Pierce Council
September 10, 2010

Present:
Richard Abel, Scott Ansevin-Allen, Bill Beardslee, Jed Donelan, Bob Lawson, Allan Rachlin, Adam Stahl, Paul Tedder, Judy Tomlinson

Absent:
Wendy Acerno, Jaimie Birge, Doug Challenger (on sabbatical), Jim Earle, Janet Gongaju, Bob Goodby, Rob Hannings, Kim Mooney, Kyle Mulcahy

Update on membership:
Kyle Mulcahy, the sophomore class president will be the additional Rindge student representative joining the Council. He was unable to attend today but is looking forward to joining the group next month.

Nominations are being sought and elections will occur in the next few weeks to fill the vacant CGPS seat on the Council.

Jed Donelan began the meeting by passing out a document that explains how a Deliberative Dialogue Forum works. He went on to inform the Council of his meetings with the President. They discussed the manner in which the forums would be run by Joni Doherty and the NECCL throughout this first semester to discuss the Identity Issues Brief. They will send out a joint letter to the community urging all department heads to support their staff if they wish to attend one of the deliberative dialog forums.

Jed and Joni have done some preliminary work on the pre- and post forum questionnaires that will be used. They are hoping to have approximately 12 separate forums moderated by one faculty and one student trained in this process. The notes generated in each forum will be collected and combined by Joni to gather all the different themes, findings and recommendations.

It was determined that two of the forums should be located at different CGPS centers in order to accommodate the folks at these outlying campuses. A good portion of the meeting was spent trying to determine how to gather the remaining 10 forums. Did we wish to target certain groups or merely post the dates and times for the forums and have folks show up? A number of people agreed that the SGA was one such area that should be targeted as that group has a huge cross-section of the student body present. It would also be advantageous to hold a forum following the business portion of one of their meetings. It became apparent that other constituencies would not have such a broad representation of the community. Some of these groups included: full-time faculty, part-time or adjunct faculty, exempt staff, non-exempt staff, etc. Two other groups that were mentioned are alumni and trustees. Someone mentioned that Shirley English-Whitman has collected data from the alumni in the past through an online format and perhaps this may be possible to do with a deliberative dialogue forum. Then again, trustees would be on campus during their annual meeting October 14 & 15th while alumni would be around for the Reunion weekend which occurs Oct 22-24th. It was pointed out that these particular groups each have very full schedules during their brief stay on campus.
It was brought up that if we target certain groups we were then choosing them over other
groups. Does giving preferential treatment to convening a particular group then equate to
giving more weight or value to their opinions? The Council struggled on this issue for a
good portion of the meeting. It was noted, that some staff members may feel
uncomfortable speaking freely if their supervisors were included in the same forum.
Thus, the group felt it may be appropriate to hold separate forums for Exempt and Non-
Exempt staff. The group felt there was value in announcing a number of “open” forums
so that anyone could attend. Everyone should be able to contribute to the identity of the
school.

Jed then addressed the four different approaches in the Identity Issues Brief. He said he
and Joni spoke about the approaches and felt that it would be difficult to cover all 4
options during the time provided for the forums. Jed stated the first three approaches
clearly address academics, while the fourth approach deals with a different kind of
growth a student can expect to have while here. Jed felt another way to state this is that
the first three approaches were values while the fourth approach was more strategic. Jed
asked if the group would be comfortable dropping the fourth approach. One member was
very uncomfortable in doing this based on the fact that members of this Council worked
on the fourth approach for about a year. This member then asked if it was possible to
incorporate this approach into the other three.

It was decided that there were too many members missing from this meeting and that
feedback would be needed from them shortly. Jed hoped to get a summary of
recommendations out to the entire group asking for feedback. He hoped that this could be
done electronically so as not to delay the forums.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:00PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Vicky Rank

Schedule of Meetings:
    Oct. 8, 2010
    Nov. 12, 2010
    Dec. 10, 2010
    Jan. 21, 2011
    Feb. 11, 2011
    Mar. 11, 2011
    Apr. 8, 2011

(All meetings are scheduled from 2-4PM in the Alumni Lounge.)