Quality Council Meeting

May 31st 2011
2:00 PM to 3:30 PM

Meeting called by:	Bruce Moses/Laura Cates	Type of meeting:	Decision Making
Facilitator:	Laura Cates	Note taker:	Claudia Tonihka
Timekeeper:	Laura Cates		

Attendees: Christy Reynolds, Melody Marcks, Lynda Lloyd, Gerry Weatherford, Brooke Holt, Lisa Anderson, Pam Nash, Amber Holloway

Agenda

Item	Person	Time allotted:
Welcome	Laura	5 minutes
Review/Decisions of Action Project	All	60 minutes
Feedback reminder for Goals document	Bruce	15 minutes
Other		5 minutes

Minutes

Welcome **L. Cates** **5**

Approval of meeting record from May 3, 2011. Review of purpose of Criterion/Guideline rating of Action Project Applications. Quality Council only checks to see that applications are complete and forwards them onto Cabinet for determination of status as Action Projects or Continuous Improvement Initiatives.

Action Project Review/Decisions **Council Members** **60**

Identifying Measures of Valuing People (developed at 2011 Strategy Forum) – Comments: Timeline may need to be adjusted from the original proposal so that faculty are on campus to participate in the development of measures for valuing people. 2 members of the team are leaving the college, those members will need to be replaced (Gates will determine replacement for CAO's slot and faculty member should replace the vacant faculty slot). Regarding criterion 5, should list upper administration. Regarding criterion 6, the wording "rank & file" refers to all college employees.

Conclusion: forward to Cabinet

Student Course Evaluation Technology System – Comments: Strong proposal that would benefit from more substantive measures, the current measures appear to be Yes/No measures. Would like to see a person from Learner Services (preferably an advisor) serving as a member of the project team.

Conclusion: forward to Cabinet

Defining and Addressing Institutional Data Needs – Comments: A measure tied to the development of a data warehouse is critical to the success of this project. Perhaps something stating that the warehouse is in place (fully functional) and accessible by campus personnel. It may also be of value to identify data currently being collected but not used so that the practice can be discontinued. IR is adding a question to its annual survey that addresses use of the data warehouse.

Conclusion: forward to Cabinet

Improving Yearly Catalog Update Process – Comments: Timeline for project should be extended from 6 months to 6 – 12 months as the availability of IT to work on project is currently unknown. A measure for success that centers around accuracy of the catalog information may be helpful for this project. The new Registrar will serve as a member of the project team.

Conclusion: forward to Cabinet

Advisor Training Program – Comments: Timeline should be broken down into specific phases. Evaluation of program to standardize the experience and to make it consistent (possibly through observations of the advising process after training). The term "process assessment" may be more appropriate than "evaluation". More concrete measures of success of this project (the training) may be helpful. Possibly a pre and post test will provide some measure of the effectiveness of the training program.

Conclusion: forward to Cabinet with suggestions once application is modified and rated by QC

Action items: Brooke Holt will visit with Eric Vest to modify the Advisor Training Program Project Application. Then the team will vote to forward to Cabinet via email.	Person responsible: Brooke Holt, Eric Vest, and QC	Deadline: 1 week
Bruce Moses will contact Curtis Harrell regarding the expansion of the Catalog Update Process project timeline.	Bruce Moses and Curtis Harrell	1 week

Goals Document	**B. Moses**	**15**
Discussion: There was not enough time remaining after rating the Action Project Criterion to discuss this item.		
Conclusions: Tabled until the next meeting.		
Action items: Make sure everyone has had a chance to see the document from their supervisors.	Person responsible: All	Deadline: June
Other	**All**	**5**
Discussion: Meeting Adjourned.		
Conclusions:		
Action items:	Person responsible:	Deadline:

Additional Information