

SPECC Report 2006 Los Medanos College

Submitted by: Myra Snell and Nancy Ybarra

I. Report on SPECC – Year II

A. Activities and Accomplishments for 2006

*What have been the major activities and accomplishments of your SPECC work in 2006?
How have these activities moved you towards your interim goals and long-term goals?*

Major campus activities in classroom practice, faculty development and inquiry:

ENGLISH

Teaching Communities: In Spring 2006 we had a teaching community that involved 6 faculty members, all but one of whom were adjunct faculty. The teaching community was facilitated by our English DE Lead and built on earlier teaching community work that had faculty conduct a literature review on effective pedagogies in the teaching of grammar. This teaching community focused on two research questions:

1. Do the practices of rhetorical grammar (analyzing and modeling paragraph-level passages to increase understanding of how grammar works with content to convey meaning) and sentence-combining (specifically, teaching sentence “templates” or lexical phrases) improve student outcomes in grammar?
2. Do students of faculty in the teaching community exhibit an increase in their grammatical skills from week two to week sixteen?

The details of this teaching community work can be accessed on our Blackboard classroom for English Teaching Communities. The work of this teaching community may have influenced an important departmental decision for our developmental education program. The one full time faculty member in the Teaching Community was also our Tutor Coordinator for Developmental English. Beginning Fall 2006, we departed from our traditional tutor training curriculum which focused on training tutors to help students in DE classes with sentence level skills – traditional grammar usage exercises. Tutors are now trained primarily in the Reading Apprenticeship model and work in the classroom with students on the skills of questioning, predicting, summarizing and clarifying. While there are many reasons for this change, one is our realization that the teaching of grammar is highly complex, and we are still grappling with it as instructors; therefore, how can we expect tutors to be effective in helping students, when we are still unsure of how to do this effectively ourselves? (This same faculty member participated in our SoTL De Seminar in Fall 2006 and researched the question of how effective tutors are in working with reading skills.)

Fall 2006 English Department Work: Designing for Success/Curriculum Mondays

We have achieved a great deal in the English department in terms of defining student learning outcomes for our integrated reading and writing courses, and writing curriculum that addresses those outcomes. In teaching communities, individual faculty have investigated how to teach this curriculum more effectively and have assessed student work in terms of the intended learning outcomes. However, we realize that we still have a long way to go before we can say with any assurance that the intended curriculum is actually being taught in all classes, and that students are being assessed for their performance on the intended learning outcomes in an equitable way.

Our first tentative step towards reaching this ambitious goal has been to institute a consistent staff development program *for the entire department*. While we can assure full time faculty participation in this endeavor, we can only strongly encourage adjunct faculty to participate. By setting the monthly dates well in advance and compensating faculty for their participation, we hope to encourage maximum participation, and build this into the culture of our department. The following is our departmental manifesto for this effort which we have dubbed “Curriculum Mondays”:

As a department we share a common goal; we want our students to learn the skills, abilities, and “dispositions” of an effective communicator – someone who can use the tools of reading and writing for multiple purposes and audiences. So, how do we as a department *intentionally design* for achieving this goal?

The first step is to have *agreed upon student learning outcomes for each course* in our program. We have done this for the courses in our developmental program sequence; of course, these outcomes should be periodically revisited to ensure that they are still current and desirable.

The second step is to make sure that we have a way of answering the question, “Are students who achieve a C or better in these courses demonstrating a proficient level of performance on the learning outcomes for the course?” The way we do this is by ensuring that *the major assignments in the course* – the assignments that weigh heavily in the students’ final grade- *actually call for students to demonstrate their proficiency on these outcomes*. This of course means that we need some overall agreement on what “proficiency” looks like – hence the need to look at *grading criteria/rubrics*.

The third step is to explore the ways in which we *provide students with opportunities to acquire* the skills, abilities and dispositions we are measuring with our major assignments. Do we have any evidence that the classroom activities and individual study students engage in actually result in learning? How do we know if lecture, demonstrations, discussions, small groups, computer aided instruction, tutoring, etc. is moving students toward proficiency in the intended learning outcomes for the course?

The fourth step is to provide *feedback to the department* that can be used to make programmatic decisions that promote improved teaching and learning. This is what we are attempting to do now. We are trying to create a departmental structure/process for systematically reviewing all of the above, and collecting information that we can use to improve our curriculum and instructional approaches, bringing us closer to our common

goal- helping students gain the skills, abilities and dispositions of effective communicators who use the tools of reading and writing to address multiple audiences for multiple purposes.

We had one flex workshop and three “Curriculum Mondays” in Fall 2006 and collected many assignments for the courses which we have organized in folders in our Blackboard Classroom. During our meetings, we met in three small groups for each of our two main developmental levels and our first transfer level composition course. We compared and contrasted assignments being given in different sections of the same courses, debated whether or not they called upon students to demonstrate the same type and level of skills, discussed obstacles students might face in doing well on the assignments, and instructional scaffolding that would lead to student success. We intend to continue these meetings, perhaps with a different purpose and focus each year.

In addition, all instructors teaching sections of English 90, our capstone developmental course, will submit student work on their last essay assignment; student essays will be holistically scored in January 2007. The department has also committed to a detailed plan for program level assessment that follows a 2 year cycle, in which we will intentionally respond to the data we collect on student performance on this capstone assessment. This will also inform the agenda for “Curriculum Mondays” in the English 90 subgroup.

MATH:

Math Assessment/Curriculum development/Staff development:

Prealgebra: In SP 06 we conducted an assessment of problem-solving ability of prealgebra students on FA 05 final exams. Weaknesses in student work motivated the work of the Prealgebra Teaching Community, which investigated two questions:

- Can the findings of math education research be applied to the community college prealgebra classroom?
- Will staff development combined with classroom-based research impact positive change in the planning, teaching, and learning of basic math skills?

We found that K-12 math education research resonates with our experiences with adult learners in community college precollegiate math courses. We also realized that arithmetic is full of conceptually rich mathematics and that we need to think deeply about these concepts in order to teach them well. The Teaching Community produced measurable positive effect on curriculum planning and pedagogy but did not result in consistent improvement in student performance on SP 06 final exams. This work is summarized more fully in a KEEP website entitled Prealgebra Classroom Research: Working Together to Improve Student Learning. Prealgebra is again a focus for SP 07 with the goal of improving students’ ability to solve problems and reason mathematically. We plan to substantially rewrite the curriculum to address recommendations of math education research.

Elementary Algebra: The last assessment of student work in Elementary Algebra was conducted in FA 03. That analysis of final exams showed student strengths in symbolic procedural skills, fair performance in use of multiple representations, and difficulty in communication and problem-solving. In response to these findings, we have conducted a series of retreats for Elementary Algebra instructors for the last two years. These retreats are consistently well-attended with at least 70% of the Elementary Algebra instructors attending in any given semester. In 2006 we offered 7 retreats for a total of 21 hours of professional development. Three of these retreats focused on the teaching and learning of procedural skills. This work culminated in a collaboratively developed set of quizzes that will be class-tested in SP 07. These quizzes set a standard for the scope and difficulty level for procedural skills in this course. Perhaps more importantly, this work highlights the fact that procedural skills are not the course, but just one of five course learning outcomes. The remaining four retreats focused on the teaching and learning of communication, problem-solving, and use of multiple representations. We applied ideas from Chapter 2 “Using Cognitively Complex Tasks in the Classroom” of *Implementing Standards-based Mathematics Instruction: A Casebook for Professional Development*, Stein et.al. We deconstructed class activities to analyze the scaffolding of tasks that foster these abilities. We designed set-up and implementation strategies for class activities and discussed whether the strategies undermined or enhanced the cognitive demand of tasks. We discussed pedagogical strategies for creating an interactive classroom. Next semester we plan to assess Elementary Algebra final exams from FA 06. Elementary Algebra instructors will be paid to conduct classroom research projects that respond to the assessment results. This will focus faculty efforts on learning outcomes besides procedural skills. Projects will be documented on KEEP webpages and used to improve the curriculum, for future staff development, and as a measure of how faculty are teaching to the broader learning outcomes.

Intermediate Algebra: We conducted an assessment of student work on final exams in Intermediate Algebra in SP 06. This is 4th consecutive semester that we have analyzed random samples of student work across sections of this capstone precollegiate math course. The 1st two assessments highlighted student difficulty in communication, problem-solving, and use of multiple representations. The 30 classroom activities written by the Intermediate Algebra Teaching Community in FA 04 were significantly revised to systematically incorporate problems and tasks designed to improve student ability in these three areas. The last two assessments demonstrate that these revisions have improved student learning. For both FA 05 and SP 06 over 80% of the sample performed at a proficient or better level on all three learning outcomes. (See Appendix A: Math 30 Assessment Report SP 06)

These assessment results do not represent all Intermediate Algebra students at LMC since we have only sampled from the sections taught by instructors using the Teaching Community’s classroom activities. Over the four semesters we have conducted the assessment, the sample represented between 25% and 64% of the sections of Intermediate Algebra.

Math Tutoring/Math Lab Services: The Developmental Math Education Committee has worked for the last year on developing and piloting a process for evaluating the effectiveness of math lab services for developmental students. The following table summarizes this work:

Steps in the assessment cycle	Library or title of Learning Support Service: Math Lab
--------------------------------------	---

Identify an Institution-level L&LSS SLO	Apply knowledge learned and competencies gained from using Library and Learning Support Services to academic coursework and assignments.
Identify a Program-level SLO	Math DE Program SLO: Students will use mathematical reasoning to solve problems and a generalized problem solving process to work word problems.
Research questions	Does tutoring improve students' ability to use the problem-solving process to solve word problems? Does math lab attendance correlate with higher course success rates? Do students feel good about the help they receive in the math lab?
Identify and develop assessment instruments or process	Direct measures of student learning: Pre-post tutor assessment of student performance on each part of the problem-solving process: paraphrasing the task, identifying relevant info, choosing a useful representation, attempting a reasonable strategy. Indirect measures of student learning: Track lab attendance (unduplicated head count) for each section of Math 12, 25, and 30. See if lab attendance correlates with course success rate. Qualitative measures of student learning: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Matched pairs: At the end of a tutoring interaction, the student will fill out a quick survey to indicate if she feels that she improved on any of the four steps in the problem-solving process. Student perception will be compared to tutor's "post" assessment of student learning. • Student satisfaction survey given in all DE math classes; satisfaction survey given after the tutoring interaction
Collect and analyze data	Direct measures: We ran a two-week pilot. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 74% of the DE students (n=23) improved in their use of all four parts of the problem-solving process; weakest improvement in "paraphrasing the task" • 48% of the DE students' self-assessment matched the tutor's assessment (50% of Math 12, Prealgebra (n=2), 44% of Math 25, Elementary Algebra (n=8), 31% of Math 30, Intermediate Algebra (n=13)) <p>There were two unanticipated observations from this pilot:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • instructors reported that they focused more on the problem-solving process when tutoring as a result of the pilot • we saw that much of what students are being asked to do does not require use of this four-step problem-solving process because the assigned problems are not word problems, but skill drills. This is particularly true in Math 12 (Prealgebra). <p>We noticed the following problems with the pilot:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tutors both do the tutoring and the assessment of student work • Due to unclear instructions, students may think that they can only check improvement in one of the four parts of the problem-solving process, thus weakening the matching with tutor perception.

	<p>Indirect measures: (FA 05)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For Math 12 and Math 30 lab attendance explained less than 1% of the variation in success rates by section, but for Math 25 there was an astonishing result: lab attendance explained 73% of the variation in success rates. • We noted a large range in lab attendance for different sections of the same course. For example, one section of Math 12 had only 2 students attended the lab during the semester while another section had 27 students. <p>Qualitative measures: (SP 02, n=407)</p> <p>Overall students rated their experiences in the math lab positively; however, we noticed that relative to other math students, Math 12 students (n=21) tended to rate their experiences in less positive terms:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Overall, 69% of the 329 answering students felt they received personalized help in the math lab; 22% felt they received “somewhat” personalized help, while 50% of the Math 12 students felt this way. • 67% of the 326 answering students felt that the help they received in the math lab from tutors/instructors enabled them to work better on their own; 23% felt “somewhat”, while 42% of Math 12 students felt this way. • 46% of the 324 answering students felt the tutors/instructors in the math lab helped them learn <u>how</u> to learn; while only 32% of Math 12 students said “yes” to this question. • 50% of the 325 answering students felt the math lab helped them to feel better about math; while only 21% of Math 12 students answered “yes” to this question.
<p>Develop action plans to improve student performance</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. We see two benefits to expanding the pilot. First, it provides a good focus for staff development for tutors and ties math lab tutoring to program-level SLOs. Second, it provides a way for the department to communicate the expectation that students should be given word problems as a regular and significant part of their out-of-class work. 2. Improve the pilot by clarifying the directions on the student portion of the form and designing a way for student work to be assessed by someone other than the tutor who worked with the student. 3. All three measures point to issues in Math 12. More data needs to be collected. Future action may include curriculum development for Math 12 that emphasizes problem-solving with word problems and/or staff development for lab personnel that focuses on the needs of Math 12 students and/or replacing the “by arrangement” lab component with in-class lab.

Our work on math lab evaluation has been recognized as exemplary by the campus Library and Learning Support Services Committee and will serve as a template for future college-wide assessment efforts in academic support services. Our research into lab evaluation practice nationwide suggests that our preliminary attempts to directly measure the impact of tutoring on learning may be viewed as innovative in a larger context. Our Math Lab Coordinator attended a Math Lab Conference with the goal of learning about best practices in lab evaluation. Presentations at this conference focused on indirect measures, such as correlation between lab attendance and course grades, or qualitative measures, such as satisfaction surveys. There were no examples of direct measures of learning in the lab setting.

Scholarship of Teaching and Learning (SoTL) Developmental Education Seminar

At the end of the Spring 2006 semester we had a 2 day workshop facilitated by Randy Bass as the kick-off event for our SoTL seminar for math and English faculty teaching developmental education courses. Randy provided a theoretical framework for SoTL projects, and helped faculty think about questions they might investigate in the classroom. In addition, he modeled several strategies for conducting some classroom research and introduced them to KEEP as a way of representing their work.

In Fall 2006, 11 faculty members participated in bi-monthly seminars in which we explored questions of teaching and learning relevant to their projects, and were coached in the development of websites that would illustrate their work. These websites will be “stitched” together with an introductory page that provides the context for the research conducted and synthesizes what we learned as a developmental program. We plan to showcase these websites at a College Assembly in Spring 2007, and include them in the development of our LMC DE program website which will be completed by Dec. 2007.

The work of our teaching communities and specifically the website produced by participants in the SoTL seminar have definitely moved us forward in achieving the two main goals of our grant:

1. Create a multi-media website for the purpose of orienting new faculty to the LMC Developmental Education program and providing information for other colleges designing Developmental Education programs.
2. Expand and enhance the professional development and assessment efforts provided by Teaching Communities. Produce a staff development “curriculum” handbook and course-level assessment “guide”.

Activities and accomplishments in campus-wide change—involvement of Academic Senate, campus committees, institutional research office, or connection between academics and student services? Have you actively involved students in the process of change?

In FA 06 the Teaching and Learning Project, a committee chaired by Myra and Nancy that is responsible for campus assessment efforts, showcased a wide variety of assessment projects, including developmental education projects, in a College Assembly for approximately 75 faculty, staff, and managers. This motivated our Academic Senate to approve a model for institutionalizing assessment of student learning and associated professional development activities that empowers the following committees: Developmental Education, General Education, Occupational Education, Library and Student Support Services, Student Services. This is a significant step for our campus. It signals institutional commitment to initiatives that began in Developmental Education. The work of the Developmental Education Committee will now serve as a template for the work of these other committees. (see Appendix B: Next Steps in Institutionalizing Assessment at LMC)

In their role as Coordinators of the Teaching and Learning Project, Myra and Nancy also worked with the LMC Planning Committee to integrate student learning outcome assessment and a reflection on professional development into program review. With these additions, a part of the DE Program's approach to program evaluation has influenced program review campus wide. (We can provide copies of the Developmental Math and Developmental English program reviews for FA 06 if anyone is interested.)

The Developmental Education Committee works with the Office of Institutional Research to develop a research agenda that is responsive to program needs. Most recently the OIR finished a persistence study that tracked a FA 03 cohort of students from the capstone precollegiate courses in English (one level below 1A) and math (Intermediate Algebra) into the first level of transfer English and math. (See Appendix C: DE Research agenda)

The Developmental Education Committee continues to sponsor the Counseling Partnership. Counselors make presentations in prealgebra classes and English 70 (2 levels below 1A). Students are required as part of the course to meet with a counselor to develop an educational plan. This last semester we had the highest level of participation ever, with all but a few instructors participating. Our Senior Dean for Liberal Arts and Sciences has supported the Counseling Partnership by sending personal memos to faculty to encourage participation.

Students are involved in the process of change in several ways:

1. their input on surveys about tutoring services and the Counseling Partnership
2. their input on surveys about classroom experience (conducted by Teaching Communities)
3. their involvement in think-alouds, interviews, focus groups, and other SoTL research

Activities and accomplishments beyond the campus—connection to other colleges, local high schools, or professional organizations?

Within the last year we have shared LMC's developmental education work in presentations at Chabot, Laney, and City College. We hosted a full day workshop at LMC for developmental educators from Sierra College. We were part of a presentation at the Strengthening Student Success conference entitled Strengthening the Developmental Program as a Whole --- Data and Action. Nancy's precollegiate English class was videotaped by West Ed; this videotape will be

used to further principles of the Reading Apprenticeship in community colleges nationwide. Myra's article entitled "Using Assessment of Student Learning As A Catalyst For Change" will appear in the SP 07 issue of the AMATYC Review. Nancy is a faculty reviewer for the literature review being conducted by the Center for Student Success which is the first step by the state Chancellor's Office to launch a system-wide initiative to improve basic skills in the California Community College system.

B. Changes and Lessons Learned

There were no changes in plans or personnel from what was proposed for 2006.

Lessons Learned:

1. Work done in Teaching Communities or in special seminars such as SoTL needs to be connected to overall departmental work in developmental education. Somehow, we need to provide a mechanism by which lessons learned by a smaller group of individuals *is disseminated and used by a majority of faculty in their actual classrooms*. This requires the will and concerted effort of the entire department.
2. Teachers are learners too, and all the same principles of learning apply:
 - a. Designing effective faculty development experiences is every bit as intensive and time-consuming as designing a course for students. It is important to be clear about the expected "outcomes" and to design backward to achieve them.
 - b. In designing a series of faculty development experiences, it is important to keep the "programmatic" goal in mind, just as a series of courses must be carefully designed in creating a program or major for students. How will one learning experience build upon another, and how will the whole be greater than (or at least equal to) the sum of the parts?
 - c. It is essential to have faculty produce a final product that represents a synthesis of their work in order to ensure a deeper level of learning. That product must be public and instill a sense of ownership in the work represented.
 - d. Faculty need considered, thoughtful feedback about their work in an on-going way- in other words, formative rather than just summative.
3. Implementing a research agenda that systematically collects direct, indirect and qualitative measures of student learning is challenging. Collaboration with the Office of Institutional Research is essential, but we are only one of many projects undertaken by that office so we often do not have access to data that could inform our work.
4. Institutional change requires great fortitude and patience – not to mention active participation in almost every college-wide committee. We believe that we have made progress in effecting institutional change as outlined in our "Next Steps" document (see Appendix A). Approved by a multitude of committees, including our Academic Senate, this document establishes committees empowered to carry out the professional development and assessment programs that will continue to move us forward in improving teaching and learning.
5. "Do it, document it, share it" – that's our new mantra. We have learned that it is equally time consuming to document and share work as it is to do it. In the past we have been so

overwhelmed by just doing the work, that documenting and sharing it has gotten short shrift. But we know now that despite the huge investment of time, it is vitally important to document and share – and we owe that insight to our Carnegie colleagues- thank you.

II. Proposed Activities for SPECC Year III

Most of our effort in 2007 will be devoted to **Goal 1** in our original grant proposal:

1. Create a multi-media website for the purpose of orienting new faculty to the LMC Developmental Education program and providing information for other colleges designing Developmental Education programs.

Building this website will draw on the work we have done for the last seven years in developmental education. We have essentially used Blackboard and to a lesser extent KEEP as a dumping ground for SoTL projects, Teaching Community reports, assessment reports, course-specific lesson plans and classroom activities, etc. We will need to spend the next year synthesizing this work into a presentation that is accessible and useful to faculty teaching in our Developmental Education Program, while also providing an organizational structure that is clear and effective for other community colleges who are designing similar programs.

Here is a descriptive sampling of some of the content we plan to put into cyberspace:

The English Department will create electronic guides to teaching our two primary developmental courses, English 70 and English 90, and our first transfer level composition course, English 100. These guides will include: philosophy and rationale for our developmental education program and for integrated reading and writing courses, the course outline of record, the learning outcomes for the program and the course, model assignments for assessing course outcomes, model curriculum units, approved book lists, rubrics, possible grading strategies, annotated samples of student work, sample first day handouts, teacher resources, etc.

The Developmental Math Committee will create electronic course portfolios for precollegiate math courses that contain: philosophy and rationale for the quantitative literacy approach to precollegiate mathematics, course outlines of record, classroom activities aligned with course and program learning outcomes, model assignments and exams for assessing course outcomes, relevant math education research and AMATYC standards etc.

The site will also contain the results of Teaching Community inquiries into teaching and learning and assessment results with associated action plans and related SoTL research.

Since the website will be an integral part of orientation for new DE faculty, evaluation of the site will be a part of this orientation.

We also plan to continue professional development activities relative to **Goal 2** in our original grant proposal:

2. Expand and enhance the professional development and assessment efforts provided by Teaching Communities. Produce a staff development “curriculum” handbook and course-level assessment “guide”.

Plans for professional development in ENGLISH in 2007:

Our primary goal in English is to implement our “Designing for Success” plan. The focus here is on attempting to move *from* course or subject specific teaching communities that intensely involve a small number of participants *to* departmental participation in curriculum based professional development and assessment. The department has committed to monthly meetings that focus on curriculum, pedagogy, assessment and grading in English 70, 90, and 100- our developmental sequence culminating in college composition. We will strongly encourage as many adjunct faculty as possible to join us. Our goals are to:

1. Reach agreement on the type and level of assignments for each course
2. Outline effective ways to scaffold instruction for different types of assignments
3. Reach consensus on equitable grading strategies for each course
4. Rewrite our formal course outlines of record to reflect department consensus on all of the above.
5. Capture this work and document it in our electronic guides for teaching these courses.

This plan builds on our previous faculty development efforts with teaching communities, and most recently, the SoTL seminar. While we have learned much from these activities, we continue to be frustrated by the difficulty of reaching more faculty. With “Curriculum Mondays” we will ensure participation by full time faculty, and hope to establish this timeslot over time with our adjunct faculty who may be able to arrange their schedules, eventually, to participate at least one semester in a two year cycle. For those who cannot participate in the meetings, they can at least submit assignments and student work to be looked at by other department faculty, and receive feedback from our DE lead. In addition, because we will document this work in our electronic guides for teaching these courses, it will be available to everyone on-line.

Plans for professional development in MATH in 2007:

We have three projects planned for 2007:

1. A series of Basic Skills retreats: We have 5 different arithmetic courses that were originally designed to fit different learning styles or for special populations, such as DSPS or Occupational Education students. Many of these courses have not been revised to include learning outcomes that are aligned with the Developmental Math Program. In addition, there has been curriculum “creep” so that it is questionable whether the needs of the targeted populations are being met. We plan to sponsor a series of retreats to study basic skills with the goal of revamping our basic skills offerings. Activities will include conversations with vocational faculty and with learning specialists that work with

students who have learning disabilities in an effort to redefine the needs of these student populations, a literature review of math education research, an analysis of OIR data on success rates and persistence to completion of certificate requirements in math, etc.

2. Prealgebra curriculum development: We plan to build on the work of the Prealgebra Teaching Community (documented on the Carnegie Foundation website or at www.cfkeep.org/html/stitch.php?s=24776222486772&id=69159735151715) to develop a set of innovative classroom activities that address the needs of the adult learner. We plan to class test these activities in FA 07.
3. Elementary Algebra Retreats: We will use the results from the holistic assessment of final exams across sections of Elementary Algebra to identify a focus for the retreats. We anticipate that classroom activities that were developed by the Elementary Algebra Teaching Community will be revised. We also plan to experiment with paying instructors to do classroom research that is specifically designed to respond to assessment results and to document their projects using KEEP. The Elementary Algebra retreats will be focused on these SoTL projects similar to the FA 06 SoTL seminar.

B. Dissemination

Our primary plan for dissemination is the website which will include the electronic teaching guides referenced above. Another primary use of this website, and these guides, is the orientation of new faculty. When faculty are hired to teach in our developmental program, the DE lead will orient them to the website, and specifically to the course guides.

Of course, since the website is on the world wide web, it can also serve as a resource for faculty at other colleges. Since we frequently receive requests for more information about our developmental education program, integrated reading and writing courses, innovative math curriculum, and assessment program, this will serve as a place where anyone can access information without needing to make a trip to Pittsburg, California.

We have also collaborated with the Strategic Literacy Initiative in promoting the Reading Apprenticeship Model in community colleges. There will be several references to this on the website: the website Nancy Ybarra did on incorporating the model into a developmental English course, a teaching community that successfully investigated the use of the model in several sections of that course, and a website that looks at training tutors in the model.

Myra has been invited to present a variety of aspects of our work in precollegiate math. She has accepted invitations to present at CMC³ South and the AMATYC conference. Pasadena City College has also included her in a 3-day workshop designed to revamp their developmental math curriculum.

III. Plans for Continuity of Work Begun as Part of SPECC

The SPECC grant has been a wonderful incentive for us to consolidate and capture the work we began in developmental education when a task force of our Academic Senate first outlined our research based vision in the Developmental Task Force Report of 1998. When the SPECC grant concludes, nearly ten years will have passed since we articulated that vision. Our college has already committed significant resources to maintaining developmental education as an institutional priority; we have reassigned time for college-wide coordination of the program, as well as reassigned time for faculty leads in English and math. We have an on-going budget allocation for professional development specifically in developmental English and math.

The DE Committee has been recognized as a committee that is charged with on-going professional development and assessment of student learning outcomes in precollegiate courses, and the membership of the committee includes key faculty leaders and senior management. In a report published at the conclusion of our Title III grant in 2004, we articulated the mission, philosophy, goals and coordination of all program components. Each year, we plan to focus on one of our four main program goals. For this year we have selected the goal that emphasizes the effective integration of academic support services and instruction which includes tutoring, labs and our counseling partnership program. Our Shared Governance Council, chaired by College President Peter Garia, has endorsed our leadership in the study of tutoring effectiveness on campus. At the end of the year, or perhaps two if we need to extend the study, we will issue a report on our findings and recommendations.

In addition to a focus on a particular program goal, we will continue to implement our overall research agenda with the Office of Institutional Research. This agenda includes direct, indirect and qualitative measures of student learning and student achievement, and the data is to be collected in a systematic and on-going way.

All of the above speaks to the continuity and sustainability of our work on developmental education, with or without grant funding. We will continue our efforts in curriculum based professional development, experimenting no doubt with a number of different forums for achieving our goal of aligning the planned, taught and learned curriculum. In addition to teaching communities, SoTL seminars, or departmental professional development initiatives, we will use our website to orient new faculty to our program and to continue to document the work we do. We will continue to assess student learning outcomes, as clearly outlined in our "Next Steps" document. We will continue to evaluate the effectiveness of our program through the systematic inquiry of our Developmental Education Committee which is well established and recognized for its work on campus.

With these reassurances about the continuance of work sponsored by the SPECC grant, we want to acknowledge that the SPECC grant has provided us the opportunity to experiment with new forms of staff development, such as SoTL projects, to network with other developmental educators statewide, and to learn from the wonderful scholars at the Carnegie Foundation. We feel that this grant has greatly enriched our work and helped us to understand the importance of synthesizing what we learn and documenting our progress.

IV. Budget

A. Reporting expenditures for 2006

See Appendix F

B. Proposed budget for 2007

See Appendix G

C. Budget Narrative and Explanation of Use of SPECC Funds

1. What funds have you used on *instruction in the classroom or beyond*?

Some funds were used to pay faculty to develop interactive classroom activities in math or quizzes aligned with course learning outcomes. Tutoring interventions were not a part of our grant proposal. Both the English and math departments have college funds to support in-class tutoring in some sections of precollegiate courses and to pay for student tutors in the math lab.

2. What funds have you used to support *faculty inquiry*?

Teaching Community participants typically attend an average of 10-16 hours of professional development a semester with about as many hours of work outside of meetings. They are paid hourly or a stipend by the project. All Teaching Communities produce some kind of “product”; for example: summaries of assessment of student work with action plans for improvement or summaries of education literature pertinent to a research question with lesson plans/activities applying research to the classroom.

FA 06 SoTL participants did the equivalent of 0.2 load release (or a stipend of \$3500), which is roughly 7-8 hours a week, with some hours completed in pre-semester workshops and seminar meetings. Each SoTL participant produced a KEEP webpage documenting their classroom research, with examples of student work or video/audio of students.

Elementary Algebra Retreat participants are paid hourly to attend retreats and complete associated assignments.

Faculty leaders receive load release from college funds to plan and conduct this professional development and document its findings electronically in the form of a Teaching Community report, a retreat summary, or a KEEP webpage. (see Appendix D for a complete job description for DE Faculty Leads)

3. What funds have you used to support the campus *SPECC* coordinator?

We did not use grant funds to coordinate the SPECC activities. Our college has institutionalized a 0.50 release for coordination of the Developmental Education Program. Myra and Nancy currently share this position and have coordinated grant activities in addition to their other responsibilities. (see Appendix E for a complete job description for DE Program Coordinator)

4. Are there other ways that you have used external funds?

We have used the SPECC grant to buy equipment for conducting think-alouds (video camera, computer, and digital recorders), to purchase books and other resources (e.g. kinesthetic math manipulatives), to pay for consultants to conduct workshops (Randy Bass and Dick Stanley), to buy release time for the website development, and to pay someone to videotape and edit videotape of students.

5. Have the external funds let you *leverage* or redirect other campus funds?

Yes and no. We decided to continue to use college funds for release time for the DE Program Coordinators and DE Faculty Leads since these positions were institutionalized after our Title III grant. We did not want to jeopardize the future of our DE Program by going back to soft money for funding program leadership. We did however use grant funds to pay for some staff development activities that would normally have been funded by the college, so some college money targeted to support DE Teaching Communities has been returned to the college for each of the last two years. Mainly we have used the SPECC grant to fund activities that are above and beyond our usual program work. We view grants as an opportunity to experiment and establish successful practices that have the potential of eventually engendering a higher level of institutional commitment to our DE program.