

Strategic Planning Committee and Social Sciences Division Meeting

May 1, 2013

Participants: Marvin Dodge, Melanie Jenkins, David Allred, Craig Mathie, Kari Arnoldsen, Danni Larsen, Sara Golding, and Greg Wright.

Members of the Strategic Planning Committee met with members of the Social Sciences Division who had an opportunity to participate in a SWOT analysis where they could identify strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats of both the college as a whole as well as their division. Below are suggestions and discussion topics generated from this exercise. Numbers in parentheses represent agreement with the suggestion listed.

Strengths

<i>College</i>	<i>Social Sciences Division</i>
• Student : teacher ratio/class size (8)	• Relationship between faculty and students (6)
• Safe (7)	• Autonomy (7)
• Tradition/history (5)	• Work horse (6)
• No graduate students teaching courses; real faculty in classroom (6)	• Interdisciplinary/Intercollegiate work (7)
• We are “not the U” (4)	• Cross-cultural context – diversity curriculum (5)
• Rural community /residential nature (6)	• Innovations and engagement (8)
• Quality of students, staff and faculty (4)	• Adaptable (7)
• Out of class contact with students (5)	• Broadcast classes
• Well-prepared students for transfer (5)	• The Dean (5)
• Cost – tuition excellent value (5)	• The morale (5)
• Social interaction for student clubs (4)	• Caring faculty (5)
• Small size – opportunity to grow (3)	• Well prepared student for transfer (5)
• Social opportunities for students (2)	
• May be first opportunity for students to live away from home (3)	

Weaknesses

<i>College</i>	<i>Social Sciences Division</i>
• Communication; faculty vs. administration: a. Decision-making; b. Goals; c. Business vs. education; d. Priority on educational goals	• Need additional faculty (2)
• Rural – lack of employment, etc. (2)	• Facility challenges (2)
• P-cards, paperwork	• Gender imbalance
• Bureaucracy	• Workload outside of classroom, i.e., FLAC (2)

• Territory “turf” (4)	• Slow progress with technology
• Pasture to the barn mentality	
• Remediation programs	
• Our location	
• Faculty workload	
• Salary	
• Morale – lack of trust	
• Communication – top down (process improving)	
• Outreach to high schools	

Opportunities

<i>College</i>	<i>Social Sciences Division</i>
• For change (2)	• Quality (2)
• A niche – already are different (5)	• Expand course offerings (3)
• Provide affordable quality 2-year education (7)	• Allows personal methods for teaching (4)
• Increased growth (2)	• Teamwork (2)
• Quality through small student faculty ratio (4)	• Short-term block classes
• Interdisciplinary/integrated GE courses (2)	• Broadcast classes
• Recruit diverse faculty (2)	• Interdisciplinary/integrated GE courses (2)
• Hispanic community / Native Americans (2)	• Local culture utilization (environment) (2)
• Community involvement (2)	• Global orientation (2)
• Global orientation – diversity; 3 + 1 programs (3)	• Research student conferences
• Research (student) conferences	• 3+1 programs; 2+2 programs
• Faculty/student interaction	
• More opportunities for non-traditional students	
• Partnerships with other institutions	
• 4-year programs; limited, strategic, high quality	
• Making concurrent enrollment benefit us	
• To pay us more	

Threats

<i>College</i>	<i>Social Sciences Division</i>
• Community cynicism (2)	• Positions not being replaced (5)
• Recruiting and retention	• Changes to GE (2)
• \$ limits on departments	• Manpower (3)
• Unwilling to change/adapt	• Identity (3)
• Concurrent enrollment	• Workload
• Believing that because faculty want to be here we don’t need more money	• Not allowed partnerships with public and other higher ed institutions
• Homogeneity	• We are not the music program (inequality)
• Territoriality (GE, etc.)	• Unwilling to change/adapt

• Ignoring our history or our tradition – identity (7)	
• Legislature – funding (2)	
• Changes to GE (2)	
• Changing too much too quickly (5)	
• Online GE	
• Salaries/quality faculty (2)	
• Our location (2)	
• Less variety with students (become too specialized)	

Those in attendance were then asked to identify their “hopes and aspirations for Snow College five years from now.” The following suggestions were made:

- Value-added to every student who chooses Snow College/ diversity (7)
- Innovation, incentivized and institutionalized (1)
- Develop private, public partnerships – prepare workforce – student co-ops (3)
- 2-year open enrollment
- Maintain high touch, 2-year transfer mission; rigorous programs (5)
- Global awareness and sensitivity (1)
- Community involvement
- Strategic limited quality 4-year programs; career and technical job preparation (2)
- Vibrant, integrated GE program (3)

After considerable discussion of the above topics the following were identified as the top four priorities:

- Value-added to every student who chooses Snow College / diversity (7)
- Maintain high touch, 2-year transfer mission; rigorous programs (5)
- Vibrant, integrated GE program (3)
- Develop private, public partnerships – prepare workforce – student co-ops (3)