Fall 2012 Program Review - Annual Update by Section

As of: 5/14/2013 04:34 PM EST

Discipline/Program/Area Name

Reading (PR)
[President's Office, Program Reviews, Academic Affairs (PR), Language Arts Division (PR)]

Reading

Academic Year

Reading (PR)
[President's Office, Program Reviews, Academic Affairs (PR), Language Arts Division (PR)]

2011-2012

Name of person leading this review.

Reading (PR)
[President's Office, Program Reviews, Academic Affairs (PR), Language Arts Division (PR)]

Anne Rees and Mary Rose Toll

Names of all participants in this review.

Reading (PR)
[President's Office, Program Reviews, Academic Affairs (PR), Language Arts Division (PR)]

Anne Rees and Mary Rose Toll

Please review the five year headcount and FTES enrollment data provided on [Program Review website](#). Comment on trends and how they affect your program.

Reading (PR)
[President's Office, Program Reviews, Academic Affairs (PR), Language Arts Division (PR)]

The annual headcount increased significantly from 382 in 2007-2008 to 582 in 2008-2009. However, class cuts in 2009-2010 reduced the headcount to 524, essentially the current headcount (525). Reading FTES has grown from 66.44 in 2007-2008 to 113.78 in 2011-2012. The reason for this increase in FTES is not entirely clear; however, now that Reading is once again a clearly defined requirement for graduation, more of the full time students who plan to earn their degree may be taking reading classes.

Five Year Headcount

Summer

READ	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011
	0	42	63	43	0

Fall

READ	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
	208	293	264	269	281

Intersession

READ	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
	4	11	24	25	0

Spring

READ	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
	190	311	227	249	300
Annual					
READ	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
	382	582	524	538	525

FTES—There was an increase in FTES from 66.44 in 2007 to 105.94 in 2010, and then a small increase to 113 in 2011. This reflects a slight increase in full time students over part time students.

Summer					
	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011
READ	0.00	7.52	10.10	6.94	0.00
Fall					
READ	33.45	45.78	48.13	48.84	55.73
Intersession					
READ	0.00	1.65	3.84	4.52	0.00
Spring					
READ	32.99	49.53	43.92	45.64	58.05
Annual					
READ	66.44	104.48	105.99	105.94	113.78

Efficiency (FTES/FTEF) This represents the efficiency of teacher-student ratios. The more students that an teacher instructs, the assumption is made that this indicates higher efficiency of instruction. This is an invalid assumption, to be sure, but if one relies upon these measures, then one can see that the efficiency of reading faculty has been increasing steadily since 2007-2008. It is surmised that this results from a change in Faculty and in Program design (adding Lab components or Lab courses to the Developmental Reading courses). One assumes the administration prefers increased efficiency on the part of the instructors at AVC. It has increased from 9.54 in 2007-2008 to 12.69 in 2011-2012.

(FTES/FTEF)	2007-2008		2008-2009		2009-2010		2010-2011		2011-2012	
SUBJECT	Fall	Spring	Fall	Spring	Fall	Spring	Fall	Spring	Fall	Spring
READ	9.65	7.60	12.60	10.16	10.84	10.20	11.47	10.00	12.63	12.69

Part time/Full Time Ratio-This shows the ratio between adjunct and full time faculty. The closer it is to 1, the more that the number of adjunct faculty is the same as the number of full time faculty. It is fiscally advantageous for the college to have a higher number, because the higher the ratio, the more adjunct faculty per fulltime faculty, and of course the cost of benefits etc. is much lower for the college when they hire more adjunct faculty than full time faculty. However, this may be detrimental to the students, depending upon the quality of the faculty. It also increases the workload of the full time faculty carrying out all of the obligations that are required outside of classroom teaching. This is especially evident in small Programs, where there are few faculty to complete these responsibilities. But that is apparently not the concern of anyone but of the faculty in small Programs. As is clearly evident, in the Reading Program, the part time/full time ratio has increased three fold from 2007-2012.

This number also indicates how few full time faculty there are in proportion to adjunct faculty. This is a constant concern to a program that has no more full time faculty than it did 28 years ago, yet other programs have increased three fold, four fold, even much more in size. This demonstrates a lack of clarity of the characteristics and needs of the student population at AVC, and the extent to which the college is willing to address student needs.

PT/FT Faculty Ratio	2007-2008		2008-2009		2009-2010		2010-2011		2011-2012	
SUBJECT	Fall	Spring	Fall	Spring	Fall	Spring	Fall	Spring	Fall	Spring
READ	0.43	0.49	0.71	1.50	1.66	0.79	1.10	1.21	0.89	1.12
LA	0.60	0.65	0.81	0.79	0.72	0.54	0.78	0.87	0.68	0.78

Using the student achievement data provided on the Program Review website, please comment on any

similarities or differences in success, retention, and persistence between race, gender, and location/method of delivery groups. Please comment on all three (success, persistence, and retention). Identify which trends and achievement gaps will be addressed in the current academic year.

Reading (PR)
[President's Office, Program Reviews, Academic Affairs (PR), Language Arts Division (PR)]

Overall Rate of Success. This information was taken from the table comparing online instruction with traditional classes. Since the Reading Program is not offering online instruction the figures for the traditional classroom were used. The data charts showing rates of success broke down the figures into groups, by ethnicity, location, gender, and so on; We was unable to locate a table showing overall rate of success by Program or Discipline.

Overall Rate of Success	2007-2008	2008-2009	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012
READ	50%	52%	54%	68%	77%

Rate of success for African American and Hispanic students

Success	2007-2008	2008-2009	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012
Afr. Amer.	34%	34%	38%	66%	66%
Hispanic	65%	75%	71%	76%	85%

Success by Location— The data has shown similar increases in success at both the Lancaster and the Palmdale campuses over the past five years. these figures have not shown a great difference in student success in comparing the two sites. The students at the Lancaster site have shown gradual improvement, and the Palmdale students' performance has gone up and down, and ended at a similar level of success.

YEAR	SUBJECT	Lancaster	Palmdale
2007-2008	READ	50%	59%
2008-2009	READ	51%	60%
2009-2010	READ	54%	53%
2010-2011	READ	68%	71%
2011-2012	READ	76%	79%

Overall Reading students have shown substantial growth in success, from 50% success in 2007-2008, to 77% success in 2011-2012. . The largest gains were made by the African American and the Hispanic populations. Of special note was the increase made by The African American student population; their success increased from 34% in 2007-2008 to 66% in 2011-2012, an increase of over 30%. The Hispanic population's success was also quite large, increasing 65% in 2007-2008 to 85% in 2011-2012, an increase of over 20% gain in success.

Why were there such large increases in student success? It is surmised that this increase is due in part to the reinstatement of the Reading requirement for graduation being once again stated in terms of completion of reading courses instead of English courses. In addition, the support provided for these students within the Reading program clearly provided support at the time of need, in the classroom with in-class tutors, or directly after class, with DLAs (Directed Learning Activities). It is hypothesized that the gains would have been even larger if there had been more access for the general student population, as the current classes have a relatively large percentage of students with learning disabilities. This is a result of two factors; the students with learning disabilities are given priority registration, and at the end of that period of time, almost all of the seats in the Reading classes are filled. There is very little access to Reading classes for the general population of students. This is a problem which must be improved, for students are required to have access to classes, and blocking access through permitting only about 3% of the incoming students who need reading to have a seat in a reading class, violates the very foundational principle of providing access to classes in a community college. It would appear discriminatory, since it is out of balance with the rest of the basic skills programs. (See Table)

The final grades for students were dependent upon performance on common reading tests as of 2008-2009. The figures used to indicate student success in reading courses have more reliability than before because the Department instituted common Reading Proficiency requirements for successful completion of the Reading courses in 2009-2010.The annual success rate increased from 50% in 2007-2008 to 77% in 2011-2012. Likewise, the retention rate has progressively increased from 72% in 2007-2008 to 90% in 2011-2012. The overall persistence rate is 72% and has fluctuated over the past five years. These data show consistent growth in gender and ethnic categories. For example, African American students show increase from 60% in 2007-2008 to 85% in 2011-2012, an increase of 32% in student success and increase of 25% in student retention in only five years.

The Reading department aligned curriculum between classes in 2008-2009. In-class tutors were hired at the end of 2009; Directed Learning Activities (DLAs) were required in several classes beginning in 2010-2011. Another support that has helped students achieve success is the addition of Reading labs. Initially, the labs were separate classes; the lab time is now integrated into the courses. READ 097 and READ 099 have decreased from the format of a 4 unit lecture course plus a .5 unit lab course to the current 4 unit lecture course (3.5 lecture and 1.5 lab) . and READ 095 has decreased from a 4 unit lecture course to a 2 unit lecture-lab course (2 hours lecture and 2 hours lab). Incorporating lab time within allowable limits in a lecture course has also contributed to the increase in student success and retention.

Retention

Retention for African American and Hispanic Students

Of special note is the increase in retention for the African American Students (increase of 25 % over 5 years) and the incredibly high retention for the Hispanic students (from 78% to an incredible 94%).

Retention	2007-2008	2008-2009	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012
Afr. Amer.	60%	67%	73%	87%	85%
Hispanic	78%	91%	93%	91%	94%

Retention by Location

It appears that historically—until now—that the Lancaster campus students have been retained at AVC at a higher rate than at Palmdale. However, Palmdale has been increasing in student retention over the past 5 years until now—and both campuses have a retention rate of 90%, which is very high.

YEAR	SUBJ	Lanc	Palm
2007-2008	READ	72%	59%
2008-2009	READ	77%	84%
2009-2010	READ	81%	85%
2010-2011	READ	88%	88%
2011-2012	READ	90%	90%

Persistence for all Reading Students—there is an overall steady increase in persistence for both Fall-Spring and Spring-Fall from 2007-2011.

Persistence	2007	2007-2008	2008	2008-2009	2009	2009-2010	2010	2010-2011	2011
Fall-Spring		72		109		187		143	
		54%		57%		60%		63%	
Spring-Fall	118		141		220		190		217
	71%		68%		75%		72%		81%

Analyze changes in student achievement and achievement gaps over the past five years. Cite examples of using data during that time as the basis for resource allocation (e.g. human, facilities/physical, technology, financial, professional development) or making other changes that resulted in improvements in student achievement.

Reading (PR)

[President's Office, Program Reviews, Academic Affairs (PR), Language Arts Division (PR)]

Student achievement has increased over the past four years. The department meets at least twice a year to review test results, including Reading proficiency scores and Student Learning Outcome (SLOs) assessment data. . In these meetings we determine our next steps and best practices. We demonstrate strategies and methods that produce results. In spring of 2012 one of our instructors attended a Reading Apprenticeship (RA) online course and a Leadership Community of Practice (Reading Apprenticeship trainer of trainers). Two additional instructors have enrolled in the Reading Apprenticeship online class and plan to attend the leaderhship training in summer of 2013. Reading Apprenticeship is indentified as a best practice in the Basic Skills Initiative Handbook (poppy copy). The entire Reading department, in-class tutors, and Directed Learning Activity(tutors received initial training in RA in August 2012.

The department continues to expand and refine the Directed Learning Activity and In-class tutor program. These supports are enabling students to increase their success in their reading classes.

Provide examples from your program where assessment findings of Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs), Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs), and/or Operational Outcomes (OOs) were discussed and used to make budget decisions in the past year. This should include brief descriptions of assessment findings, when the discussions occurred, who participated, and what, if any, budget items/resources resulted.

Reading (PR)

[President's Office, Program Reviews, Academic Affairs (PR), Language Arts Division (PR)]

Reading students are more successful in multi-modal classrooms, so one of our goals is to include a technology in our curriculum. Most of the Reading instructors are now administering assessments using technology. Our department has adopted textbooks that include web-based computers programs in addition to the Reading software that has been purchased over the past four years. Currently, students use computers in the Reading Center to test and practice skills. This is not a good environment for students to practice their reading skills because of the constant distractions. Students complain about this daily. We have discussed this at our department meetings and have requested funding for self-contained, designated Reading classrooms.

Analyze changes in SLO, PLO and/or OO assessment findings over the past five years. Cite examples of using data during that time as the basis for resource allocation (e.g. human, facilities/physical, technology, financial, professional development) or making other changes that resulted in the improvement of SLO, PLO and/or OO findings this past year.

Reading (PR)

[President's Office, Program Reviews, Academic Affairs (PR), Language Arts Division (PR)]

The Reading department meets formally at least twice a year in August and January. The Student Learning Outcomes(SLO) results are discussed at these meetings, and we determine what steps are needed to improve student success. The SLO assessment data is submitted through e-mail for input. Included in the e-mail is an evaluation. Each instructor acknowledges whether or not they have met the goal for the SLOs and makes suggestions to be included in the Action Plan. When we meet, we review the data and the suggestions. We then decide which strategies to implement the next semester. For example, for the past two semesters we have not achieved our goals for our vocabulary SLO. Collectively, we decided which strategies to use this semester and what type of vocabulary Directed Learning Activities to create. This is included in our action plan. We also revised the pre and post assessments for vocabulary.

Review the program goals and objectives related to improving outcome results and/or student achievement identified in the most recent comprehensive self study and subsequent annual update(s). List program goals and objectives for this academic year, adding new ones if needed.

Reading (PR)

[President's Office, Program Reviews, Academic Affairs (PR), Language Arts Division (PR)]

Goal #1 Self-contained classrooms with computers

Objectives: Large and small group instruction coupled with computer technology.

Time Frame: Fall 2013

Justification: To incorporate computer software into Reading curriculum to create a multi-modal approach to enhance instruction.

Goal #2 Develop and offer courses that link and/or accelerate instruction in Reading and Writing for all levels of Developmental students.

Objectives: By combining the courses, the amount of learning can progress exponentially rather than incrementally.

Time Frame: Spring 2014

Justification: This approach helps students see the symbiotic connections between reading and writing.

Goal #3 Incorporate Reading Apprenticeship strategies in our Reading classes

Objectives: All Reading classes will incorporate elements of Reading Apprenticeship

Time Frame: 2012-2013

Justification: Reading Apprenticeship has been found to be effective in community colleges statewide.

List significant new and continuing resource needs in rank order of importance. Identify the document (e.g. Educational Master Plan, action plan, state mandate, accreditation mandate) and/or data which corroborate each need.

Reading (PR)
[President's Office, Program Reviews, Academic Affairs (PR), Language Arts Division (PR)]

N/A