Strategic Planning Council
Thursday, May 10, 2012
Babylon Student Center – Eaton's Neck Room – 3:45 p.m.

Minutes

In attendance:

Dr. Maria Alzugaray	Robin Hill	Dr. Lanette Raymond
James Amoroso	Dr. James Keane	Gary Ris
Mary Lou Araneo	Dr. Dorothy Laffin	Raymond Roses
Dr. Louis Attinasi	James Lagonegro	Dr. James Sherwood
James Banks	Nina Leonhardt	Dr. Christopher Shults
Dr. Caroline Burns	Elisa Mancuso	Dr. Evon Walters
Dr. Philip Christensen	Dr. Carla Mazzarelli	Dr. Helen Wittmann
Christopher Conzen	Mary Ann Miller	Dr. Catherine Wynne
Dr. Amy Czura	Dr. June Ohrnberger	
George Gatta	Dr. Nathaniel Pugh	

The meeting convened at 3:45 p.m.

Dr. Pugh greeted the members and stated that this is a very unique meeting because it was one year ago that Dr. McKay requested that the members of the Strategic Planning Council initiate a review of the mission and vision statements. He thanked the members for staying the course and providing their insights. The results of the efforts by the members of the SPC are shown in the documents we have created.

EVP Gatta stated that it has been a challenging but productive year and thanked the members of the SPC for their work during each of the phases of the plan's development. Our goal over the next few months is to further refine the draft of the measurable institutional objectives so that we are in a position to be able to share them with the rest of the college community at the beginning of the fall semester. Since this is a very busy time of year for faculty, he suggested that we move right into the presentations by the working groups.

Dr. Pugh asked if there were any corrections to the Minutes of the April 12, 2012 SPC meeting. A motion was made by Dr. Czura to accept the Minutes and seconded by Dr. Sherwood. All members voted in favor of accepting the Minutes.

Dr. Pugh indicated that volunteers took on the task to look at the by-statements and convert them into measurable institutional objectives using as a guide the S.M.A.R.T. model. Spokespersons were identified within their respective working group to undertake the task of developing measurable institutional objectives.

Robin Hill presented the draft measurable institutional objectives developed by the working group for Institutional Goal 1 (Student Success).

- Dr. Czura asked for clarification of the term, "its members" (objective 1.2).

- EVP Gatta asked if we are increasing student support services by 5% each year (objective 1.2). Dr. Wynne indicated that if satisfaction has actually increased, then we know that we are serving the population.

- Dr. Sherwood stated that objective 1.2 should be two by statements: student activities and student services; there needs to be a distinction and stated that he does not know if 5% per year is doable.

- Professor Miller asked where we are starting from – what is the baseline.

- Dr. Wynne indicated that the working group meetings are open meetings and stated that if anyone would like to join the working group, they should contact the group leader.

- Dr. Czura stated that she thought the purpose of this meeting was to go through the institutional objectives and to make comments. Dr. Pugh responded that Dr. Czura is correct.

- Dr. Walters agreed that a baseline is needed.

- EVP Gatta stated that in objective 1, the goal of having curriculum maps for 60% of the programs is laudable, but is it possible to achieve within the first year? Perhaps a smaller number in the first year and something that is achievable in the subsequent years. Professor Hill stated that the committee has discussed this issue and they feel that if you go too low, it will not be taken seriously.

- Professor Mancuso asked how many programs actually have curriculum maps. Dr. Laffin stated that it has been part of the program review process. It is not as creative as it is organization. Dr. Laffin indicated that she would vote for 40-50%.

- Dr. Pugh stated that even though the institutional objectives are measurable, we all have to determine if they are appropriate and feasible.

- Dr. Sherwood added that these are nicely written, but we have to understand what they mean. What does "integrating into the fabric of the institution" mean?

- VP Araneo stated that what comes underneath this goal is really what is measurable.

Dean Leonhardt presented the draft measurable institutional objectives for Institutional Goal 2 (Community Development/Societal Improvement). Dean Leonhardt indicated that their working group met three times. At the first meeting, there was a discussion of what was meant by "community;" it was a good way to establish a foundation. At the second meeting, there were more members from the English and Humanities departments, which brought about more conversation about "community." The group was very pragmatic. At the third meeting, we met with Dr. Pugh who assured we were on the right track. Our group was given the latitude of coming up with eight institutional objectives, then we had ten, then nine and then seven. We tried to be realistic with our goals. We talked about where we would get the baseline data. Each time we selected an objective, we considered the baseline data.

Drs. Christensen and Raymond presented the measurable institutional objectives for Institutional Goal 3 (Access and Affordability). Dr. Christensen indicated that there were originally five by statements which they broke into eight institutional objectives. There should be close scrutiny and review of the placement process; more accurate placements for these students.

- Dr. Walters stated that the placement piece has a strong correlation with the financial barrier, but how does it relate to the social barrier? Dr. Christensen replied that the committee felt students often feel sham in that placement and it has an impact in their social role on the campus. If they are placed accurately, they are among the strongest in their cohort and feel as if the institution is placing them inaccurately from the start. Ten years ago, block placement was not successful.

Objective 3.2 relates to the by statement on admitting students to programs and services. The issue was to write an objective that would give us a guideline whether SCCC is providing those services. If there are academic and social barriers, if we can develop a rubric to demonstrate that we have programs and services in place, it will give us an indication if we are providing these services.

Objective 3.3/3.4, how do students get here: transportation and how they are able to get around campus once they are here. There are serious challenges that are being addressed by capital projects and ADA. Perhaps we could find ways in which students could carpool or have more convenient ways to travel between the campuses. While we have three campuses strategically placed, there are students at the eastern- and western-most campus that find it difficult to get to the other campuses. We are looking at relationships with other institutions; sections might be offered at their campus or their courses offered at SCCC.

Objective 3.5, there is evidence of projects that have been done to make the campuses ADA compliant. To try to help students move from one part of the campus to another as easily as possible.

Objective 3.6, we do whatever we can toward achieving the 1/3 ratio; maximize institutional efficiencies through early budget development and ways in which we might be able to advocate ancillary costs: child care, textbooks, etc. Our libraries have textbooks on loan to students. The college has a major gifts campaign for scholarships.

Objective 3.8, distance education; SCCC is one of the largest participants in SUNY in terms of distance education. We would like to see a more diverse program.

- Dean Ris added that there needs to have more online access to programs.

Dr. Helen Wittmann presented the measurable institutional objectives for Institutional Goal 4 (Institutional Effectiveness). There were no questions or comments relative to the two draft measurable institutional objectives.

VP Araneo presented the measurable institutional objectives for Institutional Goal 5 (Communication). VP Araneo stated that the group will look at the four institutional objectives with the focus on how we can develop these objectives with the activities underneath that are measurable. Creative policy development; what kind of coverage you are receiving. We have to refine the language and we will continue to work on that goal. Communication impacts us all.

Dean Banks presented the measurable institutional objectives for Institutional Goal 6 (Diversity). Dean Banks stated that this goal had no by- statements from which to work. The group examined how we would identify the objectives without the by statements. The group began to brainstorm the institutional objectives and examined populations.

- Dean Ris stated that these obviously cross goals (Access and Affordability and Diversity)

- VP Araneo stated that the actual institutional goals focus on persons of color; were there any conversations about the change in demographics on Long Island no only in color, but ages; high school population declining; adult learners, veterans.

- Dr. Shults responded that they kept trying to get back to ethnicity and economics.

- Professor Miller asked about the conversation about possibly changing the goal. Under Access and Affordability, item 2 relates to diversity, but can we expand the diversity?

- Dean Banks and Professor Miller stated that they hoped we would have that conversation about making the goal more inclusive.

- EVP Gatta indicated that planning is a dynamic process and that since the goal was added at the end of the process, he recommends that if the working group and the SPC have any recommendations for an expansion or modification of the goal, that it be forwarded to the President for review and subsequent conversation with the Board of Trustees.

- EVP Gatta asked Dr. Pugh if there is any reason why we can have only four institutional objectives for each goal. Dr. Pugh responded that based on best management practices, each measurable objective has an impact on time span and resources; four objectives for each institutional goal is what has been workable in the past.

- Professor Mancuso stated that she does not see collaboration with partnerships in the community. Dr. Pugh referred her to Goal 2.

The meeting adjourned at 5:10 p.m.