College Committee on Developmental Education

Minutes
September 2, 2008

Members Present:
Sylvia Bello-Gardner
M. L. Bettino
Renee De Long Chomiak
Geri Codd
Jan Connal
Suzanne Crawford
Bonnie Helberg
Mary Hunt (substituting for Kay Follett)
Young Kim
Ilva Mariani
Sue Parsons
Bryan Reece
Martha Robles
Sally Sestini
Joanne Sugihara-Cheetham

Members Absent: Guests:
Virginia Romero Carolyn Chambers (SEM)
Jack Swanson Kimberly Rosenfeld

Dev Ed Coordinator: Francie Quaas-Berryman

Jan Connal called the meeting to order at 2:10.

1. Welcome New Members: We welcomed Young Kim who will be the representative from Research and Development and Suzanne Crawford who will be a representative from English.

2. Approval of minutes: Bryan Reece moved to approve the minutes of the August 19, 2008 meeting. The motion was seconded by Sue Parsons. The minutes were approved as presented.

3. Conference Reports: Regional Training at Chaffey College
   - A group of ten people from Cerritos attended the regional training. One speaker, Kenneth Gonzalez, gave a presentation that captivated those who attended. Gonzalez works to help colleges train focus group facilitators. Several committee members recommended contacting Gonzalez to see if he would be available to work with faculty and staff here at Cerritos. His training could help us better understand our students. It was also suggested that Gonzalez might be engaged as an expert who could evaluate our current programs. Jan Connal and/or Francie Quaas-Berryman will contact Gonzalez to see how we might work together and what some of our options could be.
• Sue Parsons reminded us that at the brainstorming session at Chaffey, we discussed learning communities as more than just paired classes but moving into communities of learners.
• The Chaffey Success Centers were also held up as an effective practice model.

4. Update on Site Visits:
• We have contacted three sites: Grossmont, Chaffey, and Mt SAC.
  - Grossmont – Project Success: ML Bettino, Bonnie Helberg, Geri Codd, Sylvia Bello-Gardner, Virginia Romero, and Francie Quaas-Berryman
  - Chaffey College – Success Center: Jan Connal, Suzanne Crawford, Francie Quaas-Berryman
  - Mt SAC -- Learning Center: Ilva Mariani, Martha Robles, Jan Connal, Francie Quaas-Berryman
• We are also looking at ARCC data to see which colleges are doing well on specific measurements. Feather River and Santa Rosa were identified as strong in two of the measurements we are interested in.

5. Proposed “knowledge building” policy statement for distributing Dev Ed conference funds and associate template to be completed by conference attendees.
• Sally Sestini raised a question about the definition of “Developmental Education” as opposed to “Basic Skills” as well as a concern that campus-wide these terms could cause confusion.
• Geri Codd recommended defining all of the terms as well as spelling out any acronyms.
• Jan Connal suggested replacing “BSI Conference Funds” with “Developmental Education Conference Funds.”
• Sue Parsons recommended developing a paragraph that explains who the Dev Ed Committee is and where the funds are coming from.
• There was considerable discussion about who developmental students are. The discussion addressed the point that developmental students are those who begin college without college level skills in reading, writing, math, or study skills. This could include students in the developmental classes as well as those who are not currently enrolled in developmental classes.
• Francie Quaas-Berryman argued for keeping the definition broad, as “college level skills” rather than spelling out reading, writing, and math, as this could cause faculty from other disciplines to disengage, thinking they don’t work with students in those areas.
• The conversation got a bit side-tracked discussing mandatory placement and mandatory orientation. This is a key issue in developmental education and needs to be discussed in some detail.
• Bryan Reece recommended adding a standard paragraph that explains who we are and what we do.
• Renee De Long Chomiak recommended including staff in the list of people who can apply for the conference funds.
• There was discussion over the wording of the goal: “Establish and nurture a campus-wide culture of inquiry and innovation among all faculty who support developmental learners.” However, since this was the wording of the agreed upon goal from the plan that was submitted last year, at this time, the wording needs to stand.
The committee decided that the statement needed more committee work; however, there was also a request to pay conference registration fees for those attending the Student Success Conference in October.

Bryan Reece moved to approve funding registration fees for the Cerritos College faculty and counselors currently registered for the Student Success Conference in October. The motion was seconded by Sally Sestini. The motion was approved. Those who will be funded will need to follow up with the report procedure being developed.

The draft was tabled until the next meeting.

6. Proposed process, priorities and RFP for distributing “Development/Expansion” awards ($60,000)

- Sue Parsons recommended including the service department and division on the form. She also recommended including the name(s), department and division of lead faculty as well as all faculty participants. She also raised a question about the role of the “responsible administrator” in the project.
- There was discussion about the role of the managers in this process, whether the administrator’s signature indicated they managed the project, approved the project, or were simply aware that the project existed. The general consensus on this point was the administrator’s signature indicated an approval of the project.
- Sue Parsons also questioned how we are measuring the “before,” the need. Carolyn Chambers suggested including a statement about evidence that what is being addressed is actually a need on campus.
- Bryan Reece recommended changing the BSI language and consistently using the developmental education language and including the general explanation of who the Dev Ed Committee is and what we do.
- There was also discussion about who would be reading and evaluating the grants and offering the assessment. The group came to the consensus that readers could be part of the Dev Ed Committee but could not be involved in any of the grant proposals nor benefit in any way from any of the grant proposals.
- The proposed point system was discussed. There was considerable debate over the 5 points awarded to “How will your project engage Developmental Education students?”
- There was also considerable discussion about the focus of the grant funding. Since we already have considerable funding and resources devoted to faculty development and organizational foundation, these funds should be focused such that there is a measurable, direct impact on students.
- Bryan Reese recommended altering the points slightly by developing a new #1 that addresses needs assessment for 5 points, taking five points from #3, combining 4 and 5 for a total of 20 points, and taking 5 points from #6 to maintain the 100 points overall. This recommendation received general consensus with the further recommendation of moving the first line of #5 to number #6.
- Sue Parsons recommended making it clear in the cover letter that the emphasis of this year’s funding will be on impacting students directly.
- Renee De Long Chomiak raised the concern about the grant people understanding that they will only get the money they are awarded. They will not be permitted to over-spend their funds. The Dev Ed Coordinator will be responsible to oversee the spending to insure that grant groups do not overspend.
- There was discussion as to whether to let potential applicants know that there was a standard grant amount. It was decided not to limit the possibilities in that way. The
grants would be ranked by the readers, and the Dev Ed Committee would make the final determination about what would happen with the $60,000. Following the model of the VETA grants, the Dev Ed Committee could exercise the option of negotiating total grant amounts with the applicants.

- It was agreed that at the next meeting we would discuss how the committee will work with the ratings provided by the readers to reach the final decision about the funding.
- The RFP will go out by September 5th. The proposals will be due by October 3 and the readers will return the scores by October 17, allowing the committee to discuss the funding at the Oct 21st meeting. Applicants will be notified no later than October 31st.

7. **Status of hiring the BSI categorically-funded Counselor**
   - The position is currently being advertised. The position closes on September 12.
   - There was discussion about the make-up of the hiring committee. As this is a categorically funded, one-year position, focused specifically on basic skills issues and working with the committee to implement the plan recommendations, it was recommended that either the Dev Ed Coordinator or the Dev Ed Committee chair be on the hiring committee.

8. **Additional Goals needed for 2008-09 BSI plan (due to Chancellor’s Office October 15, 2008)**
   - The next phase of the plan is going to be fast tracked as it is due Oct 15. The committee briefly brainstormed some things we could focus on in the next phase of the plan.
     - Habits of Mind – fast tracking this to implement this academic year
     - Evaluating the current learning environment in the ASC/LRC and determining how the space could be used more effectively.

9. **Other:**
   - The Habits of Mind Campaign needs to be included on the next agenda.

The next meeting will be September 16 at 2:00 in the Faculty Resource Room (LC 62) in the Library.

Jan Connal adjourned the meeting at 3:40.