

Northland Pioneer College
Strategic Planning and Accreditation Steering Committee (SPASC)
December 7, 2012

Members in attendance: John Bremer, Paul Clark, Blaine Hatch, Kenneth Keith, Jeannie McCabe, Debra Myers, Ryan Rademacher, Mark Vest, Leslie Wasson

Advisory members in attendance: Trudy Bender, Eric Bishop, Ann Hess, Cindy Hildebrand, Jeanne Swarthout

Guests: Sharon Hokanson, Steve Peck, Colleen Readel (recorder)

- I. Approval of Minutes from 11/2/2012
 - a. Motion to approve by Ryan Rademacher; second by Mark Vest
 - i. Unanimously approved
- II. Action: Amend Something Previously Adopted
 - a. October 5th meeting minutes approved on October 19th
 - i. Non-voting member seconded the motion to adjourn
 1. New second by Debbie Myers to correct
 - a. Group agreed to supplement Debra Myers name into minutes
 - i. Blaine Hatch made a motion to correct the 10/05/12 minutes that were approved on 10/19/12 by substituting Debra Myers name for Ken Wilks who seconded the original motion to adjourn; second by Ryan Rademacher
 1. Unanimously approved
 2. 10/05/12 minutes will be amended
- III. Review Strategic Plan input from college employees
 - a. More input was received this year. People indicated they felt that it was more confidential emailing it rather than posting it in a public place. They preferred remaining anonymous. Review of feedback.
 - i. Person 1
 1. Ideas for new programs
 - a. Radiology tech
 - b. Electronic Health Records (EHR)
 - c. Business Admin can be done entirely online
 - d. Childcare facility
 - e. Wellness
 - f. Correction to 5.1.2

- g. Do we want to consider any of these or discuss?
 - i. Ryan stated we have heard the request for childcare many times. He feels we should consider this or it may be much of a long-term goal.
 - ii. Blaine – In the past the Pillar 6 Team has had some discussion regarding childcare facilities and didn't feel like at that point, was something that could be in the strategic plan.
 - iii. Debbie – we will be collecting single-parent info on the enrollment forms now, so if we ever get there we can consider what would be the best location for it in the future.
 - iv. Eric – That's a good start. The process of doing that, we can just throw these things in a semester or two, there has to be a process to go along with it, data collection would be a good one. It helps justify or not in a lot of situations.
 - v. Ryan – Would it be possible to have our ECD students get credit for working in the facility?
 - vi. Mark – The majority of those students do not take courses on our campuses and are already working for Head Start.
 - vii. Kenny – These programs are more successful on high school campuses. They meet the needs of faculty and staff.
 - 1. Mark – You have a consistent group of children there for a long time block as opposed to community colleges where people want drop-in childcare which drives the overhead costs for the institution up.
 - viii. Mark – The general idea of creating more Allied Health opportunities, we have looked at Rad Tech in the past, it is one of the most expensive Allied Health Programs you can develop because of the equipment costs.
 - ix. Eric – There is a note regarding a full-time grant writer. Any other discussion on this person's feedback or input?
 - 1. Debbie – There is a section on the grant writing and pursuing that more would come out of Maderia's Pillar.

2. Leslie – If we are going to do anything that affects the budget, it needs to be in the strategic plan in advance of the next budget cycle. If we foresee that this proposal might come around again in the next academic year, we may go ahead and put the specific budget items in the strategic plan.
- x. Eric asked for other thoughts about putting the full-time grant writing in the plan?
 1. Ann agreed.
 2. Blaine feels that this year may be different because feedback is coming somewhat late in the process. If there are new things introduced, any new items would need to go back to the Pillar Team and be sure they address them and respond back directly to the feedback and make sure it isn't lost so that people don't feel like their feedback wasn't important. He feels it's difficult to add something new at this point in the process.
 3. Eric's concern is that since we did give the college a little more time for input, is that we're saying we hear them but we're not listening.
 4. Blaine – Agreed with that saying that is his point if we need to give some response that we did look at the feedback and this requires some additional investigation. But he thinks that based on the feedback of one person or a small group we're adjusting the strategic plan without discussion at the Pillar level.
 5. Eric – We have a couple options: the option of taking some of these ideas that SPASC agrees with and sending them to the Pillar Teams or SPASC can make that determination based on the time frame.
 - a. Eric's concern is can we get these to the Pillar Team's soon enough to have them consider them before we make this a final draft that has to be in to Lisa next week?

- b. Blaine doesn't feel there is time this year since we've had this shortened time frame.
- xi. Mark – Haven't we moved to a schedule that pushes a lot of our discussion and investigation phase of what should go into the plan to the spring for the next cycle and then the plan is pulled together in the fall?
 - 1. Eric – We could start soliciting in the spring and gathering that for the Pillar Teams to go through in the fall.
 - 2. Mark – Not only the recommendation for the grant writer, IC will not look at a program recommendation without a feasibility study. He would not suggest SPASC putting new programs into the strategic plan, because the strategic plan implies that we are going to do it.
 - 3. Eric's thought was changing the wording to "Explore the options or explore the possibility..." at least that way we look at the input and consider it, not necessarily approve it. Are people more comfortable with that language based on how we are exploring the input and the timeframe now to maybe select some of these for exploration but not a commitment?
 - 4. Jeanne is much more comfortable with language that does not commit us to something the budget may not approve of later – explore, investigate... What you have here, whether it's the full-time employee or the specifically identified new programs we don't know if we are going to have the funding to do any of this and to put it in there is a commitment. It is misleading to the college.
- xii. Eric – Do we want to look through these and say that we are not exploring or that we're willing to explore, that there's something that is really obvious that needs to go in?
 - 1. Mark – we can forward the Rad Tech and the EHR to Nursing & Allied Health. We have looked at Rad Tech in the recent past. A

previous Allied Health Dean did explore and determined that they were too expensive. The current and previous deans have explored and currently are exploring programs to utilize equipment we have.

- xiii. Eric – The question is from this first person’s input, what do we want to do? He is in favor of “Exploring the possibility of a full-time grant writer.”
 - 1. Mark is fine with that as well as keeping exploration of childcare and looking at that on an ongoing basis. EHR is happening and faculty involved in that area are aware of it and we could ask for a specific report from them on how they are changing their curriculum to address that issue.
- xiv. Eric asked if everyone agreed.
 - 1. Blaine is opposed to adding based on one piece of feedback to the plan.
 - 2. Eric – Even if it is exploring?
 - 3. Blaine – Stated from his perspective, he would like to see broader discussion.
 - 4. Eric asked if we could hear from more than just Mark, Jeanne and Blaine.
 - 5. Jeannie agreed that we shouldn’t just randomly put things into something that we’ve been working on for a long time and given a lot of thought to. She is not comfortable with that.
 - 6. Debbie asked, does it get explored if we don’t put it in there.
 - 7. Cindy thinks that all suggestions should go back to Pillars for consideration in the next cycle.
 - 8. Paul is amazed that we would want to enter something in at this late time. He thinks it needs to go back to the person who drafted the Pillar and let them investigate it and talk to the people that need to be talked to and bring it back to SPASC for discussion.
- xv. Eric asked SPASC do we want to stop looking through this document and send to the Pillar leads, and then what do we tell the college? That the input came in, we appreciate the input, for circumstances that we didn’t

quite plan for, because of the change in the cycle of the strategic planning there wasn't enough time to incorporate into the final version, but input is going to be provided to the Pillars for the next round of planning.

1. Paul thinks that we should tell them that procedure & policy is that when you give input it needs to go to the people that established it to research it. You can't go around the people that made the Pillars. The ones that developed it should get the input.
 2. Jeanne – People are not comfortable with referring most, if not all of it back to Pillar Teams. She doesn't feel that putting out an apology is where we should go. We considered their input at SPASC, we felt that it was best that the level of input and detail and the importance of their input needed to be then reviewed by Pillar Teams and will be included in the next round, rather than apologizing. We received a level of detail that is more than we anticipated.
 3. Jeannie also does not think we should apologize, that we should positively send a comment that we appreciate the input and that we have referred it to the Pillars and we will be working on it for the next draft.
 4. John agrees with that approach.
 5. Eric agrees too, but that is not the message that we sent out.
 6. Jeanne – But the answer to that is, we received input from the college that we've never received before at a level of detail that we did not anticipate and therefore it moves to the next round. I think you can cast it very positively.
- xvi. Eric will send the document out to the Pillar leads and if there is no other discussion we can move on to the next item on the agenda.
- xvii. Jeanne asked if are there any that we think should be addressed right now.

- xviii. Eric stated there are some typos that we can quickly fix if it seems appropriate that aren't anything that changes the plan, goal or objective point of view.
- ii. Person 2
 - 1. There is a lot of support for certain things in the document.
 - 2. Question regarding full-time assessment coordinator.
 - a. Send to Pillar Team
 - 3. Suggestion for word correction.
- iii. Person 3
 - 1. Tool for documenting conversations with students.
 - a. There is a Jenzabar tool that has been reviewed in the past that would do more than this request. Our concern was the staffing levels to use that tool effectively. We can come back to this or refer to a Pillar group.
 - b. Cindy – We are looking to add and use part of the communication management where we can add various contacts where if they had a phone conversation with a student and it can be added to the student's record and it also allows for comments to that comment.
 - 2. Comment regarding new IS position dedicated to academic issues – this has been solved this month. We are moving forward with an audio/video support position.
 - 3. Concern regarding the foundation.
 - 4. Support for two goals
 - a. Full-time assessment coordinator
 - b. Implement policy of student access to faculty
- iv. Person 4
 - 1. Proposed expansion to Priority 3 to add the word "orientation".
 - a. None of the goals are related to orientation in Pillar 4.
 - b. Send back to Pillar Team
- v. Person 5
 - 1. Wrote about Pillar 1
 - a. Suggestion to change titles of Priorities
 - i. Eric didn't feel it changed the structure, just language.
 - ii. Send back to Pillar
 - 2. Question about Presidential Strategic Initiatives
 - a. Jeanne will answer that question
- b. That is the entire input we received which is very positive and we are getting more.
 - i. We need to accommodate input by adjusting to cycle of the strategic plan.
 - 1. Eric asked for comments from input.
 - 2. There was none.

- IV. Discussion on final tweaks needed to final version of 2013-2016 Strategic Plan
 - a. We did receive revisions from Pillar Teams and sent to Lisa. She assembled them into the First Read for the board. We have more clean-up to dates (2012) in a few Pillars to be done. Eric will send back to Pillar Teams to be fixed before the final board read before Tuesday afternoon. Some core components also need to be changed/updated.
 - i. Blaine asked if Eric will highlight the things he is concerned about.
 - 1. Yes he will do that.
 - ii. Jeannie saw some spacing issues that need to be cleaned up, but otherwise Lisa did a really good job.
 - 1. Eric agreed, stating it's not easy to put it all together coming from so many different formats.
- V. Other
 - a. No other items
- VI. Adjourn
 - a. Motion to adjourn by Ryan Rademacher; second by Mark Vest
 - i. Unanimously approved