

Planning and Budgeting Council (PBC) Meeting October 22, 2009 3:00pm -4:30pm AB5 309

Summary

Present: Toll, Snyder, Bullock, Crawford, Oistad, Henry, Banks, Ruder, Johnson, Shepard, and Weeks

Absent: Lennertz, Genson, Roberts, Brundage, Kavanagh , Magiera, Rollo

Report of the Council Chair:

Ron Toll noted that the reviews today were important for meeting planning process deadlines .

Mission and Vision Reaffirmation Results:

Ron reminded the Council that they had previously received and reviewed the results of the mission and vision reaffirmation process at their October 14 meeting. It was agreed at that meeting that Council members would review the results and comments received in response to the questionnaire and public forums and then come to this meeting prepared to make and discuss recommendations for any possible changes. To frame the discussion, we would try to answer the following questions:

Based on the responses of the questionnaire and input received at the public forums, do you believe changes to the university mission statement and/or the vision statement need to be made? If so, what might they be and why?

Paul noted that he had received a suggested change to the vision statement from Dr. Peter Blaze Corcoran which he had shared with the Council and might also receive consideration by the Council in its discussion.

With regard to the Mission statement there again was agreement that major changes did not seem necessary but tweaking some of the language would make the statement more inclusive. After much discussion the following changes to the second paragraph of the Mission statement were recommended:

Current statement:

Outstanding faculty uphold challenging academic standards and balance research, scholarly activities, and service expectations with their central responsibilities of teaching and mentoring. Through these efforts, the faculty and University transform students' lives and the southwest Florida region.

Proposed Revision:

Outstanding faculty uphold challenging academic standards and balance research, scholarly activities, and service expectations with their central responsibilities of teaching and mentoring. **Working together, faculty and staff of the University** transforms students' lives and the southwest Florida region.

Joe Shepard moved the above change be recommended for consideration by the President's Cabinet. The motion was seconded by Kay Oistad and was unanimously approved.

With regard to the vision statement, there was much discussion about the purpose of a vision statement in general and specifically what was originally intended by the current vision statement. There was discussion about the original vision statement of the university and the language suggested by Dr. Peter Blaze Corcoran. There was also comment that the phrase "selected graduate programs" was too limiting. Provost toll suggested the phrase be amended to "its blend of graduate programs." After further discussion, Joe Shepard made a motion that this change to the Vision Statement be recommended to the Cabinet for consideration and Shirley Ruder seconded the motion. It was unanimously approved by the Council.

Current Vision Statement:

Florida Gulf Coast University will achieve national prominence in undergraduate education with expanding recognition for selected graduate programs.

Proposed Revision:

Florida Gulf Coast University will achieve national prominence in undergraduate education with expanding recognition for *its blend of graduate programs.*

Environmental Scan Drafts:

Ron briefed the Council on this agenda item. He reiterated that at the last meeting of the Council Paul had shared two drafts: one an internal scan that Paul compiled based upon the SWOT analyses prepared by the VP's and the AD; the other document an external scan prepared by Dr. Gary Jackson, Director of the LCOB's RERI. It was agreed that an additional couple of weeks was needed for more in-depth review of the drafts to provide feedback to the authors for final revisions to occur. It was further agreed that proposed feedback be prepared based upon the following set of questions:

Do they (the 2 drafts) provide adequate summaries of the current strengths, weakness, opportunities, and threats as FGCU positions itself for the next five years?

Is there anything essential you believe is missing, if so, what?

Is there anything in each of the documents that requires clarification?

Do you believe there is anything that appears to be misstated or inaccurate?

Is there something included here you do not believe should be included?

Ron then opened the floor for comments:

Looking at the external scan document, questions were raised with the section on page 6 under the section heading "Weakness would include: "

The relationship of salary compression and faculty retention was discussed. Both Joe and Donna expressed the view that the data they have reviewed do not support such a relationship. They suggested this be removed. It was also noted that this was not a finding of the internal scan conducted by the PBC. With regard to the statement under weaknesses that the university's has a small endowment, Donna suggested a better choice of words would be the endowment has been adversely affected by the recession. Donna also felt that the bullet "Adjusting to pressures of growth" should be placed close to the top of the list of weaknesses. Clarification of the bullet "Distinguishing qualities and identity not well known" was requested, not well-known by whom exactly? Also clarification was sought of the statement "Limited number of alternative campus locations in surrounding communities."

With regard to the section on opportunities (page 8 of the draft), Paul pointed out that the statement under number 4., "There may be opportunities to partner with other educational institutions to provide education tracks leading to these degrees" would be better stated as "There may be **additional** opportunities..." since FGCU already has such partnerships for medical school and pharmacy school already successfully in place. On item 7, the \$19 million for the solar field has been reduced to \$14 million and the term solar array is preferred to solar farm.

Review of the internal scan concluded that it was fine other than corrections of typographical errors.

Ron noted that the comments would be provided to the authors for further revision and finalization of the drafts.

Standing Committee Reports:

Joe Shepard, co-chair of the **budget committee**, reported that the committee was without a co-chair. Ron said that he and Joe would get together to determine what to do about that.

Donna Henry, co-chair of the **ERMC**, noted that the ERMC had nothing new to report since the last PBC meeting.

Lewis Johnson co-chair of the **Environmental Sustainability Committee** (ESC) noted that the committee membership was nearly complete with the exception of a Senate rep, which Ron stated was actively being considered by himself and President Bradshaw. Lewis said he would proceed with scheduling of further meetings.

Kay Oistad, co-chair of the **IRC** noted the committee met on 10/15. By the time of the meeting, there were 52 questions in the shared folder regarding the strategic plan for IT. The Committee decided to go through each question and group them into categories. They reviewed the questions and created eight categories and one category to be determined.

Oistad said she would reorganize the questions into the categories in the shared folder. The committee decided to begin formulating goals based on the categories at the next meeting.

Barrett Genson, co-chair of the **Safety and Facilities Committee** was not present and no report was provided.

Paul Snyder, co-chair of the **SPIEC**, noted that the SPIEC had met on October 6. At that meeting SPIEC had begun the task of working on an assessment/institutional effectiveness plan for the strategic plan and would continue this review at its October 28 meeting.

Next Steps:

Ron noted the next meeting of the Council would occur on November 5 where we will begin consideration of Strategic Directives or Goals for the updated Strategic Plan. He said the recommendations for the edits to the existing mission and vision statements along with the environmental scan documents (once revisions were complete) would be brought before the President's Cabinet for review.