Program Review and Analysis

Part I   Outcomes

1. **What are the Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) and Institutional-Level Outcomes ("Core Four") of the program? List each along with descriptions of the appropriate indicators of program success (i.e., measures of outcomes). Include both quantitative and qualitative measures.**

Outcome(s)	Qualitative Measure(s)	Quantitative Measure(s)
◊ Participate and succeed in 300-level English courses and other courses with the "SCC minimum English" advisory.	◊ Anecdotal evidence from colleagues teaching 300-level courses and labs; ◊ student self-reports on progress	◊ Pass rates of students entering 300-level courses from the ESL program ◊ Data to indicate whether ESL students progress through the developmental English course sequence at rates comparable to other groups
◊ Determine the next steps to pursue mainstream programs and use student support services such as counseling, financial aid, and job placement.		◊ Data from student services tracking use of their services by ESL students ◊ Survey of students in level 1 ESL classes to assess their knowledge of the next steps toward their education and career goals
◊ Choose the appropriate language for specific situations in the classroom and in the community.	◊ Anecdotal evidence from colleagues teaching 300-level courses and labs	◊ Quality of academic work, as determined by grades in mainstream courses
I. a b c d		◊ Pass rates of students entering 300-level courses from the ESL program ◊ Data to indicate whether ESL students progress through the developmental English course sequence at rates comparable to other groups
II. a	◊ Instructor observation of students' abilities to apply previously-studied material in new situations both within and between courses	
III. b	◊ Instructor observation of students' abilities to interact in mixed-cultural groups	
IV. a, c		◊ Data to indicate whether ESL students progress beyond the ESL program to complete other longer-term goals ◊ Students' performance in course grade segments focused on completeness and timeliness of work

The specific SCC Strategic Direction and Goal(s) supported by this program:

Strategic Goals: 1.1, 1.2, 1.3; 2.1

Part II   Analysis

Enrollment and Fill Rate:

Before proceeding with any analysis of the data provided, we must comment on inaccuracies in the data collection process. It has come to our attention that for the period of Fall 05-Spring 08, all sections of English 350 were included in the number of sections and enrollments of the ESL program. Though the course title of English 350 indicates it is a course for ESL students, these courses were cross-listed with English 355 and were not taught by ESL teachers. Furthermore, during the period in question, we are aware that counseling and DSP were using the 350 course number to enroll special needs students to allow them to repeat the level for credit (350 students can get credit for the class but repeat it as 355 if they don't pass the CME). Thus, we feel it is inappropriate to include these sections and their enrollments as part of our program in the period indicated. Since Fall 2008 there has been a stand-alone section of 350 taught by an ESL instructor and exclusively populated by ESL students. These sections could well be included in our program data, but sadly are NOT because Fall 08 is when 350 stopped being coded as an ESL course in the data collection process.

From Fall 05-Spring 08, the program review data report 13-16 sections per semester, but there were really only 5-8 sections of ESL per semester, excluding the English 350 sections on the grounds described above. The total enrollments of the English 350 sections for that period averaged approx. 20 students per semester, with between 1-5 350 students enrolled in any cross-listed section of 350 / 355. These cross-listed sections are shown *twice* on the program review data with a 25-student fill potential for 350 and again for 355. Yet in no case was 350 ever expected to fill to 25; most students in each section were 355 students. In the semesters where 350s were counted as ESL, accounting for close to half our sections, these numbers significantly skew the data for % fill in ESL courses. When the English 350 sections stopped being counted as ESL in 2008, the fill rates leapt from percentages in the 40s and 50s to percentages in the 70s and 80s.

Our enrollments have changed little over the past years, with the exception of a 20% decline in 2007-08. As discussed in the last program review, this decline may reflect the fact that these students, who are often on the edge of the economy and the culture, are harbingers of economic downturn, foregoing education for more work hours. Our enrollment data show an additional decline of 11% in 2008-09; however, this was the year English 350 enrollments no longer were counted as ESL, and the consequent loss of approximately 20 students per semester completely accounts for this change.

While our enrollments have remained relatively stable overall, we're struggling with our offerings at the Vacaville and Vallejo Centers. Though we have continued to offer courses at one or both centers each semester, they cancel again and again due to poor enrollments. Possible reasons include: students choosing to attend colleges in other districts they're more familiar with or confident in (Contra Costa, Napa, Los Rios); lack of serious or targeted marketing to ESL populations in those communities; lack of evening bus service to the sites (Vacaville, at least).

Retention

Our lowest retention over the 5-year period under analysis was 85% in 2007-08. Our retention averages 90% over the past 5 years, 10% higher than the averages across the Humanities Division. We attribute this high retention to the fact that when ESL students are correctly placed in ESL classes, they stay because they feel they are accomplishing their goals and need what we offer.

Other Factors

As discussed in our Program Review of 2008, the line between ESL and English classes remains a blurred one. Students decide for themselves whether to take the ESL or English assessment when entering the college, and a number of students who could benefit from ESL instruction go directly into English 305 or 350/355 as the result of choosing the English assessment. Though the institution of the stand-alone 350 has mitigated this somewhat by giving students an "ESL" class within the English sequence, there remains a real lack of clarity about which students should take 350 and which ones would be better served by starting in advanced ESL courses before moving to 350 and beyond. Anecdotally, the student populations in English 350 and ESL 6 have very similar ranges of preparation. Students who are recent immigrants tend to enter the ESL program, whereas longer-term residents and "Generation 1.5" learners tend to place themselves in English.

Outcome Data

We had no Program Learning Outcomes prior to this writing, hence we have nothing to analyze or report in this area till the next review cycle.

How do the above trends relate to the factors and outcomes identified during the last review?

The above trends show that we have stable enrollments and above-average retention, suggesting that students are satisfied with our program and feel they are improving their English.

Our more recently-created outcomes (as of this writing) pertain to students' success in other courses upon leaving our program. We have been asking the Office of Research for data tracking our students' trajectories into and through developmental reading & composition since at least Fall '08, but these data were unavailable due to Banner implementation. Within just the past few weeks, we have become aware of data collection and analysis efforts in the Basic Skills initiative and through the newly-formed Office of Student Success which may finally shed light on our students' performance beyond ESL. Additionally, the statewide CB21 re-coding, which we participated in in Spring 2010, should soon yield information about how long it takes our students to reach transfer-level courses, how many attempt to do so, and how our success rates compare with those in other colleges.

Part III   Conclusions and Recommendations

1. **What are the major accomplishments of the program during the past four years?**

   ◊ Our department secured a campus mini-grant in Fall 2008 to modernize our lab with new computers, allowing us to upload the listening materials for all but one of our lab texts onto the hard drives of the machines. We got new computers again in Fall 2009 as part of the overall lab remodel. Though we still keep a small number of the old tape players for use with a couple of old-edition texts because we find those texts to be the best matches to certain students' abilities, most students of the current generation find the computer interface for the listening materials more intuitive and efficient than the cassette players. Additionally, newer versions of some texts no longer offer the option of purchasing tapes, so we needed to update to use CDs. Finally, having our lab equipped with computers allows students to type their written work if they choose to, gaining keyboarding skills along with their English practice.

◊ Since Fall '08 we have offered a stand-alone section of English 350, taught by ESL faculty. This change realizes the promise of the course's title: Reading and Writing Skills for ESL students. Since its inception the course has enjoyed high completion rates, with an average of 80% completing the class and lab and earning a grade of CR for the class. CME pass rates to move students to English 370 have approached or matched those of English 355 classes, with and75% advancing in Fall 2009 (compared to a range from 61%-95% in 355 sections) but only 38% of students advancing in Spring 2010 (compared to a range of 38%-68% in the 355 classes).

◊ Since Fall 2009 we have made it a program goal to network with the ESL faculty in our local Adult Schools, with the goal of identifying ways for students to transition from Adult Ed. programs to the college to continue their studies. We have hosted two meetings, one in April and one in October of this year, where we have exchanged information about our respective students, programs, and levels. In addition, one of our instructors attended the Fairfield / Suisun ESL program year-end completion ceremony in May, to speak a few words about our program and encourage students to consider the College in their future plans. The adult school faculty have been very receptive to working with us, and at our October meeting we set up dates over the next three months to visit each of their sites and present to their advanced-level classes. One teacher also invited us to come speak to her ESL students in a local high school where she teaches as well. We are excited about these budding partnerships and hope to see a greater proportion of our students coming from the adult schools over time.

◊ In 2007-2008 we developed 2 new courses for Health Professionals, ESL 100 and 101, but offered them without success. We know there is a need in our community for health-related VESL courses because health occupations attract a large number of non-native English speakers, so we are unsure why our offerings have had low enrollments, but feel it may be due to lack of advertising. However, we see a new possibility for filling these courses by partnering with the nursing program, which has recently begun offering two high-demand courses in sections specifically for foreign-trained nurses trying to re-certify to work in the U.S. We have begun conversation with the nursing program, and believe one or both of these courses will become pre-requisites for their international cohorts in the 2011-12 year. Additionally, we are working on a third course with direct input from the nursing dean.

◊ In Spring 2010, we completed a hiring cycle to add two well-qualified adjunct faculty to our ESL pool. Each of these instructors was scheduled to teach one course in fall 2010, but our offering at the Vallejo Center cancelled yet again. Both are scheduled to teach again in Spring 2011; we hope the section scheduled in Vacaville will be marketed in order to gain sufficient enrollment to run. We know that to expand our offerings to the centers, we need an active adjunct pool, and we know that to keep adjuncts active, we need to ensure their classes run regularly.

2. **Based on the analysis above, are there any changes needed in order to meet program goals or to improve program effectiveness? Explain.**

Our greatest challenge indicated in the above analysis has been the persistent failure to fill courses offered at the satellite centers. We feel it is the responsibility of the college administration, especially the Center Directors, to research the interests of their local populations and to select, schedule, and market courses accordingly to meet those needs. We hope that we will see these types of support grow in the coming semesters.

The question of how to place students accurately in the ESL or English program is a sensitive one, and one that requires more exploration into the current assessment mechanisms as well as more examination of students' and counselors' perceptions of the two programs. We need to meet with the new Assessment Specialist to discuss this. Additionally, we are in the process of developing an ESL web page which will include full course descriptions and sample videos addressing the instructional targets and outcomes of each course. These materials may allow future students to self-assess more accurately, and to understand the value of ESL instruction and the range of students our program serves.