

**Academic Quality Improvement Program (AQIP)**  
**November 15, 2006**

---

**Present:** J. Anderson, D. Bailey, D. Halog, D. Lutz, S. Montesi, L. Myles-Sanders, G. Przygocki, A. Ursuy, L. VandenBosch, C. Watson, J. Williams, K. Wilson, M. Wood

---

The committee reviewed Part A of the “Strategy for Action Workbook”. Listed below are the changes that were made:

1. Distinctive organizational features: In Paragraph 5 – “The innovative approach and success of DCCS serves as a...” – section approved with this change.
2. Scope of educational offerings: Section approved.
3. Students: Last bullet – “...less ~~that~~ [CHANGE TO] *than* half are reading at college level...” Section approved with this change.
4. Collaborative or partnership arrangements: Section approved after spacing fixed for 30←%.
5. Faculty and staff:
  - Paragraph 2, “The College *employees* [CHANGE TO] *employs* 1298 individuals...”
  - In the last paragraph, the committee agreed to strike the first sentence, “*Delta also employs 375 student employees.*” Section approved after these changes are made.
6. Three operational environment requirements: Section approved.
7. Three important competitors: Section approved.
8. Three important opportunities and three important vulnerabilities:
  - The first bullet under “Three important opportunities”, “*Re-look at* [CHANGE TO] *Review* programs...”
  - The second bullet under “Three important vulnerabilities”, “*Changeover* [CHANGE TO] *Turnover* of baby boomer faculty...”, and [ADD] “*while maintaining organization, culture and knowledge.*” to the end of this same sentence.
  - The committee agreed that bullet three needs to be discussed further at the next meeting.

**Part B – Delta College’s Future**

The committee began discussing the first section of Part B, “Three chronic frustrations”. Each member individually addressed what they felt to be a chronic frustration:

- Jay Anderson addressed the level of remedial students coming in, in addition to the strategic initiatives regarding enrollment within a program, and the need for more resources, plans and need for increased enrollment within specialized programs.
- David Bailey expressed concern with the shift from the past of “working towards and earning a degree to the present sense of entitlement”, stating that many students felt that since they are “paying the bill, they have a right to a degree”, with no responsibility on their part beyond that. He felt that there should be more discussion with faculty to recognize and buy into the fundamental philosophy of teaching and what their responsibilities are to gain common ground (i.e. silo thinking).

- Don Halog shared the issue of the inability to focus as a result of being pulled in so many different directions. Combined with this, he expressed the importance of communication and how we have so many different ways of communicating which leads to information overload. He stated that we need to ask ourselves what the focus messages should be that we want to send across the college. We need to have the ability to understand what the needs of our students and stakeholders are. We need to listen. Don also addressed the issue of process, in that do we operate too heavily by consensus with strung-out discussions. We need to find a way to balance all of this by making communication a major part of the plan without going into information overload at the same time.
- A chronic frustration offered by Deb Lutz was that of the state and local economy relating to student population trends.
- Sue Montesi agreed with Don that there is a need for balance, in that there is also a need to maintain the balance of dealing with/working with students in class, employees, co-workers, workload, etc. She also agreed with David, stating that there is too much on the side of “rights” rather than responsibility. Sue added that there seems to be more communication when there is a problem to deal with as opposed to when something is working, and that there seems to be less time to think, problem solve and develop solutions. She said when committees or groups are formed to work on issues or projects, it is quite often the same group of people. Sue stated that it is more difficult to balance this way, and other faculty/staff need to get involved so that it is not always the same group making the decisions. The last chronic frustration she offered was the scheduling process from the student side and the need to work on that.
- Ginny Przygocki agreed that balance, rights and responsibility were definitely some chronic frustrations. She felt that faculty and students should to be encouraged more to come up with new ideas and felt that the ones that seem to sit back and not contribute should be held accountable. Ginny added that she felt that the community, students and the college do not understand the process of validation.
- Jenny Williams felt that the relationship with SVSU and their belief system on hiring was a chronic frustration.
- Leslie Myles-Sanders stated that shared governance was both a total frustration, in that things need to be moved along, and an incredible opportunity in that shared governance gives people the opportunity to speak.

Don stated that the remaining committee members, Andrea, Leslie VandenBosch, Connie, Karen and Michael, would share at the next AQIP meeting what they felt to be chronic frustrations. The committee will then decide what they feel are the three major chronic frustrations based on everyone’s input. Don would also like to begin to look at the three elements of shared vision.