Design Team Meeting; October 17, 2012  
Minutes prepared by Melissa Van Der Wall

Attendance (in alphabetical order): Roark Atkinson, Joe Connell, Emily Emmett, Ann LePore, Lysandra Perez-Strumolo, Maya Poran (co-chair), Nicole Prisco, Danielle Reed, Melissa Van Der Wall (co-chair), Trish Williams,

The Team discussed Provost Barnett’s charges 1-5 (as presented to the Team on October 3rd)

Feedback for Charge #1: “Re-examine structure and membership and reaffirm the efforts of the working groups.”

- Mel asked about removing the membership piece from this charge and suggested discussing membership amongst ourselves as a regular course of business (as opposed to an official charge).
- Through a discussion led by Roark, the Team evolved into a suggestion to make Design Team membership on a term basis (it was suggested as a 2 year term, with alternates in place to assume the position once the term has expired). Or, the alternates could attend a Design Team meeting if the Design Team member was not available.
- Trish offered feedback about the length of the term – should we consider something less or more??
- When we talked about student representations, Emily suggested having one student per school. Presently, Danielle Reed is from SSAIS, Emily Emmett is from TAS, and Nicole Prisco is from CA.
- Roark made a suggestion that we reach out to the adjunct population and ask if individuals would want to align with the Design Team.
- Maya suggested that in order to get a sense of what is happening with the Working Groups, we would ask for the chairs to “report out” at the next meeting (irrespective of whether or not work was accomplished because we need to “take the temperature”). The Team agreed it best to do this in order to get a sense as to whether or not the Working Groups are effective or if we should reconsider the design of the Working Groups.
- Mel wanted the group to think about the Working Group volunteers and indicated that a status message to those individuals in the very near future would be wise (fearing that the volunteers aren’t sure what their place is anymore on the Working Groups).
- Ann offered thoughts about prioritizing tasks as the needs of external agencies (Middle States) and our own college- needs ebb and flow.

Feedback for #2: “Undertake another survey of faculty and students on the CEC.”

- Possible re-wording of #2 was: “Determine what aspects of the CEC need the Team’s attention and implement the proper assessment methods.” This leaves the charge in more broad strokes, so we can consider anything from a survey instrument, to focus groups, etc.


- Mel indicated that she and Maya connected with Eric about moving this objective in Weave from Goal 1 to its own Goal #3. Mel said that once the language on this has been firmed up, she and Maya will route FY13 Weave goals to the Team.
• Possible re-wording of #2 was; “Document a formal process for the Design Team via an Operations Manual.”

Feedback for #4: “Move focus from the course to the program level”
• The Team enjoyed a vibrant discussion around this Charge and also read from Eric Daffron’s written comments that he sent to Mel and Maya via e-mail prior to today’s meeting.
• Since Eric’s written commentary spoke of “actionable results” and the Team was unsure as to what that meant or what context that was written in.....it was agreed that Mel and Maya will need to speak with Eric in order to provide further clarification.
• Possible re-wording of #4 was; “Provide support to programs as the College moves the task of CEC assessment to the program-level.” OR “The Team will support the College by suggesting ways to assess the CEC at the program-level.”

Feedback for #5: “Explore use of a co-curricular transcript”
• The Team meeting was running out of time, but the discussion resulted in the Team feeling that we needed more information about the purpose and design of the current co-curricular transcript (as managed through Student Affairs). No new wording for the charge was suggested.
• Invite Pat Change to the next Design Team meeting for a CCT demonstration

Other
• Maya reached out to AFT President, Dr. Martha Ecker, regarding her attending a future Design Team Meeting. Dr. Ecker agreed, but presently has some meetings to attend to - she would be glad to visit with us after these things tease out a bit more.
• Discussion ensures about a student-centered focus on the program-level.
• Emily offered commentary about looking for more of a progressive CEC experience through the courses in each program.

Next Steps;
1. Schedule a time for Pat Chang to address the Design Team with regards to the co-curricular transcript
2. Reach out the adjunct instructors and ask if individuals have an interest in joining the Design Team
3. Inform Working Group chairs that we are looking for them to “report out” at the next Design Team meeting.
4. Talk with Eric Daffron about the intent and visions behind the assessment piece and “actionable results.”
5. Appoint students to the Design Team from ASB and SSHS