



Annual Program Review 2011-2012 - INSTRUCTIONAL

Division - Program NONCREDIT ESL

Authorization

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

Author: Pat Zayas, Alice Mecom

Division Chair: Pat Zayas

Date Received by Program Review:

Overview of the Program

All degrees and certificates are considered programs. In addition, divisions may further delineate and define programs based on their assessment needs (developmental sequences, career track, etc).

Statement of Purpose – briefly describe in 1-3 sentences.

The Noncredit ESL Program prepares students of all diverse backgrounds, ages, abilities and learning styles for their many evolving roles and responsibilities in our community and aid in their assimilation into the culture of the United States. The primary goals of the NC ESL program is to refer students to the appropriate GCC student services that support their academic and job skills goals, to provide the ESL instruction necessary for their successful transitions, and to facilitate their matriculation into the credit transfer/CTE programs, the Noncredit Business/DSL programs, and the job force.

Please list the **most significant achievement** accomplished since your last program review.

Our program has established meaningful outcomes that replace our long-standing primarily grammatical objectives. These outcomes are based on student-identified goals of matriculation to credit programs and entry into the job force. In redefining our outcomes, we have taken great steps in refining current assessment practices and creating new assessments that measure students' learning on a Bloom's taxonomy level of application and synthesis over the simplistic knowledge level. The newly-created assessments include the addition of a writing component to our placement exam and of a writing and speaking component to our exit exam. As a result of these changes, the instructors are improving their method of instruction related to these skills through attendance at workshops offered by the division and the students have improved their writing and speaking skills as indicated through test analysis data. This realignment between our outcomes and assessment processes has resulted in a stronger linkage between our program and the College's EMP and annual goals, specifically those that deal with noncredit to credit matriculation.

List the current major strengths of your program

1. Our number and variety of classes and locations that meet the various needs and goals of different nonnative populations in the both North and South Glendale communities.
2. Our rigorous, grammar-based curriculum with the newly updated assessment program that includes testing in all language skills, including writing and listening/speaking.
3. Our well-qualified and dedicated instructors who seek to improve and innovate outreach and pedagogical strategies

List the current weaknesses of your program

1. Not having the facilities or support staff to overcome the inability of our students to register via PeopleSoft and use college email.
2. Inadequate computer lab space to accommodate the needs of our students.
3. Not sufficient full-time faculty to participate in governance and head up the numerous facets of our program: CRESL, VESL, First Language Support, Curriculum Development, Matriculation.
4. Lack of Spanish speaking support staff to assist our Latino students.
5. Inadequate students support services: counselors, tutors, etc.

1.0. Trend Analysis

For each program within the division, use the data provided to indicate trends (e.g., steady, increasing, decreasing, etc.) for each of the following measures.

| Program | Academic Year | FTEF Trend | FTEF Trend | WSCH / FTEF Trend | Full-Time % Trend | Fill Rate Trend | Success Rate Trend | Awards Trend |
|---------|---------------|------------|------------|-------------------|-------------------|-----------------|--------------------|--------------|
| NC ESL | 2007-2008 | 1,473 | 88.8 | 528 | 12.3% | 0.0% | -- | 0 |
| | 2008-2009 | 1,695 | 88.4 | 610 | 8.9% | 0.0% | -- | 0 |
| | 2009-2010 | 1,760 | 85.7 | 653 | 11.1% | 0.0% | -- | 0 |
| | 2010-2011 | 1,607 | 86.8 | 589 | 9.5% | 0.0% | -- | 0 |
| | % Change | +9.1% | -2.3% | +11.7% | -22.9% | -- | -- | -- |
| | 4-Yr. Trend | stable | stable | increasing | decreasing | -- | -- | -- |

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

Our FTES is up 9.1% and FTEF is down 2.3% indicating that we are serving more students while cutting classes. The WSCH/FTEF is up 11.7% which shows that we are being more efficient and serving more students in our classes. Our full-timer percentage is down because we lost one instructor to retirement. We will be losing another instructor to retirement in December. This trend indicates that our instructors are working harder to serve the students but it also indicates that we have more students in our classes that need attention.

1.2. Is there other relevant quantitative/qualitative information that affects the evaluation of your program?

As indicated in the 2010-2011 campus profile, the ESL noncredit headcount was approximately 3000 students per semester, which constitutes approximately 20% of the entire student body, both credit and noncredit, at GCC. This program is staffed with 6 full-time instructors, one of which is retiring in December 2011. Our full-timers are responsible for managing 7 different locations and

for designing and implementing curriculum specific to Basic Skills students' needs, all while maintaining a 24 hour teaching load.

2.0. Student Learning and Curriculum

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

| List each Department within the Division as well each degree, certificate, or other program* within the Department | Active Courses with Identified SLOs | | Active Courses Assessed | | Course Sections Assessed | | If this area has program outcomes have they been assessed? Yes or No |
|--|-------------------------------------|------|-------------------------|-----|--------------------------|-----|--|
| | n/n | % | n/n | % | n/n | % | |
| NC ESL | 12/12 | 100% | 8/12 | 67% | 78/89 | 88% | No |

2.1. Please comment on the percentages above.

All of our Literacy through Level 5 classes have been assessed and the results have led to revisions made in the curriculum. These 6 courses are our most popular and serve the great majority of our students. Our conversation and older adult classes have not been assessed on their SLOs. They have been assessed using other tools but we are now creating assessment tools that will evaluate the SLOs of those courses. The assessment tools that we use to assess our citizenship SLOs are standardized tests generated by the state. We will be creating our own assessments to supplement those we are using now. OBT 071, introduction to computers for ESL students, assesses students progress through an exit final but will be focusing on assessing the individual SLOs in the future.

2.2. a) Please provide a *link** to all program assessment timelines

<http://www.glendale.edu/index.aspx?page=5120> here. This link could be to your division /department website, eLumen, etc.

- b) Briefly summarize any pedagogical or curricular elements of courses/programs that have been changed or will be changed as a result of developing assessment timelines and course/program alignment matrixes.
- c) Based on the program assessment timelines you have developed and the evidence you have gathered, please comment briefly on how far along your division/program is in the assessment process.

Our six base courses, Literacy through Level 5, have included in the curriculum the four skills of reading, writing, listening and speaking, since their inception years ago. When our program began to focus on SLOs, it became apparent that the program has emphasized the grammatical component for all of these years over the writing and speaking areas. To adjust this discrepancy and to refocus the emphasis on all skills, we have created exit exams that require the students and instructors to focus more on writing and oral communication. Students are now required to gain competency in these areas, along with their grammatical expertise, to progress to the next level of instruction. As we have progressed through our assessment timeline, we have reevaluated the effectiveness of the presentation of our curriculum and made alterations to ensure that what we teach corresponds with our course outlines. We hope students will exit our program with a deeper level of language learning that will serve them well in their academic and work force endeavors.

By the end of this school year, we will have finished assessing our six base courses and will begin working on our conversation classes in the fall of 2012. We have already created SLOs for these classes and implemented an evaluation process but have not evaluated the effectiveness of that assessment process. By the end of Spring 2013, we will have completed our assessment timeline and will begin to reassess the literacy classes and proceed from there throughout all of the classes once again.

We offer three certificates which include outcomes related to writing, reading, grammar, speaking, and technology skills. We have begun assessment for those courses that are required for these certificates with a focus on the writing outcome. Therefore, each certificate has been assessed in terms of one outcome.

2.3 a) Please provide a **link** to any program and/or relevant course assessment reports.

<http://www.glendale.edu/index.aspx?page=5128> Does the evidence

from assessment reports show that students are achieving the desired learning outcomes?

b) Please briefly summarize any pedagogical or curricular elements of courses and/or programs that have been changed or will be changed as a result of the assessments conducted.

b. In the spring of 2010, we assessed the writing ability of our students in Levels 3 and 4. We gave a pre- and post- writing assignment to students in these levels. Two of these classes were in our regular ESL program and two were in the CRESL program. Students in the CRESL program received enhanced writing instruction throughout the semester while the students in the regular ESL program did not. Both sets of classes performed equally in the pre-test but the CRESL classes improved substantially more in their writing than the regular ESL classes in the post-test. As a result, we have initiated an enhanced writing component in our Literacy through Level 3 classes. We will do this in our level 4 and 5 classes during the next year. An assessment report reflecting this process can be found at the link provided above.

2.4 Please list all courses which have been reviewed in the last academic year.

Note: Curriculum Review is required by the Chancellors Office every 6 years.

ESL 1 – Literacy, ESL 10 – Level 1, ESL 20 – Level 2, and ESL 30-Level 3.

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

The Beginning Certificate program was reviewed in the past academic year. This certificate program includes Literacy, Level 1 and Level 2 and Beginning Conversation.

2.6 For each program that was reviewed, please list any changes that were made.

A writing and oral component were added to the Literacy, Level 1 and Level 2 exit exams.

3.0. Reflection and Action Plans

3.1 What recent activities, dialogues, discussions, etc. have occurred to promote student learning or improved program/division processes?

The division, including both adjunct and full-timers, has met repeatedly during the past two years to

discuss the curriculum and revise the grammar exam and the new oral and written exit exams. Accumulative student exit exam results from the Literacy, Level 1 and Level 2 written, oral and grammar exit exams were analyzed and workshops for instructors were provided to ensure that students receive adequate instruction to allow them to progress within the program.

There has also been frequent action-oriented discussion among the full-timers to identify better integration strategies that focus on student awareness/outreach, access, persistence, and success. We hope to collaborate with other divisions, specifically CTE programs, Credit ESL, Student Services, and Noncredit Business/DSL. We are discussing the creation of new certificates that reflect student pathway options and that will encourage student use of multiple programs and services.

An aggressive effort was made to ensure that students knew how to activate and use their school email. The effort was hampered by the fact that not enough lab space was available to allow a full class of students to meet at one time and, as a result, it was necessary to take students a few at a time to show them how to fulfill the process. Fewer students were able to activate their email that had been envisioned because of this fact.

3.2 Using the weaknesses, trends and assessment outcomes listed on the previous pages as a basis for your comments, please briefly describe your plans and/or modifications for program/division improvements

| Plans or Modifications | Anticipated Improvements |
|--|--|
| Continue to aid students in the process of activating their GCC email account. | All instructors will be able to communicate with their students through the use of email. As a result of this ability to communicate with their students, the instructor will be able to keep the students interested in the learning process and improve persistence. |
| Hire a full-time instructor to work with our students who are interested in improving their English with the goal of continuing their education in credit and finding a job. | This instructor will work with our vocational oriented students who need to improve their English while pursuing a path to vocational stability. This person will be able to aid the students in the matriculation process while guiding them to the classes and job opportunities that will enable them to find the pathway to economic stability. The person will outreach to multiple student populations, including the Latino students in the Adelante program. |
| Hire a full-time instructor to work with students with the goal of credit matriculation, both transfer and CTE. | The instructor will work with students who wish to transfer and need the student services and instructional support to transition successfully. The person will outreach to multiple student populations, including the Latino students in the Adelante program. |

2011 PROGRAM REVIEW**Noncredit ESL
FT Instructor-CRESL****I: NCE-1****Section 4
IHAC Request**If this is a repeat request, please list the Resource ID code or year requested: 2008, 2009, 2010**4.1** The Office of Instruction will provide data on instructional hires during the past five years, including the full-time percentage of each new hire.

| | |
|---|-----|
| a) Number of full-time faculty currently assigned to the Program | 6 |
| b) Number of full-time faculty assigned to the Program in 2005 | 7 |
| c) Does this position cover classes currently taught by adjuncts? Yes or No | Yes |
| d) Does this position contribute to program expansion? Yes or No | No |

4.2 CPF Index (Committees Per Full-time Faculty)

| | |
|--|-----|
| 1. Total number of full-time faculty members in this department/program. | 6 |
| 2. Total number of committees in which all FT faculty members in this area participate (Governance and other campus related committees & participation). | 27 |
| 3. CPF INDEX (Total of # 2 divided by #1) | 4.5 |

4.3 Status of Released Time Faculty

| Faculty Name | Release Time Position | % RT | Term of Assignment |
|--------------|--|------|------------------------|
| Pat Zayas | Division Chair | 80% | 2007-2012 |
| Alice Mecom | Senate Exec. – 20%, SLO Committee-40% | 60% | 2011-2012 2011-2012 |
| Paul Mayer | Senate Exec. – 20% | 20% | 2011-2012 |
| Megan Ernst | Assistant Division Chair – 20% Curriculum & Assessment Coordinator – 20% | 40% | 2011-2012 |
| Deb Robiglio | Projects Manager for Transitional Program Development | 40% | 2011-2012 |

4.4 How does this assignment relate to the college's Mission Statement?

This assignment for the Noncredit CRESL Program supports the mission of the college by serving students of all diverse backgrounds, ages, abilities and learning styles. Since we are committed to student learning and success, we prepare our students for their many evolving roles in and responsibilities to our community, our state, and our society. We achieve this through teaching them the English language, introducing them to basic cultural values that may differ from their own, and informing them of their responsibilities as members of the community and as future citizens of the United States. We provide students with the opportunity and support to gain the knowledge and skills necessary to meet their educational, career, and personal goals. We refer students to our academic, professional, and personal counseling services and encourage and prepare them to enter the credit program on the campus. A great many of our noncredit students continue on as credit students at GCC, obtaining A.A. degrees, entering jobs, and/or transferring to four year universities.

4.5 How does this position relate to the objectives and functions of the college?

- | | |
|--|------------------------------|
| a) Associate Degree | d) Basic Skills development |
| b) Transfer to a four-year institution | e) Noncredit Adult Education |
| c) Career and Technical Education | f) Personal enrichment |

This position has a direct impact on Basic Skills Development within a Noncredit Adult Education setting. Our students do not yet have the communication skills that are necessary to enter job training or the credit programs. However, they have goals directly related to finding careers, earning a certificate or AA degree, or pursuing transfer. In fact, these are primary reasons why our students have immigrated to Los Angeles, and they attend our program to fulfill these life goals. <http://www.glendale.edu/index.aspx?page=5122> Many wish to enter CTE training to build on technical skills and experience that they bring with them from their home countries; others who have degrees and professions from their native countries wish to attend GCC to attain the additional courses they need to continue their professions in the U.S. A great many of our students have not yet established their goals, and rely on our program to offer them the career and professional advising and basic skills development to help them establish educational and professional plans. Our program is a gateway program to the entire campus; it has recently been identified as the primary feeder into the credit programs. We support and educate over 3000 students a semester. In addition, we also serve students who seek personal enrichment, such as citizenship, family literacy, and life skills literacy. In essence, our program relates to all six of the objectives listed above. In very recent years, both recipients of the Institute Day student award have gone to graduates who started out in Noncredit.

4.6 Describe how this position enhances student success. Ex: enhances instructional skills, meets community or industry needs, contributes to state of the art technical education, etc. What measureable outcome will result from filling this request? (No response)**4.7** Are there anticipated negative impacts for not hiring this position? If so describe.

Our students are poised for success, yet they rely on our faculty to guide them by informing them of educational and job training opportunities that are offered at GCC, referring them to the appropriate counseling and student services, providing them ESL instruction, and facilitating their transitions to other programs. In the Noncredit Program, it is up to the faculty to ensure that students are provided with all of these levels of support, and to do so with the special considerations of dealing with a variety of non-native populations that have no background in American educational and industrial systems. Furthermore, the Noncredit program is obligated to reach all community members who wish to access education and job training. We offer classes not only at the Garfield Campus and at the Main Campus, but also at a number of off-site locations, including Crescenta Valley United Methodist Church, the PDC center (which serves a primarily Korean population), Jefferson Elementary School (which serves over 300 students) and Cerritos Elementary School, where over 150 Latino students are served in the Adelante program. Therefore, the job of providing all of these populations with equal access to GCC through the Noncredit ESL program is an overwhelming one. The measurable outcomes from fulfilling this request will be:

- 1) An increase in the number of Noncredit students (specifically of the underserved off-site Latino population) who earn ESL certificates, access the Career Center and counseling services, transition to the Noncredit Business/DSL program, and transition into the Credit ESL program.
- 2) An increase in student performance in our newly-aligned student learning outcomes, specifically in writing.
- 3) Higher placement scores for students entering the Credit ESL program.
- 4) The implementation of and the measureable success of students entering a VESL program.

There are and have been negative impacts for not hiring this position that will continue. First and foremost, it is impossible to fulfill our duties to the very large, goal-driven noncredit ESL population with the very small number of full-time faculty. The students in the Noncredit ESL division comprises 20% of the entire GCC student population, yet there are only 6 faculty members (5 in December due to a retirement) to support it. There is a marked lack of attention given to our Latino population which has been steadily growing over the past 5 years in the Adelante program. There is a large body of students with hopes of transfer to the credit programs, both CTE and transfer, that relies heavily on a noncredit infrastructure that supports such transitions. The few faculty that we have, along with our heavy 24-hour load, results in a skeletal infrastructure maintained by overstretched faculty. Since noncredit is the number one feeder into credit, it is very necessary to devote resources in this area of transition for our students. The following specific negative impacts will continue to occur without increased faculty:

1. Minimal attention to outcomes and assessment efforts that ensure our students are meeting the expectations necessary for academic and workforce success.
2. Increasing equity gaps for our underserved Latino populations in terms of awareness, access, and success.
3. Stagnant numbers in student transitions to Business/DSL (which needs students) and the credit programs, and stagnant placement rates into these programs.
4. Lack of a Vocational ESL program which needs to be implemented based on the student pathways survey of 2010, which indicates between 30-40% of our students seek this goal. Currently, there is no assigned faculty member to address this need.

4.8 Are there any other special concerns not previously identified? If so, please explain.

The Noncredit ESL program serves nearly 6000 students a year with 6 full-time faculty members. This makes the f/t to student ratio 10/90. The State requires a 75/25 ration for credit programs in order to sustain quality. Though the noncredit program is not required to meet this ratio, it is still obvious that a 10/90 ratio is contra-indicated for student success. The FON is a state-wide mandate that does not consider the unique profiles of individual campuses. GCC is unique in that it offers a huge noncredit ESL program, the 3rd largest division in the District. Considering the CPDC funding that is given to the college for the noncredit programs, it seems logical to continue and increase the support of such programs with an appropriate number of full-time hires.

Since 2008, IHAC has ranked Noncredit ESL as either first or second in the need for a new hire based on the EMP, Core competencies, outcomes, and campus trends. However, we were never granted a new hire during these years.

APPROVALS

| AGENCY | DECISION | | | | | | |
|--|----------------------|-----------------|--|-----------------|----------------------|------------------|--------|
| The Program Review Committee has reviewed the data, outcomes and plans in the report and finds this request to be: <p style="text-align: center;">NA</p> | Well supported | | | | | | |
| | Adequately supported | | | | | | |
| | Not supported | | | | | | |
| | Reason: | Sect.1: Data | | Sect.2: SLOs | | Sect.3: Plans | Other: |
| Standing Committee Review of Resource Request | | | | | Prioritization Score | | |
| Committee: IHAC | | | | | | | |

2011 PROGRAM REVIEW**Noncredit ESL
FT Instructor-VESL****I: NCE-2****Section 4
IHAC Request**If this is a repeat request, please list the Resource ID code or year requested: 2008, 2009, 2010**4.1** The Office of Instruction will provide data on instructional hires during the past five years, including the full-time percentage of each new hire.

| | |
|---|-----|
| a) Number of full-time faculty currently assigned to the Program | 6 |
| b) Number of full-time faculty assigned to the Program in 2005 | 7 |
| c) Does this position cover classes currently taught by adjuncts? Yes or No | Yes |
| d) Does this position contribute to program expansion? Yes or No | No |

4.2 CPF Index (Committees Per Full-time Faculty)

| | |
|--|-----|
| 1. Total number of full-time faculty members in this department/program. | 6 |
| 2. Total number of committees in which all FT faculty members in this area participate (Governance and other campus related committees & participation). | 27 |
| 3. CPF INDEX (Total of # 2 divided by #1) | 4.5 |

4.3 Status of Released Time Faculty

| Faculty Name | Release Time Position | % RT | Term of Assignment |
|--------------|--|------|------------------------|
| Pat Zayas | Division Chair | 80% | 2007-2012 |
| Alice Mecom | Senate Exec. – 20%, SLO Committee-40% | 60% | 2011-2012 2011-2012 |
| Paul Mayer | Senate Exec. – 20% | 20% | 2011-2012 |
| Megan Ernst | Assistant Division Chair – 20% Curriculum & Assessment Coordinator – 20% | 40% | 2011-2012 |
| Deb Robiglio | Project Manager for Transitions Program Development | 40% | 2011-2012 |

4.4 How does this assignment relate to the college's Mission Statement?

This assignment will support the mission of the college by serving students of all diverse backgrounds, ages, abilities and learning styles. Since we are committed to student learning and success, we prepare our students for their many evolving roles in and responsibilities to our community, our state, and our society. We achieve this through teaching them the English language, introducing them to basic cultural values that may differ from their own, and informing them of their responsibilities as members of the community and as future citizens of the United States. We provide students with the opportunity and support to gain the knowledge and skills necessary to meet their educational, career, and personal goals

4.5 How does this position relate to the objectives and functions of the college?

- | | |
|--|------------------------------|
| a) Associate Degree | d) Basic Skills development |
| b) Transfer to a four-year institution | e) Noncredit Adult Education |
| c) Career and Technical Education | f) Personal enrichment |

This position has a direct impact on Basic Skills Development within a Noncredit Adult Education setting. Our students do not yet have the communication skills that are necessary to enter job training or the credit programs. However, they have goals directly related to finding careers, earning a certificate or AA degree, or pursuing transfer. In fact, these are primary reasons why our students have immigrated to Los Angeles, and they attend our program to fulfill these life goals. <http://www.glendale.edu/index.aspx?page=5122> Many wish to enter CTE training to build on technical skills and experience that they bring with them from their home countries; others who have degrees and professions from their native countries wish to attend GCC to attain the additional courses they need to continue their professions in the U.S. A great many of our students have not yet established their goals, and rely on our program to offer them the career and professional advising and basic skills development to help them establish educational and professional plans. Our program is a gateway program to the entire campus; it has recently been identified as the primary feeder into the credit programs. We support and educate over 3000 students a semester. In addition, we also serve students who seek personal enrichment, such as citizenship, family literacy, and life skills literacy. In essence, our program relates to all six of the objectives listed above. The adult students who participate in the VSEL program will be developing basic English and computer skills and will be receiving instruction in areas related to their career choices. They will also be made aware of and given access to the current programs already in place at GCC that support job attainment, such as the career center, career counseling, and the CTE programs.

4.6 Describe how this position enhances student success. Ex: enhances instructional skills, meets community or industry needs, contributes to state of the art technical education, etc. What measurable outcome will result from filling this request?

This position will definitely enhance student success in that it will give students guidance in how to succeed on the job and in workplace situations. It will meet industry needs through giving the students the tools with which to meet the requirements to progress within the company and meet the basic demands of the job. It is projected that immigration will continue to grow, specifically with Latinos, and that the future job market of this country will rely on the skills and knowledge of these immigrants. We must offer them equal access to an education that will support our economy and meet the needs of the high-skills job market.

4.7 Are there anticipated negative impacts for not hiring this position? If so describe.

There are and have been negative impacts for not hiring this position. First and foremost, it is impossible to fulfill our duties to the very large, goal-driven noncredit ESL population with the very small number of full-time faculty. The students in the Noncredit ESL division comprises 20% of the entire GCC student population, yet there are only 6 faculty members (5 in December due to a retirement) to support it. There is a marked lack of attention given to our Latino population which has been steadily growing over the past 5 years in the Adelante program due to insufficient time. There is a large body of students with hopes of transfer to the credit programs, both CTE and transfer, that relies heavily on a noncredit infrastructure that supports such transitions. The few faculty that we have, along with our heavy 24-hour load, results in a skeletal infrastructure

maintained by overstretched faculty. Since noncredit is the number one feeder into credit, it is very necessary to devote resources in this area of transition for our students. The following specific negative impacts will continue to occur without increased faculty:

1. Increasing equity gaps for our underserved Latino populations in terms of awareness, access, and success.
2. Minimal attention to outcomes and assessment efforts that ensure our students are meeting the expectations necessary for academic and workforce success.
3. Stagnant numbers in student transitions to Business/DSL (which needs students) and the credit programs, and stagnant placement rates into these programs.
4. Lack of a Vocational ESL program which needs to be implemented based on the student pathways survey of 2010, which indicates between 30-40% of our students seek this goal. Currently, there is no assigned faculty member to address this need.
5. Twenty-seven percent of our students have indicated that their goal is to find a job and join the workforce. <http://www.glendale.edu/index.aspx?page=5122>. We are not able to completely serve the needs of these students at this time. If we want to be able to assist these students in meeting their goals, we need to develop a VESL program with the classes and curriculum that will support them in their endeavors. If we aren't able to do that, we may lose these students to other colleges that are equipped to meet their needs. Glendale already has a higher rate of unemployment compared to Burbank and Pasadena. A VESL program would be a powerful force in closing that gap.

4.8 Are there any other special concerns not previously identified? If so, please explain.

Since 2008, IHAC has ranked Noncredit ESL as either first or second in the need for a new hire based on the EMP, core competencies, outcomes, and campus trends. However, we were not granted a new hire during these years.

The Noncredit ESL program serves nearly 6000 students a year with 6 full-time faculty members. This makes the f/t to student ratio 10/90. The State requires a 75/25 ration for credit programs in order to sustain quality. Though the noncredit program is not required to meet this ratio, it is still obvious that a 10/90 ratio is contra-indicated for student success. The FON is a state-wide mandate that does not consider the unique profiles of individual campuses. GCC is unique in that it offers a huge noncredit ESL program, the 3rd largest division in the District. Considering the CPDC funding that is given to the college for the noncredit programs, it seems logical to continue and increase the support of such programs with an appropriate number of full-time hires.

Noncredit ESL is a broad based program offering classes in Literacy, Older Adults, computer classes for ESL, EL Civics, Citizenship and College Readiness (CRESL) as well as Levels 1-5 of English. There are not enough full-time faculty to help develop the various instructional components offered in our Noncredit ESL program. First of all, the full-time to part-time ratio of faculty in Noncredit ESL is significantly lower when compared to credit programs at GCC. Based on 2007-2008 data, 11 percent of Noncredit ESL classes are taught by full-time faculty, while 49 percent of credit classes are taught by full-time faculty. This inequity of full-time to part-time faculty has crippling effects on our Noncredit ESL full-time faculty because they have less time to participate in governance and in other campus activities. Regardless of this fact, they do participate in numerous committees and stretch themselves excessively thin.

In addition, the majority of our classes have waiting lists because we are not able to offer additional classes. The fill rate for Noncredit ESL classes shows an increasing demand for classes. Starting in 2004-2005 through 2009-2010 fill rates have increased. In addition, our weekly student contact hours have increased over the same period. Starting with 2007-2008 through 2009-2010, the student attendance hours for the fall semester were 364,673, 428,177, and 461,563. As our

classrooms have swelled with students, and waiting lists have expanded, we need additional full-time faculty to provide leadership and consistency related to our program goals; especially, to mentor, guide, and evaluate our adjunct faculty who comprise the majority of teaching faculty within our division. In addition, after conducting several SLOAC cycles related to our high-level, Level 3, 4, and 5 classes, we need full-time faculty to coordinate programs and provide leadership that ensures a seamless flow to GCC's credit offerings. However, since Noncredit ESL full-time faculty have a 24-hour load, they have little time to devote to this endeavor. They must also spend time on curriculum planning, organization and development of program assessments. It will take us longer to accomplish program goals if we don't have more full-time teachers and we will not be able to adequately meet the demands of our growing noncredit population.

APPROVALS

| AGENCY | DECISION | | | | | | |
|--|----------------------|-----------------|--|-----------------|----------------------|------------------|--------|
| The Program Review Committee has reviewed the data, outcomes and plans in the report and finds this request to be: <p style="text-align: center;">NA</p> | Well supported | | | | | | |
| | Adequately supported | | | | | | |
| | Not supported | | | | | | |
| | Reason: | Sect.1: Data | | Sect.2: SLOs | | Sect.3: Plans | Other: |
| Standing Committee Review of Resource Request | | | | | Prioritization Score | | |
| Committee: IHAC | | | | | | | |