able to substantially reduce textbook costs for its students. The bookstore also has a textbook rental program and its prices are generally, although not always, competitive with other textbook sources such as Amazon. The Tartar Success Team has also requested for some budget allocation for textbooks for students who do not qualify for programs such as EOP\&S or CalWorks.

## Strategic Initiatives

Compton College has five strategic initiatives to guide our planning until 2024. Of those five, four of them directly relate to the efforts of the English department.

We are addressing the first strategic initiative "Improve recruitment, enrollment, retention, and completion rates for our students" through compliance with AB705 guidelines. We have eliminated the majority of below transfer level English offerings and are currently offering $90 \%$ of our classes at transfer level. One recommendation is to offer more co-requisite English courses. We began offering co-requisite courses in Spring 2019 and have slowly decreased the number of offerings. However, reliable state-wide data from CAP (California Acceleration Project) and PPIC (Public Policy Institute of California) has shown that co-requisite courses are one of the most effective means of helping students to pass transfer level English in their first attempt [please see appendices for excerpts from relevant reports]. We believe that by continuing to amend the format of the co-requisite and offering more of these courses, we will support students to have even higher success rates in English 101.
N.B. One oversight that needs to be corrected is that many of the formerly Academic Strategies classes (ENGL 60 - Prewriting Workshop, ENGL 61 - Test-Taking Strategies, ENGL 62 Vocabulary Building for College Students, ENGL 63 Spelling Techniques, ENGL 64 Memory Techniques, ENGL 65 Listening and Notetaking Strategies, ENGL 66 Sentence Errors and Punctuation, and ENGL 67 Thinking Skills for College Courses) became English classes and are
counted as below transfer-level. By returning these courses as Academic Strategies classes, we will comply with statewide standards of offering approximately $90 \%$ of courses at transfer level. Additionally, by moving these classes back to Academic Strategies, other instructors in other disciplines can also be eligible to teach these classes from a diversity of perspectives.

Faculty in the program continue to be one of the most active departments on campus. Amongst 10 full time faculty, there is broad participation in a variety of committees and other sorts of extra-curricular work such as accreditation, distance education, student success center support, union, academic senate, professional development and division chair. English faculty receive $200 \%$ release time between 6 instructors. Additionally, faculty are active in coordinating campus wide activities such as the Author Speaker Series, creative writing workshops with nationally known authors, and interdisciplinary coordination of a social justice speaker series (with Social and Behavioral Sciences). We believe that the implementation of Guided Pathways and Tartar Success Teams and the focus on individualized case-by-case attention for students, and the increased coordination of efforts between faculty, staff, and administration, especially with counseling, will continue to increase student participation and success.

One example of the increase coordination between counseling and faculty is the internal audit of declared majors to ensure that students have declared the correct major and are on the way to achieving their certificate, degree, or transfer goals. This information will be used to create increased awareness and communication between faculty and English majors as well as a mentorship program.

There is currently only one year of data for success and retention rates for English 101 because of Compton College's separation from El Camino College and the re-numbering of courses.
For Summer 2019, there was a 70\% success rate for ENG 101 (92 students) and a 16\% withdrawal rate. For Fall 2019, there was a $44 \%$ success rate ( 382 students) and a 31\% withdrawal rate. The data does not disaggregate between full term and shorter term courses. If we compare to the previous year, in Summer 2018 there was a $65 \%$ success rate ( 91 students) and in Fall 2018 there was a $52 \%$ success rate ( 269 students) and a $24 \%$ withdrawal rate. Although the percentages appear to have fallen, it is important to note that the overall number of students who are passing English 101 have increased with the elimination of below-transfer level English courses.

Another strategic initiative is to "support the success of students through the use of technology." One of the objectives for the program is to increase our hybrid offerings. Previously, completely asynchronous and online courses were the only alternative to face-toface/synchronous courses. In light of the COVID-19 pandemic, the English program has begun to slowly increase its hybrid offerings including literature and co-requisite courses. This scheduling change has started with the Spring 2021 semester. An increase in hybrid offerings would accommodate students' schedules, help increase students' familiarity with academic
technology, and alleviate physical classroom scheduling issues. Currently $80 \%$ of faculty are certified to teach online.

The final strategic initiative that aligns with program goals and objectives is to "establish partnerships in the community and with the K-12 schools." Dr. Rebekah Blonshine regularly attends partnership meetings with the local high schools in order to ensure that curriculum demands are met for the AB288, early college and afternoon college programs. Additionally, Dr. Blonshine ensures that faculty (primarily adjunct) regularly communicate with both high school and College staff through progress reports, early alerts and emails. The English department faculty have attended dual enrollment partnership meetings with Lynwood high school administrators and counselors. The purpose of these meetings is for both college and high school faculty and staff understand the differing regulations and demands for high school and college students, to align curriculum, and to better coordinate offerings for the dual enrollment students.

Section 2 - Analysis of Institutional Effectiveness Data
Head Count and Program Related Recommendations

| English Head Counts Fall Terms 2014-2018 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Term |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 |
| Term Head Count |  | 2503 | 2518 | 2421 | 2212 | 1786 |
| Gender | F | 1595 | 15068 | 1537 | 1382 | 1115 |
|  | M | 908 | 950 | 944 | 830 | 671 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Asian | 52 | 43 | 48 | 66 | 38 |
|  | Black | 830 | 726 | 634 | 532 | 429 |
|  | Latinx | 1505 | 1634 | 1673 | 1490 | 1252 |
|  | Alaskan / American Indian | <5 | <5 | 5 | <5 | <5 |
|  | Pacific Islander | 20 | 14 | 21 | 15 | 8 |
|  | Two or More | 57 | 60 | 69 | 62 | 32 |
|  | White | 35 | 34 | 26 | 44 | 23 |
|  | Unknown or Decline | <5 | <5 | 5 | <5 | <5 |
|  | <17 | <5 | <5 | 5 | 49 | 82 |


|  | 17 | 60 | 56 | 71 | 64 | 71 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 18 | 398 | 435 | 458 | 372 | 316 |
|  | 19 | 387 | 417 | 457 | 390 | 283 |
|  | 20 | 306 | 295 | 291 | 274 | 176 |
|  | 21 | 240 | 222 | 291 | 274 | 176 |
|  | 22 | 148 | 192 | 166 | 110 | 103 |
|  | 23 | 123 | 132 | 120 | 96 | 81 |
|  | 24 | 124 | 100 | 98 | 100 | 66 |
|  | 25-29 | 316 | 288 | 294 | 271 | 227 |
|  | 30-39 | 240 | 213 | 197 | 191 | 174 |
|  | 40-49 | 91 | 99 | 76 | 74 | 42 |
|  | 50-64 | 64 | 61 | 53 | 40 | 40 |
|  | 65+ | 6 | 6 | 5 | <5 | <5 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Full-time | 1203 | 1199 | 1117 | 952 | 787 |
|  | Part-time | 1300 | 1319 | 1364 | 1260 | 999 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Basic Skills | 12 | 16 | 13 | 14 | 18 |
|  | Degree/Cert Only | 266 | 281 | 285 | 216 | 189 |
|  | Enrichment | 10 | 31 | 53 | 44 | 58 |
|  | Intend to Transfer | 1439 | 1582 | 1555 | 1296 | 1030 |
|  | Retrain / Recertify | 23 | 28 | 25 | 26 | 29 |
|  | Undecided/Unstated | 733 | 580 | 550 | 616 | 462 |


| English Head Counts Spring Terms 2015-2019 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Term |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 |
| Term Head Count |  | 2291 | 2094 | 1908 | 1742 | 1399 |
| Gender | F | 1489 | 1327 | 1225 | 1092 | 895 |
|  | M | 802 | 767 | 682 | 650 | 504 |
|  | X | <5 | <5 | <5 | <5 | <5 |
| 둔을ㄹ | Asian | 52 | 51 | 38 | 45 | 31 |


|  | Black | 742 | 577 | 489 | 431 | 330 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Latinx | 1401 | 1306 | 1281 | 1192 | 966 |
|  | Alaskan / American Indian | <5 | <5 | <5 | <5 | <5 |
|  | Pacific Islander | 17 | 17 | 17 | 10 | 6 |
|  | Two or More | 46 | 57 | 49 | 39 | 37 |
|  | White | 29 | 26 | 29 | 23 | 16 |
|  | Unknown or Decline | < | <5 | < 5 | < 5 | 13 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Age / Age Group | <17 | <5 | <5 | <5 | 48 | 56 |
|  | 17 | <5 | <5 | 5 | 22 | 30 |
|  | 18 | 326 | 299 | 314 | 249 | 192 |
|  | 19 | 371 | 372 | 366 | 309 | 228 |
|  | 20 | 283 | 253 | 237 | 213 | 165 |
|  | 21 | 219 | 205 | 164 | 127 | 118 |
|  | 22 | 166 | 151 | 121 | 107 | 82 |
|  | 23 | 119 | 85 | 103 | 79 | 57 |
|  | 24 | 94 | 101 | 76 | 80 | 43 |
|  | 25-29 | 314 | 288 | 239 | 268 | 201 |
|  | 30-39 | 221 | 186 | 170 | 145 | 152 |
|  | 40-49 | 103 | 92 | 69 | 63 | 47 |
|  | 50-64 | 70 | 56 | 42 | 29 | 25 |
|  | 65+ | <5 | <5 | <5 | <5 | <5 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Full-time | 1065 | 933 | 793 | 675 | 628 |
|  | Part-time | 1226 | 1161 | 1115 | 1067 | 771 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Basic Skills | 10 | 13 | 7 | 13 | 10 |
|  | Degree/Cert Only | 321 | 247 | 225 | 194 | 150 |
|  | Enrichment | 17 | 31 | 43 | 34 | 48 |
|  | Intend to Transfer | 1403 | 1313 | 1176 | 1057 | 836 |
|  | Retrain / Recertify | 19 | 21 | 13 | 23 | 23 |
|  | Undecided/Unstated | 521 | 469 | 444 | 421 | 332 |

Course Grade Distribution and Program Related Recommendations

| School Year | Course ID | A | B | IB | C | IC | P | D | ID | NP | F | IF | RD | DR | W | Total | Success | Retained | Success <br> Rate | Retention Rate |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2014-15 | ENGL-15A | <5 | <5 | 0 | <5 | 0 | 0 | <5 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | <5 | 19 | 6 | 14 | 31.58 | 73.68 |
|  | ENGL-40B | 8 | <5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | <5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | <5 | 17 | 11 | 15 | 64.71 | 88.24 |
|  | ENGL-1A | 193 | 312 | 0 | 224 | 0 | 0 | 82 | 9 | 0 | 137 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 267 | 1224 | 729 | 957 | 59.56 | 78.19 |
|  | ENGL-1B | 38 | 69 | 0 | 34 | 0 | 0 | 8 | <5 | 0 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 45 | 207 | 141 | 162 | 68.12 | 78.26 |
|  | ENGL-1C | 199 | 228 | 0 | 131 | 0 | 0 | 36 | <5 | 0 | 66 | 0 | 0 | <5 | 143 | 806 | 558 | 663 | 69.23 | 82.26 |
|  | ENGL-25A | 8 | 0 | 0 | <5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | <5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | <5 | 13 | 9 | 11 | 69.23 | 84.62 |
|  | ENGL-27 | 6 | 7 | 0 | <5 | 0 | 0 | <5 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 38 | 15 | 25 | 39.47 | 65.79 |
|  | ENGL50RWA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 81 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 26 | 120 | 81 | 94 | 67.5 | 78.33 |
|  | ENGL-84 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 530 | 0 | 0 | 105 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 131 | 766 | 530 | 635 | 69.19 | 82.9 |
|  | ENGL-A | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 550 | 0 | 0 | 185 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 242 | 977 | 550 | 735 | 56.29 | 75.23 |
| 2015-16 | ENGL-15A | <5 | <5 | 0 | <5 | 0 | 0 | <5 | 0 | 0 | <5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | <5 | 11 | <5 | 8 | 45.45 | 72.73 |
|  | ENGL-15B | 0 | <5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | <5 | 0 | 0 | <5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | <5 | 10 | <5 | 8 | 10 | 80 |
|  | ENGL-25A | 10 | <5 | 0 | <5 | 0 | 0 | <5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | <5 | 17 | 15 | 16 | 88.24 | 94.12 |
|  | ENGL-40B | <5 | <5 | 0 | <5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | <5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | <5 | 9 | <5 | 7 | 55.56 | 77.78 |
|  | ENGL-1A | 214 | 298 | 0 | 177 | 0 | 0 | 58 | <5 | 0 | 136 | <5 | 0 | 0 | 258 | 1145 | 689 | 887 | 60.17 | 77.47 |
|  | ENGL-1B | 35 | 54 | 0 | 37 | <5 | 0 | 13 | <5 | 0 | 23 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 43 | 207 | 127 | 164 | 61.35 | 79.23 |
|  | ENGL-1C | 226 | 200 | 0 | 127 | <5 | 0 | 42 | 6 | 0 | 62 | <5 | <5 | <5 | 178 | 852 | 556 | 674 | 65.26 | 79.11 |
|  | ENGL-27 | 14 | 6 | 0 | <5 | 0 | 0 | <5 | 0 | 0 | <5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 42 | 25 | 32 | 59.52 | 76.19 |
|  | ENGL-50AR | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 63 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 18 | 89 | 63 | 71 | 70.79 | 79.78 |
|  | ENGL-50AW | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 47 | 0 | 0 | 21 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15 | 83 | 47 | 68 | 56.63 | 81.93 |
|  | ENGL50RWA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 54 | 0 | 0 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 83 | 54 | 70 | 65.06 | 84.34 |
|  | ENGL-84 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 441 | 0 | 0 | 77 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 149 | 667 | 441 | 518 | 66.12 | 77.66 |
|  | ENGL-A | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 430 | 0 | 0 | 201 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 241 | 872 | 430 | 631 | 49.31 | 72.36 |
| 2016-17 | ENGL-1A | 196 | 260 | <5 | 179 | <5 | 0 | 58 | 10 | 0 | 151 | 0 | <5 | 0 | 282 | 1139 | 637 | 857 | 55.93 | 75.24 |


|  | ENGL-15A | <5 | <5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | <5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | <5 | 11 | <5 | 7 | 45.45 | 63.64 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | ENGL-40B | 7 | <5 | 0 | <5 | 0 | 0 | <5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 18 | 11 | 12 | 61.11 | 66.67 |
|  | ENGL-15B | <5 | 0 | 0 | <5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | <5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | <5 | 8 | <5 | 5 | 50 | 62.5 |
|  | ENGL-1B | 33 | 52 | 0 | 34 | 0 | 0 | 18 | <5 | 0 | 14 | <5 | 0 | 0 | 37 | 190 | 119 | 153 | 62.63 | 80.53 |
|  | ENGL-1C | 264 | 226 | 0 | 133 | <5 | 0 | 52 | 9 | 0 | 42 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 162 | 889 | 624 | 727 | 70.19 | 81.78 |
|  | ENGL-27 | 9 | 10 | 0 | <5 | 0 | 0 | <5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 32 | 22 | 23 | 68.75 | 71.88 |
|  | ENGL-50AR | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 53 | 0 | 0 | <5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 65 | 53 | 57 | 81.54 | 87.69 |
|  | ENGL-50AW | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 38 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 57 | 38 | 49 | 66.67 | 85.96 |
|  | ENGL50RWA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 48 | 0 | 0 | 20 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14 | 82 | 48 | 68 | 58.54 | 82.93 |
|  | ENGL-84 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 363 | 0 | 0 | 119 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 100 | 582 | 363 | 482 | 62.37 | 82.82 |
|  | ENGL-A | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 437 | 0 | 0 | 221 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 205 | 863 | 437 | 658 | 50.64 | 76.25 |
| 2017-18 | ENGL-25A | 8 | <5 | 0 | <5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | <5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | <5 | 13 | 11 | 12 | 84.62 | 92.31 |
|  | ENGL-27 | 17 | <5 | 0 | <5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | <5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 38 | 22 | 25 | 57.89 | 65.79 |
|  | ENGL-1A | 184 | 265 | 0 | 179 | <5 | 0 | 71 | <5 | 0 | 124 | <5 | 0 | <5 | 276 | 1110 | 630 | 834 | 56.76 | 75.14 |
|  | ENGL-1B | 21 | 45 | 0 | 33 | 0 | 0 | 8 | <5 | 0 | 23 | <5 | 0 | 0 | 51 | 183 | 99 | 132 | 54.1 | 72.13 |
|  | ENGL-1C | 178 | 195 | 0 | 129 | <5 | 0 | 67 | <5 | 0 | 75 | 0 | 0 | <5 | 137 | 792 | 505 | 655 | 63.76 | 82.7 |
|  | ENGL-39 | <5 | 0 | 0 | <5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | <5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | <5 | 13 | <5 | 8 | 23.08 | 61.54 |
|  | ENGL-40B | <5 | 0 | 0 | <5 | 0 | 0 | <5 | 0 | 0 | <5 | <5 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 21 | 7 | 11 | 33.33 | 52.38 |
|  | ENGL-50AR | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 37 | 0 | 0 | <5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 47 | 37 | 38 | 78.72 | 80.85 |
|  | ENGL-50AW | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 34 | 0 | 0 | <5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | <5 | 40 | 34 | 38 | 85 | 95 |
|  | ENGL-84 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 320 | 0 | 0 | 78 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 87 | 485 | 320 | 398 | 65.98 | 82.06 |
|  | ENGL-A | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 355 | 0 | 0 | 153 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 180 | 688 | 355 | 508 | 51.6 | 73.84 |
|  | ENGL-AW | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 0 | <5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 16 | 8 | 9 | 50 | 56.25 |
|  | ENGL-RWA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 48 | 0 | 0 | 25 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 28 | 101 | 48 | 73 | 47.52 | 72.28 |
| 2018-19 | ENGL-1C | 146 | 151 | <5 | 151 | <5 | 0 | 40 | 0 | 0 | 84 | 0 | 0 | <5 | 142 | 721 | 451 | 579 | 62.55 | 80.31 |
|  | ENGL-15A | <5 | <5 | 0 | <5 | 0 | 0 | <5 | <5 | 0 | <5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | <5 | 13 | <5 | 11 | 38.46 | 84.62 |
|  | ENGL-40B | <5 | <5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | <5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 14 | <5 | 7 | 35.71 | 50 |
|  | ENGL-15B | <5 | 0 | 0 | <5 | 0 | 0 | <5 | 0 | 0 | <5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | <5 | 10 | <5 | 6 | 40 | 60 |
|  | ENGL-1A | 177 | 274 | 0 | 234 | <5 | 0 | 66 | <5 | 0 | 227 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 335 | 1315 | 686 | 980 | 52.17 | 74.52 |


| ENGL-1B | 42 | 45 | 0 | 15 | 0 | 0 | <5 | 0 | 0 | 15 | 0 | 0 | <5 | 26 | 145 | 102 | 119 | 70.34 | 82.07 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ENGL-60 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | <5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | <5 | <5 | <5 | 2 | 66.67 | 66.67 |
| ENGL-62 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | <5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 12 | <5 | 4 | 33.33 | 33.33 |
| ENGL-66 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15 | 7 | 15 | 46.67 | 100 |
| ENGL-84 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 161 | 0 | 0 | 44 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 37 | 242 | 161 | 205 | 66.53 | 84.71 |
| ENGL-A | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 139 | 0 | 0 | 50 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 63 | 252 | 139 | 189 | 55.16 | 75 |
| ENGL-AR | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | <5 | 0 | <5 | 15 | 13 | 14 | 86.67 | 93.33 |
| ENGL-AW | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | <5 | 15 | 7 | 13 | 46.67 | 86.67 |
| ENGL-RWA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 121 | 0 | 0 | 50 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 71 | 242 | 121 | 171 | 50 | 70.66 |

At the end of the current cycle for which we have data (2014/15-2018/19) there has been a downward trend in both enrollment and success rates. In 2014/15 AY, there was a $62.81 \%$ success rate in English classes and in 2018/19 AY the success rate was $56.64 \%$. In Spring and Fall 2019, the overall college success rate was 62\% in the Fall and 67\% in the Spring. For English 101, the success rate was $44 \%$ ( 382 students total) in Fall 2019. For English 101S, the success rate was $47 \%$ ( 144 students total). However, the English department taken as a whole, had a 74\% success rate during Summer 2019 and a 47\% success rate in Fall 2019.

There continues to be an equity gap between ethnicities. Asians and Pacific Islanders have the highest success rate in English at 61\% and 66\% respectively, Latinx and White students achieve at almost exactly the same rate of $56.60 \%$ and $56.25 \%$ respectively while Black students continue to lag at 47\%. It is imperative to review these numbers after institution wide efforts to promote diversity, equity, and inclusivity in faculty, course offerings and degrees makes any difference in this racial equity gap.

Decreases in this gap have been shown in state-wide data as a result of course offering changes in response to AB705 but it is too soon to tell on our own campus if it has made any difference. We believe that continued professional development and investment in proven remedies such as co-requisite courses, smaller class sizes, co-teaching, and community of practice groups for faculty prove to be successful. The 2020-2021 AY had a small group of English 101 courses involved in a pilot program of both co-teaching and smaller class sizes. Although forced remote teaching due to the COVID-19 pandemic have created challenges, it will be interesting to see if these classes fare better or the same as other English 101 classes.

The hiring of an instructional specialist to act as a liaison between English and the Student Success Center will hopefully help with declining tutoring participation by students and faculty. A number of innovative incentives, programs, and trainings are planned for the upcoming 20202021 and 2021-2022 academic years.

## Success Rates and Program Related Recommendations

Global Success Rates
At Compton College, success is defined by students earning grades $\mathrm{A}, \mathrm{B}, \mathrm{C}$, or P in a course. While the five-year success rate in the English department between 2014 and 2019 is 59.64 percent and still remains 1.5 percent above the program success standard of 58.14 percent, the average year over year success rate in English has steadily declined, for a total decrease of 6.17 percent between the aforementioned years. There are myriad of reasons for this decline. The transition away from El Camino College between 2017 and 2019 saw changes in FTES and the advent of Guided Pathways restructuring. Furthermore, environmental scans still indicate that a large number of Compton College students struggle with food and housing insecurities, and many students work at least part-time. These all serve as barriers to success in both the English department and across the curriculum.

Success Rates by Demographic
Ethnicity
The largest student demographic at Compton College is the LatinX population, which is the third highest performing group with a five-year success rate average of 61.82 percent. The Asian student population had the highest five-year success rate average with 68.65 percent, followed by white students at 66.70 percent, African American students at 48.39 percent, and Pacific Islander students at 39 percent.

Gender
Respective to gender, female and male-identified populations are nearly identical in success rates in English, with male-identified students performing marginally higher at a 54.60 percent success rate versus female-identified students performing at 53.96 percent success rate. While this marginal difference of 0.64 percent could be viewed as a success, the five-year averages tell reveal a troublesome trend, specifically among our female-identified student population. Between fall 2014 and spring 2019, the success rates of both male and femaleidentified student groups declined, with (12.14) percent and (6.09), respectively. Furthermore, since the passing of AB705, the success rates of female-identified students has fluctuated, each semester, as much as 4 to 7.31 percent per semester between fall 2017 and spring 2019. Success rates for male-identified students, however, have not seen such dramatic peaks and valleys, with variances, between the same semesters, of only 1 to 1.5 percent.

While the English department should further investigate this trend among femaleidentified students further to determine the reasoning for this significant decline, the stabilization of success rates among male-identified students could be attributed to the successful support services and initiatives to support Men of Color at Compton College. Furthermore, work among these grouping must continue, as both areas are still below the Program Success Standard.

## Age

The largest age demographic at Compton College is the 18-24 range. This student population, unfortunately, is the lowest performing in the English department, with a five-year average success rate of 56.4 percent, compared to the 40 to 49 -year-old age group, which achieved the highest five-year average success rate of 65.71 percent. One trend revealed in the data is the five-year average success rate increased as the age of the student increased. Furthermore, beginning in fall 2017, Compton College also began offering classes at local high schools as well as on-campus classes for the Compton Early College High School. These offerings, in turn, increased the 17 and under student population. Comparing overall success rates between <17, 17, and 18-24 between fall 2017 and spring 2019, students under 17 performed the highest, with a success rate of 72.32 percent, followed by 64.23 percent, and 53.62 percent, respectively. These trends speak towards the need to dramatically increase support services for the 18 to 24 -year-old population and to continue to monitor the success rates of this age group respective to AB705 implementation.
C) Retention Rates:

The five-year average of retention rates is relatively steady, with only a slight decline of 2.27 percent between the 2014-15 and the 2018-19 academic years. A comparison of retention rates in general education courses English 1A (101) and English 1C (103) also reveal
steady retention rates that fluctuate only slightly between 2014-15 and 2018-19, with the exception of a significant decrease in the retention rate of English 1A (101) in the 2018-19 academic year. Between the 2017-18 and the 2018-19 academic year, the retention rate in English 1A (101) plummeted 22.97 percent, from 75.14 percent in 2017-18 to 52.17 percent in 2018-19. This anomaly in the data should be explored further to determine the cause of this decline in retention, if possible, since the success rate in English 1A (101) for this same time period saw a reduction of only 4.49 percent. Furthermore, the retention rates in English 1A (101) are revealing a steady decline year over year from a high of 78.19 percent in 2014-15 to a low of 52.17 percent in 2018-19. English 1C (103) is also beginning to reveal a downward trend in retention rates; although, the retention rates for this course are one of the best in the English department at 80.31 percent.

Current efforts to improve the success and retention rates above include AB705 professional development, the designation of an AB705 faculty coordinator, as well as a yearlong Community of Practice where two course models are being piloted. Several English 101 courses are being team-taught or are a reduced class size to determine if these types of changes will prove to be beneficial to students in achieving greater success, retention, and attrition in their English courses.

## Success Rates

| Program Success Standard ${ }^{*}$ | $58.14 \%$ |
| :---: | :---: |
| 5-year Program Success Average | $59.64 \%$ |

*Calculated as the average between the 5-year average and the lowest yearly rate in the 5-year period.

| Year | Total <br> Grades | Success <br> Rate |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 4 - 1 5}$ | $\mathbf{4 1 8 7}$ | $62.81 \%$ |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 5 - 1 6}$ | 4087 | $60.14 \%$ |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 6 - 1 7}$ | 3936 | $59.98 \%$ |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 7 - 1 8}$ | 3547 | $58.61 \%$ |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 8 - 1 9}$ | 3014 | $56.64 \%$ |


| English Success Rate |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Ethnicity | $\begin{gathered} \text { Fall } \\ 14 \end{gathered}$ | Sprin g15 | Fall 15 | $\begin{array}{r} \text { Sprin } \\ \mathrm{g} 16 \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Fall } \\ 16 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \text { Sprin } \\ \text { g17 } \end{array}$ | Fall 17 | Sprin g18 | Fall 18 | $\begin{array}{r} \text { Sprin } \\ \text { g19 } \end{array}$ |
| Asian | 77.08\% | $\begin{gathered} 81.40 \\ \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 58.14\% | $\begin{gathered} 76.00 \\ \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 88.64 \\ \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 86.84\% | $\begin{gathered} 75.00 \\ \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 65.12 \\ \% \end{gathered}$ | 86.84\% | $\begin{gathered} 61.29 \\ \% \end{gathered}$ |
| Black | 58.01\% | $\begin{gathered} 54.55 \\ \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 53.36\% | $\begin{gathered} 51.25 \\ \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 55.51 \\ \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 52.20\% | $\begin{gathered} 53.56 \\ \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 49.87 \\ \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 51.59\% | $\begin{gathered} 47.04 \\ \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| Latinx | 66.71\% | $\begin{gathered} 64.45 \\ \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 62.54\% | $\begin{gathered} 63.84 \\ \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 61.79 \\ \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 61.25\% | $\begin{gathered} 61.49 \\ \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 59.33 \\ \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 60.28\% | $\begin{gathered} 56.60 \\ \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |


| American <br> Indian / <br> Alaskan Native | $<5$ | $<5$ | $<5$ | $<5$ | $<5$ | $<5$ | $<5$ | $<5$ | $<5$ | $<5$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Pacific <br> Islander | $35.71 \%$ | 33.33 <br> $\%$ | $<5$ | 58.82 <br> $\%$ | 50.00 <br> $\%$ | $53.33 \%$ | 21.43 <br> $\%$ | 37.50 <br> $\%$ | $66.67 \%$ | 66.67 <br> $\%$ |
| Two or More | $48.94 \%$ | 53.49 <br> $\%$ | $64.81 \%$ | 50.91 <br> $\%$ | 60.32 <br> $\%$ | $40.00 \%$ | 58.18 <br> $\%$ | 45.24 <br> $\%$ | $51.72 \% \%$52.63 <br> $\%$ |  |
| White | $84.38 \%$ | 66.67 <br> $\%$ | $58.62 \%$ | 55.56 <br> $\%$ | 65.22 <br> $\%$ | $60.71 \%$ | 66.67 <br> $\%$ | 90.91 <br> $\%$ | $61.54 \%$ | 56.25 <br> $\%$ |
| Unknown or <br> Decline | $<5$ | $<5$ | $<5$ | $<5$ | $<5$ | $<5$ | $<5$ | $<5$ | $<5$ | $<5$ |


| GENDER | Fall <br> $\mathbf{1 4}$ | Sprin <br> $\mathbf{g 1 5}$ | Fall 15 | Sprin <br> $\mathbf{g 1 6}$ | Fall <br> $\mathbf{1 6}$ | Sprin <br> $\mathbf{g 1 7}$ | Fall <br> $\mathbf{1 7}$ | Sprin <br> $\mathbf{g 1 8}$ | Fall $\mathbf{1 8}$ | Sprin <br> $\mathbf{g 1 9}$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| F | $66.10 \%$ | 63.29 <br> $\%$ | $61.81 \%$ | 62.09 <br> $\%$ | 62.24 <br> $\%$ | $59.31 \%$ | 62.53 <br> $\%$ | 57.95 <br> $\%$ | $61.27 \%$ | 53.96 <br> $\%$ |
| M | $60.69 \%$ | 58.00 <br> $\%$ | $56.90 \%$ | 57.66 <br> $\%$ | 58.39 <br> $\%$ | $58.64 \%$ | 55.23 <br> $\%$ | 55.79 <br> $\%$ | $54.79 \%$ | 54.60 <br> $\%$ |
| X | $<5$ | $<5$ | $<5$ | $<5$ | $<5$ | $<5$ | $<5$ | $<5$ | $<5$ | $<5$ |


| Age/Ag eGroup | $\begin{gathered} \text { Fall } \\ 14 \end{gathered}$ | Sprin g15 g15 | Fall 15 | $\begin{array}{r} \text { Sprin } \\ \text { g16 } \end{array}$ | Fall <br> 16 | $\begin{array}{r} \text { Sprin } \\ \text { g17 } \end{array}$ | Fall <br> 17 | Sprin g18 | Fall 18 | $\begin{array}{r} \text { Sprin } \\ \text { g19 } \end{array}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| <17 | <5 | <5 | <5 | <5 | <5 | <5 | $\begin{gathered} 89.80 \\ \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 65.96 \\ \% \end{gathered}$ | 58.54\% | $\begin{gathered} 75.00 \\ \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| 17 | <5 | <5 | <5 | <5 | <5 | <5 | $\begin{gathered} 65.38 \\ \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 54.55 \\ \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 60.32\% | $\begin{gathered} 76.67 \\ \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| 18 | 76.62\% | $\begin{gathered} 68.40 \\ \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 63.06\% | $\begin{gathered} 65.67 \\ \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 65.24 \\ \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 61.02\% | $\begin{gathered} 65.36 \\ \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 64.22 \\ \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 63.36\% | $\begin{gathered} 53.13 \\ \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| 19 | 65.43\% | $\begin{gathered} 59.77 \\ \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 56.74\% | $\begin{gathered} 58.31 \\ \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 56.45 \\ \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 60.29\% | $\begin{gathered} 56.98 \\ \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 52.36 \\ \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 59.92\% | $\begin{gathered} 49.34 \\ \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| 20 | 58.27\% | $\begin{gathered} 61.20 \\ \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 59.29\% | $\begin{gathered} 56.78 \\ \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 54.40 \\ \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 55.11\% | $\begin{gathered} 57.03 \\ \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 48.97 \\ \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 60.13\% | $\begin{gathered} 54.22 \\ \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| 21 | 53.30\% | $\begin{gathered} 56.54 \\ \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 55.34\% | $\begin{gathered} 57.79 \\ \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 56.73 \\ \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 54.43\% | $\begin{gathered} 49.41 \\ \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 49.57 \\ \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 55.36\% | $\begin{gathered} 40.98 \\ \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| 22 | 59.23\% | $\begin{gathered} 70.00 \\ \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 50.29\% | $\begin{gathered} 57.86 \\ \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 52.48 \\ \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 58.88\% | $\begin{gathered} 62.24 \\ \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 54.00 \\ \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 50.00\% | $\begin{gathered} 53.49 \\ \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| 23 | 64.04\% | $\begin{gathered} 52.83 \\ \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 63.87\% | $\begin{gathered} 57.65 \\ \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 56.88 \\ \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 62.37\% | $\begin{gathered} 53.57 \\ \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 55.88 \\ \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 51.32\% | $\begin{gathered} 50.00 \\ \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| 24 | 64.04\% | $\begin{gathered} 52.44 \\ \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 58.51\% | $\begin{gathered} 63.74 \\ \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 67.03 \\ \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 54.41\% | $\begin{gathered} 45.98 \\ \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 53.85 \\ \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 50.82\% | $\begin{gathered} 42.55 \\ \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| 25-29 | 60.92\% | $\begin{gathered} 59.06 \\ \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 59.52\% | $\begin{gathered} 61.72 \\ \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 64.17 \\ \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 60.81\% | $\begin{gathered} 64.32 \\ \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 61.79 \\ \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 56.85\% | $\begin{gathered} 58.21 \\ \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| 30-39 | 63.86\% | $\begin{gathered} 61.54 \\ \% \end{gathered}$ | 63.74\% | $\begin{gathered} 66.07 \\ \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 66.28 \\ \% \end{gathered}$ | 57.86\% | $\begin{gathered} 64.07 \\ \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 67.20 \\ \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 60.26\% | $\begin{gathered} 53.85 \\ \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| 40-49 | 67.09\% | $\begin{gathered} 69.77 \\ \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 68.49\% | $\begin{gathered} 55.84 \\ \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 69.44 \\ \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 72.13\% | $\begin{gathered} 57.14 \\ \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 57.14 \\ \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 74.19\% | $\begin{gathered} 65.96 \\ \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |


| $50-64$ | $65.85 \%$ | 58.54 <br> $\%$ | $62.22 \%$ | 60.47 <br> $\%$ | 61.11 <br> $\%$ | $48.65 \%$ | 53.13 <br> $\%$ | 65.22 <br> $\%$ | $60.87 \%$ | 76.92 <br> $\%$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $65+$ | $<5$ | $<5$ | $<5$ | $<5$ | $<5$ | $<5$ | $<5$ | $<5$ | $<5$ | $<5$ |

## Retention rates

| Year | Total <br> Grades | Retention <br> Rate |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 4 - 1 5}$ | $\mathbf{4 1 8 7}$ | $79.08 \%$ |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 5 - 1 6}$ | $\mathbf{4 0 8 7}$ | $77.17 \%$ |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 6 - 1 7}$ | $\mathbf{3 9 3 6}$ | $78.71 \%$ |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 7 - 1 8}$ | 3547 | $77.28 \%$ |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 8 - 1 9}$ | $\mathbf{3 0 1 4}$ | $76.81 \%$ |

Success rates between face-to-face courses and online courses reveal some trends that should be further explored. Using the Compton College Tableau dated April 2019, the five-year average of English face-to-face courses is 59.64 percent versus 57 percent for online courses, revealing a 2.64 percent increased success rate in face-to-face courses. In looking at Men of Color in the 18 to 24 age range, the face-to-face five-year success average is 61 percent, while the online success rate is 51 percent. Additionally, the five-year success rate average of Women of Color in the 18 to 24 age range in face-to-face courses is 66 percent and 53 percent online. These trends indicate that the largest student demographic is performing above the Program Success Standard in face-to-face courses but are not meeting this same standard in online courses. While tremendous work and progress is being made in Distance Education at Compton College since the College adopted Distance Education as an area of focus in its Quality Focused Essay to the ACCJC in 2017, these success rates should be continued to be monitored and evaluated at regular intervals between now and the next English Program Review Cycle.

## Retention Rates

Retention rates between face-to-face classes and online classes indicate that a greater number of students remain in a face-to-face course than they do in an online course. For example, according to the Tableau database, the five-year retention average for face-to-face classes is 76.81 percent, whereas online courses saw an average retention rate of 74 percent. Furthermore, Men of Color between the ages of 18 and 24 saw a five-year average retention rate of 79 percent in face-to-face courses, compared to 71 percent in online courses. Finally, Women of Color between the ages of 18 and 24 saw a five-year average retention rate of 82 percent in face-to-face courses, versus 74 percent online. As mentioned above, significant work to make English courses more accessible and successful is need to increase both the success and retention rates of online course offerings.

## Distance Education

Since the last Program Review, Compton College transitioned online instruction from Etudes to the Canvas Learning Management System by Instructure in fall 2017 while in the partnership with El Camino College. On average, the department is offering 12 sections of online courses in fall terms, 10 in spring, 6 in summer, and 5 in winter. Surprisingly, though the entire program has had a decline in enrollment, DE course offerings in the English department have remained the same or increased since the last program review. While summer, winter, and spring DE offerings have remained the same, fall offerings have increased from 7 online courses offered in fall 2016 to 12 online courses in fall 2019 and 15 in fall 2020.

## Success and retention rates

During the period under review, there is not complete Distance Education data for all of the academic terms. Instead we can track success rate trends between online and on-campus classes for a 1 year period. In spring 2017, the online English courses had a marginally higher success rate of $59 \%$ to the on campus rate of $57 \%$ although the retention rates were higher for on campus courses. But in spring 2018 the success rate was slightly lower for online English courses at $52 \%$ compared to the $57 \%$ of on campus courses with retention rates being higher in on campus classes by 7\%. The lower success rates in online classes warrant future discussion. It is also worth noting that the winter intersession and summer session shows a pattern of higher success rates with a summer 2017 rate of $70 \%$ and winter 2018 rate of $63 \%$. This can help inform future discussions about examining what is done differently during these terms to help increase fall/spring success rates. We can also make a scheduling recommendation to increase online course offerings in winter and summer sessions because of the higher success rates.

## Faculty Training and Support

In order for the English Department to continue to grow its online course offerings, we need to ensure that English faculty have distance education professional development opportunities. The Distance Education Department includes a Distance Education Faculty Coordinator and an Instructional Designer who host a variety of training and mentoring opportunities. It is important that English faculty avail themselves of these trainings to help move their courses towards CVC-OEI Course Design Rubric alignment. Currently, one English 101 course is aligned and we should work towards increasing the number and variety of courses that are rubric aligned. Four English faculty participated in the Distance Education Preparing Your Next Canvas Course Webinar Series as trainers in spring 2020 and provided DE faculty mentoring campuswide.

The Distance Education Department now offers DE Certification which includes 3 courses: Introduction to Teaching with Canvas, Introduction to Online Teaching and Learning, and Creating Accessible Course Content. Any English faculty who is interested in being DE certified should complete these trainings. Having more DE certified instructors will allow us to grow our DE course offerings. Even if faculty do not plan on teaching online, participating in these
trainings is strongly recommended to help faculty learn how to incorporate technology in classes and become versed in accessibility requirements in the classroom.

In spring 2020, the English Department established a Canvas English Repository to share course best practices and collaborate with faculty peers on curriculum revision.

## Recommendations

Considering the increased demand for online courses, the department should respond with an increase in DE course offerings outside of the period of remote learning due to the pandemic. With the implementation of the English Department Repository on Canvas, a rotation of repository leaders would allow for the materials to be updated and shared with full-time and adjunct faculty. This position could be rotated every semester or year to bring new insights and innovations into the shared materials. The department should also encourage faculty to get DE courses passed through the CVC-OEI. Once the local POCR process is up and running, faculty will have the opportunity to place courses in the exchange, which will increase student enrollment. Offering a stipend to faculty to get their classes aligned will increase the number of courses offered in the exchange, which will increase enrollment. Finally, best practice Brown Bag Meetings within the department for DE instruction would allow faculty to share and innovate within the wealth of experience and knowledge in the department.

## Degree and/or Certificate Goals

The department offers the AA-T in English and transfer level courses in composition, literature, and creative writing. There are also substantial English department course requirements in the General Studies: Culture and Communications and Arts and Humanities AA degrees.

To help students complete the major requirements in a timely fashion, as a department, we have decided to offer the needed literature courses on a rotating basis:

|  | Fall | Spring |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Year 1 | ENGL 150 British Literature I | ENGL 152 British Literature II |
|  | ENGL 243 African American Literature | ENGL 242 Chicano/Latinx Literature |
| Year 2 | ENGL 240 American Literature I | ENGL 241 American Literature II |
|  | ENGL 227 Children's Literature | ENGL 228 Images of Women in <br> Literature |
| Year 3 | ENGL 150 British Literature I | ENGL 152 British Literature II |
|  | ENGL 244 The Literature of American <br> Ethnic Groups | ENGL 239 Literature and Film |

This rotation will ensure that all students will be able to enter into the program at any time and be able to finish all of their major prep (at least in the English department) within two years with no intersession.

There are currently 17 English majors, 11 of whom started during the 2019 academic year. Our department goal would be to increase the number of majors to 20 in the next three years, which represents an $3 \%$ increase. This aligns with the California Chancellor's office projected increase for English majors (please refer to page 66 of the Compton College 2024 Master Plan). This seems like a reasonable and achievable goal. Some of the ways which the department plans to increase English majors is to hold career panels for English majors. Increased visibility of the FACH division (which includes English) with its number of student centered activities, will help to recruit students. Increased variety of literature courses will also appeal to more students and hopefully entice more students to become English majors.

Currently, the top two majors between 2013-2018 are Liberal Arts and Sciences and Arts and Humanities (please see page 61 of the Compton College 2024 Master Plan). Since these two general studies majors also include courses that overlap with the English major, it is possible to recruit from this pool of students as well.

## Section 3 - Curriculum

Review of Courses (6-Year Cycle)
All English courses are reviewed once every 6 years. All English courses are currently in compliance with Title 5. Due to our separation from El Camino College, as well as AB705, we no longer offer as many courses in the English department. Currently, there is a review in process to inactivate courses that have not been offered in the last 5 years. We have also eliminated the majority of below transfer level courses with the exception of ENGL RWA. We will also move many below transfer level courses that should be in Academic Strategies. Current offerings are geared toward compliance with AB705, AA/AS degree attainment, and transfer.

Because of the separation and the need for mass DE addendums across the disciplines, all courses have been reviewed in the last year. Currently (2021), the curriculum committee, in coordination with the division chair, has assigned a number of English faculty to review the course outlines of record for all literature courses currently in the catalog. This review is estimated to be completed by the end of the Spring 2021 semester.

## Course Additions

In 2018, the English department added 101S, the co-requisite course to be taken along with 101 . We initially made it linked to a specific 101 so that it could have the same instructor and it was a 2 unit, graded class. In 2020, we made the 101 S a P/NP option, and we are currently working to make the 101S a separate late-start course that students can enroll in upon instructor recommendation or selfplacement. We will also make this a 1 unit P/NP course (no grading option) and are beginning the process of creating a standardized curriculum to be put in place by Fall 2021.

## Course Deletions

ENGL A, B, C, 80, 82, 84 have all been inactivated and have been deleted as recommended preparations or pre-requisites from all courses across the institution.

## Maintaining and Improving Performance:

Ongoing course review and SLO assessments are necessary maintenance measures that are needed to ensure the overall course quality in English. As such, faculty are regularly engaged in both rigorous quantitative and qualitative assessments. SLO assessment data is used to inform curriculum-related decisions relative to Course Outlines of Record (CORs), SLO statements, and PLOs. The anticipated change from Curriqunet to eLumen and eLumen's integration with Canvas should enable regular (every semester) collection of SLO data from every course offered. This depth and breadth of data collection should improve our understanding of student needs in a real-time, rather than regressive, format.

## SECTION 4—ASSESSMENT AND STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES

## $\mathrm{SLOs} \rightarrow \mathrm{PLOs} \rightarrow$ ILOs

According to the ACCJC rubric, the English program at Compton College is at the proficient level, as we have assessed all ( $100 \%$ ) of our courses and have scheduled implementation of several strategies to address deficiencies that were found in previous assessments. Our current review cycle extends over 4 years. The campus is discussing adopting new software for this process. That change will result in more frequent and disaggregated SLO collection. The COVID-19 campus closure has impacted our success rates, as our English 101 (college composition) SLOs are currently at 72\% success.

## Timeline for Program Level Outcomes Assessment

Compton College faculty assess SLOs and Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs) on a four-year cycle. All course SLOs are aligned with PLOs which are then aligned with the Center's Institutional Learning Outcomes (ILOs). In Fall of 2019, PLOs 5 was due and was not assessed. At that time, the college did not have an acting SLO Coordinator. The findings of previous assessments (in 2016) determined that students who placed into English C had lower success rates than those students that placed into English A. One reason indicated was the open-enrollment system in community colleges. Similarly, it was determined that students completing the Basic Skills track performed well in transfer-level courses. With new data since the implementation of AB 705, while we saw a dip in success rates for 2019 of $4 \%$, more students successfully completed transfer-level composition than in the past.

The timeline and results of SLO data collection are found in the appendices attached to the end of this report.

## Report \& Discussion of Course and Program-level Outcomes

The program success rate over a 5 year period is 59.64 , which exceeds the program standard. As noted, the combination of AB 705 and COVID-19 have caused a drop in our success and retention rates, but this is reflected campus-wide. As we have removed all but one level of remedial composition, more students are completing college-level composition. With the removal of these remedial classes, we had 1315 students (2018-2019) attempt English 101/College Composition. This is an increase of over 300 students attempting this course.

## Assessment \& Change (instruction, curriculum, and/or program aspects)

Our overall student population comes from school districts with low test scores and low success rates. Because of the open enrollment nature of the community college system, we struggle to try to get students enrolled in English courses to master the necessary skills to succeed and the college level. This makes accomplishing our goals difficult, especially in terms of retention, persistence, and student success. With the elimination of below transfer-level classes (English C, B, A and English 80, 82, and 84) basic skills needs must be addressed in the English 101/College Composition classroom. However, the English department is currently addressing professional development in a community of practice to address the changes to our classes due to AB 705. Additionally, the department is currently trying two different experimental classroom models (co-teaching and smaller class sizes). In conjunction with Institutional Effectiveness, the department is tracking not only success and retention rates for these classes (in comparison to regular classes), we are tracking the affective domain (or emotional preparedness of students).

## Change Effectiveness

With the removal of our remedial classes, going forward, we are only collecting SLO data for English 101, 103, and RWA. The department commissioned a study (by the RP Group) of our English classes in Spring 2019 as part of our preparation for AB 705. Additionally, we are continuing to track success and retention. Our SLO success rates for English 101 have dropped (between 5$10 \%$ ), but this is likely a consequence of AB 705 . Students who formerly would have been placed in remedial courses are now able to take English 101/College Composition. Based on our previous data, students in those remedial classes lack basic skills in both reading and writing. The largest drop was noted in the English 101 for SLO 1. This drop of $17 \%$ was assessed to be caused by COVID-19 and the large number of students who could complete their courses campus-wide.

Success rates for SLOs in English 103/Critical Thinking show very little change. This consistent success rates indicate that students who pass English 101 are mastering the skills they need to continue to be successful in future writing classes.

## Refinement/Improvement to SLOs and Assessment Process

$\square$ English 101 needs to continue to be assessed to measure the effectiveness of our post-AB 705 measures.
$\square$ English 101S needs to be assessed to determine if the co-requisite support is benefiting students. Our fill rate data indicates that fewer students want to take the co-req component.
$\square$ As we have eliminated our remedial courses to comply with AB 705, we think that additional tutorial support for 101 might be necessary to improve the success rates. Given the academic success rates of our feeder schools, it is recommended that we have dedicated in-class tutorial support in English 101 to increase student success rates. The cost to hire additional tutors would be $\$ 30,000.00$ per year.
$\square$ Research should be conducted on the success rates for English RWA as those students move forward to English 101 and English 103

Given the consistent success rates of English 103's SLOs, we should revise for content the student and faculty surveys currently being used to assess English 101.

Currently, the English department is engaging in a Community of Practice. This program is open to both full time and adjunct faculty. This program should be continued so faculty can share best
practices and develop new skills to improve the post-AB 705 classroom (and the current COVID-19 remote learning environment). The community of practice should be fully funded for Fall 2021Spring 2022. Additionally, funds should be allocated to pay adjunct faculty for their participation.

Develop a mentorship program that connects adjunct faculty with full-time faculty who are assigned to writing courses. Writing instructors need to share methods, ideas, and effective lessons. As this would require additional time, money must be allocated to pay adjunct faculty for this training.

Remove Academic Strategies courses that are not related to the Basic Writing program. AS 1 and AS 60 should be given to the Student Success Center and turned into workshops

## Section 5 - Analysis of Student Feedback

The student survey covers four general areas: student support, curriculum, technology/facilities, and program objectives.

Student responses about our program goals, instructor support, and availability of classes are overwhelmingly positive. Although the survey responses were very small (only 17 students responded) between 15-17 students answered that they agreed or strongly agreed that the program helped them meet their academic goals, that they felt a sense of community within the classroom (virtual or not), and that their instructors supported them in their class.

However, almost half of the respondents felt that they needed more help with their reading comprehension to help them succeed in their English classes.

Please see the appendices for the full survey and responses.

## Section 6 - Facilities and Equipment

The overall classroom facilities have improved greatly since moving the majority of the classes from the row buildings to Tartar Village. All of these classrooms are smart classrooms with ample seating and other necessary equipment.

With the opening of Instructional Buildings $1 \& 2$ in the upcoming year, we anticipate that many of our previous requests regarding cleaning, updated equipment, and other issues will be met.

## Recommendations

- Ensure that all entrances, public use spaces such as elevators, restrooms, and lounges are ADA compliant.
- Ensure that all classrooms are equipped with special desks to accommodate all student needs for accessibility
- Storage facilities for computer carts, textbooks, other classroom supplies in classrooms
- Adjunct work areas
- Student ONLY lounges and meeting spaces that are easily accessible.
- Offices for faculty need to have better ventilation and need to have private areas for student conferences and office hours.


## Section 7 - Technology and Software

Immediate Needs (1-2 years)
In order to meet the Technology Plan's Mission Statement, Tartar Completion by Design and to address the needs of our Guided Pathways Division immediate changes must take place. The following is a list of proposed changes:

- To provide direct, universal, and user-friendly access to information and instructional technologies such as; instructional computer, laser printer and scanner, AV projector, DVD / Blu-Ray player, plus emerging technologies, updated software (Adobe, MSWord) Ethernet outlets, media screens, SMART boards, and projectors must be installed in all classrooms. Additional necessities include a paper towel dispenser and a lock box for tools (including cords, dry erase markers, erasers, and the spray bottle to clean the boards.) In addition, a printer and cupboard to store paper are needed in at least a few select classrooms. It is standard practice for English instructors to incorporate media elements to enhance learning, including video and audio. Without these basic elements, such options are limited severely. Since student learning outcomes in English courses typically include formatting requirements as well as research methods, these basic items are necessary to meet class objectives at most class levels, including basic skills. Costs for these items will vary based on bulk pricing, but are likely to exceed $\$ 25,000$ per room, including installation.
- To promote student access and success that would help students in their pursuit of educational, life and career goals, computer labs in the Student Success Center, Vocational Technology building and Humanities Building must be opened and staffed for the use of students on a regular basis. Computers labs should offer students greater access to the tools needed. These labs should be like computer satellite hubs. Extensive access to computer labs for English, reading, and ESL students are standard infrastructure at nearby community colleges, including El Camino. Cerritos, and Long Beach City colleges, all of which have stronger five-year success rates than Compton. Comparable resources should be in place for in order for Compton College to compete for these students and increase persistence and retention. Initial setup costs depend on many factors, including current market rates and bulk purchasing discounts, but a new 40 -station computer lab would cost approximately $\$ 50,000$. Additional costs for lab support at 2020 classified rates are $\$ 75,000$ annually for 40 hours per week.
- To improve communication, collaboration and coordination among those who enable students, faculty and staff to make the most effective use of technology, mandatory on-going training and attendance must be included as part of professional development. Such support is required per state and federal guidelines and must be addressed as Compton College moves forward toward reaccreditation. Dedicated classified staff for professional development needs to be retained.
- To sustain and improve instructional, student and administrative support services, Professional Development Office should maintain a robust list of offerings. Staff require a training professional on campus as well as the ability to access drop-in guidance. This is particularly important for adjunct instructors who do not have the same professional development requirements as full timers.
- To increase the use and application of technology resources, Compton College must offer technology training on campus for Microsoft, Canvas, Omni, and other new software and all other networks that make for more proficient staff. This would be the purview of an onsite trainer, as discussed above. The need for continued training in current software programs will assist our faculty and staff to remain current and meet ever-changing state and federal requirements as well as help improve basic student access and proficiency.
- To address the requirements for ADA and 504/508 Accessibility Requirements, Compton College must offer accessibility tools for in-class and online instruction. All future purchases involving technology must undergo an accessibility review to ensure compliance. Appropriate levels of training must be offered for such software tools like Read/Write, etc.
Long-range Needs (2-4+ years)
In order to meet the Technology Plan's Mission Statement immediate changes must take place. The following is a list of proposed changes:
- To provide direct, universal and user-friendly access to information and instructional technologies, all classrooms should be Smart Classrooms with the appropriate equipment. Approximate costs vary, but are likely to exceed $\$ 3000$.
- To promote student access and success that would help students in their pursuit of educational and career goals, all current computer labs should be upgraded with modern desktops and current windows media and related software to all academic divisions. Rationale and costs for such basic infrastructure is covered in the previous section on shortterm needs, but to reiterate, these basics have been in place at neighboring colleges for nearly a decade, and students at Compton College should have to similar resources. Again, a new 40 -station computer lab would cost approximately $\$ 50,000$. Additional costs for lab support at 2016 classified rates are $\$ 75,000$ for 40 hours per week.
- To improve communication, collaboration and coordination among those who enable students, faculty and staff to make the most effective use of technology resources, year-round training should be offered to faculty and staff.
- To promote alternative methods of education that integrate technology intro instruction and meet student learning outcomes in English, all future classrooms need to be smart classrooms. Accessibility software should automatically be a part of the upgrades.
- To increase the use and application of technology resources for staff development, a fully functioning training center equipped with Internet access and updated desktops must be available


## Section 8 - Staffing

Since the last program review cycle, Compton College is no longer under the umbrella of El Camino College and has received independent accreditation. We have also experienced a tremendous change through the Guided Pathways restructuring mandated statewide. The old division structure combining math and English did not make a lot of sense, as it was based on the questionable notion that since remedial English and math were both in-demand basic skills courses, the subjects should be paired. Another immense change was the inception of AB 705, which severely diminished our eliminated remedial courses. All of this impacts staffing.

With Guided Pathways, the English Department is woven into the FACH Division, Fine Arts, Communications, and Humanities. This created several release-time positions, with Guided Pathway liaisons assigned for each division in order to create professional development opportunities for faculty based on the new framework. This restructuring, as well as the transition from El Camino College, led the department to examine and expand course offerings, including the development of journalism as a new program.

Although the English department has lost four tenured faculty in the last two years, only one of whom was at retirement age, there are no current plans to hire replacement faculty. The continued downward trend in enrollment means that we are currently at capacity with 10 full time faculty (with a combined release time of $200 \%$ as noted earlier in this report) and thus cannot currently support any more full time faculty for the foreseeable future.

We have approximately 13 adjuncts who regularly teach for us and are very dedicated despite being asked to do tasks such as distance education addendums, SLO reporting, and working on workgroups that are rarely compensated. There seems to be an encouraging trend, however, that adjuncts do get compensated when they are asked to go above and beyond their normal teaching duties. Although we are currently in the bottom $10 \%$ of pay rate for adjuncts, the union has successfully fought for a pay raise for adjuncts. There is current proposed legislation to increase the percentage that an adjunct can work on one campus (from $66 \%$ to $85 \%$ ). This might help the stability of our adjunct pool. Overall, however, our adjuncts are reliable and dedicated to student success in all of its forms.

One change that has happened since the last program review is that our adjuncts can no longer teach a class and work as tutors in the writing center or in other classes. Also, because of the inactivation of the majority of below-transfer level English classes because of AB705, we no longer utilize as many in class tutors (SLAs, student learning associates). This has been a blow, not only to our adjuncts' salaries, but also to our students who often prefer to go to an instructor they are familiar with in the writing center for help. It has been explained that because of the difficulty of keeping track of hours and percentages, this practice has been discontinued. We
recommend reinstating this previous practice of our adjuncts being able to work as both instructors and tutors, embedded or otherwise.

One program that should be returned to the purview of the English Department. or assigned to FACH faculty member is the First-Year Experience program. According to a publication sponsored by the U.S. Department of Education, the Institute of Education Sciences (2016), FYE courses increase a student's likelihood of credit accumulation 9 times and increase degree attainment by 6 times. This successful program created a strong sense of community on our campus, and helped promote stable enrollment in English courses every semester. Reinstating FYE would offer our students comparable opportunities to those available at other community colleges. The demise of this program has had an impact on the reduction of English courses.

We recommend that FYE be reinstated with a dedicated staff, counselor, and training for participating professors. Since English is always a component of the FYE cohort AND given the AB705 mandate, we recommend that a faculty position with a minimum of $50 \%$ release time and a full time counselor be implemented.

The previous attempt to re-work FYE headed by Student Services has not proven to be successful to date. We recommend the need to attempt a new iteration and not to give up on this previously successful program.

## Section 9 - Direction and Vision

The vision of the program has not changed since the last program review. The department strives to be a supportive and caring milieu for students to succeed in in critical thinking, reading and writing. Active reading, creatively critical thinking, and writing in clear and lucid expository prose are the hallmarks we engender in our students toward their success. These have been our vision over time, and they remain so through the present,

While the vision of the program remains unchanged, the direction of the department has changed.

## Legislation

AB705 has played a major role in the change of direction in our department. AB705 places the burden upon the college to demonstrate that a student would have a better chance of passing transfer level English (or math) if placed in a remedial class. AB705 also eliminated a single assessment test as the determining factor for whether or not a student would be placed into a below-transfer level class. As such, high school GPA and guided self-placement, are the two factors in determining whether a student places themselves into ENGL RWA, ENGL 101+101S, or ENGL 101.

## Department level changes

The department is in the process of trying a number of innovative strategies in order to improve student success - the vision and goal of this department always has been student success and faculty have been involved in professional development, pilot programs involving
team teaching and low-cap classes, integrating adjuncts into the department more fully, a formal community of practice, an English instructional specialist who acts as a liaison to the Student Success Center, and a variety of Tartar Success Team sponsored initiatives such as guest speakers, career panels, survival kits for new students, increased contact between faculty and English major students, and the Author talk series and the Voices of Compton publication. This year (2021) there is also a funded student talent showcase video which will act as a promotion for all FACH majors.

There has been a push to offer more online and hybrid courses even before COVID 19 made that a requirement. $90 \%$ of the department is now certified to teach online.

## Direction

The department strives to improve its student success rate and to work with other areas to create unified offerings that reflect the diversity of our student body and to ensure equitable access and inclusivity.

Across the division, the chair has ensured complementary offerings such as African American Literature, History of African Art, History of Jazz or Rock Music, and African Dance to give one example. We have also work with the Social Sciences division to pair complementary courses as well.

## Section 10 - Prioritized recommendations and justification

## Strategic Initiatives

The strategic initiatives for 2017-2024 are:

1. Access and Completion: Compton College will improve enrollment, retention, and completion rates for our students.
2. Student Success: Compton College will support the success of all students to meet their education and career goals.
3. Innovation: Compton College will enhance the success of students through the use of technology.
4. Workforce Development: Compton College will offer excellent programs that lead to certificates and degrees in allied health and technical fields to supply the needed employees for the prevailing job industry.
5. Partnerships: Compton College will establish productive partnerships in the community and with the K-12 schools.

| Recommendation | Cost estimate | Strategic Initiative |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Move ENGL 61, 64, 65, 67 to Academic <br> Strategies | $\$ 0$ | 1,2 |
| Continue Community of Practice/Team <br> Teaching and Low Cap Classes | $\$ 20,000$ | 1,2 |
| Professional Development related to <br> culturally relevant pedagogy, diversity <br> and equity | $\$ 0$ (already part of PD <br> budget) |  |


| Continuation of EdReady software <br> license and faculty training | Part of SSC budget | 1,2 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Continuation of Instructional Specialist <br> position - English | $20 \%$ release time | 1,2 |
| Summer retreat for English and <br> Counseling faculty to work on AB705 <br> measures | \$TBD (committed to on <br> $3 / 26 / 21$ by Dr. Curry) | 1,2 |
|  |  |  |

## Appendices

Appendix A - Fill rates for English 2015-Spring 2019

| Term | Fill Rate |
| ---: | ---: |
| Fall 2014 | $98.54 \%$ |
| Fall 2015 | $95.88 \%$ |
| Fall 2016 | $93.03 \%$ |
| Fall 2017 | $94.37 \%$ |
| Fall 2018 | $86.77 \%$ |
| Spring 2015 | $89.76 \%$ |
| Spring 2016 | $90.51 \%$ |
| Spring 2017 | $81.51 \%$ |
| Spring 2018 | $80.31 \%$ |
| Spring 2019 | $75.81 \%$ |

Appendix B - Enrollment by Time of Day

ENGL Enrollment by Time of Day

| Term | Fall $\mathbf{1 4}$ | Spring <br> $\mathbf{1 5}$ | Fall $\mathbf{1 5}$ | Spring <br> $\mathbf{1 6}$ | Fall $\mathbf{1 6}$ | Sprin <br> $\mathbf{g}$ <br> $\mathbf{1 7}$ | Fall <br> $\mathbf{1 7}$ | Spring <br> $\mathbf{1 8}$ | Fall 18 | Spring <br> $\mathbf{1 9}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Day | 78.24 <br> $\%$ | 76.01 <br> $\%$ | 78.88 <br> $\%$ | $76.11 \%$ | $78.85 \%$ | 77.24 <br> $\%$ | 76.33 <br> $\%$ | 73.07 <br> $\%$ | 75.49 <br> $\%$ | $72.87 \%$ |
| Night | 10.90 <br> $\%$ | 12.52 <br> $\%$ | 11.16 <br> $\%$ | $12.53 \%$ | $10.74 \%$ | 10.65 <br> $\%$ | 10.86 <br> $\%$ | 10.54 <br> $\%$ | $9.03 \%$ | $11.35 \%$ |
| Unknown | 10.86 <br> $\%$ | 11.48 <br> $\%$ | $9.97 \%$ | $11.37 \%$ | $10.41 \%$ | 12.11 <br> $\%$ | 12.82 <br> $\%$ | 16.40 <br> $\%$ | 15.49 <br> $\%$ | $15.79 \%$ |

# Appendix C - Results and Timeline of SLO Collection 

https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1-7Lne-euPJJPndVTd1IZmK5xMbpUYPQGb3TbvFBI k/edit?usp=sharing
[The original excel file is too large to insert as an appendix, so a shareable Google sheet is linked here]

