Environmental Sustainability Committee
September 30, 2014
AB7 402
2:00 pm

Attendance:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Division and Department</th>
<th>Present</th>
<th>Represented</th>
<th>Not Present</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sarah Davis</td>
<td>Colloquium, Co-Chair</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhonda Holtzclaw</td>
<td>EH&amp;S, Co-Chair</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guy Cicinelli</td>
<td>SAC, Library Computing &amp; Tech Systems</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katie Leone</td>
<td>EH&amp;S</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vikki McConnell</td>
<td>Physical Plant</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sim Komisar</td>
<td>Environmental Engineering</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greg Tolley</td>
<td>Marine &amp; Ecological Sciences</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Andrew Wilkinson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anne Hartley</td>
<td>CESE, Marine &amp; Ecological Sciences</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uzair Iqbal</td>
<td>SG Dir. Of Sustainability</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Alex Erlenbach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T.C. Yih</td>
<td>Dean's Council, Graduate Research &amp; Sponsored Programs</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ron Dalton</td>
<td>Student Affairs, OHRL</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom Mayo</td>
<td>Facilities Planning</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gerry Segal</td>
<td>Faculty Senate (LCOB)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julie Yazici</td>
<td>Faculty Senate (LCOB)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Guests:
Patty Krupp (Colloquium) & [INSERT GUEST'S NAME] (Chemistry)

Review of Minutes:
Sarah reviewed the 9/16/14 meeting minutes. Guy motioned to approve, Vikki seconded his motion, and all approved.

Annual Committee Charge—Dr. Ronald B. Toll, Pd.D.
Dr. Toll presented the ESC with their charge for the year. Every committees that sits under the PBC is to lead, facilitate, and actively participate in development of five-year Strategic Plan. We hope to emulate the same approach that we used to during the previous Strategic Planning Process which entailed the following:
1. Review vision and mission statement (reaffirmation)
2. Seek broad input through the website and by hosting workshops where constituents can drop-in
and share their ideas

3. Compete an internal scan
4. Complete an external scan
5. Create a Living Document that has measurable and assessable short and medium-term goals for the five-year period

This methodology for creating the Strategic Plan was very successful last time and we would like to replicate the process as much as possible. A few things we would like to improve upon this time is to more actively communicate with businesses, community organizations, and outside stakeholders including alumni. We also want to get even broader input from students and faculty through the anonymous website. Dr. Toll emphasized the Strategic Plan is a Living Document which ensures that our compass is leading us in the right direction. Everyone owns this shared responsibility.

Dr. Toll asked us to be aware of major changes that have taken place between the last Strategic Planning Process and now. First, we are getting a slightly later start on the process than we did last time due to our SACS accreditation process which just ended. Second, when completing the external scan, we should consider funding and growth horizons and how they have changed now that we are committed to increasing retention as opposed to increasing FTIC enrollment. The last time we underwent the Strategic Planning Process, we were the fastest growing institution in the country with an annual growth rate of about 18%. Last year we grew by 4% and we have communicated that we would like to grow at an average rate of 2.5% annually. As such, we will have smaller first-year classes and increased attrition with more students graduating in 4-4.5 years; growth will primarily occur through increased retention. Retention was at about 74% a few years ago and is currently at 77.6% and junior to senior retention rates increased by 6% last year. We are slowly moving the needle in the right direction to meet our stated goals, however these new goals mean that we are now a different kind of institution then we were in the past. These changes will affect funding, athletics, and other areas. Finally, we should be aware that the BOT has changed since the last Strategic Plan and that this leadership regime is more involved in the day-to-day activities at FGCU.

Our committee should consider what implications these changes have for sustainability goal setting and planning at our institution. For example, we will see an extreme decrease in building new infrastructure and will not have any additional residence halls for the next three to five years. How might we have to refocus our sustainability efforts to accommodate these changes?

In summary, our charge is year is dual. First, we are to continue doing the important work that we have been doing for years--integrating our mission of sustainably into our institutional DNA and ensuring that FGCU continues to be nationally recognized for our sustainability initiatives. Second, we are to participate in the overall Strategic Planning Process and become more specifically involved in the review of internal scan (which will consider things like which programs are the most advantageous to prioritize) and the reaffirmation of the university mission and vision.

Follow-up Q&A:

The committee asked about the Strategic Planning timeline.
- A working draft should be given to the BOT in March and an approved final copy should be approved by the BOT in May or June.
- The schedule will be published on website and the SPIEC Committee will be led by Paul Snyder.

Julie asked about continuity and centralizing sustainability information so that there aren't individual competing projects.
- Communication flow is important and we should have two-way approach that allows for reciprocal idea sharing. There are a lot of moving parts with how large we've gotten and we are responsible to meet with our different constituencies during the internal scan and compile a list of
things we know about versus what are we not aware of to ensure that a healthy communication framework is embraced in the greater plan. We should consider how best to optimize resources when two different groups are working to a similar end and means through which alliances unbeknownst to each other can be connected.

- The PBC exists for inclusion and transparency. Every committee is represented and the input tangibly informs decision making. When ideas come to the President and his Cabinet through the ESC, they are highly valued and are approved over 90% of the time.

The committee asked about the Master Planning timeline and Dr. Toll asked Tom to give us an update.

- A Master Planning consultant has been hired and first round of meetings will begin on Oct 7th. A Steering Committee will work directly with the consultant and it is represented by faculty, staff, and students. The Steering Committee will report directly to President’s Cabinet and seek representation from the community at large throughout the process. There will also be an open comment period in which the broader community will be able to give input.
- As the ESC liaison, we should feel comfortable giving input to Tom in addition to giving input through other formalized channels.

**Sustainability, Tracking, Assessment, & Rating System (STARS) Overview Update – Katie Leone**

- We were almost out of time so we just went over the background and history of the Association for the Advancement of Sustainability in Higher Education (AASHE)’s STARS program and FGCU’s participation. STARS is a voluntary self-assessment used by hundreds of higher education sites across the globe. (Presently, the majority of users are U.S. based). FGCU was a Charter Participant and has been involved with shaping the metrics by which we are assessed and rated for years. The assessment system is constantly evolving so as to better capture sustainability and continually push it forward. In addition to receiving a rating, STARS helps us to more accurately and easily compare ourselves with peer institutions. Additionally, STARS is a useful tool for internal planning. In fact, many institutions choose to use the tool solely for that purpose and do not elect to be rated. Our most recent Gold Rating is from the 2.0 iteration of STARS which measures schools in the following weighted categories:
  - Operations (34%)
  - Academics (29%)
  - Engagement (21%)
  - Planning and Administration (17%)
- This is vastly different than the 1.2 iteration of the STARS tool and Katie will explain more details about how we scored in each category and credit during our next meeting. Katie stated that one of the most rewarding parts of completing the report was the interdepartmental information sharing that it encouraged. Working on the report brought people together that otherwise might not have a reason to meet. This allowed for departments primarily focused on operations to learn about the efforts of academically-focused departments and vice versa.