Meeting Minutes

Members Present: Cheryl Anderson, Juliann Brueske, Renee Guyer, Ryan Langemeier, Deb Salmon, Dr. Susan Tarnowski

Members Absent: Tom Kammer, Dr. Peter Wruck

Guest: Ramona Beiswanger

Approval of minutes:
May meeting minutes-Deb moved to approve, Juliann seconded. Minutes were approved.
August meeting minutes-Deb moved to approve, Cheryl seconded. Minutes were approved.

OLD BUSINESS

Update on Systems Portfolio: Gap matrix discussed at the last meeting seemed unnecessary as the outline itself illustrated gaps. Dr. Tarnowski has reviewed about half of the document (first three categories) by supplying information where she has it, asking questions where she needs input and getting data. By next week all six categories should be complete. Lisa is now drafting categories 1-3. Readers and editors are in place to review the document when complete. By the end of the semester the Systems Portfolio core team and Steering Committee should meet to plan the next Systems Portfolio. Many lessons have been learned!

Update on Action Project Progress

Program Review- FBM is piloting the review process in early October.
FYI Welcoming Environment Phase II- Project has taken a turn once again. Now instead of focusing on advising support, the team has decided to embrace the welcoming environment part of the project. They are exploring the idea of Student Ambassadors to help provide friendly and knowledgeable faces. More to come on what this will look like.
Tutoring Services- continuing with their survey

Final reports are due to HLC by September 30 for FYI Phase I and Capital funds. Project registrations for FYI Phase II and Tutoring services will be submitted at that time. Program review will need to submit an annual update.

Action Register Action Items Follow-up/Check in: Mach form for Action project submission is in progress. Action items related to A3 and other forms of continuous quality improvement are on hold until after today’s upcoming discussion on the CQI section of the Master Academic Plan.

Learning from yesterday, applying today, improving tomorrow.
Update on Membership/Committee vacancies
Our call in the Connections for members to replace Ramiro and Peter J. did not result in any interested parties. Discussion centered on asking individuals directly. We are required by our bylaws to have a representative from student affairs and we do not. Renee will start asking individuals personally until we fill the positions. Suggested individuals were discussed.

NEW BUSINESS

Academic Master Plan-Continuous Quality Improvement-
The Academic Master Plan has a section on Continuous Quality Improvement. It includes several Long term goals and objectives for each goal. Dr. Tarnowski has charged the committee with developing strategies for these objectives.

Long-Term Goal 9 is “Ensure a culture of continuous quality improvement in academic affairs”. Objective B is “Explore methods of creating and documenting quality improvements in a systematic way.” Three strategies were discussed including 1. Utilize A3s. 2. Identify Quality Improvement occurring in Academic committees. 3. Identify Quality Improvement occurring in academic programs.

Steps for the utilization of A3s include:
- Introduce A3 to the campus community. Suggestions include an announcement and a noon time workshop to give practical details and examples of how this process can be used.
- Identify A3 coaches. Possible coaches include deans, dept. chairs, interested parties, AQIP Steering Committee.
- Train A3 coaches. Start with a pilot. Feedback included don’t forget about union contracts, compensation issues.
- Pilot A3 projects
- Share A3 project results. Suggestion was to possibly use January workshop to share process and successes.

Steps to Identify Quality Improvement occurring in Academic committees
- Request academic committees (AASC and subcommittees) use reformatted PRI questions at the end of meetings, document in meeting minutes and provide annual summary to the AQIP Steering Committee *This actually lead into the “3 question” discussion which is documented below.

Steps to Identify Quality Improvement occurring in academic programs.
- Use 3 PRI questions during Advisory Committee meetings
- Request Program Review Action Team consider using PRI questions during Program Review

Also under Long-Term Goal 9, “Ensure a culture of continuous quality improvement in academic affairs”, we discussed Objective E which is “Track and report on continuous quality improvement changes and results that occurred in academic settings”. We discussed that the AQIP Steering Committee is really where these QI changes and results should be reported. The following strategies were identified: 1. A3 coaches will report to AQIP Steering Committee on completed A3 projects on a monthly basis. 2. AASC and subcommittees include PRI questions in meeting minutes and then compile annual summary. Discussed that as long as committee is recording these in minutes, it shouldn’t be difficult to compile the annual summary and provide it to the AQIP Steering Committee. 3. AQIP Steering Committee will develop a tool for compiling PRI questions from AASC meeting minutes and annual summary. Possibilities include use of a mach form to input PRI and the potential for having this be a role of the AQIP Coordinator.
Discuss the “3 questions”
In the past we have used and have asked AASC to use “3 questions” to wrap up each meeting. The three questions were 1. What quality improvement measures were discussed?
2. What processes were improved as a result of discussion and supporting data? And 3. What data/results were presented to support quality improvement?

Are these still useful and if so how? If not, should we still use them?

It was agreed that these are useful but they could be worded in a different way to make them easier for committees to understand and use. Discussed that if these are recorded in meeting minutes it provides a means of tracking CQI. Also discussed editing the questions to reflect PRI-processes, results and improvements.

Wording for new questions will be worked out by Renee and brought back to next meeting. Also, once we have discussed the edits, Renee will ask AASC to use these questions and document the answers. Dr. Tarnowski indicated she will also take this to cabinet and suggested Renee be an agenda item at one of the next meetings. Renee suggested also taking this to Shared Governance and will talk to Jay and Dave once these are edited.

While having discussion about connecting these to PRI, it was suggested that Program Review should also incorporate Process, Results and Improvements. Dr. Tarnowski will contact the Program Review Action Project team to see if this could be incorporated.

Define roles of action project team liaisons, sponsors and team leads
Liaison- Requirement: Steering Committee member. Duties: Meet with action project team lead at least once per month. Communicate action project team needs with the Steering committee and provide an update at each Steering Committee meeting. Provide action project team with assistance in reporting (project registration, annual update, and final report)
Sponsor- Requirement: Cabinet member. Duties: Ensure project aligns with college strategic plan as well as other related plans such as the Master Academic plan. Guide team on matters related to funding. Communicate with cabinet about action project progress.
Team lead- Duties: Use project management principles to guide team in creation of project registration and charter. Lead meetings and ensure minutes are taken. Communicate with sponsor and liaison including sharing meeting minutes. Submit midterm and final reports with help of the liaison.

Three questions
P: Discussed the CQI section of the Master plan and what processes should be used to meet the goals including A3. Also discussed reporting procedures for CQI occurring across the college (meetings and departments)
R: Used the status of the systems portfolio and the Action Project Registration data, Used the Master Academic plan outline
I: Updated roles and responsibilities of Action Project sponsors, liaisons and leads. Improved the three questions to have better alignment with the Systems portfolio. Requesting increased use of PRI in other committees. A3 implementation is an improvement in making CQI part of the college culture and allows for improved tracking of CQI activities.

Meeting adjourned 12:00pm
Learning from yesterday, applying today, improving tomorrow.