HUNTER COLLEGE
SENATE STRATEGIC PLANNING COMMITTEE
Meeting Minutes: March 2, 2011

Committee Members

Members Present: Philip Alcabes, Cristina Alfar, Judith Aponte, Eija Ayravainen, Sarah Bonner, Barbara Barone, Elizabeth Beaujour, Sandra Clarkson, Sherryl Graves, Robert Greenberg, Jacqueline Mondros, Andrew Polsky, Richard Stapleford, Bill Sweeney, Patricia Woodward, Len Zinnanti

Task Force Members Present: Robert Buckley (Resource Development), Case Willoughby (Student Success and Engagement)

Consultants: Anthony Knerr, John Braunstein (Anthony Knerr & Associates)

Proceedings

Meeting called to order at 10:45 a.m.

I.   Approval of Minutes of February 9, 2011 SSPC Meeting

Richard Stapleford moved to approve the meeting minutes of February 9 and 23, which were approved by unanimous consent.

II.   Review and Discussion with President Raab of *Draft Strategic Plan for Hunter College* revised by SSPC Subcommittee (Amended Draft of March 2, 2011)

The President praised the work of the Committee, reiterated that this process allows the members of the Committee to bring experience to bear on planning processes of their individual schools, and glossed key topics taken up by the draft SP.

(a) Research

Hunter is not the same place it was 3 years ago, or even 1 year ago, with respect to research. Truly is becoming more and more research intensive. Work done by Dean Mondros to create three research clusters in Social Work, new hires in Nursing, Hunter's institutional partnership with Cornell (whose Board regards Hunter as a research institution) all attest to this.

Teaching and research don't take anything away from each other. Focusing on research in SP doesn't take anything away from Hunter's legacy of excellence in teaching.

(b) Resource Development

Hunter's on sound financial footing and will be a leader in resource development. Glad to see this point in the draft SP. We'll never get the resources that we need from our primary funding source (NY State) that we need to be great. We have to think about who is going to fund public education going forward.

Everyone should be thinking more entrepreneurially.

◦Differential Tuition: What things do we do that we can charge more for because we're really good at them? SUNY hasn't been able to move this forward. CUNY is listening to ideas. Urban Planning graduate program, Accounting, Hunter's special education teacher training program, led by Sherryl Graves, very expensive programs to run, can justifying higher tuition. Hunter and others can fund scholarships to fill access gaps created by differential pricing.

(c) Interdisciplinary Issues

Hunter is on the cutting-edge in cross-disciplinary education. Our leadership in this area is embodied by the public health/social work space, spearheaded by Jacqui Mondros, Roosevelt House, LGBT Center. Pleased to see the Emerging Hunter University point speaking to this.

Would like to see the idea of institutional partnerships shine more. This (cross-disciplinary education) is one area where Hunter can stress its vision for the coming environment in which institutional partners are so important.

(d) Technology

If we don't achieve our technology/communication goals during this 10-year planning period, we've failed. Communication is obviously one of our biggest challenges. Basic technology infrastructure has finally caught up with our needs.

◦We have to hold ourselves to a high standard in terms of integrating technology into the classroom. This point crosses over to the resource development issue (i.e., If everyone is generating online learning and we're not, we're falling behind).

◦We are the pilot school for CRM. Gives us a way to reach every student and communicate with them individually to enhance the services we can provide. (e.g., creation of Muse Scholarships).

(e) Living in/with the CUNY System

Getting the most out of the system can be a College goal. What's the relationship between our goals and CUNY's goals? What are they doing and how does it relate to us? How do we say that in a strategic way?

Flagship Concept: What is Hunter College at CUNY? And what do we say about this in this plan. SP should make an aspirational statement about how Hunter can be a high-standard leader in the CUNY system and try to build consensus around this idea in the Hunter community.

> **•We believe that "flagship" means something.** How do we articulate who we are in the Hunter system?
>
> **•Hunter must define the criteria for conferring Hunter degrees**. We support support the idea of students coming from the community colleges and transferring to the senior colleges. But,
>
> **•System is somewhat tiered and we should be at the top of that tier**. If CUNY didn't give everyone the ability to grant doctorates, McCauley can grant degrees, is that a signal that the Chancellor is looking for an "honors college." Why can't we be that?
>
> **•Need to be able to communicate actual assessment criteria to help the President articulate the differences between Hunter's standard and nominal equivalents in other schools the system.**

The Committee's discussion with the President focused on:

> •Whether CUNY would constrain goals Hunter identifies for itself in SP. President Raab suggested that there is not inherent tension between acknowledging and responding to CUNY goals and engaging in real strategic planning: This is a good plan that isn't discordant with what CUNY is doing or asking us to do.
>
> •To the extent that future drafts will become more succinct, President Raab indicated that the Committee should convey to individual schools and other cohorts that detail will not be lost: Her office will make resources available for planning exercises at the school level important issues that don't appear in this high-altitude plan.
>
> •Main gap in the current draft is the institutional partnership piece.
>
> •Consider including those key points emphasized by the President in the introduction.
>
> •President will highlight SP technology goals by including on CRM and library plan.

President Raab closed her remarks at 12:05 pm. And the Committee resumed its discussion of the draft SP (dated 3/2/11).

•Draft that goes to Senate on March 23 will not be substantially less detailed.

•Need a statement from this committee introducing the package to Senate, laying out the process for review and discussion going forward.

•Treat "flagship" concept by identifying ways we are distinctive and about our aspiration to be the best.

•Deal with CUNY GER policy should under Student Success (enrollment management) with a statement that notifies of the fact that we have to pay attention to needs of transfer students?

•Consider whether information literacy and technological literacy are adequately distinguished from one another.

III.   Next Steps

March 9 – Final prep for getting draft to Senate by 3/11. AK & Associates will put together a template plan for distributing and discussing the draft SP in different Hunter forums.

March 30 – The Committee added this meeting to its schedule as a first opportunity to reconvene and incorporate feedback from March 23 Senate meeting.

April 6 – Review draft SP incorporating Hunter community comments and feedback.

April 13 – Approve final version of SP for adoption by Senate.

IV.   Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 1:05 pm.

Minutes submitted by Simone White, Administrative Assistant to the Committee.