

## Annual Performance Report

### California State University-Dominguez Hills

Name of College/University

P031S020030  
PR Award Number

110547  
Unit Identification

#### Primary contact information:

Name Linda Pomerantz Zhang

Title Professor of History

Phone 310-243-3161

E-mail lpomerantz@csudh.edu

### Title V, Part A, Hispanic-Serving Institutions

Department of Education Grant Program

4-year Public  
Type and Control of Institution

Fourth year  
Grant Year

#### Branch Campus Reporting IPEDS Data for Individual Campus:

No     Yes     Not applicable

Partnering institution(s) (if applicable)

## Section 1—Executive Summary

The purpose of the legislation that established Title V is to “expand educational opportunities for, and improve the academic attainment of Hispanic students; and expand and enhance the academic offerings, program quality, and institutional stability of colleges and universities that are educating the majority of Hispanic college students and helping large numbers of Hispanic students and other low-income individuals complete postsecondary education.”

- A. Use this section to summarize how your grant is enabling your institution to fulfill the legislative intent of the Title V Program.
1. Summarize, in 250 words or less, the impact your Title V grant has had this year in your institution’s capacity to contribute to fulfilling the goals of the legislation.

Our grant spearheads initiatives to improve the academic success of Hispanic and other students. Our Activity centers on Increasing Critical Literacy through faculty development, curriculum development, and expanded tutoring. Faculty development: A fourth cohort of 15 humanities faculty members participated in the spring 2006 seminar, developing syllabi for 30 WI courses. Fourteen more attended an eight-session workshop series in fall 2005. Additionally, in collaboration with the Center for Teaching and Learning, 8 faculty development workshops were offered to 227 faculty attendees, compared to 1 workshop in Year 1 with 21 faculty attendees. Curriculum development: The Writing Intensive graduation requirement will be phased-in starting in 2008. There are now over 120 CL infused courses that have been developed with this grant. Fifteen WI courses with 109 students were piloted in fall 2005. Expanded tutoring: Student visits to the tutoring center increased to 12,649, a 60% increase over 2001-02 baseline of 7,704, while the number of tutoring hours increased four-fold to 2,164 from 508 in the 2001-2002 baseline. Faculty associates offered 72 workshops on writing and critical literacy compared to 6 in Year 1 and developed standard sets of materials to be available on the Web. Assessment: Holistic scoring of 273 embedded assessment writing samples from 18 piloted WI courses show gains in student writing in 15 of the 18 courses. Overall, mean scores rose an average of 12.09%. Reading skills of students who had taken courses with grant-trained instructors were significantly higher than the general student population.

2. How has the grant helped to carry out the mission of the institution?

Our mission states in part, "The University is a multi-cultural, multi-ethnic teaching and learning community dedicated to excellence and committed to educating a student population of unprecedented diversity for leadership roles in the global community of the 21st century." With its emphasis on student success, the grant reinforces this dedication and commitment. We serve a student population that, for many different reasons, comes to us with a broad spectrum of academic preparation. Academic Quality has been identified as one

of the key issues in our re-affirmation process. This grant, with its focus on improving the critical literacy of our undergraduates, represents a systematic and sustained attempt to ameliorate this problem and thus help the University fulfill its mission.

3. How did the cooperative arrangement aspect of the grant benefit the institutions involved?

From the list below, select at least two questions that document your institution's experience with the grant during this reporting period. Please answer each question selected in 250 words or less.

If your institution has received more than one Title V grant over time, discuss the long-range impact Title V has had on your institution's capacity to fulfill the goals of the legislation.

The successes of this Title V (ECLP) grant inspired the University to seek collaboration with Cerritos College, one of our major feeder colleges, to utilize some of the strategies employed in ECLP to address two significant problems faced by our students: 1) inadequate support for students in math and science courses; and, 2) especially poor retention rates for first-year students. This Cooperative Title V grant (Gateways) is now in its third year. The campus is also in its third year as recipient of a US Department of Education grant to implement the Ronald E. McNair Scholars' Program.

If your institution has experienced any unexpected outcomes as a result of this grant, that affect for better or worse its capacity to fulfill the goals of the legislation, tell us about them here.

Tell us about any challenges that you have had during the reporting period or that you anticipate in the coming year which may affect your ability to meet the goals of your grant. Include, if applicable, your institution's plans to meet these challenges.

Has the grant facilitated or contributed to bringing additional resources to your institution, for example, new Federal, State, or local dollars that can be attributed partly to your grant activities?

How would you improve or change the Program (e.g., customer service, allowable activities, regulations, statute)?

As we observed in earlier reports, there is a disjuncture between Academic Quality and Student Services Outcomes in the reportage structure. Our grant focuses on improving the academic quality of the institution, but the way the APR is designed makes it difficult for us to demonstrate improvement in academic quality except through improved GPA and retention rates. Moreover, Section 3 of this Report form does not permit percentages or decimals as part of the reporting numbers, which necessitated use of narrative to present data and explain it. GPA and retention rates are subject to a great many variables and are but one indicator of academic quality.

## Section 2: Enrollment by Race and Ethnicity (4-Year Institutions)

Please report undergraduate student enrollment as of October 15, 2005 and the number of those students who received Pell Grants. Because these data are taken from your IPEDS survey, please use the IPEDS definition of full-time student. [Note: Obtain the information from Part A of your most recent IPEDS Fall Enrollment Survey.]

### Enrollment by Race and Ethnicity as of October 15, 2005

Undergraduates	Total Number Enrolled		
	Full-time students	Full-time, First-time, First-year, Degree-seeking students	Students who received Pell Grants
Nonresident alien	130	19	0
Black, non-Hispanic	1636	222	1418
American Indian or Alaskan Native	27	1	22
Asian or Pacific Islander	455	40	259
Hispanic	2085	305	1697
White, non-Hispanic	626	36	220
Race/ethnicity unknown	605	50	96
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>5564</b>	<b>673</b>	<b>3712</b>

## Section 2: Enrollment by Age and Gender (4-Year Institutions)

Please report the number of undergraduate students, by age and gender, enrolled as of the institution's official fall reporting date or as of October 15, 2005 [Note: the information for this table can be obtained from Part B of your IPEDS Enrollment Survey for the most recent year available]. Because these data are taken from your IPEDS survey, please use IPEDS definitions for full-time and part-time students.

### Enrollment by Age and Gender as of October 15, 2005

Undergrads	Total Number Enrolled				Total Students		Grand Total
	Full time		Part time		Male	Female	
Age/Gender	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	
Under 18	0	1	0	0	0	1	<b>1</b>
18-19	340	794	39	75	379	869	<b>1248</b>
20-21	0	0	0	1	0	1	<b>1</b>
22-24	24	126	8	55	32	181	<b>213</b>
25-29	103	351	115	345	218	696	<b>914</b>
30-34	96	222	177	319	273	541	<b>814</b>
35-39	73	95	108	241	181	336	<b>517</b>
40-49	81	136	172	385	253	521	<b>774</b>
50-64	47	89	95	266	142	355	<b>497</b>
65 and over	2	0	10	7	12	7	<b>19</b>
Age Unknown	0	0	0	0	0	0	<b>0</b>
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>766</b>	<b>1814</b>	<b>724</b>	<b>1694</b>	<b>1490</b>	<b>3508</b>	<b>4998</b>

## Section 2: Degrees Awarded by Race, Ethnicity, and Discipline

Please report the number of degrees awarded, by race, ethnicity, and discipline. Enter the number of degrees awarded by race, ethnicity, and discipline for students in undergraduate programs only. Use the information from Part B of your IPEDS Fall Enrollment Survey. The discipline areas selected for this table correspond with discipline areas recognized in IPEDS. Use the CIP (Classification of Instructional Programs) codes as your guide in designating students appropriately.

### Degrees Awarded by Race, Ethnicity, and Discipline

	CIP Code	Nonresident alien	Black, non-Hispanic	American Indian or Alaskan Native	Asian or Pacific Islander	Hispanic	White, non-Hispanic	Race/ethnicity unknown	Total
Biological Sciences/Life Sciences	26	0	13	0	10	9	4	2	38
Computer & Information Sciences	11	2	4	0	9	2	5	2	24
Health Profession & Related Sciences	51	1	35	0	37	32	88	29	222
Business Management and Administrative Services	52	14	93	1	45	101	43	36	333
Education	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Engineering	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Mathematics	27	0	3	0	0	2	1	4	10
Physical Sciences	40	0	2	0	1	7	2	1	13
Agricultural Sciences	02	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Social Sciences and History	45	160	54	0	10	45	19	18	306
Visual and Performing Arts	50	0	7	0	5	9	8	9	38
<b>Total Race/Ethnicity</b>		<b>177</b>	<b>211</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>117</b>	<b>207</b>	<b>170</b>	<b>101</b>	<b>984</b>

## Section 2: Accreditation

Who is your institution's primary accrediting agency? [Please check only one.]

- Southern Association of Colleges and Schools
- The Higher Learning Commission of the North Central Association
- New England Association of Schools and Colleges
- Middle States Association of Colleges and Schools
- Western Association of Schools and Colleges
- Northwest Association of Schools and Colleges
- Other (please specify)

### Section 3: Grant Activities and Focus Area

Grant activity carried out during this reporting period in your grant application:

Increasing critical literacy (reading, writing, critical thinking skills) of CSUDH students through the following means: (1) Faculty Development, with a faculty seminar to train faculty to develop and teach Writing Intensive (or "critical literacy") courses; and (2) Expansion of tutoring services through the use of more tutors, faculty associates, and an augmented staff.

Total \$ spent on this activity during the current reporting period: 248001.00

Focus area:    \_\_\_ Academic Quality             X  Student Services and Outcomes  
                  \_\_\_ Fiscal Stability                \_\_\_ Institutional Management

<b>LAA Category</b> <b>[Note: All listed activities are directly from legislation.]</b>	<b>Dollars spent</b>	<b>% of Activity</b>
Purchase, rental, or lease of scientific or laboratory equipment for educational purposes, including instructional and research purposes.	0.00	0%
Construction, maintenance, renovation, and improvement in classrooms, libraries, laboratories, and other instructional facilities.	0.00	0%
Support of faculty exchanges, faculty development, curriculum development, academic instruction, and faculty fellowships to assist in attaining advanced degrees in the fellow's field of instruction.	123227.00	50%
Purchase of library books, periodicals, and other educational materials, including telecommunications program materials.	1855.00	1%
Tutoring, counseling, and student service programs designed to improve academic success.	122919.00	50%
Funds management, administrative management, and acquisition of equipment for use in strengthening funds management.	0.00	0%
Joint use of facilities, such as laboratories and libraries.	0.00	0%
Establishing or improving a development office to strengthen or improve contributions from alumni and the private sector.	0.00	0%
Establishment or improving an endowment fund.	0.00	0%
Creating or improving facilities for Internet or other distance learning academic instruction capabilities, including purchase or rental of telecommunications technology equipment or services.	0.00	0%
Establishing or enhancing a program or teacher education designed to qualify students to teach in public elementary schools and secondary schools.	0.00	0%
Establishing community outreach programs that will encourage elementary school and secondary school students to develop the academic skills and the interest to pursue postsecondary education.	0.00	0%
Expanding the number of Hispanic and other underrepresented graduate and professional students that can be served by the institution by expanding courses and institutional resources.	0.00	0%

OTHER ACTIVITIES--PLEASE DESCRIBE IN SIMILAR DETAIL	0.00	0%
GRAND TOTAL	248001.00	100%

### Section 3: Process Measures

Please complete the following table to let us know what you have accomplished during the past year in this LAA category for this Activity.

**LAA Category** *Support of faculty exchanges, faculty development, curriculum development, academic instruction, and faculty fellowships to assist in attaining advanced degrees in the fellow's field of instruction.*

Did the number of faculty participating in developmental activities (seminars, workshops, etc.) increase? No

*If yes:* Start # of faculty 30  
End # of faculty 29  
Application objective 15

Other: Did the number of faculty participating in faculty development workshops co-sponsored with the Center for Teaching and Learning increase? Yes

*If yes:* Start 175  
End 227  
Application objective 0

### Section 3: Process Measures

Please complete the following table to let us know what you have accomplished during the past year in this LAA category for this Activity.

**LAA Category** *Tutoring, counseling, and student service programs designed to improve academic success.*

Did the number of students using tutoring services increase? No

*If yes:* Start # 22068  
End # 12648  
Application objective 10785

Other: Did the number of tutoring hours increase? Yes

*If yes:* Start 1720  
End 2164  
Application objective 0

### Section 3: Focus Area Outcomes – Student Services and Outcomes

The following are institutional outcomes that can be categorized in the Student Services and Outcomes focus area. Please provide information on at least two of the measures that you feel are *most reflective of your activities supported by Title III/V funds* for the current reporting period. You have the option of entering your own unique outcome goals in the area marked "Other."

You should indicate whether you achieved the related outcome during this reporting period. Remember, you are only required to select at least two outcomes. Many grantees might be in their first grant year and unable to report on any outcomes. If this is the case, you should indicate which goals you will report on next year. If applicable, you have the option of defining the cohort of students for which this outcome is being measured. Among other things, your cohort might be based on your academic year, a sub-population of students (e.g., students with deficiencies in basic skills), or another point in time. Please be concise in this area.

In some instances, it might be necessary to provide a statement that supports your response. (Your supporting statement should be limited to 2 to 3 sentences.)

Row below each item: If you indicate that you have achieved a certain goal, please provide supporting data elements: the initial data point related to the outcome goal, the final data point related to the outcome goal, and the actual outcome goal as stated in your grant application. Note that certain intangible goals will require you to select an appropriate "rating" (e.g., poor, fair, good, excellent).

Has the retention rate of students who participated in other student services programs increased? Yes

Cohort: 109 students who were enrolled in 15 writing intensive pilot courses in fall 2005

*If yes:* Initial rate 75  
Final rate 84  
Goal 0

I would like to provide a brief supporting statement:

The one year return rate for students in piloted WI courses was 9% higher (84.1%) than for all freshmen through juniors (75.1%).

Has the average GPA of students who participated in other student services programs increased? Yes

Cohort: 109 students who were enrolled in 15 piloted writing intensive courses in fall 2005

*If yes:* Initial GPA 2  
Final GPA 2  
Goal 0

I would like to provide a brief supporting statement:

The gain in GPA from 2.88 in spring 2005 to 2.99 in spring 2006 may not be meaningful statistically.

## Section 4: Project Status

**Activity:** Increasing critical literacy (reading, writing, critical thinking skills) of CSUDH students through the following means: (1) Faculty Development, with a faculty seminar to train faculty to develop and teach Writing Intensive (or "critical literacy") courses; and (2) Expansion of tutoring services through the use of more tutors, faculty associates, and an augmented staff.

### Narrative Supporting Completed Objectives

Please provide brief statements, with data and references to goals stated in your application as appropriate, to document the objectives that were "completed" during the reporting period.

Activity Objective	Evidence of Completion
By September 2006, as a result of training via an intensive CL faculty seminar, fifteen (15) SOH/SOE & GE faculty will each prepare two revised syllabi for a total of 30 courses with new CL components. A minimum of 20 of the 30 courses (66%) will be ready for piloting in year five.	Twenty-nine faculty members participated in a Title V seminar or workshop and produced 44 syllabi with new CL components. Over 20 of the courses developed in year four were ready for piloting in year five.
By September 2006, there will be a quadrupling of courses taught that have CL components over the estimated 2002 baseline of 20 courses; year four pilots will be in SMT and GE	In Y-4 there were 93 WI courses using CL components. Piloted courses were in the natural sciences and health science areas and GE.
By June 2006, there will have been at least a 40% increase in the numbers of students served, compared to the 2001,02 baseline.	In Year 4 there was a 60% increase in the numbers of students served, from 7704 in 2001-02 to 12,648 in Y-4.
By Y-4, there will be a 2.0% increase in university's UG mean score of GWE from prior year's base.	In Y-4, the UG mean score of GWE increased by 3.27% from the previous year.

### Section 4: Budget

Column 1	Column 2	Column 3	Column 4	Column 5	Column 6	Column 7	Column 8
Budget Categories	Carryover Balance from Previous FY	Actual Budget	Expenditures	Non-Federal Expenditures	Carryover Balance	Next Year's Actual Budget	Changes? Y/N
Personnel	6186.00	275080.00	258681.00	0.00	22585.00	281266.00	No
Fringe Benefits	24064.00	93000.00	48258.00	0.00	52806.00	117064.00	No
Travel	4874.00	5500.00	1666.00	0.00	8709.00	10374.00	No
Equipment	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	No
Supplies	7143.00	12554.00	19372.00	0.00	325.00	19697.00	No
Contractual	1952.00	7479.00	25301.00	0.00	130.00	9431.00	No
Construction	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	No
Other	6438.00	8000.00	12058.00	0.00	2380.00	14438.00	No
Endowment	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	No
<b>Total Costs</b>	<b>50657.00</b>	<b>401613.00</b>	<b>365336.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>86935.00</b>	<b>452270.00</b>	

## **Section 4: Line Item Budget Narrative**

Please describe how funds will be expended as a result of your changes in each of the line item categories.

**Personnel**

**Fringe Benefits**

**Travel**

**Equipment**

**Supplies**

**Contractual**

**Construction**

**Other**

**Endowment**

## Section 4: Summary Budget Narrative

Please explain budget changes, as needed, particularly the use of funds from cost savings, carryover funds and other expanded authorities changes to your budget. Provide an explanation if you are NOT expending funds at the expected rate. Describe any significant changes to your budget resulting from modifications of project activities.

We began Y-4 with \$50,659 in carry-forward funds as the result of savings in personnel affiliated with the project as well as from savings in benefits assumed by the university's cost share. In Y-4, enrollments at CSUDH declined by 7% from the previous year, and the university experienced budget reductions from the state and CSU system that made it necessary to postpone the phase-in cost share by the University for expanded tutoring services. The funds saved enable the project to expand our Year 5 activities in several ways: 1) Additional training for a 15-person writing leadership faculty cohort (\$15,000); 2) A mini-conference in September 2007 with keynote speaker and faculty leader-led workshops (\$est. \$20,000); 3) An additional faculty workshop in fall 2006 focusing on student engagement and critical literacy (\$15,000); 2) Faculty research into the pedagogy of engagement and critical skill development (\$7500); 3) Pilot for a CL-enhanced GE course in critical reasoning [Philosophy 120] (\$4500); 4) Travel to workshops and conferences on critical reasoning and writing for two faculty members (\$5000); 5) Pilot for on-line ENG 350 (Composition course) in accord with the revised GWE (\$9000); and 6) Assistance to departments and programs in preparing WI course proposals for approval by the University Writing Committee (\$20,000).