

English as a Second Language Unit Plan Data Elements and Goals 2009-10

Section I: Data Elements

1) Enrollment and Demand Data

a) Student FTE by Department/Division

Total ESL/IESL FTE remains at close to 3% of the total college FTE.

Annual ESL/IESL FTE change over time

Year	ESL	XISL	Total ESL	change from previous year	College FTE (4)	ESL/college
1998-99	237	100.4	337.4		11968	2.8%
1999-00	308.6	116.5	425.1	25.99%	12449	3.4%
2000-01	287.2	91.6	378.8	-10.89%	12760	3.0%
2001-02	298.9	81.5	380.4	0.42%	13265	2.9%
2002-03	307.9	73.8	381.7	0.34%	12364	3.1%
2003-04 (1)	254.69	50.52	305.21	-20.04%	10700	2.9%
2004-05 (2)	217.92	54.42	272.34	-10.77%	10178	2.7%
2005-06	224.9	67.19	292.09	7.25%	10743	2.7%
2006-07	240.8	64.6	305.4	4.5%	10591	2.9%
2007-08	245.2	46.32	291.54	-4.5%	10144	2.7%
2008-09	224.4	57.2	281.6	-3.4%	11963	2.4%

(1) Method of calculating FTE for ESL changed, resulting in lower FTE

(2) Program moved from Downtown Center to Main Campus in Fall 2004, resulting in enrollment decrease while students learned how to reach campus.

(3) 2007-08 decrease in international enrollment is partially due to change in how students attending on some categories of visas are classified. Some students are now enrolled as residents as opposed to international students. Also offered fewer class sections resulting in fewer registrations.

(4) Excludes College Now.

b) Student FTE and enrollment.

Reimbursable FTE (resident) only

	FTE	Enrollment
2002-03	307.29	3039
2003-04	254.69	2249
2004-05	217.92	1955
2005-06	224.96	2115
2006-07	240.09	2229
2007-08	245.2	2238
2008-09 *	224.4	1983

P:\Unit Planning\Enrollment_FTE\2007-08 and ESL Server\Program data\EnrollmentInfo\2007-08 Enrollment information.

Resident FTE by site

	Main Campus	DTC	CG	Spr	Total
2002-03 FTE	2.09	266.02	1.59	37.22	307.29
2002-03 Reg	12	2449	21	555	3039
2003-04 FTE	7.46	220.02	4.83	22.38	254.69
2003-04 Reg	69	1871	56	253	2249
2004-05 FTE	90.81	99.49	3.80	23.82	217.92
2004-05 Reg	706	963	44	242	1955

English as a Second Language

11-23-09

C. Lindsley x5441

2005-06 FTE	129.71	76.91	7.94	10.40	224.96
2005-06 Reg	1099	819	92	105	2115
2006-07 FTE	141.09	72.5	9.66	17.57	240.37
2006-07 Reg	1217	716	112	181	2226
2007-08 FTE	147.66	58.01	10.01	28.59	244.27
2007-08 Reg	1320	595	116	198	2229
2008-09 FTE *					224.4
2008-09 Reg *					1983

FTE increased at Main Campus, Cottage Grove and Springfield, but decreased at Downtown Center.

Resident (reimbursable) ESL registrations and FTE have increased each year since the move to Main Campus in 2004-05. DTC registrations and enrollment continues a decline.

* site breakdown not available at this time.

c) **Labor Market projection** (same data as included in 2008-09 Unit Plan)

According to Lane County census data estimates, 9,051 Lane County residents over the age of 5 speak English less than very well.

Lane County	estimate		lower bound		upper bound
LANGUAGE SPOKEN AT HOME					
Population 5 years and over	305,016		303,138		306,894
English only	280,748	92.0%	275,752		285,744
Language other than English	24,268	8.0%	19,767		28,769
Speak English less than "very well"	9,051	37.3%	6,344		11,758
Spanish	10,787	44.4%	7,953		13,621
Speak English less than "very well"	3,797	35.2%	2,282		5,312
Other Indo-European languages	3,956	16.3%	2,068		5,844
Speak English less than "very well"	265	6.7%	0		716
Asian and Pacific Islander languages	7,894	32.5%	4,979		10,809
Speak English less than "very well"	4,722	59.8%	2,811		6,633
Other languages	1,631	6.7%	415		2,847
Speak English less than "very well"	267	16.4%	0		702
	9,051		5,093	0	13,363

Need statement: According to 2003 Census data, about 9,051 (37%) of the 24,268 of Lane County residents who speak a language other than English say they speak English less than very well.

d) **Courses required for degrees or certificates**

English proficiency (listening, speaking, reading, writing) is required for success in all degree and certificate programs. For English language learners, ESL classes help students improve skills to be able to enter college, get a job, keep a job or get a better job.

An active ESL Advisory Committee with diverse perspectives provides input on community needs and resources.

2) Capacity

a) **Fill rate of course sections**

Year	ESL/IESL Sections	Registrations	Capacity	% full	College fill rate
2006-07	115	2398	2627	91.3	77.4
2007-08	101	2147	2267	94.7	79.6
2008-09	101	2150	2317	92.8	87.2

Capacity analysis

- The ESL/IESL fill rate is greater than the college average. (7th highest capacity utilization of 23 Dept/Programs w with capacity data)
- ESL/IESL provides placement tests to more students than the total class capacity so that the department has flexibility to add students where there are spaces available.
- Many ESL/IESL classes are full on the first day of classes.
- A waitlist is maintained and students are called from the waitlist.
- When/if seats become available, students are added to classes up to the 4th week.
- Classroom capacity limits the size of some of the classes.
- Processes are being evaluated to determine how registration/enrollment/assessment processes could be more efficient, allowing more registrations closer to term start.
- Low level classes are experiencing reduced enrollment. Possible explanations: change in population characteristics, fear in community, need more/different marketing efforts.
- International ESL commitment to F1 students requires running classes even if they are below capacity.
- Increase in international enrollment means fewer seats at some levels for resident students for reimbursable FTE.

b) Student FTE/Faculty FTE ratios

College ESL student FTE/Faculty Appointment FTE increased, but IESL student FTE/Faculty appt FTE decreased

Faculty and Student FTE				
Department	Year	Student FTE	Sum of Faculty Appointment Percents for the Dept. ("FTE")	Ratio of {Student FTE} / {Faculty Appointment Percent}
English as a Second Language & IESL	2006-07	305.5	10.2	30.1
Lane Total	2006-07	9,160.3	340.6	26.9
English as a Second Language & IESL	2007-08	246.0	10.7	27.3
Lane Total	2007-08	9,333.1	328.5	28.4
English as a Second Language & IESL	2008-09	281.6	11.1	25.4
Lane Total	2008-09	11,066.8	348.7	31.7

3) Success and Retention – Success Retention in ESL is not measured the same way as it is measured in other departments because students don't pass/fail or earn credits. As an alternative, Lane's ESL/ABSE performance can be compared to state Title II Workforce Investment Act performance measures and targets. Detailed 2007-08 reports will be available in February.

Title II Performance Measures

OPTIONAL DEPARTMENT/DIVISION SPECIFIC DATA ELEMENTS (ESL/ABSE)

	2004-05	2005-06	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09
<i>Skill Gain</i>	48%	45%	43%	39%	66.13% *
<i>Job Placement</i>	59%	56%	51%	44%	**
<i>Job Retention</i>	26%	27%	72%	37%	**
<i>GED</i>	42%	49%	59%	43%	**
<i>Post Secondary Ed</i>	48%	45%	43%	37%	**

** 2009-10 data match for the state will be completed and shared in February 2009.

* From Table 4B 6/30/2009

a) expenditures per unit (annual)

ESL - Not including grants	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09 *
Direct Faculty	\$832,589	\$875,598	\$911,040
Direct M&S	\$46,035	\$40,016	\$43,180
Direct Classified	\$197,538	\$200,238	\$133,520
Direct Manager	<u>\$ 57,021</u>	<u>\$57,292</u>	\$56,360
Total	\$1,133,183	\$1,173,143	\$1,144,101

Does not include EL Civics grant or assessment costs paid through Title II grant through ABSE or international tutors. Appears to include ICP. Data from Classbuilder Shared Drive: cost per FTE Summary 8DIR-DEPT

* Classified costs from international moved to its own dept.

b) Cost per FTE by subject

The ESL Department includes costs that other departments don't incur because ESL is responsible for all its own assessment and enrollment services (admissions, registration). ESL operates a program from 8:30 a.m. through 8:50 p.m. Monday thru Thursday and 8 a.m. to 5 p.m. Friday, with two offices covering four locations: Evening outreach sites at Springfield Middle School and Bohemia Elementary School, evening classes at Downtown Center and day classes at Main Campus. Beginning in 07-08, most costs related to international department will be accounted for separately.

* HR dept \$s are only included if the org from which faculty were paid was crosswalked to a student module dept.

Faculty cost per FTE with direct cost per FTE summary:

2007-08		Excluding Grants (Funds 1 and 9)		Including Grants (Funds 1, 8 and 9)		
Dept	\$*	FTE**	DIR-CPF	\$*	FTE**	DIR-CPF
ESL/IESL	875,598	251.8	3,477	920,650	251.8	3,656
Across College	29,875,136	8,942.5	3,341	30,853,063	9,149.7	3,372

2008-09		Excluding Grants (Funds 1 and 9)		Including Grants (Funds 1, 8 and 9)		
Dept	\$*	FTE**	DIR-CPF	\$*	FTE**	DIR-CPF
ESL/IESL	911,040	266.1	4,299	959,208	273.8	4,397
Across College	31,189,369	10,840.1	3,913	45,525,237	11171.7	4,075

c) Revenue per unit

Revenue 0708 Subject Description	Student FTE	Tuition (allocated by student FTE) (\$)	State Support (allocated by student FTE) (\$)	Mandatory Student Fees (\$)	Other Sources (\$)	Grant Revenue (\$)	Total Revenue (\$)	Total Revenue per FTE (\$)
ESL	245.2		657,767	24,285		57,396	739,449	3,015
IESL	46.3		124,247	225,692	1,117		351,056	7,579
ESL/IESL total	291.5		782,014	249,977	5,766	57,396	1,095,153	3,756

From Classbuilder Shared drive

Revenue 08-09 Subject Description	Student FTE	Tuition (allocated by student FTE) (\$)	State Support (allocated by student FTE) (\$)	Mandatory Student Fees (\$)	Other Sources (\$)	Grant Revenue (\$)	Total Revenue (\$)	Total Revenue per FTE (\$)
ESL	224.4		532,286	24,855		61,784	618,926	2,759
IESL	57.2		135,752	232,915			368,667	6,443
ESL/IESL total	281.6		668,039	259,885	3,313	61,784	993,021	3,527

Classbuilder Shared Drive: Revenue Report 08-09 Subject Summary

5) Division planning parameters

a) FTE target for disciplines

With 2% growth rate per year beginning with 2006-07

YR	ESL	IESL	Total	comments
2005-06	224.9	67.19	292.09	
2006-07 w 2%	229.40	68.53	297.93	
2006-07 Actual	240.8	64.62	305.42	7.49 FTE above 2% target
2007-08 Target	233.99	69.90	303.89	2% growth per yr from 06-07 1 of 2 depts w/ fewer FTE in 07-08 than 06-07
2007-08 Actual			291.54	
2008-09 Target			297.37	
2008-09 Actual	224.4	57.2	281.6	

Did not increase FTE by 2%, but also offered 5.6% fewer sections.

When unemployment increases, credit registrations increase and non-credit registration tends to decrease. Some decrease here is reflected in increase in ABSE. Some EL learners have high listening/speaking skills and lower reading/writing skills, which places them in ABSE instead of ESL.

Goals:

Title II program improvement goals submitted to Community College and Workforce Development for Lane ESL and ABSE

LIST GOAL----- for 2010-11	ACTIVITIES-----	TIMELINE-----	BUDGET IMPACT----
Continuous Improvement	Continue to follow revised Title II Strategic Plan developed during and after state review	See separate Strategic Plan on Title II wiki	
Student Recruitment	Develop, implement, evaluate a marketing plan	Implement Fall 2010 Evaluate	Carl Perkins \$ to continue work of Advisor I
Program Accountability	Each site will track attendance more carefully and post test to capture student progress gains according Share data with program staff	ongoing through June 11	Increased use of classified budget from Title II grant funds
Student Retention	Each site will track attendance more carefully and post test to capture student progress gains according to Title II requirements	ongoing through June 11	Carl Perkins \$ to continue work of Advisor I hired in Nov. 09.
Student Transition	Curriculum and procedural improvement to transition ESL students to ABSE classes	ongoing through June 11	Grant funds to pay for part time faculty to attend curriculum development meetings.
Instruction	ABSE and ESL will continue to a) revise curriculum and improve instructional strategies, b) expand use of technology in instruction c) participate in state learning standards project	ongoing through June 11	Curriculum development funds Technology fee funds

Other ESL goals in addition to and included in above

Maintain summer evening program 10-11 (skipped 07-08 for staffing reasons. Difficult to grow it back)

Adjust summer calendar to align with Title II requirements and classified resources.

Develop and implement an assessment of emerging needs of Lane County non-native English speakers. Is the population changing? Do we need to change curriculum/class offerings to meet the emerging needs? (Fewer low-level speakers. More students with literacy needs.)

Increase number of students transitioning to career-technical and transfer program

Integrate technology into language teaching and learning through use of computer lab and other strategies.

Provide leadership for program improvement at college, state and national levels.

Develop processes and tools to assess student learning outcomes.

Develop ESL Department handbook through online wiki.

Improve placement, assessment and orientation processes.

Evaluate RD89/WR89 move to credit only