CAL MARITIME

ANNUAL PROGRAM REPORT

Academic Program	Culture and Communication
Reporting for Academic Year	2018-2019
Department Chair	Julie Chisholm (F18) Colin Dewey (S19)
Date Submitted	12/1/2019

1. SELF-STUDY

A. Five-year Review Planning Goals

C&C is not following a comprehensive five-year plan. We saw a change in leadership when Colin Dewey took over the Chair from Julie Chisholm in January, 2019. 2020 will be "year zero" of a new plan which we will design and implement with participation of the faculty and input from administration. The 2019-20 report will outline the plan and initial progress.

B. Five-year Review Planning Goals Progress

Due to our lack of ownership of a program or our own or substantial participation in one housed in another department, the status of C&C remains precarious. We react to ever-changing circumstances that we cannot control and can only tangentially influence. As a service department helping to meet the general education needs of degree-granting departments and programs, any planning we undertake is subject to decisions about curricula and schedules made in other places: on campus and at the system level.

Solely a GE provider, we are subject to others' persistent attempts to reduce the number of units and courses that Cal Maritime students take at our campus. As enrollment growth schemes increasingly favor upper division transfers and students are encouraged to meet GE breadth requirements elsewhere, the department of Culture and Communication faces an uncertain future. This situation persists despite our faculty's outsized presence: as leaders in campus governance, scholars pursuing diverse and notable research, and dedicated teachers recognized by campus awards and consistently superior student testimony.

Faculty AY 18-19

Faculty	WTUs, Fall 2018	WTUs, Spring 2019
Carmichael PT	9	9
Chisholm FT	3	9
Clarke PT	3.9	3.9
Dewey FT	12	6
Frick FT	15	12
Guo PT	0 (FMLA)	resigned
Hartman PT	6	6
Manheimer PT	0 (FMLA)	resigned
Marocchino FT	12	12
Neumann PT	6	3

Parsons FT	12	12
Rodriguez PT	9	3
Senk FT	0 (FMLA)	12
Sinha FT	12	9
Starr PT	9	9
Wang PT	9	not rehired
Lu PT	n/a	3
TOTAL WTUs:	**117.9**	**108.9**

C. Program Changes and Needs

Other than the change in leadership there were few substantive changes during AY18-19. Next year's report will describe planning and implementation of the new 5-year plan, to the extent that one is possible given the constraints of "1.B" above.

2. SUMMARY OF ASSESSMENT

A.   Program Student Learning Outcomes

1. **Clearly express ideas in writing.**
2. **Clearly express ideas in speech.**
3. Identify, access, and evaluate appropriate sources of information, and cite sources consistently and correctly using conventional documentation styles.
4. Comprehensively explore texts, issues, and ideas before formulating an opinion; systematically analyze one's own assumptions and relevant contexts when presenting a position; and demonstrate ability to incorporate alternate, divergent, or contradictory perspectives.
5. Systematically explore texts, ideas, or issues through the collection and analysis of evidence, and draw informed conclusions.
6. Explain the relation between texts, ideas, and issues and their socio-political, historical, and cultural contexts.
7. Recognize the interconnection between artistic ideas and expression.

B.   Program Student Learning Outcome(s) Assessed

PLO 1 and 2 (in **bold** above) and ongoing GWE/GWAR assessments.

C.   Summary of Assessment Process

PLO 1 and 2 were assessed during AY2018-19 by IWAC as part of the regular campus assessment process. IWAC collected artifacts from C&C courses in writing and speech (EGL 100 & 110) which were assessed using a standard "LEAP" rubric.

Methodology from "Annual Learning Results Institution Wide SLO (A): Written and Oral Communication" (IWAC 2019):

On the introductory level, artifacts were gathered from multiple sections of EGL 100: English Composition and EGL 110: Speech Communication. 145 students were enrolled in EGL 100 during AY 18-19; artifacts by 95 different students were gathered from five sections of the course (capturing 65% of the students enrolled in EGL 100). 182 students were enrolled in EGL 110 during AY 18-19; artifacts by 116 different students were gathered from five sections of the course (capturing 64% of the students enrolled in EGL 110).
On the introductory level, all written communication artifacts were assessed using the AAC&U Leap VALUE Rubric for Written Communication; all oral communication artifacts were assessed using a modified version of the AAC&U Leap VALUE Rubric for

Oral Communication. Both are four-point rubrics containing five dimensions that were applied in each course to one or more assignments identified by the instructor.

D.   Summary of Assessment Results

PLO 1:
    At the introductory level, the benchmark for WRITTEN COMMUNICATION was met for four of five dimensions: "Context & Purpose" (74.7%), "Content Development" (70.5%), "Sources & Evidence" (76.6%), and "Syntax & Mechanics" (72.6%). The benchmark was missed for Genre & Discipline, with only 61.1% of students scoring a 3 or above.

PLO 2:
    At the introductory level in ORAL COMMUNICATION, five dimensions were assessed: "Organization," "Language," "Delivery," "Supporting Material," and "Message/Overall Clarity." the benchmark for ORAL COMMUNICATION was 70% achieving a score of 3 or greater on a 4 point scale for all five dimensions. The benchmark was met for four of five dimensions: "Language" (78.4%), "Delivery" (77.6%), "Supporting Material" (83.6%) and "Message/Overall Clarity" (77.6%). The benchmark was missed for Genre & Discipline, with only 65.5% of students scoring a 3 or above.

Recommendations (specific to C&C):
    We recommend that C&C investigate why certain groups and majors are failing to meet the benchmarks in EGL 100 and EGL 110, and propose strategies for improving student performance by the end of this assessment cycle (May 2020).

Graduate Writing Examination (and GWAR)
    C&C coordinates and administers the GWE, one of two means by which students meet the Graduate Writing Assessment Requirement (GWAR) at Cal Maritime. This timed writing exam is given once each semester. THE second method of meeting GWAR is successful completion of EGL 300, the somewhat misnamed "Advanced Writing" course. AY 18-19 saw a continuation of the troubling trend away from students choosing to attempt the exam in favor of the course. At the same time, the rate of passing scores in the exam has dropped. Since 2014, the earliest year for which I have records available, the pass rate overall had been 50% or better with one exception (F16, 45% n=60).

GWE Spring 2019	PASS	FAIL	PASS %
23 Total Students	8	15	**35%**
MT	4	10	29%
MET	0	1	0%
ME	2	1	67%
FET	0	0	N/A
IBL	1	1	50%
GSMA	1	2	33%

GWE Fall 2018	PASS	FAIL	PASS %
61 Total Students	13	48	**21%**
MT	5	17	23%
MET	2	12	14%
ME	4	6	40%
FET	0	0	N/A
IBL	1	9	10%
GSMA	1	4	20%

In AY 18-19, the rate dropped to 21% and 35%. What is more, the participation for the FET major ceased altogether in 2018. I am trying to ascertain the reasons for the drop in scores and participation, which I will attempt to correlate with enrollment in EGL300 and

grades earned in that course. Subsequent department reports will describe the methodology and results of that research.

3. STATISTICAL DATA

Program	Fall 2018	Spring 2019
A. Students		
1. Undergraduate	851	859
2. Postbaccalaureate	0	0
B. Degrees Awarded	N/A	N/A
C. Faculty		
Tenured/Track Headcount		
1. Full-Time	5	6
2. Part-Time	0	0
3a. Total Tenure Track	5	6
3b. % Tenure Track	38%	37.5%
Lecturer Headcount		
4. Full-Time	1	1
5. Part-Time	7	9
6a. Total Non-Tenure Track	8	10
6b. % Non-Tenure Track	62%	62.5%
7. Grand Total All Faculty	13	16
Instructional FTE Faculty (FTEF)		
8. Tenured/Track FTEF		
9. Lecturer FTEF		
10. Total Instructional FTEF		
Lecturer Teaching		
11a. FTES Taught by Tenure/Track		
11b. % of FTES Taught by Tenure/Track		
12a. FTES Taught by Lecturer		
12b. % of FTES Taught by Lecturer		
13. Total FTES taught		
14. Total SCU taught		
D. Student Faculty Ratios		
1. Tenured/Track	71.4	65.3
2. Lecturer	61.75	46.7
3. SFR By Level (All Faculty)	65.5	53.7
4. Lower Division	41.4	31
5. Upper Division	24	22.6
E. Section Size		
1. Number of Sections Offered	41	39
2. Average Section Size	27	22
3. Average Section Size for LD	25	18.4
4. Average Section Size for UD	30	30.2
6. LD Section taught by Tenured/Track	11	14
7. UD Section taught by Tenured/Track	6	6
8. GD Section taught by Tenured/Track	N/A	N/A
9. LD Section taught by Lecturer	18	13
10. UD Section taught by Lecture	6	6