A. ASSESSMENT OF INTERNAL AND EXTERNAL FACTORS AND STUDENT SUCCESS
The ESL program truly strives “to provide educational opportunity for all with innovation and distinction,” in keeping with our college’s mission. Our efforts to teach English language skills focus not only on language but also on culture, that is, the diverse cultures of the U.S. landscape in general, as well as the academic culture more specifically. In this way, we hope our students will be better prepared as employees as well as citizens to help “advance California’s economic growth and global competitiveness.”

Our students include the recently unemployed, the working poor, traditionally underrepresented minorities, those with grade school education only, those with high school diplomas from the U.S. international students, some with the equivalent of high school diplomas, others with BAs, and even MAs. We accept them into our classes with the skills that they bring with them.

Teaching such a diverse student population, in a language that they are still in the process of learning, requires a high level of skill and resourcefulness. What’s more, bridging the gap between the skills that students bring with them and the demands of the curriculum is a continuing challenge. We are fortunate at Foothill to have an ESL Department that has the capability of meeting this challenge.

INTERNAL FACTORS
• Approximately 30% of students placing in ESL do not take those courses.
• Almost 1/4 of those scoring in the two lowest levels of ESL never enrolled at Foothill.

EXTERNAL FACTORS
• Enrollment in English as a Second Language classes at Foothill has increased, along with the overall increase experienced by the college as a whole. In fact, the demand for English as a Second Language instruction at Foothill College has never been greater. According to the 2000 census, 45% of the population of Santa Clara County speak a language other than English at home. Recent active recruitment by the Foothill Outreach program, which has targeted the Hispanic population in this area, and long term recruitment efforts by the International Programs Office, have contributed to this demand. In addition, in light of CSU Executive Order 665, which proposes the elimination of remediation in the CSUs by 2007, the ESL Department will likely see increased demands for classes at the upper levels.
• The current state budget deficit will affect our ability to meet the demand for classes. In fact, we will be forced to reduce our offerings and operational budgets.
• The increase in fees in the winter and spring of 2004 may result in a significant decline in enrollment.
• The formula for funding colleges is at odds with actual needs. When demand for classes rises above the growth rate, there is no funding for additional classes.
• State Ed Code section 88003 prohibits districts from employing part-time classified personnel on an on-going basis when the service to be performed is not needed on a continuing basis.
• Recent changes in state education requirements resulted in the loss of degree applicability of all but two of our courses.
• Another change in the state education requirements eliminated the repeatability provision of our classes.

STRENGTHS OF THE ESL DEPARTMENT
1. We have an excellent faculty of full-time (7.5) and part-time teachers (18), all of whom have at least a Master’s degree in Teaching English as a Second Language. This faculty is also diverse, mirroring some of the diversity in the student population. In addition, we have a department coordinator to manage the tasks of the department: scheduling classes, coordinating testing and placement, coordinating curriculum, recruiting teachers, mentoring teachers, working with Matriculation, Assessment and Counseling on departmental issues, planning and conducting department meetings, and coordinating the preparation of reports such as this program review.
2. Our courses address the range of language development needs: grammar, listening and speaking, reading and composition at six levels of course work. Students are more likely to be placed into a
class that fits their level of learning in a program that has a range of levels. We offer a basic foundation level course up to a sheltered English 1A.

3. We have a systematic procedure for placing students into classes. We use a combination of a contextualized discrete-point grammar test with an essay that is evaluated by formally trained readers.

4. We review our curriculum on an on-going basis. One of the results of this review was the change in the structure of our classes at the lowest level from one hour a day to two hours a day. As a result, we have been able to integrate speaking, listening, basic reading and writing more successfully, enabling more students to move on to the next level.

5. Because we accept all students regardless of their previous educational backgrounds, some students, despite their best efforts, are not ready at the end of the quarter to move on to the next level. We have the ability to give students credit for their efforts but not penalize them by giving them Alternate Credit. In this way, students are encouraged to persist in their studies rather than give up.

6. Our support services include a language lab with two classrooms of computers, for class and individual use. The lab also offers individualized academic skills classes that assist students with a variety of language needs. In addition, we have an ESL Writing Center, where students can find tutors to assist them in their composition classes. A volunteer there offers a pronunciation clinic.

7. We have a collection of books at the library selected and ordered by our department faculty especially for ESL readers.

8. From the students’ perspective, the fact that we are on the quarter system is an advantage. Students like the short session of 11 weeks as opposed to the longer semester consisting of 15 weeks.

9. We have a diverse population of students, which makes it a better learning environment for students than one in which one language group predominates. It encourages students to develop their skills in English in order to communicate with other students.

10. We have a set of handbooks for our composition classes to address the need to have common standards in these classes and to convey these standards to new teachers of these classes.

WEAKNESSES OF THE ESL DEPARTMENT

Limited Capacity

1. When our classes are filled, we are often unable to open new sections, depending on budgetary constraints. This is especially problematic at the lower levels of our program. Only one section each of ESL 134 and 137, ESL 146, 145, and 146 are offered during the day and one at night (compare this to six day sections and one night section of ESL 26). Thus, even though we have had enough students for two sections of ESL 134, for example, we have had to turn students away. Pedagogically, having large classes of beginning students is far from ideal. Students with weak language as well as study skills need a great deal of attention, which instructors are unable to give when the teacher/student ratio is so high.

If the college increases its efforts to recruit Hispanic students, the probability that many of them will place into the low levels is high, unless the college recruits only students who have skills at the higher levels with transfer goals. This recruitment will only place more pressure on the lower levels with no safety valve at present. We will end up turning even more students away because we don’t have the space to accommodate them.

2. The length of our program is inadequate to prepare students for the demands of college level work. We have six levels of classes, which in theory, students who begin at the first level can complete in 2 years (one quarter less time if summer classes are taken). However, in reality, only extraordinary students would be able to accomplish this feat. At City College of San Francisco, a student starting at their beginning level would be ready for English 1A in four years.

Nevertheless, the pressure to keep our program at the current size is great. For example, a review of our curriculum and discussions with the English Department led to the development of a new course. However, because of the constraints on the number of classes we can offer as well as classroom space limitations, we will have to decide which classes we will cut in order to add this new course.

Placement of Students

Effective placement of students is a critical part of student success. If we place students in the wrong classes, either too low or too high, they may become bored or discouraged, lose motivation, and do poorly.

At present, while our current tests do a fair job of placing students, we need to make a number of changes in order to improve our placement process.
1. Some students are still being misplaced because our placement instruments are still too crude.
   a. We need to make some revisions to the rubric we are using to evaluate essays.
   b. We need to add a listening test in order to make the listening/speaking classes required.
      Although a campus-wide survey of faculty elicited the widespread observation that students
      needed work on listening and speaking, we are unable to require these classes without a
      placement test that tests at least listening directly. As a result, students who need to take these
      classes don’t, and these classes are the most vulnerable to being cut, in good times as well as
      bad.
   c. We need to add a reading test to assess students’ reading skills.
   d. Although these tests of listening and reading are available, budget and equipment constraints
      prevent us from even testing these tests.
2. When we need to change a student’s placement, it is often not possible to make that change
   because once classes begin, classes are full, and students cannot be accepted.
3. Even when some students may be properly placed, they will challenge their placement because:
   a. With the exception of one class, our classes that had been degree applicable are now nondegree
      applicable. Thus, students who have transfer goals see our nondegree applicable courses as
      hurdles that are impeding their progress.
   b. International Students are under the impression that they can transfer to a university after two
      years of study at Foothill. However, if they place into lower levels of ESL, it will take them
      longer.
   c. They are in a hurry to complete their course work.

Curriculum
1. Our classes are now nonrepeatable. That means students who marginally meet the learning
   outcomes of the class (getting a C), not because they had not worked hard but because their
   learning timelines did not coincide with the college’s, would not be able to take the class again.
2. The fact that our program is trying to accomplish in two years, what other colleges do in four years,
   results in a very challenging curriculum. We are finding that the course outlines in some classes
   require much more than students can achieve.
3. There is inconsistency in what is taught among sections of the same course. This may be due to the
   unrealistic demands of the course outlines, which leads instructors to make individual decisions
   about what to teach and what to leave out.
4. There is inconsistency in applying the standards of learning outcomes at each level. As a result, not
   all students moving on to the next level are adequately prepared to handle the work at that level.
5. Since so many of the teachers teach part-time, and since part-time teachers do not receive
   compensation for attending meetings, addressing the needs for consistency in what is taught and
   consistency in applying standards of learning outcomes has been extremely difficult.
6. We have handbooks for the composition classes that are given to new faculty. We need handbooks
   for all of our classes, and we need to put them online for ease of access as well as editing.
7. The quarter system, consisting of only eleven weeks, is not long enough for students to digest what
   they have been “taught”. As a result, although some students have diligently attended classes and
   completed their assignments, they are not ready for the next level. These students are given
   alternate credit, but must repeat the same class. In an ideal world, we would have two courses instead
   of one so that students can move progressively instead of reiteratively. Students who manage to
   pass the class with a “C” and move on to the next level are usually less prepared for that level than
   students who place into it by examination.

Student Support Services
1. Students at the lower levels do not have an extensive support system. Those who were in EOPS had
   the potential of getting tutors, but in fact, they often did not get them when tutors were not available.
   As of Spring Quarter 2003, however, no tutors will be available to them at all. Although we have an
   ESL Writing Center, low level students do not have access to the tutors there because its purpose is to
   address writing problems.
2. The ESL Writing Center has lost its ability to hire casual employees as tutors. In addition to the one
   Instructional Associate staffing the center, we can hire a student to work as a tutor for 20 hours
   only.
3. The Language Arts Division Language Lab does not have funding to remain open in the evenings
   or during the summer, effectively leaving students in the evening and summer programs without
   access to the resources in the lab. As a stopgap measure, we have placed CDs in the Media Center of
   the library.
B. STUDENT SUCCESS EVALUATION

1. The success rates of ESL students in English 1A and 1B depend on many variables, but one variable that is significant is whether they are international or resident students. It is our observation that international students who are already prescreened using the TOEFL and who already have a high school diploma before entering Foothill are more likely to be successful.

2. We do not have data on how many ESL students successfully transfer to other colleges.

3. The attrition rate of Hispanic students in the ESL program is high. Data from Summer 1999 to Spring 2001 show that Hispanic students comprised 54% of the students at the 130 level, 42% at the 140 level, 31% at the 150, 21% at the 160, 13% at the 25 and 12% at the 26 level. This pattern could be due to a number of factors:
   a. More Hispanic students enter at the lower levels.
   b. These students may have wanted only to take a limited number of courses.
   c. These students may have experienced less and less success with each subsequent level.
   d. The program may not have continued to meet their needs.

4. Because some of our students have neither transfer nor career development goals related to the college’s career development program, we are unable to document some of the other types of success that our students achieve. We have anecdotal evidence of such success. A mother reported, for example, that she is now able to communicate with her young children and their teachers. Another student reported that he was promoted from a cashier’s to a supervisor’s position at a department store. Yet another said he was promoted from a busboy to a waiter.

C. STUDENT EQUITY/DIVERSITY ANALYSIS

The ESL program serves resident students (41%), international students (those on F-1, F-2 or FX visas) (33%) and others (refugees, asylees, temporary workers, exchange visitors, etc.) (26%).

As international students are recruited by the college, how they impact the program is important to assess. The percentage of international students in classes increases by class level, not surprisingly because international students must have a high TOEFL score in order to be accepted to the college. The following chart shows: the percentage of international students by level for Winter Quarter 2003.

- ESL 130 level: 0%
- ESL 140: 1%
- ESL 150: 11%
- ESL 160: 33%
- ESL 25: 44%
- ESL 26: 54%

The percentage of Hispanic students by level is the inverse. As the level rises, the percentage of Hispanic students decreases. For Winter Quarter 2003, in ESL 134, 67% of the students are Hispanic. In the seven sections of ESL 26, 10% of the students are Hispanic.

We do not have data on the success rates for Hispanic students for the same time period. However, for Summer 1999-2001, they are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Percent Hispanic</th>
<th>Success Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ESL 130 level:</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESL 140:</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESL 150:</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESL 160:</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESL 25:</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESL 26:</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These figures show that the pass rate of Hispanic students is generally 60%. They also show those few students who persist to ESL 25 (13%) pass at a 72% rate. Those who make it to the highest ESL class have a pass rate of 65%.

Given our limited resources, how do we balance the needs of Hispanic students against the demands for our courses from other students, international as well as residents? There is a growing demand for our beginning courses, in which a large percentage of Hispanic students place. Nevertheless, we are unable to add sections due to a lack of classroom space and funding constraints.
At the same time, the imminent reduction in financial support for students will affect many Hispanic students, who generally place in our beginning courses, placing these classes in jeopardy.

D. ACTION PLANS AND PROPOSED PROGRAMMATIC CHANGES
1. Program Goals Related to Educational Master Plan and Partnership for Excellence:
   a. Faculty will research goals of students at the entry levels of the program: ESL 130 and 140 levels.
   b. Faculty will research factors affecting attrition rates of Hispanic students.
   c. Faculty will work with campus outreach office concerning the recruitment of Hispanic students and related offices to ensure proper resources are available.
   d. Faculty will communicate with counselors about the ESL curriculum and placement process.
   e. Faculty will revise the rubric used for assessing placement essays.
   f. Faculty will add reading and listening tests for placement.
   g. Faculty will revise course outlines to bring them in line with realistic outcomes.
   h. Faculty will apply consistent standards for assessing learning outcomes of composition classes.
   i. Faculty will continue to support student success by continuing to advocate a reduction in class size.

2. Other Program Improvement Plans:
   a. Faculty will put the composition handbooks online.
   b. The Language Arts Lab will put lab materials in the Media Center for evening and summer students.
   c. Faculty will research questions about teaching practices. For example, do international students drive the pace at which lessons are taught? Are there skills that students need in their English 1A and content classes that we are not preparing students for?

E. ENROLLMENT AND PRODUCTIVITY GOALS
Our productivity has been consistently over 400, with a high of 509 in Fall 2002 and an average of 458 for 2001 and 2002. We have been able to maintain this level of productivity even with a maximum seat count of 30 students per class by adding a lab unit for the grammar and writing classes.

F. SUMMARY OF RESOURCES REQUESTED
1. FULL-TIME EQUIVALENT FACULTY OR STAFF NEEDS: In the fall of 2003, we had hoped to have two new full-time ESL composition specialists. The ESL department has been growing steadily over the past several years, but our FT/PT ratio remains low. Over the last three years, our FT% in ESL has been 34%, 29%, and a low of 31% last year. Ratios among ESL faculty teaching composition are even lower: only 19% of ESL composition load (which comprises 45% of the ESL curriculum) was taught by full-timers last year.

   We recently lost 1.5 FTE in ESL composition when Karen Yoshihara became Dean and when Erica Giannini retired. We were granted a request for one ESL composition specialist for 01-02, but the search was extended. We finally filled that opening with Priscilla Butler, who started this year. Our second request for an ESL composition specialist made it to the top of the list in 2001, but was not funded. With the addition of Priscilla, our overall ESL FT/PT ratio is now around 40%, and among composition specialists, it is now about 26%, still far too low to ensure a quality program. Without a core of full-time ESL instructors in ESL composition, it is very difficult to maintain standards in this most important part of our curriculum. Without considering growth, an additional ESL instructor specializing in composition would bring our ESL FT% to 46% overall and to 40% in composition. Adding this second new position would bring us to 53% FT in all ESL, 53% FT in ESL composition.

2. FACILITIES NEEDS: (Include all aspects of the physical setting, e.g., room size, seating type and arrangement, multimedia equipment, lab stations, etc., that might provide a more effective student learning environment.)
   We need classrooms that are big enough to accommodate 30 students and allow teachers to arrange them in groups. We need overhead projectors that project clear images. We need outlets that are accessible so that we can plug in equipment to use in appropriate positions in the classroom. We need classrooms that are properly heated when it is cold and properly cooled when it is hot. We need tape recorders that have counters and are loud enough for a classroom of 30 students to hear.
MATERIALS AND SUPPLIES BUDGET AUGMENTATION
As our students, particularly at the beginning levels, require a lot of visual aids, we rely on handouts and overhead transparencies a great deal. However, we constantly face budgetary restrictions on paper and transparencies. It is impossible for one teacher to monitor what 30 different students are looking at in their textbooks and somewhat easier to direct all of their attention to an overhead transparency. In addition, the use of videos enable faculty to demonstrate dynamic relationships as opposed to using stationary images in textbooks to try to show activity. For these reasons, we would ask for funds to pay for these materials and supplies.