



# Annual Program Review 2011-2012 - INSTRUCTIONAL

## Division - Program

**ENGLISH**

### Authorization

After the document is complete, it must be reviewed and submitted to the Program Review Committee by the Division Chair.

Author: Michael Ritterbrown

Division Chair: Michael Ritterbrown

Date Received by Program Review: November 8, 2011

### Overview of the Program

*All degrees and certificates are considered programs. In addition, divisions may further delineate and define programs based on their assessment needs (developmental sequences, career track, etc).*

**Statement of Purpose** – briefly describe in 1-3 sentences.

The purpose of the English Program is to provide students a foundation which allows them to clearly and effectively express their ideas and knowledge in writing. The fundamental elements of this foundation are a knowledge of the mechanics of writing, increased facility for critical thinking, and the ability to perform and incorporate research into written work.

Please list the **most significant achievement** accomplished since your last program review.

The English Division has made significant progress in the areas of developmental instruction, incorporation of educational technology, and the creation and assessment of student learning outcomes.

List the current major strengths of your program

1. Faculty commitment to student learning
2. Service to the college community as a whole
3. Innovative teaching methods and effective use of educational technology

List the current weaknesses of your program

1. Effective use of divisional committee structure
2. Shortage of full time instructors
3. Lack of funding and space for educational technology

## 1.0. Trend Analysis

For each program within the division, use the data provided to indicate trends (e.g., steady, increasing, decreasing, etc.) for each of the following measures

| Program                | Academic Year | FTEs Trend | FTEF Trend | WSCH / FTEF Trend | Full-Time % Trend | Fill Rate Trend | Success Rate Trend | Awards Trend |
|------------------------|---------------|------------|------------|-------------------|-------------------|-----------------|--------------------|--------------|
| ENGLISH                | 2007-2008     | 1,061      | 72.9       | 463               | 43.1%             | 92.5%           | 62.6%              | 1            |
|                        | 2008-2009     | 1,054      | 69.5       | 483               | 43.6%             | 98.6%           | 64.5%              | 1            |
|                        | 2009-2010     | 1,049      | 68.9       | 484               | 47.5%             | 101.7%          | 67.4%              | 5            |
|                        | 2010-2011     | 998        | 70.1       | 453               | 39.9%             | 102.2%          | 67.0%              | 1            |
|                        | % Change      | -5.9%      | -3.7%      | -2.3%             | -7.3%             | +10.4%          | +7.0%              | +0.0%        |
|                        | 4-Yr. Trend   | stable     | stable     | stable            | stable            | increasing      | stable             | stable       |
| HUMANITIES             | 2007-2008     | 87         | 4.3        | 646               | 90.0%             | 89.1%           | 79.4%              | 1            |
|                        | 2008-2009     | 87         | 3.9        | 721               | 88.9%             | 99.3%           | 75.6%              | 0            |
|                        | 2009-2010     | 82         | 3.9        | 681               | 88.9%             | 97.3%           | 76.0%              | 0            |
|                        | 2010-2011     | 84         | 6.0        | 446               | 89.3%             | 106.5%          | 76.7%              | 0            |
|                        | % Change      | -3.4%      | +40.0%     | -31.0%            | -0.8%             | +19.5%          | -3.5%              | -100.0%      |
|                        | 4-Yr. Trend   | stable     | increasing | decreasing        | stable            | increasing      | stable             | decreasing   |
| ENGLISH DIVISION TOTAL | 2007-2008     | 1,148      | 77.1       | 473               | 45.7%             | 92.2%           | 64.1%              | 2            |
|                        | 2008-2009     | 1,141      | 73.3       | 495               | 46.0%             | 98.6%           | 65.5%              | 1            |
|                        | 2009-2010     | 1,131      | 72.7       | 495               | 49.7%             | 101.3%          | 68.0%              | 5            |
|                        | 2010-2011     | 1,082      | 76.1       | 452               | 43.8%             | 102.5%          | 67.9%              | 1            |
|                        | % Change      | -5.7%      | -1.3%      | -4.5%             | -4.1%             | +11.2%          | +5.9%              |              |
|                        | 4-Yr. Trend   | stable     | stable     | stable            | stable            | increasing      | stable             |              |

1.1. Describe how these trends have affected student achievement and student learning:

It should be noted first that the increase in FTEF for humanities does not represent an actual increase in faculty but a change in accounting practice that assigns teachers from other disciplines who are participating in team taught classes to English rather than their own discipline. The change in accounting has also resulted in the appearance of an excess of FTEF in English and needs to be addressed by the accounting process. In English classes, the increase in fill rates and the decrease in FTEF and FTES can be attributed, to some extent, to a decrease in overall offerings ; however it is clear that increased fill rates in both humanities and English are the result of more successful curricular management. Increased success rates in English are in part due to dramatically increased success in basic skills English during this period (an overall increase of more than 10%) as well as an increased focus on curricular unity and development overall. It should be noted that basic skills curricular and staff development has received funding from a variety of grants and that perhaps an increase of the same magnitude could be achieved in transfer courses if resources were devoted to curricular and staff development in that area.

1.2. Is there other relevant quantitative/qualitative information that affects the evaluation of your program?

Because FTEF is assigned by the college, the number does not reflect the actual number of full time faculty members in the division. The distinction is important because only full time faculty members can be required, or even have the opportunity, to serve the needs of the students, the division and the college, beyond the immediate needs of the classroom. The English division has experienced significant attrition due to retirement, death, and disability. While we have had the

opportunity to hire one full time faculty member in the last 4 years, we are still considerably diminished, having not had the opportunity to replace 3 of the last 4 losses.

While fill rates indicated are at over 100% for both English and humanities, what is not reflected is unmet demand. Waitlists at census for English classes indicated that over 1100 students were unable to get the classes that they wanted. 850 of those students were in transfer comp courses (101 – 104) and 335 of those students were in basic skills courses. The total indicates that demand of at least an additional 25% over our current capacity exists.

## 2.0. Student Learning and Curriculum

Provide the following information on each department and program within the division.

| List each Department within the Division as well each degree, certificate, or other program* within the Department | Active Courses with Identified SLOs |     | Active Courses Assessed |    | Course Sections Assessed |    | If this area has program outcomes have they been assessed? Yes or No |
|--|-------------------------------------|-----|-------------------------|----|--------------------------|----|--|
|  | n/n                                 | %   | n/n                     | %  | n/n                      | %  |  |
| ENGLISH  | 26                                  | 100 | 26                      | 50 | 26                       | 50 | No   |
| HUMANITIES   | 7                                   | 100 | 7                       | 0  | 7                        | 0  | No   |

2.1. Please comment on the percentages above.

The division has been very active in creating and assessing student learning outcomes. The data gathered has been very useful in analyzing the success of teaching methodology as well as the need for curricular development. Assessment has, however, been extremely labor intensive and time consuming as no mechanism for the collection and compilation of data is currently in use. The division has been forced to develop and maintain its own system with little or no outside support aside from small grants from BSI. If the college is to continue to expect that divisions collect, compile, and analyze data based on student learning outcomes, a mechanism must be implemented to allow for the effective collection and compilation of data. While the eLumen system has been purchased for the college, its development and deployment has been delayed for years. The project has received little support from the college in the form of released time for an eLumen coordinator. Despite this, delays have continued, and for several years the project and the English Division have relied on BSI funding. Additionally, effective analysis of data leading to substantial discussions of curriculum and methodology require support in the form of staff development resources. Such resources would allow for organized and effective discussion among all members of divisions, including adjunct faculty on whom we rely heavily and who often are only tangentially aware of the existence of SLOs much less of the need for analysis and the opportunity for curricular development that this analysis presents.

- 2.2. a) Please provide a **link\*** to all program assessment timelines here. This link could be to your division /department website, eLumen, etc.  
 b) Briefly summarize any pedagogical or curricular elements of courses/programs that have been changed or will be changed as a result of developing assessment timelines and course/program alignment matrixes.  
 c) Based on the program assessment timelines you have developed and the evidence you have

gathered, please comment briefly on how far along your division/program is in the assessment process.

<http://libguides.glendale.edu/content.php?mode=preview&pid=261000&sid=2233004>

It is difficult to know in any specific way how the creation of timelines for assessment will affect curricular development and revision; however, they provide a concrete structure for analysis that may be attached to a mechanism for analysis and discussion. It is important, again, that the college plan for and support these last two elements. While the existence of SLOs and a framework for their assessment is important for accreditation, it is essential, if SLOs are to be truly useful in terms of helping the college to serve students more effectively, that the college provide a framework of support for the analysis and discussion necessary to identify the need for curricular changes as well as to plan and execute these changes. With support from the college a three year assessment cycle is possible, meaning that faculty will have assessed a course or program twice within six years. Since curriculum is reviewed on a six year cycle, it is then possible to adopt a strategy in which a course would go through the curriculum review at the Curriculum and Instruction committee for minor/substantive revisions after it had been assessed twice. Or, if after the second assessment cycle it is clear that the course is only in need of extremely minor revisions, then this would be the time to update the course's textbooks, revisit the SLOs and do the other extremely minor curriculum changes which need not go through C & I. However, this type of sustainable and fully integrated curriculum and assessment cycle is only possible with sustained support from the college in the form of sufficient full time faculty members and other appropriate resources.

The division has made significant progress in the assessment of SLO's in English, with a full 50% of courses currently assessed. The humanities program, partly because it is significantly smaller and includes faculty from a variety of disciplines, has proved more of a challenge; however SLOs have been designed for 100% of humanities courses and we have scheduled these courses for assessment as indicated by our timeline. However, a shortage of full time faculty has this process more difficult and slower. While part-time faculty participate in the process, they cannot be expected to coordinate or provide substantial leadership.

- 2.3 a) Please provide a **link** to any program and/or relevant course assessment reports. Does the evidence from assessment reports show that students are achieving the desired learning outcomes?  
 b) Please briefly summarize any pedagogical or curricular elements of courses and/or programs that have been changed or will be changed as a result of the assessments conducted.

<http://libguides.glendale.edu/content.php?pid=265068&sid=2236705>

<http://libguides.glendale.edu/content.php?pid=265068&sid=2237010>

Overall, reports indicate that a majority of students are achieving the desired outcomes in courses. Areas involving critical understanding and mastery of writing indicate relatively strong achievement, while areas of mechanics, such as grammar and documentation, indicate only marginal success.

The division is currently examining methods to address the issues revealed by an analysis of outcomes assessment. We are scheduling best practice sessions for instructors as well as conducting discussions aimed at unifying the division's approach to instruction and evaluation of mechanics. Additionally, the division is working with the learning center to develop workshops and expand tutoring opportunities for students. However, greater resources are needed to move forward effectively to accomplish goals related to curriculum and instruction. Instructors need time

to analyze, plan, and change curriculum and instructional methodology, and more technological resources need to be made available to both instructors and students. Again, a shortage of full time faculty in the division has made, assessment, analysis, and curricular revision more difficult, and placed an unreasonable burden on current full-time faculty and staff.

2.4 Please list all courses which have been reviewed in the last academic year.

*Note: Curriculum Review is required by the Chancellors Office every 6 years.*

The last full review of English courses occurred in 2008. Our next full review will occur in 2014. Courses reviewed or to be reviewed in the 2011-2012 academic year include English 127, 189, 191, and 120.

2.5 Please list all degree/certificate programs within the division that were reviewed in the last academic year.

Student learning outcomes were developed for the AA in both English and Humanities.

2.6 For each program that was reviewed, please list any changes that were made.

Program learning outcomes assessment timelines have now been developed for the division's six programs. Based on these timelines, the program's curriculum will be reviewed as the learning outcomes are assessed.

### 3.0. Reflection and Action Plans

3.1 What recent activities, dialogues, discussions, etc. have occurred to promote student learning or improved program/division processes?

The division has engaged in significant discussion regarding the unification of evaluation criteria and methodology. This effort will also inform the college wide discussion of common writing expectations. Additionally, the division has collaborated in developing common expectations for course preparation and research assignments.

Discussions of educational technology have dominated best practice forums in the division. Instructors have developed and shared criteria for custom texts, e-texts, and web based texts, all of which have the potential to serve students more effectively while simultaneously reducing the cost of texts. Additional discussion has focused on tools and applications to provide more effective and immediate instruction. Division members have made use of cloud based computing, social media, tools for electronic grading, to name a few, and the division is in the process of developing resources to more effectively share and discuss all aspects of educational technology. As we continue to develop curriculum aimed at maximizing the opportunity presented by educational technology, it is essential that English faculty have adequate access to facilities that allow for the effective use of technology, in particular computer lab classrooms. The division is currently able to schedule one lab full time for its classes and another lab before 4 in the afternoon. While other divisions have been very generous in allowing English to schedule classes into their labs when those labs were not in use, this does not adequately meet the current needs of the English division much less future developments.

3.2 Using the weaknesses, trends and assessment outcomes listed on the previous pages as a basis for your comments, please briefly describe your plans and/or modifications for program/division improvements

| Plans or Modifications               | Anticipated Improvements  |
|--------------------------------------|---|
| Educational Technology Development   | Continue to modify and enhance instructional methodology to take advantage of technological innovation to better serve students. Developments will include, but are not limited to: e-texts; web-based texts; enhanced methods of instruction allowing for more immediate participation by students; enhanced methods of capture and delivery for class content.                    |
| Curricular Modification              | Curricular modification consistent with developments in instructional research reflecting methodology that enhances student participation, retention and success. Developments will include but are not limited to accelerated class structure, enhanced tutoring opportunities, workshops on mechanics;  |
| Student Learning Outcomes Assessment | Development of reliable and efficient mechanisms for processing and analyzing data at the class, program, and institutional levels.   |
| Assessment Improvement               | Review current assessment mechanisms as well as data on best practices and implement revisions to improve placement.  |
| Hire additional full time faculty    | Additional full time faculty would improve service to the students as well as the division as they are able to focus entirely on their work at Glendale and are able to serve more effectively with relation to committee service, curriculum development, assessment, cooperation with ancillary instruction, and the development of innovative classroom practice and curriculum. |

Format Rev. 8.31.11

**2011 PROGRAM REVIEW****ENGLISH**  
**2 Computer Labs****I: ENG-1****Section 4**  
**Resource Request**

**Type of Request:**       Facilities/Maintenance       Classroom Upgrades       New space  
 Instructional Equip.       Non-Instructional Equip       Conference/Travel       Training  
 Computer/Hdware       Software/Licenses       Supplies       Other

**Mandatory:** Is this request for one-time funding?  OR Does this request require ongoing funding?

If this is a repeat request, please list the Resource ID code or year requested: 2010

Mark if the following apply to this request:       Health & Safety Issue       Legal Mandate  
 Accreditation Requirement       Contractual Requirement

**4.1. Clearly describe the resource request.**

2 additional computer labs for the use of the division

Amount requested \$ 110,000

| Type of Resource  | Amount Requested | Description  | Justification   |
|-------------------|------------------|--|---|
| <b>Facilities</b> |                  | 2 rooms  | Suitable space from existing facilities will be necessary to house the labs                   |
| <b>Equipment</b>  | \$72,000         | 62 computers   | 60 computers for students and two instructor stations   |
| <b>Equipment</b>  | \$2300           | 2 printers   | Necessary for students and faculty to be able to generate hard copies of work and assignments |
| <b>Furniture</b>  | \$15,000         | Computer tables, chairs, and instructor work station | Necessary for proper set up and use of lab  |
| <b>Software</b>   | \$0              | Word processing and mind mapping                     | Necessary for students to complete assigned work  |
| <b>Training</b>   |                  |  |   |
| <b>Other</b>      | \$6000           | Electrical and painting                              | Necessary for installation of equipment   |
| <b>Total</b>      | \$110,000        |  |   |

**4.2. Justification and Rationale:** What planning goal, core competency or course/program SLO does this request address? Use data from your report to support your request.

EMP: 1.2, 1.3, 3.5  
 Core Competencies: 1a, 1b, 3a, 3b, 3c, 3d, 6a, 6b, 6d  
 SLOs: Increased ability to assess SLOs in English division focused on writing, reading, and research <http://vision.glendale.edu/index.aspx?page=2390> such as those for English 101

1. critically read materials from a variety of perspectives in order to draw logical interpretive conclusions based on textual evidence.
2. write thesis-based essays that demonstrate critical thinking skills through a variety of rhetorical and analytical strategies appropriate to the academic context, and that incorporate appropriate tone, style, evidence, and semantics.
3. prepare an essay organizing, synthesizing evaluating, and applying research materials, employing quotation, paraphrase, and summary as effective means of support and using proper documentation and format.

**4.3. What measurable outcome will result from filling this resource request?**

We will be able to accommodate a greater number of classes which make use of innovative practice involving educational technology, allowing students to participate directly in learning activities in the classroom, activities involving not only writing and reading but research and study skills and critical reasoning as well. Computer lab classrooms have transformed learning in composition classrooms by making application of skills direct and immediate. Currently, the division is unable to implement innovative curricula at the level which additional labs would make possible. Currently, the division has developed a wide array of demonstrably successful curricula that makes use of technology. This development has taken place with the express support of the institution; however, the division must currently rely on unused space allocated to other divisions. In many cases this forces the division to schedule classes at times other than those most needed by students and in spaces designed for uses other than writing and research instruction. It is necessary for the institution to support the innovative instruction developed by the division in the service of our students.

**APPROVALS**

| <b>AGENCY</b>  | <b>DECISION</b>      |                 |  |                 |                         |                  |          |
|--|----------------------|-----------------|--|-----------------|-------------------------|------------------|----------|
| The Program Review Committee has reviewed the data, outcomes and plans in the report and finds this request to be: | Well supported       |                 |  |                 |                         |                  | <b>X</b> |
|  | Adequately supported |                 |  |                 |                         |                  |          |
|  | Not supported        |                 |  |                 |                         |                  |          |
|  | Reason:              | Sect.1:<br>Data |  | Sect.2:<br>SLOs |                         | Sect.3:<br>Plans | Other:   |
| Standing Committee Review of Resource Request<br><b>Committee: Academic Affairs</b>                                |                      |                 |  |                 | Prioritization<br>Score |                  |          |



# 2011 PROGRAM REVIEW

|   |                 |
|---|-----------------|
| <b>Program Name:</b> English<br><i>HS Collaborative Funding</i> | <b>I: ENG-3</b> |
|---|-----------------|

## Section 4 Resource Request

**Type of Request:**     Facilities/Maintenance     Classroom Upgrades     New space  
 Instructional Equip.     Non-Instructional Equip     Conference/Travel     Training  
 Computer/Hdware     Software/Licenses     Supplies     Other

**Mandatory:** Is this request for one-time funding?  OR Does this request require ongoing funding?

If this is a repeat request, please list the Resource ID code or year requested: 2010

Mark if the following apply to this request:     Health & Safety Issue     Legal Mandate  
 Accreditation Requirement     Contractual Requirement

### 4.1. Clearly describe the resource request.

| Total Amount requested \$ 13,376 |                  | Breakdown of cost:                          |   |
|----------------------------------|------------------|---|---|
| Type of Resource                 | Amount Requested | Description                                 | Justification   |
| <b>Personnel</b>                 | \$9006.80        | Release time shared 20% among 2 faculty     | Necessary for faculty to administer program including visits to each high school class (approximately 25 total) which is a part of the program  |
| <b>Facilities</b>                |                  |   |   |
| <b>Equipment</b>                 |                  |   |   |
| <b>Supplies</b>                  | \$500.00         | Food for scoring sessions                   | Providing participants with food saves valuable time and money since we can work through lunch  |
| <b>Software</b>                  |                  |   |   |
| <b>Training</b>                  | \$3140.20        | Annual spring teacher-to-teacher conference | Necessary to share best practices and ensure all faculty are in alignment course policy issues; the funding of the conference will also pay for a key-note speaker who can help faculty to enhance teaching practices |
| <b>Other</b>                     | \$7300.00        | Assessment at high schools                  | Provides pretesting of 11 <sup>th</sup> grade students using GCC assessment test to know where students would place into GCC English classes  |
| <b>Total</b>                     | \$13,376.00      |   |   |

### 4.2. Justification and Rationale: What planning goal, core competency or course/program SLO does this request address? Use data from your report to support your request.

EMP: 3.1, 3.3, 3.4, 3.5  
 Core Competencies: 1a, 1b, 3a, 3b, 3c, 4a, 4b, 4c, 4d, 4e  
 SLOs: College Prep English is the course taught through the English High School Collaborative program. It is analogous to English 120. As such, the SLOs for English 120 are addressed in this request

1. analyze and synthesize information from a series of related articles, as demonstrated by summary, paraphrase, and quotation.

2. write a multi-paragraph length argumentative essay which addresses the topic, applies knowledge of essay organization conventions and basic MLA citation form, displays a command of standard English grammar, and demonstrates a growing awareness of critical thinking through its development of ideas and cited, logically applied evidence derived from a series of related readings.
3. interpretation and Evaluation: Assess a composition for unity, development, coherence, strength of evidence, proper integration of reading sources, and correct citation.

**4.3. What measurable outcome will result from filling this resource request?**

Upon completing College Prep English (the course directed by the high school collaborative program) students will be able to matriculate directly to English 101at GCC. Data shows that students who take CPE are more successful in English 101 than students who take the English placement test or English 120.

**APPROVALS**

| <b>AGENCY</b>  | <b>DECISION</b>      |                 |  |                 |  |                      |
|--|----------------------|-----------------|--|-----------------|--|----------------------|
| The Program Review Committee has reviewed the data, outcomes and plans in the report and finds this request to be: | Well supported       |                 |  |                 |  | <b>X</b>             |
|  | Adequately supported |                 |  |                 |  |                      |
|  | Not supported        |                 |  |                 |  |                      |
|  | Reason:              | Sect.1:<br>Data |  | Sect.2:<br>SLOs |  | Sect.3:<br>Plans     |
| Standing Committee Review of Resource Request  |                      |                 |  |                 |  | Prioritization Score |
| <b>Committee: Academic Affairs</b>   |                      |                 |  |                 |  |                      |



- |  |                              |
|--|------------------------------|
| b) Transfer to a four-year institution | e) Noncredit Adult Education |
| c) Career and Technical Education      | f) Personal enrichment       |

- a. English Instruction leads both directly to an associate degree in English and indirectly to all other associate degrees by providing an essential foundation of critical thinking and the ability to effectively express ideas and knowledge in writing.
- b. English instructors provide composition and literature classes required for transfer.
- c. English instructors are currently teaching contextualized classes that benefit specific CTE goals and we are working with other areas of CTE to develop more such classes.
- d. English instructors teach 4 levels of basic skills English, serving as much as 65% of incoming students.
- e. English instructors have provided literature instruction to non-credit adult learners.
- f. English instructors provide a broad range of literature and creative writing courses for personal enrichment.
- g.

**4.6** Describe how this position enhances student success. Ex: enhances instructional skills, meets community or industry needs. Contributes to state of the art technical education, etc. What measureable outcome will result from filling this request?

- a. Additional full time instructors will enhance instructional skills by providing faculty who are able to devote time and resources exclusively to GCC and its students. This will enhance instructional skill both in terms of classroom performance and in terms of overall program development owing to the addition of a full time instructor whose contributions to curricular committees and governance would be substantial. The division has made enormous strides in developing innovative curricula and classroom practice, especially in terms of incorporating educational technology. While part time instructors have been very receptive in terms of implementing such innovative methodology, the resources of full time instructors are necessary to develop and lead such efforts .
- b. Additional full time English instructors will allow the college to more effectively address the needs of the community in terms of core basic skills and transfer instruction by providing enhanced resources and focus in these areas required by all students seeking either a degree or transfer. English faculty also serve the needs of the community by providing classes in literature and creative writing that may be taken for personal enrichment.
- c. English instruction develops essential critical skills and writing proficiency required by almost all careers and jobs. Our recent work with basic skills and CTE has made apparent how important it is for English not only to provide instruction but to collaborate with other entities on campus to help students understand the essential nature of critical and writing skills and to give students more effective access to those skills. Full time instructors are essential in developing these collaborative efforts because they have both the time in an immediate sense to devote to the development of curricula and the ability to develop collaborative efforts with other entities on campus over the long term.
- d. Additional full time faculty allows for more effective development of innovative curriculum. The division has consistently developed innovative instructional methodology and curriculum, especially in the area of basic skills instruction. Current assessment of SLOs indicate a need to develop more effective methodology in several areas of instruction, especially the mechanics of writing. The significant time and effort required to research, develop, and implement such curriculum makes its development by part time faculty almost impossible. Research consistently demonstrates that such curricular development increases not only success but retention. In a time when class offerings are being reduced drastically both elements are essential in effectively serving our student population.

e. Additional full time faculty will increase the division’s ability to develop and assess student learning outcomes; while all instructors participate in this process, additional full time instructors allow for more effective implementation of this labor intensive process. A shortage of full time instructors has put a significant burden on current full time faculty where this is concerned.

4.7 Are there anticipated negative impacts for not hiring this position? If so describe.

In order for the division to effectively serve its students and the college, the contributions of full time faculty are a necessity. The English division is currently short 3 full time faculty members and we anticipate the retirement of an additional member next year. Add to this the contributions of full time faculty to efforts other than teaching in the amount 410% released time, and it is apparent that we are relying to a large extent on adjunct faculty where teaching is concerned. While adjunct faculty are certainly capable and dedicated instructors, their contributions are necessarily limited. In order to most effectively serve our students and the college we must maintain adequate levels of full time faculty.

4.8 Are there any other special concerns not previously identified? If so, please explain.

**APPROVALS**

| <b>AGENCY</b>   | <b>DECISION</b>      |                 |  |                 |                      |                  |
|---|----------------------|-----------------|--|-----------------|----------------------|------------------|
| The Program Review Committee has reviewed the data, outcomes and plans in the report and finds this request to be:<br><br><b>NA</b> | Well supported       |                 |  |                 |                      |                  |
|   | Adequately supported |                 |  |                 |                      |                  |
|   | Not supported        |                 |  |                 |                      |                  |
|   | Reason:              | Sect.1:<br>Data |  | Sect.2:<br>SLOs |                      | Sect.3:<br>Plans |
| Standing Committee Review of Resource Request<br><b>Committee: IHAC</b>   |                      |                 |  |                 | Prioritization Score |                  |