**AGENDA/MINUTES for NEASC Standard 7**
February 26, 2013
2-4 PM
Rm. 2508, Lincoln Campus

**Members Present:** Kathleen Beauchene, MaryAdele Combe, Jim Glickman, Jennifer Hurrell, AnnMarie McMahon, , Jim Salisbury, Ruth Sullivan, Marla Wallace

**(1)** Review of Document
The committee focused on the revision of the document, which has been edited down from 18 pages to 11 pages.

Specific items reviewed and discussed include:

Description
7.2
Ann Marie provided charts and funding information for IT and the library for the past five years.

7.6
The committee discussed the term Media Services. Additional numbers are needed for Help Desk information, including staffing. The committee discussed providing data about the number of CCRI faculty, staff, and students and comparing it to Help Desk staffing, current and past, to determine comparative figures. Also, MaryAdele noted that staff members in the computer lab are now answering calls placed to the Help Desk, troubleshooting, and writing Help Desk tickets for problems they cannot answer. This information should be included in the description as well as noted in the appraisal to indicate how IT is responding to staff, student, and faculty needs.

7.7
The committee agreed that 7.7 (ADA library compliance) would be better placed in Standard 8. Ruth will contact Standard 8 co-chairs to determine their opinion.
The committee also discussed ADA electronic compliance but ultimately felt such compliance would fall under Standard 6.10.

7.8
Add information about mobile apps, CCRI and Blackboard.

7.9
Provide data about actual library class sessions. Rephrasing is need of a number of sentences in the description. "Each" should be replaced by "many." "Requires" should be omitted. A syllabus is needed for Technical Report Writing to determine if research is part of the course. Kathleen volunteered to get a syllabus.

7.10
Further information is still needed about the status of the definition of technological literacy submitted to Steve Vieira and Mike Kelly. Jen will check in with Steve and Mike to be sure that they have the committee's working definition.

Further conversation is needed about how student orientation prepares students to use technology at CCRI. The one piece that is definitive is that students use MyCCRI for registration, grades, etc.

7.11
The committee reviewed ATAC's role and membership. Given the number of faculty on the committee, this committee questioned if ATAC should have faculty leadership.

<u>Appraisal</u>
7.4
Help Desk is back to 2 full-time staff after the temporary position ended. Committee wondered if this temporary position was added because of need and if another temporary position would be added. NEASC survey results indicated no problems with the HelpDesk, although a high percentage of respondents did not answer HelpDesk questions.

Improved metrics are needed.

7.6
Phrasing can be condensed. Assess schedules offered, although NEASC survey results gave Blackboard workshops high marks. Information about the DL coordinator can be moved to Description. Compensation information is questionable.

7.9
The question arose about how CCRI can measure proficiency, especially as we don't know what is being measured. Tech literacy should be infused within the curriculum and stated in gen ed core outcomes.

7.11
Determining institutional effectiveness is difficult at this time.


**(2)** Our next meeting time will be based on the return of the edited document from NEASC Steering Committee.

Meeting adjourned at 4 PM.