**Date & Location:** 12/1/2010  
Don Bautista Room

**Attendees:** Aguilar, Melisa; Alves de Lima, Diana; Browning, Mary; Ceballos, Julie; Dishno, Daniel; Hunter, Truly; Lam, Phong; Lister, Cindy; Mieso, Rob; Moberg, Kathleen; Myhre, Jennifer; Newell, Mallory; Nguyen, Jim; Reza, Jackie; Roberts, Becky; Rosenberg, Jerry; Suresh, Meera; Tomaneng, Rowena; Weinberg, Pat; Woodward, Cheryl

**Guests:** Anderson, Gregory

**Absent:** Norte, Edmundo; Poon, Gordon

**Notetaker:** Patel, Bhavi

### Discussion

**I. Approval of Agenda and the Minutes from 11/10/2010:**

The agenda and minutes were approved.

**II. Next Steps—Assessment Plan (Report)**

Some of these next steps came out of the last DARE meeting. We decided to push the deadlines out so that we have multiple drafts that are presented to the various stakeholders.

Rowena will review the last meeting, specifically the group work that was done. She’s also getting feedback from the BSI departments. She will categorize information from the discussion groups and prioritize. One outcome of categorizing the ideas is to identify the areas that can be incorporated into the planning document in the upcoming weeks. For example, Rowena would like to Survey the faculty on Assessment practices and get their input. If this is something that is feasible to do by the end of January then we will need a couple of people to volunteer to implement this survey and then add it into the report.

Ro will be meeting with Gregory to review additional info coming from the Summer ’10 assessment group. Gregory will come to one of the first DARE core meetings in January so that DARE core can specifically hear about the data part and the analysis that wasn’t included.

We should be informing the campus and all of the major stakeholders about what we are up to and the ideas that we have identified. Let them know that our meetings are open to everybody. Language Arts, PSME, Student Services, DASB, etc.

More next steps:

- Send preliminary documents and meeting notes to relevant stakeholders.
- For people representing basic skills department, let basic skills folks know about DARE so that they can participate in the dialogue and crafting of plan.
- We want to develop a power point by early January about Assessment Report similar to the one we did for DARE where we talked about history of the DARE taskforce, the five year plan from the retreat. It will be presented to student services and counseling (may be by student representative).
### III. Group Activity

Turn to a partner for a few minutes and if you can come up with some strategies for what we should put in that PowerPoint. Five minute discussion on Powerpoint presentation to various campus teams.

- Should we share it at this point?
- How does the assessment report relate to these various groups that we will be reporting to?
- Dan Dishno suggested including CTE.
- Presentation would be no longer than 10 minutes with a 5 minute Q&A.
- Are we going to give out the plan as well? Do we want to share the plan in this preliminary form with the campus community or do we want to wait until we have it almost finalized?
- You don’t want to give them a report on something that they have not looked at. Counselors and advisors will have lots of opinions on what should and should not be done. We should share it in its raw form, but we have to have some parameters as well. We cannot incorporate everyone’s input.
- Jerry—stay away from the word “report.” Present it as here’s what we are working on and we’re looking for feedback and we are creating a plan together.
- Rob: For some areas like counseling that we consider the main stakeholders, the plan may be important to share it in its current form to get kind of deeper input but on a campus wide level, it might be beneficial to keep it informational type in terms of informing what’s going on. We can do it in multiple ways.

- **We have to define the purpose.**

- Going back to the original blue form where we identified the outcomes for assessment processes in spring, some of those outcomes can be included in the purpose of the plan. The outcomes:
  - The college will achieve consistent and accurate placement of students.
  - Students will demonstrate increased understanding of the importance and impact of placement and assessment in achieving their academic success.
  - Students will more frequently assess a wider variety of preparation methods before taking the placement test.
  - The college will provide support for students to place in higher levels if possible.
  - Students will take placement test and corresponding classes earlier in their educational careers.
  - The College will expand the culture of assessment beyond the technical duties of the placement testing center (to include self-assessment schools).
  - The Assessment Center will continue to develop multiple measures procedures and policies, in cooperation with institutional divisions and discipline experts.
  - Students go to multiple places before they go to the department chair (where appeal process resides—Dean does transcript review and appeals when the chair is absent). Students are not clear about about appeal process and get referred to different areas, adding to their frustration.
  - Purpose—would be to go out with a consistent message about the “plan”
  - It’s important to engage the various stakeholders so that they don’t say this was developed
without their input. If SSPBT has never heard what DARE is doing and there are a lot of recommendations made, it will put people off.

• Include in the powerpoint, the comparative chart, focus group findings. Something that will spark people’s questions. Faculty and Staff Inquiry.

• Continue to share with some key areas. Include math and LART departments in the group. ESL department has been having a conversation about that. English is starting. Reading is starting.

  • A question for the stakeholders: how do you think this is going to affect you? And your everyday job? For some people it will affect very directly. Based on that exercise, what would be your input?

  • Have any of the stakeholders come to the meetings as a guest? Yes…last Spring 10, guests from Basic Skills Depts. did preliminary work on assessment

DARE Core—decided to meet every week while working on the Assessment report. For the multiple drafts that will be produced, we are inviting various stakeholders for feedback.

DARE Core: January 4th, 11th, 18th, 25th
DARE General: January 12th, 26th, February 9th review close to final draft on February 9th
--One more revision after feedback from Feb. 9th meeting

Math, English department, PBT, SSPBT, CTE students, DASB would be another group to include.

VI. DARE Logo:
DARE Logo: Marketing suggested not using the arches and using a similar, common logo that would link DARE and SSC. Lori designed some logos for SSC and what marketing suggested was that because they are very closely linked in terms of its focus on student success, we should have similar images that would link the two areas but not the same design. They also suggested to have the logo be more kinesthetic (active and moving). We’ll decide on a logo after the SSC votes on it at their tutor potluck (December 5)

VII. Review of Title III Teams

There is one main Title III Math Team that’s been in place for the last academic year. They formed subcommittees with math faculty to work on various projects and interventions. They’ve been working on expanding and refining Math Performance Success (MPS) Program.

• They Scaled up to 7 sections per quarter. That includes extra class time and limited counselor support to seven sections per quarter.

• Tutors are undergoing training so that they can be better integrated into SSC programs.

• Another area of intervention was to support the Enable Math program which includes more class time, taking advantage of TA (i.e class-assigned tutor).

• There was a pilot of two sections of the 3 quarter cohort pilot.
• Results of the MPS—20 – 30% in all classes.
• Enable Math again very high success rates. Students expectations of grades, they expected to get a C when they came into tutoring and 80% expected to get an A at the end of tutoring.
• These are really successful programs.
• Another category that they have been working on is expanding and refining the Group tutoring approach and encouraging more faculty members to take advantage of group tutoring and focused on students becoming familiar with instructors curricula, more efficient use of resources and students learning from each other.

The carrot is in allowing a re-test. We have very high success rates. Sometimes students are jumping to two levels and the challenge is staffing. Students are allowed to take the placement every six months. As long as you’ve completed a module, you can retake the test and there is huge opportunity for students because then they can get into higher level and they do. One of the challenges is to make sure that the model is a refresh of the content. We need to figure out a way to do it without using as many human resources because it is pretty labor intensive.

How is this made available to students? How many students are using? It is not available right now until the staffing issue is figured out. The software used was Alex. We may switch to another one. If they jump two levels on the assessment, how do they do in the class? Did they do well in the class itself? Data shows that they did do better.

Modules are not stand-alone. Students need help. Part of it is assessment first and then practice second. The assessment piece someone has to create and choose appropriate ones for their level. You need a faculty member essentially to do this. We want to avoid skipping. If they missed it by 3 points. The content of the test does not give enough information about the particular needs of the student.

Title III team on the math side has been focused on developing alternative to tutor training course and developing curriculum for that, following similar content as current courses. They would like to offer lower cost, especially for international students.

Language Arts has two teams—there are seven people combined in these two teams (SSC Re-org and the Advancing the sequence).
• In the summer they participated in 2-3 meetings/week to discuss and plan for the re-organization of the Student Success Center.
• They worked with the other SSC faculty team members on Title III small group curriculum.
• They met regularly with their own team members and SSC staff to discuss skills modules and diagnostics for our students.
• There was a focus, if you remember the plan that for the ESL department, we wanted to preserve the listening and speaking aspects of the original student success center.
• The work that was done around Listening skills workshop, there was strong input from the ESP department and also from the students.
• With the input from ESL department and student feedback, 2 sets of small group practice workshops for ESL 251 level students created: a presentation skills series and a Listening Skills
There were also diagnostic (written questionnaire) created to get feedback from ESL 251 classes who received additional support from workshops. They also developed curriculum materials for 1 hour supplemental instruction (SI) lab for ESL 251. Research was conducted on supplemental Instruction (SI) models from other colleges. There was also development of curriculum and materials for Vocabulary Supplemental Instruction Module pilot for LART 200. Diagnostics were developed for EWART and LART 200. There was a 6 week module developed for ERAT 211. There was active Recruitment/Training of peer tutors for SSC and development of tutoring training workshops.

Right now, most of the title III teams are submitting their reports and any materials they have created including the diagnostics. It’s exciting to see the diagnostics being created because it is one of the grant objectives.

Second team is the **Advancing through the sequence.**
- This team researched and developed ways for students to more effectively advance through the English, ESL and Reading developmental level sequence to college level classes (e.g. They were looking at bridge courses between two levels and accelerated training etc.)
- One project that was created but hasn’t been implemented yet is called PEAK—Preparation for Excellence in Academic Knowledge).
- It is focused on a 200 level course.
- Curriculum is divided into three parts: there is a foundation area for 2 weeks, bridge course area with the use of a portfolio evaluation system weeks 3-10. 9 weeks and beyond accelerated learning module using LART 200 and 211. Peak is really a collaborative idea.
- They have identified multiple student cohort programs and they have infused the cultural competency aspects of IMPACT AAPI, FYE, Sankofa and Puente into how they are designing the content for the different parts of this new 200.
- There was also a new LART course created combining ESL, EWRT and Read. Unfortunately it did not go to curriculum this time around because the reading departments needs further discussion of the curriculum. As a consequence of that, this team will look at workshops that have aspects of this new LART course. So at least they can begin implementing that in the rest of the academic year.
- The cohort would move to have a pre-registration to a English 1A class and there would be a faculty identified that would be introduced to the student before the quarter ended.

Rob: Are the practices working at other colleges that we could adapt?
---The MPS program is actually a model for other colleges. They are doing exactly what we are doing here.
---Other colleges have ways to collect WSCH through modules. That's not an option for us. We just have to figure out a way to do it more efficient.
---At the last SSS conference, there was a model presented with the IAs grading in the
developmental level classes. We know that it’s been very controversial here and the union here does not want us to do that on our campus.

- There was a session that had accelerated classes that were showing very good success rates. There were also schools where students were self-placing and according to them the success rate was much higher than students who were placed 2-3 levels below college level through Accuplacer.
- The examples that we have has seen, colleges are on the semester system. It would have to be very carefully thought out. In terms of the interventions, we really want to have data included in terms of the interventions. We’re kind of catching up in terms of that work.

**VII. Announcements**

Webinars: Using measurable Outcomes to evaluate tutoring programs webinar—we own the presentation and people can view if they were not able to make it. It was very good. Applications are very broad based. It showed very clear way of how you design measurements especially in terms of how you look at what you are currently doing so that you can see what you are improving from. Assessing the Quality of Tutor Training webinar, Diana is recruiting people to attend. December 3rd one is on a Friday, someone might want to be the outreach person for December 10th. Let staff development know about it. PGA available for people to attend. Get this info to Mary Kay. She can have a sign-up sheet and use the lab.

Recognize Mary Browning: Served on Dare for year and a half. Thank you for being such as tremendous support to this taskforce. She’s been holding up DARE core.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Next Meeting</th>
<th><strong>DARE Core:</strong> 1/11/2011 12:30 PM – 1:30 PM, Admin 130</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>DARE General:</strong> 1/12/2011 3:30 PM – 5:00 PM Don Bautista Room</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>