



**Strategic Planning Council  
Thursday, November 29, 2012  
Grant Campus – Captree Commons 114 – 3:45 p.m.  
Minutes**

In attendance:

Dr. Christopher Adams  
Mary Lou Araneo  
Dr. Louis Attinasi  
Joanne E. Braxton  
Dr. Caroline Burns  
Christopher Conzen  
D. Maria DeLongoria  
Joseph Gansrow

George Gatta  
Dr. James Keane  
James Lagonegro  
Elisa Mancuso  
Dr. Carla Mazzarelli  
Dr. Shaun McKay  
T. Nhotsoubanh  
Dr. June Ohrnberger

Dr. Nathaniel Pugh  
Gary Ris  
Raymond Roses  
Dr. James Sherwood  
Dr. Christopher Shults  
Dr. Evon Walters  
Dr. Catherine Wynne

Dr. Pugh welcomed the members and thanked them for their continued support of the institutional review that began a year ago.

The May 10, 2012 minutes were approved.

Dr. Pugh proposed a new schedule for the review of the 16 Measurable Institutional Objectives (MIOs) due to super storm Sandy:

- Governance and the college community will have it completed by Dec. 20, to the President by Dec. 28, and then to the Board in January 2013.
- Two of the Governance Councils have invited OPIE to make a presentation of the 16 MIOs at their meetings:
  1. Eastern Campus Congress on Tuesday, December 4, 2012 at 3:30 p.m.
  2. Ammerman Campus Senate on Wednesday, December 5, 2012 at 3:30 p.m.

Thanks were given to Dr. June Ohrnberger for her suggestion to review the 16 MIOs at the Grant Campus. Two forums are scheduled for the review on Wednesday, December 12<sup>th</sup> and Wednesday, December 19<sup>th</sup> during Common Hour (11:00-12:30 p.m.).

There has been some additional review of MIO 3.4 (Access and Affordability) by a group comprised of George Gatta, Dr. Mazzarelli, Gary Ris, Dr. Christensen & Dr. Pugh who convinced Dr. DeLongoria to take on the task of making the revisions. Another meeting to discuss 3.4 has been scheduled for Monday, December 03, 2012 to resolve some of the issues.

Dr. Pugh asked the Council if there were any concerns about the MIOs that should be addressed. EVP Gatta stated that following feedback from Governance and the college community that any final comments and/or recommendations get back to the SPC. VP Araneo stated that a College Brief will be issued after the SPC reviews MIO 3.4. Dr. Pugh spoke of the direction the College will take in regards to the Strategic Plan in order to take steps to move towards the future. The next phase of action is Operational Planning. This phase is to develop an action plan to meet the Measurable Institutional Objectives (MIOs). Dr. Pugh then showed a power point presentation entitled, "An Introduction to Operational Planning".

Presently, there are 15 thoroughly reviewed MIOs and one more to be revised (3.4) at a meeting on Monday, Dec. 3<sup>rd</sup>. Dr. Pugh pointed out that at the end of reaching the objectives, based on the action, it is not an outcome, but the results of what was done and may or may not meet what is in the objective. If the objectives are not met, we need to discover why that is.

**The Proposed Operational Plan Framework:** uses a template where each goal is taken with its set of objectives and identifies the lead person responsible (a member of the President's Councils, one or more of the VPs). The VP, working with each of the Campus Executive Deans, will put together teams for the accomplishment of a specific objective that is related to an institutional goal.

In regards to Institutional Goals, the operational planning framework has two parts: 1) An Action Plan and 2) Assessment or Evaluation Plan. A decision is required about what is to be done in each of the columns (Initiative, Lead Person, Support, Method, Target, Timeline, Value) and whether or not the MIO was accomplished.

Dr. Pugh stated that the SPC membership's role will be to monitor any reports in terms of the implemented operational plan and what the goal was to be accomplished as either expressed in the goal or expressed in the written MIO. In order to do this, a member of the President's Executive Council, as well as the three Campus Deans will be needed, to select as a trial run, one or more of the Institutional Goals (IG). What is not known is what the MIO implementation will mean to the Executive Council member at the Central level and to each of the Executive Deans if the same MIO is picked. Do they pick the same or similar action plans? This detail will need to be worked out in a negotiation. Central level should have the oversight of the implemented action. The campuses are crucial to the implementation of the action plan.

Accurate data will be required - either historical institutional data or data collected given how an MIO is written. Evidence will have to be collected in terms of what was done, how well it was done, and evaluated. Mistakes will be made in the implementation process. There will be plenty of opportunity to learn; to look back and see what went wrong or right and whether or not it should be repeated.

Dr. Sherwood asked the question that if each campus was to take a slightly different approach and/or have slightly different results, whether they be successful or not, how do we know if the institution is meeting its goals? Dr. Pugh replied that the institution cannot meet

its goals unless you are able to meet yours; if unsuccessful, it's an opportunity to find out what went wrong and take future steps to make adjustments.

EVP Gatta stated that the action plan items may vary slightly, based on the campus and the needs of the campus, but these actions must support the MIOs without violating the goals.

Dean Braxton's thoughts at first were why we are doing three different things since they help to measure which one is successful. It was discussed that three different activities could be implemented in terms of trying to reach a goal and then what we can do is compare and see which activity was more successful. For example, at Ammerman, we accomplished 30% of a particular goal, but another activity that took place at East, there was 60%. So we can say that this functional activity is less or more successful at helping us reach the goal as opposed to another activity. Then we could analyze why the difference.

Dr. Sherwood commented that if we do three different activities and Ammerman reaches 30% and East 60%, that doesn't mean it's something we should emulate at Ammerman. How do we get to the point where this has application for SCCC? Dr. Pugh stated that assessment is continuous improvement; borrowing from either your experience or the experience of others is how to enhance what we are trying to accomplish. This is an opportunity to be creative, sharing with each other across the campuses what works and what doesn't.

Q. Dean Braxton on Dr. Sherwood's comment: How do we look at it from an institutional perspective?

Dr. Pugh stated that at this level, having the institutional goals and MIOs, and with the review team with its collective wisdom, we can make sure that the goal will not be violated. Institutionally, the means in which we get to the target may be different, but in the end, the campus and the institution can collectively support a single activity and accomplish a specific goal.

The President suggested having a quarterly review report and move at the half way point for the review team instead of waiting to the end of the semester or academic year.

Dr. Pugh stated that the OPIE staff has been informed about how key performance indicators (KPIs) can support MIOs.

Dr. Shults suggested that the SPC in its review process, a year-end report could become part of an implementation process whereby information can be provided at the half-way point based on a thorough review of a measurable institutional objective.

Q. Dr. Mazzarelli: Do you envision the action plan to be one year in length so that it should be something that is an annual operational plan? Should the action plan be broken down in one year chunks?

A. Dr. Pugh: The action plan is carried out annually, but that does not mean that you cannot repeat an action plan for another year.

Dr. Mazzealli commented looking at the measurement – “so if I say that I want to accomplish something within a year’s timeframe, and I am going to measure whether I have accomplished that or not, I would take my action plan and it might be done in part or in whole, but what I would be reporting to this group would be what I have accomplished that year. That is how I am writing/developing action plans.”

The President shared with the Council that the BOT has asked us to report our assessment measures quarterly; that having a quarterly review will enable us to share results along the way.

Dr. Pugh discussed the matter of establishing a time line once the objectives have been approved by the Board. Dr. Ohrnberger questioned how it is to be broken down each year. Dr. Pugh explained that the objective, as written, is a five-year objective. The operational plan is 1/5 of each of those five years and that at any given time some aspect of the objective may be repeated.

Dr. Pugh shared with the Council that by the next SPC meeting (2/28/13) he hopes to have met with colleagues on all three campuses to put together proposed assignments of staff to objectives.

Dr. Mazzealli stated that everyone will have an opportunity to contribute to each objective for implementation even though there will be somebody who is assigned to that goal or objective. Dr. Pugh stated that through various means of media, everyone will be informed, be asked to participate, and to make contributions. All reporting/action plans should be reported and published.

The President brought up the issue of the budget and commented on the cost effectiveness involved.

The President stated that he was pleased to see the level of drive and hard work the Strategic Planning Council has shown. “It is going to transform this institution like we have never seen before. It will drive the institution through the next five years. Our colleagues and the students are the benefactors.”

The meeting adjourned at 4:55 p.m.