Strategic Planning and Institutional Effectiveness Committee (SPIEC) Meeting

April 13, 2011 2pm -3pm AB5 309

Summary

Present: Snyder, Belcher, Crabill, Henry, Lindsey, Jaeger, Johnson, McShane, Volkan, Duff
Absent: Genson, Baker, Shepard

Co-Chair’s Report

In the interest of time, Paul deferred his report until the next meeting.

Updates from Committee Co-chairs Present

ERMC: Donna reported that the committee was completing its report and hoping to get it to SPIEC later this month. She noted that she is working with Susan Byars, Greg Tolley, Jorge Lopez, and Michele Yovanovich on a questionnaire concerning enrollment management.

ESC: Lewis Johnson presented the committee’s strategic plan and indicated it was what each of the VP’s believed their areas of responsibility could practically implement and monitor. Megan complimented the committee for its work as did Paul. While the committee will not be meeting over the summer, there are two sub-groups looking at issues. One, led by Sim Komisar, is looking at energy consumption reduction efforts for buildings even though they might negatively affect LEED ratings. Another, led by Sarah Davis, is looking at activities that have low or no impact on the campus trails and others that have a higher impact and should require approval. Peter Corcoran is getting yet another group together to define what sustainability means at FGCU.

IRC: Dave Jaeger noted that the IRC was meeting Friday. He said the IRC had sent a prioritized list of IT needs to the Budget Committee to use in discussions of a funding model. Dave expects the IRC’s overall report to be forwarded in time for the next SPIEC meeting.

Budget: Chuck, although not a co-chair, indicated that the committee had not met for some time.

Continuing Review of Action Plans (Units)

Paul called the committee’s attention to the spreadsheet from the previous meeting and stated the committee had now had a month to review the action plans submitted
by the various units of the University. Paul said there were several things the committee needed to accomplish today:

1) Are we comfortable with the classification of action plans by goal and strategy as they are portrayed here (in the spreadsheet)? If not, what would you suggest be moved and why?

2) Is there a need to consider a change to the wording of a strategy or for us to consider proposing a new strategy?

[This should only be necessary if we observe many action plans that cannot be accommodated among the strategies presented here and not because we think something can be said better. Or because a strategy has no action plan associated with it (keep in mind in this latter case, we have committee reports that may address the unaddressed strategy). Remember that a lot of work went into the creation of the goals and strategies last year and changing them is not something to be taken lightly. There needs to be a compelling rationale to do so.]

3) We will want to keep the number of actions under a given strategy reasonable and manageable; probably no more than about five. This means that further consolidation will be necessary in the next phase of our review.

The committee agreed with the categorization in the spreadsheet and that there was no need for new strategies or modifications to existing strategies. Paul said he would use the spreadsheet to draft an update of the SP action plans for review at SPIEC’s next meeting. The committee agreed with this approach.

**Next steps**

Paul noted the next meeting is scheduled for April 27. He said he would get the draft of the SP updates to the committee in the next of couple of days to allow sufficient time for review before the next meeting.