Title III grant requires periodic reports to the federal government regarding progress and usage of funds. This form is designed to help us keep an accurate report of the various activities that the grant funds and assess their implementation with regards to learning goals and outcomes and grant objectives. Your responses below will assist us in preparing various reports and ensure accountability.

Name of Program or Organization: Reading

Date: 1/14/12

Contact: Kristin Skager

1. Briefly describe the project/activity for which funds were used:

The reading department held their annual department spring workshop to

1. Study the efficacy of accelerated courses and how they can be developed with culturally specific content,

2. develop rubrics to assess classroom assignments, such as presentations and reading responses,

3. share student surveys for the purpose of improving our teaching

4. share culturally responsive best practices through a department adopted book, and

5. collaborate with the Language Arts Title 3 team to addresses LART 200 and Read 200 instruction and review a new student diagnostic.

2. What were the student learning and program objectives?

Program Outcomes:

• By the end of the workshop, the department will develop a pilot model for accelerated learning in the reading department. The department will plan to work with the English Department on the LART 200 & LART 211 courses to improve student success through the developmental reading/lart sequences.

• The department will adopt 2-3 rubrics for use in Read 211 on specific learning activities that improve student learning.
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The department will adopt student surveys for the purpose of improving our teaching.

• Selected members will share culturally responsive teaching practices that engage the student population today and the department will discuss a chapter from a book on culturally responsive teaching practices.

• Selected members will share Read 200 and LART 200 diagnostics for distribution Fall Quarter, 2011.

Student Learning Outcomes:

The current emphasis on accelerated learning is directly tied to data indicated that students who place into the lowest level of English and Reading have low persistence and success rates in English 1A. One of the solutions is to combine or accelerated developmental courses. Our department will study Chabot’s model and compare it to other research that shows programs, like FYE and LART and the Integrated Reading/writing model at San Francisco State University increase persistence and success through shared curricula and academic support services. Our study will benefit students by finding the best possible pathways for their success.

• The use of new rubrics in Read 200 and Read 211 on learning activities we all practice in our classroom will clarify learning objectives and grading for students. Students will know why they are learning, and how they apply the learning and the goals. Teams of faculty will implement the new rubrics and report any enhanced student learning outcomes to the Department by the end of Fall 2011.

• Teacher evaluation surveys will give students voice in the reading classroom. Teams of faculty will use surveys last week of Spring quarter, 2011 and report to department Fall quarter, 2012.

• The implementation of culturally responsive teaching practices will engage more students in learning. Teams of faculty will try new practices, provide CATS (classroom assessment techniques), and report back to department in Spring 2011 and into the next academic year 2011/12. We will also continue our discussion of culturally responsive teaching practices using our department adopted book.

• The reading diagnostic for Read 200 and LART 200 is greatly needed to support students learning inside the class and to connect them for additional support with the Student Success Center, including learning modules, such as vocabulary and cloze activities.
3. Please Provide a Breakdown of costs:

Please see attached.

4. Were the learning and program objectives met? What methods did you use to evaluate your objectives?

Program & Student Outcomes: 1) Anne Argyriou provided a detailed analysis of Chabot College’s Accelerated Learning Program. In addition to critiquing their statistical conclusions, she also and concluded that the mode would not work effectively at De Anza for several logistical reasons, including that De Anza is on the quarter system and that our LART program is a better and more effective model for moving our students successfully to college level courses. Also, we have developed the new level 200 portfolio, which we initiated in the Fall 2011 as a joint Read/EWRT pilot program. We are currently investigating the success of this program; in its early stage we have achieved better communication among level 200 instructors, positive student feedback and a more holistic assessment of individual student success. For example, we were able to determine that several students in level 200 were in fact ready for English 1A.

2) We shared and adopted several rubrics for assignments in the reading classroom, including reading presentation rubric, summary rubric and critical analysis rubric.

3) Veronica Avila presented culturally responsive teaching assignments and a powerpoint presentation for her students. We also communicated about cultural responsive teaching practices among different programs, such as LART and FYE. During Fall 2011, we shared more teaching practices at department meetings. We have continued our discussion of cultural responsive teaching practices through our department-adopted book.

4) Veronica Avila also shared her student survey for assessment of learning in the classroom. Some of us have already adopted this survey Fall 2011 along with other learning assessments using Classroom Assessment Techniques.

5) Sarah Lisha shared her reading 200 diagnostic and Natalie Panfili shared her Read 211 diagnostics. The 200 diagnostic has been adopted by the Level 200 portfolio and many of the Read 211 instructors have adopted the Read 211 diagnostic.