South Central College
AQIP Steering Committee
September 15, 2017  9am-10:30am
Meeting Room A (North Mankato) and A156 (Faribault)

Mission: The AQIP Steering Committee shall guide and support the implementation of AQIP as a model for continuous improvement and continued accreditation at the College as it relates to the SCC integrated plans under the governance of the College and President.

Meeting Minutes

Members Present: David Armstrong, Laura Attenberger, Dr. Narren Brown, Juliann Brueske, Nesreen El-Rayes, Renee Guyer, John Harper, Ryan Langemeier, Dr. Judy Shultz, Dr. Susan Tarnowski, Brian Yingst

Members Absent: John Reinhard, Kelsey Woods-Nord

Approval of minutes:
September 1 Meeting Minutes: Fix spelling of Kris' name. Judy moved to approve with changes, Narren seconded. Motion approved

Approval of By-laws:
Laura moved to approve, John seconded. Motion approved. Renee will send to Dr. Parker.

Determination of quorum:
Renee stated that bylaw approval requires 2/3 while other requirements are set at 50% or 51%. Narren proposed 50% +1 person. No other ideas were added. Narren move to approve 50% +1 person. Brian seconded. Motion approved.

OLD BUSINESS

Systems Portfolio Status Report:
Team leads met this week with Dr. Tarnowski and Renee to review the work that has been done and kick off the work for the semester which is to create a true draft of the Systems Portfolio. Leads on the Steering Committee were asked to share about the meeting.

Judy- The amount of work is overwhelming but doable.

Laura- additional tools for work were valuable.

Dr. T compared the meeting to a year ago---we know so much more and have actually done a lot. We are comfortable with organizational things in place after some trial and error. One of the biggest moments was when the Category team leads asked what the role of the Steering Committee is for the Systems Portfolio. Almost have an AQIP Steering Committee and a Systems Portfolio Committee. Need conversation about how we contribute to the Systems Portfolio. We need to steer. The Category team lead group is very task driven and has identified what needs to happen. Steering Committee could do more of that.

Learning from yesterday, applying today, improving tomorrow.
Renee shared the document she created about linking Process, Results and Improvement as well as the types of Evidence and Data that would support each section. This was given to the Category team leads and they liked it a lot.

Dr. T said we needed to help the people know where to look for information and Judy addressed how we do need to connect Process and Results. Dr. T warned against artificially creating Process or Results where they don’t exist just to have something.

Renee’s ideas of what the Steering Committee can do:

*Address gaps/Help find information
*Review material/Category Evaluation rubric

Brian-liked doing the rubric over the summer.

Dr. T stated that when HLC visits, they want to meet with the Steering Committee and we need to identify who we are going to have them work with as we really have two teams. As we approach the review, maybe we need to have just one team so we are as well versed as possible. We need to become the Steering Committee for all things AQIP.

Judy-thinking of drafting document if my team updated all of Category 1 and we were doing it wrong, that would be disastrous. Better to stop. If teams submitted first section of a subcomponent and we as a Steering Committee evaluated, we could guide them.

Ryan-have other teams seen the work of each other?

Need to find a way to share so leads can learn from others. Thus far it has been isolated.

Renee will develop a plan for reviewing all categories.

**Action Project updates:**

**A. Early Alert**: Email with link for new Alert process will be going out soon.

**B. FYE**: Brian-we are not making progress, our wheels are spinning, members on the team are ready to give up as they have hit roadblocks before. Brian thinks there is opportunity to do broad strokes. Have limited faculty engagement but we will need faculty approval for course changes. Looking for more faculty and we are recruiting. What should the students know in their first year if we are looking at this as a broad perspective? Team members keep going back to the class.

Dr T-Judy, have you kept tabs on this?

Judy-concerned about if they are looking at credits

Instructors who are now teaching or have recently taught FYE that you would discuss the project and course with include Katie H, Mark F, Shawn S, Arlene E
Arlene did FYE in one week—She has been invited to share her experience with the Action Project team.

John H—even with the faculty and staff contracts are set up, is there no way to allow advisors to teach the course?

David-SCC policy. Most staff would either be paid overtime or we would need to work out a swap. Makes the course more expensive so it is a local choice. David has been around and around with the HR group about this. Financial and policy decision. Based on contract assuming that people already have a full time job so what about your job are you not doing?

Ryan—This has been discussed for 8+ years. Somehow this one credit course has great difficulty with the content. Trying to figure out why-perhaps because of different levels of the course. Need ownership and responsibility. Technical careers pushed back on using the FYE course as it wouldn’t count for anything. Ryan has a one credit class that he is doing similar work.

Lori—This is a common struggle. Content is truly more than one credit because there is so much that is needed. Consistency between instructors is difficult; there is great variety between how well it is taught and how effective it was. University of Wisconsin-Baraboo waived the fee of the course so it could be required. Needed to standardize the work. Not too heavy and not too light. Had a 3 credit release faculty coordinator.

Judy—Lock step training for what the core components are.

Juliann—consider a customizable course. Standardized module. Could involve content experts.

Team would like to provide content to be used in that course.

Judy—can’t go outside the 1 credit.

Dr. T—we have a group of people looking at best practices. Ask the instructors if they are willing to use the resources from this team.

Recommendation:

* Judy check with faculty to see if they are willing to use resources.

* Brian—First Year Student course could use resources from the D2L lounge.

Dr. T another option—have committee develop other materials that could be used outside of class.

Two part project option

1. Development of direct content for the course

2. Supplemental information that can be done outside of the course.

Ryan—where are we with being able to discuss having advisors teach? They actually want to teach the course. Dr T—never say never, ship has sailed but could it be investigated again, why not? Lots of models around the country. We were trying to get a handle on financial issues. Is this an ATD question? Would need a good financial model

Learning from yesterday, applying today, improving tomorrow.
David—what has worked best is that whoever is teaching it gets the same stipend for that one credit. MSCF contract prohibits this.

Judy—need to quit making this a last-minute assignment and need to identify who wants to teach it. Faculty if you don’t want to teach it, why is it in the program? Other issue—no way to make students take in their first semester.

Dr. T-St Cloud Tech valued it enough to standardize the curriculum and require it for all.

C. CI Hub Action Project—This takes us to New Business and our work plan for the year.

NEW BUSINESS

CI Hub workgroups
Template and Rubric group—Discussed the template. Altered it so that it focuses on completed project and is more user friendly, non-intimidating language.

Rubric will be for next time.

Communication Plan
Communication needs to begin as soon as possible. Let’s discuss this asynchronously via email and then have an electronic vote so the team can begin to implement.

Meeting adjourned 10:36 am

Next meeting—October 6, 2017 9-10:30am ITV: Meeting Room A/A156
Agenda items—
- Systems Portfolio Status Report: Plan for Category Evaluation by Steering Committee
- Any additional comments for Communication Plan Outline
- Sharing CI Hub Rubric for large group feedback
- Sharing Structure of Hub/Share Point for large group feedback
- Review revised Action Project guide
- Reports from Action Project groups as appropriate