Open Forum on the CEC  
Facilitated by: The Design Team  
March 9, 2011  
*53 people in attendance

**Introductions**  
A review of our agenda for the day and what we hope to accomplish  
Setting the tone: Our hope was that our time together will be forward thinking

**Description of what the charge was for the Design Team**  
1. The Charge was to look at the present state of CEC, survey the community, explore what activities are being used, look at implementation, and listen to concerns in the community  
2. We gave a brief description of how our team was born out of Great Expectations

**What the Design Team’s report is NOT……………….**  
We are doing the CEC, so we need to do it right (recognized this is messy). The Team is not responsible for negotiating any contracts or working with the union. If folks are inspired to renegotiate and reexamine the credit load, we encouraged them to seek change via appropriate bodies such as the AFT.

**What the Design Team’s report IS………………….**  
The report gives voice to the community members who chose to participate in this endeavor.

Introduced Design Team members present at the forum and reveal their role/task on the team

General Announcements  
Reviewed the Design Team’s Website  
Reviewed that the report is on-line for the raw survey data  
The focus group data was not posted because it might be too easily identifiable  
Reviewed that we stayed focused on academic freedoms in the classroom and keeping faculty in charge of what happens in their own classroom.

Reviewed the 7 over-arching themes and held a brief discussion of the themes

Review of ARC  
The difference between the Design Team report (recommendations driven by the responses to the survey and focus groups) and ARC report. ARC was charged, by Provost Barnett, to develop policies and procedures that were presented at Unit Council's last week. The “next steps” for the ARC report will be for it to be considered by the Faculty Assembly and voted on at the next FA meeting.

**Q&A from the Audience**  
- Commended for our work and design of the report  
- Glad to see we added purpose and clarity to CEC – so folks know what it is and can be forward thinking from there. In order to reach the goal – we took this opportunity to make things clearer and more developed.  
- Statement about relating the 5 hours more to the class (we noted that course integration is in the report). Desire to connect the 5 hours directly to what the course is about so that this is more purposeful. Otherwise, it will feel forced and like you just have to do it. Busy work and that feels lousy.  
- Funding issue (hopes some funding can still exist through Student Affairs). Yes, funding came forward as a challenge in our report. The Team’s recommendation is that the process with CEC by
more intentional, collaborative, and have a centralized site. Also transportation issue, with first year students not having cars, how do we manage that – need to have a centralized site for sharing breadth of ideas.

- How can faculty do this when there is no funding, can we empower the majors to build something meaningful into the majors?
- The CEC empower students to be involved on campus because that is the part of college that means the most (the out of class experience).
- Just like we need a sharing site, we need collaboration– primary issue is how to stay actively engaged. (Report suggests a liaison relationship be appointed between Academic Affairs and Student Affairs so opportunities are always being shared).
- Centralized site – let the students be more interactive with this – and involved with the experience. This works when there is a framework.
- What is defined as “experiential?” The activity needs to be tied into something, involved, and operational.....but at today’s forum some of what is being shared is that CEC is also about attending events. How is that experiential? Discussed experiential v. enrichment. An enrichment activity gives the faculty more to choose from and decide for their course. The goal is that everyone has the right to say what they want designed for their own class and what is appropriate.
- It is often asked of student “What did you learn” at the activity? What’s the main idea? Maybe this isn't what we need to be doing? The focus might need to shift into what did YOU learn… as in why was this important to you and constructive for your experience.
- Asked of the co-chairs...What mattered the most or surprised you about the data? Faculty Influence with the CEC: Student sent us a clear message in their survey answers that if the College want them to take CEC seriously, they want to see that the faculty are also taking this seriously and don’t ignore it. The faculty’s attitude about CEC easily influenced the students. Also, folks were passionate and care about CEC. Respondents told us they value this, but just wanted it done right and with clarity.
- Asked what the thoughts are on grading? That this stay with the faculty. (see ARC document). Not required, just encouraged. The Forum group discussed grading and the need to be able to assess the learning – irrespective of the way you go about grading the CEC.
- Liked the transparency of the Design Team
- How do we create this as an opportunity that is valued by everyone?
- Furthering discussion about faculty sharing – and how they are doing this – vibrant sharing.
- Was interesting to be in a focus group and listen to what faculty shared and how they are accomplishing CEC – they were getting ideas from each other.
- Give some structure to this – its our job to help students critically think about things. It's a positive thing (CEC), just needs some structure, most people are positive about this.
- Important to keep the momentum going – avoid the train wreck -

The mot pressing thing is the community – we would be fixing this anyway without Middle States. We do take that seriously – this is a real opportunity to create something coherent and it works and we're coming away with something special.