

**MEETING MINUTES**

**AQIP Systems Portfolio Team**

**November 18, 2004**

**1:30 pm – 3:00 pm**

**Next meeting: 2:00 November 24, 2004 in Room 7342**

Members Present: Doug Easterling, Dave Landom, Joan Patten, Nancy Thibeault

Members Absent: Tom Huguley, Sue Merrell, Ned Young

Meeting Leader: Doug Easterling


Meeting Recorder: Joan Patten

Meeting Objective(s):

- Discuss Lansing Trip
- Determine major points of proposal to President's Council
- Next steps

<b>AGENDA ITEMS</b>	<b>COMMENTS/CONCLUSIONS/ OR ACTIONS (IF ANY)</b>	<b>PERSONS(S) RESPONSIBLE</b>	<b>BY WHEN</b>
1. Discuss Lansing Trip	Due to time constraints (two players had to leave early) the discussion was just a validation that the view of the team as it returned from Lansing is that the strength of Lansing's situation is the expectation that all will employ quality measures of processes in decision making from leadership on down. Strong direction from leadership was noted, and something the Sinclair team felt needed to occur here.		

# MEETING MINUTES

AGENDA ITEMS	COMMENTS/CONCLUSIONS/ OR ACTIONS (IF ANY)	PERSONS(S) RESPONSIBLE	BY WHEN
<p>2. Major points of proposal to President's Council</p>  <p>I:\AQIP SYSTEMS PORTFOLIO\Lansing</p>	<p>While in earlier meetings we felt that leadership needed to understand what a portfolio 'is' and can be at Sinclair – (the parts of the portfolio; how it links to other processes at the college; what it might replace; how it can serve as a documentation of how we do continuous improvement) the team returned from Lansing with a proposal that would charge VPs with the criterion in order to promote 'buy-in' and better understanding of the criteria and need for process mapping/improvement strategies.</p> <p>Doug, Joan and Sue (two of which were naive readers of the proposal) provided some addition aspects for consideration (see attachment).</p> <p>While it is clear we want a 'blessing' to continue, the question is 'what would that blessing look like?' And would assigning VPs criteria actually drive the cultural change necessary for us to think in quality terms?</p> <p>Within the considerations listed, Doug, Sue and Joan proposed that we: 1) not assign criteria to VPs, but perhaps redirect efforts so that they review vision/mission statement; 2) then establish a strategic plan for the next five years by leveraging the 2 board-approved KPIs under initiative 9. The agreement of the Portfolio Team players was that we would be willing to help facilitate the development of the strategic plan for consideration if that would be of service. It is essential that AQIP become central to the planning process.</p> <p>Discussion of players was that this was perhaps a better solution than just charging leadership with the criteria, especially if we can integrate AQIP.</p>		

# MEETING MINUTES

AGENDA ITEMS	COMMENTS/CONCLUSIONS/ OR ACTIONS <i>(IF ANY)</i>	PERSONS(S) RESPONSIBLE	BY WHEN
3. Next steps	It was suggested that Tom and Doug should prepare a proposal (which Tom will present) that draws on these pieces. It is important that leadership understands the relationship between planning and re-accréditation. Since Tom was not present, Doug indicated he would try to find time to draft a document for 11/24 meeting capturing these issues.	Tom/Doug	11/24/04