GLENDALE COMMUNITY COLLEGE

Annual Program Review   2011-2012 – INSTRUCTIONAL

Division - Program

LANGUAGE ARTS
FOREIGN LANGUAGE

Authorization

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

Author: Teresa CORTEY
Division Chair: Lourdes GIRARDI
Date Received by Program Review: November 10, 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 Foreign Language program makes our diverse student population into citizens of a more harmonious world by giving them vehicles of communication in different languages and different cultures. We prepare our students both vocationally and academically. Our students enter a competitive workforce with crucial conversational skills.

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

> The hiring of a second full-time Tenure-Track Armenian Instructor, desperately needed in the largely Armenian community of GCC and Glendale itself.

List the current major strengths of your program

1. A variety of languages, both "classic" and demographically relevant, offered
2. Diversity of levels, students served –courses adapted to various needs and populations
3. Fulfillment of IGETC and Breadth transfer requirements
4. Preparation for a competitive workforce in multi-lingual Los Angeles County –in California in general.

List the current weaknesses of your program

1. Not enough full-time teachers in every language –cannot thus serve all potential students
2. Not enough literature offered in target language –for budgetary reasons
3 Despite great demand, no conversational classes (for budgetary reasons)
4. Not enough recognition of significance of foreign language on campus

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
AMERICAN SIGN LANGUAGE	2007-2008	50	4.6	345	0.0%	69.5%	72.4%	0
	2008-2009	64	4.4	466	0.0%	102.8%	75.7%	0
	2009-2010	45	3.3	429	0.0%	104.8%	75.4%	0
	2010-2011	52	3.2	509	0.0%	97.0%	78.7%	0
	% Change	+3.3%	-29.9%	+47.5%	--	+39.6%	+8.7%	--
	4-Yr.Trend	stable	decreasing	increasing	increasing	increasing	stable	
FOREIGN LANGUAGE	2007-2008	531	29.2	579	52.5%	82.8%	76.4%	7
	2008-2009	559	29.8	598	51.9%	90.7%	74.8%	18
	2009-2010	549	28.7	609	54.5%	98.6%	77.2%	12
	2010-2011	503	27.5	581	55.7%	100.2%	76.0%	15
	% Change	-5.3%	-5.7%	+0.4%	+6.1%	+21.1%	-0.5%	+114.3%
	4-Yr.Trend	stable	stable	stable	stable	increasing	stable	increasing
JOURNALISM	2007-2008	20	1.5	422	30.4%	46.3%	71.1%	0
	2008-2009	17	1.3	422	36.8%	44.4%	72.4%	0
	2009-2010	27	1.5	559	30.4%	75.9%	74.1%	0
	2010-2011	32	3.7	280	63.7%	92.7%	66.2%	0
	% Change	+58.2%	+138.7%	-33.7%	+109.6%	+100.2%	-6.9%	--
	4-Yr.Trend	increasing	increasing	decreasing	increasing	increasing	stable	
MASS COMM.	2007-2008	79	2.2	1,144	72.7%	99.9%	79.6%	3
	2008-2009	78	2.2	1,129	72.7%	101.6%	78.0%	2
	2009-2010	79	2.2	1,138	72.7%	118.1%	80.2%	2
	2010-2011	72	2.2	1,037	72.7%	113.4%	82.8%	1
	% Change	-9.4%	+0.0%	-9.4%	+0.0%	+13.6%	+4.0%	-66.7%
	4-Yr.Trend	stable	stable	stable	stable	increasing	stable	decreasing
SPEECH	2007-2008	234	15.1	494	56.2%	84.3%	77.7%	17
	2008-2009	235	14.7	511	55.0%	99.8%	77.9%	10
	2009-2010	248	14.8	534	48.7%	99.5%	74.8%	5
	2010-2011	225	15.4	465	49.3%	96.2%	+1.7%	6
	% Change	-3.8%	+2.2%	-5.9%	-12.2%	+14.1%	stable	-64.7%
	4-Yr.Trend	stable	stable	stable	decreasing	increasing		decreasing
LANGUAGE ARTS DIVISION TOTAL	2007-2008	914	52.6	553	49.2%	82.6%	75.5%	27
	2008-2009	954	52.3	580	48.9%	93.6%	76.1%	30
	2009-2010	948	50.5	597	49.3%	100.2%	77.6%	19
	2010-2011	883	52.0	540	51.6%	99.6%	76.2%	22
	% Change	-3.4%	-1.1%	-2.3%	+5.0%	+20.5%	+0.9%	-18.5%
	4-Yr.Trend	stable	stable	stable	stable	increasing	stable	decreasing

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

These figures and patterns are most encouraging. The enrollments in our Department have steadily increased. Our success rate, measured by grades and withdrawals in classes, is excellent. Most of our students remain in our classes, though attrition is a big problem generally in community colleges. Most of our students earn passing grades in our classes. We have an unusually high fill rate. We attribute these positive statistics to the increasing importance of Foreign Language in today's shrinking world, in today's workforce, university transfer requirements, our increasingly diverse, international demographics, the fine reputation of Glendale College, and our own excellent staff and its devoted work.

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

Some of our instructors have enjoyed recognition from outside sources, which enhances our whole Department and adds or will add to our enrollment. For example, our Armenian full time Assistant Professor, Nick Garnik Sahakyan, recently published his second novel, appeared at public lectures, appears frequently on television, and has been written about in Glendale newspapers, and our Japanese full time Assistant Professor, Shihoko Tatsugawa, inspired a generous donation of $11,000 from the Rotary Club for software purchases to the Japanese program. The recent hire of a tenure track Armenian instructor, Arevik Mikaelian, who plans to serve as a liaison between the Armenian community and Glendale College, as well as the recent sister-city relationship between Glendale and Gosong, Korea, negotiated by our President, should enhance both certain specific language programs and our Foreign Language Department as a whole.

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	%	
FOREIGN LANGUAGE	35/35	100	35/35 By Spring 2012	100 By Spring 2012	46/46	100 By Spring 2012	~~No~~

2.1. Please comment on the percentages above.

The Foreign Language Department has been a campus model for promptness and completeness of now required SLOs and Assessments. Its teachers have been unusually diligent and conscientious in fulfilling their assignments in this area, and one of them, a Spanish Associate Professor, Dr. Stacy Jazan, has achieved state-wide recognition for her creative work in Student Learning Outcomes and Assessments.

2.2. a) Please provide a *link** to all program <u>assessment timelines</u> 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.

a) Link –   http://www.glendale.edu/languagearts/SLOPLO
b) None
c) We are right on time, now completing our first 2-year cycle of course-level SLOs. We will complete our Program level SLOs in Fall 2012.

2.3   a) Please provide a *link* to any program and/or relevant course <u>assessment reports</u>. 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.

---

a)   Link –   <u>http://www.glendale.edu/languagearts/SLOPLO</u>

b)   We constantly adjust the cultural focus, enhance it, to make our courses more successful .
     We are developing a third "native speaker" course, Armenian for the Armenian Speaking
     III or Armenian 117.

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.

2010 -2011: Assessments of Spanish 101, 102, 103, 104, 115, Japanese 101, 102, 103, 104,
Korean 101, 102, Chinese 101, 102, French 101, 102, 103, 104, Italian 101, 102, 103, 104,
Armenian 101, 102, 115, 116, Russian 115

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

We have requested majors in every Foreign Language program except Russian and the approval
is pending.

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

No changes to programs, but requests made –see 2.5

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?

We have a hybrid program in Spanish 101 and 102, enhanced laboratory materials, especially in
Japanese, a second 100% full-time Armenian instructor, we have accommodated more students in
general in all of our languages. We have devoted much time to workshops in SLOs and
Assessments, thus increasing intra-departmental communication and sharing teaching
methodologies.

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

Plans or Modifications	Anticipated Improvements
Bring back the 110 series, cut for budgetary reasons	This will make our programs more relevant, more open to students with diverse learning goals and needs and

4

	improve the ability of many to enter the workforce.
Articulate more with our counseling staff, our feeder high schools, other community colleges and four-year colleges	Serve a diverse population even better, become more cognizant of transfer and vocational needs
Secure majors in all our languages except Russian –attempted but not accomplished yet	Better public relations value in general, and serve certain students wishing to transfer
Experiment more with technology (Blackboard, hybrid courses, for example)	Make learning more accessible and more attractive
Expand our offerings as much as the budget permits: expand Chinese, and Korean, acquire a third Armenian and a second Japanese instructor –full time when feasible	Be more responsive to community needs, make the program even more demographically responsive than it is now, accommodate more students, disappoint fewer students who are not able to enroll in our popular language classes

Format Rev. 8.31.11

2011 PROGRAM REVIEW

Section 4
Resource Request

LANGUAGE ARTS - FOREIGN LANGUAGE *Level 3 Classrooms w /language font computers*	I:LA-FL1

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

Mandatory: Is this request for one-time funding? _no_x_ OR Does this request require ongoing funding?
yes___ The request is for ongoing funding.

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

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

4.1. Clearly describe the resource request.

> As many foreign language font equipped computers as the ESL Foreign Language Lab can afford –computers equipped with fonts for Armenian, Chinese, Japanese, Russian, and Korean
>
> Three more level-3 classrooms for Foreign Language with capacity to comply with the course seat load, with ample board space unhindered by projection screens or computer cabinets.
>
> minimal cost for requests, or no cost_____ Breakdown of cost (if applicable):

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.

> These languages cannot be properly written without these computer fonts.
>
> Foreign Language learning cannot be fully effective without sophisticated audio-visual capacity in a room that is not cramped.

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

> Facilitate teaching and learning of languages.

APPROVALS

AGENCY	DECISION					
The Program Review Committee has reviewed the data, outcomes and plans in the report and finds this request to be: Request not well defined	Well supported					
	Adequately supported					
	Not supported					**NS**
	Reason:	Sect.1: Data		Sect.2: SLOs	Sect.3: Plans	Other:
Standing Committee Review of Resource Request **Committee: Academic Affairs**	Prioritization Score					