

YEARLY PLANNING DISCUSSION TEMPLATE

General Questions

Program Name English Language Development Academic Year 2025-2026

1. Has your program mission or primary function changed in the last year?

The program mission and primary function have not changed.

2. Were there any noteworthy changes to the program over the past year? (eg, new courses, degrees, certificates, articulation agreements)

A unit was added to the ELD 533/ELDN 7533 Advanced Writing course. This course is designed to assist students in research writing, which is necessary for transfer level English classes. This change was also reflected in the ELD Certificate of Accomplishment requirements.

3. Is your two-year program map in place and were there any challenges maintaining the planned schedule?

Yes, the two-year program map is in place.

4. Were there any staffing changes?

A permanent coordinator was hired for the ELD Center in the fall of 2025.

5. What were your program successes in your area of focus last year? (Student Services)

After reviewing Starfish, we found that the majority of the mirrored-course (credit and noncredit) students have CSEPs.

Instructors and counselors now have access to Starfish to view whether or not noncredit students have CSEPs.

A permanent coordinator was hired for the ELD Center.

Instructor tutoring hours in the ELD Center were increased during the 2025-2026 academic year.

We continued to offer student services workshops as well as registration and Comprehensive Student Education Plan reviews with counselors.

Most of the mirrored ELD courses are low or zero cost for textbooks.

We met with counselors to discuss ELD student placement in mirrored courses.

CHALLENGES

- Some students do not see and/or use the placement tool.
- There are limitations in the Qualtrics software which only allows students to make one error before placement. This often results in students being misplaced.

ACTIONS TAKEN

- A flyer with a link to the ELD self-guided placement tool was created to increase student awareness and use of the tool. The flyer has been posted around campus.
- Instructors in mirrored classes agreed to conduct informal assessments during the first week of class so that students who were misplaced could be advised of a more appropriate level.
- Bilingual counseling staff familiar with the ELD program were identified in order to assist students with course placement.

Learning Outcomes Assessment

a. Please summarize key results from this year's assessment.

We reviewed the Fall 2025 SLO data for mirrored courses and found that the CR PLO success rate was 84% while the NCR PLO success rate was 87.5%. We are above the AHC SLO target of 70%. However, we feel that the data might be skewed by whether or not students who no longer attend class drop themselves or are dropped by their instructor(s).

If the data is accurate, it reflects that the majority of students in both CR and NCR mirrored classes who persist in the class to the end of the term are able to demonstrate the learning outcomes.

b. Please summarize your reflections, analysis, and interpretation of the learning outcome assessment and data.

We were not surprised to find that 70% or more of students who complete courses (credit or noncredit) in reading, writing, grammar, and conversation are meeting the Program Learning Outcomes.

The larger question is why some students do not complete the semester. Identifying the causes for the lack of completion is a goal going forward.

c. Please summarize recommendations and/or accolades that were made within the program/department.

We met with the Dayana Zepeda and the mirrored course instructors to determine ways to improve the student placement, persistence, and success.

We will continue to informally assess students the first two week of the semester so that students can make an informed decision about their placement.

For all the mirrored courses, we aligned the credit and noncredit learning outcomes to match each other in SPOL.

In Fall 2026 we will utilize our tutors to call and survey students who have stopped attending. Information about why students stop attending will help us with future planning.

- d. Please review and attach any *changes* to planning documentation, including PLO rubrics, associations, and cycles planning.**

No changes are planned.

Distance Education (DE) Modality Course Design Peer Review Update (Please attach documentation extracted from the *Rubric for Assessing Regular and Substantive Interaction in Distance Education Courses*)

- a. Which courses were reviewed for regular and substantive interactions (RSI)?**

We do not offer ELD courses via DE Modality at this time.

- b. What were some key findings regarding RSI?**

- **Some strengths:**

- **Some areas of possible improvement:**

- c. What is the plan for improvement?**

CTE two-year review of labor market data and pre-requisite review

- a. Does the program meet documented labor market demand?**

Area of Focus Discussion Template

ENROLLMENT TRENDS AND EFFICIENCY

Enrollment Trends and Efficiency – look for areas of growth or decline, relationship to the college and similar programs, and head count (enrollment and full-time equivalents for students and full-time equivalents faculty). Sample activities include the following:

Possible topics:

- Review FTES, headcount and enrollment trends disaggregated by population groups.
- Assess trends in productivity.
- Review retention and success rates by modality and disaggregated by population groups.
- Analyze the throughput of students from every completion and assess time to completion and disproportionate impact.
- Collaborate with guided pathways success teams to determine if programmatic barriers exist.
- Establish program goals for success rates.

1. What data were analyzed and what were the main conclusions?

We compared success, retention, and persistence rates between the average AHC student and the average credit ELD student. We also compared enrollment by gender for AHC versus ELD. The noncredit student data was not available for analysis.

2024-2025 Retention

AHC Retention Average – 89%

ELD Retention Average – 90%

There is no significant difference in retention averages for AHC and ELD students.

2024-2025 Success

AHC Success Average – 75%

ELD Success Average – 58.4%

There is a significant difference in success rates between AHC and ELD students. The lower number for ELD students could be attributed to a number of factors including: 1) inaccurate initial placement into a proficiency level 2) lower primary/secondary educational levels 3) economic reasons such as course incompleteness due to seasonal employment.

There is a disparity between the mirrored-course SLO success data (86%) and AHC success data (58.5%). This difference in “success” rates may be due to the fact SPOL allows instructors to exempt students from assessment who do not complete the semester and/or do not turn in assignments.

Persistence

2020-2024 AHC Fall to Spring Persistence Average – 66%

2025-2026 ELD Fall to Spring Persistence Average – 64%

There is no significant difference between the persistence of the average AHC and ELD student. We continue to encourage to register for future semesters with the guidance of a counselor via our registration events in the ELD Center.

2024-2025 Enrollment by Gender

AHC Male – 45%

AHC Female – 53%

AHC Nonbinary – 2%

ELD Male – 35%

ELD Female – 59%

ELD Nonbinary – 5%

While the AHC enrollment of males and females is fairly even, there are fewer males enrolled in the ELD program than the AHC average. We attribute this to the economic responsibilities that men from traditional cultures have as the breadwinner of the family.

2024-2025 Enrollment by Age

Age	AHC	ELD
>20	42%	55%
20-24	26%	24%
25-34	17%	14%
35-54	16%	15%
55+	6%	0%

While most enrollment by age percentages are similar between AHC and ELD students, there is a significant difference between the under 20-year-olds. ELD courses have more students under 20 than the AHC average.

There were no 55+ students enrolled in ELD classes; however, this student population tends to enroll in the mirrored noncredit ELDN sections. We did not have access to the enrollment by age data for ELDN students.

2019 ESL Program versus 2025 ELD/ELDN Program

We were also interested in comparing the enrollment before and after mirroring our classes to include noncredit students.

Success Rate

Success Fall 2019 (7 classes) – 65%

Success Fall 2025 (8 classes) – 79%

We cannot be certain about the cause of the increase in student success; however, it may be due to students' increased knowledge and access to academic and basic needs services.

Enrollment Comparison

2019-2020 ESL (credit only) - 327

2025-2026 ELD/ELDN (credit and noncredit) – 335

We were surprised to find that the enrollments were almost identical. We think that some enrollment was lost due to AB 705/1705 restrictions on ELD high school students. On the other hand, we gained students by “mirroring” our courses with noncredit.

Rate of Attendance Comparison

Nonmirrored ELDN – 48% of total contact hours

ELDN Mirrored Courses – 74% of total contact hours

The noncredit students attending mirrored courses appear to attend classes more regularly than traditional noncredit ELDN courses.

2. Based on the data analysis and looking through a lens of equity, what do you perceive as *challenges* with student success or access in your area of focus?

Challenges with Student Success

Our population has always been more vulnerable than the average AHC population due to immigration policy as well as economic, linguistic, and cultural barriers. We strive to provide information about support services to students enrolled in our program in order to overcome these challenges.

Challenges with Student Placement

The current ELD/ELDN computerized self-guided placement tool has two limitations that reduce its effectiveness. First, not all students take the self-guided before enrolling in a course. Many students select their ELD/ELDN course(s) based on the day and time of availability. Second, the self-guided placement tool relies on Qualtrics software which will only allow for one incorrect answer before placing the student. As a result, students may place lower than their actual skill level.

Challenges with Access to Course Offerings

There is only one ELD/ELDN mirrored course offering at night, which is a combined high intermediate/low advanced course. As a result, the skill level of the student population varies significantly. Because of this, some students are unchallenged while other are overwhelmed. This situation is not good for student retention and success.

3. What are your plans for change or *innovation*?

Placement

The ELD/ELDN instructors and counselors have met to discuss the limitations of the placement tool. Andria Purdue-Keiser created a flyer with a QR code that links to the self-guided placement tool. This flyer was distributed and posted around campus in Fall 2025.

ELD/ELDN instructors in mirrored courses are conducting informal reading and writing assessments during the first two weeks of the semester to provide students with additional information about their self-placement.

Night Course Offerings

The ELD/ELDN instructors and counselors met March 2026 to discuss effective scheduling options. Beginning Spring 2027, the program will offer two ELD/ELDN night courses. These courses will be taught on the same days and times so that students will be able to select a more level-appropriate course to meet their needs.

Grammar Labs

The labs for the grammar series of courses will now feature interactive listening and speaking activities which reinforce the grammatical concepts learned in the class.

Homework

We are currently discussing ways to retain students who have little free time to complete homework and lab assignments while still maintaining rigorous academic standards for students who can complete all the assignments.

4. How will you *measure* the results of your plans to determine if they are successful?

Placement

We will ask students in all ELD/ELDN mirrored courses if they have ever used the self-guided placement tool. If students indicate they used the self-guided placement tool, we will also ask if they enrolled in the course that it recommended. We will compare student surveys with instructors' assessment of the students' proficiency level.

Night Course Offerings

We will measure the success of offering two night ELD/ELDN courses by enrollment.

Grammar Labs

We plan to give a survey at the end of Summer 2026, Fall 2026, and Spring 2027 terms to see if students feel the new oral/aural lab activities improved their language skills.

Validation for Program Planning Process: If you have chosen to do the Validation this year, please explain your process and the findings.

1. Who have you identified to validate your findings? (Could include Guided Pathway Success Teams, Advisory Committee Members, related faculty, industry partners or higher education partners)
2. Are there specific recommendations regarding the core topic responses from the validation team?

Program Review Signature Page:

Melinda Nishimori

Melinda Nishimori (May 1, 2026 13:15:29 PDT)

George B. Phelan

George B. Phelan (May 1, 2026 13:16:16 PDT)

Program Review Lead

May 1, 2026

Date



Program Dean

May 15, 2026

Date



Vice President, Academic Affairs

Jun 11, 2026

Date











ELD 2025-2026 Annual Program Update- Enrollment Trends and Efficiency

Final Audit Report

2026-06-11


Created:	2026-05-01
By:	Lilian Ojeda (lojeda@hancockcollege.edu)
Status:	Signed
Transaction ID:	CBJCHBCAABAAuS83aK_hZB3r7-hof7qFLZQwJqJyqjAU

"ELD 2025-2026 Annual Program Update- Enrollment Trends and Efficiency" History

-  Document created by Lilian Ojeda (lojeda@hancockcollege.edu)
2026-05-01 - 4:38:45 PM GMT- IP address: 209.129.94.61
-  Document emailed to Melinda Nishimori (mnishimori@hancockcollege.edu) for signature
2026-05-01 - 4:40:10 PM GMT
-  Email viewed by Melinda Nishimori (mnishimori@hancockcollege.edu)
2026-05-01 - 8:05:57 PM GMT- IP address: 104.47.55.126
-  Document e-signed by Melinda Nishimori (mnishimori@hancockcollege.edu)
Signature Date: 2026-05-01 - 8:15:29 PM GMT - Time Source: server- IP address: 98.234.236.152
-  Document emailed to gphelan@hancockcollege.edu for signature
2026-05-01 - 8:15:31 PM GMT
-  Email viewed by gphelan@hancockcollege.edu
2026-05-01 - 8:15:46 PM GMT- IP address: 104.47.55.126
-  Signer gphelan@hancockcollege.edu entered name at signing as George B. Phelan
2026-05-01 - 8:16:14 PM GMT- IP address: 209.129.94.61
-  Document e-signed by George B. Phelan (gphelan@hancockcollege.edu)
Signature Date: 2026-05-01 - 8:16:16 PM GMT - Time Source: server- IP address: 209.129.94.61
-  Document emailed to Mary Patrick (mary.patrick@hancockcollege.edu) for signature
2026-05-01 - 8:16:17 PM GMT
-  Email viewed by Mary Patrick (mary.patrick@hancockcollege.edu)
2026-05-05 - 3:48:35 PM GMT- IP address: 209.129.94.61

 New document URL requested by Mary Patrick (mary.patrick@hancockcollege.edu)


2026-05-15 - 3:35:09 PM GMT- IP address: 209.129.94.61

 Email viewed by Mary Patrick (mary.patrick@hancockcollege.edu)


2026-05-15 - 3:35:16 PM GMT- IP address: 209.129.94.61

 Document e-signed by Mary Patrick (mary.patrick@hancockcollege.edu)

Signature Date: 2026-05-15 - 3:39:08 PM GMT - Time Source: server- IP address: 209.129.94.61 - Signature Appearance Selected: IMAGE

 Document emailed to Robert Curry (rcurry@hancockcollege.edu) for signature


2026-05-15 - 3:39:10 PM GMT

 Email viewed by Robert Curry (rcurry@hancockcollege.edu)

2026-05-15 - 3:40:40 PM GMT- IP address: 104.47.58.126

 New document URL requested by Robert Curry (rcurry@hancockcollege.edu)

2026-06-11 - 11:35:49 PM GMT- IP address: 209.129.94.61

 Email viewed by Robert Curry (rcurry@hancockcollege.edu)

2026-06-11 - 11:36:00 PM GMT- IP address: 104.47.58.126

 Document e-signed by Robert Curry (rcurry@hancockcollege.edu)

Signature Date: 2026-06-11 - 11:38:26 PM GMT - Time Source: server- IP address: 209.129.94.61 - Signature Appearance Selected: IMAGE

 Agreement completed.

2026-06-11 - 11:38:26 PM GMT