

## Technology Request Form For Annual Planning and Off-Cycle Requests

Submit one form per request. Complete the entire form thoroughly and answer all questions with enough details and be specific. Incomplete or late forms will not be reviewed. For assistance completing this form, please contact your Chair or the Co-Chairs of the Technology Committee. You can also review the Technology Committee's "[Prioritization Rubric](#)." If applicable, please reflect on the technology funded by last year's plan, and how it impacted student learning and success and prioritize your requests. For all furniture requests, contact Facilities.

Classroom technology such as entire labs can be submitted as one request. Please be specific and you must provide quotes for each item. For assistance with technology quotes, email the Grossmont College Director of Instructional Technology with your requests. You should also contact District I.T. to inquire about a Statement of Work for your request. If you are submitting a quote for items that are not typically in instructional classrooms please note that you will need to include taxes, shipping and environmental fees.

Please keep in mind when filling out this form that extra consideration is given to proposals that demonstrate one or more of the following:

- i. A critical need for state of the art technology and instructional software
- ii. Support of learning outcomes (student, program, institutional, or service)
- iii. Assistance to multiple departments

Technology Plan Year

Title of Request	Location of Request	*Priority Ranking (If submitting more than one request in your department)

Discipline

Department

Contact Person

Contact Email

**DESCRIPTION**

Please provide a brief description of the technology/software or technology project and its core goal(s).

**PROPOSAL JUSTIFICATION**

**A. College and District Strategic Plan**

Please explain how the technology or enhancement supports the [strategic plan](#). Please include information on how students will be impacted and/or employees or the college or district overall. Would this be a district-wide implementation?

**B. Statewide Initiatives**

Does the technology support a [state-wide initiative](#)? Please explain.

**C. Mandates**

Is the technology mandated by legislation, in support of a legislative mandate or required by accreditation standards? Please explain.

**D. Criticality**

What are the consequences and the number of students impacted if the technology/software is not implemented, upgraded, or renewed?

**E. Urgency**

Why is this urgent? What is the preferred time for implementation?

**F. Supporting Data**

How does the data you have support the implementation of the technology? This can be qualitative or quantitative in the form of program review, surveys, observations, SLO or other assessment data, institutional research data or other reports and data.

## **COST ANALYSIS**

Please list as much information as you can in sections Funding and Staffing, Resource Factors and Costs. We understand that you may not be able to fully answer all of these questions independently. For instance, some costs will be known and some estimated; please indicated accordingly. Based on the information you provide, District I.T. and/or Instructional Computing Services may conduct a Statement of Work (SOW) analysis and provide input on items such as time to implement, employee hours, number of individuals needed to implement, the needs for a campus and/or district project manager, vendor cooperation, integration with current systems, etc.

### **Funding and Staffing**

Please describe your needs for implementing and maintain the technology by answering the following questions:

FS1. Will you need College or District staffing support? If so, please explain.

FS2. Will or could the work be contracted out to a third part? If so, who? Provide contact information and explain.

FS3. Does the company that provides the technology do installation and on-going support? Provide details. How long?

FS4. Is there categorical funding or outside funding? Be specific.

**Resource Factors**

Please provide detail on the following:

RF1. Is this new technology (new to the campus), a renewal, or upgrade of existing technology?

RF2. Is the technology compatible with current systems? Please state if you don't know.

RF3. What are the estimated maintenance fees, if applicable?

RF4. What are the estimated replacement costs once the technology reaches its end of life cycle?

RF5. Are there any associated on-going support costs? Such as access to vendor support.

RF6. Is this a one-time purchase or annual / recurring fee? Please explain.

RF7. Are there any other resources or special technology support needed to implement the technology?

RF8. What is the estimated time it will take to implement?

RF9. How does this technology impact other campus departments (academic, student services, and administrative)?

RF10. How does this technology impact campus facilities?

RF11. Does the vender have a VPAT (voluntary product accessibility template) for the technology? Please provide if they do.

RF12. Vendor name and contact information

**Cost**

C1. Estimated labor costs (if known):

C2. Estimated equipment/software costs: Indicate whether known or estimated. Include quotes for all applicable costs. This should include equipment, licenses, taxes, fees, shipping, environmental fees, etc.

C3. Do you have a funding source identified? If yes, please list source and funding allotted:

C4. Total estimated or known cost:

**Evaluation**

How do you plan to evaluate the technology after implementation? This could include explaining how you will collect qualitative and/or quantitative data showing student usage and impact on learning or student services.



**Off-Cycle Requests Only**

Has funding been identified for this project? If yes, what is the smart key or funding source (Equity, General Fund, Perkins, etc.)? (This question relates to Section G on the Technology Prioritization Rubric).

What are the exigent circumstances and/or contributing factors that would qualify this request to be eligible for Off-Cycle consideration? In other words, why can't this request wait until the next annual planning cycle? (This question relates to Section C on the Technology Prioritization Rubric.)

		3 points	2 points	1 point	Total
<b>A</b>	<b>Relationship to Strategic Plan</b>	Technology clearly supports the vision of the Strategic Plan or other college or district plan.	Technology somewhat supports the vision of the Strategic Plan or other college or district plan.	Technology has little or no support for the vision of the Strategic Plan or other college or district plan.	
<b>B</b>	<b>Support Statewide Initiative</b> Basic Skills, Student Success, Equity, Strong Workforce, OEI, OER, etc.	The technology clearly supports a state-wide initiative	The technology somewhat supports a state-wide initiative.	The technology has no relation to a state-wide initiative.	
<b>Mandates</b>		If request is verified as mandated by law or accreditation standard, push through prioritization process as highly recommended.			
<b>C</b>	<b>Criticality</b>	The consequences of not supporting this technology are significant. (Such as security concerns, loss of FTES, statewide initiative, etc.)	The consequences of not supporting this technology are moderate.	The consequences of not supporting this technology are relatively minor.	
<b>D</b>	<b>Urgency</b>	Time sensitive (less than semester) request to meet security needs, student success, strategic plan, statewide initiative	Moderate time (up to one year) to meet needs.	No timelines or rationale identified for urgent implementation	
<b>E</b>	<b>Data-informed</b>	The implementation of the technology is clearly supported by qualitative or quantitative data, e.g. surveys, observations, SLO or other assessment data, institutional research data, or other reports or data.	The implementation of the technology is somewhat supported by qualitative or quantitative data.	The implementation of the technology is not supported by qualitative or quantitative data.	



GROSSMONT  
COLLEGE

# AUP Report

English as a Second Language

---

# Annual Unit Plan

2021-22

---

## SECTION ONE: CHANGES IN THE PAST ACADEMIC YEAR

---

**In the past academic year, has the mission/purpose of your department changed?**

No

**Briefly (300 words or less) explain any changes to the mission/purpose of your unit.**

No changes.

**In the past academic year, has your department had any major programmatic changes, including major changes in an effort to increase student success and equity (e.g., adding or deleting degree/certificate programs, significant changes to course offerings, shift in course schedules or modalities, etc.)?**

Yes (Please describe below)

**Briefly (300 words or less) explain any major programmatic changes to your unit.**

Ovr the past two years (Fa19 to present) ESL has been revamping our program in response to AB705 and AB1805 guidelines. Our previous program was deleted, and all new courses have been created and offered on the schedule. The top two levels of our program, ESL 115 and ESL 122, were offered for the first time in Fall 2020. Two new courses at the true- beginner level, ESL 078/078R, are on the schedule of offerings as of Fall 2021. A new Guided Self-Placement (GSP) tool was implemented July 2020 to place new students entering in the Fall 2020 semester. In order to increase student access for part time students, co-requisites were removed at levels 088 and 098, and prerequisites added to each level. Certificates of Competency were created with the BOT dept. and offered Spring 2021.

### Staffing

**In the past academic year, has your department had any significant changes in staffing (i.e., new hires, retirements, (e.g., new hires, retirements, sabbaticals, changes in reassigned time, etc.)?**

Yes (Please describe below)

**Briefly (300 words or less) explain any changes in your unit's staffing.**

Barbara Loveless retired at the end of Spring 2020.

Craig Carroll earns .10 for tutoring coordinator. This RT time was increased to .20 in Fall 21.

Natalia Aylett earns .35 for ACE coordination. She did not earn this RT in Fall 20 as ACE was on hiatus but did earn 0.35 in Spring 21. She earns .35 in Fall 2021.

### Facilities

**In the past academic year, has your department had any significant changes to its existing facilities or shifts in its facility needs (i.e., new buildings, classroom reconfigurations, construction impacts, scheduling changes, etc.)?**

Yes (Please describe below)

**Briefly (300 words or less) explain any changes to your unit's facilities or facility needs.**

With the campus closure due to Covid-19, ESL offered all sections ERT. When we return to campus, the new ESL 078/078R will require a dedicated ESL classroom. One aspect of the TPRS approach used in 078/078R requires the creation of a print-rich environment. We will use the ESL lab (70-122) for this purpose first

## Annual Unit Plan

semester back on campus, but we will eventually need a dedicated classroom where students and instructors can leave posters and other graphics on the walls throughout the semester.

With the removal of all ESL lab classes, ESL is considering a remodel of the ESL lab to create a student/instructor haven in ESL 70-122 where students can read, access instructors during office hours, use computers, and congregate for English conversation practice.

### Implications

**If you answered yes to any of the questions above, what implications might the changes described above have for your department's planning over the next 1-3 years?**

Three full time staff retired over the past two years, and ESL gained one, leaving us under-staffed by two.

We need to hire two more full time staff to continue with the program revisions required by AB705, including GSP revisions, tutoring coordination, and ZTC curriculum to support our new courses.

Changes in our program based on AB705 and AB1805 guidance began in FA2019 and have continued through FA21. We need data to inform decisions about program revisions. A data request will be attached to this AUP.

The new GSP has significant flaws because it was implemented quickly due to the pandemic and need to move swiftly to an online modality. It needs to be revised. A request to the tech committee for support revising the GSP is included with this document.

In addition, we will need dedicated spaces for 78 level sections and space to support reading, conversation, and community building.

## SECTION TWO: PROGRESS TOWARDS EXISTING GOALS

### Institutional Goals

**Grossmont College has built the goal of achieving educational equity into its mission statement and Strategic Plan. As part of this work, we have begun to engage in dialogue institutionally about how we support this goal. In the past year, how has your department begun to support this institutional goal (e.g., departmental discussions on disaggregated data; implementation of equity-focused best practices; participation in the 12 Gateway project; equity-focused changes in curriculum or scheduling, etc.)?**

GC ESL department serves immigrant, refugee and international students who seek to remove linguistic equity barriers by improving their English proficiency. A person who has not acquired English language proficiency will be less likely to find employment, will have more difficulty succeeding in English-speaking academic programs, and will experience more discrimination based on perceived 'otherness.' In addition, language is inextricably tied to cultural competence. Without competence in the target language and culture, a student may experience barriers in the academic and workplace environments. For this reason, students in our lower-level classes tend to experience more barriers than those in our higher-level classes, regardless of race or ethnicity.

Equity efforts in ESL have been focused on the following four areas:

- Implementing best practices in the classroom (language acquisition=language proficiency=fewer barriers to academic and work/career success)
- Accurate level placement (Learning can't take place without comprehension)
- Improved access by offering ZTC sections (remove cost-based barriers)

## Annual Unit Plan

- Improved data regarding race, ethnicity, language background, country of origin and other equity factors.

Please see attached for explanation of each of the four areas.

[ESL Equity Efforts](#)

**Educational Equity - Attach any supporting documents here.**

[AUP FA 2021 Addendum 1 equity efforts.docx](#)

### Department/Unit Goals

**In the past year, what progress has your department made towards recommendations / goals from your most recent Program Review or other stated departmental goals? Please edit goals, add new goals, or input progress towards your goals using the main menu.**

**Goals/recommendations from Program Review 2018**

1. Redesign the curriculum to meet the goals of AB 705.

#### **Completed**

Previous program deleted; new program implemented. (see program chart, attached).

098C developed by Mark Poupard submitted FA21

108 developed by Craig Carroll submitted FA21

098P to become 097 elective

Inta-departmental certificates of proficiency with BOT (see attached flyer).

2. Develop an assessment and placement process for the new curriculum.

#### **Completed, needs revision**

The new GSP tool was implemented online in July 2020 with some urgency due to the campus shut down. It requires some revision to the instructions and new reading and writing samples. A major goal for the GSP is to find a way to implement the tool on a more flexible platform, so it can be revised more easily by faculty.

3. Secure funding for the development of integrated-skills learning modules, open educational resources, and SLO assessments for the new curriculum.

#### **On-going for all courses. Need new OER/ZTC materials for 098C, 078/078R and 108**

4. Secure funding for embedded tutoring and additional support services to aid students to achieve the learning outcomes of the new curriculum.

#### **On-going; semester-by-semester**

Funding was secured to develop OER for ESL 088L and ESL 078/078R through the ZTC workgroup. All sections of those courses will be offered ZTC. Because materials for language instruction need to be current and personalized, they must be updated frequently.

[ESL 088L OER](#)

[ESL 078/078R link](#)

5. Replace retiring full-time faculty and hire one additional full-time faculty member.

#### **In process; dependent on College budget; request attached**

6. Secure funding to support faculty professional development.

#### **On-going; request attached**

This semester 10 ESL faculty were able to attend the TPRS training through CARES act funding. In addition, funding was provided for Dr. Karen Lichtman, SLA expert, to speak at our Fall 2021 PD meeting.

## Annual Unit Plan

7. Improve program marketing and outreach to students and educate instructors, administrators, and staff on campus and off about the needs of ESL students and the value of the program

### In process

Outreach and messaging must be updated continually, but significant goals have been reached. The ESL website has been updated. Flyers and infographics were distributed to counseling department and other student services. Sara Ferguson presented at the Fall 2020 GHSUD/GCCCD Symposium and at the CATESOL Regional Conference SP 2021. Adjunct instructors Brittany Zemlick and Jaquelin Yang were honored for their contributions to the ESL department with Excellence in Teaching awards and presented at CATESOL, OTAN, and GC flex week. We expect an influx of Afghan refugees in the coming months, and plan to reach out to community leaders and organizations to invite them to classes at GC ESL.

### What factors have supported or hindered progress towards your goals?

Progress and Hindrances toward Goals

#### Hindrances

Covid-19 and Campus Closures  
Major Changes to College Operations  
Lack of Funding for Full Time Faculty  
Late Notice of Funding for Embedded Tutoring

#### Contributions

Collaboration across Campus  
ZTC Workgroup and Funding  
Student Support Services and GSP  
Placement Center  
AB705 Workgroup

[See addendum for explanation](#)

### Goal Progress - Attach any supporting documents here.

[AUP FA21 addendum 2 goals progress.docx](#)

### What implications might your unit's progress towards its goals have for your department's planning over the next 1-3 years?

Over the next 1-3 years ESL will focus on revisions and improvements to the program after its major overhaul in 2019-2020.

Curriculum development: Supplementary courses at ESL 098 level and ESL 105 level.

GSP revision: pending data regarding GSP accuracy, revisions will be made to place students more accurately.

ZTC courses: OER and instructor developed materials for ZTC 078/078R, 098C and 108. On-going development and revision of all materials for currency and relevancy.

Professional development: Continued PD to train instructors in best practices for courses in new program.

Improved messaging and outreach: to improve collaboration and advocacy on campus and open college gates to community members.

# Annual Unit Plan

## SECTION THREE: REFLECTION ON STUDENT LEARNING, ACHIEVEMENT, & EQUITY

### Student Learning

#### **What observations or patterns emerged from your department's analysis of its SLO and/or PSLO assessment results?**

It is almost impossible to accurately assess SLOs for language acquisition in an ERT environment. ESL has faithfully recorded SLO data for every SLO, in every section, every semester for over 10 years (this chair's first records are from 2011). This year, academic honesty in a remote environment has been an overriding concern, and in response, assessments have been drastically changed and SLO measurements have been postponed. In addition, the technical obstacles for both students and instructors, especially in Spring 2020 and Fall 2020, made it difficult to measure success, as students were struggling with logging on to accounts, negotiating Canvas and other platforms, and instructors were sometimes doing the same. Collection of SLO data in Fall 2020 and Spring 2021 was attenuated.

SLO data was collected Fall 2020 from levels 088 and 098. However, due to low numbers, technical obstacles and instructor concerns about academic honesty in 088 and 098 level, these results should be regarded with caution.

Fall 2020 ESL 088, 088R and 088L: overall pass rate exceeded 70%. Instructors expressed concerns about the ability of students to succeed in a remote environment, and the focus of this SLO cycle was adjusting instructional approaches to accommodate the remote modality.

Fall 2020 ESL 098, 098G, and 098P: overall pass rate exceeded 70%. The main concerns expressed by instructors is equity in the remote environment, as students with less access to technology or skills with technology were less successful in the class. In addition, exams and prompts are not standardized, which leads to inequity. Goals for this level are calibration meetings and the standardization of assessments.

Spring 2021 ESL 105: Over 85% pass rate for this level. Goals for this level focus on improving instruction prior to assessments.

#### **Closing the Loop: What actions is your department taking in response to these results?**

Fall 2020-Fall 2021 will be the first period of time when the ESL department has not collected and analyzed SLO data from every section at every level. We have re-set our Assessment plan so we will collect data from every section every Spring. Faculty members plan to use this break in SLO collection to regroup, revise SLOs and SLO assessments for our still new-ish program, and return to collecting and analyzing data in Spring 2022. At this time, SLOs have been revised for ESL 098, 098P, 098G, 115, and 122. Instructors at the 088 level have revisited and approved their current SLOs with no revisions. SLO and assessment revision will continue when classes return to campus in Spring 2022.

**Actions Based on Results - Attach any supporting documents here.**

### Equity

#### **What observations have emerged from your department's analysis of other disaggregated data (e.g., course success rates, course retention rates, program completion rates, semester to semester persistence rates, etc.) related to your department's mission?**

It's important to disaggregate by level in ESL; In addition to linguistic barriers to equity, students in ESL also experience a disparity in the resources they can access. International students tend to enter Grossmont ESL at level 3 or above. These students must show that they have resources before they obtain a student visa, so they are less likely to be



## Annual Unit Plan

economically disadvantaged. Resident refugees and immigrants enter the program at every level, including the lower levels. They tend to have fewer resources and are more likely to be economically disadvantaged.

The chart below bears out this relationship between level and economic disadvantage.

Level	Percent economically disadvantaged 2019	Percent economically disadvantaged 2020
1 (088)	100	91
2 (98)	98	100
3 (105)	73	94
4 (106, 115)	68	82
5 (119, 122)	48	63

The percent of students who are economically disadvantaged is higher at the lower levels. It's important to note, as well, that the percentage of economically disadvantaged students increased from 2019 to 2020 at every level except Level One, where the percentage remains very high.

[Data disaggregated by level, age, and gender.](#)

**Enrollment is one indicator of student access.**

**Enrollment (Data from Fall 2020, Course Success Dashboard)**

Enrollment has been dropping steadily since 2015, but dropped precipitously in Fall 2020, probably due to the pandemic and ERT modality. The highest successful enrollment in Fall 2015 (1275), dropped to 930 in Fall 2019, likely in part due to changes in our program, and dropped again in Fall 2020 to 559.

Overall, total enrollment in ESL has dropped by 39% from Fall 2019 to Fall 2020.

Total enrollment data by level shows that Level 1 experienced the most severe drop in enrollment at 69%, while levels 3 and 5 both experienced increases in enrollment of approximately 17%.

### Gender

Overall, female students make up the majority of the ESL population and have a higher rate of success. Data at level 1 and level 3 shows the strongest disparity between male and female students in terms of both population and success rate. At level 1, female students outnumber male students by almost 3 to 1. This ratio is similar in level 3. The ratio has increased from FA 2018, for example, before the implementation of the new AB705 program and pre-pandemic, when women made up 59% of the student population at both Level 1 and Level 3.

### Age

The majority of students enrolled in ESL are adults 20 years old and older, with the largest group between 25-39. Only a small minority (10%) of students under 20 enroll in ESL, with a success rate of 79.4%. Students over 40 have the lowest success rate at 71% and those in the 25-39 age group have the highest success rate at 79.9%.

The population of levels 1 through 4 have a higher number of adults aged 25 and up. At these levels, students under 25 are in the minority. The population of students 24 and younger is higher in Level Five. This level tends to attract younger international students and students directly out of local high schools.

### Economic Disadvantage

## Annual Unit Plan

Overall, 88% of students in ESL are economically disadvantaged. By comparison, 61% of students at GC are economically disadvantaged.

By level, lower level students tend to experience economic hardship more than those at higher levels.

Despite economic disparities, there are no disparities in success rates between those who are economically disadvantaged and those who are not.

### **Student Success**

Overall success rates remain high, ranging from 74% (Fall 2017) to 79% (Fall 2014).

Success rate for ESL Fall 2020 was 76%, slightly higher than the Fall 2020 success rate for Grossmont College, 71%.

### **Success Rate by Gender and Level**

Women tend to have a higher rate of success than men in ESL. The disparity in the rate of success ranges each semester by 4% to 11%. In Fall 2020, Female students had a 9% higher success rate.

By level, it seems that most of the disparity in success rates by gender occurs at the lowest level. At level 1, in FA20, the success rate for females at this level is 42% higher than for males.

In comparison, there is a lower disparity in success rates between males and females at other levels and any disparity tends to fluctuate by semester between the genders.

### **Success Rate by Age and Level**

There does not seem to be a strong correlation between age and success rate at any level, although there is a slight drop in the success rate for students under 20 at Level Four.

### **Success Rate by Race and Ethnicity**

Success rates disaggregated by race/ethnicity are difficult to assess because a large number of ESL students self-identify as white, when in fact ESL faculty can verify that the vast majority of students in our department would be identified as non-white by an external observer. In addition, the number of students who identify as African American indicates a flaw in the measurement tool, since African Americans speak English as their first language and are highly unlikely to learn English as a Second Language. Students indicating they are African American may be of African origin (and nationality) or they may not be able to understand the survey because it is not translated into their language.

Since race and ethnicity are socially constructed, and racial/ethnic identities are both self-determined and dictated by external factors, it's important to recognize that when refugees, immigrants and international students new to the US self-identify as a particular race, they may not have the cultural context yet to fully recognize the effects of inequitable practices that permeate US culture. Data on student first/primary language and/or country of origin would be more informative for this department.

Using the information available in the Course Success Rates Dashboard, student success rates disaggregated by race/ethnicity show very little disparity among groups except Hispanic/Latino students. Approximately 9% of the ESL student population is Hispanic/Latino and these students experience a 60% success rate, compared to a success rate of 71-76% for other groups.

SOURCE: [Course Success Rates \(gcccd.edu\)](https://gcccd.edu)

### **Retention data for Fall 2020**

Course retention rates for ESL are higher (91%) than at GC overall (85%). No trends are revealed by analyzing disaggregated data.

[Course Retention Rates \(gcccd.edu\)](https://gcccd.edu)

# Annual Unit Plan

## **Closing the Loop: What implications might these observations have on your department's planning over the next year? What actions might your department take in the next year? Improved outreach and access for underrepresented groups.**

In order to address enrollment declines, we will be seeking new FT faculty to do more outreach, and we plan to work more closely with the office of college and community relations on campus. We're also working to resolve the technical issues that prevented many prospective students from enrolling in our program.

Our [ESL exit survey](#) is designed to explore scheduling options that may improve access for male students, who may be unable to take classes due to work schedules.

### **Curricular Revisions to improve student success**

Success gaps can be located in the age group over 40, a population that is more likely to enroll in lower level classes. These students will be supported by the addition of ESL 078 and 078R, where true beginners can enroll and receive the instruction they need to succeed.

Because many students are adults re-entering college or entering after an interruption in primary or secondary school, ESL will work with Career Services to explore ways to define work and career pathways for students who are not on a traditional path. ESL 098C is being created to support students in their exploration of college skills.

### **Collection of pertinent data for future revisions**

Data points for success and retention that were not measured and published on dashboards by the district are primary language, country of origin and immigration status. These might reveal trends in course success. Also not measured is student success in GE classes during/after ESL. ESL intake and exit surveys are designed to measure these data points.

## **Has your department explored the ways that its policies and practices (e.g., scheduling, late adds, grading, office hours, etc.) might inadvertently serve as a barrier to student equity?**

Yes

### **If you checked No, how/when will you explore this issue?**

We explore this issue regularly. See the response below.

## **Briefly (300 words or less) describe how your department engages in dialogue around the identification and elimination of barriers to student equity.**

ESL has devised a student intake and exit survey which will collect information about perceived student needs and expectations for a variety of policies and practices. This survey will be administered Fall 2021.

[ESL Intake Survey](#)

[ESL Exit Survey](#)

After consultation with counseling, Calworks, and ESL faculty, we removed the co-reqs on ESL 088 and 098 levels to allow more student access to lower level classes for those students who need to attend part time.

## Annual Unit Plan

In order to serve students who are entering Grossmont College with little or no English proficiency, as well as those with low literary or an education interrupted by circumstances in their home country, GC ESL created and added ESL 078 and 078R. These are classes for true beginners in English acquisition, and they will improve success rates in the levels that follow, ESL 088 and up. After consultation with our dean, English co-chairs, and ESL faculty, we added short term (14 week) classes to improve student access if they need to change levels or departments after the semester starts.

ESL faculty offered open office hours online, advertising on the ESL website, to make office hours more accessible to students.

On-going consultation with counseling, CalWorks, the AB705 workgroup, Dean Albarran, and ESL full-time and part-time faculty provides input about potential equity barriers. A frequently unrecognized source of information comes from adjunct faculty who teach at other colleges in the region and are able to contribute fresh solutions based on their experiences at other colleges.

### SECTION FOUR: CURRICULUM REVIEW AND PLANNING

---

**Total number of active CORs for the discipline(s) in your area**

11

**Total number of CORs between one and three years old**

11

**Total number of CORs between four and five years old**

0

**Total number of CORS over five years old**

0

**Upload your Curriculum Review Process here**

[2021-2026 SLO 6-year Assessment Plan.pdf](#)

### SECTION FIVE: OTHER PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

---

**In the upcoming academic year, do you anticipate any other significant changes not already addressed in Sections 1-4 above?**

Yes

**Briefly (300 words or less) explain any anticipated changes not previously addressed.**

The ESL department has applied for a \$150,000 NEH grant for curriculum development and will learn in Feb 2022 if we will receive that grant. If we do receive the grant, we will begin curriculum development across levels in the Spring 2022 semester.

**Considering your responses in Sections 1-4, are there any overarching trends or implications that might affect your department's planning over the next 1-3 years?**

Yes

## Annual Unit Plan

**Briefly (300 words or less) explain any overarching trends that might affect planning.**

The goals ESL needs to pursue will require significant support from the college, including funding for full-time faculty, professional development, ZTC/OER, and the improvement of placement with technological support. ESL is dependent on support from CPIE for data collection and analysis, IOPS and district IT for a smooth registration process, student support services, the library, and the office of college and community relations to accomplish our goals.

### SECTION SIX: RESOURCE REQUESTS

---

**Based on the information entered in Sections 1-5, what resources does your department need in order to make continued progress towards its goals and/or address planning implications?**

Faculty Staffing, Instructional Technology, Professional Development, Research and/or Data Analysis

**If your department has ideas for innovations or projects that don't fit neatly into the categories listed above, please describe below and consider completion of an innovation request form.**

The ESL program has applied for an NEH grant and will learn whether we received it in Feb 2022. If we did receive it, we will need support from the college as we develop this curriculum and collaborate with the New Americans Museum.

**Please upload any completed resource request forms here.**

[TechRequest GSP 2021.pdf](#)

[ESL Consequential Validity Study Report.pdf](#)

[CPIE Research Request Form\\_FA21 \(1\).pdf](#)

[FSPC Application\\_2021-2022\\_FT Faculty ESL.pdf](#)

[PD request placeholder, ESL FA21 .docx](#)

### SECTION SEVEN: NOTES AND ARTIFACTS

---

**Upload any notes (e.g., department meeting minutes) or artifacts that your department may wish to document and refer to during the completion of the comprehensive program review document.**

[ESL Consequential Validity Study Report.pdf](#)

[ESL Student Data FA16-FA19.docx](#)

### AUP SUBMISSION

---

**My AUP is complete and ready for review.**

AUP Ready for Review

**Annual Unit Planning  
Dean/Manager/Supervisor Checklist  
Due: October 1**

Division **English and Social/Behavioral Sciences**

Dean/Manager Name **Agustín Albarrán**

Name of Department/Unit/Program **English as a Second Language**

AUP initiated by (Name of chair/coordinator/manager of program) **Sarah Ferguson**

Date **9/29/2021**

**Directions:**

1. Fill out one form for each AUP in your division/unit and provide a copy of the form and AUP to the appropriate Vice-President of your division *for information only*.
2. **Submit this checklist (p. 1 and 2) with each AUP and accompanying resource requests from your area to the CPIE Office on or before October 1: Grossmont.CPIE@gcccd.edu**

Description	Status
AUP is complete: All questions/prompts include a response. If the AUP is incomplete, please send back to the unit to complete before the October 1 submission deadline. If there is a significant reason that a section/prompt is incomplete, please use the comments section below to provide a rationale for submitting an incomplete AUP.	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>X</b>
Section 3 on Outcomes Assessment includes thoughtful analysis and planned action(s) needed for continuous improvement (closing the loop).	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>X</b>
Section 4 on Curriculum Review: The department/unit has a concrete plan for updating curriculum prior to six-year comprehensive program review. Note: this step is not applicable for Administrative Services Units.	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>X</b>
Data has been used to support resource request(s) and analysis of data is accurate and fair.	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>X</b>
Resource requests support department/unit's continuous improvement as a result of analysis of current course and/or program level learning outcomes.	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>X</b>
Resource requests are accurate and support the college's mission, strategic goals, and/or college initiatives.	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>X</b>
Optional: Work with your division councils to prioritize resource requests from your area. This step is intended to support the participatory governance process by providing much needed background information for decision-making. Attach prioritization list to this form.	<input type="checkbox"/>
Comments (optional):	
Print Name <b>Agustin Albarran/Dean, English &amp; Social/Behavioral Sciences</b>	
Signature and Date <b>Agustin Albarrán 09/29/' 21</b>	

<b><u>Review of Resource Requests</u></b>
---

Directions: Before submitting resource requests, please be sure to screen the requests by indicating which of the following criteria applies to each request:

- A. Request supports department/unit's continuous improvement as a result of analysis of *current* course and/or program level SLO/SSO/ASO\* assessment results?
- B. Does the request include other institutional data? If so, has it been used effectively to support the rationale for this position (for staffing requests only)?
- C. Request supports college-wide strategic goals of outreach, engagement, retention, & institutional capacity?
- D. Request supports other college-wide initiatives and/or plans (e.g., Student Equity, Guided Pathways, etc.)?

Using the prompts below, please check all resource request(s) being submitted along with this unit's AUP and indicate which of the above criteria is evident in the request. Be sure to check all that apply. Note: One application per request is needed.

Facilities Project (FPR): An approved Feasibility Report must be attached with the request (see AUP planning timeline for more information). Number of FPRs attached 0

Supports:     A     B     C     D

X Full-time Faculty Staffing: Number of positions being requested 1

Supports:     A     B     C     D

Current # of FT Faculty 5                      Current # of PT Faculty 16

Classified Staffing: Number of positions being requested 0

Supports:     A     B     C     D

Instructional Technology: Number of items being requested 0

Supports:     A     B     C     D

X Professional Development

Supports:     A     B     C     D

X CPIE Research

Supports:     A     B     C     D

**THIS PAGE FOR ACADEMIC AFFAIRS/STUDENT SERVICES DEAN/MANAGER**  
**FOLLOW-UP**

**Keep this page for your records.**

Name of Department/Unit/Program **English as a Second Language**

***Section 2: Progress Toward Existing Goals***

Has the unit provided adequate information on progress toward meeting existing goals? **(YES)** NO

Notes:

***Section 3: Student Learning, Achievement, & Equity***

Has the unit provided adequate information on how they are using outcomes assessment results (course-level and/or program-level SLOs/SSOs) for continuous improvement? **(YES)** NO

Notes:

***If not, deans should contact the SLO coordinator and/or unit SLO liaison for assistance.***

***Section 4: Curriculum Review & Planning (if applicable to requesting unit)***

Consult with department chair/coordinator on plan of action for updating official course outlines. All official course outlines should be updated prior to the six-year comprehensive program review. Progress should be recorded on annual unit plans. September 15<sup>th</sup> is the curriculum deadline for COR revisions.

Notes: