

## SUNY CANTON COLLEGE COUNCIL

### 281<sup>st</sup> MEETING

June 5, 2018

<b>Present:</b>	Chloe Ann O'Neil Joseph Rich	Ronald O'Neill, Chair Thomas Sauter	Marie Regan
<b>Absent:</b>	Grace Burke Roger Sharlow	Timothy Currier Brayden White	Cecily Morris
<b>Others:</b>	Courtney Bish Anne Sibley Zvi Szafran	Shawn Miller Travis Smith Lenore VanderZee	Douglas Scheidt Karen Spellacy Michaela Young

#### *Call to Order*

Chairman O'Neill called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m. He announced that at the end of the regular meeting there would be a brief Executive Session, with the meeting returning to regular session to adjourn.

#### *Minutes of April 17, 2018, Meeting*

Mr. Sauter made a motion to accept the April 17, 2018, minutes. The motion was seconded by Ms. Regan and approved.

#### *New Business*

##### **Advisory Board Appointments (see attached)**

Chairman O'Neill directed attention to the Advisory Board appointment/reappointment list.

Ms. O'Neil made a motion to approve the Advisory Board Appointments. The motion was seconded by Mr. Rich and approved.

#### **Program Proposals**

Chairman O'Neill introduced Dr. Scheidt for announcements regarding program proposals.

Dr. Scheidt said that in our attempt to continue to serve students and grow enrollment, we have several new programs that are building on existing strengths. The ones that have gone through the governance process include an A.O.S., which is an Associates of Occupational Science in HVAC. This is in essence moving away from a certificate to offer an associate's degree. Enrollments in HVAC have been flagging, oddly, because we cannot get students into it and yet there are jobs waiting for students. We are hoping that this will make what is a very attractive career an attractive program to students. The other one is EET Bachelor's of Science in Electrical Engineering Technology. We have an Electrical Engineering Technology B.Tech. The difference is that this is a "completer" degree. It is designed for a student who already has the associate's degree in Electrical Engineering Technology, which we and many others in the system offer. However, the EET BS degree that we are proposing is designed to be an online program, so we can serve students who graduate with an EET Associate's degree and help

them move forward to a bachelor's degree. This provides them with career advancement opportunities and is another source of revenue for us.

Mr. Sauter asked if there are any other competing programs.

Dr. Scheidt stated that there are none online. He shared that Farmingdale had a comment because they have a bachelor's degree in EET and not an associate's degree; they were concerned that we were going to encourage their students to bail and transfer into our program. Our admission requirement of needing the associate's degree makes it so they cannot bail. Utilizing our online strength makes this attractive to students with the associate's degree, as they can work and still advance their career with the bachelor's degree.

Mr. Sauter made a motion to approve the program proposals – HVAC, A.O.S. and Electrical Engineering Technology, B.S. The motion was seconded by Ms. O'Neil and approved.

### **Policy Review and Comment: Sexual Harassment and Consensual Relationship**

Chair O'Neill directed attention to the draft copy of the proposed sexual harassment policy. He stated that the Council will not be voting on it today, since it is a draft, but ask if the Council would be comfortable approving it by electronic vote if approval is needed before the next meeting in September. Ms. Bish interjected that she does not think that the policy will need to be approved before September. Chair O'Neill re-inquired if the approval needed to happen quickly would the Council be willing to approve it by email or telephone. The Council affirmed that they would.

Ms. Bish explained the policy sent to the Council is a draft that came from SUNY. It went through the Presidents' list-serve and has gone to the Title IX Officers and even the Vice Presidents' groups for comment and feedback. At the heart of this is an essential relationship policy that is trying to address relationships primarily between employees and students but also employees and those they supervise (so as to protect us in the instance of power dynamic issues). This is presumed to have come out of the Michigan State issues, with SUNY wanting to be proactive and the State getting involved. A policy was drafted, with this being the third run. Ms. Bish shared that since this policy was sent to the Council for review/comment our HR Director, Suzan McDermott, received word from SUNY Legal that this is not going to go forward at this point for this coming year's academic handbook or student handbook, because there is a new sexual harassment law making its way through the legislature that is felt might be impactful to this. If it is, it will change the policy, and it will apply to all New York State employees. This may be a draft that never sees the light of day, or it may be some iteration of this that then goes forward. So, at this point, we wanted to provide it to you so you have an opportunity to see what we have seen and also to provide any comment that you may have, because we are still communicating back with SUNY to share any concerns or feedback that we have.

Dr. Szafran mentioned that this is a topic that has been heavily discussed among ourselves here at the College, and we have had various concerns and suggestions, which we have shared with SUNY. He stated that he did not know if it is because of us or if they came up with these things themselves, but in some cases that moved in the direction we wanted.

Ms. Bish added that in the document sent to the Council there is the draft memo from SUNY, and then they also drafted an optional SUNY consensual relationship policy; we might consider using this policy.

She went on to share that that policy goes into greater detail. Initially, the language in the memo is concerning “sexual or romantic relationships,” with the draft policy talking about “intimate relationships.” A word that Dr. Szafran and Ms. Bish feel is a bit more gray. Ms. Bish explained that that is a word she is not personally comfortable with, and she does not want to try to manage the intimate relationships of employees; she does not think the rest of us do either. She shared that they also talked about academic departments and campus units in regard to not allowing people who are in an academic department with students to date versus teachers dating students in their class, which gives them a direct effect over their grade. It was noted that all of this is up for discussion, but the drafted policy that was provided is interesting in that it was far more detailed than the memo.

Dr. Szafran added some information for context. He stated that this turned up at the Presidents’ Meeting, and they were talking about two different kinds of policies: first, the sexual harassment policy – SUNY wants to have a System-wide policy. Whereas, here with the consensual relations policy, they are talking about having a SUNY minimum, so to speak, and campuses can go higher than that if they choose to do so; thereby allowing campuses some latitude based on local conditions. He stated that he questioned why that made any sense at all, in that if something was appropriate on campus A and not appropriate on campus B, and somebody on campus B then did it, they could easily argue for or against the policy due to difference on each campus. He stated that it seems to be a recipe for a problem moving forward, but they felt that more latitude for the campuses would be a good thing.

Chairman O’Neill asked if that is coming from the Board of Trustees. Dr. Szafran replied initially, I think, but also from the Governor’s Office, because obviously there is a lot of interest and concern on this matter; he was not sure what the particular impetus was in this case. He reiterated that he thought this was kind of an odd position to take – consistent policy on the one, but allowance of latitude on the other.

Chairman O’Neill asked if most of the presidents agreed that it should be the same for all campuses. Dr. Szafran stated that some of the presidents liked the idea of having some latitude. He noted that they referenced Stony Brook’s policy as being an especially good one. He stated that he has never read it, so he has no opinion one way or the other as to whether it is or not, but he remarked, if in fact Stony Brook’s is “the policy,” then why would it not make sense to have everybody adopt it? He just feels that this opens the door for some easily foreseeable problems.

Chairman O’Neill asked Dr. Szafran if there was more concern for those from rural campuses versus urban. Dr. Szafran could not tell. He stated that not a lot of people spoke on the subject – he raised the point; they answered; there was a little bit of buzz, and that was pretty much it.

Ms. Bish added that with the exception of the Title IX policies SUNY rarely gives a policy blanketed to all the campuses. She shared that the topic of a System-wide student handbook is something that Student Affairs and Student Conduct have talked about for years, and they feel it would make sense. She noted that the types of things that concern them about student conduct would be a concern at all 64 campuses, but SUNY is really, really hesitant to do anything as a blanket. Dr. VanderZee added there are some like the child protection policy that are super restrictive.

A discussion happened. Chairman O’Neill wondered if the Board of Trustees is actively involved or if they are waiting for something to be developed, so they can just act on it. The impression that Dr.

Szafran got, though it was not verbal, was that the Board of Trustees was interested in seeing this happen. Chairman O'Neill recognized that there has been a lot of input about this from campus. Dr. Szafran stated that we are trying to be helpful on this for several reasons. For example, the use of certain words may change the policy's meaning or interpretation – for example, the addition of the word “intimate.” The primary meaning of intimate is not what they are talking about here. Intimate just means “close” – (i.e., intimate knowledge of chemistry, intimate relationships with co-authors because they worked together in a common cause, and so forth). Dr. Szafran stated that the usage of intimate here does not show up until the third or fourth definition, and he feels it is wrong to use a word that the most common definitions of have nothing to do with what is being talked about. Ms. Bish added that this is particularly true when in reality “sexual” and “romantic” primarily covers the two things that we are concerned about for this policy. Dr. Szafran stated that we are trying to work with them to make it read better. He indicated that personally he was happy when they moved from a faculty member with direct supervision via a class, research, or whatever to departmental, because he thought doing it just at the class level was a bit too narrow.

Ms. Regan noted that in a lot of these cases compromise is not the best solution. She indicated that personally she agrees with Dr. Szafran and feels it should be uniform for all campuses. She remarked that some feel they need autonomy, which leads to trying to placate everybody, and it does not always come out the best for some.

Mr. Rich wondered if the trustees want it to be flexible – all colleges making their own decisions, which makes it even more difficult. Mr. Sauter agreed but stated that he is more interested in the local conditions, because once there is a policy, you then have to live with the policy. He asked what was known about this issue as it affects this campus. On an ongoing basis, are professors dating professors, professors dating students, and employee relations? Is it an issue that we are going to have to deal with? Dr. Szafran stated that that has been part of our discussions. Regardless of what the policy ultimately is, there are going to be some things that are going to be allowed, and there are going to be some things that are not. He noted that since we will have to enforce the policy we have talked about how we are going to that, no matter what it is. Dr. Szafran stated that he is in favor of one of the things that the policy calls for – if people are engaged in a relationship, even one that is allowed under the policy, they must disclose it. In discussing this, the first question of course is, disclose it to whom? The answer that we came up with was to Human Resources. HR would then obviously have to look at the particular situation, and consider if it falls within the guidelines or not. If it falls within the guidelines, then they would need to notify the supervisors that are involved to ensure that this does not lead to an improper supervisory relationship, as that is one of the major points of the policy. If this happens, the supervisory aspect would need to be shifted to someone else. He went on to say that if it does not fall within the guidelines those involved would need to be informed that their relationship is in violation of SUNY policy or campus policy. Mr. Sauter asked what the next step would be. The group discussed what would happen if people complied or not and what could and could not be done – punishments that might work as parents will not as an institution. It was noted that this point has been discussed at length. Ms. McDermott has been researching sample disclosure forms for us to use, and in preliminary discussions, it was determined that disclosures would be done separately, so there is no coercive relationship going on in terms of the completion of the form. It was also preliminarily determined that if there was a violation it would just fall into the normal disciplinary chain of events for violating a campus policy.

Mr. Sauter asked if someone could possibly lose their job over this, even if the relationship predates this new policy. Dr. Szafran answered yes. Dr. Scheidt pointed out that there are ways to avoid that depending on the violation – i.e., faculty members in the same department are dating or married – changes to the organizational chart can be made for evaluative purposes, etc. Dr. Szafran added that it is not always obvious if conflicts exist – i.e., faculty members are married, but wife keeps maiden name. In the instance that Dr. Szafran referred to, they did adjust the organizational chart, which was the right thing to do, as they subsequently got divorced and could have led to an ugly set of circumstances. It was pointed out that these examples would not lead to loss of job, but there are instances where it could – a policy that forbid a faculty member to have a relationship with a student in their own department; a relationship developed and was not disclosed; this would result in serious consequences that would involve the union and a counseling memo at the very least. If they persisted in that behavior, it would probably result in termination.

Ms. Bish added that we do currently have a policy on the employee-student piece of this, so the employee-student half of this does exist. She shared that it is vaguely specific, meaning it gives specific examples – Hall Directors cannot date students in their residence hall, University Police officers cannot date students, nor can professors that have that student in their classroom – but it does not give all scenarios.

Dr. VanderZee pointed out that scenarios like this are not as odd as you would think, especially on a campus where there are post-traditional students – a 50-year-old dating a 50-year-old, and that could still be a staff- or faculty-student relationship. Dr. VanderZee added that this policy affects her, as she and her husband both work for the College. It was a pre-existing relationship prior to moving and being hired, but they will have to disclose their relationship if this policy goes through. Dr. Szafran remarked that they are an example of the instance he mentioned above – married with different last names – and had he not known that they were married, it could have affected something, but any supervisory relationship would have been changed.

Dr. Szafran continued explaining that these things are complicated, but he reiterated that we wanted to treat it in a serious way. He stated that we thought it was important to have a real policy that at least made some logical sense as to how we would enforce it.

Ms. Bish stated that if the Council has any feedback that they would like shared with SUNY please send it to Michaela or herself.

### ***Old Business***

There was no Old Business.

### ***Chairman's Report***

Chairman O'Neill had nothing to report.

### ***President's Report***

Dr. Szafran began by reporting that graduation went well, with some 900 students graduating, of which half walked and about half earned honors. He shared that he asked his usual questions of, "Those of you who held a part-time job while going to college, please stand up" – essentially everybody. "Those of you who held a full-time job" – many. "How many of you held a part-time or full-time job and raised a

family” – good numbers. “How many were first in your family” – about 35%. He also asked how many of our students also served in the military and helped defend our country, and we had good numbers there. He stated that the question where everybody stood was how many benefited in one way or another from financial aid. Dr. Szafran remarked that this is a nice thing, as the students and the audience get to see that the hill is a little higher for many of our students in order to successfully graduate, because they are not just your typical 18-year-old going to college and doing nothing else.

He shared that Recognition Day was also well attended and went well. Winners of the President’s Meritorious Service Award included faculty member Dr. Lucas Craig, Director of Financial Aid Kerrie Cooper, and Executive Assistant to the President Michaela Young. And, for the second time in a row, the staff won the Faculty-Staff trivia challenge.

Enrollment is up a little bit in terms of deposits. Similarly, housing deposits have improved and are now even with last year. Things look like they will be either even or slightly ahead.

Dr. Szafran shared some Presidents’ Meeting information with the Council. He stated that an agreement has been reached between the State and the unions on salary increases, and they will be officially voting soon to ratify the agreement. The raises will be 2% per year plus 1% additional discretionary per year for the next six years. This is good for our faculty and staff; they have certainly worked hard to earn the money. The State has thus far not agreed to pay for the raises, which leads to financial complications for all SUNY campuses.

Dr. Szafran invited Ms. Miller to add her perspective on this subject. She indicated that she has not run a lot of the numbers yet but did a quick run on UUP this morning. Our UUP numbers are around \$16.3M – 7% increase, with 1% to cover some of the retro and \$600 in place of their discretionary for this year. It was noted that just for UUP that is \$1.1M added to our base budget for next year. If CSEA is included, that is another \$300 to \$400 thousand, and MCs are about another \$100 thousand. She stated that we are looking at about \$1.5M added to our base budget; it is a big deal, and she is still pretty nervous about it. She noted that it will be good for employees to get this raise though, as sometimes people begin to feel unappreciated when raises do not come regularly. Hopefully, union members will be satisfied with what the contract has provided, at least for this year.

Ms. Miller shared that she put in our revenue projections for next year, and she kept our numbers flat because of the Excelsior Scholarship. She noted that we have gotten some money back, but many campuses have not. She indicated that the process to certify students is manual, and she has asked the Financial Aid and Registrar staff to start the process. We had 155 that qualified. It was asked if she knew how many students we will have in Excelsior next year. She stated that she had no idea, but the window of opportunity has been open for three months, as opposed to about three weeks last year. It was noted that applying does not mean they can get it, which means the amount of manual labor involved is extensive (last year 300 applied, but only 155 qualified). People still do not understand that it is a completion scholarship – you have to finish your two-year program in two years, and if it is a four-year program, you have to finish in four years – so every semester there is a ton of work that goes along with this, and a lot of campuses are really feeling this. Ms. Miller explained another piece of the program; their tuition rate is frozen at the 2016-17 rates, so the \$200 tuition increase for 2017-18 applied to every student except the Excelsior students. She stated that in 2018-19 she believes there will be another \$200 tuition increase, except this will not apply for the first year Excelsior and the new

Excelsior students. We will be at 2016-17 rates for this group of students, yet salaries will be 7% higher – for the campus to absorb.

Dr. VanderZee asked whether the tuition is frozen in the year the students enter, or frozen at 2016-17 rates. Ms. Miller replied that it appears to be frozen at the 2016-17 rates for these students. Dr. Szafran said there is some talk that they are going to change that and move it to a cohort model, which will be based on the tuition in the year that they enter. Ms. Miller commented that that makes far more sense, and stated that to her knowledge, they have not done that yet.

A discussion happened regarding reimbursements for this program. SUNY has had to contact the DOB to at least try to get fall money back for the students because that was guaranteed, but from the chain of emails it does not appear that any campuses have received money back. She noted that we were one of the few that decided to manually certify students, and try to get those dollars back. We are waiting for about \$70 to \$100 thousand. Dr. Szafran reminded everyone that we discussed the potential cash flow problem for campuses when Excelsior first came out, and that is exactly what Ms. Miller is talking about.

Ms. Miller continued by saying that things will be tight for next year. She stated that we may be lucky enough to have a little bit of increase in enrollment, but she feels that our cash flow will be part of the problem, as now we will begin to see students fall out of the program due to not being able to meet needed criteria. This leaves many unanswered questions: What happens with that? What happens with our money? The State gave them a zero-interest loan for the Excelsior scholarship – how are they going to track that? Are we going to have to track that? How is that all going to work?

Mr. Rich inquired if all staff will receive increases or just some. Ms. Miller said everybody will get them, as they are contractual. Whatever the UUP contract is, the UUP members will get those raises.

Mr. Rich further inquired if there are certain situations because of regulations where individuals or groups would be singled out to receive increases and not others. He shared that he has known some situations like that, and it becomes messy. Ms. Miller asked if they were union members. Mr. Rich replied no. Ms. Miller responded that that is the difference; there was a level of discretion in Mr. Rich's situation. Union members are paid/awarded according to the union contract. She further shared that this year we had a few one-offs, people who came forward and felt that their job duties had increased, and they wanted raises. Others had had a change in duties, but their salaries had not changed. These requests were taken to the VP Group for discussion before they were awarded. Mr. Rich further explained that they corrected inequities by bringing the others up as well through funds from their foundation.

Ms. Miller added that CSEA signed their contract, but it will not be ratified until September. Their raises and retro pay will not come until 2018-19, and the retro dollars, which go back to July 2016, will be split between two years. Spreading this out will be of help to us.

Chairman O'Neill asked if all employees receive an evaluation annually – faculty and everyone else? Dr. Szafran answered yes. Chairman O'Neill asked if there are provisions in the annual evaluation for recommending pay increases. Dr. Szafran said that we do not have that, but we do have at least the possibility of people identifying somebody who is in effect the “franchise player” for their department,

and that is kind of what Ms. Miller is talking about. This helps to prevent losses to other institutions or whatever, and we sometimes will make adjustments on that basis. Ms. Regan commented that they used to call those merit raises. Dr. Szafran replied that the discretionary funds are the merit part of this, and this year, SUNY's discretionary criteria says half of the discretionary should address issues of compression and salary inequity. This works well as we were going to do that anyway.

Dr. Szafran added that if the current situation continues to be the case – meaning continual raises without funding – then various campuses will start going into the red. Several campus presidents at the Presidents' Meeting indicated great concern about this and indicated that their campuses either are in the red now or soon will be. Most figure they can handle the first year of it, but after that, a large number start going under. Some of them announced, for example, that they are implementing hiring freezes and not replacing vacancies due to retirements, which is of course a very bad way of doing business. We want to avoid needing to follow suit. We will be initiating discussions with our faculty and staff to let them know about the seriousness of the situation and to let them know that we want to take steps to increase revenues, cut costs, and increase efficiencies in order to avoid falling into this trap. While we are not currently at risk since we have strong reserves here at SUNY Canton, we do not want to see these reserves eaten up, which they certainly will be year after year if we do not take these steps. We will work closely with faculty and staff this coming year to identify strategies, in a collegial fashion, that will move us forward. He invited Dr. Scheidt to outline some of our initial plans.

Dr. Scheidt explained that in terms of revenue for his area it is primarily about enrollment. The Enrollment Working Group and Dr. Scheidt have focused on three pillars of enrollment management.

1. Targeted recruitment into under-enrolled programs. For example, a class or lab that has a cap at 25 where only 18 or 16 or 15 students enrolled, means we are teaching to empty seats. If we were to recruit more freshmen into the program, it would not cost us anymore, because the seats are already there. This actually already began two years ago, with Admissions working closely with several programs in Canino, resulting in the Mechanical Engineering freshman class increasing by 13%.

2. Retention. Dr. Scheidt stated that we often think of retention and graduation rate as what we do to serve students, because we are trying to help them graduate. However, retention is very important, because if students do not come back, we do not get year two's revenue. Dr. Scheidt shared that from his first year to his second year the retention rate was 61%. That means 39% of our students – 4 in 10 – in a class of 700 freshmen (280 of them) – do not come back, which is important conceptually because we want them to get their degrees to launch their lives. Financially, it is important because they do not give us money the next year or the year after that or the year after that, so it compounds across those years. He went on to share that this fall retention was at 71%, a 10% increase in three years (70 additional students who come into their freshman year, then their sophomore year, then of course proceed beyond that). He noted that most attrition happens from fall to fall from freshman to the sophomore year. Dr. Scheidt shared that SUNY asked us to set goals in 2015 for 2020 – at that point, our goal was 73% for 2020, so we are almost there.

3. Development of new programs. As we develop new programs and look to use some courses that already are in existence, additional revenue is brought in, and students are better served. Quantity and quality are important; retention is not about doing more, it is about doing better. Dr. Scheidt explained



several of our efforts to serve students in richer ways, all of which help students stay and move forward to graduation, while supporting the College financially.

Dr. Scheidt went on to explain that the big expenditure for his area is salaries. He noted that cutting back on supplies in his area is not going to move the dial, so each year, they track separations from the College – people who leave or retire. Among other things, he tracks the dollars that were separated from Academic Affairs, so he and others can determine how much they can search. Conversations are had with the President, VP for Administrative Affairs, and the Deans to determine what the priorities are. He reported that they are being really careful about recognizing the salary increases with the modest tuition increases and enrollment projections against salaries, because salaries are the big numbers, and they can be long term commitments.

Dr. Szafran further explained that this is similar to part of the reason we are all committed to bringing off-cycle increases to the Vice Presidents' Group. It allows everybody to have the opportunity to share pertinent information, so the most informed and fiscally responsible decisions can be made. This also allows for us to be very transparent and to work to maintain our strong fiscal position going forward. Many campuses are not in this kind of position; we want to avoid having to face problems that result in across-the-board cuts, which is never a good idea.

Dr. Szafran continued with his report. He noted that other topics talked about at the Presidents' Meeting included a push to make campuses 100% tobacco free, which seems to be growing in popularity; how to handle MMR (mumps, measles, and rubella) vaccines; and possibly creating a fund to allow campuses a little more latitude in scholarship for students to increase revenue. The latter would be a System fund, and those using it would have to pay some of your increased revenue back to the System to replenish the fund. He noted that the fund does not seem like a bad idea, but the devil is in the details.

Dr. Szafran asked Ms. Sibley for an Alumni Weekend update. Ms. Sibley reported that last weekend was Alumni Weekend, and a highlight of it was our 50 Years on the Hill Gala Dinner. She noted that it was a wonderful evening, very festive and fun, and there were about 160 people there. It was a resounding success all around, and a nice kick-off to the weekend. The 50<sup>th</sup> reunion class had a really good turnout – class of '68, the first to graduate from this campus. Ms. Sibley remarked that the increased engagement from graduating classes, especially around the 50<sup>th</sup>, may be because from here on all the classes will have attended college on this campus. She noted that there is definitely a stronger sense of community among alumni, so they are feeling positive about what that means for the future.

She shared that they are focusing on fundraising activities that relate to reunions or classes, as that has not been done before – asking people to make a gift in honor of their reunion, class competitions, etc. They focused on the 50<sup>th</sup> class this year as a launching point, and they came through wonderfully with five years of pledges and planned gifts. They committed over \$277,000, which is wonderful. Ms. Sibley stated that they are now going to use that as a challenge to future 50<sup>th</sup> classes to encourage reunion anniversaries that will bring alumni back to campus and get them to give. She noted that that is part of their overall effort of engaging alumni that they have been working on for the last few years – more outreach and events, reaching out to new people, broadening the base to reach the goal of a good pool of major big donors. This will provide a pipeline of donors who are being cultivated to make larger gifts when they can, which will alleviate the reliance on just two or three major donors.

Ms. Sibley shared that they have already passed their overall fundraising goal for the year, with a month left to go. She stated that she felt all of these new things that they have been doing and working towards are paying off.

With regard to enrollment and college finances, people in the Foundation have all been part of an effort to become more strategic about how scholarships are awarded on campus. Since the Foundation, Admissions, and Financial Aid all award funding to students, they have been working together to streamline and improve that process. They are also looking broadly at how they are using the dollars overall in an effort to increase enrollment, get admitted students to come here, and retain all of them. She noted that this was a more complex process than they originally thought, but they have made a lot of strides and now are troubleshooting issues that have come up. They hope that the targeted funding will stop students from leaving due to financial hardships.

Dr. Szafran stated that they have had a very successful year in terms of fundraising, and he praised Ms. Sibley and her staff for their tremendous work. He noted that there has been trouble reaching goals in the past, but to actually surpass them with a month to go speaks to the positive nature of their efforts.

Dr. Szafran continued by sharing that we have also been doing a lot of grant writing and continuing to push to develop the Entrepreneurship Accelerator. He invited Dr. VanderZee to give an update on that.

Dr. VanderZee began with an announcement of a \$250,000 grant from National Grid, which helps with the renovation of Dana Hall, where the on-campus version of the Accelerator will be located. She stated that most, if not all, of that work has been completed, so that shifts that money to other work within Dana.

Dr. VanderZee reported that we also submitted a grant to the Northern Border Regional Commission, a Federal organization, for \$250,000 on May 8. She noted that we hope to hear about that award during mid-summer. She mentioned that this is a unique grant in that the State representative with the Department of State actually scores the grants, and that carries a bulk of the weight in terms of how the funding is allocated by the Federal Government. She indicated that she had a very good conversation with the State representative, and he was very positive, so she is hopeful.

She also indicated that she worked very closely with the Village of Canton to submit a Downtown Revitalization Initiative proposal for the North Country Regional Economic Development Council (NCREDC) for a \$10M grant, which goes to one community in the North Country. There were four applicants in the region: Saranac Lake, Massena, Potsdam, and Canton. They worked really hard on what she thinks is a very strong proposal, and the Accelerator is a featured project within that proposal.

The Economic Development Agency within the Department of Commerce also has a couple of grants. One is an I-6 Challenge, which is a \$750,000 grant, for which the money was just allocated for Centers of Innovation and Entrepreneurship. They also have a much larger grant that can go towards construction, which is unique, and that is a \$3M grant. She noted that the funding for that has not been allocated yet, but as soon as it is, we can put an application in. She noted that we are working hard at finding the funding to get this thing off the ground. Support has been tremendous from the local community, our State representatives, and our Federal representatives – Senator Gillibrand’s Office has been very supportive and very positive about this project. She noted that one of the next steps is to visit

New Kensington, Pennsylvania, where the Chancellor there has done something very similar to what we would like to do here. His visit to our campus and presentations sparked interest in seeing it first-hand. Dr. Szafran mentioned that he will be meeting with our town and village officials later this week to update them on the project and to try to get some very specific support.

Ms. Spellacy reported that they have been busy with new curriculum items. They submitted a new policy in terms of transfer credits. Currently, our policy is to not transfer courses from somewhere else unless the person gets a C or better. However, if you have an associate's degree and you try to transfer in the entire associate's degree, if you had a D (or two or three) in there somewhere, we would transfer it in. They are trying to change that policy so that we will accept transfer credits of a D, making us a little more transfer friendly. She noted that transfer students have to have an overall 2.0 to come in, so this will not mean we are taking a lot of students with Ds, but it may help a few finish a little easier.

Ms. Regan asked if students who fail or do poorly in a course and improve their grade through another institution get credit for their most recent grade or get credit for just passing the course, no change to GPA. Dr. Szafran said that is correct; they get credit for three hours, but it does not affect their GPA. Ms. Regan said she always thought that was unfair. Dr. Scheidt explained that a person's GPA at Canton is their GPA of courses taken at Canton, regardless of what it is. For example, if a person repeats a course at Canton that they took here, both grades remain on the transcript, but the higher grade is what goes into their GPA. There is a benefit to suggest retaking courses here versus somewhere else. Dr. Szafran added that he is not aware of any institution that does that differently. Ms. Spellacy stated that we used to – if you took the course here and failed, then you retook the course at another campus, we would drop out the F, bring the new higher grade in. It was noted that the change happened when Dr. Hoffman was president. Dr. Szafran mentioned that it is really unusual to do it that way. Ms. Regan said she asked the question because it could affect a lot of our students. She noted that she had a case like this during her tenure, and she felt bad for the student.

Mr. Smith continued the report and stated that the summer session record for this year is more than 2,000 enrollments. This is the fifth consecutive summer session enrollment record that we have broken and the ninth consecutive off-term session record broken. Much of the off-term generated revenue helps to offset costs for many things, including an investment in marketing. He noted that he mentioned this advertising campaign at the last meeting, but it was in its early stages. The Vet Services ad that is running has received 1M impressions (number of times it was pushed out) and was actually viewed 363 times from start to finish. He noted that there have been 4,000 clicks, which went to our website. The general ad with 1.8M impressions has had 10,000 clicks from that ad. The end goal is to get students in seats, but it is a little too premature to draw those conclusions yet. One way that they are tracking this effort is by actual web hits to our website. They do this by looking at the targeted cities in New York State – New York City, Albany, Buffalo, Rochester, and Syracuse. From the previous year, we only had 54 people ping our site from those areas, but that has increased to 1,158. For out of state, they are looking at Boston, Baltimore, D.C., Atlanta, Raleigh, Charlotte, Tampa, Orlando, and Toronto. In the last year, there have been 372 hits from all those areas, and in the last month, it increased to 4,680. The next step is to recruit these people at students; we are not quite there yet, but the results are definitely promising. Mr. Rich commented it is amazing what you have done with social media – tremendous. Mr. Smith shared that social media usage is always changing, so it is a challenge to adjust and adapt quickly to reach prospective students.

Mr. Smith shared that he and Mr. Kie will be traveling to SUNY CUAD this week to accept the award they won for their “Hopper Piece” (hopper = kangaroos) (a Matt Mulkin design). He passed the promotional item around and demonstrated how the folds and cuts cause it to flip around to different scenes and information. Mr. Kie will be presenting on why we still write press releases as a part two to follow up on something he presented four or five years ago. He noted that it is still important to write press releases, and the 50 Years on the Hill release is evidence of that. Mr. Smith thanked the committee, Ms. Sibley and her staff, Courtney Bish, Jamie Burgess, DianeMarie Collins, Pat Hanss, Lashawanda Ingram, Greg Kie, Sue Law, Lorette Murray, Priscilla Leggette, Ellie Prashaw, Randy Sieminski, Geoffrey VanderWoude, Lenore VanderZee, Morgan Elliott, and Matt Mulkin for their help with the 50 Year on the Hill events. He noted that the highlights were definitely the Danny Fay recognition at Recognition Day and the 50 Year Gala.

Mr. Rich remarked about the tremendous job done by the audiovisual department and congratulated Mr. Smith’s team for all they do.

Dr. Szafran added that we have also received a lot of publicity through radio, magazines, and newspapers, as it pertains to our eSports initiative. Our eSports team was on the cover of Athletic Management, which is a magazine that goes to coaches in high schools; Forbes has also interviewed them, so they are looking forward to something showing up there.

Mr. Smith added that Campus News is doing a three-part story on us, because they are so impressed with all the things we are doing. They want to do a piece on academics, athletics, and technology and what eSports actually is.

Dr. Szafran added that we are definitely seen as a leader in this. Our counterparts in our athletic conference view us as a key member of the conference, and they are now interested in eSports.

Chairman O’Neill asked Dr. Scheidt if there is any reason that stands out as to why a student does not return. Dr. Scheidt responded that nationwide the community college graduation rate is 19%, and bachelor’s degrees nationwide is 50-55%, with a slight difference between publics and privates. Dr. Scheidt explains that our graduation rate when he arrived was 31%, and now it is at 40%. He noted that our official goal for retention is 73%, but he often references his personal goal as rhyming with “weighty.” In terms of the graduation rate, we have designed a new number, because the official numbers are based on first-time, full-time freshmen, so it ignores transfers. This new number is called “completion,” meaning, “I don’t care how you got here. You landed here. Did you leave within six years with a certificate, associate’s, or bachelor’s degree? We’re happy, because that means that we served you.” Those who transferred out are added to that number; our transfer out rate is about 30% or so – people going to Clarkson and so forth. The national trends as to why people do not succeed come down to three big reasons: academic difficulties, financial difficulties, or personal reasons. Dr. Scheidt shared some strategies to help offset these reasons. For academic difficulties, this year, we are going to be looking at developing completion loans or grants. We also have the Library Textbook Reserve Program, which has received a significant investment of funds and now has 71% of section textbooks on reserve. In 2017-18, those textbooks were checked out over 18,000 times. We also offer student support services, and most recently, we have added the leave of absence policy, which is streamlined to help students return once the problem has been resolved. We are trying to respond to all of those things to make sure that more of our students graduate.

Chairman O'Neill asked whether it was pretty easy to identify those students. Dr. Scheidt replied no, and explained that we do take steps to try to identify as many as possible and reach out to them with an offer of help. Chairman O'Neill asked if the general student population was aware that there may be help for an issue such as a problem with a \$200 book. Dr. Scheidt responded that this is a challenge in that we want them to be aware if they are legitimately in need, but if advertised, we would get others that are not truly in need. However, we rely on faculty and staff that work closely with students to bring those cases to the attention of the appropriate people. Ms. Bish shared that there is a Student Emergency Fund, supported by faculty/staff donations, that has helped with textbooks, bus tickets, winter coats, and various one-offs. She noted that they are seeing more requests, so they had to create an internal policy for how to address these requests, because the funds are not unlimited. Dr. Scheidt added that additional checks are done to see if they have other funding on their account that could be used.

He further added that in terms of academic difficulties, when Dr. Szafran came, he set in place the three week feedback from faculty about students being engaged or not engaged. Dr. Scheidt said he added the advisor follow up, so advisors are now asked to contact students if they are not engaged to discuss the feedback and create a strategy for success for the rest of the semester. We also have an ongoing process called MTS (Moving Toward Success), which is a program where a faculty member can go in and give feedback to their students at any time about attendance, performance, or a number of categories. The feedback is also sent to their coach, RD, EOP or TRiO advisor, and academic advisor; it also comes in an aggregated file to administration so if there is an appeal, we are aware of academic and conduct issues.

Mr. Rich asked about retention and how students are asked to respond if it is a personal problem. He was concerned that asking them to fill out a piece of paper might not be the most effective way of getting this information, as it could be very personal. He asked if there was a more personal way to contact those individuals who may not be able to continue for personal reasons. Dr. Scheidt said we believe strongly in faculty-staff-student engagement – creating strong relationships between faculty or staff with students. There are a number of things that we have done to drive engagement and retention. For example: in Nevaldine, due to the geography, students often do their homework at the benches and collide with faculty walking through cleaning up/setting up labs; in Payson, the Criminal Justice suite of offices had an existing space that was easily turned into a student lounge; and in the Psychology Department, a space for the faculty and students to work was created. Dr. Scheidt shared that he capitalizes on Chaney's \$5 Fridays to motivate faculty to eat lunch in Chaney once a month; this gets faculty/staff and students in the same location.

Dr. Szafran noted that our staff are very much involved in this as well; there are working groups that meet weekly to look at hundreds of factors to determine who is at risk and need to be reached out to. We work very hard to have our faculty, our staff, or somebody aware and to be there in the moment of need. Ms. Regan remarked that it is so rewarding when you help a student, and many times, they keep in contact with you through the years; Mr. Rich agreed. Dr. Szafran stated that this year he has gotten a bunch of emails from students and from parents singing the praises of the various faculty, and that has not happened before.

Mr. Sauter referenced an email from Mike McCormick and noted that he has noticed the amount of work going on around campus. He requested a presentation from Mr. McCormick at the first Council

meeting in the fall, accompanied by a tour, to see what the improvements are (a GEM car is needed). This will be worked on.

Dr. Szafran shared another new addition; at Alumni Weekend, a workman who lost their life 50 years ago was honored by a tree planting ceremony. There was a good turnout from his family, and they were honored that we did that. Mr. Smith added that Greg Kie, Pat Hanss, and the Foundation deserve the credit for putting that together. Chairman O'Neill mentioned the appearance of the sign by the footbridge on Riverside Drive is a nice improvement from years past – all the dead debris has been cleared away. And, Ms. Miller mentioned that Dr. MacArthur was surprised and pleased with the changes to Dana Hall.

It was stated that there was no Student Government update for this meeting.

Mr. Sauter made a motion for the Council to move into Executive Session. The motion was seconded by Ms. Regan and approved at 10:34 a.m.

***Regular Session Resumed***

At 10:52 a.m., the Council resumed regular session.

***Adjournment***

Ms. O'Neil made a motion to adjourn. The motion was seconded by Mr. Rich and approved at 10:53 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Michaela Young  
Secretary to the College Council

Advisory Board List for CC Approval May 2018.xlsx

Committee	Alumni	Name	Term	Term Ends	Title	Company
Air Conditioning Engineering Technology/Mechanical Engineering Technology	89	Mr. Allen Cook, P.E.	three-year	2021	Project Manager and Lead Mechanical Engineer	Maxson Engineering
Air Conditioning Engineering Technology/Mechanical Engineering Technology	75	Mr. Albert Daniels	three-year	2021	Vice President	IPD Engineering
Air Conditioning Engineering Technology/Mechanical Engineering Technology		Mr. Peter Lindabury	three-year	2021	Senior Project Manager	GHD
Air Conditioning Engineering Technology/Mechanical Engineering Technology		Mr. Andrew Sillato	three-year	2021	Account Executive	Johnson Controls, Inc.
Applied Psychology		Ms. Emma Brackett	three-year	2021	Director of Outpatient Services	CPH
Applied Psychology		Ms. Nancy L. Davis	two-year	2020	Associate Executive Director for Clinical and Youth Services	St. Lawrence NYSARC
Applied Psychology		Ms. Andrea Montgomery	two-year	2020	Director	St. Lawrence County Office for the Aging
Applied Psychology		Ms. Michele M. Montroy	two-year	2020	Administrator	United Helpers Care
Applied Psychology		Dr. John Nixon	three-year	2021	Retired Faculty	SUNY Canton Applied Psychology Program
Applied Psychology		Mr. Christopher Rediehs	two-year	2020	Commissioner of Social Services	St. Lawrence County
Applied Psychology	81	Mr. Jeffrey Alan Reifensnyder	three-year	2021	Executive Director	Massena Independent Living Center, Inc.
Applied Psychology		Ms. Carolyn L. Tracy	three-year	2021	Probation Supervisor	St. Lawrence County Probation Dept.
Automotive Technology	81	Mr. John Peterson	three-year	2021	Senior Manager Dealer Development	Volkswagen
Automotive Technology		Mr. Mark Russo	three-year	2021	Education Program Manager	Subaru Distribution Inc.
Business Administration-Management	11	Mr. Seth Belt	three-year	2021	Commissioner's Regional Representative - North Country	NYS - DOL
Business Administration-Management		Ms. Michelle Capone	three-year	2021	Director of Regional Development	Development Authority of the North Country
Business Administration-Management		Ms. Sharon Markovsky	three-year	2021	Director, Business Development/President, Society of Insurance Research	Verisk Insurance
Criminal Justice		Mr. Charles Donoghue	two-year	2020	Police Chief	Watertown Police Department
Criminal Justice		Mr. Charles Guess	two-year	2020	Retired Major	New York State Police
Criminal Justice		Mr. Timothy LePage	two-year	2020	Director	St. Lawrence County Probation Department

Advisory Board List for CC Approval May 2018.xlsx

Committee	Alumni	Name	Term	Term Ends	Title	Company
Criminal Justice		Mr. Stephen Maher	two-year	2020	Deputy Commissioner	Department of Corrections & Community Supervision
Criminal Justice		Mr. Dwayne Wisbey	two-year	2020	Onondaga County Sheriff's Deputy	Onondaga County Sheriff's Office
Decision Systems Dept. (CIS-IT-ITM)	14	Mr. Christopher Murray	three-year	2021	IT Operations Manager	Samaritan Medical Center
Decision Systems	00	Mr. Timothy Zenger	three-year	2021	VP of Information Systems Director	SeaComm Fed. Credit Union Canton Day Care Center
Early Childhood		Ms. Nancy Addison	three-year	2021	Owner/Director	Blooming Minds Day Care
Early Childhood		Ms. Lauren Diop	three-year	2021	Director	SUNY Potsdam Child Care Center
Early Childhood		Ms. Lori Moulton	three-year	2021	Director	Jefferson Campus Child Care
Early Childhood		Ms. Roxanne Silsby	three-year	2021		
Electrical Engineering Technologies	92	Mr. Alson Caswell Jr.	three-year	2021	Associate EMRA Leader	Novelis Aluminum Co.
Electrical Engineering Technologies	05	Mr. Travis H. Dawley	three-year	2021	Project Engineer	C & S Engineers
Electrical Engineering Technologies	69	Mr. Gerald Lindsey	three-year	2021	Senior Electrical Engineer	TRC
Electrical Engineering Technologies	15	Mr. Pierre Nzuah	three-year	2021	Substation Engineer	TRC Engineering, Inc.
Electrical Engineering Technologies	79	Mr. Jeffrey L. Robbins, P.E.	three-year	2021	Senior Principal Engineer	C & S Engineers
Electrical Engineering Technologies	80	Mr. Harold Rozanski	three-year	2021	Plant Manager	Afgritech, LLC
Emergency Management		Mr. George Bastedo	three-year	2021	Director of Emergency Management	Wayne County, State of NY
Emergency Management	92	Mr. Eric Day	three-year	2021	Director of Emergency Management	Clinton County
Emergency Management		Dr. Kelly Donoghue	three-year	2021	Assistant Director of Emergency Management	Clinton County
Emergency Management		Ms. Rachel Ford	three-year	2021	Adjunct Professor - Dept. of Public Health & Health Sciences/Wayne County EMA	The College at Brockport/Wayne County EMA
Emergency Management		Mr. Kevin Kupietz	three-year	2021	Fire-EMS Instructor-Coordinator	Halifax Community College
Finance		Ms. Kimberly Bell	three-year	2021	Risk Manager/Project Manager	St. Lawrence Federal Credit Union
Finance		Mr. Todd D. Green	three-year	2021	Chief Investment Officer	Alesco Advisors LLC



Advisory Board List for CC Approval May 2018.xlsx

Committee	Alumni	Name	Term	Term Ends	Title	Company
Finance		Dr. Wei Jiang	three-year	2021	Professor	University of California, Fullerton
Finance		Dr. Alex Meisami	three-year	2021	Associate Professor of Finance	Indiana University South Bend
Finance	04	Mr. Ryan Niles	three-year	2021	Sr. Executive Vice President	Niles Asset Management, Inc.
Graphic and Multimedia Design	14	Ms. Lydia Dale	three-year	2021	Intellectual Property Creative Coordinator	Guinness World Records Attractions
Graphic and Multimedia Design		Mr. Donald Paulson	three-year	2021	Asst. Prof. of CIS and Computer Graphics/Web Content Mgr.	North Country Community College
Graphic and Multimedia Design		Ms. Laura Symanski	three-year	2021	Freelance Designer	Natsuko
Graphic and Multimedia Design	16	Mr. Scott Wemette	three-year	2021	Digital Specialist	Dealer.com
Health Care Management	12	Ms. Heidi Baker	three-year	2021	Compliance & Privacy Officer	North Country Initiative
Health Care Management	16	Ms. Britney Mason	three-year	2021	Executive Secretary	Claxton-Hepburn Medical Center
Health Care Management	87	Ms. Vicki Perrine	three-year	2021	Chief Operating Officer	Claxton-Hepburn Medical Center
Legal Studies		Mr. Stephen D. Button	three-year	2021	County Attorney	St. Lawrence County
Legal Studies		Mr. John F. Richey	three-year	2021	St. Lawrence County Surrogate Court Judge	St. Lawrence County
Nursing		Ms. Julie Cruickshank	three-year	2021	Associate Director of Davis Health Center	SUNY Canton
Nursing	84	Mr. David Ferris	three-year	2021	Chief Nursing Officer	Claxton-Hepburn Medical Center
Nursing	91	Ms. Kim Weir	three-year	2021	Occupational Health Manager	Canton-Potsdam Hospital
Physical Therapist Assistant	13	Mr. Bruce Danner	three-year	2021	PTA	Alice Hyde Medical Center
Sports Management	15	Ms. Aimee Craig	three-year	2021	Manager of Youth Initiatives	Special Olympics of D.C.
Sports Management		Mr. Bob Durocher	three-year	2021	Director of Athletics	St. Lawrence University

Advisory Board List for CC Approval May 2018.xlsx

Committee	Alumni	Name	Term	Term Ends	Title	Company
Sports Management		Ms. Laurel Kane	three-year	2021	Assoc. Director of Athletics/Senior Women's Administrator	Clarkson University
Sports Management	13	Mr. John Payne	three-year	2021	Sr. Service Exec., Season Tickets	Ontario Reign - AHL Ontario California
Sports Management	17	Ms. Janea Shoemaker	three-year	2021	Strategic Communications Staff	Pennsylvania State Athletic Conference
Veterinary Science Technology	06	Ms. Fawn Clark	two-year	2020	LVT DVM	Canton Animal Clinic Jefferson Community College ~ Animal Mgmt. Program
Veterinary Science Technology		Dr. Mark Irwin	three-year	2021		
Veterinary Science Technology	90	Ms. Pamela Wantuch	three-year	2021	LVT	
Veterinary Science Technology		Mr. George White	three-year	2021	Territory Manager	Patterson Animal Health Co.
Veterinary Science Technology		Dr. John P. Zeh, III	three-year	2021	DVM	Town & Country Veterinary Clinic