**Saint Paul School of Theology**

**August 2018 Board Meeting Minutes**

**August 20-21, 2018**

**Room 137 Church of the Resurrection**

**Monday, August 20th**

Joining via Computer: https://zoom.us/j/978149687

Joining by Phone: (669) 900-6833, Meeting ID: 978 149 687

Joining from a Conference Room: 162.255.37.11, Meeting ID: 978 149 687

Board Members Present:

\* In Person: Michael Parmely, Andy Bryan, Arden Borgen (phone), Susan Lindahl, Suzanne Teel, Mark Faulkner, Tex Sample, Bishop Mutti (life trustee), Lee Myane, Glenn Grove, Mark Faulkner (by telephone), Dustin Petz, Lia McIntosh, President Neil Blair (ex officio)

Guests: Greg Henson, Jeanne Hoeft, Angela Sims, Matthew Mills, Israel Kamanzandu, Derrek Belase (by telephone), Melissa Pearce (by video conference) and Friends of Saint Paul members Linda Louderback, Rena Yokum, Jack Gregory, Nancy Brown

**Call to Order:**

9:00 am officially called into session by Chair, Michael Parmely

Michael explained that this was to be an informal meeting without parliamentary procedure unless necessary. The primary goal was to prepare for HLC site visit on September 10-12 (Monday- Wednesday). The tentative schedule for Monday, September 10 will have trustees meeting with the site visit team for lunch.

Four documents were sent to members prior to the meeting and included an agenda, a vision statement from Neil, a map of the response to 17 citations by the HLC and extensive talking points.

Michael also reminded members that the Saint Paul Convocation in Oklahoma will be held at 11 am Tuesday, August 28.

Future board meetings scheduled are as follows:

* Fall Board Meeting Date: October 22-23 (Monday-Tuesday)
* Spring Board Meeting: May 2-3, 2019 to accommodate faculty teaching schedules, avoid conflicts with the HLC Annual Conference and Palm Sunday/Easter schedule. The spring meeting will be held in Oklahoma City on the SPST-OCU campus.

Glen Grove then reviewed new trustee recruitment, noting that Govenrance is attempting to recruit 3 new board members (2 pastors from Oklahoma one attorney from the KC area). Both Oklahomans are graduates of Saint Paul and served several pastorates in the Oklahoma conference. The attorney candidate was recommended by Judge Julie Robinson.

Michael recognized Matt Mills and his team who facilitated the move to the new facilities at COR that we are meeting in today.

The meeting was turned over to President Neil Blair

**Opening Devotion:**

Rev. Lee Myane provided the morning devotion from Proverbs 9:1-10 and asked the question “Who is sitting at your table?”

**HLC Review Preparation:**

Susan Lindahl used a PPT presentation to ask what are we doing well? How can we do that better?

She highlighted strategic issues facing SPST noting assessment of student learning, linking planning to budget, student enrollment and tuition revenue and dependence on the endowment as HLC citations. She also stressed that we received two ATS Notations.

Discussion followed of the strengths, which include:

Group Discussion: What are Saint Paul’s Strengths and opportunities

Strengths

\* Board responsiveness to students

\* Trustee active engagement (we’re awake now!)

\* Board’s willingness to learn and respond to criticism

\* Strong faculty who relates well to the student body

\* Improved finances: the right team is forming, better financial information

\* Responsiveness to challenges- relocating to new campus

\* Resilience and wisdom because of dealing with challenges-

\* much better at meeting our mission

\* 3 Pillars

 \* Processes- Long term sustainably

 \* Programming- focused on student learning outcomes

 \* Community development- students, faculty, friends, trustees

\* Communication is improving including all of the stakeholders- students, friends of Saint Paul

\* Integrated Approach

\* SPST Leadership Team

 \* President (year 2 in role)

 \* VP Academic Affairs

 \* CFO/COO

 \* VP Advancement

Neil and Greg led a discussion of three documents, which were provided prior to the meeting.

**1. Honoring our Past- Embracing the Future (Presidential Narrative)**

Trustees were asked to identify topics that resonated with them. They cited:

 \* Honesty/Authenticity

 \* Claimint a seminary in two locations

 \* Naming the SPST creation story (Social justice, practical ministry, rigorous theological reflection)

 \* Partnerships

 \* Relationships, both internal andexternal

 \* Technology and data provided in dashboards

Questions then arose about the following:

 \* Partnerships- be strategic about which partnerships to invest in, must be consistent with our strategic plan

 \* Identity as a free-standing seminary. What does that really mean related to COR? With full autonomy of mission, governance, and curriculum at two locations. We do not operate with COR. We lease space with COR. This is not a business partnership. COR is collaboration.

 \* Curriculum and academic programs are autonomous.

 \* Top line Data:

 \* Enrollment: Total students: about 100 headcount, 21 new students in 2018 (two locations), Continuing Education (Course Of Study)- 400 headcount (largest in the UMC), 21 Faculty & staff (8 faculty, 14 staff, includes adjuncts)

 \* Budget: $3.6 Million Budget

 \* Diversified income is a strength: 1/4- tuition & fees, 1/4 endowment, 1/4- partnership payments (primarily Ministerial Education Fund), 1/4 fundraising

 \* No long-term debt

 \* Balanced Budget with a 4% endowment drawdown

 \* Endowment (50% goes to support student scholarships)

 \* Department of Education Financial Composite score of 3.0 (highest possible)

 \* Presidential Succession Plan to address leadership transitions

Challenges going forward:

\* Need to build relationships and share a positive narrative about who Saint Paul is. The data supports people choose Saint Paul because of a relationship with someone connected to Saint Paul.

 \* Brief history: “1959 beginning on Truman Road, with an integration of social justice, practical ministry, and rigorous theological reflection for pastoral development for the region...”

 \* Recent Past: July 2013 move from Truman Road, President Blair hired July 2016, February 2017 HLC Probation,

**2. HLC Timeline/Process Talking Points (Internal document)**

There was a recognition of a great list of accomplishments over the past 2 years. The trustees offered several suggestions on improving the document, inducing elaboration of acronyms, citation of 4 board committees, succession planning, clarity on student learning assessment vs educational program review. Strengths include very high placement rate.

Trustees also asked about feedback from Boards of Ordained Ministry. Data available on Moodle. Jeanne Hoeft will email out several reports that are included as evidence for the assurance argument:

 \* Student Learning Outcomes (2 reports)

 \* MDIV program review

 \* MATS program review

Trustees also sought information on the entire recruitment process for increasing our enrollment of students. This is included in the recruitment report, which Angela will send to trustees. Students are very sensitive to increasing debt.

Suzanne Teel then presented the Strategic Planning Committee Report (see PPT slides). Her committee is attempting to simplify the 4 Strategic Directions, 9 specific goals and indicators of effectiveness (SMARTI goals- specific, measurable, attainable, relevant, time sensitive, inspiring). She related their work back to the mission of the school.

Michael noted that SPST has been selected as a first-cohort participant in the InTrust Wise Steward Initiative Process and that this will include an In Trust board self-evaluation survey followed by a March 2019 workshop with other members of the cohort. Our board coach, Dr. Amy Kardash (President of In Trust) will join us at the board meeting in October.

The meeting was adjourned for lunch at noon.

**Call to Order:**

The meeting was reconvened at 12:30 PM.

Matt Mills led discussion of **HLC Criterion 5** refering trustees to HLC requirements at

<https://www.hlcommission.org/Policies/criteria-and-core-components.html>

**Criterion 5. Resources, Planning, and Institutional Effectiveness**

**The institution’s resources, structures, and processes are sufficient to fulfill its mission, improve the quality of its educational offerings, and respond to future challenges and opportunities. The institution plans for the future.**

Matt Mills led this discussion.

 **Core Component 5A:**  Matt noted the following-

\* Financial Management, Multi-year operating budget based on realistic data and enrollment of 96 students this fall. Student enrollment is ¼ of our income.

\* The budget undergoes on-going review.

\* In September we will begin the process of planning the 2019-20 budget working with the Strategic Planning and Evaluation Committee and the Resource Committee of the board.

\* 51.6% of total operating budget is now linked directly to the 4 Strategic Directions (program expenses); the balance is administration/operational expenses (49%)

\* Key Performance Indicators are used to evaluate progress on the strategic plan (using quantifiable data for each strategic priority) and is regularly reviewed by the Trustees. (See KPI Compendium on Moodle.)

 **Core Component 5B:** Strategic planning and trategic priorities. Matt noted that:

 \* There was a shift to a Leadership model of board governance.

 \* Meetings, information, communication has become more transparent between board, faculty, and broader Saint Paul Community.

 \* Board committees are in engaged.

 \* Annual planning cycle is linked to budget formation.

 \* Cycle: Plan--> Data—> Analysis—> Review/Adjustment. First month is August.

 \* Fiduciary responsibilities have improved: 4% drawdown of investments; board members serving as the reading committee for HLC assurance argument.

 **Core Component 5C:** Institutional planning policies & processes (see page 81 HLC assurance argument)

 \* 4 Strategic Directions with 10 Goals (under revision)

 \* 5 Intermediate Strategic priorities were adopted in August, 2017 included:

 \* Integrated relationship development

 \* Organizational structure and resource allocation

 \* Program development & evaluation

 \* Board engagement

**Criterion 4: Quality of the educational components, assessment of student learning and retention, persistence and completion rates**

Jeane Hoeft led this discussion.

 **Core Component 4A:** Quality of educational PROGRAMS (program reviews)- MDIV, MATS, MACM Christian Ministry, DMIN, Cert Theological Formation

Jeanne noted progress in the following areas:

 \* 50% of program reviews have been completed (MDIV, MACM).

 \* A cycle of program reviews every 5 years was adopted and includes trends in theological education, talking with stakeholders, budget implications, etc.

 \* Example MDIV adjustments:

\* Increased hybrid and online offerings, integration of theory & practice, recruitment, student placement after graduation.

 **Core Component 4B:** Assessment of Student Learning Outcomes (SLO)

 \* We now have rubrics for every degree program and the certificate program.

 \* Created an Academic Assessment Committee- Dean is the chair, ensures faculty engagement in the assessment progress

 \* Budget dedicated for Assessment with appropriate outside consultants.

 **Core Component 4C:** Retention, persistence and completion rates

\* These are now (tracked, reported vs benchmarks, and planned from results for each program)

\* Greg added additional clarity on assessment consisting of three types: Institutional, degree program review, and student learning.

**Criterion 3: Teaching and Learning: Quality, Resources, and Support**

**The institution provides high quality education, wherever and however its offerings are delivered.**

 **Core Component 3A:**

\* Saint Paul offers 4 degree programs (MDIV, MATS, MACM, DMIN), all graduate level

\* We use multiple delivery formats- on campus, online and hybrid all with the same content, learning outcomes, and assessments.

\* We don't have approval for fully online separate program.

\* United Methodists who seek ordination must have 1/3 of delivery in the face-to-face (on campus) format.

 **Core Component 3B:**

 **Core Component 3C:**

Questions from trustees led to the following summary:

\* We have sufficient faculty and staff to deliver effective, high quality educational programs.

\* All faculty teach in multiple areas, multiple courses can be taught by any professor. There has been an increased course teaching load for all faculty.

**Core Component 3D:**

Jeanne noted that -

\* We have an Associate Dean of Students. Faculty members provide student advising.

\* There are excellent student services at OCU, including subsidized counseling services.

\* Student satisfaction surveys, graduate student questionnaire (GSQ) all show comparable results from students at both campuses.

\* We perform regular assessment of classroom technology and make budget adjustments to ensure student support. Infrastructure investment ($200K for video conferencing), monthly cost for ongoing support, deferred maintenance (technology replacement cycle) are in place and regularly monitored.

\* With regard to the Oklahoma campus, which contains 20-25% of total students, there is no need to duplicate certain efforts adequately provided by the Kansas campus.

 \* Both locations have office managers in both sites and registrar services are available.

 \* All faculty teach on both campuses using standard distance learning technology (Zoom video conferencing)

 \* One Academic Dean oversees for both campuses.

 \* There are more adjunct faculty in residence in Oklahoma. We are working to improve adjunct communication and involvement in assessment and other faculty committee work. Will need to compensate adjuncts for additional time if they are requested to be there for non-direct teaching efforts.

 \* OCU health care and counseling is provided. Housing is available on campus if needed.

 \* We are fully accredited to offer the same degree programs at both locations.

 \* Assessment and student satisfaction surveys are the same on both campuses.

\* The library at both locations is moving to more online offerings, accumulating more electronic resources. A priority is to educate students on how to use electronic resources.

\* Co-curricular activities in both locations include chapel and student organizations. We have not fully developed the assessment plan for co-curricular activities and continue to evaluate how to assess how these contribute to student learning outcomes.

**Criterion 2. Integrity: Ethical and Responsible Conduct**

**The institution acts with integrity; its conduct is ethical and responsible.**

**Core Components**

The board asked a number of questions about core components 2A-2E.

\* Do we have policies related to student, faculty, and board misconduct?

 \* Faculty Handbook: Policy and procedures for faculty grievance, nothing specific to academic integrity

 \* Student complaint? Go to Dean of Students or Academic Dean, no clear process for student complaint about faculty members.

 \* Board integrity issues are covered in the Conflict of Interest and Board Ethics Policy statements.

 \* There is a financial hotline: external, confidential

 \* An external financial annual audit is conducted.

\* The board guards its autonomy via a Shared Governance Policy Statement, which is being drafted with faculty and administration.

 \* Transparent conversations are occurring between trustees and faculty.

 \* We have partnerships, but that does not affect our autonomy.

\* Can churches prohibit students who are fellows from participating in a demonstration?

 \* Board polices encourage freedom of expression of students and faculty.

\* What are our online offerings?

 \* We have online course offerings in all degree programs.

 \* FLEX scheduling (NOT a flex program) exists for most courses.

**Criterion 1. Mission**

**The institution’s mission is clear and articulated publicly; it guides the institution’s operations.**

**Core Components**

The trustees were generally satisfied with the following core components:

1.A. The institution’s mission is broadly understood within the institution and guides its operations.

1.B. The mission is articulated publicly.

1.C. The institution understands the relationship between its mission and the diversity of society.

1.D. The institution’s mission demonstrates commitment to the public good.

Board Questions about Criterion 1 included:

What is the diversity of our student population?

\* We track the racial/ethnic, gender, age, denominational diversity in our student body and seek to increase the racial/ethnic diversity.

 \* Incoming 21 students- 2 from OKC; 32% male, 14% asian, 5% black, 5% hispanic 76% white)

 \* We haven’t set a benchmark for student diversity (3-5 year goal). How do we intentionally recruit more diversity?

Why are we located in a white neighborhood in Kansas?

What’s our representation of LGBQT students?

\* Do we have a statement that accepts everyone? Yes, we have a non-discrimination statement.

\* Strategy: consider a statement to intentionally include LGBQT persons.

\* How does this institution approach the task of strategic planning?

\* How does the institution use data to inform the decisions it makes?

\* How does this institution ensure voices from across the institution are involved in the decision-making and planning of the school?

\* How has assessment played a role in the ongoing development of this school?

The meeting was adjourned at 5:30 PM.

**Tuesday, August 21, 2018**

**Call to Order:**

Michael called the meeting to order at 8:58 AM.

**Board Members Present:**

\* In Person: Michael Parmely, Andy Bryan, Arden Borgen (phone), Susan Lindahl, Suzanne Teel, Mark Faulkner (by telephone), Tex Sample, Bishop Mutti (life trustee), Lee Myane, Glenn Grove, Dustin Petz, Lia McIntosh, President Neil Blair (ex officio)

**Guests Present:** Greg Henson, Jeanne Hoeft, Angela Sims, Matthew Mills, Hal Knight, Jim Brandt, Derrek Belase (by telephone), Elaine Robinson (Zoom videoconferencing) and Friends of Saint Paul members Linda Louderback and Jack Gregory

Suzanne Teel presented the morning devotion from Romans 12:3-8, One Body in Christ, Unique Gifts. She called on the board to recognize each other’s contributions to the body of Saint Paul.

Michael invited board members who are willing to bring their gifts to talk with the HLC Review team on Monday, September 10 over lunch to contact Michael or Neil. Those who are willing are asked to covenant to read the full HLC Assurance Argument and be available for discussion over lunch. This is a commitment to homework and being fully prepared with accurate data.

Greg Hinson then facilitated a conversation of “What’s Next?” for Saint Paul.

Reminder: HLC is not our mission. Our mission is broader.

Those present were then asked to reflect on what are the **5 top priorities for Saint Paul for the next year** (2018/19). Responses included:

\* Alleviate Anxiety (make people less anxious)

\* Create positive awareness

\* Engage students by encouraging, enrolling, and equipping for innovative/creative ministry.

\* Raise money for student scholarships.

\* Strengthen our presence in Oklahoma City.

\* Expand relationships with all current partners- OCU, COR, AK,

\* Relaunch our DMIN Program efforts.

\* Develop a new narrative for Saint Paul.

\* Clarify our Identity/Uniqueness/Message.

\* Implement FLEX and tie it to student learning outcomes.

\* Modify the strategic plan toward SMARTI goals, assessment, and implementation.

\* Stability and follow-through on processes put in place this past year

\* Evaluate our reality.

\* Create new intentional relationships that can benefit the seminary.

\* Clarify the future of President Blair after his present 3-year contract.

\* Strengthen our relationships with the local churches.

\* Strengthen our relationships with local UMC conferences

\* Increase the number of donors who give more than $2000.

\* Connect with energy and affection that’s out there for Saint Paul (Alumni, current students).

\* Prepare for the UMC denominational reality whatever that may be.

\* Prayer movement- prayer for Saint Paul to be a part of what God is doing.

\* Internal trust building-intentional strategy and planning as an organizational culture.

The group was then asked to define the broad categories into which these priorities fall.

* Communication and Inclusiveness (collaborative decision-making)
* New Narrative
* Innovate/Programming
* Leadership
* Relationship-building
* Institutional Infrastructure
* Theological/Spiritual
* Students
* Internal
* External
* Future
* Enrollment
* OKC campus

Greg Henson noted that only 20 seminaries of the 273 belonging to ATS have grown consistently over the past 5 years. So, saying we want to increase enrollment is not a small thing. Enrollment is not a stand-alone effort.

\* Relationships are a big piece of the future but also don’t stand alone.

\* Culture of trust, infrastructure, following new processes/systems/budget, collaborative decision-making, prayer.

Taking the three categories of Innovation/Enrollment, Relationships, and Culture, the group was asked to cite two points under each category.

**1. Innovation/Enrollment**

Themes included:

\* Funding Scholarships

\* FLEX

\* POSITIVE NARRATIVE- why people should come here

\* Student Support- intentionally

\* Programs

\* Relationships with alums/healing

\* Course of Study

The following interpretations were offered:

\* The narrative must be consistent. Sometimes the narrative can become splintered... The narrative must be “This seminary cares about how it supports students.”

\* Positive narrative matters!

\* Culture creates narrative.

Greg offered several comments related to new approaches to improving enrollment.

 \* Same programs/new students- this is the most difficult.

 \* New locations- new markets/site, all theological education is regional, so expansion into new geographic locations is difficult.

 \* New programs/Innovations- something fundamentally different in the way in which students engage in learning at Saint Paul.

 \* It also gives you something to talk about, a different approach to education.

 \* Plan to start enrolling people by February, 2019.

 \* Create a cross functional team of less than 6 people without having to get it approved (this is trust building)

2. **Relationships**

Suggested themes included:

\* Conferences/churches

\* Alums, some are in strategic places

\* New relationships

\* OCU, COR

\* 3+3 program

\* Referral sources, know who’s referring students and why.

3. **Culture**

Participants’ themes included:

\* Trust

\* Be informed but not captured by where the UMC is going as a denomination.

\* Create community on both sites (KS & OKC)

\* Energy

\* Stability

\* Institutional Infrastructure

\* Understand what the growing seminaries are doing.

\* Bridges

Key Reminders:

\* There is a huge overlap in these categories. All of these are integrated. We cannot make a decision about one of these areas without impacting the others.

\* Invitation/Engage, Relationship, Trust/Feast/Community (consistent with Lee’s devotion on Monday morning.)

\* Narrative, operations, assessment must undergird innovation, relationships, and trust.

\* Building trust: identify values, norms for behavior, and consistent practices

\* Invitation: Invite people to be part of innovation

The board decided on the following next steps.

(1) Create an Innovative Task Force of 6 people or fewer.

 \* Suggest Board, faculty, administration, outside voice, someone from the church, OKC voice

 \* Do not burden this group with what needs to be done in any detail.

 \* This group has freedom to innovate as long as no SUBSTANTIVE Changes that would require accreditation agency or UMC approval (fits within the 4 degree programs).

 \* This group is free to implement without approval from Board and faculty standard processes.

(2) Review and revise the Presidential Narrative (Edit what’s been shared from Neil, no need to start from scratch.)

(3) Seek new ways of building relationships.

(4) Work toward building more trust within the organization.

(5) Perfect operations.

A motion was then offered by Susan Lindahl.

Motion : **The Executive Team of Saint Paul is designated and authorized for an innovative task force to address program innovation for Saint Paul that will report progress to the Board. Someone from the outside the board and institution must be included with no more than 6 people who are appointed by the Executive Team.**

The motion was seconded by Dustin Petz and modified by a friendly amendment from Andy Bryan (seconded by Lee Myane).

The final motion read: **The Executive Team of Saint Paul is designated and authorized for an innovative task force to address program innovation for Saint Paul that will report progress to the Board. Someone from the outside the board and institution must be included with no more than 6 people who are appointed by the Executive Team. The task force is approved to create or adapt any educational program so long as the innovation does not require a Substantive Change, as defined by HLC and ATS. This means it does not need to seek approval from any faculty or board committee or process. Such approval is implied in this Board action.**

The motion carried unanimously.

The meeting was adjourned at 10:50 AM.

Respectfully submitted,

Lia McIntosh

Board Secretary