South Central College  
AQIP Steering Committee

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.

December 1, 2017  
9am-11am  
Meeting Room A (North Mankato) and A156 (Faribault)

Meeting Minutes

Members Present- David Armstrong, Laura Attenberger, Narren Brown, Juliann Brueske, Renee Guyer, Ryan Langemeier, Judy Shultz, Susan Tarnowski, Kelcey Woods-Nord, Brian Yingst

Members Absent- John Harper, John Reinhardt

Approval of minutes from Nov. 17: Narren Brown moved to approve, Kelcey Woods-Nord seconded. Minutes are approved.

To recognize Dr. Susan Tarnowski for all of her work with AQIP and to wish her well in Retirement, bagels have been provided.

OLD BUSINESS  
Systems Portfolio Status Update/Category Evaluations

Category 5.1 was reviewed. Narren added additional material the night before the meeting but as most reviewed the document prior to those additions, we reviewed the original document. We used our individual evaluations to discuss and reach consensus on our evaluation. We reviewed all sections together as a group instead of dividing into smaller groups because many of the sections were similar. Renee summarized our thoughts and will be sharing the findings and comments with Category 5 so they can use those to improve Category 5.

Review Process Example

Renee shared the Process example she created as a template which had been requested by the Steering Committee. It states what should be in a Process and then provides a theoretical example that highlights the various components including the 5Ws and 1H as well as references to the core components and evidence. This document was also shared with the Category team leads. Some teams will use this to create a list of the responses and other teams will write from this based on the comfort level of the team. While we have been focusing on Process, the Steering Committee must now help Category teams and the campus community focus on Criteria and the core components. The process is how we do it but the Criteria and core components are what we do and they must be met for reaffirmation.

ACTION PROJECTS

FYE Action Project

This team was asking about their sponsor. As Dr. T is, sadly, retiring, it was suggested Dr. Narren Brown be the sponsor. We also discussed that in the future due to the new structure of the Management Team, we could have a sponsor who was not on the Cabinet.
We have a revised registration from the FYE team. It was not provided in enough time for us to review for today. As they will want to continue working on this project, we will do an electronic vote for approval. The document will be reviewed next week and Renee will call for an electronic vote in one week.

Continuous Improvement Hub work

Structure of the Hub subgroup-
Shared ASA site and how much better it looks than our current example. David has talked to CIO at MSU and they will meet to discuss how MSU might be able to assist us with SharePoint site development. Perhaps there are students who could use our sites as some type of project. There was also conversation about training being available to everyone.

Template and Rubric subgroup-
Share the template and discussed combining two of the questions. Template was also used to create mach form which was shared. Options for selecting the Category include either a drop down menu or boxes to be checked. The group prefers the boxes. The question was asked if there was a way for people to know what the categories are. We could add some text to the box info about the categories. There is also a typo and what should say “start” says “state”. Renee will make these edits to the mach form.
Rubric was shared and discussed. For this impact section it is only measuring integration and not economic impact. We could model the student success language instead to highlight that there are many ways to have impact.
Dr T’s example-paperwork processing sitting on a desk-change workflow so you can do more by eliminating inefficiencies. This may not have a large impact outside that one department but could be significant to that department. We want to identify the depth of the impact as well as the breadth. We discussed using language for success and decided to add a 5th category. Kelcey will revise the rubric and bring back to the group.

Recognition subgroup-
Used rubric to determine awards they want to give. Discussed giving an award for each area. Discussing having an area in the college where we could put up plaque. We could also have coins with AQIP logo and year that say award winner. Provide all individuals with certificate and coin. Graphics and CIM could help. Discussed pros and cons of recognizing multiple projects versus whole projects. Juliann and Laura want people to provide comments on the rubrics to help determine the award recipients. Awards will continued to be discussed as we are adding another section to the rubric.

Action Project Guide
Reviewed the Action Project Guide. All reports have now been included. This can be added to the CI Hub as a resource. Dr. T moved to approve the Action Project Guide. Narren seconded. Action Project Guide is approved.

Next semester we need to work on how to mentor the Action Project teams in the preparation of these reports.

NEW BUSINESS
Future meetings
Discussed that category evaluations must continue as it is this committee which must guide the Systems Portfolio. Meetings will continue to be 2 hours to accomplish all that needs to be done.

Meeting adjourned at 11:00am.

Next meeting- Friday, January 12, 2017  9-11am    ITV: TBA