

Northland Pioneer College
Strategic Planning and Accreditation Steering
Committee Meeting Minutes

Friday November 1, 2013

8:30 a.m. – 10:00 a.m.

Video 2

Members in attendance: Leslie Wasson, Mark Vest, Debbie Myers, John Bremer, Blaine Hatch, Peggy Belknap, Eric Bishop, Sharon Hokanson.

Advisory members in attendance: Jeanne Swarthout, Ann Hess.

Staff in Attendance: Lisa Jayne (recorder)

Approval of Minutes from 10/18/2013

Peggy Belknap made a motion to approve the minutes from October 18, 2013. Blaine Hatch seconded. Peggy Belknap and Eric Bishop abstained. Motion passed.

Discussion ensued about lack of a quorum. It was decided protocols would be discussed in early spring about what to do about lack of attendance on member's parts.

Update: HLC Assurance Database, My NPC page with resources

Leslie Wasson showed members where to find HLC Assurance page in My NPC.

Strategic Planning Priorities & Dates for AY 2013-2014

A polished draft needs to be ready by November 12 for DGB's November 19 meeting. It will also be sent to the College.

Quality Initiative

Leslie Wasson discussed the survey that was sent out to the College about retention and persistence as a quality initiative project. There were 114 responses, 97-98% were definitely yes or probably yes.

Eric Bishop made a motion to accept the Quality Initiative topic entitled retention and persistence. Mark Vest seconded the motion. Motion passed unanimously.

Leslie Wasson will announce the topic choice on All NPC.

Leslie stated she has eight employees who have volunteered to be on the proposal committee, including one faculty and one dean. It was decided that there needed to be a review of the committee composition for the

proposal writing. Leslie stated she would send out a list of the committee members for discussion. Also she will put together training for the committee.

Mark Vest stated that the Quality Initiative has budget implications so it has to be laid out nine months ahead of time. There's also the question of whether or not the HLC Persistence and Retention Academy be our project which would make our project deadlines the same as academy deadlines. Eric Bishop asked if SPASC could vote on whether to make the academy the Quality Initiative project and then make a recommendation to the executive team.

Peggy Belknap asked what disadvantages there were to doing HLC Academy as Quality Initiative project. Leslie stated only the timeline was identified as a drawback.

President Swarthout stated if the College decides to do the Academy, the ideal entry date would be June 2014. Peggy Belknap asked if the executive team liked the pathway. Mark Vest stated it provides support and a peer group to draw information from, but like the Assessment Academy, if the College chooses to do this, the persistence and retention project will become accountable to an external agency.

Eric Bishop state that the structure and deadlines are a plus as it provides collaborative opportunities and provides mentors. Jeanne stated a downside is that the Academy has costs, but any project chosen will also have expenses, which could be absorbed into the budget. Cost for Academy would be \$8,500 for first year and \$6,000 a year after that.

Peggy Belknap made a motion to recommend to the president that the College join the Retention Academy. John Bremer seconded the motion. Motion passed unanimously

Leslie Wasson stated there's also a page on My NPC for the Quality Initiative. Members need to let Leslie know if you want added to the quality initiative group to access the page.

Jeanne stated that Coconino Community College is interested in partnering with us for quality initiative. It was decided to revisit this at the next meeting.

Pillar Reviews

- a. Pillar 1 – Peggy Belknap
Peggy Belknap summarized the goals for Pillar 1.

Leslie stated the more general thematic approach works well.
Blaine stated he likes the approach as it allows a department or division level to drill down specifics that can be tied to budget requests.

b. Pillar 2 – Mark Vest

Mark Vest stated that the Pillar II team was uncertain how to proceed with specifics as the topic of the Quality Initiative project was unknown. Now that the Quality Initiative project topic is persistence and retention what should be done with Pillar II.

Mark Vest stated he would send out an update via email to the group before the next meeting. Leslie asked him to do an update at next meeting as well.

c. Pillar 3 – Eric Bishop

Eric Bishop reviewed the Pillar III update.

After some discussion it was decided that the pillar, as a guiding document should probably lose the details, and have bigger overarching goals, that it should separate operational from strategic aspects.

Blaine stated that sustainability bullets are most likely going to be operational.

It was decided that members would send Eric some helpful feedback about what bullets are too detailed and should be deleted and which are more general and should be kept.

It was decided that November 8 needs to be the next meeting since the Strategic Plan had to be ready for the November 19 board packet by November 12.

Adjourn

Mark Vest made a motion to adjourn. Blaine Hatch seconded the motion. Motion passed unanimously.