

STRATEGIC PLANNING COUNCIL

Thursday, September 12, 2019

Ammerman Campus William J. Lindsay Life Sciences Building, Room 114

MINUTES

In attendance:

Nina Acquavita	Dr. Alexander Kasiukov	Dr. Jeffrey Pedersen
Dr. Christopher Adams	Dr. James Keane	Dr. Irene Rios
MaryLou Araneo	Myung-Chul Kim	Raymond Roses
Dr. Paul Beaudin	Theodore Koukounas	David Schneider
Lisa Calla	Thomas Law	Carol Wickliffe-Campbell
Thomas Flesher	P. Wesley Lundburg	Dr. Helen Wittmann
Michael Forte	Dr. Patty Munsch-Eilbeck	Amy Mueller-Seal for
Kaliah Greene	Isaac Oddoye	John Lombardo
Dr. Janet Haff	Dr. Matthew Okerblom	

Professor Theodore Koukounas began the meeting at 3:51pm.

- Welcomed the membership to the first meeting of the new academic year.
- Welcomed Nina Acquavita to her first meeting as a new member of the SPC.
- A review of the minutes from the April 11, 2019 meeting was held. There being no corrections suggested, a motion was made to approve them. A vote was taken and the minutes were accepted as written.
- Membership will be looking at the work done for the new Strategic Plan.
- There have been 547 participants in focus groups, SWOTs and discussion participation, not including Professional Development Day. Combined with the 138 participants of online surveys, there were a total of 685 participants. All transcripts are available online.
 - Professional Development Day SWOT generated over 2,400 comments by over 400 participants.
 - o 300 students, 114 faculty members, 24 staff members, 32 administrators and several community partners participated in focus groups
 - 138 participants in online surveys included online students, advisory board members, community partners, a few K-12 superintendents

Suffolk County Community College promotes intellectual discovery, physical development, social and ethical awareness, and economic opportunities for all through education that transforms lives, builds communities and improves society.

Executive Director Kaliah Greene gave an update on the Strategic Planning process:

- 79 focus groups were held: 36 students, 3 staff, 21 faculty, 8 administrators and 11 community partners
- 303 students, 114 faculty members, 24 staff members, 32 administrators and 74 community partners participated in focus groups
- 138 participants in online surveys
- Kept track of number of participants and focus groups on a spreadsheet. Information on the spreadsheet included the date of the focus group, cohort of focus group (student, faculty, etc.), number of participants based off of the consent forms, name of facilitator and person who transcribed the recordings.
- 16 facilitators from different departments on all three campuses
- 4 transcribers including Executive Director Greene, Dr. Caroline Burns and OPIE office staff, Ms. Lauren Zunno and Ms. Kathleen Italiano
- Gave outline of the Strategic Planning process to date:
 - Started the process in January 2018; the SPC and other groups assisted in drafting the architecture
 - o Board of Trustees reviewed and approved the architecture in May 2018
 - Stakeholder engagement began in Summer 2018, reached out to see what parts of the Suffolk Community would be interested in participating
 - o Focus groups began in Fall 2018
 - Updates given to SPC, AAC and JPAC in Fall 2018 and Spring 2019 and implemented suggestions
 - Conducted a SWOT analysis at Spring 2019 Professional Development Day; report was given to SPC, AAC and JPAC in Spring 2019
 - Focus groups were completed later than planned because there were groups that were left off the initial list; finally wrapped up in August 2019. Wanted to also include the unions so a focus group was conducted with AME union representatives
 - A Blackboard Community was set up for the SPC where all of the documents the subcommittees reviewed is located
 - Executive Director Greene has been reviewing every single focus group recording and transcript to ensure they are accurate and true to the tone of what the group was saying
 - Identifying information from focus groups transcripts was redacted, allowing group participants to speak freely and not compromise their trust in the confidentiality of the process
- It was asked if software was being used for coding and if that data was available to the
 membership. Atlas is the coding software that is being used but the data was not available.
 Once the coding is finished, the report will be completed and given to Dr. Pedersen for review
 and revision before going to the Cabinet. The report will be available by the end of
 September.
- It was asked how the Draft Strategic Plan Subcommittee Report on Mission, Goals, and Values was able to be created and disseminated to the SPC membership if the coding is not finished. Subcommittee members were given access to the transcripts and there was some back and forth communication that helped develop the document.

Dr. Jeffrey Pedersen facilitated a discussion about the Strategic Plan draft:

 He advised that actual people reading and coding the transcripts are able to get the meaning of the document with the coding software being used to validate the people's work. An example

- is the word "website" used throughout the focus groups. For our purposes we need to know if "website" is referring to marketing, the portal, etc.
- It was asked if these people were reviewing the data or coding it because those are two different things. It was thought that September was to be used to go through the coding and then use the software to help support the coding to develop themes.
- Executive Director Greene advised that the Strategic Plan Subcommittee Report on Mission, Goals, and Values presented today is just a draft.
- A few members thought the SPC was being asked to endorse the document as presented today. Professor Koukounas advised that the document is just a draft and the SPC is being asked to review it and provide feedback.
- It was asked to have the subcommittee's work released for the membership's review to see the logic behind how the goals and values were created. That request was denied citing confidentiality. It was argued that the process is supposed to be transparent to which that argument was countered with the documents are available for review on the webpage.
- It was asked if there was a meeting or if Dr. Pedersen developed these values and goals alone. There were emails, phone calls and in-person conversations between members of the subcommittee and Dr. Pedersen; there were no formal meetings.
- Executive Director Greene advised that she was always going to be the person doing the coding; the subcommittee was supposed to read through the focus groups transcripts and SWOTs.
- The importance of the Strategic Plan was stressed and the demand to see how the values and goals were derived was again brought up.
- Concerns were raised about creating a Strategic Plan for 2020-2027 while we are in the process of selecting the next President who will be responsible for the plan. It was once again mentioned that the creation and implementation of our next Strategic Plan should be pushed back until after the College has a new President in place so that person may contribute their thoughts and vision. Dr. Pedersen explained that the Strategic Plan is dated and ends in 2020. He also explained that the philosophy behind a strategic plan is that it is not about an individual but about what the College as a whole would like to see for the institution. The best thing is for us to present the new President with a Strategic Plan that tells them what we think and ask them to help us make it happen. Dr. Pedersen was advised by Interim President Louis Petrizzo that the SPC should continue with developing the 2020-2027 Plan because the Board of Trustees has already approved the Plan's architecture.
- It was argued that for the current Strategic Plan (2013-2020) there was more dialogue other than through focus groups that encouraged the transparency being discussed at today's meeting. Those who were around for that Strategic Plan creation were expecting more of a chance to participate in the creation of the goals which they will have to strive to achieve. It was reiterated that participation in goal development was done through the ability to serve on the subcommittee responsible for creating them.
- The topic of endorsing the document was again brought up. Dr. Pedersen advised that the SPC was being asked to endorse the document to move to the next step and have the next step completed before the next SPC meeting date of October 10th, so that the document can be presented to the Board for their November retreat.
- The next step is more development of the key performance indicators and creation of a mission and vision statement. These cannot be developed until we outline the goals and values.

Dr. Jeffrey Pedersen briefly reviewed the Strategic Plan draft:

- The Collegial/Collaborative approach has been chosen as the basis for document construction.
- SPC members were invited to volunteer for the various subcommittees formed for the Strategic Plan and all documents have been placed on the BlackBoard Community, which all SPC members have access to.
- Confidentiality is being enforced so that all committee members feel free to express their honest opinions and ideas.
- Validity and reliability is not a concern for the writing aspect of this project.
- To avoid bias, several peer reviewers have been appointed to assist the writing of the Plan. Those reviewers are Professor Koukounas, Executive Director Greene, and Assistant Dean Matthew Okerblom. The SPC as a whole will review the final document to determine if it adequately represents the material gathered for the Strategic Plan.
- There were several steps involved in crafting the document:
 - o Invite SPC members to join subcommittee
 - o Make materials available
 - Solicit input from subcommittee members via response form, email, face-to-face meetings and phone conversations. Some good information came from them
 - Craft piecemeal segments of the document to gather input on wording first on Values and Goals
 - o Build document over time sending multiple drafts to members for review
 - Move on to definitions of Goals via input gathered from the subcommittee, focus groups, surveys, etc., using historic definitions used by the College, and being attentive to language used by Middle States, AtD, VFA and SUNY
 - Create draft definitions
 - o Reach out to subcommittee members for review
 - Edit definitions based on input
- Objectives were crafted using recommendations of subcommittee members, objectives already in the current Strategic and Operational Planning, Middle States recommendations, materials gathered through focus groups and such, and activities already required by SUNY, Middle States, VFA, etc.
- Sample key performance indicators are included in the document. The KPI subcommittee would review the document for recommendations for inclusion in the Strategic Plan.
- Mission and Vision Statements from other community colleges were discussed. Our Values, Goals and Objectives will help inform our Mission and Vision Statements.

Some members expressed concern and their inability to endorse the draft document without first receiving an explanation of the logic behind how the goals were established. Since the membership is not allowed to see the subcommittee's work and the coding isn't finished yet for review, it was suggested that perhaps another meeting should be held to discuss this.

The subcommittee consisted of 13 people signing up with only about 10 actually participating and 4 of those people helping over the summer to cultivate the goals.

It was questioned as to why Dr. Pedersen is the only one who is able to see everything from the subcommittee and he's the one drafting the document. Dr. Pedersen advised that the SPC should only look at the draft and agree or not agree that it accurately reflects what was in all the documents on the BlackBoard Community page.

It was suggested that the transcripts coding should have been done before the draft was written. It was explained that the document is a starting place that will inform the process. The coding did not help with things like the SWOT analyses and it was found to not be too helpful with the focus groups either.

The process involved in creating the 2013-2020 Strategic Plan was discussed. For the 2020-2027 Strategic Plan, we wanted to be aggressive and conduct focus groups over many months of many different stakeholders through the College community. The Strategic Plan is still in the draft phase and feedback is still welcome. All ideas and suggestions should be emailed to Executive Director Greene.

The membership was advised that the intent of today's meeting was to endorse the draft Strategic Plan submitted so that it can move forward to the other subcommittees for their work on the document.

It was suggested that the council needs more time to review and discuss the document. A meeting in two weeks was suggested. It was pointed out that there is an Assessment Advisory Council meeting in two weeks and quite a few members from the SPC are also on the AAC. A quick discussion about potential meeting dates ensued with a motion to adjourn for two weeks to discuss the issues presented at today's meeting passing.

It was suggested that instead of a meeting, a Discussion Board could be established where everyone could see each other's comments and discuss accordingly. That could help with the transparency issues.

Another motion was made to create a Discussion Board and have commentary in that forum. That motion passed. A Discussion Board will be created in the SPC BlackBoard Community so everyone could discuss the issues presented at today's meeting. Professor Koukounas would be the facilitator of that Discussion Board.

With no further business to discuss, the meeting was adjourned at 5:26pm.