Managed Enrollment in ESOL classes — Research Study

Managed Enrollment, the new educational buzzword from the state, has been purported to be the answer to improving student learning in adult education. Open entry/ open exit has been the norm for enrolling students for over 30 years in school districts in Florida because of its inclusive nature for adult populations. However, colleges and universities have used managed enrollment as their modus operandi for all students in large part because the practice ties in with credit offerings.

This study is the first in Miami-Dade County Public Schools that attempts to quantify measurable results of managed enrollment in one of the most distressed classroom settings in adult education, the ESOL classroom.

SUMMARY FINDINGS

- Managed enrolled students:
 - o earned LCP's at over three times the rate of the control group
 - o were able to maintain basic persistence (over 39% of total class hours) at a higher rate than the control group
 - o returned for instruction in subsequent terms at a higher rate than the control group
- Managed enrollment and percentage of class hours enrolled were the two predictors than were most correlated with increase in CASAS score

METHODOLOGY

The English Center participated in this study by recruiting students in existing classes and giving an orientation during the first week of the trimester, or after post testing. The school also targeted new/returning walk-in students. Students were told upfront that they had to commit to doing homework and having good attendance (no more than 4 absences per cycle). They were permitted to enter during the first week of each 8 cycle. After that, registration was closed.

The specific reference numbers assigned for the managed enrollment cohort are listed below:

2006-3 (4/9/07-6/1/07): 8:15-am-10:45am

#2NB9 ESOL L.I. #Y8E1 ESOL H.I.

2007-1 (8/20/07-10/19/07): 8:15am-10:45am

#2NB9 ESOL L.I. #Y8E1 ESOL H.I. #Y345 ESOL Adv.

(10/22/07-12/20/07): 8:15am-10:45am

#YLQ2 ESOL L.I. #YO14 ESOL H.I. #YO13 ESOL Adv.

In April, 2008, the data for the managed group was extracted from the Workforce Development Information System (WDIS) reporting files for surveys F and W of 2007. In addition, a control group of non-managed students was selected. One reference number from each of the trimesters was chosen with the same ESOL course number and level from the same school.

BASIC DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS

The managed enrollment cohort included 169 students. The control group was 234 students. The distribution between genders was fairly consistent with both groups (75.1% and 73.1% respectively). Age distribution was also fairly consistent among the groups.

Completion status was markedly different in the managed group, with 31.4% of the managed enrolled cohort achieving an LCP within the initial survey of instruction compared to only 11.1% of the control group.

perc_ofclasshrs (Binned)

			_			Cumulative	
managed			Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Percent	
N	Valid	<= .08	24	10.3	10.3	10.3	
		.0922	40	17.1	17.1	27.4	
		.2338	50	21.4	21.4	48.7	
		.3953	25	10.7	10.7	59.4	
		.5484	32	13.7	13.7	73.1	
		.85 - 1.00	63	26.9	26.9	100.0	
		Total	234	100.0	100.0		
Υ	Valid	<= .08	38	22.5	22.5	22.5	
		.0922	17	10.1	10.1	32.5	
		.2338	9	5.3	5.3	37.9	
		.3953	46	27.2	27.2	65.1	
		.5484	14	8.3	8.3	73.4	
		.85 - 1.00	45	26.6	26.6	100.0	
		Total	169	100.0	100.0		

INITIAL SAMPLE

Distribution of the managed and unmanaged cohort was compared as to the initial number of scaled score points from the next functioning level. The distribution was consistent, except in cases where the scaled score to goal was over 10. In order to ensure a consistent sample, all records that met this criterion (44, 9.8%) were excluded from the study.

gender

managed			Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
N	Valid	F	171	73.1	73.1	73.1
		М	63	26.9	26.9	100.0
		Total	234	100.0	100.0	
Υ	Valid	F	127	75.1	75.1	75.1
		М	42	24.9	24.9	100.0
		Total	169	100.0	100.0	

age (Binned)

						Cumulative
managed		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Percent	
N	Valid	<= 24	46	19.7	19.7	19.7
		25 - 31	43	18.4	18.4	38.0
		32 - 36	26	11.1	11.1	49.1
		37 - 43	46	19.7	19.7	68.8
		44 - 50	36	15.4	15.4	84.2
		51+	37	15.8	15.8	100.0
		Total	234	100.0	100.0	
Υ	Valid	<= 24	27	16.0	16.0	16.0
		25 - 31	27	16.0	16.0	32.0
		32 - 36	29	17.2	17.2	49.1
		37 - 43	28	16.6	16.6	65.7
		44 - 50	31	18.3	18.3	84.0
		51+	27	16.0	16.0	100.0
		Total	169	100.0	100.0	

Persistence was calculated by determining the percentage of total class hours each student was accountably enrolled in. There was significant variation in the percentages of each group at the various cut points. 62.1% of the managed students were in membership for at least 39% of the class compared to 51.3% of the control group. However, at the high cut point (85% of class or above), both groups had similar distributions (26.6% for managed, 26.9% for control).

Persistence was also measured by determining percentages of students who enrolled for more instruction in subsequent instructional surveys. 66.3% of the managed group was found enrolled in a subsequent term, compared to 43.2% of the control group.

Raw gain in CASAS score was the principal metric used for determination of statistical significance and correlations. 41.4% of managed students showed some gain in CASAS score compared to 23% of the control group. On the high end, 17.2% of managed students were able to improve by at least 10 scaled score points, compared to 6.8% of the control group.

casas_gain (Binned)

managed			Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
N	Valid	<= .00	180	76.9	76.9	76.9
		1.00 - 2.00	12	5.1	5.1	82.1
		3.00 - 9.00	26	11.1	11.1	93.2
		10.00+	16	6.8	6.8	100.0
		Total	234	100.0	100.0	
Υ	Valid	<= .00	99	58.6	58.6	58.6
		1.00 - 2.00	8	4.7	4.7	63.3
		3.00 - 9.00	33	19.5	19.5	82.8
		10.00+	29	17.2	17.2	100.0
		Total	169	100.0	100.0	

STATISTICAL SIGNIFICANCE

A linear regression with correlation analysis was performed to determine the statistical significance and correlations of various variables. The dependent variable was raw CASAS score gain. The independent variables analyzed were: managed enrollment, age, CASAS points near to next functioning level, and percentage of class hours in membership. The goal was to determine which variables were best correlated to increases in CASAS score. An additional test was to determine the effect size (how much effect) the significant independent variables had.

There were two variables that showed a modest correlation with CASAS gains: managed enrollment and percentage of class hours in membership (Pearson = .246 and .242 respectively). Gains in CASAS scores were statistically significant in both cases. Both variables' effect on CASAS score gains also was rated as significant in the analysis. The exceptionally high tolerance coefficient underscores the point that the changes in CASAS score were attributable to these and not other variables.

Correlations

		casas_gain	managed	age	Casas_init_ togoal	perc_ ofclasshrs
casas_gain	Pearson Correlation	1	.246**	060	.056	.242**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000	.227	.261	.000
	N	403	403	403	403	403
managed	Pearson Correlation	.246**	1	.030	045	.005
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000		.543	.371	.914
	N	403	403	403	403	403
age	Pearson Correlation	060	.030	1	.034	.139**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.227	.543		.499	.005
	N	403	403	403	403	403
Casas_init_togoal	Pearson Correlation	.056	045	.034	1	.033
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.261	.371	.499		.513
	N	403	403	403	403	403
perc_ofclasshrs	Pearson Correlation	.242**	.005	.139**	.033	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.914	.005	.513	
	N	403	403	403	403	403

^{**-} Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Coefficients

		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients			Collinearity Statistics	
Model		В	Std. Error	Beta	t	Sig.	Tolerance	VIF
1	(Constant)	-2.605	1.210		-2.152	.032		
	managed	2.744	.512	.250	5.355	.000	.997	1.003
	age	045	.020	105	-2.228	.026	.979	1.021
	Casas_init_togoal	.125	.094	.063	1.337	.182	.996	1.004
	perc_ofclasshrs	3.912	.729	.253	5.367	.000	.980	1.020

a. Dependent Variable: casas_gain