Cerritos College

College Committee on Developmental Education

March 4, 2008

Minutes

Members Present:
  M.L. Bettino    S. Parsons    D. Worrel
  R. Chomiak    F. Quaas-Berryman
  G. Codd    B. Reece
  J. Connal    M. Robles
  B. Farmer    V. Romero
  K. Follett    A. Soto
  B. Helberg    J. Swanson

Members Absent:
  N. Durdella    M. Centeno
  S. Sestini    J. Sugiyara-Cheetham

Guest: Dr. Bill Scroggins, Accreditation Team

Dr. Connal called the meeting to order at 2:07

1. Announcements
   a. Ms. Robles presented information on allowing funding of services through Pell
      Grants. After the committee has the plan developed, the committee will look
      at how this information informs that plan
   b. The College Committee on Developmental Education now has a web
      presence on the Cerritos College web site. The minutes, agendas, and
      membership roster are all part of the web site. Mr. Farmer asked how people
      looking at the Cerritos Web site would find our committee.
   c. At the last meeting, a question was raised about the ability of students to
      register for courses in a sequence. This is not a problem from semester to
      semester, but it is currently a problem for students who are working through 6
      or 9 week classes in the same semester. This is something we will want to
      address in more detail in a future meeting.
d. There is an open session with the accreditation team today from 5:00-6:00 in the board room and tomorrow from 11:00-12:00 in the Board Room, and the final report is 1:00-2:00 on Thursday in the Teleconference Center.

2. Review and Approve Minutes from 02-19
Dr. Follett moved to approve the minutes, and Mr. Reece seconded.
Discussion:
- Ms. Worrel brought up a concern that on page 7 a comment was made about semi-independent not working well for developmental students.
- From the first bullet under “Page #2” it was written: “Instructors who have training in methodology may be better prepared to address the needs of DE students.” However, what was said was that “faculty with training in pedagogy and andragogy teaching methodologies may be better prepared to meet the needs of DE students.”
The minutes were approved as corrected. Ms. Worrel, Mr. Swanson, and Ms. Robles abstained

3. There was a question as to whether this committee had approved payment of the Paul Nolting presentation from the 2005-2006 Basic Skills funds. There was a motion in the minutes to release the funds for other relevant activities, but there was nothing in the minutes about a second motion approving funds for the Nolting presentation. Many members of the committee remembered the motion. Dr. Follett moved we reaffirm the decision from the December meeting pay the $10,000 to financially support the Nolting workshop. Utilizing funds from the 2005-2006 Basic Skills money. The motion was seconded by Ms. Parsons. The motion passed unanimously.

4. Review and Discuss: (Draft) Planning Matrix for Operation and Coordination of Developmental Education:
Dr. Connal introduced the planning matrix for review. The information from our last meeting was organized into the planning matrix based on the two primary targets identified by the committee: the organizational/coordination component and faculty development. The order of the items is not linear.

NOTE: The following are the drafted planned action items and highlights from the discussion of each.

#1: Develop job description and reporting structure for a full-time Developmental Education Coordinator to provide for a “highly coordinated” DE program; Identify an operational budget; Hire/assign individual(s) to coordinate DE. Identify office space and hire/assign clerical support.

- Dr. Connal said that when she drafted the action item, she asserted that this would be a full-time position based on the comments from the previous meeting, but this is a point for further discussion.
- There was some agreement for the full-time aspect of the position. This needs to be a person with passion and commitment.
- Should we insert “faculty” as well?
- This could be more than just one full-time faculty member. There could be one coordinator, but specialists in the different areas, such as high school outreach and counseling.
- This position could also be done by a passionate manager.
- What is in the best interest of helping the students?
- Are we going for a single coordinator or some other model? Perhaps a faculty/student services team.
- What is shuttle diplomacy? If this is what the position relies on, how are the innovations enforced?
• Shuttle diplomacy: Many of the activities we need are already being done in various divisions and departments. The coordinator would work with the department chairs and division deans to make sure that what we are doing for DE students is happening the way it should. There will probably be more work when the person starts than later on when we are coordinating as part of second nature. The coordinator will likely not have any direct authority over people. Shuttle diplomacy is what you use when you don’t have any authority. It centers around getting people to agree and to compromise.

• What do we mean by coordination? What is this person going to do? What does coordination mean?

• Don’t make it a specific level (faculty or manager) position. Some of the most passionate people on campus are classified. Wait and see who steps up.

• There are too many pedagogical concerns, so faculty will need to work with other faculty to make this happen. It may also take the power of a manager to get this done. This may be a broader issue that a classified person can deal with effectively. This is more than just the basic skills classes. It also involves the basic skills students in all classes. Perhaps this is a short term position, not an endless position. This person might be coordinating the “future leaders academy” or some other positive “brand” as a selling point.

• Starting the BSI plan is like starting Teacher TRAC, and whoever leads this must be a champion and live and breathe DE. The coordinator must have instructional background. This needs to be research and evidence based. We need to have pedagogical and andragogical background connections. There needs to be coordination with departments, with other effective programs on campus. There will need to be a unit plan and program review. There will be a connection with staff development, strategic plan, curriculum, professional development, high school outreach, bridge programs
• Is a director different than a coordinator? The program might have a director with coordinators under. Teacher TRAC has a faculty director and there are coordinators (leadership team) that function in support of the director.

• Mr. Bettino Presented two visuals, one that shows how the academy (student success center) / assessment process might work on campus and one that shows how the Academic Support Center might function. These could be used as a potential model for an “Academy.”

• Are we talking about one full-time person who is responsible or are we looking at several release time people who report to someone like a dean or a VP?

• If we have a director, would that person have any power? How would such a person be positioned in the hierarchy of power?

• If we get into “directors and coordinators” are we moving toward a division with department chairs?

• Would a DE director be of a level with deans, for example the Director of Teacher TRAC participates in the dean’s meetings. Would this director have the same type of authority?

• Let’s re-frame the question. What outcomes do we want to achieve in regard to coordination?

• One outcome is to integrate student and academic services. Continue with integration student services with instructional services. This should be a primary charge.

• We need to look at what the rest of the program involves, which may better determine what the person needs to be able to do.

• We are pushed for time. We need to have our plan identified. As long as we have the opportunity to raise concerns about the details, we can move forward. However, it is essential to have the option to come back and visit the details.
NOTE: The discussion moved to an overview of the planning matrix. Each Item was read, and if anyone had a comment, that was heard.

QUESTION TO COMMITTEE: Is the overall plan coherent? Is anything missing? Is there anything that doesn’t need to be here? Let’s look at the big picture, and then look at individual sections. Are these reasonable next steps?

Our guest, Dr. Bill Scroggins, from the Accreditation team had some questions about how the information we were working with was generated. The committee explained that all of this was in response to the Basic Skills Initiative and explained the process from the January 11 campus-wide meeting as well as the follow up discussion that organized and prioritized the themes.

- As we build the structure of our DE program, we need to take the time to build slowly and thoughtfully. Again, we need to follow the model provided to us through Teacher TRAC.

#2: Develop and distribute President’s message introducing DE Coordinator and emphasizing the institution’s priority for supporting DE learners.
- No discussion on this item

#3: Review model program structures in the State which demonstrate success in achieving relevant positive outcomes for DE students.
- We can look at models both in and out of Cerritos. Should we be looking at other successful programs in order to determine what our next step is?

#4: Develop a responsive mission statement aligned with the institutional mission and strategic plan; develop preliminary DE goals, objectives, and effective measures.
Once we have a vision, we should be able to see the goals and objectives.

Doesn’t the Poppy Copy give model programs and objectives?

We can look in house for models of integration instruction/student services

Should we have been looking at this already?

If we can resolve this coordination issue and faculty development agenda by the time we go to the campus forum on the 27th, we will be in good shape. Everything else hinges on the support and good will on resolving those things.

This is an ongoing activity. We can continue to research successful programs.

# 5: Prioritize initial structural changes needed in scheduling, course coding, staffing, orientation, enrollment (registration), assessment and placement, course development and student support enhancements.

There were a lot of ideas that were discussed at the committee meetings and at the campus forum. Rather than name all of the ideas, they are generally clumped together as “enhancements.”

The general consensus on this is that it is a huge undertaking.

This is dynamic. We need to figure out what to address first, but we need to get as many as can be done out on the table. We will lay the ground work for what could be a five year plan.

The request was made to extend the deadline.

The activity is not to complete all of this, but rather to see what the priority is. However, this could also take longer than the proposed deadline of Sept 2008

#6: Collaborate with the Faculty Senate on common areas of interest with regard to implementing relevant elements of the Senate’s Student Learning Plan.

The terminology may not be right, but the idea will help us stay integrated by looking at what is already going on to meet student needs and work with those groups.
- How would we assess this? We need to think about outcomes so we know we have achieved it. What is the deliverable? What are we showing to outsiders?
- We need to add a column to look for measurable outcomes that we can determine if we have met the outcome and that we have evidence to show that.
- Collaborate with the Faculty Senate on final development of the Senate’s Student Learning Plan.
- Take the good work of the Faculty Senate, and develop a matrix that shows the overlap between their work and our work. Then we can do the work that seems appropriate for our committee, and the Senate can do the work that is more appropriate to their roles. The matrix could be considered a deliverable.

#7 Develop and Submit unit plan and budget request for 2009-2010.
- This would be due Nov. 2008.
- This would be part of budget and planning.
- The Unit Plan would have the budget within it.

#8: Identify related program-level SLOs and assessment methods for DE students.
- This is not about the content of the classes, but rather the “habits of mind” we want the students to develop as they finish the developmental classes. An objective may be helping students understand what “college ready” means. We want to reinforce these ideals in all college courses, not just in DE classes. The habits of mind are the skills you need to succeed in college and beyond.
- This can’t just be about transfer level courses. This has to help students reach their goals, whatever those goals are.
- Are these Institutional level SLOs? Would this get a wider buy-in campus wide? What makes a DE student a DE student? What do the DE students need to be successful at Cerritos, regardless of the program? Are these Program level or
institution level SLOs for DE students? What are the things the DE student needs?
We need to do word smithing on this.

- This needs to address the institutional buy in.
- Does this need to read: Identify related program level SLOs and assessment methods for DE.
- These are non-content SLOs
- This needs more discussion.

#9 Identify and grow evidence-based, proven programs, from among currently existing programs, awarded BSI mini-grants, faculty development FIGs, or models at other colleges.

- This is very open so that we don’t have to identify “The Ones” at this point.

#10: Develop, align and articulate credit and non-credit sequence of DE offerings.
Recruit faculty to teach newly created articulated courses.

- We are going to have to create what we need.
- There is a big un-known about what goes on in Adult Ed, which indicates a lack of articulation.
- Do we need to create new, appropriate, non-credit courses?
- If we can figure out where the holes are, we can figure out what to create.
- There is a hole in non-credit in general.
- We can only legally offer non-credit in nine areas. Much of the math/English areas have to be done under the umbrella of high school completion. ESL is one of the nine areas, so we can create the articulated program. We may have the courses already on the books, but we may need to take a look at them.
- We can look at the vocational courses, especially those with high possibility for employment. You don’t want credit to compete with non-credit.
• We need a campus-wide understanding of non-credit programs and how they might articulate with credit programs. We may need some education.

• There is concern that we might lose this idea of articulation if we are limited to the nine areas.

• The college is required to offer a class level for anyone who comes here and can benefit from instruction. We may need to develop a class even lower than our lowest level if the course does not meet the needs of the students.

• Do we need a lower level course, or do we need faculty development that would enable us to meet the needs of students more effectively?

• Students with disabilities make up a significant percentage of the lowest level classes.

• There are many different needs for the students in the lowest level classes.

• Do we need a DSPS learning community?

• This may be beyond the scope of this committee at this time.

# 11: Develop early alert function for Rosters+

• Mr. Bettino has a low tech solution that will be in place next week, an email that goes to the student and to the counselor. Another function should be available through PeopleSoft by April 1st.

• If we have the information, what are we doing with information from the early alert? We need a mechanism that creates a follow up with students. This needs to be combined with mandatory counseling. It needs to have some teeth.

• This original conversation was about making it easier for students to register for subsequent classes. This does not replace what faculty currently do. We can develop the function and then decide what we want it to do? Will this give us the outcome we want? This would force all faculty to do this, but it would benefit the students whose instructors do not provide regular feedback.
This came up in the context of prerequisites. If someone was passing a class, they would be able to register for the next class in the sequence the next semester.

This would also give students the message, you’re not passing the class at the present, but there are things you can do to improve, like go for tutoring. This is a structured campus activity. It would be related to prerequisite clearance.

This could hold students up if they were not passing at mid-term but they then turned things around later.

This may not be a good idea for enrollment or for students.

However, we can create the function and then decide how we want to use this. We could develop and pilot this function.

Develop early alert function for Rosters+ and pilot intervention program.

Could connect Sakai gradebook with the Rosters+ early alert?


- We always look back to see what worked and what didn’t.
- Do we want to collaborate with Faculty Senate on the State of Education?
- Would we be developing a research reports about student progress in DE classes, the annual report, and a series of annual reports with comparisons? The evidence would be something that could go to an outside accreditation team.

QUESTION TO THE COMMITTEE: Is there anything missing from the Operational plan or is there something that needs to come off of the plan?

- Although a couple of points were brought up, office space, assessment, it was determined those were addressed.
- There was also a question about the role of research and development. It is our hope that we would be able to work with Research and Development.
• Questions we need to consider:
  o How do you use date to determine what you need to be doing?
  o How do we know what the extent of the issue is? What the extent of the developmental needs of our students is.
  o How do we use that information to determine and refine what we do.
• We need some gathering of information.
• We need to make data collection part of the process. We need to start with baseline numbers. For example, we can look at what is going on before #11 and then look at what happens after #11. Does this have an impact?
• We often do data collection to assess outcomes, but we don’t know what to do with it. We need faculty development to address this.
• Everything we do needs to have a research question wrapped around it.
• There is no description of the shuttle diplomacy aspect of the coordination. The components don’t seem to be coordinated. This is something that would be included with the job description for the coordinator position.
• We need to base our decisions on numbers. This is essential.
• #11 offers the opportunity to measure before and after on the implementation of Early Alert. Look at retention numbers before and after to see if this actually has an impact.
• Anything we do should have a research question wrapped around it so we can study the impact of anything we do.
• We need to identify existing resources in all areas of the campus community, including adult ed. We have done some of this through the campus forum, but we could go into more detail.

5. Review and Discuss: Planning Matrix for Faculty Development to Support Developmental Learners
# 13: Assign coordination, scheduling, advertising and monitoring duties for faculty development for teaching and supporting developmental learners to the DE coordinator and DE faculty development team:

- The coordinator would have a team of faculty developers dedicated to DE. This doesn’t preclude others from participating, but there would be a team with this as their primary focus, and it would not be all on the shoulders of the coordinator.
- Would the team members come from the key areas?
- It would be up to the committee to decide who would participate on the team.
- Would these positions be release time or would they be budgeted through the DE funds?
- From Teacher TRAC experience, the coordinator would have, in addition to the DE committee, a team with which to bounce ideas, which offers a strong structure.
- Does this need to be added to operational coordination. How is this interfaced with campus wide staff development. There needs to be collaboration with staff development committee. At minimum there would need to be a liaison.
- Faculty who don’t teach reading, writing, or math would still need to be included. This is not trying to be exclusive. We need to think about how to include everyone.
- We need to also not exclude those who are not faculty. There are tutors who also work with DE students, and we don’t want to exclude people like that either.
- What about calling it Professional Development?
- We need to have both. We need the buy in of staff development. That is an established entity that needs to be a part of this.
- Professional Development and Staff Development are two different things.
- This is advocating programs specifically targeting those involved in teaching and learning outcomes. This would include tutors. This would include anyone who sees themselves in an educative role with the DE population.
- The classified staff is dedicated to student success, and we need the Staff Development Committee to be a part of this. They need to be included.
• We don’t want to put an additional burden on Staff Development to implement the plan we development.
• There aren’t a lot of funds in Staff Development for teaching and learning, yet there is a big need for this.
• Could this be a point that is added to box 15?
• There is a well-established pipeline that gets the word out on staff development. We don’t want to overlook the process that is in place.

#14: Develop online Teaching, Supporting and Learning social networking resource to conduct surveys, share proven effective practices and materials, post blogs, and host ongoing Q & A.
• This would give people a place to go for resources when they are not able to attend the workshops.
• There is an example of this for the English Department on Talonnet. This was done in part through a BSI mini-grant.

#15: Develop and distribute monthly campus-wide update/newsletter regarding what’s new with Developmental Education Initiative, including monthly faculty development opportunities.
• There was no direct discussion about this point; however, this point was referenced during other discussions.

#16: From the set of proven instructional/programmatic practices and confirmed faculty development needs from the DE Plan Open Forum, develop and support, structured and sustained development opportunities.
• We will take faculty development ideas to the faculty development forum to get a response to see if these are the things people need and want.
• Do you want to broaden that to Faculty and Staff Development?
#17: The faculty participants will contribute materials and classroom outcomes to an online resource and make presentations at General Faculty meetings and as part of the New Faculty Orientation.
- We would be part of the New Faculty two year program
- A couple times a year we would also share with the general faculty.
- This is the idea of building a community of practice.

#18 An Introduction to Teaching and Assessing Adult Development Learners course will be developed and offered through the Teacher TRAC program on a regular, ongoing basis. Faculty will be allowed to participate at no cost and be able to earn Flex credit by completing the course. Consider the development of an online delivery method for the course.
- We may not be able to offer this for free to faculty if it is part of the regular curriculum. This could be a legal issue. If we make it non-credit, this might be a way around it.
- This could be a salary advancement program. People do pay for this.
- This is also something we can offer to the community or as an in-house opportunity. There might be a broader appeal for this than just for faculty.
- We will strike anything about the cost.
- Can we do anything to address Cultural Sensitivity training.
- Culturally Responsive Teaching is different than Cultural Sensitivity Training. CRT is different than multiculturalism.
- We could develop an academy of classes that we could offer faculty. There could be both workshops and full classes.
- We might develop a modular concept, both on ground and online, as well as developing online resources. We need to address all the different ways people can access the information.
- We can also utilize the experts we already have on campus as well.
# 19 Develop and offer inter-institutional FIGS to include our faculty with 9th-12th grade faculty looking at student work in reading comprehension, writing, and math to assess skills and explore expectations.

- ABC School District, Language Arts wants to set up some writing FIGs already.
- Are FIGs going to be involved on campus generally?
- In the plan, no particular method was identified.
- This is our action plan for 2008-2009. There is a long list of actions we need to complete. Let’s be reasonable about our expectations. These are in addition to our regular jobs.
- It might be reasonable to continue expanding our current FIGs and use that to feed the community of practice in #17.
- It might be too soon to jump into discussion with K-12, but there are apparently already some things lined up.
- If we extend the work of the current FIGs, to invite or include people from the high school, maybe that would create the momentum for having connections with the high schools. We did have conversation that we never talk to the high schools and there is a disconnect.
- We need a mechanism to drive the culture of evidence we are trying to create. The FIGs seem to be a way to do this.
- As faculty we need the opportunity to formally sit and define what we think about teaching and learning, then take what we learn and formally share it with the campus community.
- We may want to be careful about inviting others to join current FIGs and potentially disrupt the flow of the current FIG discussion. Perhaps new FIGs for this, but maybe not joining older FIGs.
- The FIGs are a wonderful opportunity for us to teach each other. It is profoundly beneficial to work on a particular problem.
• We need to add “begin to develop.”
• Do we want to add a box to expand or continue the existing FIGs? Yes! Add the FIG box.

#20: Develop and awards program (could be called the “Falcies” along the lines of the Grammies) to honor faculty who best epitomize the culture of inquiry and innovation at Cerritos College. Awardees would subsequently be identified as Distinguished Mentors for developmental learners.

• The award doesn’t stop when you earn the award, but you then work with others.
• Would this be working with faculty or students or ?
• The faculty could work with others who are interested in DE issues/topics.
• Do we want a separate award, or do we want to add this to the general faculty awards.
• If we do that route, we can’t just make it. We need to work with the committee that is part of Senate.
• We also need to keep Classified in mind as we develop this,.
• This might be getting at train the trainers. We are building a culture of inquiry and we have our own faculty resources. Does that make it a different box? The distinguished mentor could be honored, but it could be something else.
• After receiving the honor, they can then join the mentor team.
• We need to be careful about referring to some people as “distinguished” and mentoring others who are doing the same job they’re doing. How are the people going to be identified? Is it only those teaching DE classes? Or is it open to anyone working with DE students? Who would be doing the choosing? What would be the criteria? We do need to reward people working with DE students, but there might be other ways to do that.
• Would there be a way to recognize people through a newsletter rather than an award? They would be honored by being included in the newsletter.
• There could be a project or a thing rather than a person. Someone developed a strategy that could help DE students.
• We are not ready to commit to an awards program, but we do need to determine some way to recognize faculty working with DE students.
• Maybe find a way to make this recognition more objective. Maybe it is about completing a series of faculty development activities.
• We need to keep the goal of building our own community of facilitators.
• What issue is this trying to address? Is it the low status of working with DE students, or is it something else? Once that is determined, it might help bring out what solution is appropriate.
• Maybe this is actually two issues.
• We have the ongoing FIG groups and at some point they generate findings. They can then share this with the campus community, kind of like delivering a paper at a conference, and they can then mentor others in this same topic. We can recognize them for “completing” a FIG process.
• We also need to look at longevity. We need to get people involved and keep them involved. Most of the time we can’t pay people for their involvement in faculty development, so we need to find a way to recognize people.
• There could be mentors in different areas depending on the instructional strategy being explored.
• A certificate and a letter from the President that goes in your permanent file can go a long way to motivate people.
• In connection to this discussion of recognizing faculty, there was also discussion about how we need to recognize students who have gone through the developmental courses as well.
• We need a positive “brand” and then get that idea/logo out where everyone can see it. Do we need to write down the idea of a positive “branded” academy?
● We have a lot of existing programs that are great and could be grown to provide more attention to developmental learners. It sounds like we are going to develop something new, but maybe we don't need something new. Maybe we can grow what we have and develop better resources. We can improve what we have.

● We need to be careful about not continuing to pigeon-hole our successful programs. We may not get the energy we need if we don’t brand it. If we have an parachute that encompasses all of the programs, we can get away from the silo problem. This can work for you and be something positive.

● Could this be part of an orientation and front load it that way?

● This could be the first page of the schedule of classes. This is the first thing we do to get students in.

● If we brand it as another program, then people have the opportunity to opt out. We do need to brand this differently and talk about it differently. As a community, we need to define teaching and define what we expect the learning experience to be here at Cerritos. This then becomes the defining backbone of our practice. There has to be a way to talk about all of this that plugs it into what we do.

● This is for the students as well as for our community of practice.

● If you brand this, it could carry the message that these are developmental students and they have come here deficient. The aim is to make student collegiate. The collegiate award: the requirement would be to take at least two developmental courses and have a certain GPA.

● Our students are developmental students. They know they are. We need to be honest with them and say this is what our mission is and we will help them. Let’s be honest. These kids have problems, and we need to be there for them.

● This comment gets back to point #1. This program is going to touch every area and most programs on campus. This is a huge undertaking. The coordinating of this will be monumental.

● Whatever we develop cannot be written off as “those developmental people.”
• What about Student Transition Program?
• The DE students may not understand this?
• It is senseless to say there is a developmental program and then something else. We are talking about how we are going to teach all of our students.
• We need to be addressing the total student. If a student comes in who is non DE, so be it. If a student comes in DE, so be it. We should be treating all students the same way. The plan should simply be the way we approach all of our students.
• We don’t demand assessment. We let them flounder, and then we say “you need help.”
• All athletes are assessed and they have to take particular classes, so it has been done for 700 students. It is possible, and it can work.
• We do need to look at how we talk about this. Do we say here is the DE plan?
• If our goal is transition to success—the student success program?
• How does the committee feel about playing with the name?
• Student success program. Our goal is to help students succeed with whatever goals have been identified.
• We are presenting strategies for student success.
• Is that really going to draw in the masses? Is that going to get everyone involved.
• If we engage heavily in a faculty/staff development program to bring everyone up to a specific place in terms of their knowledge of the concerns and issues, that there are strategies that work, there are more people on campus beyond the people on this committee who will get involved. We need to get the community knowledge up to a place where they feel compelled to get involved.
• There is concern that those who already feel compelled will get involved, but there are still others who will not.
• We have to keep moving forward. We need to keep expanding that, and eventually we get to the tipping point.
• A lot of people will never do anything different.
- We can use the same model that has been used for the SLOs. If we use FIGs to give people the chance to look at student work and teaching strategies, we can slowly develop a critical mass. They learn to understand the issue, and they have peer pressure.
- People had to do SLOs. People don’t have to do this.
- Students are floundering, and we need to do something now.
- The reality is that there is no teeth in any of this. Where is the push to make any of this happen?
- The announcements on Rosters+ would be one place.
- This has to come from everywhere.
- Students need to know that Cerritos College has a place for students to be successful. We are going to bootstrap you that directs you to what you need to do and want to do to be successful.
- That can be part of mandatory orientation.
- Mandatory gets to be a problem because students vote with their feet. When we make things mandatory, students will go elsewhere.
- There are colleges that are making these things mandatory. This is a risk we need to take.
- We need to study what happens when students do orientation and when they don’t. This could actually save us money in the long run.
- Do we have a box that addresses this?
- There are simple things. When they go online and start the process. There is a big announcement. Have you completed assessment? Stop. Go to assessment.” Or there is an online assessment. Go and take this assessment now. They have to do it or everything stops. Immediately this information connects this to what they need to do next.
• Ongoing assessment and ongoing orientation. You give the student a year, and they have to be assessed within the year or they get a hold and cannot register. This would force the issue.
• The orientation has to be substantive and needs to be worthy of their time.
• There is an online orientation.
• Some of the DE students are not readers, and they are not there yet.
• It is clear that there are not enough counselors. We can get more people involved in orientations.
• There are elements that could be better done by a content faculty member because the students often listen differently. Counselors can be seen differently than faculty. Counselors can be seen as a therapist and they reveal things they might not to a faculty member. In the orientation there are things that need to be covered, like 2 hours or homework for every hour of class, that the students don’t always believe from the counselors. But if a faculty member was to bring in a syllabus and show the students, this might carry more weight. If we could partner with instructors to have more involvement, that would be great.
• There are currently three counselors that are in the process of developing the summer institute, and this will be an opportunity to try something new. There has been a question about whether to approach the Senate about the success plan. They are trying to bridge the gap and to get faculty involved in the summer program. This plan would work with 180 students over 4 days. This would involve faculty, administrators, as well as counselors.
• Is it possible to figure out something and pilot it to determine if we are really going to jeopardize enrollment?

NOTE: As we came to the end of the meeting, there were more frequent side conversations, and it was difficult to hear and record all of the comments made by the committee members.
#21: Conduct a formative evaluation of the DE faculty Development opportunities and outcomes.

- No direct comment was made on this point.

6. THE NEXT STEP:

- We need to take all of the notes and comments and try to make revisions to the plan. We will need to do this process online because we will not have another meeting before the March 27 presentation. We will need to address the comments quickly.
- We have spent a lot of time coming up with two basic points: We want a coordinator and we need faculty development. What is the next step? How is this going to roll out?
- Once we present to the campus forum, we will collect feedback. Afterwards we will make revisions as necessary. Once we have the plan, and we decide to move forward, we need to develop a budget that will be sent to the state by May 1st.
- This would be about funding for 2009-2010.
- Then are we looking to hire a coordinator by the end of this year?
- Our role as a committee will be to advise the coordinator. We will put the responsibility for a lot of this plan on the coordinator. How does that square with the role of the chairs of the committee?
- There are significant issues that have not yet been addressed, especially in terms of the role of the coordinator, and we need to take the time to sit down and talk about those points. As this happens, we need to be sure that all of the voices of the committee are still being represented, valued, and included.
- Do we want to officially document that the committee is the advisory board for the coordinator? That advisory component is critical.
After the March 27 meeting, our committee will look at any faculty feedback from the meeting, and revisit the plan before the plan goes to the Coordinating Committee.

Could the Coordinating Committee say “Thanks a lot. We have decided that this is what is going to happen?” Do they have this type of authority?

This is a shared governance committee, so we could submit a couple more bullets that further define the role of the DE committee. ACTION ITEM: Dr. Reece is going to draft out language that would address that point. We will need to take this to the Coordinating Committee.

When we present on the 27th, we need to give the faculty the history of the process we have gone through. This has taken a lot of time, and we have listened to feedback campus wide. That needs to be acknowledged.

Can we use DE funds to provide lunch for all participants on the 27th?

Everyone on the committee is charged with getting a good turnout of for the action.

MOTION: Dr. Follett moved to use some of the DE funds to provide food for the March 27th meeting. The motion was seconded by Dr. Reese. Motion passed unanimously.

Dr. Connal adjourned the meeting at 4:47 pm