Basic Skills Annual Report

2015-2016

Mt. San Antonio College

Table of Contents

Executive Summary

During the 2015-2016 academic year, the college provided the support and funding for a total of 14 basic skills projects from funds provided by the Basic Skills Initiative (BSI). The total funding for the 14 projects was $887,630. Projects were funded in the following areas:

- Adult Basic Education
- English as a Second Language
- Humanities and Social Sciences Division
- Instruction
- Library and Learning Resources
- Student Services
- Counseling

Each project and position funded was linked to one of two five-year goals as outlined in the 2014-2015 Action Plan. They are as follows:

1. From 2014-15, increase by 2% annually the percentage of basic skills students who participate in basic skills funded interventions that have demonstrated increased student success.

   From 2014-15 the number of students who participated in basic skills funded interventions increased by 4.7% in 2015-16. This increase was primarily in tutoring for credit and noncredit students. Funding for tutoring has increased in proportion from 2009-10 and currently comprises 65% of the BSI fund amount allocated for campus basic skills projects.

2. Beginning 2012-13, the successful progression rate of basic skills students will increase 5% over the 2009-10 baseline over the next five years.

   Due to the basic skills initiative emphasis on reducing the time students take to complete the basic skills course sequence, this goal was changed from a 5-year to a 3-year throughput. Results show that the progression rate of basic skills students have stayed steady over the past five years. The 2009-10 baseline shows a 32.8% progression rate and the 2014-15 cohort of basic skills students shows a 32.1% progression rate. It is likely that results will differ in more recent years due to the modification of the English placement rubric, and assessment bootcamps in math and English. Future data will also reflect more dramatic changes as we implement more extensive use of multiple measures for placement, co-requisite models, and redesigned course sequences in math and English.

While the final approval of the funding allocation rests with the Vice President of Instruction and the Vice President of Student Services, the members of the Basic Skills Coordinating Committee, a shared governance committee of the Academic Senate, worked diligently to examine, evaluate, and recommend

projects for funding approval through a thoughtful and well-established process. Each proposed project was evaluated and ranked using a predetermined rubric for its feasibility, potential for improving student achievement outcomes, direct support to students, supporting data or rationale to support need, and direct connection to effective basic skills practices. All project managers and the teams of the funded projects, in collaboration with Research and Institutional Effectiveness, completed a formalized assessment review. These project reports included the establishment of goals, projected outcomes (Student Learning Outcomes, Strategic Actions, and Administrative Unit Objectives), research methodology, assessment, and outcomes. The details of the individual project assessments are included in this report.

Some funded projects are not included in the assessment portion of this report because the projects are not appropriate for direct assessment of student learning outcomes, the projects fund support people, or the projects provide funding for infrastructure. Some of these are as follows:

- Professional development and travel related to basic skills
- Adjunct counseling faculty
- Reassigned time for Basic Skills Faculty Coordinator

The assessment of outcomes for this year's projects shows great success. The College's basic skills student population has been provided with a myriad of opportunities and support services that have resulted in increased retention and success. Additionally, faculty, managers, and staff involved in the projects have become a community of learners dedicated to providing quality programs and services that support our basic skills students. We encourage you to read the project summaries that are provided in this report in order to more fully appreciate the efforts of all the people involved with the basic skills projects.

Michelle Dougherty
Faculty Coordinator, Basic Skills

Madelyn Arballo
Dean, School of Continuing Education

Project: Adult Basic Education: ABE Counseling Intervention

Description: This project provides ABE noncredit students with access to intensive, embedded counseling that promotes their pathways to post-secondary and employment opportunities. Specifically, ABE counselors will implement the mandates of the Student Success and Support Plan (SSSP) and align with the Adult Education Block Grant (AEBG) Program Regional Plan to increase engagement and success among students. This includes orientations assessment, educational planning, intervention for high need students, career counseling, and follow-up counseling. The ABE programs are HS Equivalency Preparation (GED and HiSET), ASVAB (military exam) Preparation, High School Programs, and other programs for transitioning basic skills students.

Objective: This project is to provide ABE noncredit students with access to intensive, embedded counseling that promotes their pathways to post-secondary and employment opportunities by increasing outcomes.

Assessment: This SLO will focus on the relationship between student outcomes and embedded counseling. This SLO will be assessed as follows:

1. Counselors will identify student needs as they relate to counseling.
2. Counselors increase engagement with students using embedded classroom strategies or through student input.
3. Data will be gathered in 2015-16 on students' completion rates to determine the extent to which embedded counseling results in a higher course completion rate compared to those who do not receive embedded counseling.

Criteria for Success:

1. At least 40 students will participate in focus groups related to SSSP and Student Equity.
2. Embedded counseling will be integrated into program schedules and will be institutionalized.
3. Course completion rates will be higher for students who met with a counselor compared to those who did not meet with a counselor.

Summary of Data:

In 2015-16, there were 2,842 ABE students who attended classes with embedded counseling. This integrated counseling came as a result of focus groups with 40 ABE students to determine what services students needed in order to improve college and career outcomes. Students could discuss with counselors during embedded counseling topics relating to college and/or career goals. From the focus group input counselors designed workshops around those topics to serve larger groups of students. For example, career workshops were implemented to teach students employment skills. Data were also collected on course completion rates, and 52% of students who met with a counselor completed a class compared to 31% of students who did not meet with a counselor.

Use of Results: Based on the results of the student focus groups there is a need to develop more targeted workshops in order to promote pathways to post-secondary and employment opportunities. In order to better track students who receive embedded counseling, a SARS code will be developed which will allow for an analysis of the outcomes for students who participate in embedded counseling compared to those who do not.

Project: Adult Basic Education: ABE In-Class Tutoring and Support

Description: This project provides in-class tutoring for ABE students enrolled in programs including High School Equivalency preparation (GED or HiSET), ASVAB (military exam) preparation, High School programs, and basic skills. The objective of this project is to promote completion of Career Development and College Prep noncredit courses, noncredit certificates, and courses and programs that improve study skills and assist students to transition into college or employment.

Objective: As a result of instructional intervention and support, ABE students will be academically successful.

Assessment: This project will focus on the relationship between student outcomes and in class tutoring. Emphasis will be placed on increasing access to tutoring, students' self-evaluation of preparedness in relationship to tutoring intervention and course completion. Students will self-report the interventions used and the impact tutoring had on their level of preparedness for an exam. Students will complete this form prior each assessment. Tutors will maintain tutor logs, which will reflect tutoring instances by student. ABE Database will provide course completion data.

Criteria for Success:

1. At least 65% of attending students will access tutoring.
2. At least 70% of students surveyed (at least 200) will report feeling prepared after accessing tutoring.
3. Students in the HS Programs who access tutoring will have at least a 20% higher course completion rate than those who do not access tutoring.
4. At least 60% of students in the Adult Basic Education Lab who access tutoring will have a higher rate of gain on their assessments than those who do not access tutoring.

Summary of Data: 760 students comprised the population for courses where in-class tutoring was available during the assessment period. Of these students, 38%, or 292 students were

documented as having accessed tutoring, which is lower than expected. The number of students who received tutoring from the previous year may have decreased because faculty have embedded meeting time within all coursework as an early alert system. Thus, the students may have obtained the intervention they needed from the faculty and therefore, did not seek tutors as often.

70% of students who accessed tutoring passed courses with a "C" or better compared to 49% for the general population.

In addition, this year students were given a survey to assess their views regarding tutoring. Out of 138 students surveyed, 120 or 87% felt that the tutors had been extremely helpful in preparing them for their test. An equal percentage of students felt that they were prepared (or extremely prepared) to take their assessment. Of the students who felt that they were extremely prepared for the test, 100% reported that the tutors were extremely helpful. Even the students who felt unprepared for the test reported that tutoring assisted them.

Use of Results: It is possible that a student may meet with a tutor and not have the interaction documented in the tutoring log. In order to determine the overall level of assistance that tutoring provides, a survey will be given to students after they take their final exam to ascertain the role that tutoring had in assisting them with finishing the course. This survey will also yield data on students who do not access tutoring. Through an examination of why students do not access tutoring, it is likely that strategies can be developed that will make tutoring more applicable and accessible to all students. Lastly, since students may be increasingly meeting with faculty prior to assessments, it is thought that a different approach, such as subject specific group tutoring, may accelerate program completion. Lastly, since students may be increasingly meeting with faculty prior to assessments, it is thought that a different approach, such as subject specific group tutoring, may accelerate program completion.

Project: Adult Basic Education: ABE Curriculum and SLO Plan

Description: This project provided non-teaching pay for ABE adjunct faculty to support the SLO process, develop and review Career Development and College Preparation (CDCP) courses and noncredit certificates, integrate new College and Career Readiness Standards (CCRS) into coursework, and develop educational and career pathways. There have been a number of emerging curricular standards and new HS equivalency coursework directed at adult education within the past two years, as well as state legislation affecting adult education programs. All of these developments have impacted ABE curriculum and instructional processes creating a need for intensive faculty work.

Objective: An ABE faculty outcomes team participated in an ongoing structure for the SLO cycle to ensure that courses are assessed, outcomes are discussed and results are used to drive improvement in student learning.

Assessment: Faculty intended to work collaboratively to evaluate the quality of the use of results, especially ensuring that the use of results is based on the summary of data for the SLO. Faculty held a workday in August 2015 to train faculty in creating quality use of results. A rubric/guide was designed to gauge the alignment between the data summary and Use of Results. Faculty worked collaboratively to evaluate the quality of the Use of Results, especially ensuring that it was based on the summary of data for the SLO. At the meeting in August 2015, faculty trained their colleagues in creating quality Use of Results. It was planned for the new guide to improve the alignment between the data summary and Use of Results.

Criteria for Success:

1. Faculty will approve the use of an internal faculty developed guide to use as a tool for writing quality Use of Results.
2. 80% of faculty participating in the Fall ABE faculty meeting will use the guide to complete the Use of Results sections for SLOs.
3. ABE faculty will assess 30% of ABE courses in 2015-16.

Summary of Data: In the prior year it was recommended that more experienced ABE faculty provide support to their colleagues on writing "Use of Results" sections for SLOs. Two faculty presented best practices in writing effective Use of Results sections and presented a guide as a tool. Participants were also given the opportunity to write sample Use of Results to reinforce the strategies presented. Faculty were able to create relevant Use of Results summaries in their groups, and as a result, all faculty used this guide as a tool for completing SLO reports. Also, 30% of ABE courses were assessed in 2015-16.

Use of Results: This single exposure to writing Use of Results was helpful, however, given the gap in time between learning about summaries and writing them, faculty have determined that it would be helpful to have strategic meetings through the year. For example, in the fall the emphasis will be on developing SLOs and data collection, at the mid-year point a follow-up meeting will focus on data collection and reporting. In late Spring 2017, a portion of a regularly scheduled faculty meeting or meetings will focus on writing Use of Results.

Project: The Basic Skills Combined Tutoring Program-Repeaters

Description: The tutoring centers of the Combined Tutoring project provide academic support services to diverse basic skills populations, including student- athletes, non-native speakers of English, and students enrolled in the EOPS/CARE/CalWORKs program. Data that have now been collected over several semesters show the positive outcomes of the project on student success rates and progression through basic skills course sequences.

Objective: Students who are repeating a basic skills class for the first or second time who receive 90 minutes or more of tutoring during a full semester (fall 2015 and spring 2016) will be less likely to have to repeat the class than repeating students who do not participate in tutoring.

Assessment: With help from Research and Institutional Effectiveness, comparative data will be gathered to assess whether tutoring participation makes it less likely for students repeating a class to have to repeat again. Repeating students who receive tutoring will have a higher success rate than those repeating the course who do not receive tutoring.

Summary of Data: Spring 2016 data (unduplicated totals) showed success increases over fall 2015 for course repeaters--Eng 67: 65.69% tutored success (spring 2016) vs. 40.69 non-tutored success (fall 2015 = 61.44% increase); math 50: 54.74% success (spring 2016) vs. 35.74% non-tutored success (fall 2015 = 53.16% increase); math 51: 49.66% tutored success (spring 2016) vs. 35.82% non-tutored success (fall 2015 = 38.63% increase). There was also a marked increase in course repeater use of tutoring in spring 2016 over fall 2015--Eng 67: 47 students (fall 2015) to 102 (spring 2016 = +55); math 50: 29 students (fall 2015) to 95 (spring 2016 = +66); math 51: 13 (fall 2015) to 145 (spring 2016 = +132). It is also of interest to note that in spring 2016 the majority of students spent 90 minutes or more in tutoring: Eng 67 (59%), math 50 (80%), and math 51 (83%). There was also an increase in use of tutoring from math 50 (26.53%) to math 51 (35.1%) among repeaters. Data on students repeating Math 50 in fall 2015 was consistent with previous semester data in showing the positive impact of tutoring for students repeating a Basic

Skills course. Repeating, tutored students had a success rate of 52%, while repeating non-tutored students had a success rate of 46%. Students repeating English 67 had an even greater chance of succeeding if they consulted with a tutor: repeating, tutored students had a success rate of 60%, while non-tutored students repeating the class had a success rate of 44%.

Use of Results: The data show a similar pattern as prior years in terms of repeating students who used tutoring succeeding in greater numbers than those who did not. Furthermore, success seemed to increase significantly in the spring semester over fall. The increase in student use of tutoring (both repeaters and non-repeaters) in spring 2016 would seem to be a step in the direction of increasing the number of Basic Skills students affected by tutoring.

Some suggested follow-ups include expanding the scope of the project to include Supplemental Instruction and Tutors in the Classroom as Basic Skills funds activities in these areas as well; including these areas would better indicate the full extent of the students reached by the project. Another follow-up could involve delving into the question of increased student use of tutoring from fall 2015 to spring 2016 and from math 50 to 51. One might speculate that this suggests repeating students in Basic Skills courses realize the importance of tutoring to their academic success. More data should be analyzed in future semesters to determine if these trends continue. Perhaps student surveys or focus groups could provide more detailed answers to these questions as well. Looking at demographics might also give a sense of how the project affects Student Equity. The tutoring centers could also work to publicize these results to faculty and counselors in order to increase campus awareness of the impact tutoring makes. The college might also consider establishing benchmarks as to what percentage of students attending tutoring is desirable to help tutoring centers better focus their efforts and gauge their effectiveness.

Project: The Basic Skills Combined Tutoring Program-Progression

Description: The tutoring centers of the Combined Tutoring project provide academic support services to diverse basic skills populations, including student- athletes, non-native speakers of English, and students enrolled in the EOPS/CARE/CalWORKs program. Data that have now been collected over several semesters show the positive outcomes of the project on student success rates and progression through basic skills course sequences.

Objective: Students attempting a basic skills class for the first time who participate in tutoring (90 minutes or more per semester) will persist (pass the first course and enroll in the next

course) at a higher rate than those who don't participate in tutoring.

Assessment: With help from Research and Institutional Effectiveness, comparative data will be gathered to assess whether tutoring participation makes it more likely for students to successfully pass their first basic skills course and enroll in the next course in the subject. Students who participate in 90 minutes or more of tutoring in a basic skills level course will be more likely to pass that course and enroll in the subsequent course in the series.

Summary of Data: Data received (unduplicated totals) looked at persistence for students in Basic Skills courses (including math 51 for the first time) from fall 2015 to spring 2016. In fall 2015, 1,211 students attempted Eng 67. In general, the tutored population persisted through winter 2016 and spring 2016 at a higher rate than the non-tutored population: winter 2016: 36% (tutored = 92) vs 25% (non-tutored); spring 2016: 65% (tutored = 167) vs. 56% (non-tutored). 937 students enrolled in math 50; in winter 2016 25% (21) of the tutored population persisted compared to 12% of the non-tutored population; in spring 2016 68% (58) of the tutored population persisted compared to 55% of the non-tutored population. In math 51, out of 1189 students attempting the course in fall 2015, 15% (17) of the tutored population persisted in winter 2016 compared to 11% of the non-tutored population. Spring 2016 shows the only reverse of the general trend: 49% (54) of the tutored math 51 population persisted compared to 53% of the non-tutored population.

Another trend of note was the higher percentage of third-course-in-the-sequence placement from fall 2015 to spring 2016 for the tutored persisters: out of the original Eng 67 cohort, 20% (51) of the tutored population was placed in Eng 1A in spring 2016 compared to 14% of the non-tutored population; for the math 50 cohort, 19% (16) of the tutored population placed in math 71 in spring 2016 compared to 7% of the non-tutored population; for the math 51 cohort, 8% (9) placed in college-level math (100+) in spring 2016 compared to 4% of the non-tutored population. However, it should be noted here that the math numbers were extremely small at this grain of detail.

It was also of interest to note that Eng 67 students took advantage of tutoring more than twice as often as math 50 and 51 students: 257 in fall 2015 compared to 95 for math 50 and 110 for math 51. This trend continued in winter and spring.

Use of Results: This second look at persistence for Eng 67 students showed similarly positive results as the previous time. The first look at math was a bit of a mixed bag: positive for math 50, somewhat less so for math 51. In any event, future data collection could help determine if trends

noted here in fact continue, especially given the low number of math participants at later stages in the progression. This study could also be linked in some way to cost-benefit considerations--specifically, how in practical terms might these trends affect the college? Looking at demographics might also give a sense of how the project affects Student Equity. We might also attempt to answer the question of why Eng 67 students seem to make use of tutoring in higher numbers than math 50 and 51 students and if any adjustments can be made to ameliorate the situation.

Project: VESL Career Paths: Tutoring & Persistence

Description: The VESL Career Paths program is offered by the ESL department as a bridge for students who are ready to transition from noncredit to credit and career pathways. It is designed with integrated curriculum that promotes communication, computer skills, and career planning. Students go through the two-semester program as a cohort, within a learning community model. The VESL tutoring program provides VESL students with assistance in completing assignments in all VESL courses as well as assistance in reviewing course materials previously taught in VESL Speaking and Writing. Students are also allowed to practice their computer literacy skills in ways that can produce an acceptable quality of academic work. Through this tutoring program, students understand that the VESL courses are aligned and integrated; they are able to utilize and practice all the skills they learn across the program, at any point in time or activity.

Objective: VESL students who utilize tutoring services provided by VESL tutoring instructors will have a higher rate of persistence and program completion in comparison to students who opt out.

Assessment: Survey - Students who are enrolled in the VESL program and utilize the VESL tutoring services will achieve one or more of the following benchmarked goals: progress from VESL 1 to VESL 2 or earn a VESL Career Paths certificate.
Criteria for Success: 80% of VESL students who utilize VESL tutoring will achieve a minimum of one benchmarked goals (progress to VESL 2 or earn a VESL certificate).

Summary of Data: Overall, 74% of students (daytime and evening cohorts) who attended 4 or more tutoring sessions during VESL 1 progressed to VESL 2; 33% of those who attended 4 or more sessions completed the VESL Career Paths Program and earned a certificate. The 74% persistence rate (VESL 1 to VESL 2) is noteworthy, although it is slightly below the criterion that 80% of VESL students who utilize tutoring will meet a minimum of one benchmark achievement (progress to VESL 2 or earn a VESL certificate).

Use of Results: VESL students who attended 4 or more tutoring sessions indicated a significantly higher persistence rate to VESL 2 than those who attended 0 to 3 sessions (74% vs. 64%). Participation in the evening tutoring sessions, however, has decreased this year due to the fact that the majority of evening students hardly have time outside the classroom to study as a result of their busy schedules balancing their jobs, family obligations, and school. At any rate, the tutoring services provided by the VESL Career Paths Program facilitate better persistence rates among students who utilize the services. It is recommended that the VESL Career Paths Program continue to offer the tutoring services and actively motivate students to utilize the services.

Project: ESL Retreat- Effective Communicators

Description: The goal of this project is to ensure that noncredit ESL students are adequately prepared for academic and career pathways upon exiting the ESL and VESL Career Paths programs. The funds are used for annual ESL and VESL retreats organized and facilitated by ESL faculty and the VESL coordinator. This project plays a critical role in streamlining the teaching and learning process by providing an opportunity for ESL faculty to collaboratively develop department-wide SLOs, practice strategies, and provide ESL learners with classroom activities and resources that promote effective communication skills that contribute to college and career success.

Objective: ESL faculty will develop lessons, practice strategies, and provide ESL learners with resources that promote critical thinking skills that contribute to college and career success.

Assessment: Course Embedded Test - ESL Level students will take the Level-specific vocabulary tests (pre and post) which examine students' vocabulary usage and critical thinking skills. Criteria for Success: ESL Level students who take the pre and post vocabulary tests will have a 5% or higher gain on their posttests.

Summary of Data: ESL students took level-specific vocabulary tests (pre and post) which ESL faculty collaboratively developed during the annual departmental retreat. The tests examined students' vocabulary usage and critical thinking skills. The students who took the pre and post vocabulary tests had a program-wide average of 23 percentage-point increase on their post-test. This well exceeded the projected outcome of a 5 percentage-point gain or higher on their post vocabulary assessment.

Use of Results: The resulting data affirms that our students are becoming effective

communicators, one of our Division Student Learning Goals (SLGs), by strengthening their English vocabulary in the daily curriculum. In addition to the pre and post vocabulary tests, students completed level-specific vocabulary knowledge self-evaluation form (pre and post). The students who completed the pre and post self- evaluation forms had the program average of 29 percentage-point gain on their post self-evaluation form.

The contributions of our dedicated ESL faculty to their students' vocabulary improvement were apparent. ESL faculty reported that they utilized a variety of teaching methods and activities in their curriculum in order to facilitate their students' vocabulary development throughout the spring semester. These activities are, but not limited to, the use of language learning software in our computer labs, online learning platforms (Weebly, Edmodo, Quizlet, and Kahoot), communicative in-class activities (conversational prompts and games), vocabulary journals and logs, supplemental reading and writing activities for target vocabulary, weekly vocabulary quizzes, reading strategies to facilitate vocabulary development, and visuals (PowerPoint and websites).

Project: Give Me 20 ESL Library Reading & Tutoring Program

Description: The Give Me 20 Reading & Tutoring Program in the ESL Department has recruited students in all classes with a brief explanation and short sign up form. Interested students fill out their forms and bring them to the ESL Department library, holding approximately 7,000 volumes of graded readers. Students commit to reading 20 minutes per day, learn new vocabulary, write a two-page book report at the end of each book, and meet one-on-one with a library instructor to review their progress. The program promotes basic reading skills through a consistent structured program which tracks students' progress and persistence. This past year (2015-2016) more students became involved in the program (1,039 vs. 969 in 2014-15) and more book reports were received than in our previous year (1,088 vs. 918 in 2014-15).

Objective: Noncredit ESL students who complete the Give Me 20 reading program (3 book reports and pre/post surveys) will gain reading skills in order to successfully complete their courses.

Assessment 1: The final course grade success rate for the students who fully participate in the Give Me 20 Program (with 3 book reports and pre/post surveys) will be compared to their classmates' final course grade success rate. Successful Give Me 20 students will show a 20% higher course success rate than a similar cohort of students who did not participate.
Criteria for Success: Successful Give Me 20 students will show a 20% higher course success rate

than a similar cohort of students who did not participate.

Summary of Data: Give Me 20 Participants had a 92.75% course success rate vs. Non-Participants who had a 65.6% success rate.

Use of Results: The overall pass rate for Give Me 20 Participants exceeded the intended outcome with a 27% higher pass rate than Non-Participants. The Give Me 20 Reading Program is effective in assisting students to gain the reading skills they need to pass their courses. It is beneficial to the ESL students to continue offering this program.

Assessment 2: Survey - Students who fully participate in the Give Me 20 Program will complete pre and post self-assessment surveys of their reading abilities. Successful Give Me 20 students will realize an overall improvement of 10% in their self- assessed reading abilities. **Criteria for Success**: Successful Give Me 20 Reading and Tutoring Program students will realize an overall improvement of 10% in their self-assessed reading abilities. Schedule: Collation of surveys will be done at the end of fall 2015.

Summary of Data: In reviewing the self-assessment surveys from the successful participants in fall 2015, we found there were large gains in reading in English daily (from 40% to 77%) as well as the amount of reading done on a daily basis. There was a large increase in their reading time of 25 minutes or more (from 61% to 91%). They definitely developed the habit of reading in English. A large majority, 96%, noted that they would like to continue doing the reading program in the future.

Use of Results: Give Me 20 students increased their reading time by 30% and increased their frequency of reading in English daily by 37%. It is beneficial to our noncredit ESL students to continue offering this program.

Project: LLC Self Directed Learning Activities for Noncredit ESL

Description: ESL students strengthen life-long learning habits as well as communication skills through tutoring for Self-Directed Learning Activities (SDLA) in the Language Learning Center. The Language Learning Center serves as a location where professors can bring classes for group work or where individual students come for independent study for their target language. ESL students, for example, frequently come in and ask what they can use to improve their grammar or their

pronunciation. The LLC staff guides them to software, media and websites that may be helpful to the learner, but then they move on to assist another student with other technology. While the dedicated and motivated students can learn in this manner, the targets of "grammar," "pronunciation," and other skills in ESL are too large to successfully determine completion of the goal. The LLC focused on the following: a) identifying noncredit ESL students' specific felt needs for them to become effective communicators in their workplace, classroom, and other areas where English is required of them; b) creating Self-Directed Learning Activities (SDLA) designed to focus on these authentic needs and personal problem areas that take advantage of software and media in the LLC; and c) providing in the lab, just-in-time tutoring for these SDLAs by a faculty member trained in Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages and experienced with technology-enhanced language learning.

Objective: Levels 3-6 Noncredit ESL students completing two or more SDLAs in the LLC with the Faculty-Tutor will have a 5 % higher class success rate as compared with a similar cohort of students not participating.

Assessment: Passing rates of Levels 3-6 noncredit ESL students completing two or more SDLAs in the LLC with the Faculty-Tutor will be compared to those not participating during spring 2015 semester.
Criteria for Success: Participants will have a 5 % higher pass rate than non-participants.

Summary of Data: 21 active participants from Levels 3 and 6 had a 100% course pass rate compared with a 91% course pass rate for their class cohorts (401 students in Levels 1-6) who did not do ESL Tutoring in the Language Learning Center in fall 2015. 16 active participants from Levels 3-6 had a 100% course pass rate compared with students not using SDLAs in Levels 3-6 with a 92% course pass rate. This represents more than a 5% higher pass rate both semesters, so criterion met.

Use of Results: Due to the successful pass rates a) We are now developing SDLAs for Pre-Level 1 - Level 2 students which will allow us greater impact. Due to the decrease in active participants Spring 2016 b) we will increase marketing efforts during 16-17.

Project: Grammar Champions: ESL Peer Mentor Project

Description: The ESL Peer Mentoring program assists struggling noncredit ESL students (low-beginning to intermediate levels) with grammar practice and troubleshooting. The students (mentees) are mentored by their peers who are recruited from advanced level ESL courses under the supervision of ESL faculty. The program provides academic assistance to mentees as well as opportunities for mentors to develop their leadership skills.

Objective: Participation in the grammar peer mentoring program will improve the success rates of struggling students in the beginning-high and intermediate ESL courses.

Assessment: Standardized Test - Students who participate in the Grammar Peer Mentoring Program will take the level-specific pre and post grammar tests in the mentoring lab.
Criteria for Success: Students who were peer mentored will have at least 5% gain on the post grammar test.

Summary of Data: Beginning-high level and intermediate level ESL students (Levels 2-4) in the Grammar Peer Mentoring Program who took both pre and post grammar tests had an average of 17.5 percentage-point gain (Level 2), 13.5 percentage-point gain (Level 3), and 22 percentage-point gain (Level 4). In addition, the course pass rates of the 124 students (mentees) during the 2015-16 academic year compared with the class pass rates without the mentees were the following: Level 2 (97% vs. 97%), Level 3 (96% vs. 95%), and Level 4 (88% vs. 94%).

Use of Results: The primary objective of the Grammar Peer Mentoring Program is to assist ESL students who are struggling in their classes in order for them to make progress and succeed. The notable percentage-point gains on the post grammar tests affirm the success of the program. Furthermore, the course pass rates of the mentees surpassing or being tied with the class pass rates without the mentees (Level 3: 96% vs. 95% and Level 2: 97% vs. 97%) indicate that the underperforming students benefit from the program. It needs to be noted, however, that the course pass rate of Level 4 mentees was lower by 6 percentage points than the class pass rate without the mentees. It is recommended that the ESL department continue to offer the program during the 2016- 17 academic year to provide struggling ESL students with supplemental academic support.

Project: Pathways to Transfer

Description: Pathways to Transfer classes offer students the community provided by a cohort, make support resources in the classroom readily available, link classes with ancillary 1-unit support classes, and reduce the number of "exit" points at which students can opt out of the sequence, therefore, increasing completion and progression rates. Supplemental Instructors (SIs) are provided in the Math courses and Tutors in the Classroom (TCs) are provided in the English courses. This resource provides significant support to students as they progress through Math and English. Faculty play a crucial role in this learning community and are required to collaborate with their SI/TC and any team instructors, if applicable. These classes are accessible to all eligible students. This project aims to significantly increase the number of students who make it through basic skills Math and English classes and become eligible to take transfer level classes and transfer.

Objective: The goal of this project is to significantly increase the percentage of students who successfully navigate their way through the math and writing sequences in preparation for college level work.

Assessment: *Student Survey* - the student survey is a tool that evaluates a student's self-reported experience in the Pathways cohort, use of tutors or supplemental instructors, grit/perseverance, demographic information, and career and major goals.
Criteria for Success: The self-reported experience in the Pathways cohort and use of tutors or supplemental instructors are the two areas that can imply a level of success. Grit/perseverance, demographic information, and career and major goals are used for context to give the Pathways team a sense of the type of students we serve. Surveys are collected at the end of each session (summer, Fall 1, Fall 2, winter, Spring 1, and Spring 2).

Criteria 1: Experience in the Pathways cohort is better than previous courses taken (Evaluation Questions I) - 100% strongly agree or agree.

Criteria 2: Use of tutors or supplemental instructors (Evaluation Questions II) - 100% use the Tutor in the Classroom (English) or the Supplemental Instructor (Math) for 3 hours or more.

Success Rates (students passing a course with a C or better)
Criteria for Success:
Criteria 3: 100% of Pathways students passing ENGL 67 - ENGL 1C

Criteria 4: 100 % of Pathways students passing LERN 49, MATH 50 - MATH 71, MATH 110, and MATH 130

Progression/Throughput Rates - Pathways students should enroll in the next level course of the cohort in the next semester.

Criteria for Success:

Criteria 5: 100% of students who pass any of the classes as the cohort progresses (excluding the last course of the cohort) will enroll in the next level course in the next semester.

Summary of Data: For the entire 2015-2016 year:

Criteria 1: Experience in the Pathways cohort is better than previous courses taken (Evaluation Questions I) - 100% strongly agree or agree.

72.73% of English students strongly agree or agree (22.22% were neutral). 69.61% of Math students strongly agree or agree (26.37 were neutral).

Criteria 2: Use of tutors or supplemental instructors (Evaluation Questions II) - 100% use the Tutor in the Classroom (English) or the Supplemental Instructor (Math) for 3 hours or more.

26.36% of English students used the tutor in the classroom for three hours or more (71.38% used the tutor for some duration of time).

25.19% of Math students used the supplemental instructor for three hours or more (67.99% used the supplemental instructor for some duration of time).

Criteria 3: 100% of Pathways students passing ENGL 67 - ENGL 1C

From summer 2015 to Spring 2016, 75.76% of Pathways students passed ENGL 67, ENGL 68, ENGL 1A, or ENGL 1C.

Criteria 4: 100 % of Pathways students passing LERN 49, MATH 50 - MATH 71, MATH 110, and MATH 130

From summer 2015 to spring 2016, 70.22 of Pathways students passed LERN 49, MATH 50, MATH 51, MATH 71, or MATH 110.

Criteria 5: 100% of students who pass any of the classes as the cohort progresses (excluding the last course of the cohort) will enroll in the next level course in the next semester.

English:

36.97% of students progressed from summer 2015 to fall 2015

21.21% of students progressed from fall 2015 session 1 to Fall 2015 session 2 there were no cohorts structured from fall 2015 to Winter 2016

48.69% of students progressed from winter 2016 to spring 2016

34.04% of students progressed from spring 2016 session 1 to spring 2016 session 2

Math:
46.25% of students progressed from summer 2015 to fall 2015
30.56% of students progressed from fall 2015 session 1 to Fall 2015 session 2 there were no cohorts structured from fall 2015 to Winter 2016
30.4% of students progressed from winter 2016 to spring 2016
20.18% of students progressed from spring 2016 session 1 to spring 2016 session 2

Use of Results: Criteria 1: English Pathways Experience: The English cohorts are not structured similarly. We need to compare the experiences of the traditional Pathways model (compressed courses) to the experiences of students in the non- compressed model only, and then compare Pathways non- compressed models to non- Pathways courses of the same model.
Math Pathways Experience: In Math there is a linked 1-unit support course (LCOM 80) in the summer or winter sessions. Most students find it difficult to connect the LCOM 80 course with their Math experience. The focus of the Pathways Program is to get students through the basic skills levels as quickly as possible while providing additional support that contributes to their success. The LCOM 80 course has a social/networking/team building component, which is not necessarily the focus of the Pathways Program. In Pathways, the community building is a byproduct of the structure, and even though the structure guides students into taking the next level course in the next semester, not all students stay in the exact cohort they started in. It is more important for students to build practical skills directly related to the Math courses they will be taking in the Pathways Program. We should consider transitioning to linked support class that can directly relate back to Math and the skills needed for Math. After consultation with the LLR Dept. Chair, STDY 85A has been determined to be a better match to help build the skills students will need to be successful in Math. Pathways will adopt this course in the next year.

Criteria 2: Use of tutors or supplemental instructors (Evaluation Questions II) - 100% use the Tutor in the Classroom (English) or the Supplemental Instructor (Math) for 3 hours or more.
English Use of Tutors: The English department has tutors in the classroom but the tutors also hold outside sessions/workshops. Questions to consider are if the faculty have sufficient training or information on how to best utilize the skills of the tutor, and does the classroom structure allow for the full potential of the tutors' skills (i.e. not enough instructional time to utilize the tutor)? Or, are students getting the needed amount of help from the tutor in class, and not all need to see the tutor for 3 hours or more outside the classroom?
Math Use of Supplemental Instructors: Supplemental Instructors are used in the Math courses and in the 1- unit support courses. Supplemental Instructors also hold study sessions outside of the classroom to provide additional support to students. Students may not realize the benefit or the additional resources available to them. It would be useful for the 1- unit support class to

allow the Supplemental Instructor to hold class time so the students know what they can expect. If the students experience this they may be more inclined to use the resource again outside of the class time.

Criteria 3: Criteria 3: 100% of Pathways students passing ENGL 67 - ENGL 1C
Higher levels of success may be affected if the Tutor in the Classroom is more effectively utilized in out-of-classroom workshops or tutor sessions. Pathways also finds high levels of success in the compressed model, but most cohorts in English are no longer compressed. More compressed cohorts should be added.

Criteria 4: 100 % of Pathways students passing LERN 49, MATH 50
- MATH 71, MATH 110, and MATH 130
Most cohorts in Math have Math 50 in summer or winter, and continue with Math 51 and Math 71 in fall or spring. This means that students are taking 9 units of Math in fall or spring, with Math 71 (5 units) ending at a critical time in the semester. To complete a fast paced Math 71 in the midst of final projects and exams is extremely challenging and may have an effect on students' ability to succeed. The structure may be more effective if Math 71 is taken alone, which would change the structure but could potentially lead to greater levels of success. Instead of summer with Math 50 and then fall with Math 51 and Math 71, we can change it to Math 50 and Math 51 in the fall, and Math 71 in the winter. Students will more likely take Math 71 by itself, rather than taking Math 71 in the fall or spring, which is when they take several additional courses

Criteria 5: 100% of students who pass any of the classes as the cohort progresses (excluding the last course of the cohort) will enroll in the next level course in the next semester.

English: The structure of the cohorts does not match the set-up of the data. Not all courses are compressed, and the current data structure is comparing the different models to each other. The data does not give an accurate picture of the progression and needs to be restructured. Each cohort may have to be surveyed individually for progression, and then this data can be compared to similar models.

Math: The data is inconclusive because our program is flexible in allowing students to switch cohorts to accommodate different time schedules. Students may not stay in their original cohort, but the overall goal of the program is to pass and progress to the next level, and not necessarily progress to the course in the original cohort they started in. The data is instead reporting the progression of the same students within the cohort. We need to check to see if these students progressed outside of their original cohort. Students also don't always know the significance of the cohort when they enroll, and by the time they register for spring they may not be prepared

for the demands of the compressed model. We can utilize more marketing strategies to communicate the demands in advance.

Project: Writing Center - Tutors in the Classroom (TC)

Description: This supplemental instruction program provides tutoring support for Basic Skills courses in AmLa and English in the form of trained, supervised tutors assigned to individual classes for the duration of the course. These tutors attend class and meet both individually and in a group setting with students. The need for such tutoring is apparent since English 67 students, for example, have overall success rates in the last two years of well under 60%. Moreover, attendance data shows that English 67 students are less likely than more advanced students to visit tutorial services on their own initiative; the Tutors in the Classroom program takes the initiative by bringing the tutors to the students rather than waiting for them to come to us. AmLa students, for their part, require intensive support since their efforts to develop basic writing skills are challenged by language acquisition issues. The goal is to improve the success and retention rates of these students and enable their progress to college level writing courses.

Objective: The Writing Center will enhance student success in English 67 through its Tutors in the Classroom program. Courses supported by a TC will have an overall success rate at least 5% higher than courses not supported by a TC. Students who have 5 or more contacts with the TC will have a success rate of 10% or more higher than the overall average for the course for all sections.

Assessment: Comparison of success rates of students participating in a TC section with overall success rates of students who are not participating in a section of 67 with either a TC or an SI. **Criteria for Success:** A differential of five percent or more for either comparison will constitute success, following the criteria offered in the RP Group's document Basic Skills as a Foundation for Student Success in California Colleges, March 2007, of a 5-10% differential constituting a successful innovation/program.

Summary of Data: In the spring of 2016, 195 students out of 555 enrolled in English 67 had a Tutor in the Classroom. The overall success rate for the course that term was 54%. The success rate for students with a Tutor in the Classroom was 60%. This is a 6% positive differential. The criterion was met.

Use of Results: The results here while meeting the criterion do not entirely satisfy our sense of the program's potential impact (based on results in years past). We deliberately added the

affective approaches of Habits of Mind to the 2016-17 TC interventions and eagerly await those results to see if they improved the program's efficacy.

Project: Writing Center – DLA Program

Description: The Directed Learning Activity involves a student working through activities online and on paper that teach a particular element of successful college writing. The student then meets with a peer tutor to review the materials and to ensure that the student understands and can apply to their own writing the concept practiced in the DLA. All current DLAs have been developed in consultation with English and AmLa faculty.

Objective: Students in English 67 or 68 who complete one DLA will have a success rate of 5% higher than the average for the respective course; students who complete two or more will have a success rate 10% or higher than the average for their respective courses.

Assessment: Student success data will be extracted from Banner by the Research and Institutional Effectiveness Office.
Criteria for Success: Students having 3 or more individual tutoring sessions will have success rates 10% higher than the average for all English 67 students not having achieved 3 tutoring sessions.

Summary of Data: In the spring of 2016, 289 students, or 52% of all students in English 67, received some kind of WC tutoring (peer or DLA) (this does not include interventions via Tutors in the Classroom). Given that six years ago, less than 10% of English 67 students were receiving tutoring, this is a very encouraging statistic. Moreover, success rates for these students was 17.9% greater than the overall average for English 67 (71.4% vs. 53.5%). In the spring of 2016, 43% of all English 68 students received some kind of WC tutoring (peer or DLA) (this does not include interventions via Tutors in the Classroom). These numbers also represent a great improvement in terms of usage from the data from six years ago, though not as dramatic as for English 67. In addition, success rates for these students were 14.7% higher than for the overall course average (72.4% vs. 57.7%). In AmLa 43W, 91 out 155 students enrolled in the spring of 2016 attended tutoring in the Writing Center (59%). It is clear that with the development of the SE supported NNES services in the Writing Center, the transition of students from AmLa tutoring to NNES tutoring in the Writing Center has been successful. These numbers show better attendance to tutoring than the combined totals for WC and AmLa faculty tutoring in the spring of 2015. Moreover, success rates have been improved over both WC and AmLa tutoring rates from

a year before as well. AmLa 43W students tutored in the WC in spring 2016 had an overall success rate of 79%, as compared to 69% for all students enrolled. DLA tutoring in both AmLa 42 and AmLa 43W had an even greater impact than tutoring as a whole. Students who completed DLAs in 43W had a success rate of 84.6% vs. an overall success rate of 69% while students who completed DLAs in 42W had a success rate of 93.8% vs. an overall success rate of 75.6%. The fact that the DLA differentials were even greater than those seen in peer tutoring comparisons reverses the usual pattern observed in English basic skills courses, in which tutoring typically has a greater impact than DLAs, unless the DLAs are structured and scaffolded within the course. Since AmLa faculty tend to use the DLAs in a very targeted, scaffolded manner and since DLAs are perfect for "drilling down" into difficult grammar issues for NNES students, these results suggest that the more thoughtfully DLAs are designed and deployed, the greater their impact upon student success. All outcome goals were met and exceeded.

Use of Results: We continue to pursue means to expand the tutoring staff to meet the demand for basic skills tutoring. We are also currently exploring DLA workshops as a means to provide more DLA support in a more timely fashion. After the return to three multiple measures, English 67 rates returned to the success rates demonstrated in the previous five years (59-65% success) and TC rates returned to showing a 5-10% positive differential over the overall course average.