

COLLEGE READING AND LEARNING ASSOCIATION

CONFERENCE CALL

January 27, 1999

Summary of Minutes

Members on line: Michael O'Hear, *President*, Lorraine Dreiblatt, *Secretary*, Pat Jonason, *President-elect*, Gretchen Starks-Martin, *Treasurer*, Vince Orlando, *Executive Assistant*, Roz Bethke, *Newsletter*, Kathy Carpenter, *Past-president*, Sylvia Mioduski, *Past-treasurer*, Rosalind Lee, *Membership Chair*

1. The meeting was called to order by Mike at 3:00 EST.

2. Agenda

The agenda was accepted.

3. Minutes

The minutes of the conference call of December 9 were approved.

4. State requests

Requests for \$500 were approved for New Mexico, Texas, North East Region, Washington, California, Colorado, Canada, and Mid-Atlantic. The request for \$300 by the Mid-South Chapter was also approved. Total state request, \$4300.

Virginia College Reading Educators requested a Board member present a pre-conference institute or keynote address March 19 or 20, 1999. Mike will attend. Gretchen reported that she will be representing CRLA in New York the same weekend.

Kathy reported that she will present a session on tutor training at the Texas conference next fall and will be the keynote speaker at the New Mexico conference, April 16, 17, 1999. CRLA will pay her air fare, the regions will pay all other expenses.

5. Gladys Shaws' request

Gladys' request for payment of her airfare of \$516 to present a session on tutor training at Kellogg was approved.

6. Operating budget

A line-by-line review of each budget item followed. A one-hundred dollar allotment was approved for phone costs by the Awards and Scholarship Committee. Clerical support for tutor certification will be increased to \$1,100. Conference revenues totaled \$86,500; expenses \$53,000 with a profit of about \$30,000.

7. Accountant

Bids will be sought by Gretchen for the hiring of an accountant for a two-year term.

8. Journals

The Board approved printing 100 additional copies of JCRL.

9. Tutor-mentor certification

A review of the findings of the survey taken by Gladys Shaw indicates approval for the mentor program to remain under the tutor certification program. Applications will be solicited in the next Newsletter for a coordinator. The Board approved to change the name International Tutor Certification Coordinator to Coordinator of Certification Programs: ITCP, IMCP.

10. Visa card application

After an extensive discussion, the Board approved the rental of a Visa/Master Card machine to make Visa available for conference registration and dues for the New Orleans Conference.

11. Symposium

Gladys Shaw will serve as one of NADE's representatives. Sue Brown will lead the CRLA contingency.

12. Website

Vince reported the address will be *CRLA.net* through Tabnet. He recommended that \$300 for Tabnet be budgeted for it as the house site. The cost for external storage space is \$320 per year. All information to be included on the website should be sent through e-mail.

13. Conference evaluations

The Board commended Jan Norton for her efforts in collating the information from the Conference evaluations. All Board members felt the format was excellent with the information conveyed in a very clear manner. For further conferences, it was suggested that the chairperson carry the evaluations and handouts from each session to the designated places.

14. New Orleans Board meeting

Schedules and plans were discussed.

15. New Orleans Conference update

Pat reported that plans are being finalized. She also reported some difficulties with communication with the Hyatt Regency.

16. Frank Christ's proposal

The Board recommended that instead of forming a new association to support the needs of administrators and staff in learning support centers as proposed, they be encouraged to support the CRLA SIG - LAC Management. The topic was tabled to the upcoming Board meeting.

17. Martha Maxwell's proposal

All feedback has been sent to Martha; Mike will edit her new book on program assessment.

18. Frank Christ's book

Frank will be notified of the Board's expectation to see a draft at the spring Board meeting.

19. Vacant positions

Applicants for Newsletter editor and membership chair were discussed.

20. CRLA membership for tutor of the year

The Board denied the request made by Tom Gier for free membership for the Tutor of the Year. The members agreed that the awarded plaque and money is sufficient.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:00 pm EST.

The minutes were approved February 21, 1999.

COLLEGE READING AND LEARNING ASSOCIATION

CONFERENCE CALL

JANUARY 27, 1999

Minutes

Members on line: Michael O'Hear, *President*, Lorraine Dreiblatt, *Secretary*, Pat Jonason, *President-elect*, Gretchen Starks-Martin, *Treasurer*, Vince Orlando, *Executive Assistant*, Roz Bethke, *Newsletter*, Kathy Carpenter, *Past-president*, Sylvia Mioduski, *Past-treasurer*, Rosalind Lee, *Membership Chair*

1. The meeting was called to order by Mike at 3:00 EST.

2. *Agenda*

Kathy moved to accept the agenda (*Attachment A*). Lorraine seconded. PASSED.

3. *Minutes*

Pat moved to approve the minutes. Kathy seconded. PASSED.

4. *State requests for funds*

Kathy reported that the following requests for \$500 have been submitted. (*Attachment B*)

New Mexico, Texas, North East Region,
Washington, California, Colorado, Canada,
Mid-Atlantic.

Lorraine moved to approve requests. Kathy seconded. PASSED.

Mid-South chapter has also requested \$300.

Pat moved to approve Mid-South's request of \$300 to assist with conference with TNADE. Kathy seconded. PASSED.

Virginia College Reading Educators requested a Board member present a pre-conference institute or keynote address March 19, 20, 1999. Mike will attend. Gretchen reported that she will be representing CRLA in New York the same weekend.

Kathy will present a session on tutor training at the Texas conference next fall and will be the keynote speaker at the New Mexico conference, April 16, 17, 1999. CRLA will pay her air fare, the regions will pay all other expenses.

5. *Gladys Shaws' request*

Gladys requested funds from CRLA to pay airfare of \$516 to present a session on tutor Training at Kellogg.

Lorraine moved to approve the request. Kathy seconded. PASSED.

6. *Operating budget (Attachment F, Conference Call, December 12, 1998)*

New initiative, Gladys' request will be included in Line 112.

Line 149 and 150 - half of the finds are allocated to the editor and half to the assistant editor.

Line 156 - Printing will be \$1500.

Lines 164, 171 - Awards and Scholarship Committee requested \$100 for phone, archives, nominations and elections will not change.

Line 187, clerical support will be increased to \$1,100 for tutor certification.

Total for committees will be \$10, 110. Lines 203, 205, 206 are to be eliminated.

Other changes will be made as discussed.

Conference revenues totaled \$86,500; expenses \$53,000, transfer to CRLA about \$30,000.

Sylvia will send a copy of the revised budget to all Board members to approve at the spring Board meeting.

7. *Accountant*

The issue of the accountant for auditing and tax returns was discussed. Bids will be sought by Gretchen for a two-year term. She will bring her recommendation to the Board meeting.

8. *Journals*

The Board approved printing 100 additional copies of JCRL.

9. *Tutor-mentor certification*

A review of the findings of the survey taken by Gladys Shaw indicates approval for the mentor program to remain under the tutor certification program (*Attachment C*). Applications for coordinator will be solicited in the next Newsletter. It was decided that the name for the coordinator would be changed to reflect both programs.

Kathy moved that the name International Tutor Certification Coordinator be changed to Coordinator of Certification Programs; ITCP, IMCP. Lorraine seconded. PASSED.

10. *Visa card application*

A discussion was held regarding the initiation of visa card use for conference fees (*Attachment D, Conference Call, December 9, 1998*).

Pat moved that CRLA rent the machine to make Visa available for conference registration and dues for the New Orleans Conference. Kathy seconded. PASSED.

11. *Symposium*

Mike reported some progress. Gladys Shaw will serve as one of NADE'S representatives. Sue Brown will lead the CRLA contingency.

12. *Website*

Vince reported the address will be *CRLA.net* through Tabnet. He recommended that \$300 for Tabnet be budgeted for it as house site. Laurie, Vince's assistant is being paid \$10 per hour for design and initial work. It will cost \$320 per year for external storage space through Tabnet. All of the information to be included on the website should be sent through e-mail.

13. *Conference evaluations*

The Board commended Jan Norton for her efforts in collating the information from the Conference evaluations (*Attachment D*). Everyone felt the format was excellent with the information conveyed in a very clear manner. It was suggested that for future conferences the chairperson carry the evaluations and handouts from each session to the designated places.

14. New Orleans Board Meeting

All schedules and plans were discussed.

15. New Orleans Conference update

Pat reported that the proposals are coming in slowly and plans are being finalized. She also stated that communications with the hotel have been poor. She will contact them immediately to remedy this situation.

16. Frank Christ's proposal

The Board recommended that instead of forming a new association to support the needs of administrators and staff in learning support centers as he proposed (*Attachment E*), they be encouraged to support the CRLA SIG - LAC Management. The topic was tabled until the coming Board meeting.

17. Martha Maxwell's proposal

All feedback has been sent to Martha. Mike agreed to edit Martha's new book on program assessment.

18. Frank Christ's book

Frank will be notified that the Board expects to see a draft of the his book at the spring Board meeting.

19. Vacant positions

Molly Widdicome will be contacted as a possible candidate for Newsletter editor. Zanette Douglas remains an applicant for membership chair.

20. CRLA membership for tutor of the year

Tom Gier recommended that a free membership be awarded to the Tutor of the Year. The Board agreed that the award which includes a plaque and money award is sufficient; therefore, the recommendation was denied.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:00 pm EST.

The minutes were approved February 21, 1999.

COLLEGE OF READING AND LEARNING ASSOCIATION

BOARD CONFERENCE CALL

January 27, 1999

List of Attachments to the Minutes

- A. Agenda
- B. Requests from states
- C. Gladys Shaw's survey
- D. Conference evaluation summary
- E. Frank Christ's proposal

Subj: Re[4]: Conference Call

Date: 1/25/99 8:02:02 AM Pacific Standard Time

From: OHEAR@ipfw.edu (OHeard,Michael)

To: carpenterk@unk.edu, pjonason@johnco.cc.ks.us, orlandov@mscd.edu, ldreiblatt@aol.com, gstarks@stcloudstate.edu, miodusks@u.arizona.edu, rosaling@kwantlen.bc.ca, rbethke@johnco.cc.ks.us, Oheard@ipfw.edu

Two days to the conference call, and here is the updated agenda as promised.

1. Approval of agenda
2. Approval of minutes
3. Budget—Sylvia joins us to continue going over the budget — 3 A 3 B
4. Tutor/mentor certification—the results of Gladys' survey. The question is whether, in light of this data, we need to change the tutor/mentor relationship established last fall.
5. VISA card—now that Gretch has given us the facts, do we want to allow the use of the card for conference registration and/or dues?
6. Symposium update—although there seems a sense that the issue must be decided soon, the progress seems minimal.
- 7A. Formal approval of state money requests.
- 7B. Gladys' request for money for airfare to Kellogg to present on tutor training (\$516).
8. Web site—Everyone should look at the model page set up at: members.aol.com/lorrie2far/grcrla.htm. Comments on Vince's plan for developing the Web site are also welcome.
9. Salt Lake evaluation report—you should have received the report by now. Jan wants Board feedback on style and content. The report seems pretty positive on the conference and may show support for an Eastern conference. As a side note, my conference report should be ready for the February meeting in New Orleans.
10. New Orleans update.
11. Frank's proposal—I have not yet received the proposal, so unless it arrives by tomorrow, this may need to go on the February agenda.
12. Martha Maxwell's fellow proposal. Martha wants to know if there is any further feedback on her proposal. She is having severe eye problems and fears she may not be able to complete her latest book.
13. New edition of Martha's book on program assessment. As many of you know, Martha asked me to do the next edition of her book, and I agreed to do so. My question is whether CRLA would want to sponsor this book in the same way we are sponsoring the learning assistance center book, whether we would be interested in co-sponsoring it with NADE, or whether neither of these seem feasible options.
14. Vacant positions—any updates on this situation?
15. Other items.
16. Tutor Award

Subj: budget for states and regions
Date: 98-12-10 11:11:26 EST
From: carpenterk@unk.edu
To: ohear@ipfw.edu
CC: ldreiblatt@aol.com, gstarks%stcloudstate@unk.edu, edu@unk.edu, pjonason@johnco.cc.ks.us

Dear voting board members:

I had promised the leaders of states and regions (those who had requested funds from national CRLA) that I would be able to confirm their funding after the board's Dec. board meeting. Unfortunately, we were not able to get that far in our budget discussions, and when we voted to table the rest of the budget until the January meeting, I didn't realize quickly enough the implications that the delay would have on our states and regionals in their ability to plan for spring conferences.

I am asking that you provide (by e-mail) confirmation for the following (to be officially confirmed by a vote during the January meeting) funding for the following expenditures to be used in financing state or regional conferences:

New Mexico	\$500
Texas	500
Northeast Reg.	500
WA/ID/MT	500
California	500
Mid-Atlantic	300
Canada	500 (the equivalent in U.S. dollars)

I have requested \$3500 in the budget to cover the costs of these grants to states and regions. Some of the above have also indicated that they would like a CRLA officer to attend their conference to serve as the keynoter or put on a workshop or institute.

Once I have e-mail confirmation from three voting board members, I will notify the above coordinators so they can firm up the plans for their spring conferences.

Kathy

Headers

Return-Path: <carpenterk@unk.edu>
Received: from rly-ya03.mx.aol.com (rly-ya03.mail.aol.com [172.18.144.195]) by air-ya05.mx.aol.com (v53.20) with SMTP; Thu, 10 Dec 1998 11:11:26 -0500
Received: from UNKmail.unk.edu (UNKmail.UNK.edu [144.216.2.9]) by rly-ya03.mx.aol.com (8.8.8/8.8.5/AOL-4.0.0) with SMTP id LAA23441 for <ldreiblatt@aol.com>; Thu, 10 Dec 1998 11:11:22 -0500 (EST)
From: carpenterk@unk.edu
Received: by UNKmail.unk.edu (Lotus SMTP MTA v4.6.2 (693.3 8-11-1998)) id 862566D6.00590421 ; Thu, 10 Dec 1998 10:12:17 -0600
X-Lotus-FromDomain: UNIVERSITY OF NEBRASKA
To: ohear@ipfw.edu
cc: ldreiblatt@aol.com, gstarks%stcloudstate@unk.edu, edu@unk.edu, pjonason@johnco.cc.ks.us
Message-ID: <862566D6.005902A5.00@UNKmail.unk.edu>
Date: Thu, 10 Dec 1998 10:12:11 -0600

Jan. 27, 1999

Attachment c

2 Page(s)

Bledys Shaw

Please respond (anonymously if you prefer) to the following question latest to enable the board to accurately assess the committee's majority position on this issue.

- 4 Yes 4 No 1. Do you object to the current umbrella title that is in the bylaws?
- 3 Yes 5 No 2. Would you still object to the title in the bylaws if the information and application packets for tutor certification did not include any reference to the mentoring program and vice versa? In other words, would it matter to you what the title is in the bylaws so long as printed matter was unique to each program?
- 4 Yes 1 No 3. If you have no objection to No. 1, or if you answered "No" to No. 2, do you think one person could serve as committee chair for both programs?
- 4 Yes No 4. If you answered "Yes" to No. 3, do you think a single chair of both should have an assistant chair for each program?
- 3 Yes 5 No 5. Do you think one person could/should chair both programs regardless of the name resolution?
- 4 Yes 4 No 6. Is there a Peer Mentoring Program at your institution?
- 3 Yes 1 No 7. If so, will there be interest in having it certified? If "yes", please provide the name and address of the person in charge of the mentoring program.
- 4 Yes 4 No 8. Are you personally interested in also serving as an evaluator of mentoring program certification applications?
- 1 Yes 7 No 9. Do you know potential evaluators for the mentoring certification program?
- If "yes" please provide name and address:
10. What to date has been your reward, if any, for serving as an evaluator of tutor certification applications.

Please give us any other comments or suggestions you have regarding the implementation of the Mentor Certification Program.

ITCP Committee Members' Comments

10. What to date has been your reward, if any, for serving as an evaluator of tutor certification applications.

- The opportunity to connect with other professionals, to share information and give back to the organization.
- New ideas and strategies for my tutor training activities, liaisons with others in the field, and an opportunity to "give back" to the profession and CRLA.
- Wow! Too many to mention – Being a part of this program for its birth has been the best reward!
- Gained valuable handouts and ideas used by other programs. Have a file of many different brochure styles. Got a great sense of what other tutor programs are doing.
- To see how very good programs can be and still be very different.
- I've enjoyed finding out how other programs conduct their tutor trainings. I also like to be involved with CRLA.
- Meeting great people who share the same mission and sharing ideas and concepts.

Please give us any other comments or suggestions you have regarding the implementation of the Mentor Certification Program.

- The evaluators of the program should have experience coordinating or directing a mentoring program.
- I see it as a natural extension of our ITCP and a chance to better serve students and professionals.
- I think the programs should be separate in the bylaws to avoid confusion, and I think they should each have their own committee chair.
- Should be separate from the tutor certification.

College Reading and Learning Association National Conference Evaluations

November 4-7, 1998

Salt Lake City, Utah

Overall Conference Evaluations

Demographic Information

Evaluation of Services & Planning

Future Conference Sites

Overall Conference Rating

Session Evaluations: Summary

Session Evaluations: Details

Pre-Conference Institutes

Post-Conference Institutes

Concurrent Sessions

Comments

Suggestions for Conference Planners

Overall Conference Evaluations

Demographic Information (N=158)

1. How many prior annual CRLA conferences have you attended?
0: 50 1: 21 2-5: 42 6-10: 19 10+: 24
2. Have you been a member of CRLA prior to this conference?
Yes: 102 No: 40
3. How did you learn of this conference?
CRLA Newsletter: 58
Mailing: 57
Colleague: 49
LRNASST: 19 (One person particularly appreciated Vince's notices/updates.)
Web Site: 8
Journal of Developmental Education: 8
Journal of College Reading & Learning: 5
Other: Last conference (9)
4. In which U.S. state or Canadian province are you currently employed?
California (17); Colorado (11); New Mexico (9); Iowa, Nebraska, Texas (7);
Arizona, Michigan, Washington (6); Alberta CA, Illinois (5); Kansas, Minnesota,
Montana, Ohio (4); Florida, New Jersey, New York, Pennsylvania, Utah (3);
Alaska, Arkansas, Idaho, Indiana, Maryland, Massachusetts, Tennessee, Wyoming (2);
Alabama, British Columbia CA, Connecticut, Georgia, Hawaii, Kentucky, Nevada,
New Hampshire, North Carolina, Quebec CA, Vermont, Virginia, West Virginia,
Wisconsin (1).
5. What type of position do you hold?
Professor/Instructor: 79 Administrator: 56
Counselor: 10 Tutor: 7
Instructional Assistant: 2
Other: Tutor coordinator (4); Adjunct instructor (4); Ed. Specialist, Chair,
Faculty development coordinator, Learning specialist, Library,
Study skills, Ph.D. student (1)
6. What is the main area of your employment?
Learning Assistance: 55 Reading: 36
Tutorial: 26 Writing: 19
Math: 10 Counseling: 7
Other: Study skills (5); College success (4); Learning disabilities (3); Administration,
Arts/Sciences, Assessment, Dean, English, ESL, Graduate Program, Honors,
Mentor/Coach, Nursing, Psychology, Teacher education, Technical (1)

7. In what type of institution do you work?
 Two-year Jr./Community College: 78
 Four-year College/University: 78
 Worksite Literacy Program: 1
 Other: 0

Evaluation of Services & Planning

Attendees were asked to rate the 11 items charted below on the following scale:
 E=Excellent, G=Good, A=Average, P=Poor, N=No Response. In order to calculate mean scores, the following number scale was used: E=4, G=3, A=2, and P=1; "N" responses are not included in the mean scores. Comments about the items are noted below the chart.

Response Tallies & Mean Scores

	E	G	A	P	N	Mean
1. Program layout, info.	107	35	9	2	4	3.61
2. Registration Process	90	54	9	5	3	3.45
3. Cost of conference	73	60	21	3	2	3.29
4. Exhibits	59	68	24	1	8	3.22
5. Resource room	33	44	23	24	44	2.69
6. Hotel location	78	67	11	2	4	3.40
7. Hotel accommodations	73	55	21	8	9	3.23
8. Pre-conference publicity	83	48	10	1	12	3.50
9. Tours/Leisure events	45	28	15	4	67	3.22
10. Banquet	54	23	7	0	76	3.56
11. Conference website	34	36	10	3	78	3.22

1. Program printing, layout, information:

One person said this year's program was "Best I've ever used!" and another complimented the page tabs. Someone else objected to the blue ink; another complained about the amount and location of advertising.

2. Registration Process:

While one person wrote "Great job!," most related comments suggested changes or indicated complaints. Three people said that the registration tables and process were disorganized: while the people working there seemed to be helpful, there was some concern about whether they knew what was going on because they couldn't answer questions, find ribbons, work with checks, and other relatively minor setbacks. One person said the registration form itself was hard to follow; three people asked for confirmations prior to arrival at the conference, and a different three people expressed interest in using credit cards for registration costs.

3. Cost of conference:

One person complained that the hotel rate was too high, and one person asked if institutes could cost \$15 instead of \$25. Five people (presumably from Canada) expressed concerns about the relative differences in costs for Canadians because of exchange rates: "Canadian dollars at par, please!!" "The cost was incredibly high with the exchange rate."

4. Exhibits:

One person felt that there should have been more math materials available. There was also a suggestion for more--or more clearly identified--displays of texts, etc. written by members present at the conference. Three people said there wasn't enough time or space to really take advantage of the exhibits; two others asked for more computers: "I was looking forward to seeing new technology/software. I am already inundated with print resources!"

5. Resource room:

The resource room drew a lot of comments, both favorable and unfavorable. The idea of it was very well received; the reality, somewhat problematic. In general, it was felt that there was a need for more assistance and organization overall (6); but there were also satisfied customers: "This was incredible--people who worked in this area deserve gold stars--they worked very hard and were very efficient." Some felt that presenters should be asked to bring more handouts, both for the sessions and to place in the resource room. See "Suggestions" for more ideas on improvement.

6. Hotel location:

One person asked for a map of the city and/or public transportation schedule; another seems to have found everything: "It was nice to be so centrally located within walking distance to restaurants, shopping, entertainment."

7. Hotel accommodations:

As might be expected, there were numerous negative comments about the hotel relating to the construction (4) and lack of a restaurant (16). And as with any large group of people, there were complaints that room temperatures were too hot or too cold (4). The fireplace areas drew particular praise: "The lobbies with fireplaces scattered around were very pleasant places to network." "I really liked the fireplace areas--very cozy, great for casual meetings with people, a comfortable place to collapse when you're tired without totally missing the action by going back to your room."

8. Pre-conference publicity:

"For a first-timers, the conference brochure was somewhat confusing, incomplete."

9. Tours/Leisure events:

One person asked for more information on informal activities. Four people took the time to praise the Mormon Tabernacle Choir and King's Singers and to express their appreciation for all the special arrangements that had to be made in order to make that excursion possible.

10. Banquet:

Food complaints (2) were balanced by food compliments (2). There were no complaints about the entertainment—just eight pieces of praise and a declaration of “beyond excellent!!”

11. Conference website:

No comments.

Other comments, praises, etc.:

John Garner was great (3)

Limit keynote to 45 minutes: "Gardner could have stopped 1/2 hour earlier and kept his point strong."

Praise for Kathy Carpenter's speech (2)

Praise for Mike O'Hear (4)

One person praised the "very considerate scheduling" and appreciated the 2-hour lunch

"The conference was beautifully organized and balanced."

"Excellent pacing of sessions and breaks. Good starting times. Good options."

Appreciate free shuttle to/from airport/hotel (3)

Hotel food overall was poor and expensive (4)

Rooms set-ups, AV equipment were not always right

Accuracy of session descriptions: "2 presentations were simply program descriptions and not advertised as such."

Suggestion for more break stations, plus options for non-coffee drinkers, some fruit, cookies, crackers to munch

Want more time between sessions so people can talk with speakers

Shorten institutes to 90 minutes

"Some sessions need to be 1 1/4-1 1/2 hour. One hour is often too short!"

One person didn't understand about the raffle and was too late to get tickets into boxes

Condense (2): "hold some evening sessions instead of having it go so long."

"Offer some session roundtables which include counselors and other college level faculty ... so we can begin some professional dialogues with them."

"When a session is so full that people are turned away, offer it again perhaps the next day."

"Clack [session #70] should come back & given a better time"

Future Conference Sites

In order to plan for future conference sites, evaluators indicated their preferences for several U.S. regions.

Midwest:	Yes: 115	No: 7	Don't know: 36
----------	----------	-------	----------------

East:	Yes: 85	No: 19	Don't know: 47
-------	---------	--------	----------------

South:	Yes: 92	No: 19	Don't know: 46
--------	---------	--------	----------------

Other cities and states were noted, each once: Colorado; Pacific Northwest and San Francisco; Houston; Alexandria or Arlington, Virginia; Baltimore; Minneapolis; Michigan; Iowa; Seattle. Three people expressed a preference for Canadian locations; one person wanted to keep alternating between North & South, East & West. People express concern about costs (19), many of whom see it as a deciding factor in being able to attend. One person suggested that tourist locations are cheaper and pointed out that "New York is too expensive."

For others, location did not seem to be much of an issue: "I would travel anywhere for CRLA." Several people responded "anywhere" (11), often with encouragement for variety.

In general, there was agreement that a variety of locations is best: "We will build a broader base, attract new members and with them new ideas if we show our interest by having the conference in other parts of the country." "Percent of members who are non-Californian and non-western has increased dramatically over 30 years. Let's quit being parochial about conference location--EXPAND to meet the needs of all members." "All areas of the U.S. should be represented since membership is not exclusive to the western states."

Overall Conference Rating

Comments were overwhelmingly favorable; 85 attendees wrote brief comments of kudos and thanks. Some felt there were too many activities to choose from; others like the selection (one of those "can't please everyone" problems). Here are some of the more enthusiastic:

"Fantastic conference--way to go!"

"A good friendly conference. I always enjoy myself & learn a lot."

"This was the best CRLA conference I've attended (& I've attended many)!"

"Could not get over how friendly everyone was. This is my 1st CRLA conference. I will come back."

"Thanks to Mike O'Hear and all committee members for planning such an effective and enlightening conference."

"A great conference. I learned a lot. Came to this instead of NADE. Was very rewarding decision."

"This was my first time--it won't be my last."

"I wish I could personally thank everyone involved in planning and presenting this conference. I will be a more effective instructor because of their hard work."

One person said the conference was good, "but not as well planned as Sacramento or Albuquerque." Another person was concerned about diversity: "Need more diversity, leaderships needs to go through diversity training--some comments were offensive... . Actively recruit more people of color as presenters, officers, etc."

Session Evaluations: Summary

Participants at the 1998 conference filled out evaluation forms for the 100+ sessions and institutes featured during the three-day conference. The evaluation forms asked participants to respond to eight questions:

1. Accuracy of title and description of session in conference program or publicity.
2. Content of presentation.
3. Clarity of oral presentation.
4. Knowledge of presenter about topic.
5. Organization of presenter.
6. Quality of handouts.
7. Effective use delivery methods.
8. Overall value of presentation to me.

Each question asked participants to respond on a scale ranging from Excellent, Good, Average, to Poor, with an option for Not Applicable. In order to rank the sessions, the first four response categories were represented by numbers (E=4, G=3, F=2, P=1) and calculated.

Overall, ratings for the institutes and concurrent sessions were very high. Of the institutes which drew 10 or more people, the top four (i.e., the highest average score for the 8-question evaluation) are as follows:

Institute	Title	Presenter(s)	# Attending	Average
0	How the Brain Learns:	Smilkstein	15	4.00
D/K	Learning Styles: Part One & Two	Baril / Wright	28	3.96
I	G.A.P.	Caverly	11	3.89
F	Using Active Learning to Encourage Critical Thinking	Krauss / Ruscica	17	3.88

Of the concurrent sessions which drew 10 or more people, the top ten are as follows:

Session #	Title	Presenter(s)	# Attending	Average
15	Transform Word Attack Into Word Play!	Miller	25	3.97
22	Creating a Community of Readers	Swinton	12	3.96
84	Succeeding In College With A.D.D.	Hickey	20	3.96
81	Five Trends That Will Shape the Future	Boylan	35	3.95
36	You are Smarter Than You Think	Platt	39	3.93
58	Study Strategies in Nursing	Stahl / Faulkner	22	3.93
31	Activities to Enhance Collaborative Learning and Persistence	Higbee / Thomas	30	3.90
47	What Tutors Want From Training	Kauzlarich / Norton	40	3.87
60	Speed Reading Course for All Students?	Ince	38	3.86
7	A Conversation with John Gardner	Gardner	26	3.85

Session Evaluations: Details

Pre-Conference Institutes

ID	#	Mean	Question 1	Question 2	Question 3	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Question 8
A	23	3.632	3.652	3.696	3.696	3.826	3.609	3.478	3.591	3.500
B	17	3.800	3.882	3.882	3.882	4.000	3.765	3.111	3.667	3.889
C	12	3.333	3.583	3.500	3.250	3.667	3.000	3.000	3.250	3.417
D/K	28	3.964	3.893	3.893	3.893	4.000	3.929	3.607	3.821	3.964
E	21	3.347	3.143	3.429	3.571	3.571	3.476	3.333	3.150	3.095
F	17	3.883	3.706	3.882	3.941	4.000	3.882	3.823	3.941	3.889
G				Cancelled			Cancelled			
H	12	3.622	3.167	3.667	3.818	4.000	4.000	2.818	4.000	3.583
I	11	3.885	3.909	3.909	3.909	4.000	3.818	3.818	4.000	3.727
J	5	3.750	4.000	3.800	3.600	3.600	3.600	3.800	3.800	3.800
L	7	3.860	4.000	3.857	4.000	4.000	4.000	3.857	3.571	3.571
M	13	3.639	3.385	3.538	3.769	4.000	3.733	3.533	3.615	3.538

Post-Conference Institutes

ID	#	Mean	Question 1	Question 2	Question 3	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Question 8
O	15	4.000	4.000	4.000	4.000	4.000	4.000	4.000	4.000	4.000
P	7	3.825	3.714	3.714	3.857	4.000	3.857	4.000	3.857	3.714
Q	16	3.828	3.937	3.875	3.750	3.937	3.750	3.687	3.812	3.875
R	8	3.437	3.625	3.500	3.375	3.375	3.500	3.375	3.375	3.375

Concurrent Sessions

ID	#	Mean	Question 1	Question 2	Question 3	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Question 8
1	30	3.562	3.500	3.567	3.700	3.867	3.800	3.207	3.387	3.467
2	10	3.225	3.200	3.300	3.500	3.600	3.300	3.000	3.000	3.900
3	29	3.824	3.828	3.896	3.793	3.862	3.828	3.767	3.828	3.793
4	14	3.718	4.000	3.750	3.538	3.846	3.461	3.769	3.615	3.769
5	16	3.119	3.286	3.133	3.214	3.267	3.267	2.933	3.133	2.733
6	21	3.729	3.880	3.714	3.667	3.952	3.619	3.714	3.667	3.700
7	26	3.848	3.923	3.808	3.885	3.923	3.840	3.875	3.808	3.731
8	19	3.297	3.429	3.286	3.214	3.786	3.231	3.538	3.000	2.933
9	30	3.739	3.720	3.846	3.731	3.926	3.654	3.885	3.606	3.577
10	7	3.281	3.143	3.143	3.714	3.429	3.250	3.429	3.286	3.167
11	33	3.301	3.424	3.394	2.823	3.485	3.364	3.606	3.059	3.273
12	4	3.875	4.000	3.750	3.750	4.000	4.000	3.750	4.000	3.750
13	14	3.714	3.643	3.643	3.786	3.857	3.857	3.714	3.714	3.500
14	21	3.770	3.842	3.789	3.789	3.789	3.947	3.737	3.632	3.632
15	25	3.965	4.000	3.960	3.920	4.000	4.000	4.000	3.960	3.880
16	23	3.585	3.391	3.478	3.696	3.739	3.696	3.739	3.609	3.318
17	37	3.656	3.568	3.676	3.784	3.842	3.784	3.333	3.730	3.486
18	40	3.782	3.806	3.743	3.771	3.912	3.806	3.750	3.778	3.694
19	14	3.649	3.786	3.714	3.714	3.929	3.571	3.500	3.385	3.571
20	14	3.795	3.778	3.800	3.800	3.900	3.800	3.900	3.600	3.778
21	19	3.783	3.789	3.684	3.789	3.895	3.895	3.895	3.684	3.632
22	12	3.958	3.917	3.917	4.000	4.000	3.917	3.917	4.000	4.000
23	29	3.084	3.241	3.000	3.067	3.393	3.250	3.107	0.793	2.852
24	27	3.621	3.833	3.722	3.556	3.790	3.529	3.500	3.444	3.579
25	29	3.247	3.241	3.077	3.214	3.267	3.321	3.556	3.286	3.000
26	18	3.403	3.556	3.500	3.222	3.722	3.556	3.000	3.389	3.278
27	13	3.637	3.833	3.667	3.750	3.917	3.667	3.917	2.714	3.250
28	13	3.086	3.083	3.182	3.250	3.364	3.167	2.750	3.083	2.818
29	14	3.804	4.000	3.786	3.929	3.929	3.786	3.643	3.643	3.714
30	15	2.734	3.000	2.786	2.333	3.143	2.929	2.643	2.500	2.571
31	30	3.898	3.889	3.926	3.889	3.963	3.889	3.926	3.923	3.778
32	8	3.641	4.000	3.750	3.625	4.000	3.625	3.375	3.125	3.625

ID	#	Mean	Question 1	Question 2	Question 3	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Question 8
33	26	2.690	2.961	2.704	2.444	2.852	2.556	2.923	2.731	2.370
34	33	3.547	3.571	3.483	3.621	3.586	3.586	3.667	3.552	3.345
35	7	3.607	3.429	3.571	3.571	3.714	3.857	3.714	3.571	3.429
36	39	3.934	3.842	3.949	4.000	3.949	4.000	3.906	3.897	3.921
37	16	3.649	3.750	3.588	3.765	3.647	3.625	3.625	3.562	3.625
38	19	3.739	3.632	3.737	3.684	3.947	3.684	3.789	3.700	3.737
39	24	3.705	3.833	3.667	3.750	3.875	3.750	3.708	3.652	3.609
40	24	3.103	3.213	3.000	3.125	3.542	3.250	3.120	2.625	2.880
41	5	4.000	4.000	4.000	4.000	4.000	4.000	4.000	4.000	4.000
42				Cancelled			Cancelled			
43	25	3.805	3.880	3.840	3.760	3.880	3.720	3.920	3.640	3.800
44	28	3.750	3.875	3.560	3.720	3.840	3.840	3.800	3.800	3.577
45	9	3.556	3.556	3.556	3.444	3.556	3.667	3.778	3.444	3.444
46	23	3.672	3.565	3.783	3.870	3.956	3.739	3.300	3.625	3.500
47	40	3.869	3.975	3.867	3.839	3.800	3.867	3.933	3.774	3.867
48	12	3.836	4.000	3.846	3.923	4.000	3.846	3.500	3.769	3.846
49	29	3.678	3.500	3.593	3.556	3.926	3.815	3.926	3.704	3.385
50	23	3.239	3.522	3.318	3.364	3.391	3.304	2.783	3.136	3.091
51	57	3.245	3.291	3.105	3.179	3.482	3.339	3.236	3.246	3.089
52	17	2.882	2.706	2.706	3.167	3.533	3.187	2.529	2.765	2.556
53	20	2.889	2.700	2.762	2.905	3.381	2.750	3.200	2.684	2.700
54	16	3.797	3.875	3.750	3.750	3.812	3.750	3.812	3.812	3.812
55			no	evaluations	turned in					
56	15	3.305	3.400	3.267	3.333	3.400	3.133	3.385	3.200	3.333
57	10	3.667	3.900	3.600	3.700	3.545	3.500	3.800	3.600	3.700
58	22	3.926	3.909	3.955	4.000	3.952	4.000	3.905	3.952	3.778
59	4	4.000	4.000	4.000	4.000	4.000	4.000	4.000	4.000	4.000
60	38	3.857	3.947	3.895	3.897	3.974	3.868	3.576	3.816	3.846
61	41	3.741	3.775	3.750	3.775	3.775	3.800	3.650	3.780	3.625
62	10	3.313	3.400	3.300	3.400	3.273	3.500	3.000	3.300	3.333
63	4	3.937	4.000	4.000	4.000	4.000	4.000	4.000	3.800	3.667
64	20	3.689	3.474	3.421	3.474	3.524	3.450	3.368	3.095	3.316
65	23	3.787	3.905	3.762	3.762	3.952	3.809	3.636	3.809	3.667
66	19	3.634	3.737	3.4286	3.632	3.700	3.579	3.722	3.632	3.500

ID	#	Mean	Question 1	Question 2	Question 3	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Question 8
67	28	3.838	3.759	3.862	3.931	3.896	3.931	3.643	3.857	3.815
68	11	3.8295	3.818	3.818	3.909	3.909	3.818	3.727	3.818	3.818
69	13	3.779	3.692	3.846	3.769	3.923	3.769	3.846	3.769	3.615
70	3	4.000	4.000	4.000	4.000	4.000	4.000	4.000	4.000	4.000
71	13	3.279	3.385	3.308	3.077	3.615	3.538	3.154	3.077	3.077
72	9	3.806	3.889	3.667	3.778	3.889	3.889	63667	3.889	3.778
73	13	3.632	3.833	3.727	3.500	3.750	3.720	3.667	3.333	3.500
74	12	3.789	3.769	3.818	3.750	4.000	3.900	4.000	3.538	3.692
75	17	3.603	3.750	3.647	3.263	3.941	3.625	3.471	3.529	3.647
76	2	4.000	4.000	4.000	4.000	4.000	4.000	4.000	4.000	4.000
77	6	3.937	4.000	4.000	4.000	4.000	4.000	3.833	3.833	3.833
78	7	3.750	3.571	3.714	3.857	4.000	3.857	3.571	3.857	3.571
79	8	3.453	3.500	3.250	3.625	3.625	3.750	3.625	3.375	2.875
80	10	3.412	3.400	3.400	3.300	3.818	3.400	3.300	3.200	3.444
81	35	3.949	3.963	3.963	3.963	3.963	3.963	3.926	3.885	3.963
82	7	3.839	3.714	3.857	3.714	3.857	3.857	4.000	4.000	3.714
83	10	3.431	3.556	3.444	3.444	3.556	3.444	3.111	3.333	3.556
84	20	3.956	3.950	3.950	3.950	4.000	4.000	3.950	4.000	3.850
85			No	One	Attended	This	Session			
86	16	3.669	3.625	3.667	3.750	3.937	3.937	3.500	3.562	3.375
87	15	3.833	4.000	3.867	3.733	3.933	3.733	3.867	3.667	3.867
88	4	3.387	3.333	3.250	3.250	3.750	3.250	3.250	3.500	3.500
89			Presenter	Did	Not	Show				

Comments

Most comments on the institute and concurrent session evaluation forms were very positive and clearly reflect the average scores. In general, people's comments reflected appreciation for the following features:

- thorough handouts which match the overheads
- clear, relevant overheads
- a lively, knowledgeable speaker
- practical advice (many thanks for "something I can use next week!")
- a well-timed presentation which allows for audience questions & discussion.

A few sessions earned multiple comments requesting that the presenter come back (or the topic repeated) next year: Institutes O, P & R; Sessions # 47, 58, 82, & 74. Others sessions, according to participants, simply deserved more time, perhaps even turning the session into a 3-hour institute: #16, #84.

There were, however, some patterns of complaints and constructive criticisms for seven of the sessions.

Session #23: First overheads did not match what [she] was reading from. Kind of boring and dry as she was reading to us from her paper." "One presenter sat the whole time & could not be seen by audience. She read her part of presentation word for word." "Talk ... don't read!"

Session #24: "Inadequate time to copy overheads." "I had trouble following main points." "Numbering would have helped us find examples quickly." "Could have used all handouts used as overheads." "Needed an 1 1/2 hours to do this presentation; went through overheads too fast." "Probably should have handout more connected to presentation. I had hoped for samples & questions at all levels."

Session #26: "Overheads included in packet would have been better." "I would have liked hard copy of samples/exercises you had us do....It's hard to grasp on an overhead." "Overheads of practice would be good." "Lack of common terms made dialogue confusing; we need overhead copies." "I wish the overheads were included in the handouts."

Session #30: "Much of presentation was self-evident. Some problems with web page projection." "She was hard to understand due to having English as her 2nd language. She also had difficulty with the computer presentation." "Needed presentation in front."

Session #33: "A little scattered" "Don't read to audience so much" "Too low level" "Information was not very useful." "You do not have to read every word on overhead." "We know THAT--please get on with what you are doing!" "90% of presentation motivational, 10% content." "Good info, but presentation was confusing."

Session #40: "Could improve by showing some actual reports." "Needed to be descriptive--less covering of point." "Would have liked more specificity in how to obtain and present data." "The presenter didn't give examples beyond what was printed." "I was expecting a more detailed presentation on how to use case study, phen., and alt."

Session #73: "The first presented got a little long...it made the other two have to hurry." "Timing with 3 presenters was difficult. Not enough time for discussion." "Improvements should include use of visuals. The format was straight lecture."

Suggestions for Conference Planners

Below is a list of suggestions that future conference planners may want to consider. A few are isolated--but perhaps useful—observations; these are noted with an asterisk (*).

1. Make the names on the nametags larger, easier to read. Perhaps add the institution name and/or location to the name tag.
2. Ask the hotel staff to schedule bathroom cleaning at times other than breaks between sessions. *
3. Run the mentor lunch twice. *
4. Add the session number(s) to the back index of presenters so that someone who sees someone they want to hear can more easily find out when that person is presenting. *
5. Keep but improve the resource room: some people suggested that the session chairs could collect the speakers' materials and get them to the room, while others suggested getting a master copy in advance. Several people thought that participants should be able to review the materials and make their own copies; other suggestions included a change machine, hole punch, stapler, etc. in the resource room. One person even suggested putting all of the handouts on a CD and offering that for sale.
6. If it is easy to get turned around in the hotel, perhaps signs in the hallway which point to different rooms, or perhaps just maps posted near session rooms would make it easier to move from one conference room to another. *
7. "Have a 'night on the town' for Wednesday dinner for people who have traveled alone." *
8. Continue to offer SIG and state/region meetings so that they don't conflict with other conference sessions or activities; several note that SIG functions need more time: "These are among the most powerful networking opportunities that the conference has to offer."
9. Seek a range of sessions in order to recognize/support the variety of participants' levels of experience. Stay sensitive to newcomers ("The CRLA members are friendly and helpful, but it's difficult to get past the "outsider" feeling because this conference is, in some ways, routine and comfortable to those who have participated for years.") without forgetting long-time members and experienced professionals ("Let's get some new & innovative workshops presented in addition to the regulars. Need some inspiration for the old timers!!") Perhaps there would be some way to indicate a level of expertise recommended to attend/appreciate sessions?
10. Offer vegetarian meal options for all food functions. *
11. Offer a closing session about making changes. People get great ideas, learn new things, but it's hard to integrate them; starting the process at the conference itself might help. *
12. Arrange sessions (or make it easier/possible for a participant to do so) in strands so that someone trying to work on a particular topic could easily make that a focus during each session time: "try not to schedule similar workshops at the same time."
13. People want opportunities to interact: keep that in mind when deciding upon dining arrangements for SIGS and other groups, session breakout times and locations, nooks and crannies to settle into with a few people for deep discussion.
14. Given the comments and evaluations about the sessions, presenters should keep in mind that participants appreciate useful information with immediate practical applications, presented in a well-organized session in which all overheads are clearly reflected in thorough handouts.

Subj: My memo to be shared with the CRLA Board

Date: 1/26/99 9:10:39 AM Pacific Standard Time

From: OHEAR@ipfw.edu (OHear,Michael)

To: carpenterk@unk.edu, pjonason@johnco.cc.ks.us, orlandov@mscd.edu, ldreiblatt@aol.com, gstarks@stcloudstate.edu, roalind@kwantlen.bc.ca, rbethke@johnco.cc.ks.us, Ohear@ipfw.edu

Here is Frank's proposal to the Board. Please read it before the meeting and be ready to discuss it Wednesday afternoon.

Thanks.

Mike

Forward Header
Subject: My memo to be shared with the CRLA Board
Author: Frank Christ <flchris@primenet.com> at Internet
Date: 1/25/99 10:29 PM

=====

To: CRLA Board Members
Subject: Founding of a New Association
From: Frank L Christ, Founder and Past-president WCRLA

For many years I have felt that my colleagues who are administrators and staff in learning support centers do not have the professional growth and networking opportunities that they need. CRLA was originally founded as a reading association and currently emphasizes learning assistance/developmental education in its conference presentations, association publications, and strategic planning. I have found it increasingly more difficult to distinguish the professional activities of CRLA from that of its sister association, NADE. Both emphasize programs and services that are essentially characterized as developmental/remedial.

In talking with many learning support administrators and staff, especially those from major universities, I became aware that they do not join either CRLA or NADE because neither association meets their special needs regarding center facilities and program management. The Winter Institute has filled this niche admirably for the past nine years through presentations and a web site that focuses on learning support center development and management.

I am not proposing that a new association be formed independently from CRLA. I am, however, proposing that CRLA consider sponsoring under its aegis a new association dedicated exclusively to the needs and concerns of learning support center administrators and staff. This new association, tentatively called Association for Administrators of Learning Support Centers in Higher Education, can be an affiliate of CRLA similar to the status of the CCCC to its parent organization, NCTE.

Briefly, here are some details. CRLA would assist AALSCHE with start-up funds. AALSCHE would have its own constitution, by laws, and officers. A CRLA Board member would sit on AALSCHE board as an ex officio member and reciprocally an AALSCHE member on the CRLA Board in an ex officio capacity. AALSCHE would have its own web site as it does now under the umbrella of the Winter Institute with

the obvious collegial linkage to CRLA

As a founding member, past president, and proceedings and newsletter editor of CRLA, then called WCRA, I have the greatest admiration and respect for CRLA, its officers, and members but I strongly believe that the founding of a new association exclusively for learning support center administrators under the aegis of CRLA would not only meet their special needs but also would serve to strengthen CRLA's membership and professional stature.

I am available by mail, email, WI web site mailto, and telephone for further dialogue.

flchris@primenet.com "...what we need at this point in human
Frank L Christ evolution is to learn what it takes to learn
Emeritus, CSULB what we should learn – and learn it."
Visiting Scholar, U of AZ ... Aurelius Peccei, Pres/Club of Rome
LSC & WI Web site: www.pvc.maricopa.edu/winterinstitute/

Received: from nt10.ipfw.edu (nt10.ipfw.edu [149.164.187.16]) by
smtplink.ipfw.edu with SMTP

(IMA Internet Exchange 3.11) id 001D0E9F; Tue, 26 Jan 1999 00:27:47 -0500

Received: from smtp02.primenet.com ([206.165.6.132]) by nt10.ipfw.edu
(Post.Office MTA v3.5.2 release 221 ID# 0-54891U3000L1600S0V35)
with ESMTP id edu for <ohear@ipfw.edu>;
Tue, 26 Jan 1999 00:27:46 -0500

Received: (from daemon@localhost)
by smtp02.primenet.com (8.8.8/8.8.8) id WAA29319
for <ohear@ipfw.edu>; Mon, 25 Jan 1999 22:27:42 -0700 (MST)

Received: from ip-47-175.fhu.primenet.com(206.165.47.175)
via SMTP by smtp02.primenet.com, id smtpd029203; Mon Jan 25 22:27:36 1999

Received: by ip-47-175.fhu.primenet.com with Microsoft Mail
id <01BE48B2.40E0B780@ip-47-175.fhu.primenet.com>; Mon, 25 Jan 1999 22:30:04
-0700

Message-ID: <01BE48B2.40E0B780@ip-47-175.fhu.primenet.com>

From: Frank Christ <flchris@primenet.com>

To: "O'Hear, Michael" <ohear@ipfw.edu>

Subject: My memo to be shared with the CRLA Board

Date: Mon, 25 Jan 1999 22:29:57 -0700

MIME-Version: 1.0

Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"

Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

----- Headers -----

Return-Path: <OHEAR@ipfw.edu>

Received: from rly-za01.mx.aol.com (rly-za01.mail.aol.com [172.31.36.97]) by air-za03.mail.aol.com (v56.24) with SMTP;
Tue, 26 Jan 1999 12:10:39 -0500

Received: from nt10.ipfw.edu (nt10.ipfw.edu [149.164.187.16])
by rly-za01.mx.aol.com (8.8.8/8.8.5/AOL-4.0.0)
with ESMTP id MAA28286 for <ldreiblatt@aol.com>;
Tue, 26 Jan 1999 12:10:35 -0500 (EST)

Received: from smtplink.ipfw.edu ([149.164.187.109]) by nt10.ipfw.edu
(Post.Office MTA v3.5.2 release 221 ID# 0-54891U3000L1600S0V35)
with ESMTP id edu; Tue, 26 Jan 1999 12:10:13 -0500

Received: from ccMail by smtplink.ipfw.edu
(IMA Internet Exchange 3.11) id 001D1685; Tue, 26 Jan 1999 12:09:21 -0500