

AGENDA/MINUTES for NEASC Standard 7

January 29, 2013

2-4 PM

Rm. 2508, Lincoln Campus

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

(1) Review of Document – Draft 1, Description and Appraisal

Discussion focused primarily on the revision of the document. Each member received the completely edited document as well as his/her own separate section inserted into a template to make the relationship between description and appraisal more distinct and easier to edit.

Specific items noted and reviewed include:

- Stressing the maximum number of pages, 4 as compared with 18 pages.
- Permitting URL's but using them purposefully and sparingly.
- Paraphrasing from the CCRI website as opposed to "borrowing" chunks of material. Quoting, if necessary, is permitted but it should be done sparingly. Also, consider if quoting rather than paraphrasing will add to the length of the document.
- Referring to Data First forms for evidence. The group was unclear as to which year we should be using for the Data First forms.
- Reinforcing the important relationship between description, appraisal, and projection. In other words, projections can't be made unless they can be traced through projection and description.
- Eliminating duplication. Areas that might have been mentioned previously in our own section or in another Standard can be omitted. Jen will ask Standard 4 specific questions about General Education requirements and the four abilities.
- Missing information: Librarians have adopted the definition of informational literacy. However, we have not had responses from Steve Vieira or Mike Kelly, Computer Studies Dept. Chair, about the definition we provided about technological literacy. Specific evidence needs to be incorporated throughout Description. Ruth stressed providing missing information, both within the revised document and also at the meeting. She pointed out that our document might be longer with evidence added, but that should be a priority at this point.
- Eliminating description from Appraisal section.
- Using English Dept. members to proofread the draft for grammar, punctuation, etc. Jim Glickman volunteered to help in this area.

(2) CCRI – NEASC Survey Results

Ruth distributed the survey results, and Kathleen noted that the results are also located at our group site in MyCCRI. These survey results can be used as data in the description section.

(3) Projection Discussed

The Projection PowerPoint modified for CCRI had been distributed prior to the meeting. The group noted how projection stems from appraisal. The group agreed that once the current document has gone through the editing process that we would work on projection as a group. It was also stressed that a projection does not have to emanate from every sub-paragraph in Standard 7.

(4) Distribution of CCRI NEASC Timeline

Although our draft was submitted on time, its length was not conducive to a full analysis. Therefore, we did not receive any feedback on our draft. Instead, the Standard 7 co-chairs worked on revising it. In turn, Standard 7 members have been charged with revising their sub-paragraphs. This delay will cause us to stray from the given timeline yet provide us with a solid document with which we can move forward to Projection.

(5) The next meeting is scheduled for Tuesday, February 19th, at 2 pm in Rm. 2508 at the Lincoln Campus.