Introduction:
Developmental Education Task Force Report

We welcome you to this overview of the work of the Developmental Education Task Force. It is based on research we have done from Fall 1996 through Spring 1998 in response to the accreditation recommendation that we "develop and implement a comprehensive developmental education program to provide the academic support many students need to succeed in the general education curriculum." We have come a long way from our first impression of "developmental" as merely remedial, and from our first Internet search which put us in touch with a program at the University of Alaska. From there we were directed to Dr. Hunter Boylan, Director of the National Center for Developmental Education, located at Appalachian State University in North Carolina. He was gracious enough to talk to us for over an hour and recommend several readings that would orient us to the field. He particularly recommended the work of Ruth Keimig, *Raising Academic Standards: A Guide to Learning Improvement*, published in 1983 as an ASHE-ERIC higher education research report. Although published fifteen years ago, this report still remains a definitive work in the field of developmental education. This study provided the Task Force with a conceptual framework for subsequent discussion and study.

The Task Force met bimonthly for more than three semesters, and subcommittees met weekly during the last six months. We read a great deal of literature on developmental education, phoned numerous sources, visited other colleges, attended conferences, and three of us spent one month in the summer of 1997 at the Kellogg Institute for Developmental Educators to be certified as developmental educators. Our job as a Task Force, as we understood it, was to study the range of options for developmental education programs at the postsecondary level and to make recommendations for the consideration of the college community. This is what we have done.

In the process, we have come to concur with President Lowell of Harvard University who said: "Curriculum reform of significance requires (1) overall thought but (2) piecemeal action. Overall thought tends to lead to attempts at overall action, but overall action tends to lead to overall resistance. Piecemeal action tends to follow piecemeal thought" (cited in Keimig, 1983). Consequently, we have chosen to give a full accounting of our study, research and, conversations in the Task Force and our overall recommendations as well as a phase by phase look at how we would put them into action at Los Medanos. As President Lowell points out, "The difficult task is to get overall thought and then to have the patience and persistence to carry out its conclusions one at a time" (Keimig).

This compendium of our overall thought is divided into four levels of institutional options for developmental education programs as described by Keimig. She describes them as a hierarchy of services which represent progressively higher levels of institutional commitment, and which research documents as having greater potential for improving learning and teaching. Within each level, we introduce its definition, relevant background research, current
practice at Los Medanos College, and our recommendations based on this information. We have utilized Keimig's hierarchy throughout to conceptualize the movement from providing services to "high risk students" in Levels One and Two to redefining possibilities for instruction of "high risk courses" in Levels Three and Four. It is crucial to point out that achieving comprehensiveness in a developmental education program requires the belief that everyone in a college is involved in the developmental growth of each student. Indeed, as Keimig points out, "Successful learning improvement programs are broadly described as having two dimensions: comprehensiveness and institutionalization... In a successful program, the developmental concept is perceived as an institutional mission, and learning services are integrated into the academic mainstream" (p.3 ). Without this college-wide buy in, as it were, classes at Level One which are targeted for students with skills deficits have a low potential for improved learning and instructional change. Keimig, using extensive research, shows that researchers and policy analysts have reached a consensus for instructional change in colleges. She says, "The consensus affirms that a level of learning appropriate for college disciplines is unattainable by most underprepared students through traditionally delivered college instruction, regardless of previous, isolated remedial experiences" (p.5 ). It is only when we have an integrated, synthesized program with increasing levels of support throughout the college curriculum that we have a high potential for improved learning and instructional transformation. This potential for widespread improvement is directly in proportion to how comprehensive and institutionalized the developmental program is.

The importance of a comprehensive and institutionalized developmental program is perhaps the definitive thing we have learned in our study of developmental education. This report is our contribution to the ongoing conversation and immense task we all have to improve the quality and excellence of learning and teaching at our college. No one group can do the vast work of helping underprepared students alone. We are in it together, and the conclusion of this report marks the beginning of the work to be done.
LOS MEDANOS COLLEGE
DEVELOPMENTAL
EDUCATION

MISSION STATEMENT

Developmental students are capable learners whose difficulty lies not in their ability, but in their preparation. Developmental education includes, but is not limited to remediation. Since learning is a developmental process, developmental education is inclusive of all learners but is particularly mindful of students who do not yet possess the prerequisite skills to pursue a course of study leading to a certificate or degree. It is our belief that these students deserve appropriate educational opportunities to facilitate their success.

Therefore our mission is to provide appropriate educational opportunities for students who are in the process of developing those prerequisite skills. These opportunities should include a coordinated curriculum which is responsive to the identified needs of the students; comprehensive services that will support their learning in that curriculum should also be provided.

Developmental education is committed to the ideal of both access and quality. It begins with a comprehensive assessment of student needs, so students can engage their academic career at the level most likely to result in achievement rather than frustration. Providing students with relevant information and guiding them in making successful choices will support faculty in maintaining academic standards; providing students with appropriate curriculum and support services enables students to reach these standards.

Developmental education is a college wide commitment. As an essential part of teaching and learning, developmental education is comprehensive in its services, and an integrated part of the academic mainstream. Additionally, it is sensitive and responsive to individual differences and special needs among learners. Each student is helped in capitalizing on individual strengths, and in developing strategies to overcome weaknesses and disadvantages. Affective dimensions of learning, such as motivation and goal setting are considered as important as cognitive skills.

The developmental education program at Los Medanos College exists to help students achieve their goals and to promote academic integrity. We are committed to high expectations and high support.
Assessment and Placement

**Definition** Assessment and placement is the process by which students are given information about the level of coursework recommended in English and math classes; in addition, some colleges include recommendations for study skills or college success courses. Assessment is more than just the administration of achievement tests. Ideally, assessment takes into account a variety of factors that may affect students' success in their coursework. In California, this is known as "multiple measures" and is mandated as part of the matriculation process outlined in Title V. A valid assessment and placement process is critical to a successful developmental education program. "Placement- the process of determining where students belong within a sequence of courses- is one of the pillars on which a developmental program rests" (Akst and Hirsh, 1991, p.1). Valid placement is dependent upon a valid assessment process. A valid assessment process, in turn, depends upon valid and reliable assessment instruments and procedures as well as a comprehensive system for academic advisement.

**Summary of Background Research**
Whether or not assessment and placement should be advisory or mandatory is a subject of debate. According to the National Study for Developmental Education, mandatory assessment is in place for 76% of developmental education programs nationwide; mandatory placement in English and math basic skills classes is practiced in 69% of four-year colleges and 35% of two-year colleges. This national study found mandatory assessment and placement was positively related to student success in English and math developmental courses and that "passing developmental courses has been positively correlated with success in college as measured by cumulative GPA and retention" (Boylan, Bliss and Bonham, 1997). Those who oppose mandatory assessment and placement express concern with the validity of the assessment instruments and the quality of developmental courses (Utterback, 1989).

Clearly, whether advisory or mandatory, it is incumbent upon the institution to have a valid and reliable assessment and placement process. Procedures to achieve this are clearly outlined in a document entitled, "Standards, Policies and Procedures for the Evaluation of Assessment Instruments Used in the California Community Colleges" published in September, 1997.

**LMC: Current Practice** At LMC, as at other California community colleges, new students are informed of the matriculation process which includes assessment, orientation, and advisement. Districts may elect to exempt students from matriculation components including assessment, orientation, and advisement by establishing written policies stating the grounds for exemption, consistent with Title V regulations. Such exemptions are granted at LMC. For example, in the Fall 1996, 24% of all new students were exempted from the assessment component of matriculation. The remaining 76% were assessed. Of those assessed, 83% were advised to take basic skills classes in English.
The current assessment instrument used at LMC is the Assessment and Placement Services (APS) published by the College Board/ Educational Testing Services. ETS no longer publishes this test, and it will be removed from the Chancellor's Office list of approved tests in June 1999. (It is still possible for colleges to use it if they participate in a consortium which would collect all the data previously provided by the publishing company; some California community colleges are pursuing this option.)

The math and English departments are currently examining new placement tests including the newest computerized placement tests published by ETS and ACT. These tests offer many advantages because they are adaptive- students are tested only within their range of knowledge, rather than all students taking the same test items in the same order- and great care has been taken by the test publishers to ensure validity, reliability, and sensitivity to bias. They are also easily adapted to the needs of disabled and ESL students. However, they may not "fit" well with the curriculum in English and math basic skills classes at LMC, which is a matter of content validity to be determined by English and math faculty. Also, they are quite expensive ($4.00 - $6.00 per student) and would require a completely new approach to orientation and advising, as only a limited number of students could be tested at one time. We currently have eight computers in the Assessment Center which could be used for this purpose.

**Based on the above, the Task Force recommends:**

1. The current matriculation procedures be reviewed by the Vice President of Academic & Student Affairs to ensure that all students are systematically informed of assessment, orientation and advising requirements upon application to the college; exemption policies should be reviewed for consistency with Title V regulations. In addition, the college's use of multiple measures in the assessment process should be examined. Overall, the role of the Matriculation Advisory Committee needs to be clarified in implementing and evaluating effective assessment and placement procedures.

2. The math and English departments select and pilot a new assessment instrument which best places students within their basic skills classes. The departments will need to follow all guidelines published in "Standards, Policies and Procedures for the Evaluation of Assessment Instruments Used in the California Community Colleges" (Sept. 1997) and will need the support of the Office of Institutional Research to do so.

3. The implementation of recommendation #2 above will require considerable time and work; therefore, developmental coordinators in English and math should be given released time to carry out this task.
Advising/Counseling

Definition
Advising/counseling is a key component of developmental education programs. Counseling in developmental programs may be defined as "assisting students to realize the maximum educational benefits available to them by helping them to better understand themselves and to learn to use the resources of an educational institution to meet their special education needs and aspirations" (Gritts, 1979). Counseling may be viewed as a service that guides college students through the decision making process as they progress through developmental stages as college students.

Summary of Background Research
Along with assessment, advising/counseling is considered the foundation of successful developmental education programs. "Advising and counseling services have regularly been cited in the literature as essential components of successful developmental programs asserts" Boylan, Bliss, and Bonham (1997). They also found "that the vast majority (71%) of developmental programs offer advising and counseling services" (1997, pp. 1-4). A review of the literature also emphasizes that contact with a significant person at an institution is a critical factor in a student's decision to remain in college. Counselors are in the best position to provide that contact (Glennen and Vowell, 1995). A personal, supportive relationship can help students identify the type of assistance that is tailored to the individual student's situation and circumstances (Gordon, 1992). Most postsecondary institutions recognize the importance of the advising/counseling function, particularly for entering students. "Both orientation and academic advising are staples of the first year college experience in contemporary American higher education, serving important roles in enhancing student success" (Noel, Levitz and Saluri, 1985).

LMC: Current Practice Currently, all students who participate in matriculation at Los Medanos attend a New Student Orientation following assessment. These orientations are group sessions conducted by counselors who provide students with information about college policies, requirements and programs. Following the presentation of this information, students select classes and may enroll at Admissions. Counselors are available to answer questions and provide guidance.

Students who are assessed as needing basic skills classes in English and math participate in the same New Student Orientation sessions as students who are assessed as being prepared for college level courses. Two LMC pilot programs, STAR and EXCEL, designed for underprepared students, found that these students benefit from a more directive, individualized approach to counseling and advisement. In addition to initial advisement, students in these pilot programs were required to meet with the program counselor at least twice during the semester. Students rated this contact as being extremely important to them, as did faculty who appreciated the additional support that they could not provide within the context of the classroom. As a result, these students became "regular users" of counseling services, although historically this is not a population that seeks this service. Students valued
counseling, and found it helpful at both an academic and personal level.

**Based on the above, the Task Force recommends:**

4. Counselors review the literature on counseling in developmental programs, consult with experts in this field, and arrive at their own recommendations for this critical component of the developmental education program at Los Medanos. Some questions to consider include:

   a. Should there be different New Student Orientations for students who assess at different levels? For example, should students who assess at English 70 (formerly English 7) receive a different type of orientation than students who assess at English 10?

   b. Should there be required counseling contacts for students who assess at the English 70 level, assuming that these students are academically "at risk" due to significant deficits in their reading and writing skills? If so, how often should they meet with a counselor during the semester?

   c. How can we best deal with the fact that students are at different developmental stages, both academically and personally, and have varying levels of experience with making important educational decisions?
I. BASIC SKILLS CLASSES
II. TUTORING AS A COMPONENT OF BASIC SKILLS CLASSES
III. STUDENT SUCCESS CLASSES
Level One Programs: Remedial Courses

**Description of Level One Programs** At the bottom of the hierarchy are separate basic skills courses (usually offered in English and math). These courses when offered as the only assistance to underprepared students are low in potential for improving student learning and represent the lowest level of institutional commitment to instructional change. However, when offered as part of an integrated program, they play an important role in supporting higher level components.

In a coordinated learning services program, the basic skills courses are designed to develop specific skills for a relatively smaller population of students, who are assigned to the courses on the basis of diagnostic placement tests. Skills courses are appropriate for the student whose needs are too pervasive to be met entirely in the course-related supplementary support components of the program. (Keimig, 1983)

I. BASIC SKILLS CLASSES

**Definition**
The terms remedial, developmental, pre-collegiate and basic skills mean different things to different people. (See article, "Back to the Basics: Remedial Education" by Lee Lazarick.) In order to avoid confusion and controversy over shades of meaning, we have chosen to use the term "basic skills" in referring to English and math courses for underprepared students.

**Summary of Background Research**
There are two models for offering basic skills courses in higher education. One is to offer such courses in a centralized program which is administered separately from academic departments; the other is to offer these courses through academic departments. The National Study of Developmental Education (1988-1994), funded by the Exxon Educational Foundation, conducted a review of the literature and collected extensive information from 160 two- and four-year institutions in order to identify components related to student success in developmental programs. With regard to the question of a centralized versus decentralized model for developmental courses and services, centralized models were correlated with higher retention in two-year colleges and with greater success in English developmental courses. In discussing this finding, the authors of the study note that high levels of coordination rather than a centralized program structure may be the important variable.

The key to the success of centralized programs appears to be their level of coordination. This is supported by the fact that many decentralized programs with coordination of developmental courses and services also had higher student first term and cumulative GPAs than programs which were not coordinated. It is possible, therefore, that the study is measuring the level of coordination of developmental courses and services rather than their centralization. Insuring that all those working with developmental students meet on a regular basis, having common goals and objectives for all courses and services, and having someone clearly in charge of all developmental courses and services certainly
appears to represent sound practice. Improving program coordination, therefore, should contribute to student success even in decentralized programs. (Boylan, Bliss and Bonham, 1997)

**LMC: Current Practice**

LMC currently offers basic skills classes in math and English. The basic skills math curriculum uses a mastery-based, self-paced, individualized program (PSI) in its lowest level courses, Math 1 and 2, which focus on basic arithmetic skills and their application in four areas of emphasis. The department originally used PSI exclusively in its Elementary Algebra courses as well, but in recent years has revised its curriculum to offer students other modes of instruction in addition to PSI, including a one-semester lecture option for 4 units/semester and a two-semester lecture option for 2 units/semester.

The English department has traditionally offered a three tier writing sequence in which the basic skills courses, 7 and 9, lead to the transferable level English 10. Basic skills reading courses were also offered (17 and 19) but were not widely taken by students, as the defined path to English 10 was English 7 and 9. LMC research indicates that for Fall 1997, 78% of students who assessed at English 7 had significant reading deficits, and 64% of students who assessed at English 9 were recommended to take a reading class (25% of students recommended for placement in English 9 on the basis of writing assessment, scored at the English 7 level in reading.) In addition, students reported reading comprehension as their number one academic concern in the Needs Assessment reported in September of 1997. Based on national research which supports the integration of reading and writing instruction, the English department has revised its curriculum to offer integrated reading and writing courses, English 70 and 90. Similar to the math department, there are one semester options - English 70 and 90 for 5 units/semester, and two semester options for 2.5/units/semester.

**Based on the above, the Task Force recommends:**

5. Coordinators for basic skills classes in English and math be designated and given released time to ensure the quality of those courses including on-going meetings of instructors (full and part time) who teach the courses in order to discuss curriculum, pedagogical strategies and assessment of student outcomes, tutor training and program evaluation. In addition, during the 1998-1999 academic year, the developmental coordinators would take leadership in the piloting of a new assessment instrument for placement into basic skills classes which would require additional released time due to the amount of work involved in establishing content validity, cut score validity and challenges where appropriate.

6. Student progress in both math and English basic skills classes be systematically followed by the Office of Institutional Research to provide the following information:
   a. the number of students assessed as needing basic skills in English and math
   b. the number of students who enroll in basic skills classes in English and math
   c. comparative rates of college success for those who take basic skills classes as
recommended versus those who do not. Retention rates within courses at each level e. persistence rates from one level to the next in English and math f. student grades in the next higher level of the sequence (This is perhaps the most important data to track and has been recommended as a national core indicator of success for developmental education programs.)

7. English and math faculty include evaluation and critiques of their basic skills programs within their unit review and planning processes, perhaps using the NADE Self-Evaluation Guidelines to identify program strengths and weaknesses and plan for program improvements. Institutional Research be used to help these departments evaluate the effectiveness of specific interventions developed as a result of program planning.

II TUTORING AS A COMPONENT OF BASIC SKILLS CLASSES

Definition
The use of tutors within the classroom is one way of facilitating students' access to those who can answer questions and provide guidance before frustration sets in. Tutors are directly under the supervision of the course instructor at the time they are providing learning assistance to students. This type of tutoring is qualitatively different than tutoring which occurs outside the classroom; therefore, these tutors may have different needs for tutor training and may be evaluated differently than tutors who hold independent tutoring sessions outside the classroom.

LMC: Current Practice
Both math and the new English curriculum require tutoring within the structure of the basic skills classes. The PSI model in math uses tutors within the classroom, as does the new English curriculum. The pedagogical assumption is that students in these classes need significant amount of practice, feedback and individualized attention which one instructor cannot provide to thirty students at a time.

Based on the above, the Task Force recommends:
8. The English and math departments train tutors who work in the classroom. This type of tutor training would best include a thorough understanding of the curriculum in the basic skills classes, the strategies used to help students access that curriculum, and also training in the unique needs of developmental students- their characteristics, needs and common obstacles.

9. Tutor training for basic skills classes be reviewed periodically and tutors evaluated each semester using criteria designed by each department.
III. STUDENT SUCCESS CLASSES

Definition
A variety of student success courses have been offered at two and four year colleges and universities for many years. They may be called studies skills, freshman seminars, college success, learning to learn, or learning strategies courses. Some are offered through student services such as counseling or learning assistance centers; others are offered by academic departments such as psychology or reading. They may be offered as pre-semester orientations, periodic workshops during the semester, or semester length courses. At some institutions, these courses are required, particularly for special populations such as students on probation or students admitted under special admissions policies; in other institutions, they are voluntary. The primary disadvantage of such courses is that when offered independently from other college courses, transference of skills to those other academic courses has been hard to demonstrate. Also, without a systematic method of referral, the students most in need of these courses may not choose to take them.

LMC: Current Practice A brief description of two such student success courses from the LMC schedule of classes illustrates the potential advantages students may gain:

Psychology 34: The Psychology of College Success: "Focuses on the many characteristics and skills that help students achieve success in college. Students learn how to take notes, take exams, overcome procrastination, manage time, manage stress and test anxiety."

Psychology 100: Taking Charge of Your College Education: "Teaches students how to transition into the college environment successfully. It teaches how to overcome past weaknesses, build productive study habits (using time management and stress management methods) and implement proven strategies to read, comprehend, take notes, concentrate, take tests and more." This course is currently offered in intensive pre-semester sessions for CARE students and was part of both the STAR and the EXCEL pilots. Students in both pilots were overwhelmingly enthusiastic about this class.

Based on the above the Task Force recommends:
10. Avenues be explored to encourage more students to enroll in the courses already offered at LMC as well as the College Success Workshops which are offered throughout the semester by the counseling department. Students enrolled in basic skills math and English courses might be especially encouraged through assessment and advisement to enroll in these courses.

11. The possibility of linking these courses to other academic courses (To be discussed further in Level Three: Course Related Services.)
I. TUTORING
II. WRITING/READING CENTER ACROSS THE CURRICULUM

LEVEL TWO:
LEARNING ASSISTANCE FOR INDIVIDUAL STUDENTS

LEVEL ONE:
REMEDIAL COURSES

ASSESSMENT AND ADVISEMENT
Level Two: Learning Assistance for Individual Students

Description of Level Two Programs
Ruth Keimig describes Level Two Programs as:

Learning assistance for individual students comprises Level II of the Hierarchy of Learning Improvement Programs because, when established in addition to instruction in basic skills, the likelihood increases that some students' atypical needs will be met and their learning approved. . . Learning assistance to individuals is not effective as a total program, however. Tutorial assistance to individuals, when it is the only service, is the least successful because it fails to address students' very real weaknesses in knowledge and skills. Such informal or "walk-in" learning assistance has several major disadvantages: (1) it is not systematic, (2) it tends to be used too little, too late, (3) it happens after a failure has occurred rather than earlier to prevent the failure, and (4) it is usually avoided by the students who need it most. (1983)

I. TUTORING

Definition
"Tutoring is defined as a one-to-one or small group activity where a person who is knowledgeable and has expertise in a specific content area or discipline provides help, tutelage, or clarification to one or more who do not" (Gier & Hancock, 1996). The focus in traditional sessions is the content, and tutors essentially "re-teach" the curriculum.

Summary of Background Research
Research supports positive short-term effects of tutoring on academic outcomes and retention of college students. However, tutoring may not be effective in terms of long-term outcomes as it can result in students becoming dependent on tutors to just get them through the course rather than learning how to become independent learners. As one article on traditional tutoring and tutor training asserts,

For example, although tutored students may get through immediate course requirements, they often remain unable to successfully and independently meet the academic demands of a course of study leading to a university degree. Further, although some of these dependent students may even graduate from the university, they may gain notoriety as degree holders who are unable to read, write, compute, or think at the level expected of college graduates. In essence, traditional tutoring efforts may produce short term academic and retention benefits, but students run the risk of becoming dependent upon tutors for academic progress and remaining unable to perform as independent learners. (Hock, Schumaker, & Deshler, 1995, p. 18)

A 1990 review of the literature on tutoring done by Martha Maxwell, nationally recognized leader in developmental education, also notes better retention rates for students who receive
tutoring, but finds that those who receive better grades after tutoring were those who were already better prepared, more experienced in college, or had higher ability - in short, she found no evidence that tutoring helped the weakest students although developmental students reported that they liked peer tutoring and felt that it helped their grades. Maxwell concluded by recommending standards for tutor training programs and the exploration of alternative services such as supplemental instruction (Maxwell, 1990).

The most recent and comprehensive study of tutoring in higher education was the Exxon study conducted by the National Center for Developmental Education from 1988-1994. The findings from that study indicated that no correlation could be found between tutoring and student success unless comprehensive tutor training and evaluation were an integral part of the program.

Two resources have national recognition for the work they have done in tutoring in higher education. One is the College Reading and Learning Association (CRLA) and the other is the National Association for Developmental Education. The CRLA offers certification of tutoring programs based on well-researched criteria. CRLA publishes a handbook for tutor training which includes comprehensive guidelines for training. The National Association for Developmental Education publishes the NADE Guidelines for Self Evaluation of several aspects of developmental programs including tutoring. NADE is currently working on offering a certification for developmental programs in higher education.

LMC: Current Practice
LMC has been through several "generations" of tutoring programs. With each successive generation, certain core issues have surfaced.

1. Should tutoring be defined differently for pre-collegiate basic skills classes in English and math than for other college courses? Should one have priority over the other?

2. Should tutoring be centralized or located in departments?

3. How will tutoring training be done?

4. How will the effectiveness of tutoring services be evaluated?

Based on the above, the Task Force recommends:
12. Departmental tutoring be one of three options for courses across the curriculum. (The other two options, a Writing/ Reading Center Across the Curriculum and Supplemental Instruction, will be discussed subsequently). For departments that choose to have their own tutoring programs, it is crucial that comprehensive tutor training and on-going evaluation be the responsibility of the department. The CRLA and NADE guidelines are recommended for this purpose.
II. WRITING/READING CENTER ACROSS THE CURRICULUM

Definition
A more centralized alternative to tutoring is the Writing/Reading Center Across the Curriculum. This option may be most appropriate for courses in which students need assistance with reading difficult textbooks and writing essays, essay tests and research papers. These centers became popular in the 1980's and continue to flourish on many campuses today.

Summary of Background Research
Writing Centers developed in the 1970's and were usually housed in the English department. However in the 1980's as "Writing and Reading Across the Curriculum" became the vogue, these centers were often expanded beyond English to include the entire college or university. In the late 80's and early 90's, the electronic classroom also became a part of some of these centers, aided especially by Title III and TRIO grants. Today in the late 90's, some Writing and Reading Across the Curriculum Centers utilize both virtual space (on-line tutoring) and face-to-face space (using faculty as writing consultants and students as peer tutors). Harold Shapiro from Empire State College in New York found in a study involving 68 sites that intervention with student writing was the single most powerful factor for college retention (1998).

What makes for a successful Center? Bradley Hughes, Director of Writing Across the Curriculum at the University of Wisconsin-Madison, advises, "Good Writing Centers are not filled with students, injured in some way, dutifully completing workbook exercises which magically cure them of all writing ills... but rather they are places for writers in all disciplines, regardless of their ability, to improve actual papers in process" (1986).

Current LMC Practice
LMC has never had such a center. In the 1980's, we did have a FIPSE grant that funded faculty workshops on reading and writing across the curriculum, and many of the ideals of this movement were incorporated into the tutoring model of that time- instructors assessed students' reading/writing based on course materials during the first few weeks of the semester and referred of students to tutoring based on those assessments.

In an attempt to move toward a Writing/Reading Center, the English department, for the past three semesters, has piloted a Writing/Reading Center for some English 9 students, but it was tied to basic skills development for the English 9 course only. In the new curriculum, tutoring for English 90 students is based within the course itself.

Based on the above, the Task Force recommends:
13. A Writing/Reading Center be established for students who are taking courses across the curriculum and who need assistance with writing and reading assignments.

14. The Writing/Reading Center be staffed by a Coordinator, faculty consultants with
expertise in reading and writing who work with referred students, and trained tutors who work under the supervision of the faculty consultants and Coordinator. Clerical support would also be needed.

15. CRLA certification be sought for the tutor training component of this center. On-going evaluation of the center should be conducted by the Coordinator.

16. The Writing/Reading Center offer workshops throughout the semester designed to help students with specific courses, e.g. writing a research paper, writing a science report, writing a business report, etc. with faculty brought in from different departments to participate in these workshops.
I. SUPPLEMENTAL INSTRUCTION
II. PAIRED COURSES
Level Three: Course-Related Learning Services

Description of Level Three Programs Level Three services represent a shift in focus. Instead of targeting "high risk students" who are presumed to have deficits which must be remediated as in Levels One and Two, Level Three services target "high risk courses".

The assumption in Level III programs is that the college must provide whatever extra instruction is necessary to bridge the gap between students' skills and knowledge at entry and those required to master the content material . . . Students' learning needs are presented as being necessary because of the nature of the objectives and content of the course rather than because of students' deficiencies. Therefore, all students have access to supplementary, possibly innovative, instructional experiences which benefit nonremedial students as well. (Keimig, 1983)

I. SUPPLEMENTAL INSTRUCTION

Definition
Supplemental Instruction is an academic assistance program which is based on the principle that students improve their mastery of a subject through interaction and discussions of difficult principles with other students. Thus, a model student (SI leader) is selected to conduct these regularly scheduled SI sessions. Although SI leaders have completed the course with a B or higher, they will attend the targeted course regularly and meet with the faculty member weekly. During an SI session, the SI leader reinforces the main concepts from the lecture, shares problem solving techniques, provides test review, and helps students construct practice tests and quizzes before actual ones are given in class. Despite the fact that the SI sessions are organized by the SI leader, who has received training in learning theory and strategies, the setting is informal and students are encouraged to participate and contribute to the discussion. The sessions integrate "how to learn" with "what to learn". Study skills such as notetaking, graphic organization, and vocabulary acquisition techniques are modeled by the SI leader. Sessions are typically offered three times a week at different times to accommodate different students' schedules.

Summary of Background Research
Much research on SI has been conducted and published by the University of Missouri-Kansas City, which began the program in 1973. High risk courses are defined as courses in which 40% of students typically earn D's, F's and W's. National data is collected annually from all colleges using SI who are willing to participate in the research. The results are impressive. The use of SI, when used according to the methods and principles which are taught in national training sessions to SI supervisors, consistently shows improved retention and GPA for participating students, even when a variety of other factors are controlled. The only area in which SI does not show impressive results is in basic skills courses for which it was not designed. The basic skills courses were not perceived as demanding by students, and they did not regularly attend the workshops. It appears that students' perception of the course as "high
risk" is key to the success of SI. Students are motivated to attend the workshops because they recognize the level of difficulty of the course based on its content, methods and objectives rather than on any perceived deficit in themselves. Math and science courses are frequently targeted for SI.

SI is offered only in classes in which the faculty member invites and supports it. Identifying instructors who would be interested in SI for their courses is the responsibility of the SI supervisor, a professional staff member who has attended the week long national training program in SI. The SI supervisor is also responsible for training, supervising and evaluating the students who are referred by faculty to be SI leaders or model peers. The SI sessions begin during the first week of the semester and all students are encouraged to attend one weekly session. Students are encouraged to "learn how to learn" in that particular course before they encounter academic difficulty. Faculty support the program by regularly announcing workshops, encouraging all students to attend, and posting the average grade of students attending sessions compared to those who are not.

While the benefits of SI are well documented, the disadvantages are that the program may be expensive and labor intensive. It takes a college-wide commitment and depends upon a competent SI supervisor and the recruitment of committed SI leaders. The program must have a sufficient budget, and the SI supervisor needs space in which to coordinate the program and train SI leaders, as well as clerical support. While SI sessions take place in the curricular areas, a centralized location such as a Teaching/Learning Center would be appropriate for program coordination. The SI supervisor also needs time to communicate regularly with participating faculty, problem solve conflicts if they arise, and conduct the necessary evaluations.

**Based on the above, the Task Force recommends:**

17. LMC identify two faculty/staff to attend Supervisor trainings which are offered several times each year at the University of Missouri- Kansas City. These SI supervisors would then identify two or three courses to pilot a SI program and recruit and train SI leaders for those courses.

18. A pilot SI program be supported for at least two years while data is collected about its effectiveness. If found to be effective, the SI model would be adopted and expanded as an ongoing program.

**IL PAIRED COURSES**

**Definition**
Paired or linked courses are the simplest form of a learning community. Two courses are identified as being linked at registration. Co-registration in the courses may or may not be mandatory. Each course is taught separately, but there may be some joint assignments, projects and discussions. Two content courses may be paired, or a content and skills course
may be paired, such as philosophy and reading. There may also be a thematic link between the courses.

**Summary of Background Research**

Paired courses can help to foster a greater sense of community among learners, promote greater retention and achievement for students, and revitalize the teaching experience for faculty members. Critical thinking is strengthened as students are exposed to different perspectives on the same issue. Pairing a content course and a skills course can promote transference of skills to content and reinforce high standards in the content course. In addition, this interdisciplinary approach is consistent with the philosophy of LMC.

a. **Pairing a 'learning to Learn' course with a content course** would be an example of a Level III approach to study skills or college success strategies previously discussed in Level I. One widely recognized program of this type has been developed and extensively researched by Dr. Clare Weinstein of the University of Texas at Austin. It is based on her model of strategic learning and has its underpinnings in cognitive psychology. The course addresses declarative, procedural, metacognitive and volitional knowledge; i.e. What do I need to know? How do I do it? When do I use which strategy? Do I choose to do it? This course fosters knowledge of the self as learner, understanding of the nature of academic tasks, and use of learning strategies. Topics may includes time and stress management, goal setting, and test-taking strategies. Assignments require students to use strategies from the course in other academic courses which they must take concurrently.

This course is offered through the Educational Psychology department at UT, Austin. Most students who take it are students who are admitted to the university under special admission criteria; other target student populations are students who do poorly their first semester, students who "hit a wall" in upper division work, and students who simply want to improve their GPA. .

A six year follow-up study comparing students who took the Learning Strategies course to the general population of students at UT Austin showed statistically significant improvement in GPA, subsequent course grades, persistence within the upper division major, and graduation rates. These improvements are particularity remarkable given that students taking the course had much lower SAT scores than the control group. This study controlled for 33 variables when constructing the control group from the general population.

b. **Pairing a Reading/Writing Course with a content course** would be another example of a Level III program. One model at Utah Valley State College offers a reading strategies course based in metacognitive strategies with a philosophy course, and offers the reading course twice per semester as a 7-1/2 week course.
Current LMC Practice
LMC has experimented with paired courses in the past. Language Arts 10 was paired with Humanistic Studies 2LS. Unfortunately, no data is available about the success of that pairing.

A pilot project funded for "at risk" students, STAR, paired basic skills English courses (7 and 9) with Psychology 100, a course designed to help students learn basic strategies for success in college.

Based on the above, the Task Force recommends:
19. LMC consider linking a Learning Strategies course (either an existing course such as Psychology 34 or Psychology 100 or a course yet to be developed) with a content course, such as Economics or History. Interested faculty would need to be identified and given some institutional support, perhaps a mini-grant or staff development funding, to plan how the courses would link. Issues of coregistration would then need to be worked out with the Admissions Office.

20. LMC consider linking a Reading/Writing course (either an existing course or one yet to be developed) with a content course, such as Child Development. Interested faculty would need to be identified and given some institutional support, perhaps a mini-grant or staff development funding, to plan how the courses would link. Issues of co-registration would then need to be worked out with the Admissions Office.

21. Student populations that would be interested in taking such paired courses be identified prior to offering them and that they be actively marketed by the college. One approach might be to list creative combinations of paired courses in the schedule of classes.
I. LEARNING COMMUNITIES
II. TEACHING/LEARNING CENTER
Level Four: Comprehensive Learning Systems

Description of Level Four Programs
Level IV programs represent the highest level of institutional commitment and change and should only be attempted when lower levels are already in place to support more comprehensive efforts. "In Level IV programs, the assumption is that the total educational experience within the course should be systematically designed according to the principles of learning theory... Learning processes for the course or curriculum are purposefully designed with students' particular needs and attitudes in mind" (Keimig, 1983).

In a 1997 presentation, "Organizing for Learning: A Point of Entry," delivered to the American Association of Higher Education, Peter T. Ewell asserts that most attempts to improve collegiate learning have had limited impact because they have been: (1) piecemeal and (2) implemented "in the absence of a broadly discussed and well articulated understanding of what 'collegiate learning' really means". He recommends that we keep in mind basic learning principles such as "learning is about "making meaning" by establishing patterns, connections and relationships, learning occurs best in the context of a "presenting problem", and learning occurs best in a cultural and interpersonal context that supplies a great deal of enjoyable interaction and considerable levels of individual personal support."

Ewell goes on to review the research that applies to curriculum and instruction in terms of approaches that have been shown to produce learning gains. These include approaches that allow faculty to model constructively the learning process and which emphasize action, experience, and interpersonal collaboration.

With reference to organizational structure and change, Ewell points out that change requires "a fundamental shift of perspective for both the organization and its members." There must be "conscious and consistent administrative and leadership support", and people will need to "re-learn their own roles".

Keeping the above principles in mind, examples of Level IV programs for comprehensive learning systems might include:

I. LEARNING COMMUNITIES

Definition
A Learning Community is a curricular structure that links together a set of courses to create an integrated educational experience for students, all of whom take the courses in the set. The idea of Learning Communities stems from the work of Alexander Meiklejohn, who founded the Experimental College at the University of Wisconsin in 1927. He later moved to UC Berkeley and directed a similar institution until his death in 1965. The work at Cal was continued by Joseph Tussman. There are five basic categories of Learning Communities:

1. Linked Courses - cohort of students enrolls in two courses, both could be content or one
basic skills and one content. (e.g. History and English)

2. Learning Clusters - cohort of students enrolls in two to four courses which are linked thematically. (Sociology, Ethnic Studies, Literature and Statistics with a common theme of immigration.)

3. Freshmen Interest Group - small cohort of students enrolls together in three larger classes. Students meet weekly with an advisor. (e.g. CARE students enroll in English, Psychology and Biology - the class also includes non-CARE students, but the CARE students meet weekly or bimonthly with an advisor for support and guidance.)

4. Federated Learning Community - cohort of students and "master learner" enroll in three thematically linked, but autonomous courses. Usually there is also a weekly seminar offered for credit which is led by a "master learner". (e.g. same as Learning Cluster example, but students also meet weekly with "master learner" who could be a staff member or tutor who would model strategies for success and reinforce the connections among the courses.)

5. Coordinated studies - cohort of students and faculty (from different disciplines) in a core of courses which are taught as a block. (e.g. Students meet from 9:00-12:00 and are team taught by instructors from three different disciplines such as Physics, Calculus, and Philosophy. Students receive credit for all three courses, but instruction is interwoven throughout the time block in all three disciplines and is not presented as autonomous units to students.)

**Summary of Background Research**

Learning Communities as teaching formats are used in colleges throughout the United States. Model programs include La Guardia Community College, New York; Seattle Central Community College and Evergreen State College, both in Washington. Closer to home, Solano has been experimenting with learning communities, and Contra Costa is planning a pilot for the 1998 - 1999 year.

Vincent Tinto, nationally recognized expert in student retention, recently conducted a research project to determine if learning communities make a difference, and if so, how? The study was carried out under the auspices of the National Center on Postsecondary Teaching, Learning and Assessment, a national research center. Both two and four year colleges participated in the study. The major findings of the study were that learning communities:

1. Build supportive peer groups
2. Bridge the Academic-Social Divide
3. Help students gain a voice in the construction of knowledge
4. Increase persistence into the next year of study at considerably higher rates than similar students not enrolled in learning communities.
Dr. Tinto concludes that learning communities are effective in assisting new students in making the transition into both the academic and social life of college; promote student involvement and achievement even among students who face multiple constraints upon their ability to become involved in college; can be an effective response to the needs of new college students who require developmental education assistance; and assist faculty collaboration and their utilization of teaching strategies that actively involve students in classroom learning. He advises colleges to "focus less on student obligations and more on the character of their own responsibility to construct the sorts of educational settings and provide the types of educational pedagogies in which all students, not just some, will want to become involved and learn" (1993).

**LMC Current Practice**
The AVANCE program is a form of a learning community which has been operating successfully at LMC for many years. Students enroll as a cohort in basic skills English, math classes and a college success class. Advising and tutoring are part of the program. The thematic link is a focus on Latino culture and studies.

A pilot project, EXCEL, which built on the STAR project for at-risk students linked basic skills English, math and a college success class. Advising and tutoring were also included. There was, however, no thematic link. Faculty involved in that pilot concluded that it would be best to initiate learning communities with students at an English 9 level rather than an English 7 level. They also suggested thematically linking the English course to a content course in addition to the college success class. It is important to note that the students were quite enthusiastic about the college success class and the advising component of the program. They also cited the sense of community as being very important to them.

**Based on the above, the Task Force recommends**
22. Learning Communities should be developed and utilized as part of our developmental education program. As a start, development of linked courses should be encouraged. Workshops, perhaps during flex, should be conducted by national experts in the field as well as local colleges who have tried learning communities on campuses similar to our own.

23. Resources should be provided for a Coordinator to develop, implement and evaluate these programs which should be given at least two years for "pilot" time and formative evaluation before any summative evaluation is undertaken. This Coordinator might be housed in a Teaching/Learning Center.

24. Faculty participating in Learning Communities be given release time to plan effectively and coordinate their classes.
IL TEACHING/LEARNING CENTER

Definition
A Teaching/Learning Center provides academic support for students often including the types of learning assistance mentioned in Level Two and Three programs, including computer-assisted instruction, tutoring, writing/reading assistance, supplemental instruction, and workshops on college success. In addition, it is a place where faculty receive support for innovation in teaching and learning, thus often housing staff development programs as well.

Summary of Background Research
The concept of a Level IV Teaching/Learning Center evolved from Level 1E Learning Assistance Centers which became popular in the 1970's as a place to house tutorial services, programmed instruction, AV materials, and counseling. It was usually considered to be part of Student Services and was based on a student deficit model- a place to send students with problems to be "fixed".

In the 1980's, Teaching/Learning Centers had metamorphosed into what was termed" Writing Across the Curriculum" and often housed the Reading and Writing Center and computer-assisted education. These Centers sought greater faculty involvement. Although LMC never had a Center, we did have a FIPSE grant in the early 80's to train and encourage all faculty to assess students' reading and writing skills in their courses, make referrals to the tutorial program, and infuse reading and writing strategies into their courses.

Teaching and Learning Centers have become more pervasive in the 1990's particularly in four year colleges and universities. Building upon the earlier models, these centers take considerably more institutional support because the focus is significantly expanded. Not only is it a place for students to receive academic support in a variety of ways, it is a place for faculty and staff to learn how to better structure learning experiences for students within and beyond the classroom.

For example, the Learning Strategies course mentioned in Level III as developed by Dr. Weinstein at UT, Austin, can be taken to a Level IV program via a staff development program offered through the Teaching/ Learning Center. In a program of this sort, which Dr. Weinstein is trying right now at several community colleges in Texas, faculty learn how to integrate learning strategies into their course content, rather than students attending a separate course or SI sessions as they might in a Level III program. Dr. Weinstein reports that faculty are enthusiastic about the project. Another example would be that of a geology professor at the University of Arizona who worked with the Coordinator of the Teaching/ Learning Center to completely redesign his freshmen introductory course based on principles of learning theory.

Dr. Vincent Tinto supports this approach as well, particularly for community college students for whom the classroom is the heart of the learning experience. For many reasons, it is difficult to get students in the community college to take advantage of supplementary learning opportunities; it is therefore imperative to direct the best resources directly into the classroom.
This involves tremendous levels of effort and commitment on the part of the faculty, and equally tremendous levels of commitment on the part of the administration to support an institutional entity such as a Teaching/Learning Center, where this type of consultation and collaboration can take place on an on-going basis.

**Current LMC Practice**
There is currently no centralized location for providing this kind of support for students of faculty/staff.

**Based on the above, the Task Force recommends:**
25. A Teaching/Learning Center be established in a central location. The following services may be provided:

   Writing/Reading Across the Curriculum Tutor Training Coordination of Supplemental Instruction Coordination of Learning Communities Advising for Developmental Students Scholarship Applications/Essay Writing Staff Development: Computer Assisted Instruction Incorporating Learning Strategies into Content Courses Consultancy on Designing and Evaluating Reading/Writing Assignments Grant Writing New Faculty Orientation (NEXUS) Intersegmental projects with K-12 and 4 year colleges

26. The Teaching/Learning Center be directed by someone with expertise in the above listed services who would be able to support the Coordinators of the following programs and services: Writing/Reading Center, Developmental Studies in English & math, Supplemental Instruction, Learning Communities, Staff Development, and others assigned to components of the entire teaching/learning program at the college. This position would need to be developed, approved and advertised well in advance of the establishment of a Teaching/Learning Center; in fact, we recommend that such a person be hired in the planning phases of creating such a Center and begin the coordination of all developmental programs and services which would eventually be housed there.
Students with Special Needs

Note: The Task Force felt it was important to include students with special needs as part of our report; however, we did not do extensive research on this topic and recommend that it receive further institutional attention. While a comprehensive developmental education program will serve all students, and while the conceptual model of Keimig's hierarchy lends itself to the consideration of students with special needs, this section of the report should not be considered a definitive statement on the subject.

**Definition**
Students with special needs are defined in two broad categories for the purpose of this report: Special Populations and Students at Risk. The Task Force saw these two categories as intersecting but not synonymous. In other words, a student could be a member of a special population, but not necessarily "at risk" and vice versa.

**Special Populations:** Students may be considered part of a special population if they share a common characteristic such as disabled students, re-entry women, racial/ethnic groups, veterans, non-native speakers of English, economic disadvantage, etc.

**Students at Risk:** Students at risk are more likely than the general population of college students to drop out of school for a variety of reasons. In addition to academic underpreparedness, students may be "at risk" due to other factors such as domestic instability, depression, substance abuse, lack of successful role models and attitudes which encourage failure. Many such students are anxious, disbelieving of their abilities and talents and short sighted in the development of goals.

**Summary of Background Research**
The available institutional research at LMC provides data about retention, persistence and course success rates by racial/ethnic categories. Although this information is also provided on the basis of age and gender, only the breakdown by race/ethnicity fits our description of special populations and is excerpted below:

**LMC data summary:**

**Institutional Effectiveness Report 1996:**

Retention Rates: (Definition: Student is retained in the course to end of term.)

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

25
Latino  81%

Course Success Rates: (Definition: a letter grade of "A", "B", "C" or "CR")

African American  53%
Asian  65%
Caucasian  77%
Latino  73%

Institutional Research Data from a 5 year study of the 1990 entering class:
Cumulative GPA comparisons: African American students have a lower average cumulative GPA after the first semester (1.85) when compared with other ethnic groups (overall cumulative first semester GPA was 2.47). This was the only statistically significant difference in GPA that occurred along ethnic lines within the cohort studied.

Semester to semester persistence rates: by ethnicity range from 20% for African-Americans to 38% for Filipinos.

Cumulative degree/certificate attainment rates: by ethnicity range from 1% for African Americans to 3% for Caucasians.

Fall 1993 First Time Student Cohort:

Semester to semester persistence:

Overall:  21% (after 5 semesters)
African-American  16%
Asian  25%
Caucasian  21%
Latino  23%
Filipino  33%
Am. Indian  25%

Fall 1995 Overall Academic Performance (Definition: Course Success with a letter grade of "A", "B", "C" or "CR")

Overall  68%
African-American  55%
Asian  77%
Caucasian  73%
Latino  65%
Filipino 72%  
Am. Indian 59%

Other research:
1. In Promoting Persistence and Academic Achievement Among Minority Undergraduates A Force Field Analysis of Student Adjustment, Dr. Edward Anderson identifies the following ranked factors as promoting academic persistence in minority students: financial support, assessment and referral procedures, orientation activities, counseling services, and support systems within the college environment. He identifies a different list of ranked factors as promoting academic achievement in minority students: diagnostic testing of skills and preparation, curricula consistent with students' diagnosed skills and preparation, comprehensive educational planning and academic advising, assessments of study skills and needs for tutorial assistance, learning skills instruction and course content tutoring, monitoring of progress and performance, and recognizing academic achievement. (Note that these factors closely correspond to the program components recommended by the Task Force.) He questions whether special programs for minority and low-income students are the most effective approach. Frequently, these programs do not control resources, testing and advising, tutoring, and other support services necessary for minority student success. He advocates a hierarchy of services integrated throughout the academic institution.

2. In a keynote address to the 1997 NADE Conference, Dr. James Anderson states that developmental models are not homogeneous. Different models may be required for different special populations. He cites the advantages of special programs: they help personalize the college environment and provide role models. Minority and low-income students are given top priority and services are tailored more precisely to student needs. The disadvantages of special programs are that they may be the only institutional action taken to address the needs of these students, and may not be adequately or consistently funded. Dr. Anderson also emphasized the importance of good assessment practices and placement in appropriate courses for underprepared students. He argues that 'right-to-fail' doctrines are destructive and unethical because they set students up with unrealistic expectations. He argues that students at risk lack confidence and attribute failure to their own lack of ability and consequently lose motivation and decrease their efforts to succeed.

LMC: Current Practice
LMC has the following programs for special populations:

**AVANCE provides** an enriching academic environment which allows RAZA/Latino and other students to complete their educational goals" (LMC Spring 1998 Schedule of Classes).
DSPS "is committed to providing opportunities for students with physical, learning and other disabilities to fully participate in all programs. A variety of services is provided to students with identified disabilities" (DSPS brochure). **EOPS** "is funded by the state to provide academic/economic support services to eligible students. EOPS provides an additional support program to encourage students faced with economic and educational disadvantages: the CARE program"(LMC Catalog, 1997-1998). **CARE** "provides support services to FOPS students who are single parents with preschool age children and recipients of Aid to Families with Dependent Children" (LMC Catalog, 1997-1998)

Currently, not all special populations are being served. While clubs such as Black Students United and the Society of the Four Winds are organized for African-American and American Indian students respectively, there are no programs that are specifically designed to meet their needs.

Similarly, although a number of courses are offered in our curriculum to assist ESL students in improving their reading, writing and speaking skills in English, there is no comprehensive program that addresses this population of students and their unique needs.

The "Not Only for Women" Center which provided support for students who might be considered "high risk" due to domestic and financial difficulties is not in operation at this time.

**Based on the above, the Task Force recommends:**

27. The progress of "special population" students (i.e. DSPS, EOPS, AVANCE, ESL, etc.) enrolled in basic skills classes in English and math be followed using the same criteria listed previously for all students enrolled in such courses. 

28. That each level of Keimig's hierarchy as described in this report be examined from the perspective of students with special needs and interventions developed which specifically focus on serving those students. For example:

   Assessment: Is the assessment process sensitive to the needs of ESL, disabled and minority students?

   Advising/Counseling: Are we providing effective advising and counseling for students with special needs?

   Level One Programs: We already have special courses for ESL, DSPS, AVANCE and CARE students. Should we develop other courses for students such as thematic English courses at the 70 or 90 level which might be of interest to special populations such as children's literature, African-American literature or topics dealing with being disabled in an able-bodied culture?
Level Two Programs: Specialized tutoring is currently provided for DSPS and EOPS students. How do we make sure that tutoring services are responsive to the needs of other special populations? How can we recruit a diverse population of tutors? Should we revitalize a mentoring program and link it to the community?

Level Three Programs: Can we link courses that would provide a bridge to collegiate courses for ESL students? Can we recruit SI leaders who would serve as role models for special population or high risk students?

Level Four Programs: Avance is an example of a Learning Community which is responsive to students who are interested in Latino themes and issues. Can other Learning Communities be formed which thematically link courses which might be of particular interest to students of other special populations? Can we provide staff development through a Teaching/Learning Center which would help faculty more effectively teach "high risk" students within their courses?

The Task Force believes that Keimig's hierarchy lends itself to an investigation of developmental education from the point of view of students with special needs. It is essential that this work be done as we move toward implementing a developmental education program at LMC.
References


Appendix
1. PURPOSE
The purpose of establishing a series of tutoring certificates is twofold. First, it allows tutors to receive recognition and positive reinforcement for their successful work from a national/international organization, CRLA. Secondly, the certificates help set up a standard for the minimum skills and training a tutor needs to be successful.

2. PROCEDURES FOR HAVING A PROGRAM CERTIFIED
A) An institute that wishes to have a tutor program certified should designate one individual per tutor program or group of tutor programs who will act as liaison between the CRLA International Tutor Certification Program (ITCP) and that institution's program or programs.

B) The designated individual will then complete and then submit the originals and three collated and bound copies of: 1) "CRLA Application For Certification Of Tutor Programs"; 2) the necessary "Verification of Tutor Program" forms; 3) plus the necessary documentation concerning how the institution's tutor program(s) meets the criteria outlined in "CRLA'S REQUIREMENTS FOR CERTIFICATION OF TUTOR PROGRAMS" to the CRLA ITCP.

C) The originals of the application and documentation concerning an institution's tutor training program(s) will remain on file with the CHLA ITCP Coordinator.
I. REQUIREMENTS FOR REGULAR/LEVEL 1 CERTIFICATION

A. AMOUNT/DURATION OF TUTOR TRAINING
   (one or more of the following):
   1. Minimum of ten hours of tutor training
   2. A quarter/semester tutor training course
   3. A quarter/semester of tutor training (non-course work)

B. MODES OF TUTOR TRAINING
   1. Classroom and/or workshop instruction PLUS any combination of the following:
   2. Tutor training videotapes
   3. Conferences with tutor trainer/supervisor
   4. Special tutor projects
   5. Other (please specify)

C. AREAS/TOPICS TO BE COVERED IN TUTOR TRAINING
   A minimum of eight (8) of the following topics should be covered:
   1. Definition of tutoring and tutor responsibilities
   2. Basic tutoring guidelines
   3. Techniques for successfully beginning and ending a tutor session
   4. Some basic Tutoring Do's
   5. Some basic Tutoring Don'ts
   6. Role Modeling
   7. Setting Goals/Planning
   8. Communication Skills
   9. Active listening and paraphrasing
   10. Referral Skills
   11. Study Skills
   12. Critical Thinking Skills
   13. Compliance with the Ethics and Philosophy of the Tutor Program
   14. Modeling problem solving