

**2010-2011 Basic Skills Allocation End-of-Year Report**  
**2011-2012 Basic Skills Allocation Action Plan and Expenditure Plan**  
Submission Deadline: October 10, 2011

**Monterey Peninsula College**

**[1a] 2008-09 Basic Skills Allocation End-of-Year Expenditure Report  
for FY 2010-11 and Signature Page  
Due October 10, 2011**

**Monterey Peninsula College**

**Basic Skills funds allocated in 2008-2009 expire as of June 30, 2011, and cannot be expended beyond that date.** All unexpended funds as of July 1, 2011, revert back to the State Budget. Enter from the 2008-09 allocation the total expenditures from 7/1/2008 through 6/30/2011, for each budget category. The total must not exceed the total basic skills allocation for 2008-09 funds (refer to the final 2008-2009 allocation posted on the Chancellor's Office website). Original signatures are required of the Chief Executive Officer, the Chief Business Officer, and the Academic Senate President.

<b>Category</b>	<b>Total Allocation for 2008-2009</b>	<b>Total Expenditures by Category from 7/1/08 through 6/30/11</b>	<b>Total Unused Allocation Reverting Back to the State</b>
A. Program, Curriculum Planning and Development	\$35,000	\$25,407	-0-
B. Student Assessment	\$25,000	-0-	-0-
C. Advisement and Counseling Services	\$30,517	\$46,655	-0-
D. Supplemental Instruction and Tutoring	\$30,000	\$22,625	-0-
E. Course Articulation/ Alignment of the Curriculum	-0-	-0-	-0-
F. Instructional Materials and Equipment	\$ 5,000	\$ 9,132	-0-
G.1 Coordination	\$14,402	\$40,460	-0-
G.2 Research	\$ 5,000	\$ 445	-0-
G.3 Professional Development	\$ 5,000	\$ 5,195	-0-
<b>TOTAL:</b>	<b>149,919</b>	<b>\$149,919</b>	<b>-0-</b>

\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature, Chief Executive Officer

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature, Academic Senate President

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature, Chief Business Officer

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

**[1b] 2009-2010 Basic Skills Allocation End-of-Year Expenditure Report  
for FY 2010-11 and Signature Page  
Due October 10, 2011**

**Monterey Peninsula College**

**Basic Skills funds allocated in 2009-2010 expire as of June 30, 2012, and cannot be expended beyond that date.** All unexpended funds as of July 1, 2012, will revert back to the State Budget. Enter from the 2009-10 allocation the total expenditures and encumbered amounts from 7/1/2009 through 6/30/2011, for each budget category. The total must not exceed the total basic skills allocation for 2009-10 funds (refer to the final 2009-2010 allocation posted on the Chancellor's Office website). Original signatures are required of the Chief Executive Officer, the Chief Business Officer, and the Academic Senate President.

<b>Category</b>	<b>Total Allocation for 2009-2010</b>	<b>Total Expenditures by Category from 7/1/09 through 6/30/11</b>	<b>Total Encumbered Amounts by Category as of 6/30/11</b>
A. Program, Curriculum Planning and Development	\$23,000	-0-	-0-
B. Student Assessment	\$ 2,000	-0-	-0-
C. Advisement and Counseling Services	\$22,784	-0-	-0-
D. Supplemental Instruction and Tutoring	\$22,000	-0-	-0-
E. Course Articulation/ Alignment of the Curriculum	-0-	-0-	-0-
F. Instructional Materials and Equipment	\$ 5,000	-0-	-0-
G.1 Coordination	\$12,000	-0-	-0-
G.2 Research	\$ 1,000	-0-	-0-
G.3 Professional Development	\$ 5,000	-0-	-0-
<b>TOTAL:</b>	<b>92,784</b>	<b>-0-</b>	<b>-0-</b>

\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature, Chief Executive Officer

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature, Academic Senate President

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature, Chief Business Officer

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

**[1c] 2010-2011 Basic Skills Allocation End-of-Year Expenditure Report  
for FY 2010-11 and Signature Page  
Due October 10, 2011**

**Monterey Peninsula College**

**Basic Skills funds allocated in 2010-2011 expire as of June 30, 2013, and cannot be expended beyond that date.** All unexpended funds as of July 1, 2013, will revert back to the State Budget. Enter from the 2010-11 allocation the total expenditures and encumbered amounts from 7/1/2010 through 6/30/2011, for each budget category. The total must not exceed the total basic skills allocation for 2010-11 funds (refer to the final 2010-2011 allocation posted on the Chancellor's Office website). Original signatures are required of the Chief Executive Officer, the Chief Business Officer, and the Academic Senate President.

<b>Category</b>	<b>Total Allocation for 2010-2011</b>	<b>Total Expenditures by Category from 7/1/10 through 6/30/11</b>	<b>Total Encumbered Amounts by Category as of 6/30/11</b>
A. Program, Curriculum Planning and Development	<b>\$20,716</b>	-0-	-0-
B. Student Assessment	<b>\$ 2,000</b>	-0-	-0-
C. Advisement and Counseling Services	<b>\$22,784</b>	-0-	-0-
D. Supplemental Instruction and Tutoring	<b>\$22,000</b>	-0-	-0-
E. Course Articulation/ Alignment of the Curriculum	-0-	-0-	-0-
F. Instructional Materials and Equipment	<b>\$ 5,000</b>	-0-	-0-
G.1 Coordination	<b>\$12,000</b>	-0-	-0-
G.2 Research	<b>\$ 500</b>	-0-	-0-
G.3 Professional Development	<b>\$ 5,000</b>	-0-	-0-
<b>TOTAL:</b>	<b>90,000</b>	-0-	-0-

\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature, Chief Executive Officer

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature, Academic Senate President

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature, Chief Business Officer

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

**[2] 2007-2010 Basic Skills Completion and Improvement Rates for Credit Courses  
Narrative Response**

**Monterey Peninsula College**

**Annual Successful Course Completion Rate for Credit Basic Skills Courses (in percent)**

	2007-2008	2008-2009	2009-2010
Mathematics	55.3	56.4	59.3
Writing	64.0	52.7	56.5
Reading	63.5	63.8	66.4
ESL	76.4	75.8	74.8
All Basic Skills	68.1	64.7	65.2

**Improvement Rates for ESL and Credit Basic Skills Courses over three years (in percent)**

	2005/06 to 2007/08	2006/07 to 2008/09	2007/08 to 2009/10
Mathematics	55.7	50.0	54.0
Writing	53.6	53.1	59.1
Reading	57.5	59.6	65.8
ESL	49.5	55.9	41.8
All Basic Skills	55.1	54.8	60.8

PLEASE NOTE: The implementation of activities/interventions did not start at Monterey Peninsula College until academic year 2009-2010. We are not able to measure progress using the most recently released ARCC Basic Skills Supplemental Report data.

- In terms of expenditure from the basic skills allocation, what were the top five basic skills activities/interventions for your college during the last year? Identify these activities by the Effective Practices ID found on pages 106-138 in Basic Skills as a Foundation for Student Success in California Community Colleges.*

<b>Activity/intervention</b>	<b>Effective Practices ID</b>
PASS Learning Community: Learning Communities were formed with Basic Skills level English and Math classes with a one unit Personal Development class. Academic Supplemental Instruction was provided for the Math class and the same counselor who taught the Personal Development class provided "intrusive counseling" for all students in the program.	A.5.1 A.5.2 B.4.1 B.4.2. D.2.1 D.2.2 D.3.1 D.3.3 D.3.5 D.9.2 D.10.3 D.10.5
Math Learning Center Tutoring Support: Math tutors were funded to provide tutoring for Basic Skills Math students in our Math Learning Center.	A.5.1 D.9.2 D.10.2 D.10.3 D.105 D.106 D.10.7
Kurzweil Smartxt Project: Basic Skills English and ESL faculty were trained to use and integrate Kurzweil text-to-speech software into their classes to assist students in developing their reading and writing skills.	C.2.1 C.2.4 C.4.5 D.2.1 D.2.4

	D.3.3 D.9.2 D.10.3
Basic Skills Initiative Counselor: An adjunct counselor visited Basic Skills classes and provided both drop in and scheduled counseling for Basic Skills students, often engaging in “intrusive counseling” in consultation with Basic Skills faculty.	B.3.1 B.3.4 B.4.1 D.3.3 D.9.2
Mentoring for Basic Skills English Faculty: New Basic Skills English faculty were mentored by two experienced Basic Skills faculty.	C.2.2 C.2.4 C.2.5 C.2.6

2. *In what way do you think these five activities/interventions impacted your basic skills improvement and completion rates? Please explain.*

**NOTE: Implementation of interventions began 2009-2010 so ARCC data is not yet relevant.**

- **Partnering for Academic Success (PASS) Learning Community:** It created a truly supportive community. Students became very clear about college services, resources, and college expectations. Counseling and tutoring appear to have had a positive impact on retention, success and persistence. The surveys also reveal more positive attitudes towards college and a greater “sense of belonging”.
- **Math Learning Center Tutoring Support:** According to student surveys, Basic Skills students benefited from the tutoring.
- **Kurzweil Smartxt Project:** Student surveys indicated increases in ease of reading and understanding material and being able to catch errors in their writing. Faculty surveys reported increases in student interest, attention spans, quality of written work, reading comprehension and study skills—all of which tend to have a positive impact on completion and retention rates.
- **Basic Skills Counselor:** By visiting basic skills classrooms, counselors established a team identity with students and faculty and increased their knowledge of counseling services. Intrusive counseling supported some students before they dropped, failed, or left college. Developing education plans increased progress. Analysis of data is continuing.
- **Mentoring for Basic Skills English Faculty:** By meeting and communicating regularly, mentors were able to help new faculty identify problems and issues, and find solutions—impacting positively on student outcomes.

3. *What activity/intervention worked particularly well for your college/center? Please explain.*

PASS Learning Community has clearly worked well in its design, evaluation efforts, and results. This program has a paid coordinator who is adjunct faculty. She attends conferences and meetings related to learning communities, and has worked closely with our college researcher to design meaningful assessments. The coordinator and faculty collaborate and communicate well, and are reflective about the program. They have made significant changes in the program for the coming year based on interviews, surveys and outcomes.

4. *What activity/intervention didn't work well for your college/center? Please explain.*

Basic Skills Counseling: The project started off well, but because it is an adjunct faculty position, we did not have the same counselor continuing in the position, offering continuity for students and a solid knowledge base for the counselor. The counselor was unclear about what was expected, there was no evaluation component designed for the project, roles and responsibilities were not clearly defined, and supervision of the counselor was fragmented. Additionally, many students were not aware that a basic skills counselor was available. This coming year we still have an adjunct counselor, however we now have clear supervision, clear expectations, and an evaluation plan in place.

5. *What challenges did you face in engaging in these activities/interventions?*

- a. Inadequate funding and funding cuts, which impact tutoring, staffing, and course offerings. This includes reduction of matriculation services staff, and few sections of basic skills classes in reading offered.
- b. Large number of adjunct faculty teaching basic skills classes who may not be connected to college student services and may be isolated from other faculty.
- c. Connection between counseling and basic skills faculty not as strong as we would like it to be.
- d. Lack of regularly scheduled non-transferable personal development courses for Basic Skills students.

- e. Lack of time –faculty and staff are overloaded with work which makes involvement in innovation challenging.
- f. Lack of experience in mining available data to justify interventions and the N's for some interventions were too small to realize statistically significant differences between the intervention and comparison groups.
- g. Lack of dedicated computer lab space on campus for projects using technology and/or that are introducing technology to students.
- h. Change is always challenging, particularly in a small college where finding enough people to create momentum is difficult.

6. *What type of support, financial and otherwise, do you need to engage more deeply in these activities/interventions?*

- Help with analyses of projects. There are so many variables which affect this particularly vulnerable population and we are a small college with relatively few sections of Basic Skills classes, so our N's are low.

7. *Additional comments*

Like most colleges, we were negatively impacted last year by state budget cuts and uncertainties. These uncertainties in Academic Support and Counseling adversely affected planning.

Reporting only ARCC data makes understanding the successes and challenges of projects difficult. For instance, the faculty participating in the PASS Learning Community realized two things as they were discussing the relatively poor performance of the Spring Math cohort: (1) many students put off taking math until the end of their time at the college, so pairing the math class with an orientation to college 1-unit course doesn't make a lot of sense--instead perhaps a math lab would be a better class to pair with; (2) this particular group of students appeared to be one of those "hard to motivate", "not interested in learning" classes that every teacher has had at least once—they were hard to reach. These discussions have led the PASS faculty to plan a meeting with the Math faculty to problem-solve about these issues.

### [3] Data Analysis for Selected Activities

**PLEASE NOTE:** We are submitting preliminary data for two interventions (PASS Learning Community and Kurzweil Smartxt Project). The data have only begun to be analyzed, and were presented for the first time to the Basic Skills Initiative Committee at our first meeting of the semester on September 9, 2011 during which our committee approved this report. More data and further analysis will be conducted in the following months.

#### **Partnering for Academic Success (PASS) Learning Community**

**Please note that the N's are small.** In Fall 2010, there were two PASS learning communities--an English learning community and a math learning community. The English learning community consisted of two basic skills English courses, ENGL 301 (Introduction to Academic Writing) and ENGL 302 (Introduction to Academic Reading), paired with PERS 200 (Orientation to College), a one unit college success class. The math learning community consisted of a basic skills math course, MATH 351 (pre-algebra), paired with PERS 200 (Orientation to College).

In Spring 2011, we again offered the English and Math learning communities for our basic skills students. Please note, persistence data for Spring 2011 has not been collected yet.

#### **English Fall 2010 and Spring 2011 Cohorts**

##### **Fall 2010 English Learning Community Outcomes**

There were 23 students in the English learning community. We identified 17 students to serve as the comparison group. These 17 students were also enrolled in both ENGL 301 and ENGL 302 during the fall 2010 semester.

	PASS (ENGL 301 & 302 and PERS 200)		Comparison (ENGL 301 & 302 only)	
	N	%	N	%
Cohort in fall 2010	23	100.0%	17	100.0%
Students who were successful in Writing course	15	65.2%	14	82.4%
Students who were successful in Reading course	16	69.6%	8	47.1%
Students who were retained in both writing & reading until end of semester	16	69.6%	13	76.5%
Of the students who were retained, number who persisted to spring 2011	14	87.5%	10	76.9%
Of those who persisted, number who continued in English writing or reading sequence	11	78.6%	9	90.0%



	PASS (ENGL 301 & 302 and PERS 200)		Comparison (ENGL 301 & 302 only)	
<i>Of the original cohort, number that progressed to Writing 111</i>	<b>11</b>	<b>47.8%</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>35.3%</b>
<i>Of the original cohort, number that progressed to Reading 112</i>	<b>3</b>	<b>27.3%</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>11.1%</b>
<i>Number who repeated 301</i>	<b>0</b>	<b>0.0%</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>33.3%</b>
<i>Number who repeated 302</i>	<b>0</b>	<b>0.0%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0.0%</b>

For the English classes, we see a difference in success between the reading and writing classes. For the writing classes, a higher percentage of non-PASS students were successful than PASS students, while the opposite was true for the reading classes. A higher percentage of PASS students persisted to Spring than non-PASS students, although a higher percentage of non-PASS students persisted in English, due in part to a large percentage of non-PASS students retaking 301.

### **Spring 2011 English Learning Community Outcomes**

There were 13 students in the English learning community. We identified 43 students to serve as the comparison groups. These 43 students were also enrolled in both ENGL 301 and ENGL 302 during the spring 2011 semester.

	PASS (ENGL 301 & 302 and PERS 200)		Comparison (ENGL 301 & 302 only)	
	N	%	N	%
Cohort in spring 2011	13	100.0%	43	100.0%
Students who were successful in Writing course	10	76.9%	28	65.1%
Students who were successful in Reading course	11	84.6%	27	62.8%
Students who were retained in both writing & reading until end of semester	12	92.3%	28	65.1%

In Spring 2011 semester we see a higher percentage of success for PASS students in every category than the comparison group. The retention percentage for staying in both the reading and writing sections was extremely high for the PASS group.

**Fall 2010 and Spring 2011 PASS and Comparison Outcomes**

	PASS		Comparison	
	Fall	Spring	Fall	Spring
Students who were successful in Writing course	65.2%	76.9%	82.4%	65.1%
Students who were successful in Reading course	69.6%	84.6%	47%	62.8%
Students who were retained in both writing & reading until end of semester	69.6%	92.3%	76.5%	65.1%

When we compare the fall and spring percentages for success and retention, we see the PASS program showed impressive gains in success in each class and in retention between Fall and Spring. This, in part can be attributed to the efforts of faculty fine-tuning the program.

**Math Fall 2010 and Spring 2011 Cohorts**

**Fall 2010 Outcomes for Math Learning Community**

There were 19 students in the math learning community in Fall 2010. We identified 74 students in a comparison group. These are students who were enrolled in a non-PASS section of MATH 351. The retention, success, and persistence rates for the PASS and comparison students are shown in the table below.

	PASS (MATH 351 & PERS 200)		Comparison (MATH 351 only)	
	N	%	N	%
Cohort in fall 2010	19	100.0%	74	100.0%
Students who were successful	12	63.2%	45	60.8%
Students who were retained until end of semester	15	78.9%	62	83.8%
Of the students who were retained, number who persisted to spring 2011	14	93.3%	54	87.1%
Of those who persisted, number who continued in math	10	71.4%	38	70.4%
<i>Of the original cohort, number that progressed to Math 261</i>	<i>10</i>	<i>52.6%</i>	<i>36</i>	<i>48.6%</i>
<i>Of the original cohort, number that repeated Math 351</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>0.0%</i>	<i>2</i>	<i>5.3%</i>

For the Math students, the PASS group had a slightly higher percentage of success, and slightly lower percentage of retention than the non-PASS group. However, a higher percentage of PASS students persisted to Spring semester than non-PASS students. The percentages of students continuing in Math were essentially identical.

### Spring 2011 Outcomes for Math Learning Community

There were 24 students in the math learning community in spring 2011. We identified 28 students in a comparison group. These are students who were enrolled in a non-PASS section of MATH 351. The retention, success, and persistence rates for the PASS and comparison students are shown in the table below.

	PASS (MATH 351 & PERS 200)		Comparison (MATH 351 only)	
	N	%	N	%
Cohort in spring 2011	24	100.0%	28	100.0%
Students who were successful	11	45.8%	23	82.1%
Students who were retained until end of semester	15	62.5%	26	92.9%

These findings lead to a discussion within the PASS Learning Community faculty about why the math cohorts did not do as well as the English cohorts in general and in comparison to the non-PASS class. First, in any class-to-class comparison, different instructors' teaching styles can affect student performance as well as can class characteristics (there was a different adjunct math faculty for the PASS class between the Fall and Spring semesters). Additionally in this instance, the PASS faculty were struck by the lack of motivation in this particular PASS math class. With further discussion, the PASS faculty decided that our PERS 200 Orientation to College class is probably not an appropriate pairing for the basic skills math classes because many MPC students wait to take math until they have completed most of their other college course requirements. It may be more appropriate to link the math class with a Math Study Skills class which would focus on note taking, using your math book, group work, how to think about math, process of working through problems, etc. The PASS faculty are going to investigate successful models at other campuses. Their discussion also led to focusing solely on English classes for PASS for the 2011-2012 year while further analyses take place.

### Kurzweil Smartxt

#### Software Usage Spring 2011

Please note that there were many different measures of the effects of this program which have not been analyzed yet. Software usage is just one measure.

During the spring 2011 semester we gathered information on students' actual usage of the Kurzweil software as well as their perceptions on the usefulness of the software. The actual usage data was downloaded from the Kurzweil software and covered the period from January 2, 2011 to June 2, 2011.

Students' perceptions of the usefulness of the software were gathered through a survey administered in two classes that used the Kurzweil software during spring 2011. There were four classes that used the software and completed surveys.

The Kurzweil usage data indicates that the software was used in 9 class sections, including English 301, 321 and Learning Skills 325, 329, 331B, 331C, and 333/331. The software was available in the English Study Skills Center, the English as a Second Language Lab, the High Tech Center for students with disabilities, and the Marina satellite campus lab. Software data indicates that the software was accessed for a total of 1,708 sessions.

Students were provided with a personal login and password for Kurzweil; however, they also had the option of using a universal login and password. Because a number of students used the universal login, the exact number of student accounts is not known. We do know there were at least 185 students who logged in to the software at least one time during the spring 2011 semester. The difficulty of measuring usage is being addressed for the current year.

In a pilot survey, students' perceptions of how often they used the Kurzweil software are presented in the table below.

<b>Frequency</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>%</b>
More than once a week	1	3.7%
Once a week	5	18.5%
Several times during the semester	16	59.3%
Rarely or never	5	18.5%

The actual usage statistics indicate that the number of times that students logged into the software ranged from 1 – 59 times during the semester. Forty-eight of the students who used their personal login used that login only one time during the semester. The median number of logins was four sessions.

Based on the data that was collected, there appeared to be significant variability in students' usage time. The length of each Kurzweil session varied greatly from as little as less than one minute to 7.5 hours per session (we excluded any logins of over 7.5 hours). Over the course of the semester, the total per student session time ranged from one minute to over 60 hours.

There was also variability among classes or labs in the amount of time that Kurzweil was used. The table below shows the total number of hours that students used Kurzweil in each of the classes or learning centers.

<b>Lab/ Learning Center</b>	<b>Hours</b>	<b>Course</b>	<b>Hours</b>
ESSC	1	ENGL 301 - Dennehy 4398	22
ESL	87	ENGL 301 - Dennehy 4396	42
		ENGL 301 - Gerard	33
AD 102	46	ENGL 321 - Gerard	72
AD 103 - Rozman	38	LNSK 325	179
		LNSK 329	304
Marina	16	LNSK 331B	162
		LNSK 331C	85
		LNSK 333/331	83

Note: Any individual session length over 7.5 hours was not included in the table.

These initial data confirm that the program is being used, and that there have been some issues with data collection due in part to the program itself. These issues are being addressed for the upcoming year.

Although there are problems with comparisons of outcomes between different classes, particularly when the classes are taught by different instructors, we did compare retention rates between a class where the students were required by their instructor to use the Kurzweil software and another class where Kurzweil was not offered. In the Kurzweil section 81.82% of the students were retained compared to 71.43% retained in the non-Kurzweil section. While these results should be viewed with caution, they are encouraging. With the expansion of the Kurzweil project in 2011-2012, we will be conducting pre- and post-surveys and using other analytical approaches to assist in calculating the effectiveness of the intervention. A case study model is being developed to analyze and evaluate differences between high-end users, mid-level users and low-end users of the software.

## [4a] 2011-2012 ESL/Basic Skills Action Plan

District: Monterey Peninsula College

College: Monterey Peninsula College

*Due on or before October 10, 2011*

Planned Action	Effective Practice ID	Target Date for Completion	Responsible Person(s)/ Department(s)	Measurable Outcome	Criteria that Demonstrates Effectiveness
A. Provide Dialogue and Discussion opportunities for new and continuing English and Math Basic Skills faculty	A.7.2 A.7.4 A.7.5 C.2.1 C.2.2 C.2.4 C.2.5 C.2.6 C.3.2 C.4.1 C.5.1 D.2.4 D.6.1	May 30, 2012	Basic Skills English and Math Faculty	Faculty participants will meet four times per semester for face-to-face collaboration sessions, as well as communicate via email and phone to discuss effective teaching strategies for basic skills students. There will be increased dialogue and problem solving discussions among participants.  A plan will be developed for basic skills faculty professional development needs for academic year 2012-2013.	Participants have more confidence, are aware of different teaching strategies, and are better able to refer students to student services and resources, as measured by surveys of participating faculty.  Participants will be able to identify areas they would like to learn more about, such as accelerated learning, classroom research, assisting students with life skills, etc.
B. Develop a plan for institutionalization and possible expansion of Basic Skills Learning Communities	D.1.1 D.1.2 D.1.3 D.2.4 D.3.1 D.6.1	December 1, 2011	PASS coordinator, BSI Co-Chairs, English, Math and Counseling faculty	A plan will be developed for scheduling, advertising and evaluating Basic Skills Learning Communities for Fall 2012 and Spring 2013. Records will be kept by all participating faculty to document time spent in non-classroom faculty and coordinator activities. Discussions will begin between BSI and the English and Math departments to explore additional learning communities.	Basic skills learning communities will continue to show meaningful success, retention, and progression rates through their established evaluation process, which will support the case for institutionalization and the need for additional learning communities.
C. Counseling services for basic skills students integrated into counseling department	B.3.1 B.3.2 B.3.4 D.3.1 D.3.3 D.3.5 D.9.2 D.10.3	June 2012	Chair Counseling Division, BSI Faculty Co-Chair, Basic Skills Counselor	Basic skills counselor attends counseling department meetings and Basic Skills Initiative Committee meetings, and visits Basic Skills classes. Basic skills students' needs are discussed regularly at counseling department meetings by Basic Skills Initiative counselor and Counseling Chair.	The number of basic skills students seeing counselors increases and more referrals to a counselor are made by Basic Skills faculty.  Communication between Basic Skills faculty and general counselors increases as measured by pre- and post-surveys.

D. Provide math tutoring for more basic skills math students.	D.2.2 D.3.3 D.10.2 D.10.3 D.10.5	May 30, 2012	Math Learning Center Coordinator	The Math Learning Center (MLC) Coordinator or basic skills adjunct will visit all Basic Skills Math classes the first week of class each semester. The number of basic skills students using the Math Learning Center will increase from previous years.	There will be a 10% increase in number of basic skills students served in the MLC compared to 2010-11 year.
E. Provide Kurzweil Smartxt to more faculty and students	C.2.1 C.2.4 C.3.2 D.3.3 D.9.2 D.10.3	May 30, 2012	Kurzweil Coordinator, English Study Skills Center and Reading Center Director, Reading Center Coordinator	Kurzweil Smartxt will be offered in the Reading Center for the first time; more faculty will be introduced and coached in using the program in their classes.	There will be a 10% increase in faculty using the software and a 10% increase in student use compared to 2010-11 year.  Twenty-five percent of students will indicate more confidence than before in their reading/comprehension and writing skills after using the program.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature, Chief Executive Officer

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature, Academic Senate President

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

## **[4b] Long-Term Goals (5 yrs.) for ESL/Basic Skills**

(Use this form to update the 5-year long-term goals only if the long term goals have changed)

**This academic year, the Basic Skills Initiative Committee will be re-examining our 5 year goals to better reflect our planning for large scale changes which are sustainable and measureable to support students in their progress through the developmental sequences to college level classes.**

**[5] 2011-2012 ESL/Basic Skills Allocation Expenditure Plan  
Due October 10, 2011**

Basic Skills funds allocated in 2011-2012 expire as of June 30, 2014, and cannot be expended beyond that date. All unexpended funds as of July 1, 2014, will revert back to the State Budget. Enter the total planned expenditure by category through the expiration of the funds on July 1, 2014. Original signatures are required of the Chief Executive Officer and the Academic Senate President.

**District:** Monterey Peninsula Community College District

**College:** Monterey Peninsula College

**2011-2012 Basic Skills Contact Information** (Provide the names, positions, and emails for all individuals at your college who should receive communications regarding the Basic Skills Allocation):

Name	Position	Email
Stephen Ma	Vice President Administrative Services	sma@mpc.edu
Laura Franklin	Dean of Instruction	lfranklin@mpc.edu
Rosemary Barrios	Controller	rbarrios@mpc.edu
Connie Andrews	Budget & Operations	candrews@mpc.edu

Category	Planned Expenditure by Category
A. Program and Curriculum Planning and Development	\$20,716
B. Student Assessment	\$ 2,000
C. Advisement and Counseling Services	\$22,784
D. Supplemental Instruction and Tutoring	\$22,000
E. Articulation	-0-
F. Instructional Materials and Equipment	\$ 5,000
G.1 Coordination	\$12,000
G.2 Research	\$ 500
G.3 Professional Development	\$ 5,000
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>90,000</b>

\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature, Chief Executive Officer

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature, Academic Senate President

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date