

South Central College AQIP Steering Committee

March 18, 2016 9am-12pm
President's Conference Rooms (North Mankato and 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:, Juliann Brueske, Renee Guyer, Tom Kammer, Jodi Olson, Deb Salmon, Deann Schloesser, Dr. Judy Shultz, Dr. Susan Tarnowski

Members Absent: Cheryl Anderson, Ryan Langemeier, Dr. Peter Wruck

Visitors Present: Dr. Parker, Dr. Joan Costello (via telephone)

Systems Appraisal

The Systems Appraisal is back from HLC! Because of this, our regular agenda was tabled and we met with Dr. Parker, Dr. Tarnowski and Dr. Joan Costello via telephone to discuss the appraisal and the plan for moving forward.

After reviewing the appraisal, Dr. Tarnowski started identifying focus areas that need to be worked on. She shared these focus areas and the appraisal itself with Dr. Joan Costello, an HLC Consultant evaluator and Academy mentor. Dr. Costello, retired Vice President from Inver Hills joined us via telephone to give us her take on the Systems Appraisal.

According to Dr. Costello, the purpose of the Systems Appraisal is as an evaluation of our Systems Portfolio and our work but perhaps more importantly is to advise our college on improvement efforts. The judgements are temporary and are suggestions for improvement. We can either start doing what we aren't doing or we can document what we are doing if it wasn't fully documented in the Systems Portfolio.

Also according to Dr. Costello, as our first AQIP Systems Portfolio, SCC is right about where most institutions land. We, like others, are not used to doing this form of documentation and are not used to using data in this way. We need to focus more on the criteria not just the categories.

Dr. Costello recommends looking at two places/items in the appraisal:

1. The Appraisal of PRI in categories-this is where maturity level is measured. As AQIP babies or perhaps toddlers, we are expected to rate low. We should, and do, have lots of reactive and systematic ratings. Reactive areas are opportunities/identified next steps.
2. The criteria for accreditation. The 5 criteria can be reviewed in Appendix C. The appraisal at this point in our pathway is a soft review of these criteria but we need to prepare for



Learning from yesterday, applying today, improving tomorrow.

the review at reaffirmation time. We must focus more on these criteria, not just the categories of the Systems Portfolio.

Dr. Costello's message to us is that we should be thinking about building on strengths and using the Systems Portfolio as a living document to provide evidence of the criteria which are our processes and what we do whereas the categories are how we function. She also recommends using the HLC Annual Conference to attend presentations related to our areas of focus.

We all thanked Dr. Costello for the information and her time on the phone. Dr. Tarnowski and Dr. Wruck will be meeting with in person on April 1 to discuss these issues in more detail.

Dr. Tarnowski shared her Systems Appraisal Focus areas.

Systems Appraisal Focus Areas

1. Assessment

- a. Common learning outcomes (our Institutional Core Competencies): assess in academic and non-academic programs; thread through SCC Mission and Strategic Plan
- b. Program-level Student learning Outcome Assessment: operationalize in every academic department
- c. Document course-level outcome assessment through Curriculum Mapping process (see below) Are the SLOs relevant to the level of the course (look at Bloom's taxonomy)
- d. Develop and implement a plan for Student Support Services outcome assessment (tie to ICCs)
- e. Incorporate outcome assessment across non-academic units
- f. Create a format for campus-level summary reporting: perhaps a line for each program in the college report card (new)
- g. Document how we ensure that courses are equivalent regardless of delivery method

2. Campus-wide Process Analysis

- a. Map out process steps in all critical areas of the college
What information (data/evidence) can you/do you use?
How do you know this information is appropriate for making your decisions?
- b. Conduct a gap analysis: where do we need to create or revise a process? Where do we need to define targets/stretch goals? (see below)
- c. Describe how are data collected in individual units for use in these process evaluations

3. Development of SCC-specific Goals / Targets and Metrics

- a. Administrative team sets specific local (SCC) goals for the college (perhaps use MnSCU Benchmarking categories to begin as baseline data)
- b. Each unit, middle managers as leaders, set specific goals/targets for their units
- c. Determine what metrics will be used to know whether the goals/targets are met



Learning from yesterday, applying today, improving tomorrow.

4. Curriculum Mapping

- a. In which course(s) is the content that relates to the outcomes?
- b. Are either SLOs or ICCs addressed at the course level? Where?

5. Program review

- a. Successfully complete cycle in academic reviews; document process, results (evidence), improvements
- b. Expand to non-academic “programs”

6. Develop process to identify the needs of all college stakeholders

(students/subgroups of students, grant partners, foundation donors, advisory committee members, industry and
Develop process to assess whether the needs of these stakeholders are being met (metrics? improvements?)

7. Create Continuous Quality Improvement culture

- a. Support for this effort from all levels
- b. Training for administration and middle management on CQI, including using the language of AQIP as a method SCC is using for CQI (Steering Committee?)
- c. Establish and follow processes, overtly tie results to processes, overtly tie improvements/revisions to results and to processes

Program Review and the Systems Appraisal

One of the pieces often discussed in our Systems Portfolio was the Program Review Process Improvement Action Project. Because of this, it was often mentioned in the systems appraisal and several times it was mentioned that the new process could potentially help the college fix some of the issues identified. There was discussion of if program review in non-academic areas should be part of the Action Project or if they are really done-they have submitted their final report to us for review. There was also discussion about ensuring that the items mentioned in the Systems Appraisal as part of Program Review are actually incorporated into Program Review. Renee will contact the team to see what they think about the Systems Appraisal and adding program review for service areas to their project.

Next meeting-Friday, April 8-9am Faribault C37, North Mankato E132



Learning from yesterday, applying today, improving tomorrow.