****

**YCCC Strategic Planning 2015-2016**

**Meeting Notes, February 9, 2016 (DRAFT)**

**Strategic Planning Members (**[x] **: indicates attendance)**

[x]  Nicholas Gill (Chair)

[x]  Maria Niswonger

[x]  Tami Gower

[ ]  Dana Petersen

[x]  Brittany Heaward

[x]  Audrey Gup-Matthews

[ ]  Angela Nadeau

[x]  Jason Goldstein (non-voting member, note-taker)

[ ]  Student representative (not appointed)

Community members in attendance: None

Meeting recorder: Jason S. Goldstein

**1. Call to order and roll call**

Nicholas: called meeting to order at 2:36 PM

**2. Correction of Angela’s notes from previous meeting**

Discussion– motion to change ‘notes’ back to ‘minutes’ (approved unanimously by Committee).

**3. Updates**

Audrey – research into USDA, FEMA, and Homeland Security grants; next goal is to look into funds for an emergency shelter.

Discussion – the logistics and challenges of building an emergency shelter are varied.

Tami – conducting future surveys needs to be done to capture the highest number of individuals

Discussion - Make sure to include campus surveys related to Strategic Planning so that input is gained from all.

**4. Old business**

None to report (but see updates).

**5. New Business**

**5.1 Review “Connecting MCCS Strategic Goals with YCCC Strategic Goals” data packet**

*Discussion succeeded (overall data, focusing on first few graphs), the committee noted:*

* + - A focus on ‘MCCS Institutional Student Success Rates: Fall 2012 Entry Cohort’ shows disparity and variation among all the schools and a look at YCCC in relation to the others.
		- Possible to compare to the national average?
		- How to quantify ‘success’ for non-matriculated students?
		- Data represents ‘brand new’ students as the cohort base.
		- Fall 2011 is a special case since YCCC offered a program called ‘Free College’ which might skew the data
		- Model can be used to follow other cohorts and follow retention and graduation rates among other metrics
		- Model does not currently capture vocational data and this would be an advantageous parameter to include in future anayses
		- How can these data be made to eventually be used to inform strategic planning for specific area?

*Discussion succeeded (with respect to AMR Data, 2014), the committee noted:*

* + - The sample size is 250
		- Actual data and preferred methodology indicate that students are not that interested in going onto a 4-year school
		- The online component is significant and should be looked at closely
		- Interesting to see that the preferences for semester length exceeds 8 weeks
		- Data should be used to make the appropriate adjustments especially since data that is accumulated becomes
		- For example, how will faculty react to moving courses into evening slots?
		- Great care should be taken in how some of this data is implemented and which options are the most reasonable and prudent, as well as the needs of both students and faculty; weekends however are very favorable to the dental industry because they have Fridays and Saturdays off
		- It is also important consider how much it costs to educate students at YCCC – a standard cost allocation analysis would have to be calculated to determine this
		- Data-driven scheduling and review of that data subsequent to this (i.e., gap analysis) – a pivotal tool in helping drive this process
		- Increase collaboration between student entities to make sure that all voices are heard and how this impacts students, faculty, and others
		- New tools (e.g., software) to help faculty and others be creative and efficient at collating classes, room schedules, etc.

*Proposed Actions:*

* + - Begin to share these data with other institutions
		- Perhaps explore more transfer advising as a vehicle to capture more data for this model
		- Begin to think about which pieces of data are going to be most beneficial
		- What are some themes that we want to concentrate on? For example scheduling? (An action item for example)? How could that data be coupled with what we are currently offering?

**5.2 Review of Master Planning Survey (2014 data)**

*Discussion succeeded, the committee noted:*

* + - Permit appears to be tangible for YCCC campus
		- Funds for programmatic content for Sanford seem to also be in place
		- Survey data included 180 individuals (see survey for breakdown)
		- A variety of student-led infrastructure wants (esp. classrooms, technology support, and space for fitness and health)
		- Important to consider renovations to the existing building once the new building becomes operational
		- Should there be technology fees (or a reassessment to existing fee structure) to aid in future institutional improvements?
		- Should a differentiated fee structure be something to consider?
		- Advertising course requirement needs to be emphasized and clarified as well; communication formatting of the existing course catalogue to ensure students (esp. new ones) are comfortable and confident

*Proposed Action:*

* Obtain a quote for how much scheduling software might cost

**5.3 Examine and educate the community on what ‘Strategic planning’ is?**

*Discussion succeeded, the committee noted:*

* Seems to be very favorable and popular with the community

*Proposed Action:*

* Reach out to folks to coordinate a time to offer an open forum (lunch-time, in general seems to be a good choice, particularly mid-week)

**6. Announcements**

* None.

**7.** **Public Comment** – None

**8.** **Adjournment**

* + Meeting adjourned by Nicholas Gill at 4:02 PM