



**Strategic Planning Council
Minutes
Thursday, April 3, 2014
Grant Campus
Captree Commons – Room 114
3:45 p.m. – 4:40 p.m.**

In attendance:

Dr. Christopher Adams
Dr. Mary Lou Araneo
Joanne E. Braxton
Felipe A. Espitia Cetina
Dr. Philip Christensen
Frances Dearing
Audrey DeLong
Dr. Marc Fellenz
Dr. Alexander Kasiukov
Dr. James Keane
Ted Koukounas
Dr. Dorothy Laffin

John Lombardo
Elisa Mancuso
Dr. Carla Mazzarelli
Toni-Anne Nhotsoubanh
Dr. June Ohrnberger
Dr. Jeffrey Pedersen
Gary Ris
Raymond Roses
Dr. Christopher Shults
Paul Turano
George Tvelia
Dr. Helen C. Wittmann
Dr. Catherine Wynne

Theodore Koukounas:

- Provided corrections needed regarding the error in the spelling of his name in the January 6, 2014 Strategic Planning Minutes.
- Accept Minutes from February 6th, 2015
- Adjusted order of the agenda for those who have to leave early by moving up the discussion on the Operational Plan process and feedback
- Stated the need for additional subcommittee members to participate

Frances Dearing:

- Spoke of the need to revise the Strategic Planning Council Charge. All members agreed on changes to the Charge that will work for the better.
- Indicated Theodore Koukounas and she developed a process involving the Strategic Planning Council (SPC) members looking at the Operational Plan, structure process, and feedback to be the best way to do this. She stated that the council really wanted to be more involved in College activities and projects.

- Suggested ideas of structuring subcommittees for the Institutional Goals (IGs), recalling Theodore Koukounas' suggestion of starting with smaller committee sizes.
Subcommittees were identified as follows:
 - IG-1 - chaired by Dr. Mark Fellenz
 - IG-5 - co-chaired by Nina Leonhardt who was not able to attend this meeting
 - IG-6 - chaired by Maria Alzugary who was not able to attend this meeting
 - IG-1 - Liaison, Dr. Lanette Raymond from the Office of Institutional Effectiveness
 - IG-5 - Liaison, Dr. Catherine Wynne
 - IG-6 - Liaison, Kathy Massimo
- Discussed getting ideas to share with subcommittees looking at various institutions
- Most Chairs already met twice with their subcommittees and began developing questions for the survey
- Pointed out to refer to folder for actual IG groups
- Established a time table in folder provided showing subcommittees to establish questions regarding the Operational Plan structure and process. The IG subcommittees for IGs 2, 3, and 4 will reach out with their subcommittees to look at the questions in order to come up with instrument(s) hoping to have key people responsible for the IGs. There will be some open-ended questions. Not only the executives will be responsible but all will be reaching down into the Operational Plan to interview those who have subparts of the IGs as well. To reduce redundancy, before we book interviews with administrators, staff, and faculty, we will exchange information. For example, it will be only necessary to interview Dr. Mazzarelli once and be as broad based as possible in reaching out to those involved with plan in spirit of feedback only.
- Stated there will be three areas in Charts that the exercise will cover
 - First area reviews plans and the process made in effecting them, providing input in various points of the planning process and proposes any changes in the process of planning. The goal is to have interviews and collect the data by early May; an aggressive time table. When faculty return in the Fall, the SPC committee members will recommence and a report will then be written with an executive summary. Possible recommendations will be taken into consideration. These recommendations will be shared with Dr. Shults, who is currently working on an important key to the Operational Planning process. Any feedback, questions and comments that occur will be shared to incorporate them into Dr. Shults' plans.
- Maria DeLongoria summarized all the questions that the subcommittees came up with and divided them into structured categories.

Theodore Koukounas:

- Stated the process has been extremely collaborative between him, Frances Dearing, chairs, co-chairs and subcommittees. The most critical part is trying to come to one set of questions that covers every IG. Ideally, we will have one complete questionnaire that will go out to different folks of the campus.

Frances Dearing:

- Indicated the summary is on the last page of the packets received at the meeting.
- Meeting is turned over to the subcommittee members starting with Marc Fellenz, the chair of IG-1.

Mark Fellenz:

- Revealed that the most important aspect of the meeting with Frances Dearing, Theodore Koukounas and chairs was to get a clear sense of exactly what their work was. As Frances Dearing said, we are not in the position to do any assessment and we are not experts to overlook the content that are in all the lines of the action plan. The SPC was trying to get a sense of the experience the folks had with the process. IG-1 was the first to meet with a lot of input from all members. They developed the first draft of the questions that are distributed in the CAPIE. Questions about how well you were informed about your thought of what you were supposed to be doing, putting together your action plan and understanding what's involved in putting information about the columns in the template that is to be filled in, including all kinds of experiential things. They are close to reaching census across the groups about what the core questions are going to be. The next challenge for his subcommittee will be narrowing down the lead of administrators that will be reaching out to IG-1 and is broad enough that implicates everyone from the President down to the custodial staff to be sure they are casting all at the appropriate levels and getting a relevant amount of feedback. Qualitative information are questions designed to be interesting and useful; trying to revise the process of developing this going forward.

Frances Dearing:

- Thanked Mark
- Announced that Dr. Philip Christensen was filling in for Nina Leonhardt who was unable to attend the meeting.

Dr. Philip Christensen:

- Shared that their group convened on March 24 and turned their report over to him.
- Indicated they had a strong turnout of the following: Vice President Araneo, John Bullard, Nina Leonhardt, Dr. Catherine Wynne and himself.
- Reiterated what Mark Fellenz had said that they began with clarification of their Charge and they are not called to critique the plans themselves, but the process. Fortunately for them, IG-1 has done a terrific job of developing possible questions that Nina Leonhardt began sharing with her group. Was pleased of the IG1's decision to add another question related to the comfort level with developing the process so they too are going to add that as well. The questions are going to be used as they interview those working on the development of IG-5 and will fine-tune the questions as they get closer to that moment. Their next meeting is scheduled to talk about rubric and criteria. That meeting is scheduled for April 21, 2014 at 1:00pm.

Frances Dearing:

- Thanked Dr. Christensen
- Introduced Dr. Dee Laffin who filled-in for Maria DeLongoria for IG-6.

Dr. Dee Laffin:

- Stated that the group met on March 13, 2014 with colleagues, June Ohrnberger, Helen Wittmann, Maria DeLongoria and herself.

- Explained that the group looked at the rubric and had the same experience thinking it was very suitable. They understand the process by looking at the questions and plan. The group had a few concerns making sure that there was good communication and any reports about the process should be made as public as possible to increase the number of folks who are to contribute. They spoke about inclusion and expansion; more participants that would like to be involved. Questioned if the folks that would like to join them are being recruited (should they recruit them)? They also looked at the entire annual process.
- Indicated their meetings were held electronically and by phone.
- Commented their IG is about Diversity which touches every single person in the College. For those who have any interest, please send them their names.

Frances Dearing:

- Thanked Dr. Dee Laffin
- Stated they need people for IG2 (Community Development), IG3 (Access and Affordability), and IG-4 (Institutional Effectiveness). We have some names for each committee but we would like a few more people. Theodore Koukounas will circulate the sign-up sheet and asking if those who are not on a subcommittee yet to please participate.
- Asked if there were any questions or comments on the process. Thanked all who directly and indirectly participated; Administrators, Nina Leonhardt connected with Vice President Araneo, Dr. Fellenz worked with Vice President Mazzarelli, and Dr. Maria DeLongoria reached-out to Alicia O'Connor and Christina Vargas early in the process, which helped pave the way before they met with their subcommittees.
- Expressed her appreciation for all their hard work.
- Mentioned her appreciation to the OPIE Office colleagues; Dr. Wynne, Dr. Raymond and Kathy Massimo in their time and efforts, who met several times before the subcommittees actually convened. They have been a tremendous resource.

Theodore Koukounas:

- Stated the subcommittees have been a great foundation in the process and have each made good recommendations that are shaping the nature of the project.

Frances Dearing:

- Thanked all for their participation because they wanted to be included in the process and wanted a Strategic Plan and Council that matches their Charge.

Theodore Koukounas:

- Dr. Pedersen has been a great leader for the IG groups and has been helpful in all aspects of the survey project.

Dr. Pedersen:

- Indicated the Operational Planning piece moved very quickly at the end of last Summer into the Fall. Looking at the work they have now is extremely important. We are into the first stages of development of a new robust Operational Planning procedure. It will be very important not only for the College and what we do with our limited resources. We

need to prioritize how we spend money, how we use our resources, how we use our people to best serve our students. In terms of Middle States, the main focus is how we use info, data, evaluation and assessment to inform the practices of planning and resource allocation. As we develop and look at the Operational Plan, there are questions about understanding the process at the Central level and understanding the process as it works at the local Campus level and how those two levels meet. Has asked people in leadership to look at that and at the Operational Plan and see how those decisions are made and how to use assessment outcomes and data to inform our decisions in resource allocation, budgeting, and in planning at both levels

- Referring to Middle States, we have been in contact with the follow-up groups of the small team. We have our Vice President of Middle States, Debra Kleinman, who was here in October and has been here before, and Deborah Mental from SUNY. The dialogue of the small team has been a little bit concerning and the reason for that is at times it feels as though they keep moving the gold post on us a bit when those of us had read the exit report back in October. The team told us, regarding assessment, to assess, assess and assess and show us what you do and indicate what impact it has. We did that and more. Anyone that has viewed it was very impressed. Deborah Mental was very impressed with the document of over 1,000 pages of evidence we put forward and stated that SCCC has done so much more than many in the SUNY System. The new team from Middle States has focused more on our program review, unit review, and integrated planning, especially budgeting and resource allocation. The big question is how to use the results they have in program review, unit review, and assessment when you make decisions in budgeting, resource allocation and planning. We are now gathering evidence of those things you will see that all that has been clearly delineated in the CAPIE. The problem is that we are at various stages of implementing pieces of that. A lot of the assessment that was done in the AES Unit is new and is in the early development of the Mission Statements and outcomes and have already performed assessments and developed action plans. An enormous amount of accomplishments were made in the last six months at the College. The problem is they are often looking for closing the loop activity. Closing the loop means that you have completed your assessment, made some judgments, perhaps making changes or implemented something in an action plan and then go back and see that it had any effect. We need time to be able to go back and assess if any difference has been made. The schedule of the Middle States visit has been made by Middle States. Invitations have been sent and they have indicated to whom they would like to speak with for each session. We are making sure we have a broad selection of those who will speak about their experiences. That could be from assessment, program review, budget resource allocation, etc. Some will be asked to come more than once. Executive Council, where the Campus Deans and Executive Deans sit, will meet with Middle States and there will also be a separate meeting with Executive Deans. Assessment Advisory Council and Strategic Planning Council together, known as JPAC, have chosen people from there. We try to get faculty, staff, governance representatives and all who are involved in the process. We are trying to get information from Dr. Kleinman, who is the leader of the group, as to exactly what she wants for the group sessions. For example, what part of JPAC does she want to talk about. This is to be able to have the right people that can answer their specific questions in that area. Middle

States dictates the schedule which may be inconvenient for those who may be in class. We will try to accommodate as many people as possible. We are also, between now and April 24th, conducting some briefing sessions. For example, some will meet with Dr. Mazzarelli and Jennifer Browne about program review where they can discuss particular questions Middle States may be asking.

- Mentioned Academic Assessment web page and Vice President Mary Lou Araneo's videos showing the process of what people are doing to evaluate during assessment.
- Thinks that we are in a good "spot" with what we have been presenting to Middle States. Believes that Middle States will take us off warning and that they will be stern in informing us to continue showing what closing the loop activities are. Generally when you come off warning, there is a progress report that was provided a year earlier and when taken off warning, they request that report. The work that has been done across the College has been extraordinary and feels we will be taken off of warning.

Dr. Dee Laffin:

- Thanked Dr. Jeffery Pedersen

Frances Dearing:

- Thanked Dr. Dee Laffin, Dr. Jeff Pedersen, Dr. Christopher Shults, Dr. Phil Christensen, Dr. Helen Wittmann and all that played a role to this point.

Dr. Christensen:

- Wants to meet the expectations of the team and will put together a schedule to meet those expectations. All meetings are scheduled for April 24th from 7:30am to 5:00pm. By the time they are finished, Middle States will have heard a great deal, will be very tired and will return to the hotel to put the report together. Dr. Pedersen and team have done a great job putting together the areas Middle States wants to see and which people need to be there for those meetings. All the sessions will occur in the NFL Building. On Friday the 25th, they will present their exit report to the College Community and at this time it will be simulcast to all Campuses. The team will not give us their recommendation at that time but you can tell then from how they frame the report and what areas they discuss. The report will go back to a Middle States subcommittee which will meet approximately May 29th and then in June the whole commission will make their decision.

Theodore Koukounas:

- Asked how Middle States will communicate their decision. Dr. Christensen explained that Middle States will communicate their decision in a letter to President McKay. The letter then is placed on their website after the President receives the letter.

Frances Dearing:

- Thanked Dr. Christensen
- Introduced Mary Lou Araneo

Dr. Mary Lou Araneo:

- Thanked Paul Matus

- Explained the Middle States comment to Dr. Pedersen’s question, “What is your plan for training the community?” Dr. Araneo suggested a video as a good solution you can point them to the video. This might be a timely response to someone’s inquiry.
- Said they had a wonderful JPAC meeting and it was a terrific gathering where many colleagues gave presentations and the combination between the presentations and the Middle States questions show how the video idea came together. Bearing in mind the presentations we made, Vice President Pedersen, Dr. Helen Wittmann, Dr. Troy Tucker, Dr. Dee Laffin, Dr. Christopher Shults and Gail Vizzini were asked to recreate their presentations as part of the video project. The original memo stated they wanted to create three to five minute videos which turned into a really good five to six minute videos. They have a distinct order that begins with Dr. Pedersen, who gives an overview of Institutional Effectiveness and the difference between assessment and evaluation. Followed by the joint video of Helen Wittmann and Troy Tucker where they talk about the AES Units. Dr. Tucker, in a separate video, discusses the AES Unit Review of the Office of Grants Development and gives specific examples of what is involved in Unit Reviews. Dr. Dee Laffin’s presentation is on Academic Program Review, walking you through the website. Included are two videos with Dr. Shults talking about the CAPIE and the last video is on Operational Planning. The videos will be available for viewing soon and will also be shown publicly.

Gary Ris:

- Spoke about a YouTube option for the public.

Dr. Mary Lou Araneo:

- Wants the videos to be somewhat completed for the Middle States visit.

Dr. Pedersen:

- Thanked Dr. Araneo and all for putting the videos together.

Frances Dearing:

- Introduced Dr. Christopher Shults who spoke about the AES website.

Dr. Christopher Shults:

- Introduced the AES website
- Showed the Institutional Effectiveness website pointing out the AES Unit Assessment and the Assessment Advisory Council, focusing on the AES Unit Assessment.
 - Indicated that the CAPIE explains what an A and E is so you can understand what AES is all about.
 - Identified 3 different areas which are: administrative support that is the back-bone operation, facilities, and educational support areas such as the registrar and the library
 - Community outreach - Some of it is Institutional Advancement, some is in special events and some in workforce government as well
- Stated the CAPIE differentiates the three administrative support areas and by looking at all three separately, we acquire aspects of our missions.

- Pointed out the Web explaining the following:
 - AES tools and templates; specifically the annual assessment template
 - New CAPIE showing a full glossary instead of acronyms
 - Guidelines for the academic program review process
 - Unit review template, external review guidelines
 - Templates for follow-up plans for the reviewer. We will have 6 or 8 AES areas that are involved with the action plans and putting them in place.
 - Regarding the PDFs; the table of contents is hyperlinked which will take you to the area you wish to view.
 - By clicking on the word narrative under the appendix, it will return to where you were reading. This is a fully functional connected document.
 - Documents for creating a report for the action plan worked on, asks questions such as, “What did you do with it and what did you find?” This document can be attached to the original appendix and now there will be a record of having to close the loop. In this area, goals and outcomes, we will also have identified AES Unit’s missions, goals and outcomes which are constantly being updated.
 - Grants Development

- Explained after each of the five unit reviews are completed and sent to him (Dr. Shults), he takes them through the Adobe process coming up with a formalized clean professional look for each document. Of course these will all be provided to the Middle States’ reviewers. Ideally, and we are pretty sure it can happen by April 22nd, we should have all five completed external reviewer comments included and action plans listed so that the reviewers will be able to see that we have the five unit reviews that Middle States asked for.
- Applauded those working on the unit reviews for the tremendous amount of work they put into the process in the short amount of time.

Dr. Jeffrey Pedersen:

- Suggested to take a look at the Registrar Unit Review that he finds very impressive. Encourages everyone to view at least one of the unit reviews and spend some time looking at the extraordinary work put into them.

Dr. Christopher Shults:

- Pointed out that Unit Reviews are all good but suggested to particularly look at the Registrar or Grants Development to view the type of model you’re working from for next year. Career Services, having collaboration across all three units, also have another dynamic. What comes out of both of these is how many things the Campuses are doing differently and the plans to get some systems aligned where possible. These all have been very beneficial for the College and the report will be very useful. Feel free to access the AAC website where the Charge, membership and the 6 subcommittees will be working on for each of these areas for the next few weeks. You will be able to see the minutes and rubrics for each of the subcommittees as well. There are also minutes going back three years for the AAC. A few “bugs” in the site will be worked out and will be in good shape for the reviewers.

Frances Dearing:

- Thanked Dr. Christopher Shults

Theodore Koukounas:

- Thanked Dr. Shults
- Asked Dr. Shults if there is a process by which we can comment on in the website. Dr. Shults informed Ted that there is a place for comments on the bottom of each page.

Dr. Christopher Shults:

- Stated that he is absolutely, continuously looking for suggestions of improvement since this is a “first-go”.
- Indicated to Gary Ris that he could not have succeeded in getting the website “up there” without the help from Paul Matus. The amount of work that goes on behind the scenes with putting everything together is tremendous. When published, it doesn’t look anything like what you originally thought. Paul Matus has been a “God-send”.

Frances Dearing:

- Thanked everyone and asked if there was any new business.
- Announced the JPAC meeting May date was to be determined. There will be additional updates at the next JPAC meeting with our subcommittee chairs. We look forward to seeing you then.
- Thanked all for their service, time and energy this year. Commented all had been wonderful.
- Gave thanks to Theodore Koukounas and Dale Catalano

Dr. Christopher Adams:

- Stated, as the Student Affairs Associate Vice President, brought special attention to the students who received awards at the PTK luncheon. He mentioned the Chancellors Award was a big deal; best of the best of SUNY. Brought special attention to SCCC student Felipe Espitia Cetina. He introduced Felipe Espitia Cetina as the PTK and Chancellors Award winner. Congratulated him for his hard work.
- Spoke of the student retreat at Shelter Island
- Pointed out that Suffolk County Community College has students that are actively engaged on all three campuses now; so much so that now we have five candidates for the Student Trustee position because of the good work Felipe Espitia Cetina and his colleagues have done this year.
- Thanked Felipe Espitia Cetina for his hard work as well.

Meeting adjourned on April third, 2014 at 4:40 pm.