

## Basic Skills Initiative Plan Outline/Notes

### Campus Research

- Demographics of population served
- Baseline data

### Throughput Rates

#### CAMPUS-BASED RESEARCH

- A. Basic Skills and Developmental Completion.** CCCCO Basic Skills Throughput Rate: Ratio of the number of students by population group who complete a transfer level course within three years after having completed their first developmental math or English course at Crafton Hills compared to the number of students who completed such a final course.

#### Math Basic Skills Throughput Rate

**Table C1: 2011 – 2012 to 2013 – 2014 Basic Skills Three-Year Math Throughput Rate by Gender, 80% Rule Ratio, and Effect Size.**

Gender	# Successful	Cohort #	Throughput Rate	80% Rule Ratio	Effect Size
Female	191	616	31.0	Reference Group	
Male	159	570	27.9	90.0	-.07
Total	350	1,186	29.5		

**Table C1.A: 2011 – 2012 to 2013 – 2014 Proportion of the Number in the Math Cohort and Throughput Number by Gender and Proportionality Index.**

Gender	Cohort		Throughput		Proportionality Index
	#	Column %	#	Column %	
Female	616	51.9	191	54.6	1.1
Male	570	48.1	159	45.4	.94
Total	1,186	100.0	350	100.0	

**Table C2: 2011 – 2012 to 2013 – 2014 Basic Skills Three-Year Math Throughput Rate by Ethnicity, 80% Rule Ratio, and Effect Size.**

<b>Ethnicity</b>	<b># Successful</b>	<b>Cohort #</b>	<b>Throughput Rate</b>	<b>80% Rule Ratio</b>	<b>Effect Size</b>
Asian	19	54	35.2	Reference Group	
African American	6	43	14.0	39.8	-.48
Hispanic	144	533	27.0	76.7	-.18
Native American	2	9	22.2	63.1	-.27
Caucasian	154	488	31.6	89.8	-.08
Multi-Ethnicity	23	60	38.3		
Total	348	1,187	29.3		

**Table C2.A: 2011 – 2012 to 2013 – 2014 Proportion of the Number in the Math Cohort and Throughput Number by Ethnicity and Proportionality Index.**

<b>Ethnicity</b>	<b>Cohort</b>		<b>Throughput</b>		<b>Proportionality Index</b>
	<b>#</b>	<b>Column %</b>	<b>#</b>	<b>Column %</b>	
Asian	54	4.5	19	5.5	1.2
African American	43	3.6	6	1.7	.47
Hispanic	533	44.9	144	41.4	.92
Native American	9	0.8	2	0.6	.75
Caucasian	488	41.1	154	44.3	1.1
Multi-Ethnicity	60	5.1	23	6.6	1.3
Total	1,187	100.0	348	100.0	

**Table C3: 2011 – 2012 to 2013 – 2014 Basic Skills Three-Year Math Throughput Rate by Age, 80% Rule Ratio, and Effect Size.**

<b>Age</b>	<b># Successful</b>	<b>Cohort #</b>	<b>Throughput Rate</b>	<b>80% Rule Ratio</b>	<b>Effect Size</b>
19 or younger	246	731	33.7	86.1	-.11
20-24	93	238	39.1	Reference Group	
25-29	32	88	36.4	93.1	-.06
30-34	5	39	12.8	32.7	-.55
35-39	3	18	16.7	42.7	-.46
40-49	8	29	27.6	70.6	-.24
50 and above	2	13	15.4	39.4	-.49
Total	389	1,156	33.7		

**Table C3.A: 2011 – 2012 to 2013 – 2014 Proportion of the Number in the Math Cohort and Throughput Number by Age and Proportionality Index.**

Age	Cohort		Throughput		Proportionality Index
	#	Column %	#	Column %	
19 or younger	731	63.2	246	63.2	1.0
20-24	238	20.6	93	23.9	1.2
25-29	88	7.6	32	8.2	1.1
30-34	39	3.4	5	1.3	.38
35-39	18	1.6	3	0.8	.50
40-49	29	2.5	8	2.1	.82
50 and above	13	1.1	2	0.5	.46
Total	1,156	100.0	389	100.0	

**Table C4: 2011 – 2012 to 2013 – 2014 Basic Skills Three-Year Math Throughput Rate by Disability Status, 80% Rule Ratio, and Effect Size.**

Disability Status	# Successful	Cohort #	Throughput Rate	80% Rule Ratio	Effect Size
No	332	1,097	30.3	72.3	-.25
Yes	39	93	41.9	Reference Group	
Total	371	1,190	31.2		

**Table C4.A: 2011 – 2012 to 2013 – 2014 Proportion of the Number in the Math Cohort and Throughput Number by Disability Status and Proportionality Index.**

Disability Status	Cohort		Throughput		Proportionality Index
	#	Column %	#	Column %	
No	1,097	92.2	332	89.5	.97
Yes	93	7.8	39	10.5	1.3
Total	1,190	100.0	371	100.0	

**Table C5: 2011 – 2012 to 2013 – 2014 Basic Skills Three-Year Math Throughput Rate by Economically Disadvantaged Status (BOG Fee Waiver), 80% Rule Ratio, and Effect Size.**

Economically Disadvantaged	# Successful	Cohort #	Throughput Rate	80% Rule Ratio	Effect Size
No	238	500	47.6	Reference Group	
Yes	177	510	34.7	72.9	-.26

Total	415	1,010	41.1	
-------	-----	-------	------	--

**Table C5.A: 2011 – 2012 to 2013 – 2014 Proportion of the Number in the Math Cohort and Throughput Number by Economically Disadvantaged Status (BOG Fee Waiver) and Proportionality Index.**

Economically Disadvantaged	Cohort		Throughput		Proportionality Index
	#	Column %	#	Column %	
No	500	49.5	238	57.3	1.2
Yes	510	50.5	177	42.7	.85
Total	1,010	100.0	415	100.0	

**Table C5.B: 2011 – 2012 to 2013 – 2014 Basic Skills Three-Year Math Throughput Rate by Economically Disadvantaged Status (Cal B or C, CARE, Pell, or SEOG), 80% Rule Ratio, and Effect Size.**

Economically Disadvantaged	# Successful	Cohort #	Throughput Rate	80% Rule Ratio	Effect Size
No	238	500	47.6	Reference Group	
Yes	148	414	35.7	75.0	-.24
Total	386	914	42.2		

**Table C5.C: 2011 – 2012 to 2013 – 2014 Proportion of the Number in the Math Cohort and Throughput Number by Economically Disadvantaged Status (Cal B or C, CARE, Pell, or SEOG) and Proportionality Index.**

Economically Disadvantaged	Cohort		Throughput		Proportionality Index
	#	Column %	#	Column %	
No	500	54.7	238	61.7	1.1
Yes	414	45.3	148	38.3	.85
Total	914	100.0	386	100.0	

**Table C5.D: 2011 – 2012 to 2013 – 2014 Basic Skills Three-Year Math Throughput Rate by Economically Disadvantaged Status (Scholarship), 80% Rule Ratio, and Effect Size.**

Economically Disadvantaged	# Successful	Cohort #	Throughput Rate	80% Rule Ratio	Effect Size
----------------------------	--------------	----------	-----------------	----------------	-------------

No	238	500	47.6	54.4	-.80
Yes	7	8	87.5	Reference Group	
Total	245	508	48.2		

**Table C5.E: 2011 – 2012 to 2013 – 2014 Proportion of the Number in the Math Cohort and Throughput Number by Economically Disadvantaged Status (Scholarship) and Proportionality Index.**

Economically Disadvantaged	Cohort		Throughput		Proportionality Index
	#	Column %	#	Column %	
No	500	98.4	238	97.1	.99
Yes	8	1.6	7	2.9	1.8
Total	508	100.0	245	100.0	

**Table C5.F: 2011 – 2012 to 2013 – 2014 Basic Skills Three-Year Math Throughput Rate by Economically Disadvantaged Status (Work Study Student), 80% Rule Ratio, and Effect Size.**

Economically Disadvantaged	# Successful	Cohort #	Throughput Rate	80% Rule Ratio	Effect Size
No	238	500	47.6	87.3	-.14
Yes	6	11	54.5	Reference Group	
Total	244	511	47.7		

**Table C5.G: 2011 – 2012 to 2013 – 2014 Proportion of the Number in the Math Cohort and Throughput Number by Economically Disadvantaged Status (Work Study Student) and Proportionality Index.**

Economically Disadvantaged	Cohort		Throughput		Proportionality Index
	#	Column %	#	Column %	
No	500	97.8	238	97.5	1.0
Yes	11	2.2	6	2.5	1.1
Total	511	100.0	244	100.0	

**Table C6: Fall 2013 to Spring 2014 Math Basic Skills Improvement Rate by Foster Youth Status, 80% Rule Ratio, and Effect Size.**

Foster Youth	# Improved	Cohort #	Improvement Rate	80% Rule Ratio	Effect Size
No	350	853	41.0	NA	NA
Yes	0	3	0.0	NA	NA
Total	350	856	40.9		

**Table C6.A: Fall 2013 to spring 2014 Proportion of the Number in the Math Cohort and Basic Skills Improvement Number by Foster Youth Status and Proportionality Index.**

Foster Youth	Cohort		Improvement		Proportionality Index
	#	Column %	#	Column %	
No	853	99.6	350	100.0	1.0
Yes	3	0.4	0	0.0	NA
Total	856	100.0	350	100.0	

**Table C7: Fall 2013 to Spring 2014 Math Basic Skills Improvement Rate by Veteran Status, 80% Rule Ratio, and Effect Size.**

Veteran	# Improved	Cohort #	Improvement Rate	80% Rule Ratio	Effect Size
No	340	827	41.1	Reference Group	
Yes	10	29	34.5	83.9	.13
Total	350	856	40.9		

Note: The math improvement rate refers to the number of students who successfully completed a developmental level math course in fall 2013 and successfully completed the next highest level math course in spring 2014.

**Table C7.A: Fall 2013 to spring 2014 Proportion of the Number in the Math Cohort and Basic Skills Improvement Number by Veteran Status and Proportionality Index.**

Veteran	Cohort		Improvement		Proportionality Index
	#	Column %	#	Column %	
No	827	96.6	340	97.1	1.0
Yes	29	3.4	10	3.9	1.1
Total	856	100.0	350	100.0	

Note: The math improvement rate refers to the number of students who successfully completed a developmental level math course in fall 2013 and successfully completed the next highest level math course in spring 2014.

## English Basic Skills Throughput Rate

**Table C8: 2011 – 2012 to 2013 – 2014 Basic Skills Three-Year English Throughput Rate by Gender, 80% Rule Ratio, and Effect Size.**

Gender	# Successful	Cohort #	Throughput Rate	80% Rule Ratio	Effect Size
Female	226	452	50.0	Reference Group	
Male	164	379	43.3	86.6	-.13
Total	390	831	46.9		

**Table C8.A: 2011 – 2012 to 2013 – 2014 Proportion of the Number in the English Cohort and Throughput Number by Gender and Proportionality Index.**

Gender	Cohort		Throughput		Proportionality Index
	#	Column %	#	Column %	
Female	452	54.4	226	57.9	1.1
Male	379	45.6	164	42.1	.92
Total	831	100.0	390	100.0	

**Table C9: 2011 – 2012 to 2013 – 2014 Basic Skills Three-Year English Throughput Rate by Ethnicity, 80% Rule Ratio, and Effect Size.**

Ethnicity	# Successful	Cohort #	Throughput Rate	80% Rule Ratio	Effect Size
Asian	26	46	56.5	Reference Group	
African American	11	34	32.4	57.3	-.48
Hispanic	182	405	44.9	79.5	-.23
Native American	1	2	50.0	88.5	-.13
Caucasian	146	300	48.7	86.2	-.16
Multi-Ethnicity	22	41	53.7	95.0	-.06
Total	388	828	46.9		

Note: Groups chosen as the reference group had to have 50 or more cases in the cohort and be the highest rate.

**Table C9.A: 2011 – 2012 to 2013 – 2014 Proportion of the Number in the English Cohort and Throughput Number by Ethnicity and Proportionality Index.**

Ethnicity	Cohort		Throughput		Proportionality Index
	#	Column %	#	Column %	
Asian	46	5.6	26	6.7	1.2
African American	34	4.1	11	2.8	.69
Hispanic	405	48.9	182	46.9	.96
Native American	2	0.2	1	0.3	1.1
Caucasian	300	36.2	146	37.6	1.0
Multi-Ethnicity	41	5.0	22	5.7	1.1
Total	828	100.0	388	100.0	

**Table C10: 2011 – 2012 to 2013 – 2014 Basic Skills Three-Year English Throughput Rate by Age, 80% Rule Ratio, and Effect Size.**

Age	# Successful	Cohort #	Throughput Rate	80% Rule Ratio	Effect Size
19 or younger	276	523	52.8	Reference Group	
20-24	67	128	52.3	99.1	-.01
25-29	26	57	45.6	86.4	-.14
30-34	8	23	34.8	65.9	-.36
35-39	3	14	21.4	40.5	-.63
40-49	7	24	29.2	55.3	-.47
50 and above	5	10	50.0	94.7	-.06
Total	392	779	50.3		

**Table C10.A: 2011 – 2012 to 2013 – 2014 Proportion of the Number in the English Cohort and Throughput Number by Age and Proportionality Index.**

Age	Cohort		Throughput		Proportionality Index
	#	Column %	#	Column %	
19 or younger	523	67.1	276	70.4	1.0
20-24	128	16.4	67	17.1	1.0
25-29	57	7.3	26	6.6	.91
30-34	23	3.0	8	2.0	.69
35-39	14	1.8	3	0.8	.43
40-49	24	3.1	7	1.8	.58
50 and above	10	1.3	5	1.3	.99
Total	779	100.0	392	100.0	



**Table C11: 2011 – 2012 to 2013 – 2014 Basic Skills Three-Year English Throughput Rate by Disability Status, 80% Rule Ratio, and Effect Size.**

Disability Status	# Successful	Cohort #	Throughput Rate	80% Rule Ratio	Effect Size
No	364	750	48.5	Reference Group	
Yes	28	69	40.6	83.7	-.16
Total	392	819	47.9		

**Table C11.A: 2011 – 2012 to 2013 – 2014 Proportion of the Number in the English Cohort and Throughput Number by Disability Status and Proportionality Index.**

Disability Status	Cohort		Throughput		Proportionality Index
	#	Column %	#	Column %	
No	750	91.6	364	92.9	1.1
Yes	69	8.4	28	7.1	.85
Total	819	100.0	392	100.0	

**Table C12: 2011 – 2012 to 2013 – 2014 Basic Skills Three-Year English Throughput Rate by Economically Disadvantaged Status (BOG Fee Waiver), 80% Rule Ratio, and Effect Size.**

Economically Disadvantaged	# Successful	Cohort #	Throughput Rate	80% Rule Ratio	Effect Size
No	190	393	48.3	Reference Group	
Yes	201	425	47.3	97.9	-.02
Total	391	818	47.8		

**Table C12.A: 2011 – 2012 to 2013 – 2014 Proportion of the Number in the English Cohort and Throughput Number by Economically Disadvantaged Status (BOG Fee Waiver) and Proportionality Index.**

Economically Disadvantaged	Cohort		Throughput		Proportionality Index
	#	Column %	#	Column %	
No	393	48.0	190	48.6	1.0
Yes	425	52.0	201	51.4	.99
Total	818	100.0	391	100.0	

**Table C12.B: 2011 – 2012 to 2013 – 2014 Basic Skills Three-Year English Throughput Rate by Economically Disadvantaged Status (Cal B or C, CARE, Pell, or SEOG), 80% Rule Ratio, and Effect Size.**

<b>Economically Disadvantaged</b>	<b># Successful</b>	<b>Cohort #</b>	<b>Throughput Rate</b>	<b>80% Rule Ratio</b>	<b>Effect Size</b>
No	190	393	48.3	92.2	-.08
Yes	152	290	52.4	Reference Group	
Total	342	683	50.1		

**Table C12.C: 2011 – 2012 to 2013 – 2014 Proportion of the Number in the English Cohort and Throughput Number by Economically Disadvantaged Status (Cal B or C, CARE, Pell, or SEOG) and Proportionality Index.**

<b>Economically Disadvantaged</b>	<b>Cohort</b>		<b>Throughput</b>		<b>Proportionality Index</b>
	<b>#</b>	<b>Column %</b>	<b>#</b>	<b>Column %</b>	
No	393	57.5	190	55.6	.97
Yes	290	42.5	152	44.4	1.1
Total	683	100.0	342	100.0	

**Table C12.D: 2011 – 2012 to 2013 – 2014 Basic Skills Three-Year English Throughput Rate by Economically Disadvantaged Status (Scholarship), 80% Rule Ratio, and Effect Size.**

<b>Economically Disadvantaged</b>	<b># Successful</b>	<b>Cohort #</b>	<b>Throughput Rate</b>	<b>80% Rule Ratio</b>	<b>Effect Size</b>
No	190	393	48.3	Reference Group	
Yes	2	5	40.0	82.8	-.17
Total	192	398	48.2		

**Table C12.E: 2011 – 2012 to 2013 – 2014 Proportion of the Number in the English Cohort and Throughput Number by Economically Disadvantaged Status (Scholarship) and Proportionality Index.**

<b>Economically Disadvantaged</b>	<b>Cohort</b>		<b>Throughput</b>		<b>Proportionality Index</b>
	<b>#</b>	<b>Column %</b>	<b>#</b>	<b>Column %</b>	

No	393	98.7	190	99.0	1.0
Yes	5	1.3	2	1.0	.83
Total	398	100.0	192	100.0	

**Table C12.F: 2011 – 2012 to 2013 – 2014 Basic Skills Three-Year English Throughput Rate by Economically Disadvantaged Status (Work Study Student), 80% Rule Ratio, and Effect Size.**

Economically Disadvantaged	# Successful	Cohort #	Throughput Rate	80% Rule Ratio	Effect Size
No	190	393	48.3	Reference Group	
Yes	4	10	40.0	82.8	-.17
Total	194	403	48.1		

**Table C12.G: 2011 – 2012 to 2013 – 2014 Proportion of the Number in the English Cohort and Throughput Number by Economically Disadvantaged Status (Work Study Student) and Proportionality Index.**

Economically Disadvantaged	Cohort		Throughput		Proportionality Index
	#	Column %	#	Column %	
No	393	97.5	190	97.9	1.0
Yes	10	2.5	4	2.1	.83
Total	403	100.0	194	100.0	

**Table C13: Fall 2013 to Spring 2014 English Basic Skills Improvement Rate by Foster Youth Status, 80% Rule Ratio, and Effect Size.**

Foster Youth	# Improved	Cohort #	Improvement Rate	80% Rule Ratio	Effect Size
No	351	548	64.1	96.1	-.05
Yes	2	3	66.7	Reference Group	
Total	353	551	64.1		

**Table C13.A: Fall 2013 to spring 2014 Proportion of the Number in the English Cohort and Basic Skills Improvement Number by Foster Youth Status and Proportionality Index.**

Foster Youth	Cohort	Improvement	Proportionality
--------------	--------	-------------	-----------------

	#	Column %	#	Column %	
No	548	99.5	351	99.4	1.0
Yes	3	0.5	2	0.6	1.2
Total	551	100.0	353	100.0	

**Table C14: Fall 2013 to spring 2014 English Basic Skills Improvement Rate by Veteran Status, 80% Rule Ratio, and Effect Size.**

Veteran	# Improved	Cohort #	Improvement Rate	80% Rule Ratio	Effect Size
No	349	544	64.2	Reference Group	
Yes	4	7	57.1	88.9	-.15
Total	353	561	62.9		

Note: The English improvement rate refers to the number of students who successfully completed a developmental level English course in fall 2013 and successfully completed the next highest level English course in spring 2014.

**Table C14.A: Fall 2013 to spring 2014 Proportion of the Number in the English Cohort and Basic Skills Improvement Number by Veteran Status and Proportionality Index.**

Veteran	Cohort		Improvement		Proportionality Index
	#	Column %	#	Column %	
No	544	98.7	349	98.9	1.0
Yes	7	1.3	4	1.1	.85
Total	551	100.0	353	100.0	

Note: The English improvement rate refers to the number of students who successfully completed a developmental level English course in fall 2013 and successfully completed the next highest level English course in spring 2014.

### Analysis

**Gender:** The math and English throughput rates were slightly higher for females (31% and 50%, respectively) than the male throughput rates (28% and 43% respectively). However, the differences were not substantial as indicated by the 80% rule, effect size, and proportionality index. At the same time, males had a lower (Cohen's  $d = -.13$ ) English throughput rate (43%) than females (50%).

**Ethnicity:** The ethnic group with the highest math (35%) and English (57%) throughput rates were Asian students. African American students were disproportionately impacted for both the math (14%) and English (32%) throughput rates when compared to the Asian reference group. At the same time, Hispanic students almost had a substantially (Cohen's  $d = -.18$ ) lower math

throughput rate (27%) than Asian students (35%). In addition, Hispanic students had a substantially (Cohen's  $d = -.23$ ) lower English throughput rate; however, both the 80% rule ratio and proportionality thresholds were met.

**Age:** Students 20 – 24 years old had the highest math throughput rate (39%) and were the reference group. Three of the age groups had less than 30 students and were excluded from the disproportionate impact analysis (35-39, 40-49 and 50 years or older). All three indices indicated that 30 – 34 year old students were disproportionately impacted on the math throughput rate. Specifically, 30 – 34 year old students (13%) had a substantially (Cohen's  $d = -.55$ ) lower success rate than the 20 – 24 year old students (39%).

Students 19 years old or younger had the highest English throughput rate (53%) and were the reference group. Four of the age groups had less than 30 students and were excluded from the disproportionate impact analysis (30-34, 35-39, 40-49 and 50 years or older). None of the other age groups were disproportionately impacted.

**Disability:** The math throughput rate was substantially (Cohen's  $d = .25$ ) higher for students with a disability (42%) than for students not identified as having a disability (30%). Students identified as having a disability were not disproportionately impacted on the math throughput rate.

Only the proportionality index (.85) indicated that students identified with a disability were disproportionately impacted on the English throughput rate. Specifically, students not identified as having a disability had a higher English throughput rate (49%) than students who were identified as having a disability (41%).

**Economically Disadvantaged:** The number of students in each economically disadvantaged cohort was large enough to examine disproportionate impact for students who received a BOG Fee Waiver or students who received a Cal B or C, CARE, Pell, or SEOG financial aid award. All three indices indicated that students who received a BOG Fee Waiver were disproportionately impacted on the math throughput rate. Specifically, students who received a BOG Fee Waiver had a substantially (Cohen's  $d = -.26$ ) lower math throughput rate (35%) than students who were not identified as being economically disadvantaged (48%). All three indices also indicated that students who received a Cal B or C, CARE, Pell, or SEOG financial aid award were disproportionately impacted on the math throughput rate. Students who received a Cal B or C, CARE, Pell, or SEOG financial aid award had a substantially (Cohen's  $d = -.24$ ) lower math throughput rate (36%) than students who were not identified as being economically disadvantaged (48%).

All three indices indicated that disproportionate impact did not occur for the English throughput rate by economically disadvantaged status.

**Foster Youth:** There were not enough foster youth identified to examine disproportionate impact. Foster youth students have only been tracked since 2012 and only three foster youth students had taken a developmental math or English course in fall 2013.

**Veterans:** Since Veteran student status was not identified in the CCCCO Basic Skills Throughput Rate Data Mart, the basic skills improvement rate from fall 2013 to spring 2014 was examined for CHC student veterans. The results indicated that disproportionate impact did not occur for veterans for both the math and English improvement rates. However, students not identified as veterans had a higher math improvement rate (41%) than veterans (35%). In addition, students not identified as veterans also had a higher English improvement rate (64%) than veterans (57%).

LCOMS/Accelerated Courses

CHC 900

### **Government Guidelines**

- what it is, where it comes from, what's allowable

### **Goals**

- Long term goals
- objectives/projects (benchmarks and outcomes)
- activities (getting there)

### **Program, Curriculum, and Development (A)**

- Support and information to departments (department driven)
- Define programs (distinguish among programs, projects, activities)

### **Student Assessment (B: SSSP)**

- Assessment and placement concerns and current activities
  - Accuplacer
  - Advancer Learning Diagnostic and Coursework
- Use of high school transcripts for placement

### **Advisement and Counseling services (C:SSSP)**

- Department liaison between counseling and math, English/reading, and tutoring center
- Support of Basic Skills related activities

- Early Alert

- Referral to DSP&S, EOPS, Veterans

### **Supplemental Instruction and Tutoring (D: SEP)**

- Structured Learning Assistance (SLA)

- Individual/group tutoring

  - by appointment

  - walk-in tutoring

  - weekly/recurring

- workshops

  - English/math

- Reading

  - Directed Learning Activities (DLA)

### **Course Articulation and Alignment of curriculum (E:SEP)**

- Discussion with Math department to identify pros/cons of changing math 090 to a 900 level class

- Discussion with English department to identify pros/cons of changing Eng 010 to a 900 level class

- Explore linking math 943 with math 090 or 095 in conjunction with high school transcripts and assessment placement.

### **Instructional Material and Equipment (F)**

- Coordinate with tablet initiative

- technology for basic skills specific classrooms

- lots of white board space for basic skills specific classrooms

### **Coordination (G1)**

- Basic Skills Committee (AS)

- Basic Skills Coordinator

- reading/English/math coordinator

## **Research (G2)**

## **Professional Development (G.3: SEP)**

## **Funding Request Process**

## **Glossary**

- Structured Learning Assistance (SLA)
- Supplemental Instruction (SI)
  - formal program focuses on serving at risk, but not limited to, gateway courses
  - gateway course: a course that is required to . . .
- Programs
- Activities