**GLENDALE COMMUNITY COLLEGE**

## Annual Program Review  2012-2013 – INSTRUCTIONAL REPORT

# CREDIT ESL

### Authorization

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

Author:  Kathleen Flynn                          Division Chair:  Kathleen Flynn

Date Received by Program Review:     January 17, 2013

## 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 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Credit ESL | 2008-2009 | 1,323 | 68 | 620 | 40.2% | 100.9% | 77.6% | 0 |
|  | 2009-2010 | 1,249 | 66 | 599 | 39.6% | 103.4% | 78.9% | 0 |
|  | 2010-2011 | 1,145 | 69 | 531 | 39.4% | 107.1% | 77.2% | 0 |
|  | 2011-2012 | 1,136 | 69 | 524 | 38.5% | 106.0% | 75.5% | 0 |
|  | % Change | -14.1% | +1.7% | -15.5% | -1.7% | +5.1% | -2.1% | -- |
|  | Four-Year Trend | decreasing | stable | decreasing | stable | stable | stable | -- |

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

The FTES trend has become smaller as the number of class offerings has become smaller.  The division has had smaller Summer Sessions and has offered fewer courses in recent years. The number of faculty as seen in the FTEF trend has been stable.  This is due, in part, to the fact that many adjuncts were employed as tutors in the ESL Lab.  The WSCH to FTEF trend shows a decrease since fewer courses were offered.  The next three columns were stable.  The full-time percentage trend is fairly steady since there are a number of students in the lower levels who are taking several ESL courses each semester in order to learn enough English to enter regular college courses.  The fill rate trend has become slightly higher since students are registering for available seats and are not as concerned with the time of the class.  The success rate is stable.  The slightly lower rate may be due to the fact that students cannot always register for the grammar and reading courses that they need in the same semester.

**1.2**　Please explain any other relevant quantitative/qualitative information that affects the evaluation of your program?

There are 15 full-time faculty and approximately 58 adjunct faculty.  The division has changed the final essay grading system in ESL 123 and 133 from Pass/Fail to a numbered system (0 to 4).  The division had asked for funding to provide training to more adjuncts and was given money to support this effort through the Basic Skills Grant.  Four training sessions were held in November, 2012 and all instructors in ESL 123 and 133 were asked to score their final essays using this system.  The training will be repeated in Spring, 2013.  The faculty who are conducting research on the SLOACs for these levels will examine the impact of this new grading system on the way faculty calculate final exams.  The division is in the process of revising the course outlines for ESL 111, 123, 133, and 141 (grammar and writing 1-4).  The faculty have met to discuss changes in the teaching sequence of the major grammar topics and will use this new sequence when re-writing the course outlines this spring.

## 2.0.  Student Learning and Curriculum

**Course Level**

| Year | SLOAC Course Count | | % of Courses Assessed |
|---|---|---|---|
| 2010-2011 | 19 | 100.0% | 73.7% |
| 2011-2012 | 17 | 100.0% | 94.1% |
| % Change | | +0.0% | +20.4% |
| Four-Year Trend | | stable | increasing |

Provide the following information on each department and program within the division.

| List each program within the division | Active Courses with Identified SLOs | | Active Courses Assessed | | Course Sections Assessed | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | N / N | % | N / N | % | N / N | % |
| Credit ESL | 17/17 | 100 | 15/17 | 88% | 6-10 per course | |

**2.1**　Please comment on the percentages above.

SLOs were written for all 17 active courses.  In the first three-year cycle, 15 of 17 courses were assessed.  The division is in the process of a second three-year cycle.  Faculty members are assessing three to four courses each fall and spring semester.  Since most of the assessment cycles are tied to data in the final exam, some faculty are using January 2013 to write the reports.  Both full-time and adjunct faculty are participating in the assessment cycles.

**2.2**   Using the results from your division/departments recent assessment reports, please summarize any pedagogical or curricular changes that have been made as a result of your course assessments.

The full-time faculty met at a division retreat and determined that the list of grammatical topics taught in ESL 111, 123, 133, and 141 needed to be reexamined and revised.  The grammatical topics listed in the current course outlines require quite a bit of repetition from level to level.  The faculty met and decided to focus on certain grammar points in more depth in the lower levels and also decided to move the introduction of other grammar points.  This list was presented to the faculty at a division meeting and accepted by the full-time faculty.  The next step is to re-write the course outlines for ESL 111, 123, 133, and 141 to reflect the changes in this list.  The faculty plan to begin this work at the division retreat on January 17, 2013.

In the Fall, 2012 semester, ESL 133 (grammar and writing level 3)was paired with ESL 136 reading and vocabulary 3).  Both courses were taught in an accelerated (8-week) format.  This same group of students then took ESL 141 (grammar and writing 4) in the next seven weeks.  Elis Lee will teach the two grammar and writing classes in this accelerated format again in the Spring, 2013 semester.  She will write a report for the ESL 136 teacher so that grammar topics are tied to ideas that are discussed in the reading class and used in the essays and reports required in ESL 136. The aim is to strengthen the students' competency in writing.

Dr. Patricia Hironymous and Ms. Kay Baldwin will conduct research on the writing taught in ESL 151.  This year-long project was funded by the Gateway Grant.  They will partner with Steve Taylor of the English Department who will focus on English 120.

The final exam for ESL 115 (Listening and Speaking level 1) has been changed.  The division-wide final exam was compromised, with many students aware of the answers.  The division has written a rubric of test topics for instructors so that they can write their own final exams.  It is hoped that this will reduce the opportunities for cheating.  In the SLO assessment that was conducted, the materials produced by the instructors appeared to better test the abilities of the students in ESL 115.  The faculty who teach ESL 125 will also use a rubric for creating future final exams.  In Fall 2012, two ESL 126 teachers gave a shortened version of the division-wide reading exam and then wrote their own test passages.  The faculty will discuss the results and may change to final exams that are partially produced by individual instructors.

**2.3**   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.*

The division reviewed ESL 111, 123, 133, 141, 115, 125, 116, 126, and 136 and removed the ESL Lab requirement.  This change has already gone through the C&I process.  As part of the SLO Assessment Cycle, ESL 115, 125, 111, 123, and ESL 136 assessments have been run in the last year.  Several faculty members have reviewed the book lists in classes and the changed booklists will appear in the re-written course outlines.  The final exams in each of these courses have been examined and suggestions for improvement have been made.  These suggestions will be reported on at division meetings in Spring, 2013.

### Degree, Certificate, Program Level

| List each degree and certificate, or other program* within the division | AA/AS Degree PLO Identified | | AA/AS Degree Assessment Cycles Completed | | Certificate PLO Identified | | Certificate Assessment Cycles Completed | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | YES | NO | YES | NO | YES | NO | YES | NO |
| Credit ESL | 1 | | | No degree | | No Certificate | | X |

**2.4**    Please comment on the percentages above.

Credit ESL does not offer a degree or certificate.  The research done for PLO #1 is related to the success rate in English 101 by those students who have passed ESL 151 with a C or better.

**2.5**    Using the results from your division/departments recent assessment reports, please summarize any. changes that have been made as a result of your program level assessments.  Your summary should include a summation of the results of all degrees, certificates, and other programs which were recently assessed.

The research done for PLO #1 reported on the success rate of ESL 151 students who then took English 101.  A chart that illustrates this research is attached to the document.

Final grades in English 101 were collected from students who had passed ESL 151 and compared with students who had passed English 120. On the attached chart, the results are listed comparing several semesters (Spring 2010 compared to Summer/Fall 2010; Fall 2010 compared to Winter/Spring 2011; Spring 2011 compared to Summer/Fall 2011; and Fall 2011 compared to Winter/Spring 2012).

Students who passed ESL 151 completed English 101 at a success rate of 82.8%.  This is compared to students who had completed English 120 (passing rate of 67.1%) and students who placed directly into English 101 (passing rate of 66.8%)  The students who completed ESL 151 had more explicit grammar instruction.  Perhaps a greater emphasis on grammatical constructions would be beneficial for all three groups.

Describe what changes will be made to improve student achievement.

The division will continue to examine the results of future semesters and will then compare the success rate of students in ESL 151 who have either passed ESL 141 and 146 or have just taken ESL 141.  This is PLO #2. Dr. Patricia Hironymous and Ms. Kay Baldwin have received assistance from the Gateway Grant to compare the instruction in ESL 151 with the instruction in English 120.

>>See English 101 Success of Students from ESL 151 attachment at end of this document.

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

Credit ESL does not offer degrees or certificates.

**2.7**   What recent activities, dialogues, discussions, etc. have occurred to promote student learning or improved program/division processes in the last year?

Mark an "X" in front of all that apply.

| | |
|---|---|
| X | Curricular development/revisions of courses |
| | Curricular development/revision of programs |
| X | Increased improved SLO/PLOs in a number of courses and programs |
| X | Other dialog focused on improvements in student learning |
| X | Documented improvements in student earning |
| X | Increased/improved SLO/PLOs in a number of courses and programs |
| | New degree or certificate development |
| X | Best Practices Workshops |
| X | Conference Attendance geared towards maintaining or improving student success |
| X | Division Retreat in 2011-2012 |
| X | Division or department attendance at Staff Development activity geared towards maintaining or improving student learning |
| X | Division Meeting Minutes |
| | Reorganization |

Please comment on the activities, dialogues, and discussions above

The division has met frequently over the last year to discuss the sequence of the grammar topics in ESL 111, 123, 133, and 141.  The level leaders of ESL 123 and 133 have met to discuss the types of writing topics which are used for the division-wide midterm and final essay exams.  Three course outlines are being re-written and the drafts of these revisions will be presented to the division for discussion and/or further revision.  Much of this discussion is the result of the division retreats and meetings held in the last two years.  Additional discussion has focused on the exact nature of the writing tasks that students will need after they complete ESL 151.

## 3.0  Reflection and Action Plans

**3.1**   Based on your data and analysis presented above, as well as on issues or items that you were unable to discuss above, comment on the Strengths and Weaknesses of the Program

**Strengths**
List the current strengths of your program

1.  Faculty are willing to revise the core grammar and writing curriculum after looking at the results of SLO reports for ESL 123 and 133.
2.  Faculty have piloted new texts, most of which have e-book or online components.
3.  We remain a strong bridge to the traditional GED curriculum.

**3.2   Weaknesses**

List the current weaknesses of your program

1.  Cutbacks in the number of hours mean that there are not enough sections of spelling to meet the demand.  Faculty are considering writing a spelling workshop.

2.  The fact that the college will no longer fund the ESL lab tutors will give fewer opportunities for students to get assistance outside of regular class hours.  Faculty have discussed creating grammar workshops, but this will take time to set up.

3.  There is no lab set aside for upper-level Credit ESL classes.

**3.3**   Using the weaknesses, trends and assessment outcomes as a basis for your comments, please <u>briefly</u> describe any future plans and/or modifications for program/division improvements. Any plans for reorganization should also be included, along with a resource request if applicable.

| Plans or Modifications | Anticipated Changes/ Improvements | Link to EMP, Plans, SLOs, PLOs, ILOs |
|---|---|---|
| Revise Course Outlines for core grammar and writing classes | The first revision will be ESL 123. | SLO for ESL 123 |
| Revise Course Outline for ESL 126 | Remove book report from the course outline and synchronize the grammar and reading topics | SLO for ESL 126 |
| Do research on the topics taught in ESL 151 and English 120 and examine the outcomes of the pilot and experimental classes. | The report will depend on the outcomes of this research. | SLOs for ESL 151 and Eng. 120 and PLO #1 for Credit ESL |

Format Rev. 9.21.12

6

# 2012  PROGRAM REVIEW

**Section 4**
**Resource Request**

| CREDIT ESL | |
|---|---|
| *Larger Chairs for Classroom* | **I:ESL- 1** |

**Mark Type of Request:**

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | Facilities/Maintenance | | Computer Hardware for Student Use |
| | Classroom Upgrade | | Computer hardware or Faculty Use |
| | Instructional equipment | | Software/Licenses/Maintenance/Agreements |
| **X** | Non-Instructional Equipment | | Conference/Travel |
| | Supplies | | Other |

**4.1**   Clearly describe the resource request.

There are a number of students in ESL classes who fall into the category of "full-figured."  Many of these students take classes in VGT-1, 2, 3, and 4.  While observing teachers in these classrooms, I have seen students who were struggling to sit through the class period in chairs which did not accommodate their bodies.  The division needs five larger tablet arm chairs per room for a total of 20 new chairs

Amount requested:  $4,600

Breakdown of cost, if applicable:      20 chairs at $200 per chair plus tax and shipping

**4.2**   Funding

| | |
|---|---|
| *X* | Requires One Time Funding |
| | Requires Ongoing Funding |
| | Repeat Request |
| | Year(s) Requested |

**4.3**   Please check if any off the following special criteria apply to this request:

| | |
|---|---|
| **X** | Health & Safety Issue |
| | Accreditation Requirement |
| | Contractual Requirement |
| | Legal Mandate |

Please explain how/why this request meets any of the above criteria.

Students cannot pay attention to the lesson if they are struggling to fit into the available chairs.  They are also at a disadvantage when trying to take an exam. The lack of suitable furniture also leads to students moving chairs from room to room.  This wastes class time and can result in a fire hazard.

**4.4**   Justification and Rationale:  What EMP Goal, plan, SLO, PLO, or ILO does this request address? Please use information from your report to support your request.

This is related to Health and Safety.

**4.5**   What measurable outcome will result from filling this resource request?

Students will be more comfortable and will feel that they are being treated like adults.

*APPROVAL*

| AGENCY | DECISION | |
|---|---|---|
| The Program Review Committee has reviewed the information in this request and finds it to be: | COMPLIANT | |
| | NON COMPLIANT OR INCOMPLETE | **X** |
| | a)  Request not adequately described or incomplete | |
| | b) Request not linked to assessments or assessments not completed | |
| | c) Request not linked to EMP, plan or SLO,PLO or ILO | |
| | d) Report Incomplete | |
| PRC Comments | | |

*Form Revised 9.19.12*
*Reports determined to be "Non-Compliant" will be returned to the division member responsible. Reports must be resubmitted with needed changes to the Program Review Office. Requests will not move forward in the budget process if the report or request is Non-Compliant.*

# 2012  PROGRAM REVIEW

## Section 4
## Resource Request

| Credit ESL | I:ESL- 2 |
|---|---|
| *Chairs for AU104* | |

**Mark Type of Request:**

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | Facilities/Maintenance | | Computer Hardware for Student Use |
| | Classroom Upgrade | | Computer hardware or Faculty Use |
| | Instructional equipment | | Software/Licenses/Maintenance/Agreements |
| X | Non-Instructional Equipment | | Conference/Travel |
| | Supplies | | Other |

**4.1**   Clearly describe the resource request.

The movable chairs in AU 104 were purchased specifically for this room in 1995.  They were considered to be "collaborative learning" furniture.  Half of these chairs are broken and are safety hazards.  Using a regular tablet arm chair does not work in this room.  The request is to purchase 14 new chairs on wheels.
Amount requested:  $1,700

Breakdown of cost, if applicable:    14 chairs at $100 per chair plus tax and shipping   Note:  These are the regular rolling student chairs.

**4.2**   Funding

| | |
|---|---|
| X | Requires One Time Funding |
| | Requires Ongoing Funding |
| | Repeat Request |
| | Year(s) Requested |

**4.3**   Please check if any off the following special criteria apply to this request:

| | |
|---|---|
| X | Health & Safety Issue |
| | Accreditation Requirement |
| | Contractual Requirement |
| | Legal Mandate |

Please explain how/why this request meets any of the above criteria.

Broken chairs are a safety hazard.  Chairs on wheels are needed since they are used with individual desks to form collaborative groups.

**4.4**    Justification and Rationale:  What EMP Goal, plan, SLO, PLO, or ILO does this request address?
Please use information from your report to support your request.

Health and Safety

**4.5**    What measurable outcome will result from filling this resource request?

Students will have a better learning environment and the classroom will be a safer
The current mix of broken chairs in this room is an eyesore.

*APPROVAL*

| AGENCY | DECISION | |
|---|---|---|
| The Program Review Committee has reviewed the information in this request and finds it to be: | COMPLIANT | |
| | NON COMPLIANT OR INCOMPLETE | **X** |
| | a)    Request not adequately described or incomplete | |
| | b)  Request not linked to assessments or assessments not completed | |
| | c)  Request not linked to EMP, plan or SLO,PLO or ILO | |
| | d)  Report Incomplete | |
| PRC Comments | | |

*Form Revised 9.19.12*
*Reports determined to be "Non-Compliant" will be returned to the division member responsible. Reports must be resubmitted with needed changes to the Program Review Office. Requests will not move forward in the budget process if the report or request is Non-Compliant.*

# 2012  PROGRAM REVIEW

## Section 4
## Resource Request

| CREDIT ESL *Replace Chalkboard* | I:ESL-3 |
|---|---|

**Mark Type of Request:**

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | Facilities/Maintenance | | Computer Hardware for Student Use |
| | Classroom Upgrade | | Computer hardware or Faculty Use |
| X | Instructional equipment | | Software/Licenses/Maintenance/Agreements |
| | Non-Instructional Equipment | | Conference/Travel |
| | Supplies | | Other |

**4.1**   Clearly describe the resource request.

Replace a green chalk board with a **white board** in VGT-1.

Amount requested:  $600

Pricing was provided by Susan Courtey. Mike will remove the green board and replace it with a white board.

**4.2**   Funding

| | |
|---|---|
| X | Requires One Time Funding |
| | Requires Ongoing Funding |
| | Repeat Request |
| | Year(s) Requested |

**4.3**   Please check if any off the following special criteria apply to this request:

| | |
|---|---|
| X | Health & Safety Issue |
| | Accreditation Requirement |
| | Contractual Requirement |
| | Legal Mandate |

Please explain how/why this request meets any of the above criteria.

One of the full-time Credit ESL instructors is allergic to chalk dust.  She has a letter from her physician asking that she teach in a room which does not contain a chalk board.

**4.4**    Justification and Rationale:  What EMP Goal, plan, SLO, PLO, or ILO does this request address?  Please use information from your report to support your request.

Health and Safety


**4.5**    What measurable outcome will result from filling this resource request?

The instructor will be healthier and there will no longer be chalk dust getting into the computer equipment in this room.  Long term, this should be a benefit.


## *APPROVAL*

| *AGENCY* | *DECISION* | |
|---|---|---|
| The Program Review Committee has reviewed the information in this request and finds it to be: | COMPLIANT | **X** |
| | NON COMPLIANT OR INCOMPLETE<br>a)    Request not adequately described or incomplete | |
| | b)  Request not linked to assessments or assessments not completed | |
| | c)  Request not linked to EMP, plan or SLO,PLO or ILO | |
| | d)  Report Incomplete | |
| PRC Comments | | |

*Form Revised 9.19.12*

*Reports determined to be "Non-Compliant" will be returned to the division member responsible. Reports must be resubmitted with needed changes to the Program Review Office. Requests will not move forward in the budget process if the report or request is Non-Compliant.*