

Strategic Planning and Institutional Effectiveness Committee (SPIEC) Meeting

May 15, 2009 9am -10am AB5 210

Summary

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

Review of Third Meeting:

Paul Snyder provided a brief recap of the April 28 meeting noting the group's review of the planning model and its discussions surrounding the steps dealing with action plans and gap analysis. He noted that George Alexander had done an excellent job summarizing the process as the committee had discussed it. The meeting today was to review that summary and discuss a potential timeline for the process.

Presentation of SP Process Model:

Paul guided the committee through the summary which is in a number of PowerPoint slides. (These materials may be found on the website: <http://www.fgcu.edu/Provost/StrategicCommittee.html>). The committee offered a couple of tweaks to the slides: 1) the Vision Statement review should consider the context of the vision as it exists at present and how it might exist in the future; and 2) emphasize that the examination of the Mission is really a reaffirmation process rather than a redefining review.

Discussion of Process Model and Suggested Changes:

Paul then informed the committee that he had received guidance from Provost Toll that an April 2010 completion date for the planning process was desired. Paul then presented a timeline for the process for discussion. The pros and cons of an April timeline or alternatively a June timeline were discussed. Paul emphasized that either April or June were possible, but June would provide more flexibility. It was agreed that this information would be provided to the PBC when Paul Snyder presented the committee's recommendations to the PBC for its consideration.

Barratt Genson raised a question of how the facilities master planning process will intersect with the strategic planning process as they will likely proceed simultaneously. Paul noted that it would be preferable if the strategic plan preceded the master plan, but state imposed deadlines dictated differently. Nevertheless, he believes there is enough cross-fertilization between the two processes that there should be ample opportunity for each to inform the other.

Next Steps:

Paul stated that George and he would take the input from this meeting and make the requested edits before presenting the committee's recommendations to the PBC most likely in mid-June. It was agreed that another meeting of the committee would not be scheduled until feedback from the PBC was received.