PROGRAM REVIEW - Instructional Programs 2008-2009

VALIDATING COMMITTEE REPORT

RESPONSE to Self-Study Report for the **ESL** program Date: 5/19/09

Validating Committee Members (signatures required)

Liz Russell, Faculty Chair: Liz Russell

Faculty

CSEA Christin Reiny

Validation Questions

1. For the data presented in Tables 1.01A-1.01E (Demand, Success and Retention), what significant positive or negative trends did you notice which were not adequately addressed?

The document attributed the increase in enrollment in year 2007-2008 to an influx of students from Iran as well as the implementation of Saturday assessment testing in 2006-2007. The committee is curious if any data was collected to determine what percentage of the students that enrolled in 2007-2008 were from the Saturday assessment testing.

The data in Graphs and Tables 1.01A – 1.01D, show that from year 2004-2005 (the first year for which data is available) there is a downward trend culminating in year 2006-2007. The document acknowledges that enrollments in the ESL program during the report period were at its lowest in the 2006-2007, but no reasons for this trend were identified.

2. For the data presented in Tables 1.02 & 1.03 (Fill Rate & Number of Majors), what significant positive or negative trends did you notice which were not adequately addressed?

The fill rates in the program are respectable and tend to run at or slightly above the overall average for Credit classes. The document points out their higher daytime fill rate and compares it to that of other divisions. The committee suggests caution in comparing the ESL daytime rate to the "All Credit" rate in the data since the "All Credit" rate includes both daytime and evening classes and there is no comparable daytime "All Credit" rate available.

3. The GCC SLO timeline requires that SLOs be written for all courses and at least one assessment cycle (assessment completed and analyzed) is to be completed in Fall 2008.

   a. Indicate the program's SLOAC progress with the timeline:

   ____ The program has not met the timeline.

____ The program has met the timeline.
__X__ SLO progress exceeds the timeline.

4. How is the program responding to the data presented in Table 3.01 (Efficiency WSCH per FTEF)?

The document states that the ESL efficiency rating is above the average; however, this isn't supported by the data in Table 3.01 (Efficiency (WSCH per FTEF)). In each of the years covered in the data, the ESL WSCH Per FTEF is significantly below the Credit WSCH Per FTEF. It is worthy to note however, that in the last year of the data (2007-2008) the ESL rate increased and came closer to the overall credit rate.

In discussing the efficiency rating, the document highlights the lower cap in writing classes (27 for day and 30 for night). The committee queried why the caps were different for day and night classes and it was attributed to slightly higher drop rates in the night classes.

5. Comment on the program's responses to Sections 4.01 & 4.02 (FTEF and FT/PT Ratio) and how the responses support the Resource Needs stated in Section 5.

The document highlights that the ESL FT/PT Ratio continues to lag behind the average for all credit programs. A strong argument is made for an additional Full – Time faculty member. It would be desirable to include an analysis of the effect of an additional FT faculty member in the event of fluctuations in enrollment due to shifts in the demographics of the community.

6. Section 5: Resource Needs List each resource need described in the report under "Brief Description. Compute numbers for **DATA + SLOAC** and total them in the next column.

DATA support will be rated from 0-3 regarding how well the report data supports the specific resource requested.

0 = Not Supported
1 = Somewhat supported
2 = Supported
3 = Strongly supported

SLOAC support will be rated from 0-3, but (this year only) will be based on the program's general progress with the SLOAC process, completing the assessment, analysis and plan least one assessment for improvement.

0 = Only 1 written SLO or less
1 = At least 1 SLO & assessment
2 = More than 1 assessment comp
3 = Completion of 1 cycle or more

Please give a brief reason for your scores under "Rationale for Decision"

Resource Need	**Brief Description**	**Supported by:**		**Rationale for Decision**
		DATA + SLOAC	**TOTAL**	
FT Faculty	1 Full Time Faculty	3 + 3	6	Low FT/PT ratio over entire time period of report.

Staff	1 ESL lab staff 1 proposed writing lab staff	0 + 3	3	Although the committee accepts the argument for the staff member for the existing lab, the low score is attributed to concerns regarding the proposed writing lab. These concerns are twofold: 1) the committee has reservations regarding the need for an additional lab to meet the writing needs and 2) if such a lab were to be created, the committee does not see how one staff member would be sufficient to provide enough lab hours to adequately serve the needs of both day and night students.
Facilities/space	Larger classrooms? Larger reception area? Larger ESL lab New writing lab	1 + 3	4	The document argues that some classrooms are too small, but no solution is proposed. The document argues that the division reception area is too small, but no solution is proposed. Regarding expansion to the existing lab, the document does not address the need to expand the facilities: are people currently being turned away? Would a larger lab generate enough money to be cost effective? Regarding the new writing lab, the committee is unconvinced that creating a new lab is warranted.
Equipment	5 computers for faculty Computers for ESL and writing labs.	2 + 3	5	The need for Faculty computers may already be addressed. As for the equipment needed for the ESL and Writing Labs, please see rationales for Staff and Facilities.
Technology	Upgrade remaining 7 classrooms to level 3	2 + 3	5	Although the committee has some concerns [Are the classrooms adequately secure? Do all sections of all classes require level 3 technology?] since the plan implements this request at 2 classrooms per year, the committee feels this is

				not unreasonable. This resource need may be mitigated by a recent decision to upgrade several classrooms in CR,SF,AU,AD and VGT to Level 3.
Software	ESL lab software Writing lab software	1 + 3	4	The committee would like more details regarding the software needs. Again, the uncertainty of the need for a new writing lab influences the ranking.
Other	Supplies Travel	2 + 3	5	Conferences, such as CATESOL, are needed for faculty enrichment.

7. Section 6.01 (Planning Assessment) Did the program adequately reflect on their past plans, and any program improvement that resulted from those plans?

Yes.

8. Section 6.02 –Educational Plan
   a. How valid is the plan given the data?
   b. Comment on the plan, especially with regard to resource needs.

a. The committee has significant concerns regarding the justification for various components of the plan. The plan wishes to upgrade classrooms to Level 3. At a rate of 2 classrooms per year, this is not an unreasonable request; however, nowhere is data presented validating the need for **all** classrooms to be updated to Level 3 as mentioned under resource needs. This resource need may be mitigated by a recent decision to upgrade 15 on-campus classrooms to a level 3. The committee feels insufficient data is presented regarding the expansion of the existing ELS lab. No statistics are available showing current student usage and projected usage needs. No argument is made to justify the expansion of the existing lab. The creation of a new ESL Writing Lab is presented as part of the plan. However, again, there is insufficient data or statistical support to show the need for this lab. Please see comments regarding this in the response to the next question. The committee would like to note that since the implementation of the proposed new Writing Lab does not take place until the second year of the plan; perhaps investigation, justification and planning is intended for year one of the plan – if so, it needs to be mentioned in the plan. It is difficult for the committee to understand the request for additional staffing in the lab when data regarding current staffing and possible deficiencies is not available.

b. The committee has major concerns and questions regarding the resources to support the plan.

While the committee believes that classroom needs are justified, it is unclear what is intended by “Replace classroom”. Is the program seeking to remodel the existing classrooms to increase the size or wishing to trade for larger rooms?

This has an impact on the resources required.

The committee has questions regarding the technical assistance required in the existing ESL Lab and the proposed new writing lab. The document does not address how current technical needs are met, not does it comment on how the technical needs of an expanded lab and new lab would be satisfied. Year 1 of the plan includes purchasing additional computers for the existing ESL lab; year 2 includes purchasing computers for the proposed writing lab; yet no specific number of computers is mentioned in either place. Who will be responsible for the technical support of these computers?

9. Summarize the committee’s overall view of the document.

The document was clearly written and easy to read.

The data presented in the first section of the document highlights the health of the program.

The committee regrets the lack of statistical support in the document and feels this could provide justification for what the program proposes. As an example, in Section 5 number 5 it is desired to upgrade all Credit ESL classrooms to level 3 technology. There is no data to support this need. Have instructors been surveyed as to their wish to use this technology? What percentage of current classes have instructors desiring to utilize Level 3 capabilities but are unable to do so? Are any instructors using laptops, thus alleviating the need for Level 3 capabilities? Have security issues been adequately addressed?

Another example is the lack of statistical support for expanding the existing lab and creating a new writing lab. Creating a new lab is an ambitious project. This lab is put forward as the solution to address a student weakness brought to light through the SLO process. The committee commends the use of SLO’s to identify this student weakness and acknowledges completing the SLO loop in seeking to remediate this weakness; however, no data is presented that a Writing Lab has been proven successful in addressing the identified weaknesses. Given that the activities envisioned would in fact work toward correcting the weakness, the particular activities of the proposed Writing Lab are not specifically mentioned. The committee infers that students would be utilizing software on the computers to practice their writing skills. If this is the case, then could this be accomplished in existing lab facilities, or perhaps be accommodated in the existing ESL lab facility? The committee feels that a more thorough investigation of options should be undertaken. There is also a lack of detailed information regarding the proposed lab.

The committee wishes that proposals contained more details in order to get a better understanding of what is intended. As an example, under Section 5: Resource Needs, number 3 Facilities/space needs, the documents lists concerns regarding the size and quality of some of their classrooms. However, no solution is proposed. It also notes that the reception area for the

Division Office is inadequate; again, no solution is suggested. It is unclear what is being requested.

The committee is concerned that due to the lack of data and details there may be issues that we are unable to identify and address.

10. Based on the document, please comment upon this program.

Credit ESL is a strong and healthy program as evidenced by the data at the beginning of the document. Credit ESL exhibits good success rates and excellent retention rates; both are well above the All Credit college average. The program has healthy fill rates at or above the All Credit average.

The Credit ESL program works to respond to student needs as demonstrated by the development of hybrid classes and coordination with non-credit ESL.

The program is ahead of the timeline regarding the development and implementation of SLO's. The committee commends the program's usage of SLO's to identify student weaknesses and taking action to address them. The committee encourages the program to investigate alternate funding sources (such as Basic Skills grants) to allow implementation of various projects during this fiscally challenging period.

Study Manager: Kathy Flynn, x5510, kflynn@glendale.edu

I have reviewed this report _____ Date 07/22/09

Study Manager's Comments (optional):