DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 361 036 JC 930 415

AUTHOR	Berry, David A.
TITLE	Partnership Program, Essex County College.
INSTITUTION	Essex County Coll., Newark, N.J.
SPONS AGENCY	Fund for the Improvement of Post-secondary Education (ED), Washington, DC.
PUB DATE	31 Aug 89
CONTRACT	G008642090-88
NOTE	51p.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Descriptive (141)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Articulation (Education); *College School Cooperation; Community Colleges; *Faculty Development; High Schools; *Participant Satisfaction; Partnerships in Education; Program Descriptions; Program Evaluation; Student Attitudes; Teacher Attitudes; *Teacher Workshops; *Teaching Methods; Two Year Colleges
IDENTIFIERS	Essex County College NJ

ABSTRACT

The Partnership Program at Essex County College (ECC), in Newark, New Jersey, was a 3-year, intensive, college-high school faculty development project designed to coordinate curriculum and learning strategies in area feeder high schools with content and instructional methods used in introductory college courses. Weekly workshops were conducted over a 9-month period for high school and college faculty, focusing on training the participants to use new strategies in writing, reading, listening, speaking, thinking, and computer literacy instruction. Each of the 41 faculty members who participated in the project produced a student learning guide to be used in a targeted course. The guides were designed to help students master course content and instructional methods in these courses and to reinforce learning strategies across the curriculum. Interviews with 15 high school students and questionnaires administered to college and high school students in 13 classes in which the learning guides were used revealed that students particularly appreciated knowing teachers' expectations. Results of interviews with high school teachers conducted in fall 1989 also revealed support for the project and the guides. However, time constraints and lack of administrator support were mentioned as obstacles to implementing the learning guide approach more broadly. Attachments outline components of a learning guide and features of a course designed around learning guides. (AC)

Partnership Program

Essex County Community College

Essex County College
Humanities Division
303 University Avenue
Newark, NJ 07102

Grant No.: G008642090-88

Project Dates:
Starting Date: September 1, 1986
Ending Date: August 31, 1989
Number of Months: 36

Project Director: David A. Berry
Humanities Division
Essex County College
303 University Avenue
Newark, NJ 07102
Telephone: 201-877-3320

FIPSE Program Officers: William Thompson
David Holmes

Budget: $152,982.00

Summary of the Project:

The Partnership Program at Essex County College (Newark, NJ) was a three-year, intensive, college-high school faculty development project for 41 faculty members. The Program trained faculty to use new strategies in writing, reading, listening, speaking, thinking, and computer literacy instruction. The Program sought to coordinate curriculum and learning strategies in area feeder high schools with content and methodologies used in introductory college courses. Each faculty member produced a student learning guide for use in a targeted course(s). The guides were designed to help students to mastery course content and method in particular courses and to reinforce learning strategies across the curriculum.

Project Title: Partnership Program

Project Director: David A. Berry
Essex County College
303 University Avenue
Newark, NJ 07102

Executive Summary:

Project Title: Partnership Program

Grantee: Essex County College
303 University Avenue
Newark, NJ 07102

Project Director: David A. Berry
Humanities Division
201-877-3320

Project Overview:

The Partnership Program began as an effort to coordinate course content and student learning strategies at area feeder high schools with introductory college courses (primarily in general education) at Essex County College. The Program built on a successful faculty development effort at the college and sought to work with high school and college faculty to use new techniques and strategies for instruction in writing, reading, listening, speaking, thinking, and computer literacy. Faculty produced student learning guides for use in targeted courses. Both faculty and students enrolled in these courses were directly served by the project. Students in both high school and college courses reported benefits from the use of student learning guides.

Purpose:

The purpose of the Partnership Program was to address the problems inherent in the instruction of under-prepared students who entered Essex County College from inner-city area high schools by faculty who had been traditionally trained in graduate programs. Over 93% of all entering students at the college required remediation in at least one of the areas of writing, reading, or mathematics. Many students experienced difficulty in college-level courses even after completing remediation courses and/or passing placement tests. The Program developed a series of workshops and training seminars that sought to combine new instructional strategies in writing, reading, listening, speaking, thinking, and computer literacy with the content in the disciplines of introductory courses.

Background and Origins:

The Partnership Program began as a result of a New Jersey State funded faculty development program that sought to help faculty to incorporate new techniques and strategies for helping students with writing, reading, and thinking tasks needed to succeed in introductory college courses. The impetus for the faculty development effort came from the college's Project for Writing and Thinking, initially directed by Dr. John Seabrook and then by

David A. Berry. Both directors had been trained at the Bard College Project for Writing and Thinking and had been strongly influenced by the LaGuardia Community College integrated skills reinforcement approach and the development of student learning guides.

Project Description:

The project consisted of weekly workshops conducted over a nine-month period for high school and college faculty. Workshops were conducted primarily by faculty at Essex County College, including the director, Ladylease White, John Seabrook, and Ned Wilson. Outside experts were used at critical points. The workshops were characterized by a collegial climate in which high school and college faculty were treated as equals and in which all individuals were considered to have the teaching expertise and knowledge to contribute meaningfully to each other's further development.

Project Results:

Forty-one faculty participated in the project. Student Learning Guides were produced by 41 faculty members, 20 for high school classes and 21 for colleges courses. Both college and high school teachers reported that the collaborative program was a valuable experience that enabled them to revitalize their teaching and incorporate new teaching techniques into their classrooms. Learning guides helped students because teacher expectations were made clear and communicated effectively, because the content was made more understandable, and because students could be better prepared for class. The outside evaluator noted that "A total of 63.2% of all students surveyed consider the learning guide class better or much better than other classes."

Summary and Conclusions:

The Partnership Program was a very effective faculty development program. The organization of workshops was sound and the mix of emphasis on pedagogical techniques and strategies and content in the disciplines appropriate. The writing and production of student learning guides was an effective vehicle for the translation of workshop training strategies into classroom useable materials. Individual faculty and students in learning guide courses benefitted enormously. The major problem is that no mechanism has been found to institutionalize the program. Hence, the end of the grant period has effectively spelled the end of the program. Yet three years after participation in the project many faculty are still using modified learning guides and report that they are more effective teachers as a result. It must be noted that some faculty have found the task of learning guide revision too onerous to maintain on a consistent basis; but even these faculty report the increased use of workshop techniques,

and a greater sensitivity to the question of how content is taught and to the needs of under-prepared students. A major unintended but important result of the project was the improved reputation of the College and its faculty at the participating high schools and, in turn, the enhanced levels of cooperation that have emerged.

Appendix:

I. Outside Evaluators' Report

The very positive outside evaluator's report noted that "findings clearly indicated that both students and faculty found the learning guide approach extremely useful. The Partnership Program has had a positive impact on both how teachers teach and consequently on how students learn."

II. Faculty Learning Guides

Each faculty member produced a student learning guide for his/her course during the year of participation in the Program. These guides were then used in the target course in the following academic year.

FINAL REPORT: Partnership Program:

Project Overview:

The Partnership Program was an intensive faculty development program for the faculties of Essex County College, Science High School (Newark), the Vocational-Technical High School District (Irvington Center, North 13th Street High School, Market Street Center), and the Clifford Scott High School (East Orange). A total of 41 faculty were trained, one-third in each of a series of three, year-long programs of workshops and collaborative working sessions.

The impetus for the project came from the realization that Essex County College and its feeder high schools served the same student population (at various points in the lives of their student populations since the average age of the students ECC is 27). The aim was to help students to mastery course content and method by working directly with teachers, and to attempt to coordinate curricula and teaching strategies between high schools and college. The vehicle for focusing the workshops and the training sessions was the development of student learning guides for use in targeted courses. While faculty, then, were directly served by the Partnership Program, its aim was always to produce materials for use in the classroom and thereby to transform student learning. The benefits to students in learning guide courses were considerable and are summarized in the outside evaluator's report.

Purpose:

The Partnership Program attempted to address the problems

inherent in the instruction of under-prepared student who entered Essex County College from inner-city high schools by faculty who had been traditionally trained in graduate school. Over 93% of all entering students at the college required remediation in at least one of the areas of writing, reading, and mathematics. Many students experienced difficulty in college-level courses even after completing remediation courses and/or passing placement examinations. If learning strategies and literacy skills could be reinforced across the curriculum, that is, extending across the introductory courses taken in the first year at college, than success rates for course completion and mastery of content would be increased. If the same strategies and literacy skills could be strengthened in high school, then entering colleges students would have a greater chance of success. If students could assume a greater share of the burden of their own education in high school, then their preparation for and their likelihood of success in college would be enhanced. One way to accomplish this goal would be to bring high school and college faculty together in a collaborative faculty development program. These were the kinds of assumptions that defined the initial problem and suggested the nature of the program proposed to FIPSE. What is apparent to me now is the exceedingly broad definition of the problem. A definition of this sort is both a great strength, for it sets in relief the massive crisis of urban, secondary education in Essex county, and a great weakness, for it implies a limited solution will be effective. Moreover, because of the generality of definition, a specific, identifiable

faculty and student population was not targeted in the high schools.

Background and Origins:

Interest in faculty development was prompted by the College Project for Writing and Thinking, initially directed by Dr. John Seabrook and then by David A. Berry. Both had been trained at the Bard College Project for Writing and Thinking, and both were strongly influenced by the LaGuardia Community College integrated skills reinforcement program. The Partnership Program was initiated following a successful New Jersey State funded faculty development program that sought to help faculty at Essex County College to incorporate new techniques and strategies for helping students with writing, reading, and thinking tasks needed to succeed in introductory college courses. This modest program enabled the director, David A. Berry, and the other workshop leaders, John Seabrook and Ladylease White, to work out a year-long series of faculty workshops and seminars. It led directly to the writing of the FIPSE proposal.

Project Description:

The Partnership Program consisted of a series of weekly (following the academic calendar) workshops and seminars for combined groups of high school and college faculty. In each year fourteen faculty, seven from ECC and seven from feeder high schools, participated (one high school participant in year one dropped out and could not be replaced). Participants were competitively selected by the project director in conjunction with the college Dean(s), high school liaison project staff, and

high school principals. The selection of participants was a difficult process, involving many visits with Department chairs, high school liaison staff, and the potential participants themselves. This was the case in each year of the grant period. The workshop and seminar schedule involved the coordination of workshop leaders and outside consultants. Once begun, the activities of the workshops and the supervision of the writing and production of fourteen learning guides became enormously time consuming. A central aspect of the project was always the group process that occurred as a result of the collaborative aspects of the endeavor. Efforts had to be made to maintain an egalitarian approach in regard to all participants, high school and college. In this way, participants could begin to help each other and to provide constructive criticism on workshop assignments. An atmosphere of trust had to be established in order for the workshops and seminars to be effective and for faculty to begin to think reflectively about their own teaching.

The workshops and seminars examined and modeled a wide range of techniques and strategies, including the design of brief writing assignments (including peer review, drafting, positive evaluation), exercises to preview textbooks and other reading materials, the evaluation of reading levels, the use of oral reports in the classroom, the use of computer word processing in the classroom, the design of research, field or laboratory projects, the use of discussion and questioning in the classroom, the use of critical thinking strategies in the classroom, the use of primary sources in the classroom. A major emphasis was placed

on collaborative learning in the workshops. The aim was to encourage faculty to design classroom experiences and assignments that turned passive students into active learners and to encourage students to take on more of the responsibility for their own learning.

Project Results:

The primary result of the project was the production of student learning guides for targeted courses. Workshops and seminars were product centered: each participant did weekly assignments which ultimately ended up as part of his or her learning guide. This was one of the most satisfying, rewarding, and frustrating aspects of the project. It was here that faculty confronted and "worked through" their own approaches to instruction, to difficulties in the presentation of the most complex areas of their particular courses, and to the holistic conceptualization of course content and method. The quality of student learning guides varied considerably, although each was a positive outgrowth of the workshop and seminar training experience and a personal attempt to design an appropriate set of student centered instructions and assignments.

A peculiar part of the training process always centered on the computer literacy component. All faculty agreed that students ought to become computer literate (that is, to use word processing), but not all agreed that they should become computer literate. It was discovered early on (in year one of the grant period) that training in the use of the computer had to be made as painless as possible, that computer experts were the least

helpful guides to helping faculty to use the computer, and that some faculty members would resist the use of the computer on all levels. One of the aims of the program was to get faculty to produce their own student learning guides using the computer. For many, this was a tremendously helpful part of the program for it pushed them to overcome resistance to using the computer and to become proficient in the use of WordPerfect (which soon became the program of choice for the project). Some bought their own personal computers. Some made the use of computers a central feature of their classrooms; in the most extreme case one instructor required his students to do all course assignments on the computer. But others resorted to the expedient of using their stipend money to hire someone else to "type in" their materials. Few noted the irony of this situation.

The most rewarding aspects were the reactions of faculty when they used their learning guides in the classroom. Some faculty members experienced a transformation of their teaching capabilities. As a result of the project, some discovered new strategies, such as the use of short writing assignments or the use of oral reports, that were particularly effective for them. Some found the student learning guides to be remarkable instruments for engendering student mastery of course content.

The evaluation component of the original proposal did not identify a particular student cohort that could be identified and tracked longitudinally over the course of the grant period. Attempts to identify such a group during the project were unsuccessful. Evaluation centered on the faculty participants in

the project and on the students who enrolled in the learning guide courses (that is, courses in which the learning guide was used) of these faculty. The very favorable results are summarized by the outside evaluator.

Summary and Conclusions:

Sustained, systematic faculty development that enables faculty to become more effective teachers is possible and desirable. The effort involved in the process is enormous, on the part of workshop leaders and on the part of the participants. Few faculty (high school or college) had thought systematically about their own teaching approaches and style, or about their courses and course objectives in holistic terms relative to student learning. Few had thought in any sustained way about how and why they teach the way they do. More surprising, few have thought seriously about what and who they teach. Most teachers (high school and college) are bound by the dictates of coverage, defined most usually in terms of a textbook or a set of topics to be dealt with in a particular course/class. The Partnership Program asked faculty to think seriously about these how's and why's and what's and who's.

The collaboration between high school and college faculty was a beneficial part of the program. Both groups, in fact, did learn from each other. Some of the high school teachers were seriously restricted by the institutional requirements of their jobs and could not change curriculum materials even if they knew they were ineffective or inappropriate; others demonstrated

remarkable creativity and innovation in their learning guides. Ironically, even through the college faculty had more latitude in terms of what and how they could teach, some had difficulty moving beyond the "cover the textbook" approach.

I should have initiated major efforts to involve senior administrators in the life of the project so that the benefits of the program would be known and appreciated. The high school component of the project should have been initiated at the level of the superintendent, not, as was done, at the level of the principal.

It became clear by the second year of the project that the benefits of the faculty development program were very great, but so were the costs, and, therefore, it was not likely that the college or any of the high schools would pick up the program, or portions of it, for continuation. In fact, this turned out to be the case.

Evaluation Report: Essex County College Partnership Program

Barbara Schaier-Peleg

Project Evaluator

INTRODUCTION

The Essex County College Partnership Program is essentially a faculty development program designed to help faculty rethink their approaches to teaching. Working together in teams composed of high school and college teachers, each participant in the program was required to develop a learning guide for a specific course that would be used by students as a guide for that course. The guides contained assignments, questions, vocabulary, and readings that helped to clarify key concepts, encourage critical thinking, and improve writing and reading skills. In order to design their guides, faculty had to carefully review and adjust course curricula and at the same time were encouraged to re-examine their expectations of students.

During the past three years we have examined both faculty reactions to the training and their expectations about the effectiveness of the guides on enhancing student learning. We have also looked at student reactions to learning guide courses both through interviews and by assessing responses to a series of questions. In each of the previous evaluations, findings clearly indicated that both students and faculty found the learning guide approach extremely useful. The Partnership Program has had a positive impact on both how teachers teach and

consequently on how students learn. Evaluation of the third and final year of the FIPSE grant includes interviews with students and teachers and analysis of student reactions to questionnaires. The findings from these interviews and surveys are consistent with those from the past years and will be described in detail in this report. In addition, to determine the extent to which the project has resulted in a lasting effect upon teachers, we conducted a follow-up survey of all participants in the faculty training program.

A series of recommendations will be discussed at the conclusion of the evaluation report. The recommendations are offered after careful examination of all faculty and student data.

STUDENT INTERVIEWS

At the end of the Spring, 1989 semester, interviews were conducted with fifteen Science High School students from four different classes in which instructors used learning guides. The following strengths and weaknesses of learning guides were reported.

Strengths

1) Students liked the fact that they knew what teachers expected of them. They complained about courses where they

were not certain about what the teacher wanted them to learn and felt that the learning guide very definitely helped the teacher to effectively communicate expectations for the course. They believed they were playing a much "fairer game" in learning guide classes.

2) Many students also claimed that the guide helped them with their homework. At times when they could not understand material that was presented in class they were able to review it at home at their own pace.

3) A few of the more advanced students liked the guide because they were able to preview material and approach this new material on their own. This made the course more stimulating for them.

4) Almost all of the students interviewed thought that the learning guides were so useful that they wanted guides designed for other classes. Students were not at all ambivalent about wanting to take additional classes that used guides.

5) Learning guide classes tend to be better than other classes, but the degree to which this is true depends on the ability of the teacher and her commitment to using the guide and to making it work. For example, students studying French were

by far the most enthusiastic and supportive of learning guides. They felt that learning guides made French more exciting and easier to learn. If I would be asked to pick out the class most likely to successfully use a guide, based upon subject matter, French probably would not have been my first choice. The teacher of this class clearly was committed to the learning guide approach and was able to use the guide creatively.

Weaknesses

1) Assignments are sometimes based too closely upon the text and are at times redundant. In this case, they do not add anything, but become time consuming and tedious.

2) Not enough questions and critical reading assignments are available for students who want to advance themselves.

3) Some teachers required students to use guides erratically. In classes where the guide is not emphasized, students use them only prior to exams instead of on an ongoing basis.

4) No bilingual guides are available for those who are ESL students. The ESL students believed that a bilingual guide would dramatically help them improve their skills and understanding of course content.

TEACHER INTERVIEWS

During Fall, 1989, teachers from Vocational Technical High School were interviewed during which time they offered the following comments:

Strengths

1) The teachers felt that the training program was extremely stimulating for them and that the collaboration with college teachers was an especially valuable experience that in itself helped to revitalize their approach to teaching.

2) The teachers also believed that the quality of student work was enhanced by the guide. They concurred that students were generally more responsive and answered questions more thoughtfully.

3) Teachers reported that they used new teaching techniques more extensively because of the Partnership Program. The guide provided a stimulus for experimenting with new approaches such as using small groups in the classroom, assigning a greater number of writing tasks, and formulating more stimulating questions.

Weaknesses

1) The high school curriculum is strictly enforced with standardized midterms and finals. Consequently, teachers

have little flexibility in deciding upon which topics to emphasize and how much time to spend on them. Therefore they believed it difficult, if not impossible, to significantly rethink and redesign a course for the learning guide approach.

2) No high school administrator has been closely involved with the program. Even though the administration had voiced support for the program at the outset, in many instances administrators have not continued to provide the support that was needed. One teacher complained that after an administrator had visited the learning guide class in which students had been involved in an exercise, she was reprimanded the next day for leaving some scraps of paper in the room. Teachers were also not convinced that the school administration would duplicate their learning guides for them each year.

3) The time required to adequately develop a learning guide was a problem for high school teachers in particular. Since their work days were totally filled and the Partnership Program required that they attend sessions after school on their own time, they were adamant about being compensated. They were actually more interested in receiving academic credit towards promotion than stipends.

STUDENT QUESTIONNAIRES

Students from thirteen different classes which used learning guides (ten college classes and three high school classes) were asked to complete questionnaires to assess their attitudes towards the classes and the guides. The same questionnaires used in the past two years were again employed. The specific data are reported in Appendix I of the report.

Analysis of the results indicate that the three key reasons that students find learning guide classes better than from other classes are 1) that the guide helps make what is learned easier to understand (35%), 2) the guide helps the student to better prepare himself for class (20%), and 3) teachers' expectations are clearer (18%). When looking at classes individually, findings indicate that in each of the high school classes most students pointed to the fact that the learning guide classes were better because the guides made the material easier to understand, while in many of the college classes the majority of students reported that clearer teachers expectations and the fact that the guide helped them to better prepare themselves for class were the essential differences between learning guide and other classes.

When asked why the learning guide class was less appealing than the other classes, the majority of students felt none of

the reasons was applicable. We are making the assumption that in most cases students clearly do not find the learning guide class less appealing than other classes.

Students in all classes at both high school and college levels, with the exception of one psychology class, claim that the learning guide class is better or much better than other classes. The students in the one psychology class tend to think the class is the same as others. A total of 63.2% of all students surveyed consider the learning guide class better or much better than other classes.

The following points indicate students reactions to learning guide classes based upon agreement to specific statements. They are presented in the order of strongest agreement.

1) Teachers provide clear directions when they use the learning guide

In all but two classes, students tend to strongly feel that teachers who use learning guides provide clear directions. Over 87% of total students surveyed concur that this is true. In 9 out of the 13 classes over 80% of students disagree that teachers using learning guides do not provide clear directions.

2) Teachers expectations are clearer

In all classes (with the exception of English 102) students agree strongly that the class is a better one because teachers expectations are clearer - 74% of all students agree with this point.

In response to another question developed to examine the same point, students in 11 of 13 classes students disagreed and strongly disagreed that teacher expectations are not always clear in the learning guide classes.

3) Students would recommend that friends take a learning guide class

Seventy-three percent of all students would encourage their friends to take a learning guide class. Agreement was strong in all classes with a clear majority of students recommending that their friends take a learning guide class. The range of agreement was from 60% of students in Math 101 to 100% of students in the high school French class.

4) The guide helps student to understand difficult concepts

Over sixty-six percent of all students agree that the guide help students to understand difficult concepts. The strongest agreement is in the following college classes: math (80%), biology (75.1%), history (73.6%), and psychology (76.9%). The class with the least agreement is high school

French (50%).

5) Participating in a special program makes the class exciting

Sixty-one percent of student respondents agree the learning guide class is more exciting just because they are participating in a special program. With the exception of history, over 50% of students in each class agree with this point. These findings seem to be consistent with studies which indicate that there is usually a halo effect with experimental programs.

6) The learning guide does not make the class too easy

Students tend to disagree that the learning guide makes the class too easy. Close to 60% of all students disagreed. Again the range of response is great depending upon the class. For example 94% of students in high school French disagree with this point, while few students in psychology 101 disagree. Over 60% students in only 5 out of 13 disagreed with this point.

7) It is not difficult to keep up with class assignments

Only 20.3% of the total students agree that it is difficult to keep up with class assignments. Students definitely concur that in learning guide classes it is easy to keep up with the work.

8) Student writing has improved in learning guide classes

As would be expected students in both college and high school English classes agree that their writing has improved as a result of the classes (87.5% of students in college English and 100% in high school English). On the other hand only 24% of students in college biology agree that their writing h improved. In all, about 56% of students agree.

9) Student vocabulary has improved in learning guide classes

A total of 55.2% of students agree that their vocabulary has improved. The highest percentage of agreement is in psychology (92.4%), history (79.4%), English and French classes.

10) The teacher is a better teacher because of the learning guide

About 53% of all students agree that the learning guide helps teachers improve their teaching. A particularly high percentage of students in high school French (68.8%) and elementary physics (71.6%), concur.

11) Students read more in learning guide classes

While a total of 52% of all students agree, responses vary widely from class to class. In Biology 101, for example, 100% students agree (87.5% strongly agree), 94.1% of students in the high school English class agree, and 73.6% of students in History 101 agree. On the other hand, only 25.5% of students

in Physics 101 agree, and 30% in Math 101, 46.2% in Psychology 101, and 45.5 of students in high school history agree.

12) Students who do not keep up waste class time

A total of 50.3% agree. In most classes 50-60% of students agree with this point. In a few classes, however, the majority of students disagree that those who do not keep up with the work waste class time. In Biology 101, for example, 62.6% of students disagree.

13) Using a learning guide will help the student to do well in other classes

A large number of students in college physics (80.9%) agree that using the learning guide will help em do well in other classes. In most classes, however, only between 40-50% of students concur that they can transfer skills from learning guide classes to other classes.

14) There is more work in a learning guide class than in other classes

Classes differ widely with regard to how students responded to this point. In some classes many students strongly agree, while in others, many disagree. For example 87.5% of students in the college biology class agree or strongly agree, while 87.5% of students in high school French disagree or strongly

disagree. In some clases students are fairly evenly divided with large numbers both agreeing and disagreeing. In college math 40% agree and strongly agree, and 40% disagree and strongly disagree. It is not surprising that the amount of work differs significantly from one teacher to another.

15) The student is a better student because of the learning guide

While a total of 48.9% of students agree that the student is a better student because of the guide, responses also differ greatly from one class to another. Students in college physics (71.4%), college psychology (77%), and history (57.9%) most strongly agree with this point, while only 18.2% of the students in college biology agreed.

16) Students participate more actively in class discussions in learning guide classes

The responses again differ considerably from class to class. For example in the two psychology classes taught by the same teacher, 67% of students in one class and 85% of students in the second agree that they do participate more actively in class discussions, while 69% of students in the biology class disagree. It is important to note, however, that over 60% of students in 9 out of 13 classes agree or strongly agree.

17) Students want more of their work graded

Only 38.5% of students agree that they want more work graded. However, again in a few classes students do not conform with the general feeling - 81.3% of high school French students, 61.6% of students in psychology want more of their work graded.

FACULTY FOLLOW-UP SURVEY

Follow-up surveys were mailed to the 35 teachers who participated in the training and who were still teaching. We mailed twelve surveys to participants from 1986-87 (year one), eleven from 1987-88 (year two), and twelve from 1988-89 (year three). We received a total of 26 responses--nine from year one, eight from year two and nine from year three.

Only four of the college teachers are not teaching the same course for which the guide was initially developed, while all of the high school teachers were still teaching the same course. Only one of the college teachers did not use the guide after it was developed--only because he became a division chairperson. He did, however, give the guide to another instructor who used several parts of it. All of the high school teachers used the guide after it was developed.

Again almost everyone responded affirmatively. When asked if they were still using the guide, twelve Essex faculty said yes, and three said no; wh.le five high school teachers said yes, and two said no. Those who were no longer using the guide said they stopped using it because of changes in course content, insufficient learning guides, or because of changes in teaching assignments. One teacher was now using a learning guide that was designed by the author of the text that is currently being used for the course. Many of the teachers are not using the entire guide, but are using selected assignments or are adapting previous ones to new situations.

Only a total of seven teachers--five from Essex and two from the high schools--are using learning guides in other courses. In most cases teachers have adapted the guides, but have not redeveloped new guides. Many would like to or are actually planning to develop new guides, but are restricted by time constraints. Only thirteen (50%) of the respondents answered the question would you like to use the learning guide more extensively? Nine said yes and four said no to this question.

Although the interaction between teachers from college and high school was a valuable component of the program, the interaction ceased once the training was over. When asked whether they still met with other members of their original

group, those who responded favorably, (twelve said yes and ten said no), most only interacted with teachers from the same institution. Only two of the college teachers have maintained contacts with teachers from the high schools, and these contacts have been sporadic.

Each of the respondents very definitely believed that the guide had an impact on students. The following comments list the ways in which faculty perceive that the guide has been helpful to students:

- It helps students understand difficult concepts
- It helps students to improve reading and writing skills
- It helps students to better understand assignments
- It provides students with a more thorough understanding of content
- It helps involve students in the use of the MacIntosh computer
- It helps increase student self-reliance
- It helps students to advance at their own pace
- It helps absentee students to catch-up with work
- It helps students improve thinking skills
- It helped students with solving problems
- It helps student know what to expect and consequently how to organize themselves and budget time for assignments

When asked whether there has been a lasting effect on teaching, again most teachers responded affirmatively. The following comments were offered:

- the guide provides me with a school plan for teaching the course
- I am now using new collaborative techniques in the classroom
- I provide students with specific directions
- I require more writing assignments in all of my classes
- I give students more difficult thought problems and take-home assignments, after which I review and discuss solutions
- I plan lessons in greater detail by using a step-by-step system
- I am now more aware of the language of the text and take more time to select a text
- I am now more aware of the organizational impact of course content and focus more on quality than on quantity

When asked whether their expectations for student performance or responsibility have changed as a result of the Partnership Program, most said no. Several did say, however, that while their expectations did not change, they felt the program provided them with the tools to help students perform

up to the their expectations. Only five respondents claimed that since their participation in the Program they did expect more of their students; they especially felt that students should take more responsibility for their own learning.

Respondents offered several suggestions about ways to improve the program. These include the following:

- Particularly successful learning guides should be made available as models at the beginning of the training
- The program needs a second phase, about a year or so after the guide is developed, to enable faculty to revise the guide or rewrite a second one
- Pairing of high school and college teachers by discipline would be especially useful
- Teachers should be provided with additional copies of the guide
- Financial rewards or graduate credits towards promotion should be offered for revising the guide or for developing new ones
- Teachers should be provided with clear goals and objectives at the beginning of the program
- Periodic follow-up meetings for Partnerhsip Program participants should be scheduled

- Computer instruction should be improved

SUMMARY

The following summary focuses on the key strengths and weaknesses of the program. Specific strengths and weaknesses have been discussed throughout the report. Although the Partnership Program has accomplished most of its primary objectives, a few problems do remain. The evaluator strongly believes that this is an extremely valuable program, both for students and faculty, and hopes the following recommendations will be useful.

Strengths

1) In the three years of the project almost every teacher who participated in the program developed and used a learning guide. The process of developing the guide required them to rethink the way they teach, to develop new strategies, and to clarify what really was important for students to learn. This in itself is a significant accomplishment. Most teachers are still using either the complete guide or parts of it. Several teachers have adapted the guide for other courses and others are planning to do so in the future.

2) Collaboration was a very positive experience for both high school and college teachers.

3) The guides definitely appear to have had a positive impact on student attitudes towards learning and very likely significantly facilitated learning. Students consistently reported that the guide makes it easier for them to learn difficult concepts, it makes teachers' expectations and directions clearer, and it helps them to better prepare for class.

Weaknesses

1) Teachers seem to feel that while the program was extremely valuable, it was essentially operating in a vacuum. Both high school and college administrators need to be more closely informed about the accomplishments of the program. Communication with key people needs to be strenghthened.

2) While almost all faculty want to sustain their high level of enthusiasm for the learning guide approach, without ongoing external support, in some form, they may eventually lose interest.

3) Collaboration between high school and college faculty has generally not lasted beyond the initial year of participation.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1) The Partnership Program has been very successful to

date in positively affecting both faculty and student attitudes and behaviors. Use the successes of the program to persuade key administrators from both high school and college to buy into and own the learning guide concept more intensively. Designate the critical person or persons at each institution and invite them to a meeting where you will decide next steps for the Partnership Program. Perhaps convene a Partnership Board of Directors. Be sure to invite students and faculty who were involved with the program to participate.

2) You must provide an opportunity for learning guide teachers to interact with each other on an ongoing basis after their initial year of participation. Even if this interaction takes place only once a semester it would be valuable for sustaining faculty motivation and interest. A forum for exchanging information about successes and problems teachers encountered in using the guide should be provided.

3) Several teachers have developed excellent guides. Utilize your best learning guides as models for other teachers who wish to refine their guides or who are about to develop new guides. This may even be an agenda for one of the meetings--the sharing of learning guide success stories. These successful guides can also be used to help convince administrators of the importance of the Partnership Program. You have tangible results--use them.

APPENDIX I

Analysis of Results from Student Questionnaires

1) The three most prevalent reasons students find the learning guide class different from other classes:

A) It makes what is learned easier to understand (35%)
B) It helps students feel better prepared for class (20%)
C) Teacher expectations are clearer (18%)

College Classes	Percentage of students agreeing
Course #01 - Math	
There is no difference	30%
It helps students learn to think for themselves	20%
Course #02 - History	
It makes what is learned easier to understand	37%
It helps students feel better prepared	26%
Teachers expectations are clearer	21%
Course #03 - Physics	
It makes what is learned easier to understand	43%
Students feel better about participating in class discussion	19%
Course #05 - Biology	
	36%
It helps students feel better prepared for class	25%
Teachers expectations are clearer	
Course #06 - English	
	75%
It helps students feel better prepared for class	
Course #09 - Mass Communications (Bristol Community College)	
	32%
It makes what is learned easier to understand	29%
It helps students feel better prepared for class	
Course #18 - Psychology	
	30%
It makes what is learned easier to understand	21%
It helps students to think for themselves	
Course #19 - Psychology	
	39%
Teachers expectations are clearer	23%
It help students to think for themselves	

Course #33 - History	Percentage of students agreeing
It makes what is learned easier to understand	26%

Course #51 - Physics

It helps students feel better prepared for class	29%
It makes what is learned easier to understand	24%

High School Classes

Course #21 - French

It makes what is learned easier to understand	75%
There is no difference between learning guide class and other classes	19%

Course #22 - English

It makes what is learned easier to understand	59%
It helps students to think for themselves	18%

Course #23 - History

It makes what is learned easier to understand	64%
Teachers expectations are clearer	18%

2) The three most prevalent responses students gave as to why the learning guide classes were less appealing than other classes:

A) None of the responses were appropriate (68%)
B) There is a lot of unecessary work (10.3%)
C) Too much time is required to prepare for class (10.3%)

College Classes

Course #01 - Math	Percentage of students agreeing
None of the above	50%
Using the guide makes the class too rigid	20%

Course #02 - History

None of the above	53%
There is a lot of unecessary work and too much time is required to prepare for class	16%

Course #03 - Physics	Percentage of students agreeing
None of the above	62%
Course #05 - Biology	
None of the above	37.5%
There is a lot of unnecessary work	31.3%
Too much time is required to prepare for class	19%
Course #06 - English	
None of the above	87.5%
Course #09 - Mass Communications (Bristol Community College)	
None of the above	89%
Course #18 - Psychology	
None of the above	58%
Course #19 - Psychology	
None of the above	46%
Too much is expected of me	38%
Course #33 - History	
None of the above	63%
There is a lot of unnecessary work	16%
Course #51 - Phsics	
None of the above	86%
High School Classes	
Course #21 - French	
None of the above	87.5%
Course #22 - English	
None of the above	76.5%
Course #23 - History	
None of the above	82%

1) My learning guide teacher does not provide clear directions

Total - 87.6% Disagree

College Class	Percent Disagree
Math 101	80%
History 001	84.1%
Physics 101	80.9%
Biology 101	87.6%
English 102	25%
Mass Communications	92.9%
Psychology 101	54.2%
Psychology 101	69.2%
History 101	84.3% (Agree)
Elementary Physics	85.7%
High School Class	
French	81.3%
English	94.1%
History	90.1%

2) Teachers expectations are clearer in the learning guide class

Total - 74% Agree

College Class	Percent Agree
Math 101	70%
History 001	68%
Physics 101	85.7%
Biology 121	56%
English 102	25%
Mass Communications	93%
Psychology 101	66.6%
Psychology 101	84.6%
History 101	79.9%
Elementary Pysics	76.2%
High School Class	
French	36.3%
English	82.3%
History	79.9%

3) I would not encourage friends to take a learning guide class

Total - 73% Disagree

College Class	Percent Disagree
Math 101	60%
History 001	73.7%
Physics 101	71.4%
Biology 101	62.5%
English 102	62.5%
Mass Communications	85.7%
Psychology 101	66.7%
Psychology 101	69.2%
History 101	68.5%
Elementary Physics	76.2%
High School Class	
French	100%
English	82.3%
History	63.6%

4) The learning guide helps student to understand difficult concepts

Total - 66.4% Agree

College Class	Percent Agree
Math 101	80%
History 001	73.6%
Physics 101	61.9%
Biology 121	75.1%
English 102	62.5%
Mass Communications	67.8%
Psychology 101	66.6%
Psychology 101	76.9%
History 101	52.6%
Elementary Physics	66.7%
High School Class	
French	50%
English	64.7%
History	72.7%

5) Because the learning guide class is a special program it is more exciting

Total - 61% Agree

College Class	Percent Agree
Math 101	60%
History 001	47.3%
Physics 101	57.2%
Biology 101	50%
English 102	50%
Mass Communications	57.2%
Psychology 101	70.8%
Psychology 101	92.3%
History 101	68.5%
Elementary Physics	66.6%
High School Class	
French	50%
English	64.7%
History	54.5%

6) The learning guide makes the class too easy

Total - 59.2% Disagree

College Class	Percent Disagree
Math 101	40%
History 001	63.2%
Physics 101	42.9%
Biology 101	87.5%
English 102	87.5%
Mass Communications	64.3%
Psychology 101	50%
Psychology 101	46.2% (Undecided)
History 101	52.6%
Elementary Physics	52.4%
High School Class	
French	93.8%
English	58.9%
History	72.8%

7) It is difficult to keep up with assignments in the learning guide class

Total - 57.9% Disagree

College Class	Percent Disagree
Math 101	100%
History 001	68.4%
Physics 101	66.7%
Biology 101	53.8%
English 102	37.5%
Mass Communications	60.7%
Psychology 101	20.8%
Psychology 101	7.7%
History 101	73.7%
Elementary Physics	71.4%
High School Class	
French	68.8%
English	64.7%
History	72.7%

8) Students feel that their writing has improved in the learning guide class

Total - 55.6% Agree

College Class	Percent Agree
Math 101	50%
History 001	52.6%
Physics 101	57.1%
Biology 101	24.3%
English 102	87.5%
Mass Communications	39.3%
Psychology 101	41.6%
Psychology 101	76.9%
History 101	47.4%
Elementary Physics	47.6%
High School Class	
French	62.6%
English	100%
History	81.8%

9) Students feel that their vocabulary has improved

Total- 55.2% Agree

College Class	Percent Agree
Math 101	50%
History 001	79.4%
Physics 101	42.9%
Biology 101	50.1%
English 102	62.5%
Mass Communications	53.6%
Psychology 101	45.8%
Psychologh 101	92.4%
History 101	53.7%
Elementary Physics	52.4%
High School Class	
French	62.6%
English	47%
History	54.6%

10) The teacher is a better teacher because of the learning guide

Total - 53.8% Agree

College Class	Percent Agree
Math 101	30%
History 001	63.7%
Physics 101	57.1%
Biology 101	37.6%
English 102	50%
Mass Communications	57.2%
Psychology 101	50%
Psychologh 101	76.9%
History 101	31.6%
Elementary Physics	71.6%
High School Class	
French	68.8%
English	41.2%
History	54.5%

11) I read more in the learning guide class

Total - 52.9% Agree

College Class	Percent Agree
Math 101	38%
History 001	52.6%
Physics 101	25.5%
Biology 101	100%
English 102	62.5%
Mass Communications	57.1%
Psychology 101	45.9%
Psychology 101	46.2%
History 101	73.6%
Elementary Physics	47.6%
High School Class	
French	61.6% (Disagree)
English	94.1%
History	45.5%

12) Students who don't keep up waste class time

Total - 50.3% Agree

College Class	Percent Agree
Math 101	30%
History 001	63.1%
Physics 101	52.3%
Biology 101	62.6% (Disagree)
English 102	37.5%
Mass Communications	35.7%
Psychology 101	58.4%
Psychology 101	61.6%
History 101	68.4%
Elementary Physics	52.3%
High School Class	
French	62.6%
English	58.8%
History	63.7%

13) The learning guide will help me do well in other classes

Total - 50.2% Agree

College Class	Percent Agree
Math 101	40%
History 001	42.2%
Physics 101	52.3%
Biology 101	25%
English 102	50%
Mass Communications	46.4%
Psychology 101	50%
Psychology 101	92.3%
History 101	31.6%
Elementary Physics	80.9%
High School Class	
French	50.1%
English	46%
History	45.5%

When asked for their comments about positive aspects of the learning guide, students gave the following responses:

	H.S.	College	Total
1. Clearer understanding of material	13	44	57
2. Better prepared for class	12	31	43
3. Builds vocabulary	5	26	31
4. Good to study from	1	25	26
5. Guide is organized and clear	4	16	20
6. Know what teacher expects	3	13	13
7. Helpful in learning the computer	0	13	13
8. Develops writing skills	7	6	13
9. Highlights key points	1	10	11
10. You learn more	3	8	11
11. You can perform at your own pace	6	2	8
12. Guide has great exercises	6	2	8
13. Makes student think	1	6	7
14. Lexicon is helpful	0	7	7
15. Is a good reference	0	6	6
16. Makes class more interesting	0	5	5
17. Eliminates extra steps	1	4	5
18. Helps students pass course	0	5	5

When asked for their comments about negative aspects of the learning guide, students gave the following responses:

		H.S.	College	Total
1.	Too much work	11	25	36
2.	There is nothing wrong with guide	5	24	29
3.	Too much time required to prepare for class	3	19	22
4.	Charateristics i.e. weight, size	6	13	19
5.	Guide is boring	10	2	12
6.	Some work is unnecessary	4	8	12
7.	Too much writing	2	9	11
8.	Not easy to understand	1	9	10
9.	Too many questions	1	8	9
10.	The lexicon needs improvement	2	5	7
11.	Too many exercises	6	0	6
12.	Do not like the media analysis	0	6	6
13.	Do not like the computerized assignments	0	6	6
14.	Skips around too much (disorganized)	2	3	5
15.	Too much vocabulary	0	5	5

Partnership Program - FIPSE Project
Essex County College

Components of a Learning Guide

Note on printing: All Guides will be printed in the Essex County College print shop. They will be bound with a 19-hole binder. Include a cover sheet. Copyright your Guide; date (year) and the phrase. "All rights reserved."

1. Preface or Letter to students: explain the key topics considered in your course and perhaps, your expectations for students; introduce the central features of your course; note your participation in the Partnership Program, funded by the Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education (FIPSE).
2. Acknowledgements page: thank individuals who have been helpful to you; mention institutional assistance - especially the Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education.
3. Course syllabi and course objectives. Include policies concerning attendance, grading, lateness, classroom decorum, make-up work, missed examinations or quizzes. Information about access to area libraries, tutoring, or other sources of assistance with course work should be included.
4. A short description of your discipline and the special characteristics of the use of language in your discipline. Include a list of cue words most frequently used; point out unusual definitions.
5. An exercise for previewing the text(s). If you use more than one text, you will need separate exercises for each work.
6. Organize your learning guide materials chronologically and use a consistent format.

   For each chapter of your text, or, for each work examined, or, for each unit considered include:

   a. reading guide questions for all reading assignments;
   b. difficult vocabulary words - in manageable, length and hopefully using creative strategies for mastery;
   C. study guide questions - for mastering content.
7. Place at least six short writing assignments at Key points in your learning guide. Include due dates for structured

drafting, peer review, proof-reading. Increase formal requirements for style, footnoting, bibliography for each successive writing assignment and coordinate with the long research project (below).

8. Include a draft of your own writing with hand-written corrections of your own text to illustrate (in part) how the writing process works. (If you include a long piece, you might want to place it in an appendix.)

9. Critical reasoning strategies -- explicit ways to help students to "think through" specific problems suggested by the content of the course -- can be incorporated at key "cognitive turning points" in the course. Strategies can cover a wide range of approaches to the content and methodology of the course. Examples might include a section titled "How to Evaluate Evidence," or "How to Present a Logical Argument," or "How to Apply What You Know," or "How to Interpret Data," etc.

10. Include a computer module (1) which requires students to produce a piece of written work using word processing, and /or (2) which requires students to work with computer graphics, a data base, or a simulation. You might suggest "drill" programs for use outside of class. Questions of access, introduction to the software and to the computer, and provision for "start-up" will have to be addressed.

11. Include at least one long research project, or lab report, or field trip project. Model the instructions and the format and the process on the short writing assignment (see#7 above). Insist that all parts (and drafts) of the work be done in sequence.

12. Find and include high interest primary texts and /or scholarly articles for inclusion in your Guide, Supplement your text(s) with primary source material: documents, letters, literary/historical sources, charts, graphs, illustrations, drawings. Show how scholarship in your discipline is important. Include, especially, contradictory pieces of evidence; or, perhaps, a point of view which is different from that contained in the text. Use the Association of American Publishers suggested format for requesting permissions from publishers to use copyright material.

13. Suggest ways students can become active listeners in the classroom. Ask students to practice listening to each other.

14. Describe effective note-taking strategies for students. Explain why they are important.
15. Include at least one oral assignment. The importance of oral expression should be emphasized (in classroom discussion, in the oral assignment).
16. List techniques for students to effectively study and prepare for examinations in your course.
17. Include at least two collaborative learning exercises in your Guide.
18. Design ways to communicate the raised expectations you have for students mastery of content and for performance in the classroom.
19. Design ways to urge students to take increased responsibility for their own education.

For additional information contact:

David A. Berry, Director or Ladylease White, Workshop Leader
Partnership Program
Essex County College
303 University Avenue
Newark, NJ 07102
201-877-3320

D. Berry
Essex County College
Newark, NJ 07102

Partnership Program - FIPSE Project
April 4, 1989

COMMON FEATURES OF LEARNING GUIDE COURSES

1. A basic assumption: learning guide courses enable more effective teaching and learning than non-learning guide courses.

2. A basic assumption: critical and creative thinking is learnable.

3. Learning guide courses use problems, questions, etc. as points of entry to teach and to motivate.

4. Learning guide courses provide students with clear and complete instructions and explanations about what is to be learned and suggests ways to learn.

5. Learning guide courses are assignment centered, rather than text or lecture centered. A learning guide consists primarily of student assignments.

6. Learning guide courses incorporate a hierarchy of skill and cognitive capacities and provide for consistent reinforcement.

7. Learning guide courses use extensive primary sources -- the "real stuff" of a discipline and/or subject area.

8. Learning guide courses balance challenges to think with students' developmental needs.

9. Learning guide courses require students to write frequently and in a variety of formats, including journal writing, short writing assignments, longer writing assignment, essay assignments, and research paper assignments.

10. Learning guide courses ask students to formulate and justify their ideas.

11. Learning guide courses require students to collaborate to learn.

12. Learning guide courses require students to use word-processing.

13. Learning guide courses transform "hidden" agendas into an explicit curriculum.

D. Berry - Essex County College

"STAGES" OF INTELLECTUAL DEVELOPMENT

Perry, Forms of Intellectual and Ethical Development in the College Years (1970)

Belenky, et al., Women's Ways of Knowing (1986)

1. DUALISM/RECEIVED KNOWLEDGE

   - There is a right answer to everything
   - Students acquire information

2. MULTIPLICITY/SUBJECTIVE KNOWLEDGE

   - Everything is "mere" opinion
   - Use your opinion

3. RELATIVISM/PROCEDURAL KNOWLEDGE

   - Some opinions are better, e.g. supported by reasons
   - Focus on disciplinary methods, or how others see things

4. COMMITMENT IN RELATIVISM/CONSTRUCTED KNOWLEDGE

   - Individuals must take position
   - Integrate knowledge with their inner values (truth)