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Several years ago the term "new student" often referred to economically and/or educationally disadvantaged students that were entering two-year colleges through the "open-door". More recently the term non-traditional student has also been used to describe other new students; people seeking a career change, women and working adults returning to update or acquire employment skills, or individuals simply sampling the expanding offerings of the two-year college.

The institution has recognized the needs of the new and newer students for educational experiences of a remedial or developmental nature in order to increase their chances of success in their academic and career pursuits. This institutional recognition has given rise to a wide variety of program efforts across the state that are often referred to as developmental studies. There is however no universally accepted definition of developmental studies. For the purposes of this study and publication an inclusive description is appropriate: Developmental studies programs are organized educational efforts providing a range of learning experiences intended to ameliorate educational skill and attitude deficiencies of students.

The goal with this sourcebook is to compile and summarize the state of the art in this diverse area with particular focus on occupational education students. The sourcebook is a guide to what is happening and a resource of procedures and materials for staff members seeking to initiate or improve existing programs. The publication also provides a human resource list -- names and addresses of two-year college staff members working in developmental studies programs who have agreed to share ideas and problems with others.
Source of Information. The information in this sourcebook is derived from data collected during a statewide survey of developmental program efforts. The sample was comprised of 51 two-year colleges that offer programs in occupational education and 10 SUNY Educational Opportunity Centers. The total return rate was 58% with responses from five agricultural and technical colleges, six private colleges, four EOC centers, and 20 community colleges -- three of which were inner-city/urban. The questionnaires consisted of items that had been derived from four sources: a) survey of the literature to procure a general overview; b) review of VEA-funded developmental projects (1970-76) to attain a sense of programming for occupational students; c) written reactions of the project advisory committee to open-ended questions in order to obtain a valid vocabulary/concept pool, and d) staff experiences and field inputs.

The responses have been synthesized from the returned questionnaires by the project staff, and arranged into this sourcebook with assistance from cooperating two-year college staff identified in the acknowledgements.

Format of Sourcebook. Four major parts constitute the handbook. Part I, State of the Art, reports the survey date in summary form. Part II, Program Descriptors, contains three sections which consist of a scenario of a composite program based on survey data, a statement in recognition of diversity among programmatic efforts and a summary of program commonalities and standards. Part III, Program Resources, identifies, by component, relationships between instructional resources and selected characteristics of settings in which they exist.
Part IV, Human Resources, lists college staff members working in developmental studies programs who have agreed to be identified as resource personnel and willing to share with others. Attachments supplement the information presented in the four parts of the document.

**Delimitations.** The reader is reminded that the contents of this sourcebook are based upon self-assessment data from respondents. Although bias must be present, the data does not appear to be unreasonable. Also, the authors know of several worthy programs that are not included in the list of respondents because staff members chose not to respond to the request for information. The response rate and subjective nature of the data notwithstanding, we feel that the sourcebook can be a valuable tool. Too often in education, information is not shared because it requires reader judgment and interpretation. In this case, we feel that sharing is appropriate in hopes that the critical instructional success variable, the teacher, might locate an otherwise hidden resource, concept or strategy.
STATE of the ART

Part I provides a summary of survey results related to developmental program descriptors and the environmental characteristics in which they function. The diversity of programs becomes less evident in this kind of summation; however, it does reflect the state of the art as reported. The data are the perceptions of respondents from 35 institutions. For easy reference, a question-and-answer format is employed. Percentages do not always total 100 due to rounding and multiple responses.

What is a general description of the total student body?

-- Socio-economic level
  upper levels: 2%
  middle levels: 55%
  lower levels: 43%

-- Background
  inner-city: 13%
  suburban-urban: 47%
  suburban-rural: 38%

-- Minority Population
  less than 5%: 32%
  5% to 25%: 41%
  26% to 50%: 9%
  over 50%: 9%
  no response: 9%

-- Goal Orientation
  strong: 21%
  moderate: 47%
  weak: 32%
--- Common Needs of Student Body

Academic:
- reading skills: 94%
- study skills: 94%
- communication skills: 84%
- math skills: 69%

Non-Academic:
- motivation: 72%
- career decision-making skills: 72%
- knowledge of self: 59%
- personal goal setting: 53%
- ability to cope with cultural gaps: 25%

What is a general description of the total college faculty?

Responses to critical items relative to faculty are summarized below:

--- Faculty Attitudes Toward Non-Traditional Students
- a positive attitude: 28%
- a moderate/neutral attitude: 47%
- a negative attitude: 25%

--- Faculty Attitudes Toward Value of Career Programs
- high value: 75%
- moderate value: 16%
- no value: 6%

--- Climate for Faculty Freedom and Staff Inputs
- very encouraging: 63%
- moderately encouraging: 37%
- restrictive: 0%
What generally is the institutional response to needs?

Three items addressed the institutional aspect of climate -- specifically in terms of student needs, community pressures and faculty needs. As the responses to the three items are similar, they are summarized as one item.

-- Responsiveness of Institution to Needs
   active: 41%
   moderately active: 50%
   passive: 19%

What general characteristics constitute developmental programs?

Selected characteristics provide general information relative to programmatic structure, as subsequently summarized.

-- Identified Program Patterns
   block-scheduling: 28%
   skill and remedial courses: 82%
   skill centers: 50%
   supplementary services/assistance: 53%
   each instructor assumes responsibility: 9%

-- Current Source of Funding
   college funds: 65%
   grant funds: 13%
   combination grant/college funds: 19%
   other: 10%

-- Recruitment Procedures
   testing during orientation: 53%
   student self-selection: 50%
   faculty recommendation/referral: 40%
   special recruitment activities: 35%
   selection by admission personnel: 28%
   selection by faculty and admissions personnel: 25%
   faculty/staff review: 19%
-- Criteria Used in Selection Process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>standardized test scores:</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>high school records:</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>recommendations from high school counselors:</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>recommendations from high school staff:</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>skill test scores:</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other, i.e. self-selection:</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What is a general description of students enrolled in career-oriented or occupational education programs?

Input was received from faculty and staff at two-year institutions offering programs in occupational education. However, not all students at each of these campuses are enrolled in a career program. In order to establish perspective, responses to demographic items relative to the target group are summarized.

-- Percent of Student Body Enrolled in Occupational Programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Enrollment</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>over 60%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-60%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>under 40%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

-- Percent of Students Served by Developmental Programs That Are Enrolled in Occupational Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Enrollment</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>over 75%</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>about 50%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>less than 40%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unable to estimate</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

-- Description of Primary Audience Served by Developmental Programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Audience</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>day students:</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>full-time students:</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>degree students:</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>certificate program students:</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pre-program students:</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>part-time students:</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>general studies students:</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other; i.e. community center, evening:</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Procedures Used by Occupational Students to Enter Developmental Programs

- volunteer: 44%
- faculty advisement: 53%
- admission scheduling: 40%
- other; i.e. testing, counseling, high school records: 19%

How are developmental efforts generally viewed in terms of effectiveness?

In order to provide an initial reference to effectiveness of developmental/remedial efforts, two subjective ratings were requested; 1) how they rated their program, and 2) how they perceive that others would rate their program.

Rating of Overall Success of Program

- very successful: 62%
- moderately successful: 16%
- less successful: 6%
- no response: 16%

(The criteria on which these judgments were made are listed in terms of the frequency identified.)

- student feedback (40%)
- retention rate (38%)
- GPA or academic achievement (28%)
- staff judgments (13%)
- testing measures (13%)
- faculty-staff response (9%)
- placement rate (6%)
- completion of developmental/remedial program (6%)
- administrative approval (3%)
- availability of services (3%)
- student-teacher relationships (3%)

Rating of How Other Faculty and Staff Would Perceive Overall Success of Program

- very successful: 41%
- moderately successful: 25%
- less successful: 16%
- no response: 18%
These two ratings of total program success are summarized by mean average on a scale of 1-5. The data indicates that programs are viewed as better than moderately successful by respondents (3.7), however other faculty tends to view them less so (3.1).

Each program has discrete characteristics. Diversity among efforts remains a constant. The design of programs as reflected by data can be generally categorized into four basic programmatic approaches as follows:

1) Block Scheduling: usually four credit-bearing courses that most, if not all, developmental students take for one semester; subjects include reading, writing and study skills in most programs, mathematics, and vocational-personal guidance in many programs.
   (Frequency of Use: 30% combined with other designs; 13% Block only.)

2) Centers: usually a physical area for a learning center or skill center that provides for a focus for the program's learning activities, individualized instruction, referral, and audio-visual and/or material resources.
   (Frequency of Use: 67% combined with other designs; 7% Centers only.)

3) Designated Courses: usually one or two credit courses in basic language and study skills and/or a course in one or more departments that has been designed as a remedial or developmental course in a particular subject field (i.e. communication, math, physics, social science, personal psychology).
   (Frequency of Use: 60% combined with other designs; 13% Courses only.)

4) Integrated Teaching: a policy with and the responsibility for conscious effort to integrate remedial or developmental instruction in regular course offerings as needed by the students enrolled.
   (Frequency of Use: 10%.)

Ratings of overall success within each programmatic approach did not vary appreciably from the mean:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programmatic Approach</th>
<th>Overall Faculty Rating</th>
<th>Other Faculty Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Block Approach</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Center Approach</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course/Teaching</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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**Self-Assessment of Program Components.** Respondents were also asked to rate their respective program components on a continuum with end points of "most successful" and "least successful". Approximately 60% of the respondents rated two or more components. These data are summarized as mean ratings in the following frequency table.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Components</th>
<th>Least Successful</th>
<th>Most Successful</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study Skills</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational/Personal</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision-Making</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tutoring</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counseling and Related</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>7</strong></td>
<td><strong>25</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Percentage</strong></td>
<td><strong>11%</strong></td>
<td><strong>38%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of the components that were rated by a minimum of 10 respondents, reading was seen as most successful by the largest percentage (46%) followed by math and study skills (37%).
The self-assessment responses were used as a criteria from which to develop a composite of a mythical most successful program. The programs included in this composite profile were selected on these criteria:

- a minimum of one rating of four or above on the overall program assessment rating.
- a minimum of two program components rated at "most successful".

Five programs met both criteria. The figures given in the text are a mean average of responses given by the five programs to the questionnaire items, expressed on a scale of one to five. All data is subjective, therefore interpretations should be made with caution. The composite does however provide a kind of performance standard given the available data. The criteria (self-assessment ratings) result in urban/inner-city and EOC programs being excluded from this composite.

The climate as a whole, at Composite College is not unlike the mean ratings, on a scale of one to five, found across the state. The entire faculty are encouraged to experiment to a moderate degree (3.6), value effective teaching (4.2), and are not overly positive (2.8) in their attitudes toward non-traditional students. They have a moderate voice in governance (3.2) and their attitudes toward the value of career programs is middle-of-the-road (3.6).

The total student body is largely lower and lower-middle class (2.6) from suburban-rural homes (2.8). The minority population is approximately 20%. The students, as a whole, exhibit an average goal orientation (3.2) and 56% of the student body are enrolled in occupational programs.

The institution is moderately responsive to needs of students (3.0), faculty (3.4), and community (2.8). The needs of the student
body are perceived to be as follows: reading, communication, and study
skills are highest priority, closely followed by self-awareness and
motivation. Skills in mathematics, personal goal setting, career
decision-making and cultural differences are identified as less
pressing needs.

Out of this institutional context a developmental studies program
was organized using the block scheduling design and supplemented by a
skills center operation managed by volunteer faculty. The block
schedule includes elective credit courses in reading, composition,
mathematics and study skills in a class/lab format. Counseling and
tutoring assistance are available, and in addition, course instructors
infuse attitudinal and interpersonal experiences with cognitive/basic
skills and applied field experiences. The center offers short-term
help to any student who so requests as well as assistance to course
instructors with materials and techniques. Most courses meet four
hours weekly with an additional hour in the lab being the norm rather
than the exception. The block schedule is repeated second semester
with smaller enrollments and additional non-credit courses in reading
and writing skills that progress beyond the basic course level offered
by the center.

The program serves approximately 75 full-time degree students,
about 50% in occupational programs, but does not exclude part-time or
general studies students that are recommended for enrollment.

The program staff currently reports to the Academic Dean but the
Dean of Students works closely with the program in both planning and
implementation. The program was initiated with grant support but is
now totally funded from the operating budget. Administrative support
has been relatively strong, especially when the program was new and served primarily HEOP students but current educational economics is forcing some accountability questions to be raised. The recruitment and selection process is a combined effort of staff and admissions counselors. Student self-selection is encouraged through special publicity as well as by faculty referral or advisor recommendation. Skill testing during orientation with a variety of instruments is an important selection criterion together with high school records and recommendations from high school counselors when available.

The program staff assess their results in a combination of ways: pre-post skill level measures, student satisfactions, grade point averages and retention rate comparisons. The developmental studies program staff make concerted efforts to promote faculty interaction through individual conferences, student referral, follow-up meetings and joint planning/consultation. This interaction is enhanced by the status of program staff as faculty members who do some teaching outside of the developmental studies area. The developmental studies staff are usually faculty advisors of the developmental studies students but not always. The developmental studies faculty also act as liaison personnel between the program and the counseling staff and departmental faculty groups.

The developmental studies faculty are proud of their program and rate its success as better than average (3.9). However, they still feel that the college has an element of elitism with which they must contend. They feel that parts of their program are needed by more students but the problems of credit and cost are difficult to combat.
In spite of relatively good success, the struggle for full acceptance of programs for the high-risk student remains.

The Realism of Diversity

The staff members, identified in the acknowledgements, who attended the workshop to cooperatively revise the working copy of this sourcebook, found a need to address the diversity that is present among two-year institutions, and which may become obscured through summation of data. Consensus was reached that such diversity could most effectively be described relative to the Composite College scenario which is based on a segment of the total data.

A major goal of two-year colleges is to meet the specific needs of individual students. Out of this focus emerges elements of diversity found at institutions generally and with developmental efforts specifically. There are various definitions of developmental studies, and differing perspectives as to what is appropriate for a developmental program. There is also a range of diversity with clientele, and as previously noted, this range continues to expand in comprehensiveness.

The workshop participants addressed the diversity in terms of four institutional groupings -- Agricultural and Technical, EOC, upstate community colleges, and city-urban community colleges. The information utilized in the Composite College was used as a guide in summarizing numerical data relevant to survey respondents within each grouping. These mean ratings are presented in a Comparison Summary Chart.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Composite College (N = 5)</th>
<th>Ag and Tech (N = 5)</th>
<th>EOC (N = 4)</th>
<th>City Community Colleges (N = 3)</th>
<th>Update Community Colleges (N = 22)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Climate: Faculty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freedom to experiment</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value effective teaching</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty attitudes toward non-traditional students</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty voice in governance</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitude toward value of career programs</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate: Students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socio-economic status of student body</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minority student population*</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>50%+</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student goal orientation</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Background of student body</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student body in occupational programs*</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>75%+</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate: Institution</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College response to student needs</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College response to community needs</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College response to faculty needs</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Assessment Ratings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall success of program</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perception of other staff rating of program success</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students served by Developmental Programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion enrolled in occupational education*</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* percentages rounded off
As discernible from the chart, the category of Upstate Community Colleges has the greatest number of respondents, while the other groupings range from three to five. Observations should be made within this perspective. Discussion will focus only on those ratings that have a mean of four or above, and of two or below, and that vary from the composite mean a minimum of .5.

**Agricultural and Technical Colleges.** Data from Agricultural and Technical respondents suggest that their faculty enjoy a greater freedom to experiment (4.4) and voice in governance (4.6) than Composite College and demonstrate a very positive attitude toward career programs (4.8). Over 75% of the student body is enrolled in occupational programs with this high percentage reflected in the occupational education audience served by their developmental efforts. The programmatic design employed is a center approach with courses usually offered in reading, study skills, and writing on an individual or non-credit basis; in conjunction with other supportive services such as counseling and tutoring. Community needs (4.6) are viewed as an important consideration.

**Economic Opportunity Centers.** The staff at EOC's possess positive attitudes and understandings (4.0) toward non-traditional students and programs which are above the Composite College mean as ultimately all serve as developmental faculty. This fact diminishes problematic areas associated with faculty interactions, administrative support, line/staff and budgeting. The student body represents the lower SES level (1.0) and has an inner-city background (5.0). The minority population
tends to comprise over 50% of the student body. EOC's, by definition, operate to meet student needs (4.3). The major audience served are those students enrolled in certificate programs. The majority of support comes from SUNY funds although there are small grant resources. Programmatic approaches are eclectic in that usually it consists of a center and supporting services in conjunction with courses.

**City Community Colleges.** The city or urban community college faculties have a greater than the Composite average voice in governance (4.6). Their students tend to be more goal oriented (4.6), and come from a more urban background (4.6) than the Composite College. The programmatic approach is often a center with supporting services and courses offered in reading, writing, English as a second language, speech, study skills and math. In some cases, basic skill courses are integrated with content courses (i.e. psychology, history) or utilize skill materials that may be related to the major program of study (i.e. nursing).

**Upstate Community Colleges.** The upstate community colleges do not vary significantly, except in scope of program or program design, from the description of Composite College. The greatest difference is the 10% minority population which is one-half that segment in the Composite.
Commonalities of Programs

The preceding discussion underscores diversity while simultaneously indicating areas of commonalities among programs. These commonalities cut across programmatic approaches and institutional settings, and are illustrated in the following statements:

1. Faculty members at two-year institutions generally value effective teaching and career programs to a great extent.

2. Institutions respond to student and community needs in a moderately active degree.

3. Developmental programs are rated at better than moderately successful although there remains need for a more successful image generally, as evidenced by lower "other" faculty ratings.

4. Students are usually from middle/lower to lower SES levels, and they are seen to exhibit goal orientation of moderate strength.

5. Student academic needs in reading, study, communication and math skills are universal followed closely by non-academic needs such as motivation, career decision-making skills, and knowledge of self.

6. Components of developmental programs reflect student needs utilizing a variety of programmatic designs. Several kinds of supporting services and components address personal non-academic student needs.

7. The clientele of developmental efforts are usually comprised of 50%+ enrolled in occupational programs; and are usually day/full-time degree or certificate programs.
8. A variety of student selection and recruitment procedures are employed. Testing in some form emerges as the most common technique in both selection and recruitment. Students in career programs are enrolled in developmental offerings through a combination of methods such as faculty advisement, admission scheduling and volunteering.

9. The majority of programs are largely supported by institutional funds, however grants are often employed to initiate and/or supplement.

10. In the forthcoming Section IV, recommended materials, strategies or techniques provided by the respondents are delineated. Commonalities within these recommendations are observable in programmatic components relative to: 1) desired student outcomes, 2) standards of program success, and 3) mode of instruction. With less frequency, commonalities are also discernible for: 1) measurement tools utilized, 2) recommended materials, and 3) unique strategies or approaches.
AM RESOURCES

Resources recommended by respondents are grouped by components that are most programs. These include reading with a total frequency of 29, writing with a total identification skill frequency of 22, and decision-making with a total identification frequency of each component, recommendations of more than one and in Resource Summary Charts relative to: a) us, b) standards of success, c) unique measurement tools, e) recommended materials, tion. These strategies and materials are linked environmental characteristics in which they are student characteristics, basic program design, frequency of recommendation. It was determined characteristics were more discriminating than fell mid-range.

Importance of noting the frequency an item had underscored by consensus of the workshop partic-
above one are given for each item in the . Those items having been identified by one attachment A.
Assessment. Resources that received recommendations from respondents teaching program components that were rated "most successful" are so identified in the Summary Charts.

Special Student Characteristics. To aid in the linking of resources to environment, special student groups with which these resources and techniques have been used are identified. When resources received recommendations from institutions with 50%+ minority population, with an inner-city/urban setting, and/or with 75%+ student population enrolled in occupational education programs, it is shown in the Resource Summary Charts. The lack of an "X" indicates that the materials were recommended by respondents in no particular discriminatory pattern or that they were not recommended by programs reflecting the student characteristics.

Basic Program Design. The diversity of developmental programs is evident in the data. As previously noted, responses can be grouped into four categories: 1) block scheduling -- usually four credit courses a semester in length, i.e. reading, writing, math; 2) centers -- a physical area that serves as a learning or skill center and as programmatic focus; 3) designated courses -- one or two credit courses in basic skill areas or in a content area; and 4) integrated teaching -- a conscious effort and policy to integrate developmental instruction with regular course work. Nearly all respondents described their programs as offering supporting services. The variety of these services ranged from peer tutoring to normal access of counseling services or individual faculty assistance as requested.
Therefore, it is assumed that supporting services are present to some degree in each of the four basic program designs. Recommendations from the respective programmatic approaches are indicated in the Resource Summary Charts.

Other areas identified as additional components by one or two respondents are illustrated by areas such as English as a second language, speech, English, science and business. Usually these areas were singularly identified. By way of illustration, selected additional components are summarized in Attachment B.
# Reading Program Component: Resource Summary #1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Outcomes</th>
<th>Frequency of Identification</th>
<th>Program Design</th>
<th>Program Design</th>
<th>Program Design</th>
<th>Program Design</th>
<th>&quot;Most Successful&quot; Assessment Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Block Scheduling</td>
<td>Designated Courses</td>
<td>Integrated Teaching</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>increase comprehension</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>increase reading level</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>increase reading rate</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>increased vocabulary</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>positive attitude</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>increased enjoyment of reading</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Standards of Success

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency of Identification</th>
<th>Program Design</th>
<th>Program Design</th>
<th>Program Design</th>
<th>Program Design</th>
<th>&quot;Most Successful&quot; Assessment Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Block Scheduling</td>
<td>Designated Courses</td>
<td>Integrated Teaching</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>general improvement</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>reading at specified grade level</td>
<td>12th grade level</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>reading at specified grade level</td>
<td>10th grade level</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>score of 50+ on Stanford Task Exam</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>double rate of reading 70% comprehension</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Gue Strategies/Approaches

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency of Identification</th>
<th>Program Design</th>
<th>Program Design</th>
<th>Program Design</th>
<th>Program Design</th>
<th>&quot;Most Successful&quot; Assessment Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Block Scheduling</td>
<td>Designated Courses</td>
<td>Integrated Teaching</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>frequent short readings of high interest selections with immediate test, correction and review</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>consecutive class-lab periods; instruction followed by practice</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Measurement Tools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency of Identification</th>
<th>Program Design</th>
<th>Program Design</th>
<th>Program Design</th>
<th>Program Design</th>
<th>&quot;Most Successful&quot; Assessment Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Block Scheduling</td>
<td>Designated Courses</td>
<td>Integrated Teaching</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nelson Deny</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stanford Tests</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California Reading Achievement</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City/Urban 50%+ Minority Population 75%+ in Occupational Education</th>
<th>Diagnostic</th>
<th>Pre-Post</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## READING PROGRAM COMPONENT: RESOURCE SUMMARY #1, cont.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Frequency of Identification</th>
<th>Program Design Centers</th>
<th>Designated Courses</th>
<th>Integrated Teaching</th>
<th>&quot;Most Successful&quot; Assessment Ratings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Recommended Materials</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jamestown Publishers</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topics for the Restless</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selections from the Black</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voices from the Bottom</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bantam Series -- High Interest Paperbacks</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRA Reading for Understanding</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRA Reading Lab</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROBE: Workbook and Cassettes, C. Merrill Publishing Company</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDL Controlled Reader and Skimmer</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tactics II, III</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>How to Read Factual Literature (W. Pauk)</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program SRA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Be a Better Reader</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading Versatility (W. Boyce Adams)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Six-Way Paragraphs (W. Pauk)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McGraw Hill Basic Skills</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Type of Instruction                           |                          |                        |                    |                    |                                      |
| Learning lab                                  | 17                        |                        |                    |                    |                                      |
| Discussion                                    | 14                        |                        |                    |                    |                                      |
| Audio/tutorial                                | 9                         |                        |                    |                    |                                      |
| Lecture                                       | 7                         |                        |                    |                    |                                      |
| Tutoring                                      | 4                         |                        |                    |                    |                                      |
| Seminar                                       | 4                         |                        |                    |                    |                                      |

### Analysis

The table above summarizes the frequency of various reading program components and their integration within different educational settings. The "Most Successful" column indicates the assessment ratings for each component. The table highlights the frequency of each item's identification and categorizes its use within various educational contexts. The data underscores the importance of integrating reading materials and programs into the curriculum to enhance educational outcomes.
Special Student Characteristics
In Occupations
Diagnostic
Pre-Post
### STUDY SKILLS PROGRAM COMPONENT: RESOURCE SUMMARY #2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Frequency of Identification</th>
<th>Block Scheduling</th>
<th>Program Design</th>
<th>Designated Courses</th>
<th>Integrated Teaching</th>
<th>&quot;Most Successful&quot; Assessment Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Desired Student Outcomes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>time management skills</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>task organization skills</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standards of Success</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>general improvement</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unique Strategies/Approaches</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bi-weekly plan sheet</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>main idea, example clues</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SQ4R study method</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measurement Tools</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown Holtzman</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommended Materials</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How to Study in College (W. Pauk)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listen and Read -- EDL Program With Cassettes</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How to Survive in College -- Cassettes</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective Study (Robinson)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mode of Instruction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lecture</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>discussion</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>learning lab</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>seminar</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tutoring</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>audio/tutorial</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inner City/Urban</th>
<th>50%+ Minority Population</th>
<th>75%+ in Occupational Education</th>
<th>Diagnostic</th>
<th>Pre-Post</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Frequency of Identification</th>
<th>Block Scheduling</th>
<th>Program Design Centers</th>
<th>Designated Courses</th>
<th>Integrated Teaching</th>
<th>&quot;Most Successful&quot; Assessment Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Desired Student Outcomes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>improved grammar usage</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>improved sentence structure</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>improved spelling</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>improved theme structure</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>improved style</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>increased confidence</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>logic of organization of thought and writing</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>structure and development</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>improved vocabulary</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standards of Success</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>general improvement</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>demonstrate ability to write an acceptable essay</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>skills in specific content</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unique Strategies/Approaches</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>small group peer evaluation</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tutor conferences</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pre and post conferences</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measurement Tools</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>essay or writing sample</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommended Materials</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paragraph Practice (Kathleen Sullivan)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English 3200 and English 2600 (Harcourt, Brace, Jovanovich)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essays, articles, short stories from NY Times, Saturday Review, Atlantic, NY Magazine and others</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steps in Composition (Troyka and Nudelmann)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sentence Combining (W. Strong; Random House)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mode of Instruction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>discussion</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>skill(s) lab</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tutoring</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lecture</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>seminar</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>individual instruction</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inner City/Urban 50% Minority 75% in Occupational Population</th>
<th>Diagnostic</th>
<th>Pre-Post</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### Desired Student Outcomes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Frequency of Identification</th>
<th>Block Scheduling</th>
<th>Program Design Centers</th>
<th>Designated Courses</th>
<th>Integrated Teaching</th>
<th>&quot;Most Successful&quot; Assessment Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>improve basic arithmetical computational and reasoning skills</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>improve computational and reasoning skills used in Algebra</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Standards of Success

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Frequency of Identification</th>
<th>Block Scheduling</th>
<th>Program Design Centers</th>
<th>Designated Courses</th>
<th>Integrated Teaching</th>
<th>&quot;Most Successful&quot; Assessment Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>math through elementary algebra</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>general improvement</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Unique Strategies/Approaches

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Frequency of Identification</th>
<th>Block Scheduling</th>
<th>Program Design Centers</th>
<th>Designated Courses</th>
<th>Integrated Teaching</th>
<th>&quot;Most Successful&quot; Assessment Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>small group study</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Measurement Tools

### Recommended Materials

**Elementary Algebra**
(Moon and Davis; C. Merrill Publishing Company)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Frequency of Identification</th>
<th>Block Scheduling</th>
<th>Program Design Centers</th>
<th>Designated Courses</th>
<th>Integrated Teaching</th>
<th>&quot;Most Successful&quot; Assessment Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elementary Algebra</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Intermediate Algebra**
(Moon and Davis; C. Merrill Publishing Company)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Frequency of Identification</th>
<th>Block Scheduling</th>
<th>Program Design Centers</th>
<th>Designated Courses</th>
<th>Integrated Teaching</th>
<th>&quot;Most Successful&quot; Assessment Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intermediate Algebra</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Mainstream Tapes**
(C. Merrill Publishing Company)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Frequency of Identification</th>
<th>Block Scheduling</th>
<th>Program Design Centers</th>
<th>Designated Courses</th>
<th>Integrated Teaching</th>
<th>&quot;Most Successful&quot; Assessment Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mainstream Tapes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Mode of Instruction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Frequency of Identification</th>
<th>Block Scheduling</th>
<th>Program Design Centers</th>
<th>Designated Courses</th>
<th>Integrated Teaching</th>
<th>&quot;Most Successful&quot; Assessment Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>tutoring</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>discussion</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>learning lab</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>audio/tutorial</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lecture</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*No measurement tools were identified more than once.*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Special Student Characteristics</th>
<th>Inner City/Urban</th>
<th>50%+ Minority Population</th>
<th>75%+ in Occupational Education</th>
<th>Diagnostic</th>
<th>Pre-Post</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### Vocational-Personal Decision-Making Program Component: Resource Summary #5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Frequency of Identification</th>
<th>Block Scheduling</th>
<th>Program Design Centers</th>
<th>Designated Courses</th>
<th>Integrated Teaching</th>
<th>&quot;Most Successful&quot; Assessment Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Desired Student Outcomes</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>improved understanding of personal needs and abilities</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>identification of tentative career goals</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>selection of program major</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Standards of Success</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>general improvement</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unique Strategies/Approaches</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest Tests: Kuder or GATB</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Measurement Tools</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong-Campbell Interest Inventory</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kuder Preference Inventory</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hall's Occupational Orientation Inventory</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Recommended Materials</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEEB Decision Making Materials (Decision/Outcomes: Deciding)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mode of Instruction</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>group experiences</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>discussion</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>one-to-one</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lecture</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>seminar</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>audio-tutorial</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>characteristics</td>
<td>Diagnostic</td>
<td>Pre-Post</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>y: 75% in O</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c: 75% in O</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e: 75% in O</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x: 75% in O</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x: 75% in O</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x: 75% in O</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x: 75% in O</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Recommendations for Programmatic Standards

An intended long-range outcome of the project has been the identification of standards or quality measures for developmental studies programs. The questionnaire data synthesis and the discussions by the workshop participants point to recommendations of what ought to be, rather than validated criterion measures based on what is.

Many but not all staff members, for example, feel that an eleventh grade reading level should be a program exit criterion. Some staff members feel that a well-written essay is an appropriate indicator while others look to discrete writing skills as evidence. Several programs use an interdepartmental mathematics examination as a proficiency measure, but the proficiency level required for engineering technology differs from that necessary for many human service programs. An improved self-concept and increased skill in decision-making were listed as goals of many developmental programs but few require that a firm career goal be set as an exit criterion.

Because of this diversity consensus from data was reached on only one rather comprehensive exit standard, general improvement. This criterion is defined as the instructor's judgment that improvement in skills and attitudes has taken place to the extent that the student now has a reasonable chance to succeed in his or her chosen course of study. Instructor judgment is arrived at through a variety of assessment techniques ranging from standardized test measures to observation of behaviors that reflect attitude changes.
The data resulted in several commonalities among programs as identified in the preceding Resource Summary Charts. These commonalities provide recommendations in the form of state-of-the-art standards. However, the data available at this time does not provide sufficient evidence to support recommendations in the form of quantified quality measures to which all programs should subscribe.

The following consensus recommendations supplement the data-based commonalities and provide direction from which institutions can establish their local performance standards given student needs, institutional characteristics, and available resources.

1. Instructors for developmental programs should hold faculty rank and be recruited as specialists in developmental education.

2. The remedial or learning skills center should be organized and staffed by professionals trained and experienced in developmental education.

3. Communication and interaction among faculty and staff should be operational to not only encourage positive attitudes but to provide for professional growth.

4. The teaching assignment of developmental instructors should include time allocation for joint planning and follow-up activities.

5. A realistic range of entrance and exit measures should be established in accordance with institutional policy.

6. A diagnostic testing program should be used as the basis for assessing student progress through performance objectives or competencies identified for all components of developmental programs.

7. To the extent possible, subject matter used in developmental courses should be drawn from regular college courses and the skills taught should be those needed by students in their occupational program areas.
8. Courses should be credit-bearing, and class size should enhance the use of individualized instruction techniques.

9. Institutional course scheduling should be sufficiently flexible to allow students to take advantage of segments of developmental programs as needed.

10. Labs and classroom facilities used in developmental programs should not be physically isolated from other institutional services and courses.

11. Existing counseling services, if not an organized program component, should be closely integrated with the developmental studies program.

12. A peer tutoring or tutoring program should be professionally organized and managed as part of the developmental effort.

13. The faculty and administration should examine the question of institutional versus student accommodation; the extent to which the institution can change techniques, textbooks and schedules or must the student always change to meet existing standards.
Staff members who completed one or more of the survey forms were asked to indicate whether or not they would be willing to be identified as a contact person for developmental programs. Eighty-seven staff members agreed to be so identified. Names, institutional addresses, title and appropriate program component are listed to facilitate direct contact by colleagues who are interested in sharing or inquiring about aspects or items relative to developmental studies programs.

Private Colleges

Jr. College of Albany --------- Russell E. Wise, Jr.  
Albany, New York  12208  
Director, HEOP

Carol Benjamin  
Learning Center Coordinator

William H. Cummings  
Instructor

W.S. College --------- Sylvia Connolly  
Ogdensburg, New York  13669  
Instructor

Linda Swanson  
Coordinator  
Learning Skills Center

Villa Maria College ---------- Jerome Neuner  
of Buffalo  
240 Pine Ridge Road  
Buffalo, New York  14225  
Instructor  
Developmental Studies  
COORDINATOR;  
READING, WRITING,  
STUDY SKILLS
Agricultural and Technical Colleges

**Alfred Agricultural and Technical College**
Alfred, New York 14802

Rosemary Lasho, Director
Reading and Study Skills

Dr. L. Constantine
Writing

Dennis T. Johnson
Math

**Canton Agricultural and Technical College**
Canton, New York 13617

Dr. John D. Ryan, Dean
Arts and Sciences

Frederick C. Monaco
Assistant Professor

H. J. Stephens
Associate Professor

John G. A. O'Neil
Associate Professor

Joseph Lamendola
Associate Professor

**Cobleskill Agricultural and Technical College**
Cobleskill, New York 12043

Leo A. Bryant
Director, EOP

Donald Cohen
Professor

James Nuhlicek
Assistant Professor

Veronica Marano Smith
Assistant Professor

Charles W. Merrill
Professor

COORDINATOR
MATH
STUDY SKILLS
WRITING
READING
MATH
STUDY SKILLS
ADDITIONAL COMPONENT--- GENERAL BIOLOGY
Virginia Abrahamson
Delhi Agricultural and Technical College
Professor
Delhi, New York 13753

Fred Hildebrand
Norrisville Agricultural and Technical College
Instructor
Norrisville, New York 13408

COORDINATOR,
READING, WRITING, MATH,
STUDY SKILLS, DECISION-
MAKING

ADDITIONAL COMPONENTS--
PEER TUTORING, FACULTY
REFERRAL OF STUDENTS NEEDING
ASSISTANCE, FACULTY WORK-
SHOPS, COLLEGE SKILLS FOR
NON-TRADITIONAL STUDENTS

COORDINATOR,
STUDY SKILLS, READING,
WRITING
Community Colleges

Borough of Manhattan Community College
135 West 70th Street
New York, New York 10027

Dr. Henry Pruitt
Assistant Professor/Department Chairman

Charlotte G. McIver
ADDITIONAL COMPONENT—ENGLISH AS A SECOND LANGUAGE

Broome Community College
Front Street
Binghamton, New York 13902

Sharon K. View
Counselor

DECISION-MAKING

Columbia-Greene Community College
Box 1000
Hudson, New York 12534

Mary D. Hoddick
Director

COORDINATOR

Corning Community College
Corning, New York 14830

Anne Cohn
Director, Special Programs

COORDINATOR, READING

Penelope Smith
Instructional Assistant
Math Lab

MATH

Kenneth A. Miller
Professor

WRITING

Clark Maloney
Dean of Students

DECISION-MAKING

Dutchess Community College
Poughkeepsie, New York 12601

Deborah Weibman
Coordinator, Study Skills

COORDINATOR, STUDY SKILLS
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Program</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fulton-Montgomery Community College</td>
<td>Harold R. Morrell</td>
<td>Reading and Study Skills</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnstown, New York 12095</td>
<td>George Pilkey</td>
<td>Director of Counseling</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Arlene C. Rambush</td>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hudson Valley Community College</td>
<td>Edward F. Wightman</td>
<td>Coordinator</td>
<td>Developmental Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Troy, New York 12180</td>
<td>Dana L. Johnson</td>
<td>Study Skills</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>William G. Muller</td>
<td>Writing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ruby Painton</td>
<td>Math</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ruth Getbehead</td>
<td>Reading</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stephen Hyatt</td>
<td>Additional Component</td>
<td>Biology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>James T. Hogancamp</td>
<td>Coordinator</td>
<td>Reading, Study Skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jamestown Community College</td>
<td>Elaine S. Johnson</td>
<td>MATH</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jamestown, New York 14701</td>
<td>Doug Skuggen</td>
<td>Reading, Writing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wyman Ansley</td>
<td>Study Skills, Decision-Making</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jefferson Community College</td>
<td>James T. Hogancamp</td>
<td>Reading, Study Skills</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watertown, New York 13601</td>
<td>David R. Moore</td>
<td>Decision-Making</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Carol Y. Scanlon</td>
<td>Writing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mohawk Valley Community College
1101 Sherman Drive
Utica, New York 13501

Paul M. Guerra
Director, Learning Center
COORDINATOR, DECISION-MAKING

Monroe Community College
Rochester, New York 14623

Anthony D. Rosica
Acting Director
Developmental Studies
COORDINATOR, MATH, WRITING, READING, STUDY SKILLS

Nassau County Community College
Stewart Avenue
Garden City, New York 11530

James J. Richards
Chairperson
Student Personnel Services
DECISION-MAKING

Hedda Marcus
Instructor
WRITING

Niagara County Community College
3500 Saunders Settlement Road
Sanborn, New York 14132

Dr. Kathleen McWhorter
Director, Learning Skills Center
COORDINATOR, READING

Dr. Gary Livent
Director, Counseling
DECISION-MAKING

North Country Community College
Saranac Lake, New York 12983

Edward Stodola
Director of Counseling
COORDINATOR

Patricia Wiley
Assistant Professor
READING

Ken Youngblood
Assistant Professor
WRITING

Robert Abdo
Assistant Professor
STUDY SKILLS
Orange County Community College --------- D. Linda Girardin
Prep and EOP

Associate Professor

Norma Ell
Assistant Professor

Derek Bloomfield
Math

Robert Greenman
Professor

Queensborough Community College ---------- Judith Barbanel
Principal Investigator

Sandra Seltzer
Principal Investigator

Arnold Steiner
Project Director

Rockland Community College ---------- Dr. Margaret Martin
College Skills Program

Ellen Klohmamn
Instructor

Marie Caruso
Counselor

Schenectady County Community College ------Marilyn M. Stacer
Instructor

Jesse Malheiros
Assistant Professor

51
Tompkins-Cortland Community College ---------- Nancy Lieberman
Dryden, New York 13053
Developmental Studies Program

Pat Bonney
Director, Writing Lab

Ulster County Community College ------------- Lawrence P. Borzuato
Stone Ridge, New York 12484
Director, College Skills Center

J. P. Quirk
Counselor

L. James Hess
Chairman, English Department

Rhoda R. Mone
Professor

Edward Peifer
Assistant Professor

Joyce Blake
Instructor

COORDINATOR,
MATH, DECISION-MAKING

WRITING

COORDINATOR,
READING

DECISION-MAKING

WRITING

ADDITIONAL COMPONENT--
SPEECH/THEATRE

MATH

STUDY SKILLS
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Centers

Brooklyn EOC ---------------------- Joyce A. McCoy
470 Vanderbilt Avenue
Brooklyn, New York

Alliyah Abdul Karim

STUDY SKILLS

Buffalo EOC -------------------------- Claudia E. Chiesi
Room 403
465 Washington Street
Buffalo, New York 14203

Earle M. Lacey
Associate Director
Program Development and Research

MATH, WRITING, READING

Schenectady EOC ---------------------- Edith N. Jones
240 Broadway
Schenectady, New York 12305

Lorraine Boas
Instructor

ADDITIONAL COMPONENT--SECRETARIAL SCIENCE

Syracuse EOC ------------------------- Nancy Brisson
155 Gifford Street
Syracuse, New York 13215

Edith V. Robinson, Head
Department of English

WRITING

Michael O. Sedore
Assistant Professor

MATH
Reading Program Component

**Desired Student Outcomes**
- Better understanding
- Skimming and scanning techniques
- Development of flexible reading skills
- Growth of grade level
- Adjust reading rate
- High school equivalency

**Standards of Success**
- Davis Reading Test
- Nelson-Denny pre-post testing
- Student judgment on improvement

**Unique Strategies/Approaches**
- Required minimum of reading
- Quarter system, requiring several modules
- Lab work, completed at 80% or better
- Competency based learning
- Working on a one-to-one basis
- Short readings with written oral testing
- Personal journal in which students identify reading strengths/weaknesses; instruction directed toward their identified needs
- Dual testing—teacher and student read the same selection, take tests individually, then discuss answers using student assistants who have already been through the program
- Limit the class size to five
- Student corrects own work for immediate feedback
- Comfortable, attractive room for sustained silent reading and textbook study
- Comprehension and factual questions
- Popular paperbacks divided into chapters
- Class members read and report
- Jamestown Timed Reading Exercises
- Cognitive style mapping
- Reading eye camera
- Individual tutorial with tests and with individual speed machines
- Individual reading—student chooses material; teacher and student discuss audio-visual aids with instant self-testing
- Class periods with immediate testing
- Vocabulary worksheets
- Present vocabulary before reading selections
- Written sum of paperbacks or magazine articles
- Short-time segments dealing with definite areas of reading
- Fiction and essays with discussions on literal, critical and affective comprehension
- Core course using interpersonal relationships as vehicle for skills work
- Use articles and file after readability indexed

**Measurement Tools**

**Diagnosis**
- English Cooperative Reading Test
- Gates MacGinitie Reading Test
- REA Placement Test
- EDL Eye Camera Test
- Iowa Silent Reading Test
- Read aloud ungraded material
- Spache Diagnostic Reading Scales
- Xerox Listening Test
- High school reading records
- REAL
- SRA Every Day Adult Reading Efficiency Test

**Pre-Post**

**Gain Scores**
- English Cooperative Reading Test
- Gates MacGinitie Reading Test
- REA Placement Test
- Stanford Tests of comprehension and rate related to tests
- Spache Diagnostic Reading Scales
- Cornell Study Skills Inventory
- Cooperative reading comprehension test
- Davis Reading Test
- Reading Research Center—University of Wyoming
- Gates MacGinitie
- Iowa Silent Reading Test—Level II
- Diagnostic Reading Survey—Triggs

**Recommended Materials**
- Increased Reading Efficiency and Maintaining Reading Efficiency (Miller)
- Efficient Reading (J. Brown; Houghton-Mifflin Company)
- Toward Reading Comprehension, Book 2
- (J. F. Sherburne; D. C. Heath Company)
- How to Survive in College
- Instructional/Communications Technology
- Readings for Understanding (Thelma Gwinn Thurston)
- Wordcraft: J-Communicad
- PAR
- Vocabulary for College Students
- Structural Approach to Reading Improvement
- Vocabulary: English Vocabulary Cards

**Mode of Instruction**
- Timed readings
- Reading and answering questions
- Structured classroom
- Daily practice
- Two levels of programs—class and lab
Measurement Tools

Diagnosis------McGraw Hill CTE
Wrenn's Checklist
SSSA
class discussion
library constructed test
informal
use own diagnostic instrument

Pre-Post
Gain Scores------McGraw Hill Basic Skills
Nelson Denny
Purdue High School English Test
Madden Peak Computational Self-Evaluation

Recommended Materials

Academic Skills Program (Quest, Cohen, King, et.al.)
Variety of texts and self development exercises
Studying Effectively (Gilbert, Wrenn)
Joffe materials (Wadsworth Publications)
College Skills Program (Sack, Yourman-Reading and
Social Studies series combined with an approach
that allows students to discover own needs)
Basic Skill Program (McGraw Hill)
Systems for Study (McGraw Hill)
How to Read and Study for Success in College
(Holt, Rinehart)
Innovation Learning Strategies, 1975-SRA, Special
Groups (edited by Stan Klosek, Agahoga College)
How to Take Tests (J. Millman and W. Pauk)
How to Write Themes and Term Papers (B. Ellis)
Developing Reading Efficiency (Hess)
Writing the Research Term Paper (Houser and Gray)
The Reading Line-Social Studies (Irene Reiter)
Student's Guide to Effective Study (Brown)
How to Study (Norgren and Reese)
Best Methods of Study (Smith)
Learning to Learn (Smith, et.al.)
Study Skills Cassettes and Filmstrips (New York Times)
Singer-Grafex Audio Study Materials

Mode of Instruction

assessmannt
study guides

logs work, play
own strengths and
4, students direct

ass over of skills
other

tills and overcoming
accomplishment of
mental set for studying
wise

2-3-5 students in groups
plan and study jointly
development of concepts

Discussion and
of study problems
Writing Program Component

**Desired Student Outcomes**

- Logic, critical reading
- Emphasis on adequate writing
- Library resource
- Improve reading and listening skills

**Standards of Success**

- Peer judgment
- Acceptable paragraph essay
- Achieve success in job/school
- Competent for "C" in composition
- Grammar/mechanics test
- Basic research project measurably improved
- Student judgment

**Unique Strategies/Approaches**

- Diagnostic essay
- Taxonomy of writing difficulties
- Mastery quizzes
- Small group instruction; instant evaluation and feedback
- In-class writing from models
- Difficulty of conveying one's Gestalt to another
- Small group of students do rewrites of other papers
- Discover what is involved in reading and listening then write for the benefit of listener or reader from that point of view
- Writer takes point of view of someone else
- Manageable groups-20 or less
- Mastery learning techniques with each written assignment
- Students begin writing about their interest areas
- Individual or small group instruction
- Student/instructor conferences
- Heuristics (several systems) journal, sentence, etc.
- Class exchange
- Actively engaged in writing experience at each session
- Daily journal writing
- Individual chapters-orally shared; base
- Listening and writing or reading
- Experiential writing
- Diagnosis of specific problem areas to encourage prompt improvement
- Outline of topics as group
- Workshop approach
- Use accessible models from students

**Measurement Tools**

**Diagnosis**

- SAT-ACF
- Harbrace diagnostic tests
- Tests for business English essentials
- Educational Skills Test

**Pre-Post**

**Gain Scores**

- English 3200 tests
- Educational Skills Test

**Recommended Materials**

- Gestalt Materials
- Eschler on Perspective
- Thesaurus
- English Review Manual
- Harbrace College Workbook
- Correct Writing (Rutler)
- The Practical Stylist (Sheldon Baker)
- You Can Write (Grasso and Nancy)
- Grassroots (Writer's Handbook-Fawcett and Sandberg)
- How to Read and Write In College (Dodge)
- Students Guide for Writing Papers (University of Chicago Press)
- Write On! (Slack and Cottrell)

**Mode of Instruction**

- Discussion
- Demonstrate and edit
- Conference and classroom practice
- Writing practice
- Program workbooks
Math Component

**Desired Student Outcomes**
- relief anxiety over math
- prepare for next course
- attitudes and awareness

**Standards of Success**
- math through intermediate algebra
- pass non-credit course
- ability to pass math course required by department
- 96% accuracy of percentage of problems
- math skills grades on modules tests

**Unique Strategies/Approaches**
- group tests
- sit in on chemistry, physics and general science course and correlate these to math
- marathon sessions to do remediation
- faculty recommendations, worksheets, application of math to interdisciplinary curricula
- self-paced instruction, unit tests, tutoring
- two teachers available between classes
- student needs
- topics intersected with English curricula
- experiential activities in graphing, algebra, arithmetic and theory
- peer tutoring, self-testing
- Math Learning Lab

**Measurement Tools**

**Diagnosis**
- NYS Minimum Competency Test
- California Achievement Test
- Comparative Guidance and Placement Program of the College Entrance Exam Board
- Form A and B of Diagnostic Test in front of text
- high school grades
- standard test scores
- personal interview
- department competency test
- local diagnostic test
- short locators and check-up tests
- interviews
- informal advising session
- in-house math test

**Pre-Post**
- gain scores
- department competency test
- content test
- series in math modules

**Recommended Materials**
- Elementary Algebra (Cohen and Cameron; Cummings Publications)
- Arithmetic Module (Washington; Cummings Publication)
- Essential Arithmetic (Johnson and Willis; Wadsworth Publishing Company)
- Essential Algebra (Johnson and Willis; Wadsworth Publishing Company)
- any low-level elementary algebra test
- After Math (Creative Publications)
- Preliminary Math (Amsco School Publishers)
- Series in Math Modules (Abion et al.; Cummings Publications)
- SRA Basic Computation Skills-Algebra Skills Kit
- Basic Math Forms: Arithmetic-Algebra-Trigonometry and the Slide Rule (Keller and Tank; Houghton Mifflin Company)
- From Arithmetic to Algebra (Bloomfield Reston Division of Prentice Hall)

**Mode of Instruction**
- seminar
- individual instruction (tutoring)
- program tests
- receive help as needed
- small group study
- self-paced
- problem-solving
Vocational-Personal Decision-Making Program Component

**Desired Student Outcomes**

* 

**Standards of Success**

- Better awareness of self
- Student judgment outcomes
- Self-understanding and relate to career
- Clearer identification of career choice
- Attendance
- Ability to follow verbal/written directions
- Upgrade employment
- Job placement
- Idea of goals and design strategy
- Personal sense for effectiveness
- Interest-involvement

**Unique Strategies/Approaches**

- Interaction in counseling—in-depth counseling
- Peer counseling
- Freedom of discussion but opinions must be substantiated
- Reality-testing, on-site visits by students in area of interests
- Require individual sessions
- Emphasis of cognitive and affective; also theory in a credit course

**Measurement Tools**

- General Aptitude Test Battery
- Minnesota Vocational Inventory
- Edwards Personal Preference Survey
- Flanagan Aptitude
- Personal Orientation Inventory
- EPI
- Strong Vocational Interest Battery

**Recommended Materials**

- Simon, Monetares, Rogers, Maslow
- *How to Decide: A Guide for Women. If You Don't Know Where You're Going, You'll Probably End Up Somewhere Else*

- Occupational Outlook Handbook
- Directory of Occupational Titles - Volume I and Volume II
- Career Exploration Kit-SRA
- *What Color Is Your Parachute (halves)*
- Achievement Motivation, Goal Setting, Self-Analysis, Environmental Search materials
- You Pack Your Own Chute-Film
- Values Clarification, Success Analysis
- Hard Choices: Strategies for Decision-Making
- Center for Humanities-Slide, cassette
- Values Auction

**Mode of Instruction**

- Learning lab
- Tutoring

*No desired student outcomes with a frequency of less than three were identified.*
### ENGLISH AS A SECOND LANGUAGE

**Desired Student Outcomes**
- Essay to meet requirements for Comp. 100
- Prepare students to write English on college level
- Speak, read, write English

**Standards of Success**
- Content well-organized
- Correct sentence structure
- Correct usage of language
- Slow measurable improvement
- Communicate in English to enter skills course

**Unique Strategies/Approaches**
- Counseling-learning should be investigated
- Model paragraph-reinforce and stimulation
- Tape recorder for pronunciation

**Measurement Tools**
- Written/oral tests
- Interview
- Essay
- Objective Grammar Test
- Grammar-diction close tests

**Recommended Materials**
- All "Silent Way" materials
- Reading Skills Development
- Writing English As a Second Language
- Twenty-Six Steps (L. Kunz)
- Controlled Composition (L. Kunz)
- Teacher-made materials, reproduced

**Mode of Instruction**
- Discussion
- Lecture
- Audio tutorial
- Student participation as instructional mode
- Practice

---

### Additional Components: Resource Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Frequency of Identification</th>
<th>Block Scheduling</th>
<th>Program Design</th>
<th>Integrated Teaching</th>
<th>&quot;Most Successful&quot; Assessment Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ENGLISH AS A SECOND LANGUAGE</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inner City/50% Minority/75% in Vocational Education</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Recommended Materials**
- All "Silent Way" materials
- Reading Skills Development
- Writing English As a Second Language
- Twenty-Six Steps (L. Kunz)
- Controlled Composition (L. Kunz)
- Teacher-made materials, reproduced
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Frequency of Identification</th>
<th>Block Scheduling</th>
<th>Program Design</th>
<th>Critical Courses</th>
<th>Designated Teaching</th>
<th>&quot;Most Successful&quot; Assessment Rating</th>
<th>Inner City/ Urban</th>
<th>50% Minority Population</th>
<th>75% in Occupational Education</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SCIENCES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desired Student Outcomes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- improved laboratory skills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- ability to write reports clearly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standards of Success</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 80% or higher on written quizzes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- competency in basic lab skills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- positive self-evaluation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- good notes, test grades</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- active role in set-up and use of equipment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unique Strategies/Approaches</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- low-keyed attitude</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommended Materials</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- multi-media learning materials</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- peer-group tutors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mode of Instruction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- lecture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- discussion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- audio/tutorial</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- each student has the option of contracting or accepting an individualized time-mode prescription</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;No Measurement Tools identified.&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Frequency of Identification</td>
<td>Block Scheduling</td>
<td>Program Design Centers</td>
<td>Designated Courses</td>
<td>Integrated Teaching</td>
<td>&quot;Most Successful&quot; Assessment Rating</td>
<td>Inner City/Urban Population</td>
<td>75%+ in Occupational Education</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BUSINESS AREA</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desired Student Outcomes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80% wpm dictation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 wpm typing (course goal)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>alphabetical correspondence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standards of Success</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>completion of required projects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70% minimum grade on final test</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>accurately transcribe material</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>completion of required projects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unique Strategies/Approaches</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>individual instruction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measurement Tools</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult Basic Learning Exam</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>timed writings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dictation test</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommended Materials</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gregg Typing 300</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gregg Shorthand Tape</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>timed writings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mode of Instruction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>discussion tutoring</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Frequency of Identification</td>
<td>Block Scheduling</td>
<td>Program Design Centers</td>
<td>Designated Courses</td>
<td>Integrated Teaching</td>
<td>&quot;Most Successful&quot; Assessment Rating</td>
<td>Inner City/35% Minority 75% in Occupational Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPEECH COMPONENT</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desired Student Outcomes</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>raise diction level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>increase use of flexibility</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standards of Success</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>improvement in general fluency in speaking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ability to hear nuances</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>acquisition of vocabulary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unique Strategies/Approaches</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tapes of student voices</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>speech exercises</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vocabulary lists developed by College Skills Center; used jointly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measurement Tools</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tape using basic sounds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommended Materials</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speak Well-record and booklet</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mode of Instruction</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>discussion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>audio/tutorial</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>learning lab</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tutoring</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Desired Student Outcomes

- Demonstrated ability to plan, execute, and interpret a questionnaire.

### Standards of Success

- Students must be presented with real need to do a questionnaire, examples of poor questionnaire shown to demonstrate problems.

### Unique Strategies/Approaches

- Measurement Tools
- Recommended Materials
- AV-“How To” programs

### Mode of Instruction

- Audio/tutorial

---

*No Desired Student Outcomes or Measurement Tools identified.*