College Committee on Developmental Education
Minutes
Oct. 7, 2008

Members Present:
Sylvia Bello-Gardner
M.L. Bettino
Marilyn Brock
Geri Codd
Jan Connal
Suzanne Crawford
Bonnie Helberg
Young Kim
Ilva Mariani
Sue Parsons
Bryan Reece
Virginia Romero
Sally Sestini
Yvette Juarez

Members Absent
Renee De Long Chomiak
Mary Hunt
Martha Robles
Michelle Rodriguez
Joann Sugihara-Cheetham

Dev Ed Coordinator: Francie Quaas-Berryman
Assistant: Liz Castelo

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

- **Motion**: A motion was proposed for the Basic Skills committee to adhere to the initial deadline imposed for the innovation proposals grants due October 3rd. Motion was passed.

1. **Conference Reports (hold)**

2. **Rubric for proposal readers to use in scoring grant applications**
   - Jan Connal presented copy of the rubric agreed upon the committee for the readers to use.
   
   - Suzanne Crawford reviewed the changes and modifications she made to the rubric. She explained that points will be given in multiples of fives, with the max being one hundred. The committee agreed that points would be awarded intuitively.

   - The committee reviewed language used to write criteria in rubric document. Changes were made in language defining the difference between “exemplary” and “good” in criteria one and two. For the third criteria in box three, language
was slightly modified and C12, which refers to one of the effective practices, was stricken. In criteria five, reference to measure of student success and retention was embellished upon by adding new language. A portion of criteria five was stricken from document but will be included in instructions that will be given to readers. In the sixth criteria, the last line was stricken and the percentage number was replaced with “a measurable increase.”

- The committee discussed the standards to determine whether a proposal will be funded after it has been scored and ranked by the readers. It was agreed that there would be a necessary and sufficient threshold score set that a proposal must receive in order to be considered for funding. In addition, proposals with a non-acceptable score in the key categories, worth more points, will not be considered for funding. It was also agreed, that the committee would accept the readers’ recommendations but would ultimately choose which eligible proposals to fund and that any left over money would be rolled over to the second cycle.

- **Motion:** Bryan Reece motioned that committee should retain the right to fund or not fund all proposals submitted. Motion was passed.

3. **Draft 2008-09 BSI Plan: Goals and Activities (due to Chancellor's Office October 05, 2008)**

- Francie Quaa-Berryman went over revisions to the 2008-09 BSI Plan draft which dealt with the “Success Center(s).” It was determined that the decision to create one ‘success center’ or a series of ‘success centers’ would be established after collecting evidence from the evaluations made of the labs and programs on campus. The committee went on to modify, add, and omit language from this portion of the document.

- The committee discussed how data for the evaluations will be collected and how student success will be measured in accordance to it. It was agreed that one of the factors for measuring success should be the evaluation of the correlation between student participation in tutoring in the labs and course passing rates. On this same note, Jan Connal stated that she believed doing an evaluation with data that the committee has access to, will help to illuminate data that hasn’t been collected but needs to be collected in order answer many of the questions at hand.

- It was suggested that in the terminology dealing with space evaluation in labs around campus, that the labs/centers be specified by name. The committee compiled a list: Reading, Writing/ESL Center, ASC (Math), Language Lab, and CAI Lab. A member added that the committee should be flexible in including office space, classroom space and open lab space in the space evaluation. Jan Connal reminded committee members that the role of the committee in assessing this space will be to collect data, evaluate and make recommendations, perhaps with consultant assistance. A suggestion, to use department unit plans and work with department chairs in the evaluation of space. This language was added to the plan.

- Francie Quaa-Berryman brought up the topic of the budget. She mentioned that one of the projects included in the budget is The Habits of Mind which is ahead of
where it was scheduled to be this year. Francie explained that it was supposed to be planned this year and implemented next year, but now it will be implemented this spring semester. Francie added that it wasn't in the budget for this year, but The Habits of Mind would like to include three units of release time for the person who's going to be running the campaign from semester to semester.

- **Motion:** It was moved that Developmental Ed support a recommendation for three units of release time for the Habits of Mind Coordinator, to further student success in developmental education for spring 2009. The motion was passed.

- Francie Quaa-Berryman explained the rest of the changes and modifications she made to the current Dev Ed plan. Jan Connal made a correction to date of the end of categorical funding for this year to read June 30th. Francie added that because of this deadline, pilots for summer first year student orientations will be developed but not implemented until next year. It was suggested that to encourage students to sign up for these orientations, the committee should consider making them worth one transferrable unit so it falls into a student's GED package.

4. **FIG inquiry questions**
   - Francie Quaa-Berryman went over the revisions of the first objective. Jan Connal explained the idea behind the terms she added to that portion of the plan. It dealt with the committee looking at data that could be shared with those that work closely with student's around campus for their own monitoring of success in their own classes. Jan expressed that most faculty on campus have information about their own classes, but they don’t yet see how it’s connected to the bigger picture, so sharing this data with them will be very beneficial.

- Francie Quaa-Berryman reviewed the section of the plan that talks about the development of SLOs and the assessment instrument rubric that will be developed by faculty inquiry groups for Developmental Ed courses. The first two steps in developing these SLOs have a deadline in March.

- Jan Connal requested three units of release time for a SLO coordinator who will work with the Reading, English, ESL, and Math FIGs developing SLOs. Jan also requested stipends for a lead participant in English, Math, and Reading to coordinate the meetings and documentation.

- Jan also presented an rough estimates of $40,000 for a SLO management assessment system and $100,000 for a consultant contract (Hunter Boylan). There was consensus among the committee members that these would be important expenditures.

The next meeting will be October 21 at 2:00pm in the Faculty Resource Room (LC 62) in the Library.

Jan Connal adjourned the meeting at 3:50pm.