

Basic Skills Initiative Committee

Agenda

Monday, April 22, 2013

2:30 to 4:00

18-207, Classroom

Members: Sylvia Aguirre-Alberto, Juanita Alunan, Lloyd Davis, Precilla Del Rosario, Kathy Diamond, Jon Kitamura, Chris Rico, Jamie Marron, Ruth Turner, Brandon Smith, Carol Wills, Jeramy Wallace
Co-Chairs: James Carranza and Henry Villareal

1. 2:30. Review agenda and March 25 minutes

2. General Updates and Information

- Kathy Diamond and Theresa Martin will be presenting RA to the board of trustees on 4/24 at 6:00pm at the district office.
- RA event on 4/12 went well but there were not enough new attendees to expand FIGs. Approximately twenty people attended including Mike Claire.

3. Academic Senate Committee Status

To be or not to be . . . an Academic Senate Committee?

- We are holding off on making BSI a standing AS committee because AS committees tend to be more faculty driven. The BSI committee is comprised of both faculty and student support staff. Perhaps it may be a better idea to pursue status as an institutional committee because it would give us more leeway in including staff.

The BSI budget is continuous because we are a categorical committee. Funding is indefinite until state makes changes.

Advantages of becoming an AS standing committee: Jamie thinks we should pursue this avenue because the BSI committee is student-focused. James noted that BSI initiatives would carry an AS “stamp of approval” but questions whether we need that stamp. Brandon noted that merging with AS would give the BSI committee the weight of AS’s approval.

Disadvantages: The “stamp of approval” creates several steps in initiative/project approval, as it requires AS and IPC approval. These layers of approval could create obstacles and prolong the implementation of BSI initiatives. Henry is in favor of remaining an *ad hoc* committee because it gives us flexibility but also allows us to seek AS support. James noted that as an institutional committee, we could bypass AS and seek project approvals from IPC directly. However, we could still go to AS and ask for their endorsement on BSI initiatives. Krystal recalled that BSI didn’t even operate under

AS until James was AS president. She believed that we should not become an AS standing committee. In fact, Krystal argued that we would carry more weight as an institutional committee. Sylvia noted that becoming an institutional committee creates more structure but that by doing so, BSI risks losing interest from faculty and staff. Chris thought things were going well as is. Krystal echoed concern that by becoming an AS standing committee, we might lose student support staff.

It was decided that we would go to IPC and advocate for status as an institutional committee.

4. BSI Committee Membership and Leadership Planning

- James asked if there were any members that wanted to leave committee or if there were any members of the faculty or staff we would like to recruit.

Kathy asked if there were any rules that governed committee size. BSI started with Math, English, Reading, and Counseling and was “very basic skills oriented.” Because we have a budget, we need administrator and faculty/staff co-chairs (student services admin/instructional faculty OR instructional admin/student services staff).

Krystal recalled that the BSI committee started out with a broad membership but the committee dwindled down, especially as the budget shrank and faculty and staff lost interest. She noted that we have never had an official structure or bylaws that govern the committee’s membership/governance.

Kathy asked whether we should create bylaws regarding committee size/structure. Perhaps we should create bylaws as part of our goal to become an institutional committee.

James asked whether we should expand our mission. Only a small percentage of students test into true “basic skills” courses. James asked if we should include more students from pre-transfer level courses (i.e. ENGL 838/848).

James asked for volunteers for the next faculty co-chair. James wants a clear plan for leadership succession. Krystal and Kathy advocated that James should stay on as co-chair until the end of fall semester so as to transition out of Academic Senate first (this spring). James noted that it is important for committees to cycle co-chairs so that ideas and leadership strategies stay fresh and innovative. James will stay on next semester but noted that we need to start thinking about a new co-chair.

Jamie mentioned that the Reading department has two new adjuncts that may be interested in joining the committee. Jon noted that we need to start bringing in new faculty/staff members as a means to foster new ideas and projects. These new faculty should be from different disciplines.

5. Funding Priorities

Determine policy and priorities for funding projects serving non-basic skills students and faculty.

- James noted that classified staff and administrators have \$1000 in annual professional development funds or \$750 per event, respectively, and asked if we should fund them after they exhaust their PD funds. Committee said yes as long as PD is basic skills oriented.

James also brought up projects, like Reading Apprenticeship, that are technically not basic skills oriented and asked if we should continue to fund these types of projects. Brandon noted that all faculty work with students that are concurrently enrolled in their courses and basic skills courses. Krystal pointed out that reading is a basic skill. Kathy referred back to the chemistry proposals that were not approved because they were not targeted at students in basic skills classes and argued that the decision should be made at the discretion of the committee.

Jamie asked for clarification between basic skills and underprepared. Krystal pointed out that basic skills are the lowest pre-transfer level courses. James noted that the RFP requires that projects target underprepared students, “especially basic skills.” Jon approved of that language and argued that the committee should look at project proposals on a case-by-case basis and decide whether it targets underprepared and basic skills students. Ruth asked that we never lose sight of our original mission, which is helping students in our basic skills courses.

RFP was adjusted to focus on basic skills students. High tier funding was restricted to basic skills but tier D will still include basic skills and underprepared students.

Ruth asked how an instructor knows which students are enrolled in basic skills courses. James noted that Jon Sewart used to provide rosters that let faculty know which students are concurrently enrolled in basic skills courses. Kathy asked if it was possible to get that information still. James will follow up with Jon Sewart on acquiring a list of disciplines that have high concentrations of basic skills students.

6. Review Goals and Action Plan

Review Goals and Action Plan, BSI reporting (report due October 10, 2013), and related BSI projects: Math SI and Reading Apprenticeship.

- James reviewed BSI long-term goals and activities. Long-term goals and activities have not changed (though “Summer Bridge” has changed to “Pathway to College” and “Peer Mentoring” is now “S.M.A.R.T.”). BSI will continue to fund half of Ron Andrade’s costs through next the academic year.

James pointed out that the Learning Center is understaffed and that they are no longer responsible for . He mentioned that we may be able to create new initiatives next year to help alleviate this shortage.

7. SoTL Update

Goals and plans, per the BSI Action Plan, AS goals, and Institutional Priorities.

- Jeramy updated committee on SoTL website including PD calendar, funding opportunities, and goals/mission

8. Additional items

9. Next meeting: Summer Scheduling

- **Jon – during 6-week session**
- Kathy – Here off and on**
- Sylvia – until end of June**
- James – during 6-week session**
- Ruth – through end of June (on email all summer)**
- Jamie – Email access**
- Jeramy – during 8-week session**