English as a Second Language

Summary of Program Review:

A. Major Findings

1. Strengths:

- The non-credit side to the program is booming.
- Credit enrollments are lower than ideal but are growing after previous low caused by the pandemic.
- Assessments have been regular and thorough.
- New hires include two new adjuncts (needed to staff non-credit classes)
- A new outreach coordinator was hired.
- Improved collaboration with instructors and outreach coordinators at NVAE.

2. Areas for Improvement:

- Continue to increase class size in all of our sections, and especially credit classes.
- Increase our fill rates, headcounts, and productivity within the program.
- Continue to promote our courses in a variety of areas including social, outreach, flyers, etc.
- Increase awareness and value of our certificate program.
- Improve collaboration and training of instructors

3. Projected Program Growth, Stability, or Viability:

- The non-credit side of the program will continue to grow.
- Credit enrollments should continue to grow as we get further away from the pandemic.
- We plan to harness the growth in non-credit classes to increase enrollments in credit classes.

B. Program's Support of Institutional Mission and Goals

1. Description of Alignment between Program and Institutional Mission:

- Continue to grow all ESL classes, especially credit courses
- Increase course advertisements and outreach
- Increase certificate advertisements and outreach
- Identify resources to support ESL students with online learning (especially lower levels)
- Explore curriculum development on ESL computer literacy
- Explore curriculum development and certificates for inter-disciplinary programs (e.g. ESL & Viticulture, ESL & Business, ESL & Psychology, etc.)
- Use StarFish early alert system to improve retention
- Reach out to high schools, local colleges and additional consortia members to advertise our ESL classes

2. Assessment of Program's Recent Contributions to Institutional Mission:

- NC Course Certificates to better serve community members
- Provide a pathway with our updated mirrored curriculum to better offer open-access to Career Development and College Preparation

- Continuously evaluate and improve recent curriculum modifications and the Self-Placement tool

3. Recent Program Activities Promoting the Goals of the Institutional Strategic Plan and Other Institutional Plans/Initiatives:

- Continued work with local educational partners (NVAE, PUC, Puertas Abiertas, UpValley Family Centers, etc.) to promote educational opportunities and prepare incoming students for college success.
- Expand our Equity services to better support ESL students from all backgrounds, including ranging work and study skills
- Maintain collaboration with community members and civic partners who make up our Consortia
- Create a more approachable pathway for students to receive Academic ESL courses to complete educational and job training goals

C. New Objectives/Goals:

- Hire at least one full time ESL Instructor for the health of the program.
- Reduce the unit load of credit and non-credit "academic" courses to 4 units (from 6).
- Work closely with other non-credit programs to develop more non-credit courses to cater better to the needs of our population.
- Strengthen relationships with Napa Valley Adult Education to increase transfer rates and improve continuity between the two programs.
- Build a budget to be able to pay adjunct instructors for program work, such as regular meetings, trainings, curriculum development, etc.
- Work with the Division and Counseling to draft greater educational plans for incoming International (F-1 Visa) students, especially ones with lower levels of English proficiency.

D. Description of Process Used to Ensure "Inclusive Program Review"

- Several in-person conversations were held between the coordinator and the "academic" instructors, to discuss what is working for our students and how we can adjust to better fit their needs.
- A program wide meeting was called (and attended by mostly non-credit instructors) to discuss the program review and elicit feedback and suggestions about potential solutions to some of the challenges the program faces.

Program Review Report Spring 2024

This report covers the following program, degrees, certificates, area(s) of study, and courses (based on the Taxonomy of Programs on file with the Office of Academic Affairs):

Program	English as a Second Language
Degrees/Certificates	ESL: High-Intermediate Academic: CoC ESL: Low-Advanced Academic: CoC ESL: Low-Intermediate Academic: CoC ESL: Pre-Intermediate Academic: CoC
Courses	ESL 55 (p. 50)
	ESL 54
	ESL 60
	ESL 65 (p. 64)
	ESL 70
	ESL 75 (p. 74)
	ESL 80
	ESL 85 (p. 84)
	ESL 106
	ESL 108 (p. ESL 110)
	ESLNC 855
	ESLNC 862
	ESLNC 865
	ESLNC 875
	ESLNC 884
	ESLNC 885

Taxonomy of Programs, July 2022

I. PROGRAM DATA

A. Demand

1. Headcount and Enrollment

Credit & Noncredit Separately

	2020-2021	2021-2022	2022-2023	Change over 3-Year Period
Headcount				
Within the Credit Program	**44**	**18**	**35**	**-20.5%**
Across the Institution (Credit Courses)	**7,193**	**6,653**	**6,155**	**-14.4%**
ESL-54	--	--	--	N/A
ESL-55	14	7	16	14.3%
ESL-60	--	--	--	N/A
ESL-65	4	5	11	175%
ESL-70	--	--	--	N/A
ESL-75	10	8	4	-60.0%
ESL-80	--	--	--	N/A
ESL-85	19	6	11	-42.1%
ESL-106	6	--	--	-100%
ESL-108/110	--	--	--	N/A
Within the Program	**53**	**26**	**42**	**-20.8%**
Across the Institution	**30,381**	**25,212**	**23,473**	**-22.7%**
ESLNC-855	15	30	46	207%
ESLNC-862	13	31	65	400%
ESLNC-865	28	20	40	42.9%
ESLNC-875	15	22	17	13.3%
ESLNC-884	34	26	41	20.6%
ESLNC-885	14	3	16	14.3%
Noncredit Program Total	**119**	**132**	**225**	**89.1%**
Noncredit across the Institution	**941**	**1,158**	**1,662**	**76.6%**
Source: SQL Queries for Fall 2023 Program Review for credit courses; SQL Server Reporting Services – Term to Term Enrollment FTES Load Comparison Report (by Non-Credit Course) for non-credit courses				

<u>RPIE Analysis</u>: The number of students enrolled (headcount) in the credit English as a Second Language Program decreased by 20.5% over the past three years, while headcount across the institution decreased by 14.4%. Enrollment within the credit English as a Second Language Program decreased by 20.8%, while enrollment across the institution decreased by 22.7%.

Enrollment in the following credit courses changed by more than 10% (±10%) between 2020-2021 and 2022-2023:

Credit courses with enrollment increases:

- *ESL-65 (175%)*
- *ESL-55 (14.3%)*

Credit courses with enrollment decreases:

- *ESL-75 (-60.0%)*
- *ESL-85 (-42.1%)*
- *ESL-106 (-100%)*

Between 2020-2021 and 2022-2023, enrollment within the noncredit English as a Second Language Program increased by 89.1%, while enrollment across all noncredit courses increased by 76.6%.

Enrollment in the following noncredit courses changed by more than 10% (±10%) between 2020-2021 and 2022-2023:

Noncredit courses with enrollment increases:

- *ESLNC-862 (400%)*
- *ESLNC-855 (207%)*
- *ESLNC-865 (42.9%)*
- *ESLNC-884 (20.6%)*
- *ESLNC-885 (14.3%)*
- *ESLNC-875 (13.3%)*

No noncredit English as a Second Language courses experienced a decrease in enrollment over the past three years.

Program Reflection:

- In general, enrollments have exploded in the lower level non-credit and credit courses, and have slightly decreased in the intermediate and higher levels.
- In the credit ESL courses, enrollments are not yet up to pre-pandemic numbers, but are trending upwards. These reflect the institutional trends. However, the non-credit mirrored versions of these classes are stronger and on the uptick, which implies more demand.
- Lower-level classes have seen the highest increases. ES-55/NCESL 855 and ESL-65/NCESL-865 are the highest enrolled. These courses are offered every semester, and this should continue.
- We have had huge increases in non-credit enrollments. These classes seem to be serving community needs.
- In general the program should make an effort to increase enrollments at higher levels, either through increasing student persistence or increasing outreach.
- It would be useful to see:
    - Term-to-term persistence in the program. Are we losing students as they move up into higher levels, or are our students just stepping in for a semester and then leaving?
    - Number of non-credit students who moved on to credit classes?
    - Number of ESL students who moved on to college level classes in English or other departments?

Credit & Noncredit Enrollments Combined

	2020-2021	2021-2022	2022-2023	Change over 3-Year Period
ESL-55/ESLNC-855	29	37	62	114%
ESL-65/ESLNC-865	32	25	51	59.4%
ESL-75/ESLNC-875	25	30	21	-16.0%
ESL-85/ESLNC-885	33	9	27	-18.2%
ESL-106	6	--	--	-100%
ESLNC-862	13	31	65	400%
ESLNC-884	34	26	41	20.6%
Program Total	**172**	**158**	**267**	**55.2%**
Total across the Institution	**31,322**	**26,370**	**25,135**	**-19.8%**
Source: SQL Queries for Fall 2023 Program Review for credit courses; SQL Server Reporting Services – Term to Term Enrollment FTES Load Comparison Report (by Non-Credit Course) for non-credit courses				

RPIE Analysis: Enrollment within the credit and noncredit English as a Second Language Programs (combined) increased by 55.2% over the past three years, while credit and noncredit enrollments across the institution decreased by 19.8%.

Enrollment in the following ESL combination credit/noncredit courses changed by more than 10% (±10%) between 2020-2021 and 2022-2023:

Combination credit/noncredit courses with enrollment increases:

- *ESL-55/ESLNC-855 (114%)*
- *ESL-65/ESLNC-865 (59.4%)*

Combination credit/noncredit courses with enrollment decreases:

- *ESL-85/ESLNC-885 (-18.2%)*
- *ESL-75/ESLNC-875 (-16.0%)*

When compared with the patterns in the credit ESL program and the noncredit ESL program (considered separately, above), the patterns of increase are attributed to the noncredit program and the patterns of decrease are attributed to the credit program.

Program Reflection:

This data, which reports combined credit and non-credit classes by level, upholds the interpretation stated above; the non-credit classes are very popular and seem to be serving an important need in the community. The credit courses have been less popular (especially during the pandemic lockdown).

2. Average Class Size

	2020-2021		2021-2022		2022-2023		Three-Year	
	Sections	**Average Size**	**Sections**	**Average Size**	**Sections**	**Average Size**	**Average Section Size**	**Trend**
ESL-106	1	6.0	--	--	--	--	6.0	-100%
ESL-55	2	7.0	2	3.5	2	8.0	6.2	14.3%
ESL-65	1	4.0	1	5.0	2	5.5	5.0	37.5%
ESL-75	2	5.0	2	4.0	1	4.0	4.4	-20.0%
ESL-85	2	9.5	1	6.0	1	11.0	9.0	15.8%
Program Average*	**8**	**6.6**	**6**	**4.3**	**6**	**7.0**	**6.1**	**5.7%**
Institutional Average*	**1,199**	**25.3**	**1,112**	**22.7**	**1,009**	**23.3**	**23.8**	**-8.2%**
Noncredit								
ESLNC-855	2	7.5	2	15.0	2	23.0	15.2	207%
ESLNC-862	1	13.0	2	15.5	2	32.5	21.8	150%
ESLNC-865	2	14.0	1	20.0	2	20.0	17.6	42.9%
ESLNC-875	2	7.5	2	11.0	1	17.0	10.8	127%
ESLNC-884	2	17.0	2	13.0	2	20.5	16.8	20.6%
ESLNC-885	2	7.0	1	3.0	1	16.0	8.3	129%
Program Average*	**11**	**10.8**	**10**	**13.2**	**10**	**22.5**	**15.4**	**108%**
Institutional Average (All Noncredit Classes)*	**52**	**18.1**	**47**	**24.6**	**93**	**17.9**	**19.6**	**-1.1%**

Sources: SQL Queries for Fall 2023 Program Review for credit courses; SQL Server Reporting Services – Term to Term Enrollment FTES Load Comparison Report (by Non-Credit Course) for non-credit courses

Average Section Size across the three-year period for courses, and both within academic years and across the three-year period for the program and institutional levels is calculated as:

$$\frac{\text{Total \# Enrollments}}{\text{Total \# Sections}}.$$

It is not the average of the three annual averages.

RPIE Analysis: Over the past three years, the credit portion of the English as a Second Language Program has claimed an average of 6.1 students per section. The average class size in the program is lower than the average class size of 23.8 students per section across the institution during this period. Average class size in the program increased by 5.7% between 2020-2021 and 2022-2023. Average class size at the institutional level decreased by 8.2% over the same period.

Average class size in the following courses changed by more than 10% (±10%) between 2020-2021 and 2022-2023:

Courses with increases in average class size:

- *ESL-65 (37.5%)*
- *ESL-85 (15.8%)*
- *ESL-55 (14.3%)*

Courses with decreases in average class size:

- *ESL-106 (-100%)*
- *ESL-75 (-20.0%)*

Over the past three years, the noncredit portion of the English as a Second Language Program has claimed an average of 15.4 students per section. Average class size in the noncredit program increased by 108% between 2020-2021 and 2022-2023. Average class size across all noncredit courses combined decreased by 1.1% over the same period.

Average class size in the following noncredit courses changed by more than 10% (±10%) between 2020-2021 and 2022-2023:

Courses with increases in average class size:

- *ESLNC-855 (207%)*
- *ESLNC-862 (150%)*
- *ESLNC-885 (129%)*
- *ESLNC-875 (127%)*
- *ESLNC-865 (42.9%)*
- *ESLNC-884 (20.6%)*

No noncredit English as a Second Language courses experienced a decrease in average class size over the past three years.

Program Reflection:

- As above, the data suggests that our non-credit classes are very popular and are growing in popularity. This was predicted in the last program review from 2021, before the non-credit classes were implemented.
- The credit classes are comparatively less enrolled.
- We stopped offering ESL-106 during the pandemic, which is why its class size is 0. It has been replaced by ESL-108/ESLNC-907, which has been in place for Fall 2023 and Spring 2024.
- The new Outreach Specialist hire has taken this on and will work with the coordinator to increase enrollments. She has already suggested regular visits to NVAE, registration festivals, and other ideas.

3. Fill Rate and Productivity

CREDIT COURSE INFORMATION

Fill Rate			
	Enrollments	**Capacity**	**Fill Rate**
2020-2021	53	200	26.5%
2021-2022	26	150	17.3%
2022-2023	42	160	26.3%
Three-Year Program Total	**121**	**510**	**23.7%**
Productivity			
	FTES	**FTEF**	**Productivity**
2020-2021	10.2	3.5	2.9
2021-2022	5.2	2.0	2.6
2022-2023	8.4	2.4	3.5
Three-Year Program Total	**23.8**	**7.9**	**3.0**
Sources: SQL Queries for Spring 2024 Program Review; SQL Server Reporting Services – Term to Term Enrollment FTES Load Comparison Report (by Credit Course)			

RPIE Analysis: Between 2020-2021 and 2022-2023, the fill rate within the English as a Second Language Program ranged from 17.3% to 26.5%. (The fill rate has not been calculated at the institutional level.) The rate across the three years was 23.7%. Between 2020-2021 and 2021-2022, both enrollment and capacity decreased, resulting in a decrease in fill rate (due to a higher rate of decrease in enrollment). Between 2021-2022 and 2022-2023, both enrollment and capacity increased, resulting in an increase in fill rate (due to a higher rate of increase in enrollment).

Productivity within the English as a Second Language Program ranged from 2.6 to 3.5 over the three-year period. (Productivity has not been calculated at the institutional level.) The three-year program productivity of 3.0 is lower than the target level of 17.5, which reflects 1 FTEF (full-time equivalent faculty) accounting for 17.5 FTES (full-time equivalent students) across the academic year. (This target reflects 525 weekly student contact hours for one full-time student across the academic year.)

Program Reflection:

(See below for reflection)

NONCREDIT COURSE INFORMATION

Fill Rate			
	Enrollments	**Capacity**	**Fill Rate**
2020-2021	119	290	41.0%
2021-2022	133	270	49.3%
2022-2023	225	290	77.6%
Three-Year Program Total	**477**	**850**	**56.1%**
Productivity			
	FTES	**FTEF**	**Productivity**
2020-2021	5.6	1.0	5.6
2021-2022	5.9	1.0	5.9
2022-2023	5.4	1.3	4.2
Three-Year Program Total	**16.9**	**3.3**	**5.1**
Sources: SQL Queries for Spring 2024 Program Review; SQL Server Reporting Services – Term to Term Enrollment FTES Load Comparison Report (by Credit Course)			

RPIE Analysis: Between 2020-2021 and 2022-2023, the fill rate within the noncredit English as a Second Language Program ranged from 41.0% to 77.6%. (The fill rate has not been calculated at the institutional level.) The rate across the three years was 56.1%. Between 2020-2021 and 2021-2022, enrollment in noncredit courses increased while capacity in noncredit courses decreased, resulting in a increase in fill rate. Between 2021-2022 and 2022-2023, both enrollment and capacity increased, resulting in an increase in fill rate (due to a higher rate of increase in enrollment).

Productivity within the noncredit English as a Second Language Program ranged from 4.2 to 5.9 over the three-year period. (Productivity has not been calculated at the institutional level.) The three-year program productivity of 5.1 is lower than the target level of 17.5, which reflects 1 FTEF (full-time equivalent faculty) accounting for 17.5 FTES (full-time equivalent students) across the academic year. (This target reflects 525 weekly student contact hours for one full-time student across the academic year.)

Program Reflection:

- According to the data given, fill rate and productivity are higher in non-credit classes.
- There was a dip in fill rate and productivity (in both credit and non-credit classes) during the pandemic, but these numbers are increasing again.
- As we have seen in other sections of this review, we see a large increase in non-credit classes and a decline in credit classes.
- These statistics do not account for the ABEN classes that the ESL program offers. These are also our most well-enrolled courses, so it seems clear that both fill rate and productivity would be higher if those data were included.

Productivity within Credit and Noncredit (ESL Combined)

	FTES	FTEF	Productivity
2020-2021	15.8	4.5	3.5
2021-2022	11.1	3.0	3.7
2022-2023	13.8	3.7	3.7
Three-Year Program Total	**40.7**	**11.2**	**3.6**
Sources: SQL Queries for Spring 2024 Program Review; SQL Server Reporting Services – Term to Term Enrollment FTES Load Comparison Report (by Credit Course)			

RPIE Analysis: Productivity within the credit and noncredit English as a Second Language Programs (when combined) ranged from 3.5 to 3.7 over the three-year period. (Productivity has not been calculated at the institutional level.) The three-year program productivity of 3.6 is lower than the target level of 17.5, which reflects 1 FTEF (full-time equivalent faculty) accounting for 17.5 FTES (full-time equivalent students) across the academic year. (This target reflects 525 weekly student contact hours for one full-time student across the academic year.)

Program Reflection:

This data was requested in order to ascertain if combining the credit and non-credit numbers would make a difference in fill rate and productivity, since those classes are essentially the same sections, at the same time, with the same instructor.

However, fill rate is not included in these data.
These combined data don't show a large difference between a combined analysis and a separated analysis. The fact is that the non-credit classes are enrolling more than the credit classes.
One important aspect of the program that is not present here is the statistics of the ABEN ESL classes. As low level non-credit classes, they are among our most popular and well-enrolled. However, they fall under a different division, so those numbers are not present here.

4. Labor Market Demand

This section does not apply to the English as a Second Language Program, as it is not within the Career Technical Education Division.

B. Momentum

1. Retention and Successful Course Completion Rates

	Retention Rates (Across Three Years)			Successful Course Completion Rates (Across Three Years)		
Course	Rate	Course Rate vs. Program Rate		Rate	Course Rate vs. Program Rate	
		Above	Below		Above	Below
ESL-106	100%	X		83.3%	X	
ESL-55	89.2%		X	54.1%		X
ESL-65	100%	X		65.0%	X	
ESL-75	95.5%	X		77.3%	X	
ESL-85	86.1%		X	58.3%		X
Program Level	91.7%			**62.8%**		
Institutional Level	90.0%			72.7%		

Source: SQL Queries for Fall 2023 Program Review
-- Indicates a value that is within 1% of the program-level rate.
Bold italics denote a statistically significant difference between the course-level rate and the program-level rate.
Bold denotes a statistically significant difference between the program-level rate and the institutional rate. The lower of the two rates is highlighted in bold.
Note: Grades of EW (Excused Withdrawal) for spring 2020 and beyond are not included in the calculations of the three-year retention and successful course completion rates reported above. This approach reflects the standard recommended research practice of not including EWs in either the numerator or the denominator for these rates.

RPIE Analysis: Over the past three years, the retention rate for the English as a Second Language (ESL) Program reflected the retention rate at the institutional level. No courses within the ESL Program claimed a retention rate that differed significantly from the program-level rate. The retention rate for the ESL Program falls within the second quartile (Q2) among program-level retention rates (across 58 instructional programs, over the past three years). The retention rate for ESL is among the lowest 50% of retention rates among NVC programs.

Over the past three years, the successful course completion rate for the ESL Program was significantly lower than the rate at the institutional level. No courses within ESL Program claimed a successful course completion rate that differed significantly from the program-level rate. The successful course completion rate for ESL falls within the first quartile (Q1) among program-level successful course completion rates (across 58 instructional programs, over the past three years).

The successful course completion rate for ESL is among the lowest 25% of successful course completion rates among NVC programs.

Over the past three years, the difference between retention and successful course completion at the program level (28.9%) was significantly higher than the difference at the institutional level (17.3%). This figure represents the proportion of non-passing grades assigned to students at the end of the semester (i.e., grades of D, F, I, NP).

The following ESL courses claimed a difference (between retention and successful course completion) that exceeded the 28.9% difference at the program level:

- *ESL-55 (35.1%)*
- *ESL-65 (35.0%)*

Program Reflection:

- Retention rates are above the institutional average; course completion rates are lower than the institutional average.
- The fact that we have so few credit students likely skews these numbers; one or two students who do not successfully complete a course can affect these averages quite severely.
- That said, these data suggest we need to improve our course completion rates.
    - Increase engagement of instructors in students' lives; check in on and encourage students who miss class.
    - Arrange meetings and provide training for instructors on retention and completion to signal this is a priority for the program.
    - Foster engagement of instructors early and often
    - Foster a better learning community
        - ESL/Spanish conversation activities are a good start; this semester there are not a lot of Spanish speakers at meetings (more encouragement needed, perhaps grading or extra credit
        - Community building activities between classes and campuses (this requires funding)
    - One major component of this problem is the fact that our academic courses have a 6 unit load. This is likely just too much for a busy English learner, who has a job, a family, and other responsibilities. It makes sense to reduce this to 5 units or even 4.

2. Student Equity

	Retention Rates (Across Three Years)		**Successful Course Completion Rates (Across Three Years)**	
	Program Level	**Institution Level**	**Program Level**	**Institution Level**
African American/Black	*	87.7%	*	65.9%
Pacific Islander	N/A	86.7%		
Latinx/Hispanic			***59.8%***	69.0%
19 or Younger			***58.9%***	71.0%
First-Generation			68.6%	69.7%
Not Disabled/Not Reported			***61.9%***	72.5%

Source: SQL Queries for Fall 2023 Program Review

Bold italics denote a statistically significant difference between rates at the program and institutional levels, with the lower of the two rates in ***bold italics***.

*Data suppressed due to low N (<10 students in cohort).

Notes:

Grades of EW (Excused Withdrawal) for spring 2020 and beyond are not included in the calculations of the three-year retention and successful course completion rates reported above. This approach reflects the standard recommended research practice of not including EWs in either the numerator or the denominator for these rates.

The age groupings are based on the student's age of August 15 of each academic year.

The shaded cells in the table do not have data reported because evidence of disproportionate impact was not found at the institutional level (for those demographic group – metric combinations).

RPIE Analysis: This analysis of student equity focuses on the six demographic groups with significantly lower retention and/or successful course completion rates found at the institutional level (vs. the corresponding rates among all other demographic groups, combined) over the past three years. Tests of statistical significance were conducted to compare program-level and institution-level rates among the six groups listed above.

[Due to the low number of African Americans/Blacks and Pacific Islanders enrolled in the English as a Second Language Program, this analysis does not include comparison of program-level and institution-level retention rates.]

Within the English as a Second Language Program, the successful course completion rate among Latinx/Hispanic students, students age 19 or younger, and students without a disability reported were significantly lower than the corresponding rate at the institutional level. First-generation students also claimed a lower successful course completion rate in the program than they did at the institutional level (The difference was not statistically significant.) [Due to the low number of African Americans/Blacks enrolled in the English as a Second Language Program, this analysis does not include comparison of program-level and institution-level successful course completion rates.]

These findings regarding equity groups reflect the findings that emerged from the comparison of retention and successful course completion at the program vs. institutional level, where the program-level successful course completion rate was significantly lower than the institution-level rate. (See Section I.B.1 above.)

Program Reflection:

It seems likely that the trend that we see here with respect to completion rates (which are lower than those at the institutional level) is a mirror of the trend seen in Section I.B.1, above. This is likely because such a large percentage of our students identify as Latinx/Hispanic.
The strategies discussed in Section I.B.1 would apply here also.
The population of the ESL program is different from that of the institutional level. We have few to no African American/Black or Pacific Islander students. Most of our students identify as Latinx; we have a few Asian students too. It does not serve a useful purpose to compare these populations for the ESL Program.
That said, these data indicate that course completion rates could be improved, as stated in above in section B1.

3. Retention and Successful Course Completion Rates by Delivery Mode (of Courses Taught through Multiple Delivery Modes, i.e., In-Person, Hybrid, and Online)

RPIE Analysis: Over the past three years, one course within the English as a Second Language Program has been offered through at least two delivery modes within the same academic year. In 2022-2023, ESL-55 was offered in online and hybrid formats. An analysis of retention and successful course completion by delivery mode for ESL-55 is not included here because less than 10 students were enrolled in each of the two sections in 2022-2023.

C. Student Achievement

1. Program Completion

NVC did not award any ESL certificates of competency in 2020-2021, 2021-2022, or 2022-2023.

Program Reflection:

This is an area where the program can improve. It seems a missed opportunity that no certificates have been awarded; they were created since the last program review.
This could have the effect of increasing retention and completion in all our classes.
The fact that our program is so heavily non-credit might be one reason why certificates are not a popular option among our students. However, I think many students don't know that they are available or what their value might be, so more communication will be key.
The newly hired Outreach Specialist will work with the Coordinator and the other instructors to raise awareness of the certificates and generate more interest in them.

2. Program-Set Standards: Job Placement and Licensure Exam Pass Rates

This section does not apply to the English as a Second Language Program, as the discipline is not included in the Perkins IV/Career Technical Education data provided by the California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office, and licensure exams are not required for jobs associated with the discipline.

II. CURRICULUM

A. Courses

Subject	**Course Number**	**Date of Last Review & Approval by Curriculum Committee** *(Courses with last review dates of 6 years or more must be scheduled for immediate review)*	**Has Prerequisite/ Corequisite*** *Yes/No* **& Date of Last Review**	**In Need of Revision** *Indicate Non-Substantive (NS) or Substantive (S)* **& Academic Year Anticipated**	**To Be Archived** *(as Obsolete, Outdated, or Irrelevant)* **& Academic Year Anticipated**	**No Change**
ESL	55	1/31/2020	No	S 2025		
ESL	65	11/19/2021	No	S 2025		
ESL	75	1/31/2020	No	S 2025		
ESL	85	1/31/2020	No	S 2025		
ESL	106	3/6/2020	No			
ESL	108	2/21/2020	No			
ESLNC	855	12/6/2019	No	S 2025		
ESLNC	862	1/31/2020	No			
ESLNC	865	12/6/2019	No	S 2025		
ESLNC	875	12/6/2019	No	S 2025		
ESLNC	884	1/31/2020	No			
ESLNC	885	12/6/2019	No	S 2025		
ESLNC	907	4/20/2023	No			

*Note: Prerequisites need to be validated (in subsequent process) through Curriculum Committee.

Program Reflection:

It would be beneficial to our students to reduce the number of credits of the integrated skills courses to 5 credits or even 4. This would be less overwhelming for students and increase their chances of completing the courses, given their busy lives (most have children and work full time jobs).

B. Degrees and Certificates+

Degree or Certificate & Title	Implementation Date	Has Documentation *Yes/No*	In Need of Revision+ *and/or Missing Documentation* & Academic Year Anticipated	To Be Archived* *(as Obsolete, Outdated, or Irrelevant)* & Academic Year Anticipated	No Change
ESL: High-Intermediate Academic (Certificate of Competency)	FA21	Yes			
ESL: Low-Advanced Academic (Certificate of Competency)	FA21	Yes			
ESL: Low-Intermediate Academic (Certificate of Competency)	FA21	Yes			
ESL: Pre-Intermediate Academic (Certificate of Competency)	FA21	Yes			

*Note: Discontinuance or archival of degrees or certificates must go through the Program Discontinuance process or the Program Archival Task Force.

+Degrees and Certificates cannot be implemented until the required courses in them are approved and active.

Program Reflection:

As stated above, the certificate system, as it is now, does not seem to be serving the needs of our students. The program should make it a priority to focus more on sharing information about the certificates and their value to employers.
The new outreach coordinator can help disseminate information about the certificates and their value.

III. LEARNING OUTCOMES ASSESSMENT

A. Status of Learning Outcomes Assessment

Learning Outcomes Assessment at the Course Level

	Number of Courses with Outcomes Assessed		Proportion of Courses with Outcomes Assessed	
Number of Courses	Over Last 4 Years	Over Last 6 Years	Over Last 4 Years	Over Last 6 Years
7	7	7	100%	100%

Learning Outcomes Assessment at the Program/Degree/Certificate Level

Degree/Certificate	Number of Outcomes*	Number of Outcomes Assessed		Proportion of Outcomes Assessed	
		Over Last 4 Years	Over Last 6 Years	Over Last 4 Years	Over Last 6 Years
(None)					

Program Reflection:

Program, Course and Learning outcomes are concise and as consistent as possible through our different level courses, which aids in assessment. All courses have been assessed in the last four years, which signifies a change for the better since the last program review in 2021.
The program intends to continue to follow this process; but the coordinator will collaborate with the SLO assessment coordinator to verify that the process is as effective and efficient as possible.

B. Summary of Learning Outcomes Assessment Findings and Actions

All of the assessments in the last three years were successful except for one criterion assessed in 2021 at the ESL-55/ESLNC-855 level. The mirrored courses all assessed both sections (credit and non-credit) for each class. In the assessments, instructors noted that generally students did well learning and producing verb tenses and structured sentences or paragraphs. Some instructors noted that students had difficulties applying punctuation rules. Others thought that some students had spotty attendance, so they were not always prepared to succeed in paragraph or essay assignments.

To further improve student success, individual instructors plan to offer punctuation practice early in and throughout the semester, and to provide more contextualized and practical practice. To keep engagement high, other instructors plan to provide more consistent feedback; another suggestion was to keep in touch with students via email when they miss a class to encourage them to keep coming back.

Program Reflection:

We have found through our assessments that the majority of students are regularly meeting SLO's, though some struggle with punctuation or learning paragraph or essay structure because of inconsistent attendance. Students generally have high speaking and reading comprehension levels, but need more practice with contextualized or practical practice to really master these skills.

Some churn among students seems to be part of the process for classes that are mirrored; the credit students are generally very engaged and consistent, but the non-credit students tend to come and go as their schedules permit. However, there are usually a few non-credit students in each class who are able to commit to consistent attendance and homework completion. These are the students that benefit the most from the non-credit sections that we offer.

IV. PROGRAM HIGHLIGHTS

The program-level plan that emerged from the last review (spring 2021) included the following initiatives:

Program: ESL
Program Plan Years: 2020-2023

Strategic Initiatives Emerging from Program Review	Relevant Section(s) of Report	Implementation Timeline: Activity/Activities & Date(s)	Measure(s) of Progress or Effectiveness
Revise and refine the Self-Guided Placement Tool developed in Fall 2020	1A.1, 1A.2, 1A.3, 1B.1, 1B.2	2020-2023	1A.1, 1A.2, 1A.3, 1B.1
Continually revise and refine the newly approved mirrored curriculum	1A.1, 1A.2, 1A.3, 1B.1, 1B.2	2020-2023	1A.1, 1A.2, 1A.3, 1B.1
Training and collaborating with colleagues	1B.1, 1B.2	2020-2023	1B.1, 1B.2
Sharing of online teaching materials	1B.1, 1B.2	2020-2023	1B.1, 1B.2

A. Accomplishments/Achievements Associated with Most Recent Three-Year Program-Level Plan

- The Self-Guided Placement Tool seems to be working well for the students. We have not heard any complaints about it, and in general placements seem more accurate than they were with the previous assessment test (Celsa).
- The mirrored curriculum seems to be serving the needs of the students very well. It is a good option for a large portion of our community who can't commit to a credit class.
- Training and collaborating were priorities before the pandemic, but these fell off during and after the lockdown. The program would benefit from more training and collaboration for the instructors. When the previous coordinator was here, he said that there was no budget for meetings or trainings. Present coordinator will confer with the Dean to clarify this.
- We have made several PT hires to cover classes that are available, especially the non-credit ABEN courses that don't follow the regular semester calendar because they are offered to consortia members.

B. Recent Improvements

- The non-credit side of the program is booming. The previous coordinator did a lot of great work developing this and it is one of the main strengths of the program.
- We are continuing to collaborate with the Spanish Department. We hold regular language exchange meetings for Spanish leaners and English learners.

C. Effective Practices

- Regular and effective assessment
- A variety of teaching methods are used to address different learning styles of students.

V. PROGRAM PLAN

Based on the information included in this document, the program is described as being in a state of:

- ○ Viability
- ○ Stability
- ● Growth

*Please select ONE of the above.

This evaluation of the state of the program is supported by the following parts of this report:

1 A 1-3: Headcount, class size, and fill rate is much higher at the lower levels and the non-credit courses. Enrollment for these classes are booming. This does not take into account the non-credit ABEN courses, which are very highly enrolled.
1 B 1: Retention rates are slightly higher than the institution's; Completion rates are slightly lower. These can be improved, and it would be a service to the students for this to improve.
1 C 1: No Certificates been awarded after being introduced after the last program review. Improving these could help with enrollment, retention, and completion.
2 A: The 6 unit academic courses are most likely too much for a typical student to handle. Units will be reduced to 5 or even 4 to make workload more reasonable for our busy learners.
3 A. Assessment is occurring regularly, and the findings are positive.

V. RESOURCES NEEDED TO IMPLEMENT PROGRAM PLAN

A. Describe the current state of program resources relative to the plan outlined above. (Resources include: personnel, technology, equipment, facilities, operating budget, training, and library/learning materials.)

Identify any anticipated resource needs (beyond the current levels) necessary to implement the plan outlined above.

Description of Current Program Resources Relative to Plan:

THREE-YEAR PLAN

PROGRAM:	**English as a Second Language**			
PLANNING YEARS:	2024-2025 through 2026-2027			
Unit-Level Initiative	*Anticipated Year of Implementation*	*Anticipated Outcome of Initiative*	*Description of Resource Need*	*Type of Resource Need*
Hire a Full time instructor	2024-2025	Better leadership and the ability to spend more time guiding the program		Staffing
Reduce Units for Academic Classes from 6 to 4	2025-2026	Increased retention and completion rates; higher enrollments		Other
Increased/Improved team building and collaboration with adjunct instructors	2024-2025	Better engagement with students, leading to increased retention and completion rates		Other
Strengthen collaboration with counseling and non-credit programs	2025-2026	Establishment of courses that are better focused on the needs of our students (computer skills, agriculture, wine making, etc).		Staffing
Develop a pricing system for Contractual Education courses provided to local organizations	2024-2025	Ensure the fiscal viability of this program		
Attract more F1 Students	2024-2025	Increased class sizes for academic and higher level courses; more diversity in classrooms		Other

ENGLISH AS A SECOND LANGUAGE SPRING 2024

Completed by Supervising Administrator:

Robert Harris

Date:

06/03/2024

Strengths and successes of the program, as evidenced by analysis of data, outcomes assessment, and curriculum:

- Expanded non-credit courses that are offered stand-alone and concurrently (mirrored) with credit courses.
- Development of an adjunct pool.
- Solid relationship(s) with community constituencies that bring ESL courses to different venues that can provide child/family care during scheduled classes.
- Ability to adapt/tailor courses within curriculum to provide services to the needs of the students in the given course(s).
- Recent hiring of outreach coordinator to assist with development of program enrollments.
- Improvement of instructor meetings to develop appropriate plans for the program.
- Collaboration with SPAN Program in developing conversational curriculum.

Areas of concern, if any:

- Low level of credit enrollments relative to non-credit enrollments.
- Need for development of contract education contract(s) for specific outreach purposes.
- Need for a full-time faculty member to provide regular oversight and guidance of the program.
- Solidification of adjunct pool/instructor pool to allow for better planning.

Recommendations for improvement:

- Develop program needs for professional development.
- Increase development of certificate offerings, streamline the process, and create outreach to illustrate the value of the certificate in the workplace.

Additional information regarding resources:

The efficacy, and data review, of the hiring of a full-time instructor is appropriate. The ESL program took off several years ago when there was a dedicated, full-time, ESL faculty member (who also served as the Program Coordinator). As opportunities arise for increased enrollments, in both the credit and non-credit areas, relying upon a part-time instructor pool will likely be problematic.

Professional development funding opportunities need to be identified to provide the faculty with development programming to potentially enhance retention and completion rates.

The opportunity for enrollment growth is exciting as is the opportunity to develop a robust contract education program that can provide ESL courses at the site of the employer so that employees can participate in ESL programming without the need to leave their worksite.