2026-27 Comprehensive Program Review

Program: French

Division: Arts & Humanities

Writers: Savanna Alliband-McGrew

SLO/SAO Point-Person:

Email your completed form to Karin Spirn and your dean by November 2, 2026.

Helpful Links:

- ★ Tools for Writers - with contacts and info for help with specific sections.
- ★ Program Review Glossary - defines key terms you can review when writing.
- ★ Discipline Data Packets – institutional research about disciplines and student services
- ★ Course Success Rates Dashboard – allows you to research your program's success rates

Detailed information and instructions appear at the end of this form. For help, please contact Karin Spirn at kspirn@laspositascollege.edu.

Section 1: Program Reflection and Planning

These questions appear on all Program Reviews including comprehensive and updates.

1. Please describe your program's most important **achievements** in year 25-26.

- *Both French 1A and 1B were approved as non-credit offerings. This will increase opportunities for students who want to take the course as lifelong learners, or students who passed the course successfully but want to retake it for deeper learning.*
- *Developing a French program through Community Education to develop pathways to the noncredit course for lifelong learners. These programs feed nicely into each other.*

2. Please describe your most important **challenges** in year 25-26

- Student use of AI, and working to define proper use for my discipline. Creating appropriate guidelines, expectations, and assignments for students to use this development as a learning tool.
- Working out the "kinks" with the compressed calendar and unexpected wrinkles with the new schedule.

3. What are your upcoming **plans**? Please note any ways that these support student achievement and equity.

- I plan to keep offering one-on-one meetings with asynchronous students early in the semester. Creating a personal connection early on helps both the student and me feel more "bonded" and makes it easier for students to reach out when they encounter difficulties later in the semester. I believe this can support retention and persistence in Distance Education, particularly for students whose work, family, transportation, or other circumstances make asynchronous learning the most accessible option.
- I will continue developing more interactive and communicative activities that allow students to use French in meaningful contexts rather than encountering grammar and vocabulary primarily as isolated skills. This includes role-plays, partner activities, games, and tasks based on everyday situations. Providing frequent, low-stakes opportunities to use the language helps students build confidence while reinforcing foundational skills.
- Finally, I am developing course materials that provide multiple ways for students to engage with and practice French, including written, audio, pronunciation, cultural, and interactive activities. Providing varied ways to encounter and demonstrate learning supports students with different educational backgrounds, learning preferences, and levels of previous exposure to language study.

Section 2: SLOs/SAOs

This section is completed every three years as part of the Comprehensive Program Review, with brief annual check-ins on the Program Review Updates. The following resources will be useful when completing this section:

- Three-Year Assessment Template
- Aggregated and Disaggregated Data from the following sources:
  - ELumen (if saved--no longer available online)
  - CurrIQunet
  - Student Success Dashboard

1. During the 2023-2026 three-year assessment cycle that just concluded, what did your program set out to learn through your PSLO/CSLO/SAO assessments?

- *N/A*

2. Based on your analysis of your PSLO/CSLO/SAO assessment data, what conclusions did you draw about student outcomes and equity in your program?

- *N/A*

3. Explain potential plans to improve student outcomes and close equity gaps.

I plan to continue using a portfolio-based assessment model that has been successful in supporting students with a wide range of prior experience and educational goals. I removed traditional chapter tests and exams several years ago because I found that they were too finite in the grammar they assessed and did not always provide an accurate picture of a student's developing ability to communicate in French. Instead, students build a portfolio of written and spoken work in stages throughout the semester. By the end of the course, they have a body of work that demonstrates their individual ability to communicate in French about the common topics covered in French 1A and 1B.

This approach also allows me to address differences in students' starting points and goals. Some students enter the course with previous French experience or oral proficiency but limited writing skills, while others have had no previous exposure to the language. Students also enroll for very different reasons, ranging from completing educational requirements to preparing to live, travel, or study in a French-speaking country. I openly encourage students to work at an appropriate level of challenge and provide flexibility in how they approach portfolio assignments while maintaining the same course learning outcomes.

Continuing this approach can help close equity gaps by reducing the extent to which prior access to French instruction determines success in the course. Students have multiple opportunities to practice, receive feedback, revise, and demonstrate growth rather than having their achievement determined primarily by performance on a small number of high-stakes assessments. The goal is not for every student's final portfolio to look the same, but for every student to demonstrate meaningful growth in their ability to communicate in written and spoken French.

4. Describe any obstacles that you encountered in your assessment process and any supports that would be helpful.

- *N/A*

Section 3: Data Discussion

This section is completed every three years as part of the Comprehensive Program Review. Workshops and office hours will be offered in Fall 2026 to support Program Review writers.

1. RPIE Data Review: Discuss any significant trends in the data provided by the Office of Research, Planning, and Institutional Effectiveness (or any other data you use for decision-making and planning).

*(**Note**: Not all Programs have RPIE data available; if your program does not have a data packet or dashboard data, you may note that in the response box and reach out to the RPIE team.)*

Data may come from:

- RPIE Data Packets
- Transfer data
- Succes Rates Dashboard (scroll down on page)
- Requested data from the Office of Research, Planning, and Institutional Effectiveness (RPIE)
- SLO/SAO data
- Data from program-created surveys or investigations
- Any other relevant source of quantitative or qualitative data

- French enrollment has shown encouraging growth in recent years. Annual enrollment increased from 58 in 2022–23 to 83 in 2025–26, the highest enrollment during the six-year period shown. Enrollment has increased in both FREN 1A, which is offered in Fall, and FREN 1B, which is offered in Spring. The demographic data also show that French serves students across a wide range of ages and educational backgrounds, including a substantial population of older and returning students. Because French is a small program, individual student outcomes can have a significant effect on percentages from year to year, so the data should be interpreted with this in mind.

2. Equity: Did your data reveal any patterns of inequity? If so, please explain those patterns and any actions that should be taken at the program or college level.

One notable finding is the representation of African American students in French. In 2025–26, African American students represented approximately 7% of French enrollment, compared with approximately 4% of enrollment college-wide. This suggests that African American students are proportionally well represented in the French program.

Success data for this group is difficult to characterize because of the very small number of students involved. In 2025–26, six African American students were represented in the data, with two successful outcomes, two unsuccessful outcomes, and two withdrawals. Outcomes for this group have varied considerably across years as the number of students has remained small, making it difficult to identify a reliable trend or conclude that there is a persistent equity gap.

I will continue to monitor disaggregated success and withdrawal data as enrollment grows. More broadly, I plan to continue strategies designed to support student connection and persistence,

particularly in asynchronous courses, including early opportunities for individual contact with the instructor.

3. Course Modality (Instructional Programs Only): In reviewing your program's data packet and Succes Rates Dashboard, are there differences in success rates by modality (i.e. face-to-face, asynchronous, synchronous, hybrid, or hyflex)? If so, reflect on what might account for differences and any actions that should be taken. (Non-instructional programs may also choose to reflect on online vs. in-person services if applicable).

- The modality data provided in the program data packet do not allow for a meaningful comparison of success rates by modality for French. FREN 1A and 1B are offered with both asynchronous and Hyflex participation options, and the institutional data categorize enrollments as face-to-face or Distance Education in a way that does not fully reflect how the courses are structured or how individual students participate. In the Hyflex portion of the course, students may participate either in person or synchronously through Zoom. In contrast, asynchronous students are invited to attend class if/when able and sometimes do. In Spring 2026, two Asynchronous enrollees attended almost all of the F2F classes, seemingly because once they came to class, they wanted to keep attending. As a result, the reported F2F and DE enrollment and success figures cannot reliably compare outcomes between Hyflex and asynchronous students.
- This is an area I would be interested in examining more closely if modality-specific data that reflect actual student participation become available. In the meantime, I continue to develop strategies to support engagement across modalities, particularly personal connection and instructor presence for asynchronous students.

4. Program-Set Standard (Instructional Programs Only): The program-set standard is a baseline that alerts programs if their student success rates have dipped suddenly below 95% of the rolling 5-year average. There is no punishment for not meeting the standard, and many valid reasons this may occur. When a program does not meet this standard, they are asked to examine possible reasons and note any actions that should be taken, if appropriate. | Program-set standard data can be found on this page

5a. Did your program meet its program-set standard for successful course completion in AY25-26? No.

Yes____ No__x__

5b. If your program did not meet your program-set standard, discuss possible reasons and how this may affect program planning or resource requests. Success rates for individual courses can be found on the Success Rates Dashboard.

- The French program's 2025–26 success rate was 61%, slightly below the program-set standard of 64%. Success rates have fluctuated over the six-year period rather than showing a consistent downward trend, ranging from 58% to 79%. Because French is a small program, the outcomes of a relatively small number of students can noticeably affect the annual success rate. It is also noteworthy that enrollment increased to 83 in 2025–26, the highest level in the six-year period.
- Withdrawal appears to be an important factor in the current success rate. I therefore plan to continue focusing on early student engagement and persistence, particularly in asynchronous courses. This includes offering individual meetings early in the semester to establish a personal connection and making proactive contact with students who begin to disengage. I will continue monitoring success and withdrawal patterns to determine whether additional changes are warranted.

Section 4: Special Topics

These questions have been chosen for this year's Comprehensive Program Review to meet reporting mandates (for accreditation, Ed. Code, or other sources).

1. Mission: Describe 1-3 examples of how your program's work has aligned with the college's mission, vision, values, and/or educational master plan over the past three years. (Possibilities might include new initiatives, resource allocation/use, program improvements, or other activities).

- Mission, Vision, and Values
- Educational Master Plan

- The French program supports the college mission by providing an inclusive and flexible learning environment for students with a wide variety of educational goals and backgrounds. French courses serve students pursuing transfer and degree goals as well as students studying French for personal, intellectual, and cultural development. The program has a particularly strong connection to LPC's commitment to lifelong learning; students represent a **broad range of ages** and **educational backgrounds**, including returning students and students who already hold college degrees.
- The asynchronous and Hyflex structure of the courses also provides multiple ways for students to access and participate in instruction. Within the courses, I use a variety of learning experiences—including speaking, listening, reading, writing, pronunciation, interactive activities, and cultural exploration—to help students develop confidence and competence in French. I continue to look for ways to strengthen connection and persistence, particularly for asynchronous students.

- French language study also supports the college's vision of preparing students to participate in local and global communities. Learning another language requires students to encounter perspectives and cultural practices different from their own and to develop the ability to communicate across cultural differences. The study of Francophone cultures encourages curiosity, respect, cultural awareness, and an understanding of the diversity that exists within the French-speaking world.
- I strive to create an environment in which beginning students feel comfortable taking risks, making mistakes, and developing their own voice in another language. **French is one of the places where LPC's "global communities" language becomes literal.** Students aren't just learning *about* global engagement; they're acquiring an actual skill that allows them to communicate with people beyond their own linguistic community.

2. Regular Substantive Interaction (Instructional Programs Only)

To meet our college, ACCJC, state, and federal standards, **all online instructors** must demonstrate "**regular and substantive interaction**" (RSI) with students. That is, we must be clearly providing instruction and interacting with our online students, just like we would in an on-campus class. The following reflection questions allow us to capture how RSI is occurring in our classes.

The following documents explain requirements and best practices for RSI:

- ACCJC Quality Continuum Rubric for Distance Education
- Regular and Substantive Interaction (RSI) requirements

2a. If your program offers DE courses, how are Regular and Substantive Interaction (RSI) requirements met in your area? Examples appear on the DE addendums of your Course Outlines of Record. Place an X next to each method used in your courses.	
x	Course materials make clear to students how often and when the instructor will interact with students (e.g. syllabus/home page lists email/office hours/other ways to communicate and typical response times)
x	Provides direct instruction over Zoom (e.g. regularly scheduled live online class sessions in synchronous/hybrid/hyflex courses)
x	Provides direct instruction through instructor-created videos (e.g. lecture videos created using Studio in asynchronous courses)
x	Provides additional information from various sources/mediums to engage students with course content (e.g. instructor-curated content in Canvas pages that help deepen students understanding of course content)
x	Facilitates discussions (e.g. through Canvas discussion boards, Pronto, Studio, or Hypothesis)
x	Provides feedback on students' coursework (e.g. through detailed rubrics and/or assignment comments in Speedgrader; note: a grade alone does not quality as RSI, nor does auto-graded feedback students may get through completing publisher content)

x	Responds to students' questions (e.g. through timely responses to student messages in Canvas Inbox, discussion boards, social annotation assignments)
x	Facilitates student success through ongoing outreach (e.g. posts announcements; uses "Message Students Who" to encourage struggling students to attend office hours or access free tutoring)
	Other [explain]:

2b. What challenges if any have you faced in implementing RSI? What additional training or resources might instructors in your program need to increase the quality of RSI in online courses?

- **The most challenging aspect of RSI is engaging students who do not respond to or take advantage of opportunities for interaction.** I provide individualized feedback each week/module to help students improve their written and spoken French. I post announcements regularly and invite students to attend office hours for support or make an individual appointment if office hours are not convenient. I respond promptly to student emails and to comments and questions submitted through Canvas assignments.
- At the beginning of the semester, I also offer short individual appointments so that asynchronous students can meet with me personally. Many students do not voluntarily sign up for these appointments, but I have observed that students who do often seem more comfortable reaching out for help later and are more likely to remain engaged in the course.
- Additional training focused specifically on effective strategies for initiating and sustaining interaction with students who are becoming disengaged would be helpful. I would also be interested in learning about effective RSI practices being used by other asynchronous instructors, particularly approaches that encourage interaction without creating additional required meetings or reducing the flexibility that students value in asynchronous courses.

Section 5: Program Review Feedback

What questions or suggestions do you have about this year's Program Review forms or process?

- *Write responses here*
- *Add or remove bullets as needed*

Detailed Instructions

Instructions

1. Send an electronic copy of this form to Program Review chair, Karin Spirn, and your Dean by Monday, November 2.
2. Please respond to questions with enough detail to present your information; it doesn't have to be long.
3. If the requested information does not apply to your program, write "Not Applicable."
4. Even if you don't have much to report, we want to hear from you, so your voice is part of the college planning process.
5. Optional/suggested: Communicate with your dean while completing this document.

Sections: There are five sections to the document:

1. Program Reflection and Planning
2. SLO/SAO Review
3. Data analysis
4. Special topics
5. Feedback on the PR template and process

Time Frame: This Program Review should reflect your program status during the 25-26 academic year. It should describe plans starting now and continuing through 2026-27. It is fine to discuss topics beyond these time frames, but please specify the time frame in your responses.

Audience: Deans, Vice Presidents of Student Services and Academic Services, All Planning and Allocation Committees. This document will be available to the public.

Uses: This Program Review will inform the audience about your program. It is also used in creating division summaries, determining college planning priorities, and determining the allocation of resources. The final use is to document the fulfillment of accreditation requirements.

Equity: Here is the LPC definition of equity, which is a guiding principle in reviewing programs: "Equity is parity in student educational outcomes. It places student success and belonging for students of color and disproportionately impacted students at the center of focus."

Please note: Program Review is NOT a vehicle for making requests. All requests should be made through appropriate processes (e.g., Instructional Equipment Request Process) or directed to your dean or supervisor.

Helpful Links:

- ★ Tools for Writers - with contacts for help with specific sections.
- ★ Program Review Glossary - defines key terms you can review when writing.
- ★ Fall 2023 Program Reviews
- ★ Program Review FAQs

For help with your program review, please contact Karin Spirn at kspirn@laspositascollege.edu