NARRATIVE RESPONSE:

What specific steps is your college taking to institutionalize your basic skills funded programs and projects?

From the beginning of the Basic Skills Initiative (BSI) in 2006 through our current iteration of the BSI action plan in 2015, Los Angeles Valley College has expanded upon and institutionalized seven major initiatives (detailed below). The specific steps include data analysis of measurable outcomes performed on an annual basis and integration and leveraging of specially funded programs through our grants committee and shared governance structure. This fosters dialogue and collaboration as our Foundational Skills Committee feeds into College's larger Student Success Committee, which is a clearinghouse for 3SP and Equity as well. Through these steps the College maintains an ongoing effort to ensure that our shared mission of increasing student success and completion remains an institutional priority.

What are the obstacles to doing so?

As noted in last year's report, the primary obstacle related to institutionalization of BSI funded activities has been the college's budget deficit, which in turn had impacted staffing in all areas of the College including tutoring, research and planning, and classified staff. However, for the first time in over five years, the College ended the fiscal year without a deficit. Furthermore, leveraging of 3SP and Equity funds has allowed for hiring of additional staffing in the aforementioned areas.

What projects and programs have you been able to successfully expand from a small program to a larger and more comprehensive program within your college? (Please list the projects/programs):

1. Accelerated Math Sequence
2. Tutoring/Embedded Tutoring
3. Jamboree/Welcome Fair
4. PACT/START
5. Intrusive/Embedded Counseling
6. Accelerated English Sequence
7. Assessment/Placement Test Reform

How were you able to successfully accomplish the process of expanding or " scaling up" these successful projects and programs? (Please provide descriptions for each project/program).

Expanding and scaling up successful programs requires making data driven decisions within a shared governance framework that fosters collaboration, innovation, and an institutional commitment to student success. Los Angeles Valley College, one of the pilot schools for the State's initial Basic Skills Initiative (BSI) self-assessment inventory in 2006, has continued to use BSI planning and funding to build the framework for many of the campus's student success initiatives. Using extensive data and with the spirit of piloting innovative programs, the College launched a number of initiatives and evaluated their effectiveness. As the College received additional funds through grants and categorical programs, these BSI projects were integrated into the plans of these new initiatives with the focus of scaling up and institutionalization. For example, with BSI planning and funds, the College piloted an accelerated math pathway (including curriculum redesign). This initiative was then integrated into the College's Title 5 STEM grant, scaled up, and the accelerated math pathway has been institutionalized. Another prime example is tutoring. Data has shown that students who used the tutoring centers in 2014-2105 succeeded at approximately 14% higher and were retained at 5% higher than those who did not. The LACCD/LAVC Fall 2014 student survey identified 95% satisfied with campus's tutoring centers. With BSI funds, we have expanded tutoring hours to include additional evening and weekend hours to accommodate student needs in basic skills English and math courses. We have developed a new comprehensive tutor-training program that will be accredited by the College Reading Learning Association (CRLA). One component of the training includes strategies for incorporating essential academic skills into tutoring. Providing training on this topic has been successful in raising the awareness of the tutorial staff about the importance of addressing these areas within the context of tutoring content. Communicating the importance of students adopting these same essential academic skills is also being infused into the classroom with Math 110. This will allow us to scale up an intervention with targeted outreach to all students in basic skills math and in the future English courses as well.

Also through the BSI, the College piloted the Student Success Jamboree, a program to welcome new students and provide workshops on success strategies prior to the new semester; the Pathways Academy for Completion and Transfer (PACT), a program aimed at enrolling students in math/English courses their first two semesters along with discipline specific courses related to their majors. The Student Success Jamboree evolved into the College's Welcome Fair program, and the concept behind the PACT program evolved into the College's START program. Both of these programs have been institutionalized. Another BSI funded project of note is intrusive/embedded Counseling, an intervention that was part of the College's BSI action plan since the beginning. With a dedicated counselor housed within the tutoring centers and making classroom presentations to basics skills math and English courses, we have provided targeted, accessible advisement to students in the basic skills sequence. Beginning in fall 2015, these activities have been folded into the College's general Counseling Office, another mark of a BSI activity that has been institutionalized. A long-standing BSI activity has been assessment/placement test reform, where the College has continued to work toward improving the accuracy of the placement process. Over the years, we have developed videos, materials, and a website to help inform and prepare students for the placement test, while slowly moving toward adopting more rigorous multiple. As we approach the Spring 2016 testing cycle, we are excited to report that our 3SP plan will

continue this work through our College's participation in the statewide multiple measures project. We will also continuing to work on an accelerated English pathway offering an additional accelerated course (English 99) in Fall 2016. The College's first iteration of accelerated English, which started with BSI funds, has already been institutionalized. This next phase will work to further streamline the basic skills pathway for English and ESL, removing possible exit points, and increasing the number of students who make it to college level English.

How are you integrating your basic skills efforts with your college's SSSP and Equity plans?

Our basic skills fund supports the goals of SSSP plans and Student Equity plans by having fostered a culture that is engaged in data analysis, which has already served as a starting point for identifying areas of focus, baseline measures, and longer term planning. Basic Skills Committee members also serve on the shared governance committees for SSP and Equity, which helps to coordinate efforts across multiple plans. Furthermore, in the fall semester 2015, the College will host a retreat to further align goals and activities between the three plans to avoid duplication and ensure that the plans are complementing each other and the needs of students at the College. As in the past, BSI funding has provided a space for exploring innovative best practices, piloting programs, and then when successful, working to institutionalize with other college initiatives to leverage resources.

5) To what extent did your college's basic skills program demonstrate more progress in 2013-2015 than in 2011-2013?

Explain your answer for each discipline of English, ESL and mathematics separately. Include quantitative results in the narrative.

English-Writing Discipline

The Basic Skills Cohort Tracker tool and Z test demonstrate that the College's general basic skills sequence showed a decrease in success moving from 71% in 2011-2013 to 67% in 2013 to 2015. However, the accelerated basic skills English pathway continues to show promise when compared to the traditional pathway even when looked at within one year increments. For example, from Fall 2014-Summer 2015, the accelerated pathway (two levels below) showed four times the rate of successful completion of the basic skills sequence (25%) compared to the traditional pathway (three levels below at 6%). With improved accuracy of placement through our participation in the statewide multiple measures project and the introduction of our next accelerated English pathway in Fall 2016—a pathway that condenses what was previously two levels below transfer to one level below transfer—we expect to see an increase in success and completion. Also, we know that students who use the College's Writing Center succeed up to 14% higher than those who don't (see Appendix A). Now with the expanded access of tutoring, embedded tutoring in accelerated courses, and a focus on high impact practices to increase persistence, we expect to see more students using this Center and benefitting from its service. When disaggregating our most recent data (Spring 2013-Summer 2014) for English and looking at courses two levels below, we see the age group of 35-54 with the lowest success rate at 10%, Hispanic Males at 35% (the lowest excluding "multiple ethnicities" at 14%), and females at 18% compared to males at 24% (See Appendix B). Through our Equity plan, the College is working to address these gaps with specialized programs and cohorts to support Hispanic students

English-Reading Discipline

The Basic Skills Cohort Tracker tool and Z test demonstrate that the College's basic skills sequence for English Reading shows a decrease in success moving from 76% in 2011-2013 to 75% in 2013 to 2015; however, the Z test score of .25 did not indicate that this was significant. When disaggregating our most recent data (Spring 2013-Summer 2014) for English Reading and looking at courses three levels below, we see the age group of under 20 with the lowest success rate at 5%, Hispanics at 5%, and females at 7% compared to males at 10% (See Appendix B). The College is excited that our Developmental Communication Department (the area responsible for reading) was able to hire a full time faculty member beginning in Fall 2015 to coordinate the Reading Lab, which will provide more access to students. And moving forward, as indicated in this year's action plan, the College will be working to revise a recommended pathway to students enrolled in basic skills English and/or Math courses. This will help to create a clear understanding of how non degree applicable courses in the Developmental Communication, Communication (ESSL), and Learning Skills areas can complement basic skill students who are pursuing degree/certificates.

Mathematics-Discipline

The Basic Skills Cohort Tracker tool and Z test demonstrate that the College's general basic skills sequence for Mathematics showed an increase in success moving from 54% in 2011-2013 to 56% in 2013 to 2015. Furthermore, for Fall 2013-Summer 2015, the accelerated math sequence (three levels below) showed four times the rate of successful completion of the basic skills sequence (22%) compared to the traditional pathway (four levels below at 5%). Also, we know that students who use the College's Math Center succeed up to 14% higher than those who don't (see Appendix A). Now with the expanded access of tutoring, embedded tutoring in accelerated courses, improved accuracy of placement through our participation in the statewide multiple measures project, and a focus on high impact practices such as a embedded essential academic skills and a common final in lowest level of math, we expect to see an increase in success and completion. When disaggregating our most recent data (Spring 2013-Summer 2014) for Math and looking at courses three levels below, we see the age group of 35-54 with the lowest success rate at 3%, Hispanic Males at 5% (the lowest excluding "multiple ethnicities" at 14%), and males at 7% compared to females at 8% (See Appendix B). Through our Equity plan, the College is working to address these gaps with specialized programs and cohorts to support Hispanic students.

ESL-Integrated Discipline

The Basic Skills Cohort Tracker tool and z test demonstrate that the College's general basic skills sequence for ESL Integrated shows a decrease in success moving from 83% in 2011-2013 to 81% in 2013 to 2015; however, the z test score of 1.36 did not indicate that this was significant. Of greater concern, is the long pathway for the College's credit Basic ESL program, which feeds into English 101. The current model has six courses below college level, and with so many possible exits points between classes, we see 11% of students completing the ESL basic skills sequence and zero students completing transfer level English for the Fall 2011-Fall 2014 cohort. To address this issue, the College has formed a faculty inquiry group through our Equity Committee charged with the following (See appendix C for more information):

- Review existing NC and CR course outlines for overlap/duplication
- Align highest level of NC ESL to transition into lowest level of CR ESL
- Reconsider how many courses need to be in each program in consideration of California Acceleration Project's (CAP) work on attrition and long pathways
- Propose how many courses should be in NC ESL Pathway and Credit ESL Pathway

When disaggregating our most recent data (Fall 2012-Fall 2014 for ESL Integrated and looking at courses three levels below, we see the age group of 25-34 with the lowest success rate at 5%, whites (possibly Armenian/Russian) at 2%, and males at 7% compared to females at 2% (See Appendix B). Through our Equity plan, the College is

working to address these gaps with specialized programs and cohorts to support ESL students.

Appendix A

Success Rate by Tutorial Services[i], Fall 2014, LAVC

Biology Tutorial Services Vs. Success Rate in Anatomy Biology, and Respiratory -therapy courses

Attended Biology Tut Center	ANATOMY			BIOLOGY			RESP TH			ALL		
	Total	Success #	Success %	Total	Success #	Success %	Total	Success #	Success %	Total	Success #	Success %
No	175	94	54%	824	601	73%	178	120	67%	1177	815	69%
Yes	111	77	69%	51	37	73%	38	29	76%	200	143	72%

Source: OIE, LAVC 2014

Math Tutorial Services Vs. Success Rate in Math Courses

Tutorial Center Attended	Total	Success #	Success %
Math-LARC-226	1100	698	63%
Transfer Math Lab	307	233	76%
Didn't Attend any of the Centers	3779	1853	49%

Source: OIE, LAVC 2014

Speech, Writing, and General Tutoring Services Vs. Communication, Developmental Communication, and English Courses

Center	COMM			DEV COM			ENGLISH		
	Total	Success #	Success %	Total	Success #	Success %	Total	Success #	Success %
General Tutoring	29	23	79%	18	17	94%	100	82	82%
Speech	1350	1227	91%	134	100	75%	426	360	85%
Writing Center	140	120	86%	29	25	86%	425	353	83%
Didn't Attend any of the Centers	1491	1049	70%	304	219	72%	3552	2418	68%

Appendix B: Disaggregated Student Data

English Writing										
		Fall 2011 Cohort: English (Fall 2011 to Fall 2013)			Fall 2012 Cohort: English (Fall 2012 to Fall 2014)			Spring 2013 Cohort: English (Spring 2013 to Spring 2015 2013)		
	Placement	Attempt	Success	%	Attempt	Success	%	Attempt	Success	%
	1 Level Below	**94**	**70**	**74%**	**262**	**113**	**43%**	**90**	**31**	**34%**
	20 - 24	40	32	80%	85	38	45%	38	13	34%
	25 - 34	14	9	64%	17	3	18%	16	4	25%
	35 - 54	2	1	50%	5	2	40%	2		0%
Age	55 and Above				1		0%			
	Under 20	38	28	74%	154	70	45%	34	14	41%
	2 Level Below	**154**	**52**	**34%**	**306**	**55**	**18%**	**111**	**23**	**21%**
	20 - 24	71	23	32%	107	15	14%	47	11	23%
Group	25 - 34	9	2	22%	21	2	10%	19	4	21%
	35 - 54	1		0%	14	5	36%	10	1	10%
	55 and Above							1		0%
	Under 20	73	27	37%	164	33	20%	34	7	21%
	Grand Total	**248**	**122**	**49%**	**568**	**168**	**30%**	**201**	**54**	**27%**
	1 Level Below	**94**	**70**	**74%**	**262**	**113**	**43%**	**90**	**31**	**34%**
	American Indian/Other Non-White									
	Asian/Pacific Islander	12	11	92%	40	23	58%	4	1	25%
	Black, African-America	2	1	50%	20	7	35%	7	3	43%
	Caucasian, White	38	29	76%	61	31	51%	20	7	35%
Ethnic	Hispanic	32	20	63%	109	43	39%	41	13	32%
	Multiple Ethnicities	7	6	86%	32	9	28%	7	1	14%
	Unknown	3	3	100%				11	6	55%
	2 Level Below	**154**	**52**	**34%**	**306**	**55**	**18%**	**111**	**23**	**21%**
	American Indian/Other	1		0%						
	Asian/Pacific Islander	17	8	47%	28	7	25%	12		0%
	Black, African-America	16	4	25%	13	2	15%	10	3	30%
Group	Caucasian, White	23	7	30%	37	7	19%	23	6	26%
	Hispanic	78	26	33%	185	29	16%	43	10	23%
	Multiple Ethnicities	10	4	40%	28	8	29%	9	1	11%
	Unknown	9	3	33%	15	2	13%	14	3	21%
	Grand Total	**248**	**122**	**49%**	**568**	**168**	**30%**	**201**	**54**	**27%**
	1 Level Below	**94**	**70**	**74%**	**262**	**113**	**43%**	**90**	**31**	**34%**
	F	50	35	70%	132	57	43%	52	18	35%
	M	44	35	80%	130	56	43%	38	13	34%
	2 Level Below	**154**	**52**	**34%**	**306**	**55**	**18%**	**111**	**23**	**21%**
Sex	F	80	33	41%	167	25	15%	65	12	18%
	M	74	19	26%	139	30	22%	46	11	24%
	Grand Total	**248**	**122**	**49%**	**568**	**168**	**30%**	**201**	**54**	**27%**

Developmenal Communication: Reading

	Placement	all 2011 Cohort: English-Readin (Fall 2011 to Fall 2013)			all 2012 Cohort: English Readir (Fall 2012 to Fall 2014)			pring 2013 Cohort: English Readi (Spring 2013 to Spring 2015 2013)		
		Attempt	Success	%	Attempt	Success	%	Attempt	Success	%
	2 Level Below	**963**	**379**	39%	**767**	**139**	18%	**1021**	**276**	27%
	20 - 24	270	81	30%	170	18	11%	388	85	22%
	25 - 34	79	33	42%	66	11	17%	150	32	21%
	35 - 54	31	13	42%	45	5	11%	86	25	29%
A	55 and Above	3		0%	6	1	17%	9	1	11%
g	Under 20	580	252	43%	480	104	22%	388	133	34%
e	**3 Level Below**	**203**	**34**	17%	**594**	**59**	10%	**185**	**16**	9%
	20 - 24	76	13	17%	198	16	8%	68	5	7%
G	25 - 34	20	2	10%	20	2	10%	54	8	15%
r	35 - 54	30	4	13%	41	6	15%	35	2	6%
o	55 and Above	6	1	17%	6		0%	9		0%
u	Under 20	71	14	20%	329	35	11%	19	1	5%
p	**Grand Total**	**1166**	**413**	35%	**1879**	**396**	21%	**1206**	**292**	24%
	2 Level Below	**960**	**379**	39%	**767**	**139**	18%	**1024**	**276**	27%
	American Indian/Other Non-White									
	Asian/Pacific Islander	84	40	48%	73	12	16%	65	21	32%
	Black, African-America	38	15	39%	54	4	7%	80	16	20%
	Caucasian, White	246	117	48%	199	52	26%	247	77	31%
E	Hispanic	467	165	35%	346	49	14%	489	118	24%
t	Multiple Ethnicities	67	19	28%	71	18	25%	66	21	32%
h	Unknown	58	23	40%	24	4	17%	77	23	30%
n	**3 Level Below**	**203**	**34**	17%	**597**	**59**	10%	**185**	**16**	9%
i	American Indian/Other Non-White									
c	Asian/Pacific Islander	35	11	31%	72	10	14%	28	4	14%
	Black, African-America	21	3	14%	23	2	9%	16	2	13%
G	Caucasian, White	53	11	21%	162	26	16%	72	7	10%
r	Hispanic	73	7	10%	280	20	7%	57	3	5%
o	Multiple Ethnicities	12	1	8%	44	1	2%	12		0%
u	Unknown	9	1	11%	16		0%			
p	**Grand Total**	**1167**	**415**	36%	**1883**	**396**	21%	**1209**	**292**	24%
	2 Level Below	**963**	**379**	39%	**767**	**139**	18%	**1024**	**276**	27%
	F	516	196	38%	465	98	21%	600	171	29%
	M	447	183	41%	302	41	14%	424	105	25%
	3 Level Below	**203**	**34**	17%	**597**	**59**	10%	**185**	**16**	9%
S	F	96	6	6%	332	38	11%	88	6	7%
e	M	107	28	26%	265	21	8%	97	10	10%
x	**Grand Total**	**1170**	**415**	35%	**1883**	**396**	21%	**1209**	**292**	24%

Math

	Placement	Fall 2011 Cohort: Math (Fall 2011 to Fall 2013)			Fall 2012 Cohort: Math (Fall 2012 to Fall 2014)			Spring 2013 Cohort: Math Spring 2013 to Spring 2015 2013		
		Attempt	Success	%	Attempt	Success	%	Attempt	Success	%
	1 Level Below	**557**	**265**	**48%**	**951**	**291**	**31%**	**516**	**192**	**37%**
	20 - 24	135	49	36%	234	70	30%	190	69	36%
	25 - 34	34	21	62%	63	25	40%	71	30	42%
	35 - 54	7	2	29%	17	1	6%	42	19	45%
	55 and Above	2	1	50%	7	3	43%	9		0%
	Under 20	379	192	51%	630	192	30%	204	74	36%
	2 Level Below	**648**	**103**	**16%**	**1125**	**118**	**10%**	**559**	**45**	**8%**
	20 - 24	154	25	16%	285	26	9%	223	16	7%
	25 - 34	51	5	10%	71	11	15%	90	13	14%
	35 - 54	17	6	35%	55	13	24%	46	3	7%
	55 and Above	5		0%	6	1	17%	18	3	17%
	Under 20	421	67	16%	708	67	9%	182	10	5%
	3 Level Below	**198**	**18**	**9%**	**312**	**15**	**5%**	**185**	**14**	**8%**
	20 - 24	66	5	8%	92	7	8%	82	9	11%
	25 - 34	47	11	23%	53	1	2%	38	2	5%
	35 - 54	29	1	3%	37		0%	31	1	3%
Age	55 and Above	1		0%				9	1	11%
	Under 20	55	1	2%	130	7	5%	25	1	4%
	4 Level Below	**640**	**8**	**1%**	**808**	**14**	**2%**	**733**	**13**	**2%**
	20 - 24	224	3	1%	259	10	4%	275	5	2%
Group	25 - 34	100	1	1%	80		0%	220	4	2%
	35 - 54	66		0%	102		0%	112		0%
	55 and Above	2		0%	18		0%	25	1	4%
	Under 20	248	4	2%	349	4	1%	101	3	3%
	Grand Total	**2043**	**394**	**19%**	**3196**	**438**	**14%**	**1993**	**264**	**13%**
	1 Level Below	**557**	**265**	**48%**	**951**	**291**	**31%**	**518**	**193**	**37%**
	American Indian	2	1	50%	1		0%			#DIV/0!
	Asian/Pacific Isl	56	22	39%	134	48	36%	58	22	38%
	Black, African-A	24	13	54%	37	8	22%	24	9	38%
	Caucasian, Whit	202	113	56%	299	110	37%	188	76	40%
	Hispanic	201	81	40%	362	96	27%	159	55	35%
	Multiple Ethnicit	37	13	35%	85	18	21%	56	17	30%
	Unknown	35	22	63%	33	11	33%	33	14	42%
	2 Level Below	**648**	**103**	**16%**	**1125**	**118**	**10%**	**559**	**45**	**8%**
	American Indian	6		0%	3		0%	5	1	20%
	Asian/Pacific Isl	52	11	21%	75	9	12%	29	1	3%
	Black, African-A	18	1	6%	40	9	23%	38	11	29%
	Caucasian, Whit	170	28	16%	273	38	14%	175	14	8%
	Hispanic	322	51	16%	579	43	7%	199	6	3%
	Multiple Ethnicit	43	5	12%	116	15	13%	76	7	9%
	Unknown	37	7	19%	39	4	10%	37	5	14%
	3 Level Below	**198**	**18**	**9%**	**312**	**15**	**5%**	**185**	**14**	**8%**
	American Indian/Other Non-White									
	Asian/Pacific Isl	13	3	23%	11		0%	10	1	10%
	Black, African-A	19	1	5%	20	1	5%	5		0%
	Caucasian, Whit	42	5	12%	61		0%	66	8	12%
Ethnic	Hispanic	106	9	8%	170	12	7%	77	4	5%
	Multiple Ethnicit	11		0%	31	1	3%	18	1	6%
	Unknown	7		0%	19	1	5%	9		0%
	4 Level Below	**640**	**8**	**1%**	**808**	**14**	**2%**	**737**	**13**	**2%**
	American Indian/Other Non-White				3		0%			
	Asian/Pacific Isl	25		0%	26		0%	49	1	2%
	Black, African-A	38	1	3%	47		0%	71		0%
Group	Caucasian, Whit	171		0%	207	4	2%	229	7	3%
	Hispanic	323	7	2%	413	4	1%	278	2	1%
	Multiple Ethnicit	50		0%	64	1	2%	72		0%
	Unknown	33		0%	48	5	10%	38	3	8%
	Grand Total	**2043**	**394**	**19%**	**3196**	**438**	**14%**	**1999**	**265**	**13%**
	1 Level Below	**557**	**265**	**48%**	**951**	**291**	**31%**	**518**	**193**	**37%**
	F	259	127	49%	420	116	28%	281	110	39%
	M	298	138	46%	531	175	33%	237	83	35%
	2 Level Below	**648**	**103**	**16%**	**1125**	**118**	**10%**	**559**	**45**	**8%**
	F	312	52	17%	614	63	10%	279	26	9%
	M	336	51	15%	511	55	11%	280	19	7%
	3 Level Below	**198**	**18**	**9%**	**312**	**15**	**5%**	**185**	**14**	**8%**
	F	99	6	6%	178	5	3%	114	9	8%
	M	99	12	12%	134	10	7%	71	5	7%
	4 Level Below	**640**	**8**	**1%**	**808**	**14**	**2%**	**737**	**13**	**2%**
Sex	F	399	4	1%	522	11	2%	464	7	2%
	M	241	4	2%	286	3	1%	273	6	2%
	Grand Total	**2043**	**394**	**19%**	**3196**	**438**	**14%**	**1999**	**265**	**13%**

Area	SUM OF COMPARISON FISCAL YEARS				PERCENTAGES		z	*p*	Significance Interpretation
	FY 11/12 + FY 12/13		FY 13/14 + FY 14/15		111213	131415			
	Attempt	Success	Attempt	Success					
English writing	4,858	3,459	5,821	3,912	.7120	.6720	4.47	.0000	Significant Decrease
English reading	1,449	1,103	1,185	897	.7612	.7570	0.25	.3998	
Mathematics	6,825	3,708	8,231	4,663	.5433	.5665	2.85	.0022	Significant Increase
ESL-Integrated	738	618	843	684	.8374	.8114	1.36	.0871	
ESL writing	0	0	0	0	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!
ESL reading	0	0	0	0	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!

Area	SUM OF COMPARISON FISCAL YEARS				PERCENTAGES		z	*p*	Significance Interpretation
	FY 11/12 + FY 12/13		FY 13/14 + FY 14/15		111213	131415			
	Attempt	Success	Attempt	Success					
English writing	4,858	3,459	5,821	3,912	.7120	.6720	4.47	.0000	Significant Decrease
English reading	1,449	1,103	1,185	897	.7612	.7570	0.25	.3998	
Mathematics	6,825	3,708	8,231	4,663	.5433	.5665	2.85	.0022	Significant Increase
ESL-Integrated	738	618	843	684	.8374	.8114	1.36	.0871	
ESL writing	0	0	0	0	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!
ESL reading	0	0	0	0	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!

Appendix C: ESL/ESSL Pathway Alignment (Equity/FSC)

All materials will be available on www.lavc.edu/fsc

ESL/ESSL Workgroup Meetings:

Data Highlights:

- From Summer 2004- Spring 2013, 11% of students who passed Eng. 80 passed Eng. 101
- From Fall 2011-Fall 2014, 11% of Eng. 80 students passed Eng. 361, and 0% passed Eng. 101
- Most popular Ed Goals: improve basic skills readiness (26%); obtain BA after AA (20%); Prepare for new career (15%);Obtain AA without transfer (12%);
- 54% of ESL Armenian students take ESL placement
- 22% of ESL Hispanic students take ESL placement

Additional Data Questions

1. Are we offering enough sections of Eng 361-363?
2. Number of students moving Noncredit to credit and success rates in credit courses. How many Noncredit get a Voc Ed certificate, degree, or transfer?
3. How many who complete ESSL courses complete Eng 101 and Com. 101?
4. What's the success rate of students who identify as ESL yet choose ENL pathway?
5. Are students who start in NC ESL more successful in Credit ESL than those who just start in Credit?

Suggestions:

- Review Credit and Noncredit course outlines to eliminate redundancy
- Start Credit ESL pathway at Eng. 361
- Short bridge from Eng. 363 to Eng. 101
- Have another Credit ESL path for Eng. 80-83 that leads to a certificate, and then a bridge to 361
- Make Eng. 80-83 Non Credit and review and integrate with existing Noncredit curriculum.
- Bridge/pathway from Noncredit to Credit
- Revamp placement model: writing sample, multiple measures, listening, reading etc.
- Combo ESL-Voc-ED Courses to learn ESL and get certificate at same time
- More resources for ESL: tutoring, computers, counseling, etc.
- Ensure instructors need to follow course outlines
- Separate ESL department

Next Steps: Develop Work Groups*

Explore possible stipends for participation and deliverables

1. ESL CR/NC Curriculum Alignment: Review for redundancy
   - Eng. 80-363 & 01CE-17CE
2. ESSL Curriculum Alignment: Review for redundancy
   - Comm. 61-75 & NC 23 and 24 CE Speech
3. Revamp placement process for credit ESL
4. Research most successful ESL/ESSL programs pathways in District and State. What's success rate? Best Practices?

*** see workgroup chart for details**

Important Dates

Fall 2016 Gallies:

- Early November

Influx of Adult Ed (Assembly Bill 86) funding/students:

- January 2016

Changes to Placement Process:

- Needs to happen by end of December 2015 to affect Fall 2016 students
- John Hetts from CalPass offered to do workshop just for English/ESL faculty, possibly opening day.

Proposed Deadlines for Workgroup Projects and Meeting Date

1. 10/23, 11/13
2. 10/30, 11/20

ESL/ESSL Work Group:

Project	Goal	Action Items	Possible Deliverables	Participants
ESL Curriculum Alignment: Eng. 80-83, 361-363 & 01CE-17CE, Learning Skills 13	• Develop clear pathway from Noncredit to Credit ESL • Eliminate unnecessary duplication/ redundancy	1. Review existing NC and CR course outlines for overlap/duplication. 2. Align highest level of NC ESL to transition into lowest level of CR ESL. 3. Reconsider how many courses need to be in each program. See Myra Snell's work on attrition and long pathways. 4. Propose how many courses should be in NC ESL Pathway and Credit ESL Pathway	1. Possible revised course outlines showing alignment from NC to Cr 2. Proposal for new pathway: how many courses in sequence; certificate; bridge 3. Proposal for how ESSL and Dev. Com complement courses	1. Cheryl Stoneham 2. Reginald Hubbard 3. Lilit Davoyan 4. Lilit Petrosyan 5. _____ **Time Frame:** 10/23, Nov 13
ESSL Curriculum Alignment: Comm. 61-75 & NC 23 CE and 24 CE Speech	• Develop clear pathway from Noncredit to Credit ESSL • Eliminate unnecessary duplication/ redundancy	1. Review existing ESSL NC and CR course outlines for overlap/duplication. 2. Align highest level of NC ESSL to transition into lowest level of CR ESSL. 3. Propose how many courses should be in NC ESSL Pathway	1. Possible revised course outlines showing alignment from NC to Cr 2. Proposal for new pathway: how many courses in sequence; certificate; bridge 3. Consideration of ESL and Dev. Com complement courses	1. Amadeo Quilicili 2. Josh Miller or designee **Time Frame:** 10/23, Nov 13

Project	Goal	Action Items	Deliverables	Participants
Assessment/Placement into Credit ESL	Institutionalize most accurate way of placing students at their highest level.	1. Review State's proposed Common Assessment Tools for Fall 2016 2. Review data on best practices for assessment and placement (e.g. John Hetts's work) 3. Review timeframe for Valley 15/16 assessment dates	1. Propose new ESL assessment protocol 2. Provide timeframe for implementation 3. Provide budget for new process	1. Reginald Hubbard 2. Patrick Hunter 3. Scott Weigand 4. (La Vergne Rosow) **Time Frame:** 10/30, Nov 20
Identify best practices and most successful ESL programs in District and State. Propose new innovations. Check City College San Francisco; Mira Costa, San Diego	Use best practices and research from successful programs to inform our decisions when updating our pathways	1. Research best practices 2. Identify success rates 3. Analyze pathways 4. Determine what might work at Valley	TBD	1. Greg Kappy 2. Margaret Sarkisyan 3. Kristine Aslanyan 4. (La Vergne Rosow) 5. _____ **Time Frame:** 10/30, Nov 20

Continuing ED: Course Outlines http://lavc.edu/Committees-Workgroups/vccc/courseoutlines/esl.aspx

Communications: ESSL: Available through ECD search: http://ecd.laccd.edu/Default.aspx

English 80-83: Electronic copies through Academic Affairs
ESL Resources: http://extranet.cccco.edu/Divisions/AcademicAffairs/BasicSkillsEnglishasaSecondLanguage.aspx

Long-Term Goals (5 yrs.) for ESL/Basic Skills

Refer to your last year's report. Enter the long-term goals you submitted last year. These goals should provide an umbrella for the activities and outcomes of your 2015-2016 action plan.

Long-term goals should have been informed by an analysis of historical data (such as that provided by the Basic Skills Cohort Progress Tracking Tool) and should have focused on student success goals in ESL and basic skills. Include only the funds from 2015-2016 that are allocated to each goal.

Identify the 5-year long term goals from 2015-16 through 2019-20 for your college's Basic Skills Program.

Insert your long-term goals from the report you submitted last year and add any new goals identified for future years.

1. Develop clear pathway/recommended classes for students who assess below college level English, ESL, and Math
2. Increase the number of students who complete the basic skills math course sequence 2%
3. Increase the number of students who complete the basic skills Eng. course sequence 2%
4. Increase the number of students who complete the basic skills ESL Credit course sequence 2%

	GOAL ID	LONG TERM GOAL
LONG TERM GOAL 1	A	Develop clear pathway/recommended classes for students who assess below college level English, ESL, and Math
LONG TERM GOAL 2	B	Increase the number of students who complete the basic skills math course sequence 2%
LONG TERM GOAL 3	C	Increase the number of students who complete the basic skills Eng. course sequence 2%
LONG TERM GOAL 4	D	Increase the number of students who complete the basic skills ESL Credit course sequence 2%

Long Term Goal Total*

This question checks the addition of the budgeted amount entered in question #8 above for the Long Term Goals. Please enter the amount from the above question.

Long Term Goal #1 Amount: $40,068

Long Term Goal #2 Amount: $60,000

Long Term Goal #3 Amount: $60,000

Long Term Goal #4 Amount: $30,537

9) Please insert the planned expenditure amount for the 2015-16 ESL/Basic Skills Initiative Program by category.*

List the amount of each expenditure summarized by category

$90,922	Program and Curriculum Planning and Development
$0	Student Assessment
0	Advisement and Counseling Services
$90,180	Supplemental Instruction and Tutoring
$9,503	Coordination & Research
0	Professional Development

TOTAL: $190,605 ($9530 FOR DISTRICT COORDINATIO

Basic Skills Initiative: Action Plan for 2015/2016

	Description of Activity	Target Date	Responsible Dept/Persons	Measurable Outcomes
Activity # 1	Develop Persistence Management Plan using high impact teaching practices including: 1. Inquiry into reasons that successful course completers do not enroll in subsequent courses and develop interventions to provide students with clear pathways for persistence (i.e. guaranteed classes, peer mentor program for probation students, identification of obstacles (transportation, child care, etc with solutions researched and explored through town hall conference. 2. Using Chico State's model, pilot cross disciplinary "town hall/great debate" (possibly	July 2016	Foundational Skills Committee	1. Survey and focus group research with recommendations for successful course completers that do not persist 2. Development of Persistence Management action plan with concrete activities, timeline for implementation, and overview of how plan complements existing student

	using “one book/one campus model; service learning; current events; obstacles identified 1.1” with a cohort of students that culminates in a conference presentation by students. Coordinate integration of tutoring services to assist students with research papers and efolio presentations.			success efforts.
Activity # 2	Evaluate existing recommendations for complementary Non Degree Applicable Courses: Developmental Communication, Communication (Speech Lab), Writing Center, Learning Skills. Create consensus between teaching faculty, counseling faculty, and assessment office about recommended basic skills pathway.	June 2016	Foundational Skills Committee; Chair Dev. Com; Chair Communications; Chair English; Continuing Education	Development of new materials (infographs and flowcharts)depicting recommended Foundational Skills Pathway with both degree/transfer required courses and complementary Non Degree Applicable courses
Activity # 3	Pilot an accelerated English course that combines one and two levels below transfer into one accelerated course (English 99).	Fall 2016	English Department; Foundational Skills Committee	Development of course outline, curriculum, teaching resources, and the percentage of students

				who complete the accelerated pathway.
Activity # 4	Expand and improve tutoring for foundational skills students in math, English, and ESL by increasing staffing in the tutoring centers, providing additional workshops on essential academic skills, integrating faculty drop-in hours into tutoring centers, enhancing tutor training, and providing professional development for faculty and staff regarding best practices for tutoring.	July 2016	Committee for Academic Resources and Tutoring Services (CARTS)	Success rates for students who use the tutoring centers are at least 5% higher than those who do not use the service.
Activity # 5	Coordination and support for the district-wide student success initiatives focus on first-year experiences, curricular redesign, placement/assessment, culturally responsive teaching and learning.	June 2016	LACCD Dean for Student Success and the LACCD Student Success Initiative Steering Committee (SSISC)	Facilitated support activities throughout the year; Documented the number of positions of participants at each college involved in the SSI assessment &activities; recommendations created for future activities based on ongoing feedback from participants; documented emerging practices reported

				regularly to the LACCD SSISC and other shared governance groups.