

**MEETING OF THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES OF THE
WILLIAM PATERSON UNIVERSITY OF NEW JERSEY**

Saturday, December 3, 2005

BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT: Mr. Adzima, Mr. Burroughs, Mr. Campbell, Dr. Fan, Mr. Gruel, Mr. Jackson, Mr. Mazzola, Mr. Pesce, Dr. Pruitt, Ms. Rosado, Mr. Taylor, and President Speert.

Absent were: Ms. Gehrman, Ms. Temple

OTHERS PRESENT:

Interim Vice President for Academic Affairs Hahn, Vice President Bolyai, Vice President Deller, Vice President Martone, Mr. Seeve, Mr. Van Duyne, DAG Clarke, Dr. Elizabeth Sibolski, Dr. Schaeffer, Mr. Duffy, Mr. Tanis, Mrs. Santaniello

The meeting was called to order at 9:05 a.m. in the Board Room at KPMG Offices, Short Hills, New Jersey.

Mr. Taylor thanked Mr. Paul Merrill for providing the KPMG Board Room for the meeting. Mr. Merrill welcomed everyone and gave a brief history of KPMG. Mr. Taylor introduced Mr. Steve Adzima, newest member of the WPU Board of Trustees, Mr. William Duffy, Chair of the Faculty Senate, Mr. Michael Seeve and Mr. Aaron Van Duyne, two officers of the WPU Foundation Board, and Dr. Elizabeth Sibolski, of The Middle States Commission on Higher Education, facilitator for the first session on University Mission. Mr. Taylor stated he was pleased with the opportunity for open discussion that a Board retreat offers. He then outlined the schedule for the day.

ANNOUNCEMENT CONCERNING ADEQUATE NOTICE OF MEETING:

In accordance with the "Open Public Meetings Act," the Chairperson publicly announced and had entered into the minutes that "adequate notice" of this meeting was provided. In compliance with this Statute, this notice was posted on the University's bulletin board, reserved for these announcements, and also distributed to The North Jersey Herald and News, The Record, and The Star Ledger more than 48 hours prior to this meeting.

UNIVERSITY MISSION:

Mr. Taylor asked President Speert to give an overview of the 150 year history of William Paterson University as a background for the discussion of the current University Mission Statement. Dr. Speert said Paterson Normal School was started by the City of Paterson to train and provide teachers for the children of the mill workers. We began a long history of the training of mainly K-8 teachers and contributing as well to the growth and development of education at the regional level. In the mid-60's the role of state colleges was expanded beyond the primary focus of preparation of teachers to encompass the needs of a broader post-war constituency.

1. In the late 60's through the early 70's a transformation of state institutions to multi-purpose colleges was begun.
2. William Paterson first offered a professional program in Nursing as a means of transitioning to a multi-purpose institution.
3. A decision was made to become a more comprehensive institution and focus on the growth of the arts and sciences programs and to begin the business school.

In 1986 the first autonomy legislation proposed by Governor Kean enabled the public institutions to manage and direct their tuition dollars. The 1994 autonomy legislation signed by Governor Whitman eliminated the role of the Chancellor and Board of Higher Education and gave greater autonomy and responsibility for the direction and future of the institution to individual Boards.

The Mission Statement of each institution is its core statement of purpose. One concern raised by Trustees over the years has been, "How do we know we are meeting the Mission and how do we know the Mission is the correct one for our institution?". Dr. Speert and Mr. Taylor discussed ways to approach the task. They decided to look at the Mission Statement and decide how to quantitatively measure its implicit goals and objectives.

Dr. Speert introduced Dr. Elizabeth Sibolski, Executive Associate Director of The Middle States Commission on Higher Education who facilitated a discussion of quantitative measures to assess progress in fulfilling the Mission Statement. Dr. Sibolski described her extensive professional experience in the field of quantitative measurement and assessment.

She focused the discussion on three key areas – defining the concepts of mission, goals and objectives, and assessment; outlining key questions that the Trustees want to have answered about the Mission Statement; and then discussion of those, a summary and suggested next steps.

It was generally agreed that a mission statement represents the purpose and core values of an institution, that it should have a long-term view, and have input from the entire University community. Goals and objectives as part of a strategic plan are part of the framework needed to assess and measure progress in meeting the mission. The Student Success Plan 2005 was discussed in the context of the goals and objectives identified there. Dr. Sibolski stressed that it is important to stay mindful of the link between the mission and the strategic plan. The goals provide the broad framework for policy setting. The objectives outline how the goals will be met and how they will be measured. The results of the assessment are the catalysts to improvements and future planning as part of a continuous improvement cycle. Dr. Sibolski noted that institutional research is very helpful in strategic planning. Measures of outcomes are very important – benchmarking, norms for the region and comparison to peers are some tools, but it is equally important for the University to measure its own progress. The Board needs to decide what they want to know, when they want to know it, who is providing it and from what sources? With multiple objectives, - our Student Success Plan 2005 lists about 35, and with limited resources, - there needs to be some prioritization. Mr. Pesce praised the Student Success Plan 2005 and said he believes the document is a comprehensive strategic plan. The plan identifies its goals and objectives: student success, academic excellence, faculty and staff development, community outreach and external relations.

Building on the discussion Dr. Sibolski framed three points for the Trustees to consider:

1. Can the Trustees agree that the Mission Statement, as currently written, is still an accurate and useful representation of what the mission and programs at William Paterson University should continue to be?

2. That the Student Success Plan 2005 represents a strategic plan for the University and the goals and objectives represent a significant amount of work approved by the Board, and
3. What timeframes will be set for meeting the goals established in the plan, and what is the priority of each of the goals in relation to the others?

Mr. Taylor recognized that the Mission Statement is the central point of discussion, and asked each Trustee to indicate if he or she was supportive of the Mission Statement as currently written. The Trustees were in support of the current mission statement and its core values, but further discussion suggested that the mission statement should also grow and change with the needs of the constituencies served by the University, while holding true to its core values. It should be reviewed on a periodic basis. Dr. Sibolski brought the discussion to a conclusion summarizing that the Board, as a group, is taking steps to strengthen the link between the Mission Statement and the strategic plan. Some next steps would include assigning responsibilities for certain objectives, setting timeframes for achievement of goals, determining measures for success, and continuing discussion on mission and direction and how they are actualized.

MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING WITH THE WILLIAM PATERSON UNIVERSITY FOUNDATION

Mr. Taylor said that the Board would review, discuss and hopefully reach a consensus on the document. If so, a resolution endorsing the Memorandum of Understanding would be recommended for approval at the Board meeting scheduled for December 10, 2005.

Dr. Speert presented a brief history of the origins of New Jersey College and University auxiliary corporations and then foundation boards for public institutions. The autonomy legislation also included legislation allowing the formation of auxiliary corporations, and foundations, which enabled institutions to accept donations from individuals specifically for the institution. These donations would not be public funds and would be restricted in use to the specific intent of the donor. Foundations were formed specifically to raise monies to support the initiatives of their institution in the face of decreasing state support.

The Association of Governing Boards (AGB) has developed guidelines to codify a formal understanding of the role of the Foundation Board and its relationship to the institutional Governing Board. The Memorandum of Understanding serves to define, clarify and reinforce the roles and responsibilities of both the University Board and the Foundation Board. The initial template for the Memorandum of Understanding was provided by AGB.

Several iterations have been reviewed and edited by members of both Boards resulting in the present document. Members from both Boards also expressed an interest in future opportunities to meet and discuss issues together and advance collaboration and understanding between the Boards. Dr. Pruitt suggested that the Board of Trustees receive copies of the minutes of the Foundation Board meetings to stay informed about their activities. Mr. Pesce emphasized that the ability of the University to grow and update facilities and implement new programs will become increasingly dependent upon

the ability of the Foundation to raise funds, since we can rely less and less on state funding to accomplish our goals. After further discussion, there was a consensus to present a resolution for approval of the Memorandum of Understanding at the next University Board meeting on 12/10/05. Dr. Speert and Mr. Taylor thanked the Boards for the in-depth discussion and suggestions for continued collaboration and support between the Boards to accomplish the University goals and promote its mission. A resolution was moved and seconded to move into Executive Session to discuss Personnel Matters. The resolution was unanimously adopted.

At 12:15 p.m. a motion was made and seconded for the meeting to be adjourned. The motion carried unanimously.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Donna Santaniello".

Donna Santaniello
Assistant to the President
and Board of Trustees

December 3, 2005