

To: Work Team 2 (WT2) File

APPROVED!

From: Christine Sellin

Date: Thurs. May 19, 2011

Re: Minutes from WT2 Meeting # 14 (held Thurs. May 19, 2011, 10:30 to 11:30 am)

Present: Griffin, Hanson, Hoang, Odegard, Price, Loberg, Lorimer, Sellin.

- 1.0 The meeting was convened at 10:35 am. Maureen Lorimer (Education) joins the WT2 committee. Welcome Maureen!
- 2.0 The minutes from the last meeting (Meeting #13, held on May 16) were approved.
- 3.0 Debriefing from the PDD workshop – we will write up the survey results, etc. In the meantime, what two noteworthy ideas did each WT2 member take away from the workshop (what struck you?).
 - 3.1 That EL has the potential to even shape policy, social issues; that admin/staff is an area that could participate in and enhance the overall EL experience on campus;
 - 3.2 The Idea that EL should be centralized in some manner or a campus-organized initiative, but not grown “in the pockets” of campus; and the idea that it would be useful to have current EL initiatives (already happening!) inventoried.
 - 3.3 Staff workers and their involvement is important; extend communication about EL.
 - 3.4 Logistics and resources are important – perhaps we can be more specific about transportation, logistics – should the university consider a “pool” or a fund resource somehow – that individual instructors apply for? How to efficiently organize the scheduling of class time, the funding of classes – these could be organized too somehow?
 - 3.5 Administrative presence at the workshops was striking – nice to see! Whatever is decided, however we move forward, we should find a way to include faculty, admin, etc.
 - 3.6 We should also think of campus jobs as EL opportunities; employers/supervisors with their D.A.’s, for example. We should find a way to articulate this aspect of learning – that there are elements outside fo the classroom that are crucial, we just need a way to talk about it.
 - 3.7 Is this institution doing things that other institutions are doing in terms of EL? Where does CLU stand in terms of the “EL” spectrum of possibilities and varieties? There could be a niche for CLU in all this. At least one institution for example, houses their student employment services within their CAAR services, so that EL, work, and career center, etc., all brought within one area – brings the pieces together.
 - 3.8 The EL experience had powerful inter-disciplinary connections (the community garden example, brought up at the workshop by Colleen W.H.).
 - 3.9 We should request ‘best practices’ (what other institutions do), inventory what we are doing; and it was requested that we run a practical workshop on EL options/activities for instructions at the CLU Fall retreat, end August. (Is it possible to have some logistics in place, or recommendations worked out for how to make EL possible, to bring to the retreat?) Might be interesting, it was added, to look at Cal Poly’s 1st draft of a “Visions” statement they are in the process of compiling.
 - 3.10 We may want to bring in more ideas on and pursue information about technology – shall we consult with Sue Bauer?
 - 3.11 Also striking in the workshop, was that many EL examples seemed to ask students to set aside, abandon their technology, to connect and engage more richl

3.12 The issue of “Virtual” or “Simulated EL” surfaces occasionally in discussions; we want to be sure to maintain a distinct sense of EL? At a certain point, almost anything can be argued to be “EL”. (Youtube, for example). We want to maintain distinctions, but find a way to maximize use of technology at the same time.

3.13 An interesting point: it would be nice to suggest to Study Abroad students courses that they could take IN ADVANCE of their trip (as prep), and courses that they could take upon their return, to extend and further enrich the study abroad EL experience. Instructors could submit course content information to Study Abroad to get this going – great idea!

ACTION ITEMS – WT 2 MEMBERS - TIMELY

- 4.0 Workteam 2 reports (summary of activities this semester) are due: each member contributes a piece to the report. Assignments as follows:
 - 4.1 Haco will do qualitative analysis of the EL survey results from the PDD workshop;
 - 4.2 Christine will do schematic summary of our process (list of names, consultants we met with; list of various documents produced – a kind of “activities and consultants” log;
 - 4.3 Kristin and Stine: work together to produce a summary of the “observations and findings” that came out of the process (descriptions of pilot survey, PDD workshop, for example, etc.).
 - 4.4 Lisa and Maureen: assemble ‘best practices’ (“issues that arose that needs to be considered in the next strategic plan”).
 - 4.5 Paul, Grady, and Haco: will tackle these two items: firstly, what were the areas not covered (or not covered enough) in this WT2 process at this point? What still needs to be addressed and why? Secondly, to develop recommendations: what major goals should CLU incorporate into its next strategic plan and what ‘tactical’ elements as well....
- 5.0 The first four components of the Report (Christine’s, Kristin’s and Stine’s, Lisa’s and Maureen’s; and Paul’s, Grady’s and Haco’s) need to be done in the next week. It was agreed that all would have these materials ready by next week’s meeting: Weds. May 25, 12 to 1:30 pm, Swenson 209 (you can bring your brown bag lunch, if you wish!).
- 6.0 Meeting was adjourned at 11:35 am.