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1.0 Program Data and Resource Repository

1.1 Program Summary

The program should provide a descriptive summary of the program.

**Narrative:**
The English Language and Literature program at Independence Community College offers courses in composition, literature, creative writing, and technical writing. The courses in these areas prepare students for university programs in English and in other disciplines. Studies in the English Department emphasize reading, writing, and critical thinking skills. This program prepares students for careers in occupations such as teaching, clerical, business, technical writing, and any profession requiring clear written communication skills.

1.2 Quantitative and Qualitative Data

All programs are provided with the most recent two years of data by the Office of Institutional Research (IR) as well as two-year budget data provided by the Business Office.

The data sets provided by the Office of Institutional Research include the following elements for the most recent two (completed) academic years:

- Number of Faculty (Full Time; Part Time; Total)
- Student Credit Hours by Faculty Type
- Enrollment by Faculty Type
- Faculty Name by Type
- Average Class Size, Completion, and Attrition
- Course Completion, Success and Attrition by Distance Learning v Face-to-Face
- Number of Degrees/Certificates Awarded
- Number of Graduates Transferring (if available from IR)
- Number of Graduates Working in Related Field (technical programs only)
- Expenditures and Revenues

Additional data may also be available for reporting from the Office of Institutional Research, as applicable. Requests for additional data must be made through a data request.

*(See Section 1.2 in the Program Review Handbook for more information.)*
**Narrative:**

ENG Assessment Data AY 2018

**Number of Faculty:**
4 full time (Sanchez, Peralta, Mydosh, Pinkard)
7 part time (Botts, Sexton, Cox, Faythe, Gudde, Menefee, Stanley)

**Enrollment & Student credit hours by Faculty type:**
Full time: 138 total credit hours taught, with 668 total students enrolled
Part time: 63 credit hours taught, 299 total students enrolled

**Average Class size:**
13.81 students in Face-to-Face classes
15.20 students in online classes
14.01 students across all courses

**Completion rates:**
95.95% face-to-face
87.50% online
94.62% all courses

**Pass (‘D’ or better) rates:**
92.07% face-to-face
76.69% online
89.84% all courses

**Pass (‘C’ or better) rates:**
89.00% face-to-face
70.68% online
86.34% all courses

**Number of Majors:** 2 (0 returned in Fall 2018)

**Degrees Awarded:** 0

**High School Classes Only**

**Completion rates:**
99.69% all courses

**Pass (‘D’ or better) rates:**
97.52% all courses

**Pass (‘C’ or better) rates:**
95.67% all courses
Non-High School Classes Only
Completion rates:
93.48% face-to-face
87.5% online
92.07% all courses
Pass (‘D’ or better) rates:
88.23% face-to-face
76.69% online
85.64% all courses
Pass (‘C’ or better) rates:
84.31% face-to-face
70.68% online
81.25% all courses

ENG Assessment Data AY 2017

Number of Faculty:
4 full time (H. Mydosh, L. Pinkard, B. Sanchez, J. Pete)
9 part time (K. Gudde, E. Smith, A. Botts, R. Stanley, K. Fayhe, J. Presley, L. Kill, M. Menefee, C. Barwick)

Enrollment & Student credit hours by Faculty type:
Full time: 153 total credit hours taught, with 682 total students enrolled
Part time: 102 credit hours taught, 417 total students enrolled

Average Class size:
12.45 students in Face-to-Face classes
15 students in online classes
12.78 students across all ENG courses

Completion rates:
95.82 % face-to-face
90.30% online
95% all ENG courses

Pass (‘C’ or better) rates:
85.14% face-to-face
70.47% online
83.05% all ENG courses

Number of Majors: 4
Degrees Awarded: 0
**College vs. High School comparison:**

**Completion rates:**
92.23% Full time, college faculty
99.52% High school faculty

**Pass (‘C’ or better) rates:**
74.09% Full time, college faculty
96.61% High school faculty

---

**2.0 Student Success**

**2.1 Define Student Success**

The program faculty should provide a definition of how student success is defined by the program. *(See Section 2.1 in the Program Review Handbook for more information.)*

**Narrative:**
The English Department defines student success as the acquisition of a set of skills and competencies required for the production of work that exhibits critical thinking, clear self-expression, and a strong sense of self in written communication and composition, along with academically-sound technique and craftsmanship that enables the student to independently evaluate and interpret the written work of others. With this intellectual foundation, the successful student will be prepared for any number of future careers and success in the next stage of their lifelong educational journey.

**2.2 Achieve/Promote Student Success**

The program faculty should describe how the program achieves and promotes student success. *(See Section 2.2 in the Program Review Handbook for more information.)*

**Narrative:**
The English Department promotes student success by maintaining strong one-to-one relationships with students and colleagues through a focus on small section sizes, innovative teaching strategies in multiple modalities (courses are routinely offered on-ground, online, and in hybrid formats), the refinement of course offerings to better meet students’ needs (course sections are offered to target times of high demand with additional sections opened as enrolment dictates), strong collegial relationships, and the continuing education of the Faculty to bring in new ideas and new opportunities for the student body.
3.0 Assessment of Student Learning Outcomes

3.1 Reflection on assessment

The program faculty should provide a narrative reflection on the assessment of program curriculum. Please provide data gathered for outcomes at both program, course, and general education levels. Please review the Assessment Handbook for resources on gathering this information provided by the Assessment Committee.

Narrative:
For the purposes of this narrative, the courses included for analysis are Composition I (ENG1003), Composition II (ENG1013), and Introduction to Literature (ENG1073) as these were the courses with multiple sections assessed over multiple semesters. For all three of these courses, the AAC&U Written Communication VALUE Rubric is the assessment tool agreed upon by the faculty as the standard against which the common assessment is scored for the purposes of internal reporting. This rubric is part of the VALUE Rubric suite and is a national standard.

For Composition I, the KBOR-approved course-level outcomes are:
1. Employ conventions of format, structure, voice, tone, and level of formality to produce writing for specific purposes and audiences as required by various writing situations. **Common Outcome**
2. Practice ethical means of creating their work while integrating their own ideas with those of others.
3. Demonstrate an ability to fulfill standards of syntax, grammar, punctuation, and spelling for various rhetorical contexts.
4. Apply flexible strategies for prewriting, developing, drafting, revising, editing, and proofreading.
5. Critique own and others' work.

As noted, the common outcome for assessment in all our sections is the first outcome, which was chosen by consensus of the full-time faculty as being the baseline of student success in this first course of the composition sequence. The common assessment of this common outcome is specified in the master syllabus as:
1. Entry and Exit Diagnostics as assigned at beginning and end of course
2. Analysis Genre Essay
3. Informative Genre Essay

As reported by the individual instructors, the aggregate results of the students enrolled in this course are as follows (out of a 4.00 possible score):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Context of and Purpose for Writing</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>3.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content Development</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>3.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genre and Disciplinary Conventions</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>3.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sources and Evidence</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>2.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control of Syntax and Mechanics</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>2.71</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
For Composition II, the KBOR-approved course level outcomes are:
1. Compose persuasive or informative texts acknowledging the expectations of specific audiences.
   **Common Core Outcome**
2. Apply research strategies including finding, evaluating, analyzing, and synthesizing sources.
3. Employ an appropriate style for citing and listing sources.
4. Demonstrate the ability to read and think critically about texts.

As noted, the common outcome for assessment in all our sections is the first outcome, which was chosen by consensus of the full-time faculty as being the core of student success in this second and capstone course of the composition sequence. The common assessment of this common outcome is specified in the master syllabus as:
1. Entry Diagnostic—this brief essay will be assigned within the first week of the course.
3. Exit Diagnostic—this brief essay will revisit the material used for the Entry Diagnostic and be assigned in the last week of the course.

As reported by the individual instructors, the aggregate results of the students enrolled in this course are as follows (out of a 4.00 possible score):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Context of and Purpose for Writing</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>3.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content Development</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>3.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genre and Disciplinary Conventions</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>3.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sources and Evidence</td>
<td>2.30</td>
<td>3.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control of Syntax and Mechanics</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For Introduction to Literature, the KBOR-approved course level outcomes are:
1. Communicate an awareness of the range and complexity of human experience as expressed through literature.
2. Examine the interactions of reader and writer in the creation of meaning.
3. Articulate the distinctive features of various genres. **Common Outcome**
4. Apply modes of critical inquiry specific to the discipline.
5. Write thoughtful literary analysis using appropriate terminology and conventions.

As noted, the common outcome for assessment in all our sections is the third outcome, which was chosen by consensus of the full-time faculty as being the one which allowed for greatest instructor freedom in choosing the course material to meet these outcomes, which still ensuring a commonality of skills attained. The common assessment of this common outcome is specified in the master syllabus as:
1. Midterm or final writing assignment, which includes poetry, fiction, or drama, that demonstrates an understanding of the genre’s literary conventions, including theme, setting, point of view, characterization, plot, style, and, in the case of poetry, form.

This course only has one common assessment, as opposed to those classes in the compositional sequence, because the entry and exit diagnostics which are mandated by the department (not the administration) for self-assessment purposes do not apply to this literature-based course.
As reported by the individual instructors, the aggregate results of the students enrolled in this course are as follows (out of a 4.00 possible score):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Context of and Purpose for Writing</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>3.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content Development</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>3.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genre and Disciplinary Conventions</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sources and Evidence</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>2.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control of Syntax and Mechanics</td>
<td>2.30</td>
<td>2.92</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It should be noted that the numbers for the 2017 data were taken from the previous annual program review report without specific context as to how many students were included in this data pool or what the range of the scores was prior to averaging. As this is my first year as the compiler of this report, I have seen the benefit of the internal changes in the reporting of this data that the Assessment Committee have put into place with the new template in the OneDrive which will amend some of the gaps in the data currently shown here (such as which specific common assignment the data is drawn from, the number of students represented in the pool, etc.).

The most current program-level outcomes available at the time of the creation of this document are as follows:

1. The student will be able to research and evaluate source materials for validity and bias.
2. The student will be able to employ fundamental grammatical concepts and mechanics.
3. The student will be able to recognize rhetorical situations and strategies in order to communicate to a diversified world.
4. The student will be able to interpret the role of the writer as citizen in a changing world.
5. The student will be able to compose academic prose using appropriate voice when responding to rhetorical purpose.

The data from the common assessments maps to these outcomes in multiple ways. Composition I and Composition II specifically support outcome one and the criterion of Sources and Evidence on the assessment rubric provides the granular data to track over time. Composition I, Composition II, and Introduction to Literature all support outcome two with the assessment of criterion two (Control of Syntax and Mechanics). Composition II supports outcome three with criterion covering rhetorical situations and genre (Context of and Purpose for Writing). Outcome four is specifically supported by our survey courses, those being British Literature I (ENG2123), British Literature II (ENG2133), American Literature I (ENG1083), and American Literature II (ENG2113), but as we have not had majors advance to the second year of studies within the program, we have not been called upon to offer these courses. Outcome five encompasses all writing done in composition and literature courses excluding Creative Writing (ENG2023) and ties to criterion three (Genre and Disciplinary Conventions) on the VALUE rubric.

General Education level outcomes are as follows:

1. Access and evaluate information from credible sources
2. Collaborate respectfully with others
3. Communicate effectively through clear and accurate use of language
4. Demonstrate an understanding of the broad diversity of the human experience
5. Process numeric, symbolic, and graphic information
6. Read, analyze, and synthesize written, visual, and aural material
7. Select and apply appropriate problem-solving techniques
8. Use current technology efficiently and responsibly

When presented with the task of mapping whether courses introduce, reinforce, or demonstrate mastery of these outcomes, it was determined by the full-time faculty in a meeting during in-service that Composition I serves to reinforce outcomes one, three, and six most directly. Composition II serves to provide evidence of mastery of those three same outcomes. Introduction to Literature serves to reinforce outcomes three, four, and six. All other ENG courses were mapped at this same time. In that the data for the common assessments for these three core courses are provided in this report, tying the success at this level to the general education outcomes is self-evident.

3.2 Significant Assessment Findings

The program faculty should provide a narrative overview of the program's significant student learning outcomes assessment findings, any associated impact on curriculum, as well as any ongoing assessment plans. The program may attach data charts, assessment reports or other relevant materials. (See Section 3.2 in the Program Review Handbook for more information.)

Narrative:
The data for Composition I (ENG1003) shows the general trend of modest improvement in each category for the years gathered, though the criterion ofSources and Evidence and Control of Syntax and Mechanics remain lower than the others. The positive movement could be attributed to the discontinuation of the 8am classes which saw lower scores overall, and the further targeting of these specific skills.

The data for Composition II (ENG1013) shows a general trend of improvement in all five areas assessed by the rubric, with the greatest ground being made in the category of Genre and Disciplinary Conventions. This could be credited to a move away from a prescriptive textbook by the full-time faculty and better utilization of online learning resources with more interactive explanations of argumentative rhetorical modes. It may also be a reflection of the improvement noted in the Composition I data. As with Composition I, the overall positive movement could be attributed to the discontinuation of the 8am classes which saw lower scores overall, and the further targeting of these specific skills.

The data for Introduction to Literature (ENG1073) shows a dip in three of the five categories (Context and Purpose for Writing: -0.10, Genre and Disciplinary Conventions: -0.10, and Sources and Evidence: -0.12). There was a significant increase in the score for Content Development (+0.24) which was good to see as a positive as it speaks to students being more capable of demonstrating mastery of the technical vocabulary and literary terms set forth in the common assessment and connecting them to the development of their midterm or final essay. Regarding the recessive movement of the three criterion, it may be that not enough emphasis was placed on the importance of the transferrable skills of written communication as gained in their composition sequence courses.
3.3 Ongoing Assessment Plans

The program faculty should describe ongoing assessment plans and attach any new assessment progress reports for the current or past academic year.

**Narrative:**
The English Department has adopted the recommendations of the Assessment Committee and is recording data from individual sections of courses in the shared files on the OneDrive to be reviewed by an assigned member of the aforementioned committee. A meeting at the start of the Fall 2018 semester was also called with the adjunct and concurrent faculty, which was attended by Amber Botts, Rene Stanley, Martha McGee, Jim Presley, Karen Gudde, and Tracy Lee, during which we discussed master syllabi, course policies, common assessments, and data reporting. This was a collaborative meeting facilitated by all three full-time faculty.

The text to which students respond for the entry and exit diagnostic was opened for suggestions though ultimately it was decided to remain with the current essays for the time being (Barbara Huttman’s “A Crime of Compassion” for Composition I and Sherman Alexie’s “Why the Best Kid’s Books Are Written in Blood” for Composition II). It was at this meeting where department policy on the use of the TurnItIn LTI within Canvas (our Learning Management System) as an external tool for student submissions was discussed, and all in attendance agreed to its use. As such, the assessing of the common outcomes should be a straightforward matter of exporting the grade report from Canvas and uploading it as a file to the shared folder as evidence for archival purposes.

It is the desire of the full-time faculty to change the previous practice of reporting all outcome data as a single aggregate number to allow for more useful analysis of trends within sections and across courses so that it is possible to make future decisions based on direct evidence of student success (for example, being able to track over multiple semesters if there is a specific time slot in the schedule where students either outperform other sections or underperform compared to their peers, thus making changes to the schedule to optimize a student’s likelihood of success). There had previously been resistance to this by former faculty as it had been feared that the assessment data could be used in decisions of contract renewal or termination, or in performance review of an instructor. As it is the consensus of current instructors that this kind of thinking is disadvantageous to the department, the benefit of the possibility of close analysis outweighs these former fears.
4.0 External Constituency and Significant Trends

An important component of maintaining a superior program lies in awareness and understanding of other possible factors that may impact the program and/or student outcomes. After consideration of these other factors, program faculty should document the relevant information within this section. As applicable, this should include the following.

4.1: Program Advisory Committee:

Narrative:

- Include Advisory Member Name/ Title/ Organization/ Length of Service on committee; note the Committee Chair with an asterisk (*).
- Upload meeting minutes from the previous spring and fall semesters and attach in the Appendices section (10.0).

The English Department does not have a Program Advisory Committee at this time.

4.2: Specialized Accreditation:

Narrative:

- Include Accrediting Agency title, abbreviation, ICC contact; Agency contact, Date of Last Visit, Reaffirmation, Next Visit, FY Projected Accreditation Budget.
- Upload the most recent self-study and site visit documents.
- Upload agency correspondence which confirm accreditation status.

Narrative:

The English Department does not hold any specialized accreditation unique to the English Program at this time.

4.3: Other:

Discuss any external constituencies that may apply to the program. (See Section 4.3 in the Program Review Handbook for more information.)

Narrative:

Independence Community College’s regional accrediting body, the Higher Learning Commission (HLC), uses categories to evaluate the culture of continuous quality improvement on campus. The English Department falls into the area of Criterion 3: Teaching and Learning: Quality, Resources, and Support. Additionally, all three previously analyzed courses fall within the KBOR Transfer Matrix.
5.0 Curriculum Reflection

5.1 Reflection on Current Curriculum

The program faculty should provide a narrative reflection that describes the program’s curriculum holistically. The following are prompts formulated to guide thinking/reflection on curriculum. While presented in question form, the intent of the prompts is to stimulate thought and it is not expected that programs specifically answer each and every question.

- Is the curriculum of the program appropriate to the breadth, depth, and level of the discipline?
- How does this program transfer to four-year universities? (give specific examples)
- What types of jobs can students get after being in your program? (Please use state and national data)
- How dynamic is the curriculum? When was the last reform or overhaul?
- In the wake of globalization, how “internationalized” is the curriculum?
- How does the program assess diversity?
- Does the program have any community-based learning components in the curriculum?

Narrative:

Regarding the curriculum of the English Program, there has been very little need to reinvent the wheel, perhaps because there hasn’t been much call for use of said wheel. The English program is largely subservient to the more populous programs of Liberal Studies and General Studies as either electives or general education credits. That said, a comprehensive review of course offerings in English was undertaken by the Faculty in Spring 2017 and revisions of course titles and descriptions was taken all the way through Academic Council. This cleaning of the books resulted in a paring down of the possible course offering as courses like Speed Reading I and II were eliminated, while revising Greek and Latin Elements in English hopefully sets the course up to be reinvigorated and perhaps offered once demand is created.

The breadth of the program is significant and comparable to the first two years in a program at a four-year university. We have the potential to offer both the American Literature and British Literature sequence, as well as both Technical and Creative Writing. Introduction to Dramatic Literature and Contemporary Dramatic Literature are the third sequence currently offered with any regularity and is a component of the Theatre Arts program. These literature classes are supplemented by Survey of African American Literature, Introduction to Modern Novel, Inge and Contemporary Playwrights, Topics in Writing, and Topics in Literature. We actively seek to offer courses in which the readings are diverse and are making use of the Introduction to Literature course to meet the mandated learning outcomes while using non-standard texts to great result. LaTonya Pinkard offered a section using superheroes as the focus with a completion rate of 95% and a pass rate of 94.74% in the summer session 2017.
On the composition side of the house, we are now offering the English Language Learners I and II sequence as well as the revised Composition I and II paths. Having attended a conference on acceleration last academic year as a department, we found that we were in-line with current best practices if not slightly ahead of the curve with our class sizes and multiple paths to completion. By offering Composition I with a supplement, we are actively addressing the needs of the student and adjusting our offerings appropriately. Again, by seeking to serve our international student population both on campus and in the community, the department reaffirms its commitment to diversity and maintaining a global outlook.

Having only two declared majors in the past three years with the AA in English, it is a straightforward matter of reporting that neither were successful in maintaining a good standing with the college and thus did not re-enroll. Other students who have expressed an interest in majoring in English have unfortunately either withdrawn from the college for non-cognitive reasons or chosen to focus on the degrees in education as they desire to become English teachers in a K-12 environment. As the Education program at Pittsburg State University is our closest transfer school and the most attractive option in recent memory (as opposed to Newman and Friends in previous years), in our course offerings, which for the Secondary Ed majors are virtually the same as for a strictly English Language and Literature major. It is imperative for these students to take as many of the 200 level courses as they can prior to transfer so that they do truly transfer in as juniors and not have to over-point for their final four semesters.

No employer has ever complained that an interviewee had language skills that were too good, that one’s written work was of too high a quality, and so a major in English will never fully fall from future-career grace. There is literally no limit as to where an English degree could take a person. Any field in which skilled written communication is required befits the undertaking of the subject. Still, even in the strictest sense of the major, there is a profitable career path. According to the US Bureau of Labor and Statistics, 71,270 people were employed in teaching English at the postsecondary level in the USA in 2016. While one could not do this with only an AA in English from ICC, an associates would be a good start on the road to further postsecondary degrees. Careers in grant writing, transcription, technical writing, journalism, and clerical fields are only some of the many options.

Program faculty should list what degrees and certificates are offered and/or describe how the program curriculum supports other degrees and/or certificates awarded by the college.

5.2 Degree and Certificate Offerings or Support

**Narrative:**
While the AA in English is still in the ICC Academic Catalog, with no majors in the program, it is the role of the English Department to support the Liberal Studies and General Studies programs, as well as nearly every other program offered at Independence Community College as they require their students to complete Composition I, Composition II, and Public Speaking as the Analysis and Oral Communication
component of the degree audit. Introduction to Literature and the two survey sequences are a major component of the Human Heritage requirement.
6.0 Faculty Success

6.1 Program Accomplishments

The program faculty should highlight noteworthy program accomplishments.

Narrative:
The English Program is the institutional sponsor of the ICC Lit Guild, which has a proud tradition of hosting Open Mic Nights on campus, bi-annual Write-Ins to celebrate National Novel Writing Month (NaNoWriMo) in November and National Poetry Month in April, the Visiting Writers’ Series, and the Creative Writing Club with its weekly or biweekly meetings as student interest dictates. The Lit Guild also sponsored a Holiday Book Tree to solicit donations of specific titles of books (or monies for their dedicated purchase) for the local elementary library to help meet the needs of younger readers in our community.

6.2 Faculty Accomplishments

The program faculty should highlight noteworthy accomplishments of individual faculty.

Narrative:
Faculty-member LaTonya Pinkard was featured on the third season of the Netflix documentary series Last Chance U where she exemplified the ideals of inspirational instruction and student-centered learning. This candid glimpse into the classroom showed millions of viewers the very real work of studying composition here at Independence Community College, the rigor of our assignments, and the tremendous heart of one of our dearly valued instructors.

Faculty-member Heather Mydosh completed the requirements for her Masters of Fine Arts in Creative Writing with an emphasis in Poetry at the Stonecoast MFA program through the University of Southern Maine, where she worked closely with Martín Espada, internationally famed poet and winner of the 2018 Ruth Lilly Prize. This is a terminal degree (equivalent to a Ph.D. in its credentialing) for a creative discipline, and is in addition to her previously-held degree of Master of Letters in Comparative Literature and Thought through the Centre for Modern Thought at the University of Aberdeen. The MFA required the completion of a creative thesis titled When the Redbud Wilts. It is the culmination of three years of study on her part. She also presented a lecture seminar at the Winter 2019 Residency in Freeport, Maine entitled “The Poetry is in the Pity: Wilfred Owen, Brian Turner, and the crucible of poetry.”

Faculty-members Heather Mydosh, Camilo Peralta, and Bridget Carson all participated in an event at Independence Public Library called Book and Brew. The event paired Kansas beers with different genres of books. As participants rotated through the room, they were introduced to a new genre and a new beer by the faculty members who were able to speak to common genre hallmarks to widen patrons’ literary pallets while sipping on regional beers.

Faculty-member Heather Mydosh has had original poetry published in After the Pause, Inscape Magazine (through Washburn University), The Midwest Quarterly (through Pittsburg State University), Corvus Review,
velvet-tail, 99 Pine Street, Deep Water Literary Journal (international Irish journal), Ghostlight, Glass Kite Anthology, Third Wednesday, Kansas Time + Place, 365 Anthology, and Little Rose Magazine. She is also on the editorial board for the Journal of Contemporary Poetics through the International Islamic University of Islamabad, Pakistan.

6.3 Innovative Research, Teaching and Community Service

The program faculty should describe how faculty members are encouraged and engaged in promoting innovative research, teaching, and community service.

Narrative:
The English Department is engaged in exploring trends in community college and open-enrolment education in our region and as such attended the Conference on Acceleration at Butler Community College, from which they took many valuable pieces of information.

Faculty-member Heather Mydosh was heavily involved in the Astra Arts Festival as the co-chair of the Literary Arts Committee and served for a year as secretary for the executive board. She and fellow faculty-members Bridget Carson and Isaias McCaffery lead the Independence Ghost Tours to raise money and awareness of the Festival to the delight of several van-loads of patrons. Her crowning achievements with the Festival were the readings of Joy Harjo, Guggenheim scholar and award-winning poet, and David Lee, Poet-Laureate of Utah and self-proclaimed best runner-up in the history of poetry.

Faculty-member Heather Mydosh was the coordinator of the Scholars’ Conference within the 2018 Inge Festival honoring Carlyle Brown. This involved crafting and publishing the call for papers, curating the submissions, and coordinating events on the day. She has also been a long-time volunteer with the Inge Festival and has appeared in several staged readings, including of New Voices’ Winner Laura Gunderson’s play Ada and the Engine and visiting playwright Mary Sue Price’s trilogy Chat Rats.

Faculty-member Heather Mydosh has played for the past several seasons with the Independence Midcontinent Band for their summer music in the park series on Tuesday nights through the summer in Riverside Park at the Lille Memorial Band Shell. She also played tuba in the pit for ICC’s production of South Pacific a few years ago.
7.0 Program Planning & Development for Student Success

7.1 Narrative Reflection on Qualitative and Quantitative Data and Trends

Provide a thoughtful reflection on the available assessment data. *(See Section 7.1 in the Program Review Handbook examples.)*

**Narrative:**

As viable and relevant data has not been available from AY 2016, these observations are specifically drawn from the AY 2017 and AY 2018 data pulls.

Based on the data provided in section 1.0 of this document, the total number of credit hours offered by full time faculty was down by 15 credit hours, and the total number of students enrolled only dropped by 14 students, which is easily accounted for by the dip in overall enrollment of these years. That this loss is as small as it is speaks to the sore status that the composition sequence holds in the enrollment process at the college—everyone has to take Comp, and that remains true. The major difference in enrollment was not in the classes of the full-time faculty but in those of the part-time instructors, where the total number of students dropped by 118 students. With Sedan High School and West Elk High School no longer providing qualified English instructors within their districts, the full-time faculty were able to bridge the gap by offering the concurrent-eligible students the Composition I and II courses in an online modality with at least one instructor (Heather Mydosh) travelling at her own expense to visit the high schools to interact with students and answer questions as strategically advantageous points during the semester. This did take that enrollment away from the part-time category, and when combined with the shrinking populations at our service district schools (Altoona-Midway did not field a whole section in AY 2018 at all), the triple-digit drop is further proof that the department and the college cannot count on increasing (or even maintaining) this market-share, even with the excellent work being done by concurrent coordinator Jaicey Gillum.

While there were slight fluctuations in the completion rates, the numbers remain basically consistent with passing rates in the mid to high 80% range. This success and consistency is further proof of the quality of instruction and is made all the more impressive by the study out of KU in 2017 which found ICC to be the premiere community college when it comes to the success of transfer students at their destination institutions. That the English Department courses have a 86.34% completion rate with students earning a grade of ‘C’ or better does not mean that there is either grade inflation or a watering-down of the course material—students learn and learn well here, and if they can pass Composition II at ICC, they will likely do well anywhere they choose to go.

High school (concurrent) completion rates continue to be eye-wateringly high when compared to the general population, but this can be explained relatively easily. Concurrent classes self-select for the very strongest compositional students, frequently the valedictorian contenders for their cohorts, and are thus already high performers. These are also studious and highly-motivated high achievers, and so their success in these classes is not unexpected.
7.2 Academic Program Vitality Reflection, Goals and Action Plans

The program vitality assessment, goals and action planning are documented by completing the Program Summative Assessment form.

Programs should use previous reflection and discussion as a basis for considering program indicators of demand, quality, and resource utilization and a program self-assessment of overall program vitality. *(See Section 7.2 in the Program Review Handbook for more information.)*

**Narrative:**
According to the Vitality Indicators in the Program Summative Assessment Form, the English program falls between Category 2: Maintain Current Levels of Support/Continuous Improvement and Category 3: Revitalization Opportunities or Needs. This assessment is based on frequency of course offerings, section class size, impacting trends, course completion, course success, formalized articulations, transfer success, cost per FTE, student FTE per faculty, and the remarkably low equipment needed; basically, the English program hits it out of the park. The English Department serves the overwhelming majority of the student body and costs virtually nothing in resources beyond payroll. However, when one looks at declared majors, degree attainment, industry engagement, and external affiliations, there is definitely room for growth.

7.3 Academic Program Goals and Action Plans

Programs will also establish or update 3 to 5 long-term and short-term goals and associated action plans which support student success. These goals should include consideration of co-curricular and faculty development activities. Long-term goals are considered to be those that extend 3 to 5 years out, while short-term goals are those that would be accomplished in the next 1 to 2 years. Additionally, programs should update status on current goals. Programs should use S.M.A.R.T. goal setting for this purpose. *(See Section 7.3 in the Program Review Handbook for more information.)*

**Narrative:**
The English Department has drafted three goals with associated action plans which support student success as follows:

1. **Short-Term Goal:** Increase student participation in Lit Guild activities to promote a sense of community and thus address attrition among students who do not feel they “have a place” within the college.
   a. **Plan:** Investigate opportunities to partner with the ICC Student Government to coordinate an Activities Fair at the beginning of each semester to increase visibility.
   b. **Plan:** Actively recruit additional Writing Scholarship students from within and outside of the service area to reinvigorate the student leadership of Lit Guild.
2. Short-Term Goal: Broaden range of English courses regularly offered to increase variety of student learning opportunities and diversify the English Department’s support of Program and General Education outcomes in assessment.
   a. Plan: Actively pursue additional courses being added to the KBOR Transfer Matrix (survey sequences, Creative Writing, etc.) through attendance at the KBOR Core Outcomes Group Project meetings.
   b. Plan: Seek community support and engagement for classes not targeted at transferability but rather community enrichment (Special Topics classes) which allow for partnerships with other local entities (Independence Public Library, Independence Housing Authority, etc.).

3. Long-Term Goal: Establish a Writer-in-Residence Program akin to the Playwright-in-Residence Program through the Inge Center for the Arts to bring in working writers from diverse backgrounds working in various genres to offer masterclasses and readings as cultural enrichment events on campus and in the community.
   a. Plan: Research and target grant funding for the launch of such a program.
   b. Plan: Nurture relationships with professional writers and regional publication houses to better understand the viability of such a program.
   c. Plan: Cultivate support and enthusiasm for such a plan within the ICC community and the local area by hosting small-scale events (such as visiting authors, publication workshops, writing workshops, etc.).

7.4 Mission and Strategic Plan Alignment

Program faculty should indicate the ways in which the program’s offerings align with the ICC mission. Also, in this section program faculty should provide narrative on the ways that initiatives may be tied to the ICC Strategic Plan and to HLC accreditation criterion. It is not necessary to consider an example for each HLC category, but program faculty are encouraged to provide one or two examples of initiatives in their program that are noteworthy. These examples may be helpful and included in future campus reporting to HLC. (Refer to section 4.3 for HLC categories)

Narrative:
The English Department serves the best interests of students and the community by providing academic excellence while promoting cultural enrichment and economic development through professional instruction, annual assessment, nimble responses to trends within the wider learning community, and a desire to see the community thrive as individuals better their station through access to quality education.
8.0 Fiscal Resource Requests/Adjustments

8.1 Budget Requests/Adjustments

Based on program data review, planning and development for student success, program faculty will complete and attach the budget worksheets to identify proposed resource needs and adjustments. These worksheets will be available through request from the college’s Chief Financial Officer. Program faculty should explicitly state their needs/desires along with the financial amount required.

Programs should include some or all of the following, as applicable, in their annual budget proposals:

- Budget Projections (personnel and operation)
- Position Change Requests
- Educational Technology Support
- Instructional Technology Requests
- Facilities/Remodeling Requests
- Capital Equipment
  - Non-Capital Furniture & Equipment
  - New Capital Furniture & Equipment
  - Replacement Capital Furniture & Equipment
- Other, as applicable
  - Accreditation Fee Request
  - Membership Fee Request
  - Coordinating Reports

Resource requests should follow budgeting guidelines as approved by the Board of Trustees for each fiscal year. The resource requests should be used to provide summary and detailed information to the division Dean and other decision-makers and to inform financial decisions made throughout the year.

**Narrative:**
The English Department has operated for the current academic year with three full-time instructors (LaTonya Pinkard, Camilo Peralta, and Heather Mydosh). Camilo Peralta has regrettably chosen not so seek contract renewal and will thus be leaving the college at the conclusion of this semester. The current plan of the Chief Academic Officer is to forego rehiring for this position as the college continues to tack its sails and navigate the storm of contracting enrollment figures. This means that the personnel...
budget projection will only need to account for two full-time salaries rather than the four needed in AY 2018. There are no other personnel requests made at this time.

As far as Education Technology Support, the college’s renewal of the software license with TurnItIn is imperative to the department’s day to day functions as the program constitutes the institution’s protection against cases of plagiarism, both from the wide world of the internet and the vast repository of recycled in-house student work. Anecdotally, just this spring semester, Heather Mydosh has caught five separate students in cases of plagiarism which have afforded painful but important learning opportunities for these individuals in a lower-risk environment than their next institution. The subscription cost of $5,500.00 for this academic year is no small sum, but this incredibly helpful tool is available to all instructors teaching for Independence Community College, not just the English Department, and not just full-time instructors.

While it would be collegial and, frankly, nice if the college were able to pick up the cost of membership in a professional organization such as the National Council of Teachers of English ($50.00 per year per instructor) or the Modern Language Association (approximately $100.00 per year per instructor) in this time of belt-tightening, it isn’t essential.
9.0 Program Planning and Development Participation

9.1 Faculty and Staff

Program faculty will provide a brief narrative of how faculty and staff participated in the program review, planning and development process. List the preparer(s) by name(s).

Narrative:
This document was prepared by Heather Mydosh with data collected from courses taught by all full-time and part-time instructors as gathered in the shared assessment folders and internal reporting, and with data provided most helpfully by Anita Chappuie, Head of Institutional Research, who has been of great assistance in the drafting process. LaTonya Pinkard and Camilo Peralta both declined to assist and chose not to provide additional information or materials to include in this accounting. Additional brainstorming of goals was helped along by Bridget Carson, Developmental English instructor.

9.2 VPAA and/or Administrative Designee Response

After review and reflection of the Comprehensive Program Review or the Annual Program Review, the Division Chair and VPAA will write a summary of their response to the evidence provided. The Division Chair and VPAA’s response will be available to programs for review and discussion prior to beginning the next annual planning and development cycle.

Narrative:
PRC Committee: The Program Review Committee agrees with the findings of this report suggesting the program should be in category 2. Efforts are being made to create more consistent assessment practices across the four full-time instructors and various adjunct/concurrent instructors which will only strengthen the quality of three key courses within the department: Comp I, Comp II, and Introduction to Literature.

VPAA: I concur with the findings of the Program Review Committee. My recommendation is Category 2: Maintain current levels of support/continuous improvement, with an expectation that assessment becomes more streamlined and reviewed more regularly within the department.
10.0 Appendices

Any additional information that the programs would like to provide may be included in this section.

1. AAC&U Written Communication VALUE Rubric
2. Entry Diagnostic for Composition I (ENG1003)
3. Entry Diagnostic for Composition II (ENG1013)
4. Sample Instructions for Argumentation Essay, Composition II (ENG1013)
5. Sample Syllabus with Course Schedule for Introduction to Literature (ENG1073)
6. Current English Associate of Arts degree outline as printed in Academic Catalog
7. Current Liberal Arts degree outline as printed in the Academic Catalog
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