CERRITOS COLLEGE

TO: Members of the Program Review Advisory Committee

FROM: Miriam Tolson, Program Assistant II

DATE: March 17, 2010

SUBJECT: Minutes of IPR meeting – March 16, 2010

In attendance at the meeting:
Mark Fronke, Chair
Angela Beck
Angela Conley
Christina Fernandez
Todd Gaffaney
Nick Kremer
Cynthia Lavariere
Rachel Mason
Lola Rizkallah
Linda Rose
Shantal Voorwinden
Farid Wissa
David Young

Absent:
Lorraine Gersitz (Absent)

Guest (s):
Chris Myers
Bonnie Helberg
Matt Paige
Geri Codd
Robert Renteria

Call to order – The meeting was called to order at 3:02 P.M.

1. Reading Presentation – Mark Fronke welcomed the presenters, Bonnie Helberg and co-chair Matt Paige. Geri Codd and Robert Renteria later joined the meeting. The presentation is summarized as follows in the report summary following the minutes. Mark Fronke requested that the presenters focus on what their department wants to do within the next five years to improve instruction. The committee had a thorough discussion with the presenters on their goals and Core Indicator Codes as well as how the Reading Department’s desire to be universal over the campus. Motion: A motion
was made by David Young that the Reading department extend approval of the Program Review until April 6. The department will finalize their program review based on the recommendations and submit Appendix D by the deadline to include the specifics discussed with timelines and deadlines along with names of individuals assigned to tasks. Action: The committee unanimously approved the department’s program review based on the extension.

2. Review/Approve Minutes from February 16, 2010 – Mark Fronke - Approval was postponed due to the agenda item timeframes. The committee agreed to approve the minutes of 2-2-10 and 2-16-10 at the next meeting on Tuesday, April 6.

3. Discussion on Student Success and Validation Process – Chris Myers - Mark Fronke began the discussion with asking Chris Myers about the fact of students enrolled in Academic courses where the Basic Skills is an issue. Recommendations and Prerequisites comes into play in these situations. Inquiry was made by Mark Fronke to discover the percentage or some type of measurement to assess what level students are on that failed certain courses. Chris Myers recommended content review as the first step and courses to help students to be successful in a particular course. At this point an advisory would be made and thirdly if the Faculty feels this should be a prerequisite then they need to request that a validation study be done by that department. At this point the course recommendation would go to the Curriculum Committee. Chris Myers informed the committee that he has been working with Bryan Reece on this process with the Humanities/Social Science Division. The committee discussed thoroughly the issues involved with students repeating courses due to the lack of prerequisite preparation. Nick Kremer mentioned the focus of student success, but there must be something in between to avoid discouraging a student that enrolled to take a single course. Christina Fernandez inquired about researching what would go to student failure rather than success, i.e. whether economic etc. David Young informed the committee that Santa Monica College used this validation process 20 years ago. The committee discussed the importance of students being informed and expectations. Angela Conley noted the importance of informing students of their status in not being successful in their classes early on. Chris Myers informed the committee that certain information can be used only as an advisory.

4. Comments on Foreign Language – Mark Fronke and the department commented on the large amount of information in the report. It was noted that there were items that did not need to be focused on that was. It was recommended that the departments under review follow the form and comply with the specific information requested and not overload the document with unnecessary information.


6. Liaisons for 2010-11 school year – This item will be discussed at the next meeting on April 6.

7. Items from the Floor – A discussion was held regarding the committees role in
promoting student success. Mark Fronke agreed that something should be done to research whether establishing recommendations or pre-requisites on certain courses would be appropriate. In light of the fact that many programs under review have expressed concern over students who are not prepared because of lacking the necessary reading, writing and math skills.

8. **Adjournment** - The meeting adjourned at 4:25 P.M.

Next Program Review Meeting  
Tuesday, April 6, 2010  
3:00-4:30 P.M.  
SS 141

**Reading Department Presentation Summary**

The Presenters Bonnie Helberg, Matt Paige, Geri Codd, and Robert Renteria, and Department chair included the SLO’s, long-term and short-term goals.

The department has spent a lot of time brainstorming and expanding the scope of the Reading department. Since every program on the campus includes reading the goal is for the department to get their program out in all aspects. Bonnie Helberg informed the committee that the Reading department desires to raise the profile and to capture students as they take the assessment test to make awareness about their program so they can start achieving college success earlier on.

The department’s major goal is their desire to raise awareness of what they offer, as well as access to students all across campus. The department is also focusing on courses that students are enrolled in where i.e. vocational, nursing, cosmetology which they do not have room to take a traditional reading course.

The Reading Center is now staffed with faculty throughout the day. There are individualized program options available to students outside of reading courses as well as pilot, on-line, hybrid, and computerized courses. In addition, the department wants to raise awareness that there are a lot of services offered for low level readers, but their main goal is to provide awareness for all levels whatever the student may need. The department also encourages students to bring in their textbooks for reading assistance.

The department is developing additional strategies to improve student reading skills. Bonnie Helberg addressed their goal of partnerships. Geri Codd gave the department a thorough presentation on students lacking Reading skills with their textbooks to emphasis study reading. They have been working as part of the Reading FIG pilot program for Social Science with Susan Oliver and have been collecting data from the effectiveness of the workshops they presented where the students bring in their textbooks and receive assistance.

The department has received very positive feedback from the surveys and data that was collected from these workshops. The students gave the department input as to how this type of workshop and assistance was beneficial to them. The department is hoping to pilot and
expand on this in the coming semesters. Geri emphasized that the department would like to know what the demographics of the reading student is so they can identify what they look like.

The department wants to provide more flexibility where students can come in on their own or with a class and get assistance with study reading. More reading strategy workshops will be provided. This department continues to develop strategies for managing this.

Matt Paige indicated that some instructors have informed the department that many students are struggling in their courses. The department has realized that the challenge is that they tested low in Reading but are not taking the appropriate reading courses. Once the instructors are aware of this challenge they are stuck with having to keep these students in their classes due to timeframes imposed at the admissions level.

The current Assessment Center test which is called the Accuplacer allows from the spring year to year for the SLO’s process (Student Learning Outcomes). The department is determining whether the accuplacer results are accurate. Matt informed the committee that approximately 66% of the students who tested into reading classes never enrolled in Reading and that 60% of students have tested into reading. Research is being done to make sure the test scores are accurate. There are only about 40% of students that don’t need any reading classes. The department desires that through Administration and/or Counseling that the students needing reading are required to enroll.

There is concern because there are loop holes set-up with the reading courses don’t affect the other prerequisite courses; however these same students are not able to avoid taking Writing and Math courses.

Matt Paige elaborated on the loop holes of the Reading department affects the following student groups as follows: A student is not required to take Reading if the student is a transfer student or has an undeclared major; however, they are required to take English 100 and pass Math 60 (negotiations are currently going forth with the Chancellor’s office to change the requirement to Math 80) but they do not have to take Reading. Students sign up on-line and don’t seek the guidance of a counselor are able to bypass taking Reading that would ordinarily be recommended.

David Young emphasized that the major concern is that there are no prerequisites on a lot of courses. Since there are a lot of courses that need reading proficiency where reading is automatically embedded in the course and students fail to be proficient in reading, the students are unsuccessful prior to beginning the course. At the point of entry into the course, the student is already defeated and makes it extremely difficult for the student to move forward. This has been an ongoing concern.

Committee RECOMMENDATIONS: The Reading department recommends that English 54 become a prerequisite.
Mark Fronke wants to make sure the departments are aware that the Program Review document is a tool for the department in managing the process of the Program Review. A road map making measurable goals with specific goals with specific individuals that will be responsible for tasks is recommended. This tool is needed to measure the process. Specific dates and deadlines should be listed in the document. Focus should be on the document.

Linda Rose, Dean of the Liberal Arts Department recommended using the readability statistics to assist students and faculty. Linda Rose commended the department and noted that they have not given themselves enough credit for what they have already done in a short amount of time. Linda Rose observed the Reading Center and did an assessment after interviewing students and found out what was beneficial to them in the Reading Center and how it was helpful. Being comfortable in the environment, students then recommended it to other students which will bypass the stigma of lower level readers. Mark Fronke recommended this data gathering be documented in the department’s goals.

The committee had a thorough discussion on this topic. The discussion points are as follows:

David Young noted that the lobbying at for prerequisite recommendations begins at the institutional and administrative level for success. He used the comparison with Algebra being the student is not passing not because he can’t count, but because he can’t read.

Shantal Voorwinden brought a student perspective to the committee on how the recommendations could have a negative stigma with the students.

Angela Conley noted that students could find the similarities with Student Success measures, i.e., iFalcon and recommendations made for Reading. She also informed the committee on methods she used to measure student success in her classes.