

COMPREHENSIVE DEVELOPMENT PLAN

CONSEQUENCES OF NOT SOLVING PROBLEMS: Institutional researchers estimate that in the past five years over 10,000 full-time students have been blocked from achievement of educational goals because they have not passed English and math gateway classes. The lingering effects of the deep, economic depression in Silicon Valley, recent policy changes in the University of California and CA State University systems limiting access to under-prepared students, and the dramatic changes in the Valley's demographics, intensify the situation. **Given the current economic and demographic realities (combined with the fact that De Anza is projected to grow 20% by 2010), without vital systemic changes, an additional 25,000 students will be derailed by English and math barriers to their educational goals over the next decade.**

PLANNING & PROCESSES FOR ANALYSIS OF PROBLEMS: This CDP and development of the responding Activities has been supported by the foresight of college leaders and bolstered by the shared-governance process, a collaborative effort involving all campus constituencies. Numerous groups and individuals have supported the analytical work of the Title III Steering Committee, documenting strengths and weaknesses, providing ideas and relevant data, including the documents identified in the "Selected Planning Documents" detailed on the next page. In particular, Professor John Lovas' survey of over 2,000 developmental Language Arts students has provided key information about the current student population and their needs.

Administrators, faculty, staff, and students have shared articles, studies, books, surveys and reported on visits to model programs at other colleges. De Anza's *Program Review Process*, *Student Equity Plan*, and *Educational Master Plan* are foundational to planned strategies. The District Office of Institutional Research has supplied extensive analysis of research data about student academic performance, as well as input from community, K-12, business and industry.

Constituencies Involved In Title III Planning and Analysis Processes:	
Developmental Task Force Tutorial/ Skills Centers Faculty and Staff of the Language Arts Math, Physical Science and Engineering Division Student Services and the Diversity Council Educational Diagnostic Center Assessment Office Financial Aid Office Admissions Staff Faculty Academic Senate Faculty and Staff: Readiness Department Workforce and Economic Development Marketing Department	Educational Technology Services Students/De Anza Student Body Association Curriculum Committee Office of Staff & Organizational Development Enrollment Management Team College Council & Deans' Council The President's Cabinet Foothill-De Anza Board of Trustees Part-Time Faculty and the LinC Program De Anza College Alumni Association Office of Institutional Research Local Businesses and Industry CupertinoCityCouncil&Mayor-faculty member
Selected Planning Documents used for Title III Analysis	
Foothill/DeAnza Educational Master Plan 2005-2015: Advancing the Legacy "Curriculum Guide -Student Equity,"Sp05 "Exit Exam Results Troubling." <i>San Jose Mercury News</i> .11/ 2/02. p.1A & 14A De Anna Student Language Survey. F'02 De Anza Student Equity Action Plan.F'05 K. Stange, <i>Economic Impact of Foothill- DeAnza Comm. College District</i> , 11/05 Educational Master Plan-DeAnza 2005 College Accreditation Self-Study, 2005	"Results from DeAnza Math Performance Success (MPS) Program," 2005 "Transitions and Tarpits: Access to Higher Ed and the Silicon Valley: 2010 Vision "Counseling 100, Orientation to College: Summer Enrollment Trends & Persistence," 2003 "Examining Course Advisories in Social Sciences, Humanities Division: Proposed Methodology and Examples", June 2003 "Student Success in DeAnza LinC Program," 2003 DeAnza College Program Review—English, Mathematics, Reading

ANALYSIS OF STRENGTHS, WEAKNESSES, AND PROBLEMS

STRENGTHS OF DEANZA COLLEGE <i>Related to Title III Project</i>	
Strengths of Academic Programs and Services	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Excellent Faculty and Staff: The College has a faculty with a high number of Ph.D.s and discipline experts, many with published works in their fields, and numerous faculty who have won state and national awards for excellence in teaching and for leadership in their respective fields. • Superior Transfer Program: De Anza is major gateway to four-year institutions, according to the CA Postsecondary Ed Commission, and is one of top California colleges transferring students to UC and CSU systems. • Excellent instructional technology infrastructure: De Anza's location in the Silicon Valley has helped in keeping De Anza's technology current. • Strong faculty commitment to the development of varied and innovative instructional strategies as well as to more technology-based instructional delivery systems is widespread. • Exemplary student support programs such as EOPS, DSPS and other specialized programs assist low-income, high-risk students; College Readiness Program offers peer tutoring and academic assistance.

<p>Strengths of Institutional Management</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Students serve on governance committees from Board to division advisory committees. • Under the strong leadership of its college president, De Anza maintains a devotion to being responsive to community needs and to a constituency-based shared governance process. • Faculty, administrators, and trustees participate in local, State, and national organizations and maintain close ties with high schools as well as with State colleges/universities and with key State government branches. • Quality Program Review & Enrollment Management processes are used annually with a three-year update that involves contributions of divisional staff, faculty, administrators, and researchers. • The budget is tied directly to the College Mission, to the annual Student Equity Action Plans developed in every program and division, and the <i>De Anza 2005: Pathways to Excellence</i>, the Education Master Plan. • De Anza publishes an annual report documenting its progress toward the goals outlined in the Education Master Plan.
<p>Strengths in Fiscal Stability</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Historically, De Anza meets or exceeds its state FTE allocation. • In 1999 voters approved bonds for renovating, repairing and constructing classrooms and facilities. • Faculty, staff, administrators, and students work closely to monitor expenditures and to establish budget guidelines according to college and community goals and needs. • The Foothill-De Anza Community Colleges Foundation raises and invests funds to support educational excellence at both colleges in the District.
<p>INSTITUTIONAL WEAKNESSES OF DE ANZA COLLEGE</p>	
<p>Weaknesses of Academic Programs and Services</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assessment services are underdeveloped beyond that which is necessary for initial course placement; weak diagnostic testing and retesting. • Development and application of instructional technology has been focused at higher levels of transfer curriculum and in various partnerships with industry to the exclusion of developmental and entry levels of curriculum. • The 2005 Accreditation Team recommended that De Anza needs to provide more technology training for faculty. • The application of best practices to developmental levels of curriculum has not kept pace with the instructional innovation in transfer level courses. Faculty training has been haphazard and at times, non-existent. • Perceptions, and the reality, of exclusivity limit the use of student support programs such as EOPS, DSPS² and other specialized programs designed to assist low-income, high-risk students • Math and Writing Centers do not have the capacity to help the majority of incoming students in developmental courses leaving thousands unserved. • African-American, Hispanic, and Filipino students consistently perform 5% to 38% below the performance norm of other ethnic groups; their retention

² EOPS: Extended Opportunity Programs & Services; DSPS: Disabled Students Programs & Services

	<p>in key courses is similarly significantly below the average, a major problem identified by the 2005 Accreditation Team.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The coordination of learning services is hampered by site location and organizational fractures.
Weaknesses of Institutional Management	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The continual challenge to diversify staff and faculty to better align with diversity mix of students. • Ability to track and monitor student progress is weak. Less than 5% of students in developmental classes have Educational Plans and there is no effective early alert, degree audit, or other means of /monitoring progress • Poor centralized referral services for students in need of assistance – only 16% of students in developmental classes ever visit a counselor or advisor for educational planning. • Services to Non-Native English Speakers: 75% of developmental students do not speak English as their primary language thus increasing the magnitude of deficiencies related to advising and intervention.
Weaknesses in Fiscal Stability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A Diminished 2005-2006 Budget: CA budget for 2003-04 implemented <i>major</i> cuts – triggered by the economic recession, exacerbated by the State’s 2001 energy crisis. De Anza was forced to cut its budget by 3.9 million dollars. The College has not yet recovered from its economic loss.

DOCUMENTATION & ANALYSIS OF INSTITUTIONAL PROBLEMS AND WEAKNESSES

Problems of Academic Programs Addressed in this Title III Proposal	
Major Problem #1	De Anza College has unacceptably poor retention and persistence rates among students taking <i>pre-requisite/pre-college level</i> (developmental) courses in math and English.
Related Accreditation Recommendations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Slow progress in discussion and formulation of student outcomes. ▪ Unacceptable progress in the development of a Technology Plan which includes faculty training.


Students have high goals and no way of fulfilling them: A survey of 1,060 Developmental English students and 978 ESL students in Fall 2004 showed that 89% of students in Developmental English and 60% of ESL students hope to transfer or obtain an AA/AS or vocational degree.³ However, very few students placing in developmental levels ever reach those goals.

Additional Data on Developmental Students—2005	
Success Rate	The five-year historical success rate (passing the class with a C or better) for most of the students in developmental courses is less than 54%.
Time to Goal	Students in developmental math courses take a longer period of time to pass than those not placed in developmental courses and are less likely to attempt or

³ Overall only 41% of De Anza students indicate a goal of transfer to a 4-year or to complete a degree or certificate; so the 89% corresponding goal for developmental students was surprising.

	advance to college level math courses																																																											
Failed Attempts	Students placed in developmental courses have a higher rate of failed attempts than those students who are not placed in developmental courses.																																																											
Persistence/GPA	Students placed in developmental courses have a lower grade in subsequent English or math courses than students not placed in developmental courses.																																																											
GPA	Students placed in developmental courses have a lower cumulative GPA than those not placed in developmental courses.																																																											
Ethnicity	Hispanics and African Americans place in developmental courses at a disproportionately high rate & fail to persist to the next level at even higher rates.																																																											
Goal Completion	The majority of developmental students never complete two most basic college level classes- English 1A & Math 114, Intermediate Algebra)—needed to reach goals; with in 4 years, only 35% pass English 1A and only 16% pass Math 114.																																																											
Goals of Developmental and ESL Students at De Anza College																																																												
	<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th rowspan="2"></th> <th colspan="2">Transfer To 4-Yr</th> <th colspan="2">Voc</th> <th colspan="2">AA/AS</th> <th colspan="2">Personal Growth</th> <th colspan="2">Parents</th> <th colspan="2">Determine Life Goal</th> <th colspan="2">Other</th> </tr> <tr> <th>#</th> <th>%</th> <th>#</th> <th>%</th> <th>#</th> <th>%</th> <th>#</th> <th>%</th> <th>#</th> <th>%</th> <th>#</th> <th>%</th> <th>#</th> <th>%</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Dev</td> <td>792</td> <td>80%</td> <td>3</td> <td>0%</td> <td>89</td> <td>9%</td> <td>25</td> <td>3%</td> <td>17</td> <td>2%</td> <td>46</td> <td>5%</td> <td>21</td> <td>2%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>ESL</td> <td>418</td> <td>45%</td> <td>22</td> <td>2%</td> <td>123</td> <td>13%</td> <td>227</td> <td>25%</td> <td>8</td> <td>1%</td> <td>76</td> <td>8%</td> <td>45</td> <td>5%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		Transfer To 4-Yr		Voc		AA/AS		Personal Growth		Parents		Determine Life Goal		Other		#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	Dev	792	80%	3	0%	89	9%	25	3%	17	2%	46	5%	21	2%	ESL	418	45%	22	2%	123	13%	227	25%	8	1%	76	8%	45	5%
	Transfer To 4-Yr		Voc		AA/AS		Personal Growth		Parents		Determine Life Goal		Other																																															
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%																																														
Dev	792	80%	3	0%	89	9%	25	3%	17	2%	46	5%	21	2%																																														
ESL	418	45%	22	2%	123	13%	227	25%	8	1%	76	8%	45	5%																																														

ANALYSIS OF ENGLISH GATEWAYS: The boxed diagram below, shows the distribution of 2000-2005 testing placements averages for both English and reading, as well as, the sequence of developmental courses leading up to transfer level, ‘Freshman Composition’ EWRT 1A. Students placing in the lowest levels of English (EWRT 200 or 100B) and/or reading (READ 201 or 100) are also required to enroll in a half-unit co-requisite class which supplements these courses and focus on the core principles and skills needed for the next level course.



In addition to passing the course itself, students must also pass a final exam in each of these co-requisite classes prior to enrolling in the next level English/Reading course. This exam is given and evaluated by faculty and staff in the English and reading courses. This final co-requisite test is crucial for making sure students have necessary competencies to progress to next level. Over 15% of students taking these courses and the co-requisite do not pass this “exit” exam and must repeat the co-requisite classes, often several times, before they pass and move up.


ENGLISH GATEWAY COURSES: BARRIER FOR THOUSANDS OF STUDENTS		
Course	Success Rate Data⁴	Why is this a Critical Gateway Course?⁵
EWRT 200: Fundamentals of Writing (taken concurrently with EWRT 150-Guided Practice in Writing).	70% of enrolled students (2000-2005 cohorts) successfully passed EWRT 200. <i>However:</i> <u>Poor Rates of Persistence:</u> Cohort tracking indicates only 45% of students beginning at EWRT 200 pass EWRT 100B within three years and only 35 % complete EWRT 1A*	2000-2005 assessment data, indicates an average of 24% of students tested place at this level two courses below EWRT 1A** <i>8-10 sections enrolling 200-225 students are offered each Fall.</i>
EWRT 100B: Preparatory Reading and Writing Skills (taken concurrently with EWRT 160-Guided Practice in Reading and Writing)	76% of enrolled students (2000-2005 cohorts) successfully passed EWRT 100B. <i>However:</i> <u>Persistence:</u> Cohort tracking indicates that only 53% of students beginning at EWRT 100B are passing EWRT 1A** within the next three years. <u>Repeaters:</u> Students can retake EWRT 160 (preparing to pass the exit test) three times for credit. 15% of 100B students repeat the course each year.	2000-2005 assessment data, indicates an average of 57% of students tested place at this gateway level - one courses below EWRT 1A**. About 2500 students take this course each year – the majority have declared degree and/or transfer as goal. <i>In a typical Fall term, 35 sections enrolling a total of almost 1000 students is offered.</i>
2000-2005 assessment data indicates an average of only 16% of those tested place directly into EWRT 1A		

**EWRT 1A (Composition and Reading: Standard ‘Freshman Composition).
This course is a requirement for all degrees and transfer students

⁴ Barr, R., “Tracking Of Cohorts” Study, District Office of Institutional Research, Spring 2005.

⁵ De Anza Assessment Center Data 2000-2005

ANALYSIS OF MATH GATEWAYS: The diagram below shows the distribution of testing placements averages and the overall sequence of developmental courses leading to transfer level.



Developmental students fail at an even higher rate in math than they do in writing. .

Fewer than 20% of students starting initially with Math 210 attempt college-level math course higher than Math 114, Intermediate Algebra. Of 932 students tracked in the 2004 cohorts, for example, only 10.5% completed any course higher than Math 114 within a period of four years.

Pre-College Math Courses Barrier For Thousands Of Students (2000-05 Cohort)		
Course	Success Rates Data ⁽¹⁾	Why Gateway Course? ⁽²⁾
Math 210 Pre-Algebra	An average 65% of enrolled students successfully passed Math 210, only 35% went on successfully pass Math 112 within three years. <u>Persistence:</u> Cohort tracking indicates that on average 16 % of students beginning at Math 210 are passing Math 114 within 3 years and less than 10% ever successfully complete math course above 114.	2000-2005 assessment data, indicates an average of 22% of students tested place at this lowest math level. <i>12-15 sections enrolling a total of 480-600 students are offered each Fall term</i>
Math 112 Begin. Algebra	While pass rates for students beginning in Math 112 reach as much as 72% only 40% went on successfully to pass Math 114 within three years. <u>Persistence:</u> Cohort tracking indicates that 24% of students beginning at Math 112 successfully complete a math course above Math 114 within three years.	2000-2005 assessment data indicates an average of 27% of students tested place here. <i>Fall 2004: 26 sections enrolling a total of 1040 students</i>

Math 114 Interm. Algebra	<p>About 70% of students that begin at Math 114 pass the course. <u>Persistence:</u> Cohort tracking indicates that 50% of students beginning at Math 114 successfully complete a course above Math 114 within 3 yrs. y</p>	2000-2005 assessment data, indicates an average of 32% of students tested place here. Course pre-requisite for most college programs.
-----------------------------------	--	--

FACTORS CONTRIBUTING TO THE PERSISTENCE AND RETENTION PROBLEM

Explosive Growth of Households in which English is Not the First Language: Contributing to the high numbers of developmental students is that “nearly half of Santa Clara County’s residents speak a language other than English at home following a decade of immigration that reshaped the Bay Area’s ethnic landscape.”⁶

In 2004 over **75% of non-ESL developmental students had a first language other than English in addition to the 100% of ESL students.** Typically, these students are recently arrived nonnative English speaking immigrants; they may have little or no English language proficiency; may or may not have first language literacy; and will require specialized instruction to develop oral fluency as well as academic reading and writing proficiency.

De Anza’s Service Area Transformed, but De Anza’s Developmental Program Did Not: As documented on subsequent tables, De Anza’s ethnic diversity and the first language spoken by the majority of its students have changed dramatically since the mid-1970s when the College’s developmental programs were instituted. **These programs had been designed to meet the needs of at-risk students whose first language was English, but the program did not change to meet the needs of students whose first language is not English.** De Anza’s developmental curriculum, as well as coordination between English, reading, math, and ESL developmental faculty, has not changed adequately to meet the needs of this new population.

⁶ *San Jose Mercury News*, 27 Aug., 2002, A1

Dramatic Shift in Ethnicity and Language at De Anza College						
	Fall 1970	% of Total	Fall 2005	% of Total	Change as % of Total	<i>For the College, the importance of these ethnicity shifts is not one of race, but of language. Faculty must implement new methods and innovative strategies to help non-native English language speakers get past critical educational gateways.</i>
Asian/Filipino/Pacific Islander	296	3%	9,591	41.3%	+41.2%	
Caucasian/White	8,666	91%	5,982	25.7%	(-65.3%)	
African American	164	2%	1,218	+5.2%	+5.2%%	
Hispanic	445	5%	3,200	+13.8%	+13.7%	
Other	0	13.5%	3,133	13.5%	+13.5%	
Total	9,571		23,255			

The analysis of data gives an interesting profile of the De Anza students enrolled in developmental English. Most telling was the fact that **English is the first language of only 27% of the students NOT in the ESL program.** There was no single majority ‘first language’ group in ESL courses, although Chinese was highest at 31% followed by Vietnamese at 18%. *In total fifteen different first languages were found for non-ESL students.*

College’s Assessment Instruments Have Not been a Part of Regular Program Review:

Approximately 16,000 students per year take De Anza’s required Math, English, Reading, and ESL placement tests before they can enroll in college-level courses needed to transfer or obtain a degree/certificate. According to De Anza’s Director of Assessment, **85 – 90% of students tested during the past five years have placed into developmental classes.**

All entering new students who hope to transfer or obtain an AA/AS degree must prove their competency in English, reading, and math. Consequently, the majority of students take required placement tests. For English and reading, they take the College Board’s DTLS (Descriptive Test of Language Skills) and write an essay; for math, the College Board’s DTMS (Descriptive Test of Math Skills). Key faculty normed these tests when they were instituted in the mid-1980s, seven years ago, faculty re-evaluated the tests and modified the cut scores

accordingly. It is time to review them all again, as the current DTLS and DTMS **assessment tools do not provide adequate diagnostic assessment of a student's individual deficiencies.**

Assessment Shortcomings	Example: Impact on Students
Without better diagnostic assessment, faculty and counselors cannot identify a student's particular remediation needs and cannot prescribe the appropriate classes, modules, or skills sets that will most help that student.	A student scoring low on the DTMS because s/he did not understand fractions is currently placed into Math 112 (Beginning Algebra) Were the student able to have an intense review of fractions via specialized modules there could be a timely progression to Math 114..

Faculty Development and Support: Most faculty teaching developmental courses are also unprepared and inadequately trained to implement new and relevant technological resources and methods that might help their students. **The 2005 Accreditation Team recommendations included the need for new technology resources and technology training for faculty.** The tasks outlined in the Activity section of this grant respond directly to this recommendation.

Faculty in English, reading, and math are inadequately prepared to remediate individual skill deficiencies and/or identify the variety of learning styles they encounter in their students.

Faculty Development Shortcomings	Example: Impact on Students
English, reading, and math faculty have continually demonstrated their desire to find more effective ways to help under-prepared students.	A student whose first language is not English, may need work exclusively in clause manipulation, sentence boundaries, or vocabulary and usage. De Anza's faculty does not have adequate language-based training to address these particular problems

Progress to Date: In the Language Arts Division, over half of the faculty participate in the Developmental Task Force activities and attend yearly Developmental Task Force retreats which focus on ways to help developmental students improve their skills. They also provide and share workshops to inform each other about successful techniques that work. They have created a limited number of **LinC courses which combine English and reading instruction (coded LART)** specifically for students who have not reached college-level English. In the Math Department, faculty have developed a **Math Performance Success Program (MPS)** designed

specifically for under-prepared students. This limited program has achieved its goals of enabling its under-prepared students to succeed at a much higher rate than those students enrolled in regular math classes. It is, in fact, **the success of these two programs (LinC and MPS) which has, in part, inspired the plans and goals of this Title III proposal.**

PROBLEMS OF INSTITUTIONAL MANAGEMENT Addressed in this Title III Proposal	
Major Problem #2	Too few developmental students are served by a fragmented and duplicative infrastructure of student support programs & uncoordinated support services.
Related Accreditation Recommendations	De Anza must do more and better equity work for specific groups of students, specifically among Latino, African American and Filipino students.

Uncoordinated and Fragmented Services: In Fall 2005 a survey of students enrolled in developmental English and ESL revealed vital information about this large and growing group self-declared as transfer bound, who (as documented in Problem #1) have poor rates of success in critical gateway pre-requisites. This data, along with an analysis of relevant systemic weaknesses at the college impacting these students, follows. The vast majority of students enrolled in developmental levels of English and math are: in the traditional college-aged group, ages 18-24 years; are taking more than 10 credits; and have declared intent to get a degree or transfer. The following chart is based on student response to the survey question “*What resources out-side of classroom have you accessed at De Anza College?*” and is strong evidence that developmental students, the vast majority of whom plan to transfer to a four-institution, are literally falling through the cracks in the student support and learning assistance network at the college. **Only 4% used tutoring services; less than one in seven saw a counselor; and almost none were participating in the myriad of special programs designed to help students succeed.** In an effort to meet the needs of all, De Anza has added programs and services pertaining to specific needs. The College currently supports numerous small and large

Resources Accessed by Developmental Education and ESL students Fall 2005 (Partial list of resources available)				
<i>(Check all that apply)</i>	Dev. Education		ESL	
	#	%	#	%
Counseling	360	16%	230	13%
ATC computer labs	255	11%	255	14%
Open Media Lab	344	15%	331	18%
Lib. Internet Lab	231	10%	164	9%
Tutorial Center	81	4%	65	4%
Library	534	23%	457	25%
Career Center	74	3%	41	2%
Assessment Office	51	2%	17	1%
Transfer Center	113	5%	24	1%
Intl. Stnt Center	34	1%	93	5%
EOPS	89	4%	73	4%
CARE	9	0%	3	0%
OTI	10	0%	13	1%
EDC	22	1%	1	0%
CDEP	1	0%	1	0%
DSS	6	0%	3	0%
STARS	62	3%	44	2%
SLAMS	23	1%	5	0%
Total	2299		1820	
<i>EOPS: Extended Opportunity Programs & Services; OTI: Occup. Training; EDC: Educational Diagnostic Center; DSS: Disabled Student Services; STARS: Student Transfer Academic Retention Services; SLAMS: Student Leadership Academic Mentoring for Success; CARE: Cooperative Agencies Resources for Education; CDEP: Career Development Employment Program</i>				

programs and pockets of services all designed to aid ESL, under-prepared, and at-risk students. While each of these programs has merit, they do not meet the holistic needs of the student, and overwhelm staff, faculty and the college as a whole. **For students, faculty, program managers, and counselors alike, such a chaotic array of “avenues to success” is confusing, in fact, formidable; additionally it is expensive and not responsive to the needs of the students.** As documented previously, too few developmental level students find or seek appropriate support and guidance; too few students know or are directed to alternative methods and programs designed for their particular needs; too few staff and faculty are sufficiently aware of various instructional or support services available

for developmental students and refer/direct individual students to them. *Strategies are proposed in this grant for centralization and coordination of developmental instruction and counseling to help alleviate this problem.*

Poor Access to Information for Advising, Referral, and Student Tracking: Currently, there are no reliable **resources** for identifying potentially high risk students. Faculty and counselors do not have thorough and consistent **methods** for directing these students to appropriate sources for help. Additionally, they do not have clearly designated **places** to send students who need specific remediation. **Students have neither access to, nor help with designing Individual Educational Plans (IEP).** Counselors are unable to monitor a student's academic progress or to implement interventions at strategic points in a student's progress through the system.

De Anza's Ethnicity Success Gap: Fall 2005, the Director of Institutional Research shared data with faculty indicating student success rates in English and math by ethnicity. These figures dramatically highlight success gaps between African Americans, Filipinos, Hispanics and other ethnic groups. Contrary to College goals in *2005 Pathways for Student Equity*, **a gap of 5% to 38% exists between success rate of these groups** and the success rate of other groups such as Whites and Asians. **In Math 112 (Beginning Algebra) Asians and Whites passed at a 55% and 59% respectively while only 21% of African Americans and 48% of Hispanics passed.** In EWRT 100B, the developmental gateway for English, the success gap was closer but still unacceptable. Asians and Whites passed at 82%, while 77% of African Americans, 73% of Hispanics and 79% of Filipinos passed.⁷ In October 2005, the visiting Accreditation Team recommended that De Anza exert every effort to close this ethnicity success gap.

PROBLEMS OF FISCAL STABILITY

California does not fund multiple class repetitions: De Anza does not receive CA State apportionment when a student repeats a course more than twice. The following chart analyses the number of students repeating in just one class (**5.5 unit course *Preparatory Reading & Writing***

⁷ These figures do not account for the students who began in lower-level developmental classes and failed to make it to the EWRT 100B level.

Skills). If only 1 in 10 of the 375 repeaters was taking the class for a 3rd time, \$100,000+ in revenue went uncollected in the last two years for repeaters in just this one class. In addition, 15 sections of the 5.5 unit class *Preparatory Reading and Writing Skills* must be offered each year just to allow enrollment of those students repeating course.

High cost of repetitions from just a single developmental level English course		
EWRT 100B: Preparatory Reading and Writing Skills (taken concurrently with EWRT 160-Guided Practice in Reading and Writing)	An average of 76% of enrolled students (2000-2005 cohorts) successfully passed EWRT 100B. BUT <u>Persistence:</u> Cohort tracking indicates that only 53% of students beginning at EWRT 100B are passing English 1A within the next three years. <u>Repeaters:</u> Students can retake EWRT 160 (which prepares them to pass exit test) 3X for credit.	2000-05 assessment data, indicates an avg of 57% of students tested place at 100B-1 courses below transferable 1A. About 2500 students take this course each year – the majority of whom have declared degree and/or transfer as goal. <i>In a typical Fall term, 35 100B sections enrolling a total of almost 1000 students is offered.</i>
Of the 2500 students who take EWRT 100B annually, an average of 15% (375) repeat each year. 375 students = 15 class section of 25 students.		

The current budget remains unstable because a 7% drop in enrollment, a drop that probably still reflects the remnants of the economic downturn suffered by the Silicon Valley. Hiring of new personnel has been postponed, technical trainers and classes designed to teach faculty how to use innovative technology were eliminated and equipment replacements have been delayed.

PROPOSED SOLUTION TO PROBLEMS: Strengthen and centralize the coordination of student success efforts for developmental students into two large, staffed, and well-equipped Centers - with embedded assessment, advising, tutoring, and instructional methods targeting a decrease in the equity gap among ethnic groups: **Language Arts Success Center (LASC) and the Math Resource Center (MRC)**. Both Centers will be supported by increased collaboration on success of students between Students Services and Instruction and faculty and staff development.

4. KEY INSTITUTIONAL GOALS	
De Anza 2005: Pathways for Student Equity, Achieving Goals of Master Plan, emphasizes three Title III related goals paramount to the college mission:	<p>1) Increase number of students earning degrees & certificates;</p> <p>2) Improve the success rates of all students across demographic groups so that learning outcomes are comparably high with no more than a 5% variance between each group;</p> <p>3) Build the college's research to examine student learning outcomes & retention</p>
<p>The Goal Setting Process is an integral part of effective shared governance at DeAnza. The following College goals respond to documented problems and weaknesses and were extracted from DeAnza departmental level planning documents –</p>	
<p>Academic Goal: To increase % of students successfully progressing through developmental Math and English course sequences into college programs and persisting to completion of AA/AS degrees, vocational degrees or transfer status.</p>	<p>Related College Academic Goal Statements</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Redesign curriculum, programs and services to increase efficacy of bridging developmental students to college-level 2. Decrease equity gap in course and program completion. 3. Establish a Language Arts Success Center, centralizing College Readiness, tutoring, embedded counseling, and English/Reading/Writing diagnostic assessment 4. Establish a Math Resource Center, centralizing MPS, tutoring, embedded counseling, and diagnostic math assessment testing/re-testing 5. Increase professional development faculty teaching development level 6. Train faculty in instructional applications of technology. 7. Continue to identify causes of poor persistence and research best-practice approaches for implementing change in classrooms 8. Develop faculty training in uses of technology, of on-line system for input and tracking of student progress.
<p>Institutional Mgmt Goal: To increase numbers of dev. students using support services, strengthen and restructure service and referral systems in advising, assessment, and tutoring</p>	<p>Related College Institutional Management Goal Statements</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Work to decrease equity gap in student success, especially in math. 2. Strengthen student assessment, tracking systems, and early alert 3. Implement Individual Ed Plan (IEP) use for developmental students. 4. Develop increased capacity for diagnostic student assessment, with regular retesting for determination of skill mastery. 5. Student Services and Instruction will work together to create Math Resource Center and Language Arts Success Center as hubs for embedded student support and improved referral and follow-up systems. 6. Review service programs, restructuring as appropriate to increase effectiveness, improve access, and eliminate unnecessary duplication.
<p>Fiscal Goal: To decrease revenue loss: course repetitions & services duplication</p>	<p>Related College Fiscal Goal Statements</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Decrease numbers of students repeating courses (3rd repetition or greater = no revenue). 2. Reduce costly duplication of programs and services

5. Five-Year INSTITUTIONAL OBJECTIVES to Measure Success of Reaching Goals	Related Problems & Goals																														
<p>Objective 1. Persistence to Degree Achievement for Students Entering at Developmental Level: At least 18% of 2006-11 student cohort, entering at developmental level in Math and/or English, will progress to completion of degree requirements, compared 1998-2004 cohort 6-year baseline of 13%.</p> <p>Objective 2. Developmental English/Reading/Language Arts Progression</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>English 200:</i> By September 2011, increase the percentage of students beginning at EWRT 200 who pass English 1A within five years to 45%, over a 1998-2004 cohort baseline of 35%. • <i>English 100B:</i> To increase the percentage of students beginning at EWRT 100B who pass English 1A within three years to 65% over a 1998-2004 cohort baseline of 53%. <p>Objective 3. Developmental Math Progression:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Math 210 - Pre-Algebra:</i> By September 2011, increase the percentage of students beginning, at Math 210 who pass Math 114 within five years to 45% over a 1998-2004 cohort baseline of 35% and the percentage of students beginning Math 210 who pass Math 114 within three years to 25% over a 1998-2004 cohort baseline of 10%. • <i>Math 112 - Beginning Algebra:</i> Cohort tracking data for 2006-2011 will indicate that at least 50% of students successfully passing Math 112, will persist to successfully complete Math 114 within three years, compared to a 2000-05 cohort baseline of 40% progression. • <i>Math 114 - Intermediate Algebra:</i> By September 2011, increase percentage of students beginning at Math 114 who pass course to 75% over a 1998-2004 cohort baseline of 70%. <p>Objective 4: By September 2011, increase by four times over the 2005 baseline of 15% the percent of faculty teaching developmental math and English who have integrated use of technology and best practices into their courses. <u>Targets:</u> 07-08: 20%; 08-09: 33%; 09-10: 45%; 10-11: 60%</p>	<p>Academic Problem #1: De Anza College has unacceptably poor retention and persistence rates among students taking <i>pre-requisite/pre-college level</i> (developmental) courses in math and English.</p> <p>Title III Academic Goal: Increase % of students progressing through developmental Math and English sequences into college programs and persisting to completion of goal.</p> <p>All 5 CDP Objectives also address Fiscal Problem #3 and Fiscal Goal. <i>See Activity Objectives For Related Annual Performance Measures to monitor progress</i></p>																														
<p>Objective 5. Student Services for Developmental Students: By September 2011, increase the percentage of developmental students who receive tutoring, counseling, have an Individual Education Plan (IEP), and are given diagnostic testing/retesting to assess skills mastery.</p> <p>Baselines & Annual Targets follow:</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>06-07</th> <th>07-08</th> <th>08-09</th> <th>09-10</th> <th>10-11</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Tutoring 2004 Baseline: 4%</td> <td>8%</td> <td>12%</td> <td>15%</td> <td>18%</td> <td>20%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Counseling 2004 Baseline: 16%</td> <td>20%</td> <td>25%</td> <td>33%</td> <td>40%</td> <td>50%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Individual Ed Plan -IEP 2004 Baseline 5%</td> <td>7.5%</td> <td>10%</td> <td>15%</td> <td>20%</td> <td>25%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Diagnostic Assessment 2004 Baseline: 2%</td> <td>---</td> <td>10%</td> <td>20%</td> <td>30%</td> <td>40%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		06-07	07-08	08-09	09-10	10-11	Tutoring 2004 Baseline: 4%	8%	12%	15%	18%	20%	Counseling 2004 Baseline: 16%	20%	25%	33%	40%	50%	Individual Ed Plan -IEP 2004 Baseline 5%	7.5%	10%	15%	20%	25%	Diagnostic Assessment 2004 Baseline: 2%	---	10%	20%	30%	40%	<p>Institutional Mgmt. Problem #2: Too few developmental students are served by a fragmented and duplicative infrastructure of student support programs & uncoordinated support services.</p>
	06-07	07-08	08-09	09-10	10-11																										
Tutoring 2004 Baseline: 4%	8%	12%	15%	18%	20%																										
Counseling 2004 Baseline: 16%	20%	25%	33%	40%	50%																										
Individual Ed Plan -IEP 2004 Baseline 5%	7.5%	10%	15%	20%	25%																										
Diagnostic Assessment 2004 Baseline: 2%	---	10%	20%	30%	40%																										

6. INSTITUTIONALIZING NEW PRACTICES AND IMPROVEMENTS:

Impact on Accreditation Recommendations: By implementing Title III strategies, De Anza will directly respond to three recommendations for improvement. The College will 1) evaluate student success more directly through use of student outcome measures; 2) strive to close performance gap between African Americans, Filipinos, Hispanics and other ethnic groups; and 3) provide much needed faculty and staff development, particularly in technology.

Title III Leverages Permanent Changes in Programs & Facilities: The proposed Activities will develop and institutionalize the **Language Arts Success Center (LASC)**, which will be housed in the renovated Advanced Technology Building, and the **Math Resource Center (MRC)**, in a central space in the new Science Building. The locations for these Centers have been built or are being renovated with Measure E bond funds, and **donations have been secured for a portion of the equipment to establish these Centers.** Title III is only being asked to assist with a portion of the start-up costs.

Commitment to Equipment Maintenance and Upgrade: In concert with the District Technology Center, De Anza will fund post-grant maintenance, equipment and software upgrades and license renewals. These costs will be included in college departmental budgets on an annual basis. De Anza will 1) purchase equipment that can be serviced by present staff; 2) purchase hardware that has a lifetime expectancy beyond the years of the grant; 3) purchase technology with a warranty of at least a year and site licensed software with built-in upgrades.

Compliance with Required Governance and Curriculum Approval Processes: Following standard procedures, any new curricula will be submitted to department faculty for approval then sent to the De Anza College Curriculum Committee for scrutiny and approval.

Continued Professional Development: The establishment of a cadre of internal expertise in developmental education via the Kellogg Institute, will position the College for continued professional development via a train-the-trainers strategy. On-going training as planned in this application includes new strategies, methods, and technologies, and provides for effective continuation of those new practices at the conclusion of funding. Faculty training will be planned in conjunction with the Office of Organizational and Staff Development which will assume the on-going costs for faculty and staff training which will be needed post-grant.

Staffing the LASC and MRC Post-grant: In addition to creation of new LASC and MRC Coordinator positions, this proposal designates - on a release/replace model - dedicated faculty and staff with well-established working relationships, qualified and ready to assume responsibilities, who will help to assure post-grant continuation. Those closest to responsibility for institutionalization are part of team designing and implementing this project.

SUSTAINABILITY OF MATH AND LANGUAGE ARTS CENTERS Cost Analysis for Recurring and Non-recurring Costs Related to Title III Funding	
Recurring Costs to run LASC & MRC <i>Post Title III</i>	Non-recurring Costs <i>Five Years of Grant Only</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Salary/benefits for Center Coordinators • Salaries/benefits for Instructional Assistants, Faculty and Tutors • Upgrades/replacement for equipment • Additions, upgrades, and probable eventual license fees • Supplies budgets • On-going training for staff and faculty • Technical support and equipment maintenance 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Faculty replacement costs for curricula and methods development and pilot-testing • Costs for training new DeAnza internal expertise at the Kellogg Institute for Developmental Educators • Initial equipment and software acquisition • Initial set-up of Centers procedures, security, and scheduling, etc. • Initial development of training materials • Grant management personnel, supplies and travel costs

Fiscal Commitment to Post-grant Continuation: Toward validation of De Anza’s absolute intention for full institutionalization of operational costs of these centers post-grant,

College leaders met (included reps from Budget Planning, Instructional Management, Facilities Planning, Faculty and Staff, along with the lead of the Title III planning group) and completed a comprehensive analysis of costs related to creation and continuation of these Centers. The ‘Sustainability...’ table on the preceding page is a composite of the parameters of the discussion.

Because the district had a 7% drop in enrollment in Fall 2005 and strict budgetary restrictions have been temporarily implemented, DeAnza is forbidden to submit this project showing any costs phasing onto the college budget. Had this prohibition not been in place, we would have absolutely submitted a budget phasing the MRC and LASC director positions off the grant in years 3, 4, and 5. DeAnza leaders are confident that funds for continuation will be available in 2010-2011 as shown in the following table:

Where Will the Money Come from to Sustain/Institutionalize the MRC and LASC?
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Cost-effective centralization of services will be a result of this grant. Included in the Activity is a plan to reassess all special services programs and combine, coordinate, and restructure or eliminate them as appropriate. A large portion of the funds freed by this restructuring will be directed to continued funding the Title III activities. 2. Many faculty will retire within the next five years, allowing for restructuring of assignments and workloads. Faculty will be reassigned part of their contractual assignments to activities in the LASC and MRC. 3. Additional revenues will result from decreasing the incredibly high number of third time course repetitions which are not funded by the State. <i>As described in the fiscal stability problem, it has been <u>conservative</u> calculated that over the past five years, there have been between \$250,000 and \$500,000 in lost revenue allocation reimbursements – mostly due to multiple repetitions in developmental level classes.</i> 4. Finally, if even 50 additional full-time students per year (25 per semester) – 250 over five years - are prevented from dropping out by restructured student support services and the support of the MRC and LASC established with via Title III it will substantially add to college budget. $250 \text{ FTE} \times \\$3350 = \\$837,500$ in new revenues per year.