College Committee on Developmental Education
Minutes
September 30, 2008

Members Present:
Sylvia Bello-Gardner
M.L. Bettino
Geri Codd
Jan Connal
Suzanne Crawford
Bonnie Helberg
Mary Hunt
Ilva Mariani
Sue Parsons
Martha Robles
Michelle Rodriguez
Virginia Romero
Sally Sestini
Joanne Sugihara-Cheetham
Yvette Juarez

Members Absent
Renee De Long Chomiak

Guests
Carolyn Chambers
Young Kim
Bryan Reece

Dev Ed Coordinator: Francie Quaas-Berryman

Jan Connal called meeting to order at 2:05 pm.

1. Welcome New Members: Jan Connal introduced two new members to the committee, Michelle Rodriguez from the Academic Support Center, and Yvette Juarez from Distance Ed and Academic Support Center.

2. Approval of Minutes: Sally Sestini moved to approve minutes from the September 16th meeting. The motion was seconded. There was one correction made to the portion of the minutes concerning the RFA and Process for Developmental/Expansion Grant. That portion of the minutes was amended to include, “the proposals will be funded based upon the rankings that the readers provide.” The minutes were approved as amended.

3. Conference Reports:
   - It was decided that conference reports would be put on hold and discussed during regularly scheduled meetings due to the urgency of time.
   - Jan Connal reminded the committee about the upcoming Basic Skills Initiative Workshop series. She urged those who are interested in
attending any of the workshops to please sign up as soon as possible because attendance is limited.

4. Draft of Innovation Grant Rubric

- Jan Connal presented the latest draft of the Innovation Grant Rubric which is a framework and still needs to be elaborated. She opened a discussion on whether the committee is satisfied with the level of detail in the document.
- Bonnie Helberg proposed the possibility of extending the deadlines for turning in these proposals. She believes, based on conversations she’s had with others, that there really hasn’t been enough time for people not involved in the Basic Skills Committee, and not familiar with the process for submitting their proposals. There is some confusion, even by some of the department chairs, as to how to incorporate some of the 26 effective practices. She wondered if there would be any opportunity to do some training sessions or workshops on the process of developing and submitting proposals. She believes it will get more people involved across campus.
- Jan Connal explained that the committee has $60,000 that needs to be spent by June 30th. The committee can choose to use additional Basic Skills money for an additional round of Innovation Grants, because there is money that doesn’t have to be spent by the end of the academic year. The committee can choose to make the next grant process more involved, and provide people an opportunity to attend a Bidders Conference and learn all about the process and the grant proposal expectations. The crucial issue right now is to figure out how to spend the $60,000 before deadline, otherwise it’s lost. Her question then to the committee was whether or not there are enough proposals out there, that are ready, and that would consume the $60,000.
- ML Bettino suggested that a short term answer might be to bring the grant cycle issue before the Senate as an update. Explain to them that while the deadline for spending this money is quickly approaching, there may be additional opportunities to submit proposals in the future.
- Geri Codd thought it’d be a good idea for the committee to agree on the size of the fund and go to the Senate with those numbers and inform them that there will be another cycle and that also, training will be provided.
- Sue Parsons also expressed her support for presenting this plan to the Senate in the near future. She believes that this will satisfy the people who submitted the proposal for this cycle and those who didn’t have enough time to submit theirs and will have a chance to do so during the second cycle. Action Item: In response to Jan Connal’s request, Bonnie Helberg has agreed to oversee the information campaign for the next round of Innovation Grants.
- Sue Parsons added that by the time the Senate meets next, the committee will have already received feedback on the rubric from the readers which can be presented to the Senate along with the previously
mentioned. She suggested maybe making up an informative packet that can be distributed.

- Jan Connal returned to the subject of the revision of the rubric. Currently, all the document consists of is the items off the RFD. Jan asked committee to participate in an exercise in which each will fill out items 3-6 and reflect what each thinks an exemplary review on a proposal should look like. She explained that this exercise will provide a perspective on what the committee is looking for in a proposal, and from that, develop the appropriate language for the rubric.

- Jan Connal shared her idea of what she considers would be a proposal that would get a high rating. She explained that she would want to give the money to someone who can explain their proposal with enough detail that she could visualize it. Their plan must seem reasonable, and it can be done in the time frame that they provide. She’d also like to see that they’ve planned out their next steps of action and included how their proposal will benefit students. Lastly she would like to see that they’ve connected their proposal to at least one of the effective practices.

- Action Item: Jan Connal asked the committee’s permission to take all the examples they provided and fashion them into the different columns on the rubric document. The modified document will be presented for approval and revision at the next meeting.

- Suzanne Crawford suggested a disclaimer of publication might also be nice to include in the document. It would just let the readers know that the things listed on the rubric may not be the only things that can deem a proposal outstanding because the committee might learn things during the process of review that might add on to these standards.

- Action Item: At Jan Connal’s request, Suzanne Crawford agreed to revise final draft of the Rubric document once Jan is done modifying it.

- Francie Quaa-Berryman presented the list of readers that was sent to her by the committee. She emphasized that the list is subject to changes and additions. In response to a question, Francie Quaa-Berryman spoke about guidelines that prevent readers from taking part in the review process for a proposal that they’ve taken part in creating to avoid any conflict of interest. The guidelines are still vague as far as whether a reader will be allowed to review a proposal from his/her own department. That would eliminate a lot of people on the list. Francie Quaa-Berryman does believe the committee should come up with guidelines to balance this out.

- Sue suggested developing a system whereby the reading scores could be weighted to eliminate reader bias.

- M.L. Bettino suggested that once the committee has gathered a larger pool of readers, the committee should choose and assign readers from that pool based on the criteria that they cannot have a conflict of interest with any of the grants brought to the table. The rest of the committee agreed to implement that process.
The committee agreed to allow Jan Connal and Francie Quaaas-Berryman, once the grants come in, to determine who on the list may constitute a conflict of interest and will be removed from the list.

5. Draft 2008-2009 BSI Plan: Goals and Activities

**Goal One:**

- Francie Quaaas-Berryman talked about the elaborations being made to this years plan for resubmission on October 15, 2008. She informed committee that she picked out three things that committee is currently working on that were on the original plan and expanded on those things. There are three parts to it. The first goal to look at the gate keeper courses and, based on data collected, try to determine what those classes are. Also begin to look at success rate by ethnicity and determine whether there’s an equity issue there. The committee can then start determining what the program needs to target as it works toward eliminated the gate keeper problem.
- In response to a question Jan Connal asked the committee, the committee agreed to the five year goal plan but want to establish an achievable improvement goal.
- Ilva Mariani added that in order to help students pass, these gate keeper classes, for example Math 80, the help needs to begin not necessarily in that class but in the classes prior, like Math 60. The classes before the Gate Keeper class should be the main focus.
- Francie Quaaas-Berryman pointed out that for this year, the focus will be directed mainly towards collecting the data and through that, establishing more clearly what needs to be worked on. Without the data the committee can’t determine what steps it needs to take next or make arguments to that respect. The data will point out where the gap is and where the students are running into trouble.
- Jan Connal suggested that the goal statement should read that in five years the program is looking to improve student’s success in basic skills classes.
- Francie Quaaas-Berryman clarified that she chose to use the term gate keeper classes because she is also looking into working with the California Benchmarking Project at USC (Benchmarking Equity: Alliance College Network Leadership) in order to establish what the institutions benchmarks are now and what can be improved.
- Sally Sestini mentioned that a few years back there was a committee that dealt with benchmarks and that collected an extensive amount of data. She suggest that this committee utilize that data to compare the current situation, and then move forward with plans to improve what since then has not changed or has worsened.
- Geri Codd also mentioned that she has significant data that was collected previously.
• Ilva Mariani recommended looking at past data and comparing it to current data and looking for changes. This way we avoid the “been there done that” perspective.
• After much discussion the committee agreed to change the goal statement to read: Improving instructional practices by fully engaging in a cycle of student learning outcomes assessment for our basic skills sequence.
• Action Item: In light of the committees desire to embellish on the goal statement, Jan Connal will work with Frank Mixson to establish groups that will work with Reading, English, Math, ESL to develop the range of SLOs for the course sequence and follow up with the assessment tools to evaluate the SLOs developed.

Goal Two
• Francie Quaas-Berryman went on to introduce the second five year goal: To establish a well coordinated and inclusive and effective “Success Center” with highly integrated academic curriculum to support developmental learners in both preparing for and succeeding in college level courses and programs. Francie Quaas-Berryman explained that a way to go about this is to take a look at the labs across campus with fresh eyes and assess their success. If there is no data that supports that a particular center is working well, then it needs to be changed and if it’s working then we need to ask ourselves whether we can further improve it. This will all be based on numbers and as was stated in the original plan, the committee will be assessing how space is being used in these labs. The goal is to restructure how the labs are set up on campus within these five years. The plan would advocate that the programs in the “Success Center” be run by full time coordinator, not just people with release time. She presented the “Success Center” and lab set up at Chaffee College as a good model to look at. Francie Quaas-Berryman explained that the students on that campus are required to go and participate in these programs in the “Success Center” as part of their class hours but the school has it set up so that this isn’t were you necessarily go for help. It’s just part of what you would do as a successful student before you have to resort to it as a help center. This wouldn’t be just restructuring the centers on campus but changing the campus perspective on how to utilize this particular resource.
• Bonnie Helberg wanted to add to the topic that it’s her understanding that Chaffee didn’t have any programs set up on their campus when they decided to establish their “Success Center.” Cerritos already has a lot of these centers set up on campus so she’s interested in knowing how to adapt what Chaffee has on their campus to the culture here on campus, which is very different.
• Francie Quaas-Berryman agrees that Cerritos already has labs but the problem is that some work better than others.
• Jan Connal suggested that the campus may have to adjust their culture if the evidence shows that what it’s currently doing isn’t working. These
plans are all huge changes that the program is going to need the faculty to support.

- Mary Hunt commented on the strategic intervention model that was integrated into the Success Center at Chaffey and could serve as a model here at Cerritos.
- Geri Codd expressed concern regarding the committee's role in making recommendations in this area, and whether faculty input from the related areas of the centers was to be included as part of the information gathering on the various centers' use.
- Sylvia Bello-Gardner commented that the initial steps in the plan call for data collection and program review.
- Francie Quaas-Berryman reminded committee the main goal for this year is really about collecting evidence and getting discussions going about what is possible, as well as collecting feedback from faculty since the project is faculty driven. The vision for these centers is to have them coordinate their programs and services with what’s being taught in the classroom, so that it promotes student learning and it’s not just about fixing a piece of work paper.
- Jan Connal shared that that this committee will eventually take the role of unearthing this evidence and evaluating these centers and assessing whether they’re working or not. She thinks that the committee needs to be ready to offer assistance to those who are responsible for these centers, whether it involves providing them with extra resources or time to do an evaluation. The committee’s approach should be to create a partnership with them and bring more people in to the process. In order to do that, the committee needs to back up and be collegial in every step of the process.
- ML Bettino would like to see the word “center” changed to “centers” in the second goal statement.
- Carolyn Chambers added that committee must find opportunity to connect Basic Skills with Habits of Mind and plot out how that integration is going to happen. Habits of Mind might be the way to get faculty involvement and support.

Goal Three

- Francie Quaas-Berryman went on to present the third and last goal: Establish and or expand mandatory orientation programs and accelerated academic preparation programs to improve success rates for first year students. The goal focused on these three things: Orientation Programs, English Summer Bridge Program, and Accelerated Math Programs.
- Jan Connal restated that the idea behind goal three is that for Math, Counseling, Reading, and English there will be a summer deadline to pilot a program or expand on something that’s working and already in place, in order to jumpstart first year students.
- Sally Sestini had some concern about the deadlines, especially since the math department has not done anything like this before.
• Action Item: Jan Connal asked people involved in Summer Connection (orientation), Counseling, Math, and Reading programs to begin to think about how this new pilot will look like. Jan also suggested adding ESL to the list of focus items.

• Jan Connal suggested bringing in someone, like Hunter Boylan, help the committee make an assessment of where it stands currently. She believes that it might get to be overwhelming if the committee tries to do this all on its own.

• Item Action: Jan Connal will contact Hunter Boylan to get a sense of what his services would cost and what he could do along those lines.

6. Faculty Inquiry Groups (FIGs)
   • This item on the agenda was held over to the next meeting.

7. Draft 2 of Dev Ed Conference attendee form
   • This item on the agenda was held over to the next meeting.

8. Other
   • Jan Connal summarized action items for the committee so that they’re clear on what needs to be accomplished by next meeting.

The next meeting will be October 7 at 2:00pm in the Faculty Resource Center Room (LC 62) in the Library.

Jan Connal adjourned the meeting at 3:37pm.