



**National Alliance of Concurrent Enrollment Partnerships
Board Meeting Minutes
Saturday, Oct. 22, 2011
Mystic, CT**

Executive Board Members

President:	Lynn Burbank (University of Minnesota, Duluth)
Past President:	Ted Ungricht (Utah Valley University)
Vice President:	Sandra Gonzalez (Schenectady County Community College)
Treasurer:	Kent Scheffel (Lewis & Clark Community College)
Secretary:	Ginger Ramsden (University of Southern Indiana)
Member at Large:	Elena Samson (Finger Lakes Community College)

Committee Chairpersons and Representatives

Accreditation Committee:	Becky Carter (Indiana University)
Communications Committee:	Julie Williams (University of Minnesota, Twin Cities)
Governmental Relations Committee:	Jaclyn Dumond (University of Southern Indiana)
Membership Committee:	E.J. Anderson (Rio Salado College)
Research Committee:	Gillian Thorne (University of Connecticut)
4-year Private Postsecondary Institutions:	Dennis Waller (Northwest Nazarene University)
4-Year Public Postsecondary Institutions:	Fabiola Juarez-Coca (Boise State University)
2-Year Postsecondary Institutions:	Karl Madeo (Tompkins Cortland CC, NY)

Present: Lynn Burbank, Ted Ungricht, Sandra Gonzalez, Kent Scheffel, Ginger Ramsden, Elena Samson, Becky Carter, Julie Williams, Jaclyn Dumond, E.J. Anderson, Gillian Thorne, Dennis Waller, Fabiola Juarez-Coca, Karl Madeo

Also attending: Adam Lowe, Executive Secretary (Ex Officio).

- 1 President Lynn Burbank called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m. and stated it had been requested
- 2 to remove item numbers 5, 6, and 9 from the Consent Agenda, moving them to the Non-Consent
- 3 Agenda for further discussion.

4 CONSENT AGENDA

- 5 1. *Approve minutes from the July 19, 2011 Board conference call*
- 6 2. *Accept reports from committee chairs and officers*
- 7 3. *Record the Board's electronic vote on a resolution committing to*
- 8 *nondiscrimination in the performance of the University of Connecticut contract*
- 9 4. *Record the Board's electronic vote to accept the bid from the University of*
- 10 *Washington to provide conference services support for the 2013 conference*
- 11 5. *Adopt the revised NACEP essential questions for evaluation surveys*
- 12 6. *Amend the required evidence for Standard A3 to delete the words "or syllabi"*
- 13 7. *Approve Karl Madeo as an ambassador for the NACEP Speakers and*
- 14 *Ambassadors program*
- 15 8. *Approve Loralee Stevens as an ambassador for the NACEP Speakers and*
- 16 *Ambassadors program*
- 17 9. *Approve July 1 as the deadline for accepting accreditation applications for 2012*

18 **Dennis Waller moved to approve the Consent Agenda with item numbers 5, 6, and 9**
19 **(highlighted, above) removed; motion seconded and approved.** Lynn will add these items to
20 the Non-Consent Agenda, as time allows.

21 NON-CONSENT AGENDA

- 22 1. *Approve Presidential Appointments of Standing Committee Chairs, Treasurer, and Ad*
- 23 *Hoc Committee Chair*
 - 24 a. Accreditation Committee- Becky Carter; Communications Committee- Julie
 - 25 Williams; Governmental Relations Committee- Jaclyn Dumond; Membership
 - 26 Committee- E.J. Anderson; Research Committee- Gillian Thorne
 - 27 b. Treasurer- Kent Scheffel
 - 28 c. Ad Hoc Secondary School Partners Committee Chair - Joni Swanson
- 29 Those seeking appointment recused themselves from the meeting. **Ted motioned to accept**
30 **the appointments as proposed; seconded, unanimously approved.**
- 31 2. *Set Date for April Board Meeting*

32 After discussion, the group determined the dates for the spring Board meeting, to be held
33 in the location approved for the 2013 conference, will be Thursday, April 19-Saturday
34 noon, April 21, 2012. Board members should travel to destination on Wednesday, as a
35 Strategic Planning meeting is scheduled for all day Thursday, with Board meetings
36 Friday and Saturday, ending by noon, Saturday.
- 37 3. *Proposal to Establish a Benevolence or Sunshine Fund*

38 The discussion of a Benevolence or Sunshine Fund had been raised in the Good and
39 Welfore discussion at the prior meeting, with the suggestion that Dennis draft a formal
40 proposal to bring back to the Board at this meeting. An overview of the proposal
41 follows:

42 Recent circumstances (death or illness) have occurred involving NACEP members,
43 which suggests the need for NACEP Board and/or Organization comment. Such
44 comment should occur via an appropriate card or some form of remembrance to the
45 NACEP member or family. The proposal, prepared by Dennis Waller, suggests the
46 creation of a Benevolence or Sunshine Fund as a line-item added to the NACEP yearly
47 budget. The name of the fund would be determined by the NACEP Board as part of this
48 proposal. Suggestion for names might be either Benevolence or Sunshine. The proposal
49 recommends putting \$500 per year in the fund, yearly renewal with each new budget.
50 Distributions will be via a card or remembrance, facilitated by the NACEP Executive
51 Secretary:

- 52 a. The NACEP Executive Secretary will serve as the contact person for
53 recipients and card/remembrance sending.
- 54 b. A subcommittee may be appointed to help in decisions related to recipients,
55 etc.
- 56 c. The NACEP Executive Secretary will provide a report of cards or
57 remembrance to the Executive Committee on a bi-yearly basis, or upon the
58 request of the NACEP.

59
60 **Ginger moved to place the proposal to establish a Benevolence or Sunshine Fund on**
61 **the table for discussion and vote; seconded.**

62 Discussion: Concern was expressed that the Board might miss sending a card or
63 remembrance to a NACEP member; not all members make their losses known, and as the
64 organization grows, keeping track of member's personal issues will become more
65 difficult. Sending cards might be appropriate, but purchasing larger gifts, such as flowers
66 would significantly impact the NACEP budget. How would the membership view this
67 use of NACEP funds?

68 Adam showed the group an example of the newly created NACEP note cards that are
69 available to all Board members. Board members could choose to send individual notes to
70 NACEP members who are in ill, or who have lost a loved one.

71 **Lynn called for the vote; the motion did not pass, with four in favor of the**
72 **Benevolence/Sunshine Fund proposal and all others opposed.**

73 Board members will use the note cards distributed by Adam to send personal notes to
74 NACEP colleagues, when appropriate.

75 4. *Executive Secretary 3 Year contract*

76 Adam was asked to recuse himself from the meeting. **Dennis Waller motioned to enter**
77 **an Executive Session to discuss all personnel issues, moving out of the Executive**
78 **Session upon completion of discussion and vote; seconded, motion carried.**

79 **The Board moved out of Executive Session.**
80

81 5. *Adopt budget for calendar year 2012*

82 **Sandy Gonzalez motioned to approve the budget as presented; seconded.**

83 Discussion: Kent explained the budget will look different than past budgets as the
84 revenue and expenses from the fall conference will now pass through the budget, while in
85 the past, only the net revenue was reflected. He also mentioned that some expenses that
86 are budgeted, especially those allocated for Strategic Planning initiatives, may not be
87 used. Kent offered to email everyone a separate, more detailed budget report that would
88 include visuals showing trends. Lynn mentioned that NACEP should work towards
89 creating an annual report that shows overall trends in a variety of areas, and set a goal for
90 the first annual report to be published next year, 2013.

91 Kent brought it to the group's attention that the year is not yet over, so many expenses
92 will not hit until the year's end. The group also acknowledged that NACEP earned
93 additional revenue from conducting workshops regarding accreditation standards in KY.
94 NACEP could pursue replicating such workshops in other states as a means of generating
95 revenue.

96 **Lynn called for the vote. The Board unanimously approved the budget.** Note: The
97 budget is filed as a separate document.

98 6. *Adopt the Revised NACEP Essential Questions for Evaluation Surveys*

99 Lynn requested this item, the #5 item removed earlier from the Consent Agenda, be
100 inserted into the non-consent agenda at this point.

101 After the April Board meeting discussion about the NACEP Essential Questions for
102 Evaluation Surveys, Jill Thorne and Brenna Kelleher of UConn worked with an Ad Hoc
103 committee of Board members to revise the essential questions that NACEP requires
104 all accredited programs to use for the 1 Year Out Alumni Survey (E2), the 4 Year Out
105 Alumni Survey (E3), and the Instructor, Principal, and Guidance Counselor Impact
106 Surveys (E4).

107 **Jaclyn Dumond moved to accept this proposal; motion seconded.**

108 Discussion: The group spent a considerable amount of time going through each of the
109 five NACEP required surveys, providing Jill with suggested edits. Jill took copious
110 notes, determining she should revise the surveys again, to reflect the edits.
111

112 **Jaclyn withdrew her motion to accept this proposal. Dennis Waller moved to table**
113 **the *Essential Questions for Evaluation Surveys* discussion until after Jill completes**
114 **her revisions and submits them to the Board for review; motion seconded,**
115 **approved.**

116 Jill will send the revised surveys to the Board within the next couple of months, before
117 the end of January.
118

- 119 7. *Addition of item moved from the Consent Agenda: #6, Amend the required evidence for*
120 *Standard A3 to delete the words "or syllabi"*
121 **Jaelyn moved to discuss and vote on the item; seconded.**

122 Discussion: Changing language in the Standards would be perceived negatively,
123 especially by those programs "in process." Becky addressed this Standard's evidence in
124 the newly created Accreditation Guide and clearly explains when syllabi may be used as
125 evidence, and when they may not be used. She suggested we move through this
126 accreditation cycle to see if the language continues to be a problem. It is much easier to
127 change the language in the Guide, than in one of the Standards. **Lynn called for the**
128 **vote; motion did not carry.** The language in Standard A3 will remain as it stands.

- 129 8. *Approve July 1 as the deadline for accepting accreditation applications for 2012*
130 Lynn requested that this item, the #9 item removed earlier from the Consent Agenda, be
131 inserted into the non-consent agenda at this point.

132 Becky Carter, Accreditation Committee Chair, explained that for a number of years
133 the deadline for submitting NACEP Accreditation Applications has been August 1st ,
134 and this year, the Accreditation Committee has stated a goal of completing all peer
135 reviews in time for votes at the Spring Board meeting. The schedule has become
136 compressed with the addition of the coordinators' application completeness
137 screening process, resulting in numerous application problems identified and
138 rectified prior to applications being assigned to peer review teams. In addition,
139 many reviewers take vacations in August, manage student enrollment in September,
140 and prepare for the NACEP conference in October. Shifting the deadline to July 1st
141 should provide reviewers and applicants with the time necessary to complete a
142 thorough application review in time for a vote at the spring Board meeting.

143 **Kent Scheffel moved to place this item on the table for discussion and vote; motion**
144 **seconded.**

145 Discussion: Becky will inform programs of the July 1 deadline for applications being
146 submitted in 2012 for 2013 approval. It was suggested that since this is the first year to
147 move the date back one month, programs that need the August 1 deadline could contact
148 Becky to request the additional month for preparation, if needed.

149 **Sandy Gonzalez made a motion to amend the motion on the table to state, "Approve**
150 **July 1 as the deadline for accepting Accreditation Applications;" seconded, motion**
151 **approved.**

152 The deadline for submitting NACEP Accreditation Applications will now be July 1, and
153 programs that require additional preparation time may contact the Accreditation Chair for
154 approval or denial, based on circumstances.

- 155 9. *Review conference schedule and responsibilities*

156 Jill reviewed the Mystic conference agenda, to be sure all Board members know
157 responsibilities and explained meals will be served in various locations, since the hotel
158 doesn't have one central location large enough to accommodate serving the entire group
159 of attendees. It was decided each board member will present a short, concise report at the
160 annual meeting, with one institutional representative providing a consolidated report from
161 the institutional reps.

162 *10. Review 2012 conference hosting bid from University of Washington – Seattle*

163 Tim Stetter, University of Washington, met with the Board to overview the plans for the
164 2012 NACEP Conference which will be held in Seattle. Information shared included:

- 165 • Printed postcard distributed in 2011 conference materials that highlights the 2012
166 Seattle conference, available for Board members to distribute
- 167 • Conference theme- “Launching Students to Success”
- 168 • Featured speakers still being sought, to be announced
- 169 • Plan to offer a panel of STEM experts during at least one session
- 170 • New UW president invited to welcome NACEP conference attendees
- 171 • Possibility of including key legislators behind Washington state legislation that
172 promotes concurrent enrollment programs
- 173 • Marketing strategies being developed include tags available to put at end of email
174 messages, website information, flyers
- 175 • Budget revisions include elimination of the registration fees overhead, as
176 registration fees will go directly to NACEP, increasing net income for NACEP
- 177 • Number of proposed registrants has been raised to 320, with maximum
178 registrations as 380, based on size of hotel and ballroom
- 179 • Meal counts of Mystic will be tracked so that Seattle can do a better job of
180 estimating the number of people eating at each meal; suggestion was made to
181 inquire if Seattle hotel can count plates
- 182 • Whether the attendees will make the 20 minute bus ride to the UW main campus
183 is yet to be determined, but the Board encouraged the host group pursue this, as
184 past conferences have included similar successful trips
- 185 • NACEP Board will be provided free space for meetings
- 186 • Tim will review the 2011 conference evaluations to gain feedback on the
187 professional development tracks, topics, to ensure new things as well as keeping
188 the core items that stay popular year-to-year

189 *11. Discussion of process for selecting conference hosts for 2014, and managing conference
190 growth*

191 Sandy Gonzalez, who serves as the Board's liaison with the conference host site
192 representatives, has created a preliminary conference hosting form that institutions
193 interested in hosting a future conference can complete and submit to the Board before the
194 spring Board meeting. The current conference host proposal form is very complex and
195 requires a lot of time and effort to complete. With the implementation of Sandy's
196 suggested process, institutions can submit a simpler form and get feedback from the
197 Board as to whether or not to proceed in completing the formal conference host proposal
198 form. The Board was very supportive of this process, as it seems interest in hosting

199 future conferences is growing, and this process would allow the Board to target site hosts
 200 for future years, allowing potential host programs time to prepare the full host proposal
 201 form that includes hotel expenses, closer to the time of the proposed conference date.
 202 Currently, institutions from the following cities/states have shown interest in hosting a
 203 NACEP conference: Chicago, Kentucky, Niagara Falls, Little Rock, Gettysburg and
 204 Jackson, Wyoming.

205 Sandy reviewed what services our current conference planning provider provides,
 206 stressing the host sites continue to have many responsibilities to ensure a successful
 207 conference. The group discussed other issues regarding the conference that will require
 208 future Board decisions:

- 209 • Whether to limit enrollment—how big do we want the conferences to become
 210 before we lose intimacy?
- 211 • Making certain we hold the conferences in various geographical regions
 212 throughout the country.
- 213 • How often should popular conference sessions be repeated?
- 214 • Should we determine conference tracks based on the demographics of the region?
- 215 • How to describe the workshops more clearly and concisely, so that people attend
 216 what they expect.
- 217 • Review the current fee structure, perhaps offering a discount such as, “Send two
 218 people and get one registration free.” Or, offer a discounted rate if attendee
 219 doesn’t wish to include meals in his/her registration.
- 220 • Brainstorm offering new, purposeful sessions such as:
 221 ○ How to use Canusia
 222 ○ Marketing
 223 ○ Use of Web 2.0 tools
 224 ○ Poll our own membership to suggest other ideas

225 The motion was made to adjourn the meeting at 4:55 p.m. and seconded; President Lynn
 226 Burbank adjourned the meeting at 4:55 p.m., with the remaining Non-Consent items scheduled
 227 for discussion at the Tuesday, October 25th meeting, being held immediately after the closing
 228 session of the 2011 Mystic Conference.

229 Respectively Submitted,
 230 Ginger Ramsden

231 Non-consent Agenda items not discussed, due to lack of time:

- 232 1. *Discussion regarding committee structures*
 - 233 a. *Establishing regional representatives for Membership & Governmental Relations*
 - 234 *Committees*
 - 235 b. *Plan for engaging Research Committee volunteers*
- 236 2. *Discussion on regional accreditors' interest in concurrent enrollment (as time allows)*
- 237 3. *Discussion on potential collaborations with other organizations (as time allows)*