

Strategic Planning and Institutional Effectiveness Committee (SPIEC) Meeting

March 31, 2009 9am -11am AB5 309

Summary

Present: Duff, Snyder, St. Hill, Wright-Isak, Baurer, Belcher, Pegnetter, Losado, Genson, Henry, McBride

Absent: Shepard **Guest:** Alexander

Review of First Meeting:

Paul Snyder drew everyone's attention to the meeting summary of the inaugural meeting that occurred on March 10. He pointed out that Provost Ron Toll had attended and reviewed the team charge noting in particular that the Committee was to design a process for the development of a new strategic plan that would be submitted to the PBC in the next two months. The design should include the steps in the process, stakeholders, and a timeline for beginning and completing the new process leading up to the adoption of a new Strategic Plan for FGCU. He also stressed the need to take a long view. Paul added that at that meeting it was his intention to invite Dr. George Alexander, Associate Dean for Planning and Institutional Performance, to the current meeting to make a presentation on a strategic planning process model. Paul indicated that George would serve as Committee facilitator to present a model and then help us to customize it for our purposes based on our responses to a series of questions.

In response to a question, Dr. Snyder described the current strategic planning process that has been employed by the institution since 2005. He added that this process was recently reviewed by the visiting SACS COC team and that they were highly impressed with regard to FGCU's institutional effectiveness practices.

Presentation of SP Process Model:

George Alexander distributed to the committee a series of documents to facilitate the development of a strategic planning process. He described each document and the various components of a typical strategic planning process. (These materials may be found on the SPIEC website <http://www.fgcu.edu/Provost/StrategicCommittee.html>)

Discussion of Process Model and Suggested Changes:

Dick Pegnetter noted that the initial focus of the committee must be on the Mission and Vision of the university since these were necessary to inform the environmental scan. The committee spent considerable time identifying stakeholders to be included, scope of the review, modes of soliciting input, and oversight of the process. George Alexander noted these suggestions on a flip chart. There was considerable discussion about the timing of completion for this part of the strategic planning process. It was generally felt that the mission statement needed reaffirmation rather than a major change and that the vision statement might need some updating in light of the growth of the university and changes to public higher education within the state. It was hoped that this review could be completed by mid-fall

semester, but others cautioned that a review might take longer to complete, possibly requiring approval by the UBOT at its January 2010 meeting.

Next Steps:

Paul stated that George and he would take the input from this meeting and synthesize it for review and consensus at our next Meeting on April 7. He added that we would then work on further elucidation of the other steps in the strategic planning process.