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Chancellor Hallman opened the meeting by stating that this group needs to be clear on why we're doing what we're doing and why it's important. Dr. Robert Shirley's visit to the campus on September 25 & 26 provided much useful information. Dr. Hallman added that we're not locked into this model, but it is a place to begin. In the past, our success has been measured, in part, by which institution could enroll the most students. Performance Based Funding tried to reshape our thinking. The risk that the state runs is we have "homogenized" our institutions. We have a grand and courageous task, but when we're done, this will guide the institution in the years to come. When we look at what we hold dear and what we have in common, a model will be developed that will be appropriate for USC Aiken. Lastly, Dr. Hallman stated that he hoped that all members of the committee would do their own environmental scanning in books, television, news articles, etc. and bring those ideas back to this group.

Dr. Lacy distributed several handouts including a Working Timeline, Strategic Planning Process/ Fall 2001, and a Strategic Planning Process - Level 1. Discussions followed as each of the handouts were distributed. The Strategic Planning Process - Level 1 consists of an External Environmental Evaluation (4 groups with 6-7 persons in each group); an Internal Environment Evaluation (5 groups with 5-10 persons in each group); and an Institutional Core Values Working Group (15 members). Tasks and a completion dates were listed for each group. The External group will also include some community people. The Institutional Core Values group will consist of 5 faculty/staff from this group, 5 faculty/staff not in this group, and 5 students & alumni or community leaders.

Dr. Lacy stated that she hoped the working groups would be established by late next week and that they would begin their work right away.

Randy Duckett stated that a web site had been created for the Strategic Planning process and that minutes and much of the information regarding the process will be put there. Reading materials related to strategic planning will be placed on reserve in the library and listed on the web as well. A listserve for committee members will also be established. SPC members were asked to indicate 3 different working groups with which they may want to work and rank their preferences (1-3).
Dr. Lacy stated that this group would meet again on **Nov. 9, at 3:00 p.m. in Room 237/ B&E Bldg.**
Strategic Planning Steering Committee

November 5, 2001

Present: Elaine Lacy, Randy Duckett, Bill Claxon, R.L. Andrews (for Tom Boyd), Mike Hosang (for David Harrison), Mike Lemons, Angie Osbon (for Jeff Jenik), David Jaspers, Deidre Martin & Karl Fornes (for Allen Dennis), Sandra Field, Patti Cook, Tony Ateca, Brenda Hill

Elaine welcomed the group and thanked those representatives attending for committee chairs who were not available today.

The focus of the meeting today was to make announcements and get reports from the groups. Elaine mentioned that there are several articles related to strategic planning on the SPC web page. These articles have been scanned and placed directly on the web page for easier access. Some books on the topic are also available in the USCA library. At the Circulation Desk, ask for books on 'general reserve.' There is a two-day check out time and photocopying of pages is available in the library if needed.

Elaine and Randy spoke with Dr. Shirley last Friday. Much of the information from that discussion has been passed along to appropriate chairpersons. Elaine added that Dr. Shirley would visit USCA again the first week in December. He plans to meet with each group before their final report is due. A draft may be sent to him prior to that visit (by Dec. 3rd) which would be very helpful to him. Elaine also mentioned that last Friday she traveled to USC Columbia for a talk given by George Keller, the "guru" of strategic planning in higher education, and that she would share pertinent information from that talk with appropriate working group chairs. She also mentioned that, as chair of your group, if there is some literature that a committee member or someone he/she knows of, please pass that on to Elaine or Randy so that can also be shared.

Group reports followed:

Group 1 - External Technology & Economy (Mike Lemons) - Mike mentioned that his group had met 3 times with good participation, especially from the non-USCA people. They have identified 13 trends (all may not be rightfully in their group, some more appropriately in External Social & Demographic). The economy, in light of Sept. 11 events, is anyone's guess as to where that will lead. There have not been a lot of contentious issues. Their report should be finished around the first of December.

Group 2 - External Social & Demographic (David Jaspers) - This group has met 3 times and still trying to focus on their list. They have identified 10 items for further research. Some members have been assigned to different areas. They are looking at such issues as 1) the lottery, 2) ethnic and international populations, and other areas as well. It was noted that
there will be an increase in population in Edgefield County due to the new prison facility. At their next meeting, the list will be prioritized.

Group 3 - External Political & Legal (Mike Hosang for David Harrison) - This group has met 2 times and spent most of the time brainstorming about trends that may affect USCA politically and legally. Mike cited several issues (other than issues related to state politics) that have arisen: a) safety issues on campus (may be more in Tony's group), b) lottery, c) recession, and d) competitiveness/relationship of USCA and area tech schools. David has broken the group into 2 sub-groups to look at the trends identified and strategic plans at other colleges and universities.

Group 4 - External Competitive & Educational (Sandra Field) - Sandra reported that her group had identified 5 trends that relate to education. They will be looking at issues such as 1) educational programs at other institutions, 2) image (how we appear to the outside community). They plan to take advantage of different groups visiting the campus by gathering information from these groups. They will also be talking with area guidance counselors and others to gather information about high school graduates and their needs.

They will be looking at USCA’s major competitors and what programs they offer. Sandra also mentioned that they are looking at the programs USCA can offer. Elaine mentioned that that should be included in their “implications for action,” and that their primary efforts should probably relate to gathering information on the competition and on the needs of our target potential student population. The next meeting is planned for Nov. 27.

Group 5 - Internal Human Resources and Financial & Physical Plant (Tony Ateca) - Tony reported that his group had met 3 times. In Human Resources, they are looking at areas such as compensation packages, and faculty/staff workloads. They are still brainstorming ideas and identifying SWOTs. They have been looking at many resources such as SACS Report, and surveys hoping to identify recurring themes. In financial area, they will be looking at out-of-state waivers and how this impacts USCA. In physical plant, they will be looking at the quality of our buildings, proximity of the buildings, etc. The next meeting is Friday, Nov. 9.

Group 6 - Internal Campus Image/Climate/Culture (Angie Osbon for Jeff Jenik) - Two meetings have been held and weekly meetings are planned until the report is done. This is a good and active group but they are struggling with the direction to proceed. They are looking at image among faculty, staff and students and how people perceive the institution. They will be examining survey summaries, and conducting focus groups to determine the image, climate, and culture of the campus. They have looked at student opinion surveys, athletic surveys and faculty governance information. Some of this information is several years old, and they have raised the question re: how old can survey information be and still be valid. Elaine and Randy said that it depended on what the survey related to. Elaine also suggested that that group may want to get information gathered by the Values working group in their focus
group meetings.

It was pointed out that working group chairs should be provided with a comprehensive list of all the surveys that have been done on campus in recent years. Much of this information can be found in the self-study room, in the USCA Fact Book, also located on the web, and from Jodi Herrin.

Group 7 - Academic Programs (R.L. Andrews for Tom Boyd) - R.L. reported that this group had met 3 times and identified 14 major criteria. They will be looking at academic programs across the board with that criteria. The group has spent a great deal of time determining just what courses and programs they will review, and at present they are working to define the criteria and how to proceed in gathering the information. Sub-groups will work on this. R.L. said that there had been much discussion of how to determine quality of faculty.

Group 8 - Administrative Programs (Deidre Martin reporting for Allen Dennis) - (Karl Fornes also represented this group). This group has met 3 times and focused on criteria of administrative offices/areas. They are looking at administrative programs on and off-campus and had also raised questions concerning the evaluation of various USCA ad hoc committees. They are developing criteria in 4 areas: 1) centrality to mission, 2) need of services, 3) quality of services, and 4) cost effectiveness. Program reviews did not capture everything the group wanted, so a narrative/questionnaire and a follow up interview is being planned for each unit reviewed. A meeting is scheduled for next Monday to finalize the criteria.

Group 9 - Athletic/Student Services Programs (Bill Claxon) - Bill reported that his group has determined programs to review. 3 sub-groups will define criteria (same as administrative programs). Many of these programs are quite different and criteria are hard to define. Their next meeting is planned for Nov. 15th.

Group 10 - Institutional Values (Patti Cook) - Two meetings have been held by this group. They plan to conduct focus groups with administrators, faculty, staff, students, and alumni to see what they "value." There has been poor attendance by most of the outside folks on the committee. Patti stated that the Dec. 15 deadline would be difficult to make. Their next meeting is Wed., 11/7 at 3:45 p.m.

Elaine added that if any group feels they cannot do a good job because of the short time frame, then we need to look at the timeline again and make adjustments. The criteria for each group were to be ready by the Nov. 9th SPC meeting. It was decided to put this meeting off one week (to Nov. 16) to give more time for the criteria to be completed by the groups. IPC meets that day at 2 p.m. Randy will check with Ginger Steel about coordinating the SPC and IPC meetings on the 16th.
Elaine welcomed everyone to the meeting, and announced that the most pressing item on the agenda was to approve criteria for the three program evaluation working groups (Academic Programs, Administrative Programs, and Student Services and Athletic Programs). Once the criteria are approved, these groups will begin to gather information from chairs, unit heads, and administrators. The other working groups will also give updates on the progress that they have made to date.

I. Review of Academic Programs Evaluation Criteria - Tom Boyd

Dr. Boyd began by distributing copies of a narrative outlining the work of the Academic Programs' committee to date. This group is required to gather certain information about each academic program, which will be used to evaluate that program. Information will be gathered regarding degree programs as well as from units that offer courses but no degree. The criterion developed by this working group closely resembles the guidelines set forth by Dr. Bob Shirley. The following criteria were offered for review and approval:

1) Academic Unit's Mission
2) Current Faculty Complement
3) Current Faculty Quality (in aggregate)
4) Potential Program Development
5) Contribution to Institutional Identity
6) Demand by Majors
7) Currency of Program
8) Service to Non-Majors
9) Library

10) Facilities

11) Equipment (including Technology)

12) Locational Advantage

13) Comparative Advantage

14) Community Impact

15) Cost/Revenue Relationship

There was discussion on each criteria and suggestions made to clarify certain areas. A motion was made to approve the criteria and the motion was seconded.

II. Review of Administrative Programs Evaluation Criteria - Allen Dennis

Dr. Dennis also distributed a handout describing his group's efforts so far. Information gathered will be used by the committee to evaluate USCA's administrative programs in three key areas:

1) Quality of programs/services 2) Need for services; and 3) Cost effectiveness. Under the Quality of Programs/Services, the committee will be concentrating on personnel, facilities, and technology. A list of the administrative programs to be evaluated was also included with the handout, and some adjustments were made regarding which units this working group would evaluate. After further discussion, a motion was made to approve the criteria and the motion was seconded.

III. Review of Student Services and Athletic Programs Evaluation Criteria - Bill Claxon

Dr. Claxon distributed a handout outlining four criteria their group would use to evaluate student service and athletic programs: 1) Quality of program/service; 2) Need for program/service; 3) Cost effectiveness, and 4) Centrality to mission. It was noted that the following quantitative and qualitative factors will be utilized in evaluating each program or service:

- Availability of services
- Variety and depth of services
- Usage rates (when appropriate)
- Satisfaction survey results (student, faculty, staff)
- Comparison to similar institutions
- Comparison to professional standards (when available)
• Outside recognition (when applicable)
• Quality and adequacy of human resources
• Quality and adequacy of facilities
• Quality and adequacy of equipment
• Adequacy of funding levels

A list of departments to be reviewed was included with the handout. After further discussion, a motion was made to accept the criteria and the motion carried.

Reports on the External Assessment Working Groups followed.

External Technology & Economy - Mike Lemons, Chair

Mike distributed a list of 8 tentative forces/trends that his group is working on.

External Social & Demographic - David Jaspers, Chair

David presented seven tentative forces/trends from his group. Their work is not yet complete.

External Political & Legal - David Harrison, Chair

David reported that his group had so far identified nine forces and trends of a political and legal nature that affect USCA. The group is putting their draft together to be ready by Dr. Shirley's visit in early December.

External Competitive & Educational - Sandra Field, Chair

Dr. Field mentioned that her group had identified the institutions that comprise USCA's competition, and that they were forming the forces and trends related to the competition and to high school graduates.

Internal Human Resource and Financial and Physical Plant - Tony Ateca, Chair

Tony distributed a handout of strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats related to USCA's human resources, financial resources, and physical plant. The handout reflects all thoughts in process so far.

Internal Campus Image/Climate/Culture - Jeff Jenik, Chair

Jeff stated that his group is in the process of determining the perception of USCA that exists on campus and in the community. They are gathering information from existing surveys and from the focus groups currently being conducted by the Institutional Values working group.
Institutional Values - Patti Cook, Chair (Christine Wernet Beyer represented this group)

Christine reported that this group has been very busy. They have been conducting focus group interviews and would engage later in additional efforts to get at commonly held institutional values.

Elaine concluded the meeting by informing the committee members that each working group would have the opportunity to meet with Dr. Shirley when he is here in December, and that the schedule of meetings would be determined as soon as possible. She thanked everyone for their hard work during this process and said that the dedication that she and Randy have witnessed as they visit the working group meetings says a lot about how people feel about this institution and its future.

Respectfully submitted,

Brenda Hill
Administrative Support