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Strategic Planning Steering Committee

February 1, 2002

Minutes

Present: Chancellor Tom Hallman, Randy Duckett, Elaine Lacy, Ginger Steel, David Jaspers, Allen Dennis, Deb Kladivko, Bill Claxon, Mike Lemons, Mike Hosang, Jeff Jenik, Patti Cook, Jane Tuten, David Harrison, Christine Wernet-Beyer, Tom Boyd, Tony Ateca, Charmaine Wilson, Jack Goldsmith, R.L. Andrews, Sandra Field, & Dr. Bob Shirley

Dr. Lacy thanked everyone for all the work that has been done to date. Dr. Hallman added that he felt it had been a very productive academic year in various ways. He has looked over some of the draft reports and has been impressed with the work that has been done and the work that will need to be done in the future. He added that it has been very helpful to have Dr. Shirley involved because of his vast experience in helping other institutions in this planning process.

Dr. Shirley complimented the group on the fantastic job that has been done. February 15th is the date that working group reports are to be completed for the Strategic Planning Committee (SPC). At that point the Strategic Planning Steering Committee will begin work on an institutional vision statement which will encompass the following 5 areas: 1) institutional mission, 2) clientele to be served, 3) programs to be offered, 4) comparative advantages, and 5) strategic objectives.

The first step for the Steering Committee will be to revisit the Mission Statement. Committee members will read the reports of the internal and external evaluation working groups and the institutional values group, then will examine our current mission statement to be sure that there is a "match." This process will be facilitated by the use of a matrix, which will also help in drafting a vision statement. The information from the reports can be plugged into this matrix, which will have the 5 components of the institutional vision as one axis and the 10 working groups' findings on the other. It may be necessary for the SPC to go back to the working groups from time to time for clarification or for more information. Dr. Shirley suggested that 2-3 members of the Steering Committee draft a matrix as a starting point for discussion by the entire group. Once the vision statement has been drafted (a process that should be completed by the end of spring semester 2002), plans may be begun to implement the new vision. Using the vision statement as a guide, units may begin to devise new plans in the areas of finance, facilities, enrollment, and so on.

Dr. Lacy informed the group that the completion of a mission statement would be a
simultaneous process with the grid development, and we would work within existing University policies regarding the adoption of a new mission statement. She stated that the University Planning Committee is charged with the task of reviewing mission statements, and two members of that committee also serve on the SPC. The University Planning Committee's chair, Dr. Bill Pirkle, will sit in on Steering Committee meetings during review of the mission statement. Should a new draft of the mission statement result from the deliberations, the UPC will take the draft to the faculty assembly for a vote.

Dr. Hallman added that a concerted effort has been made to build the SPC so that it was a representative group. He also suggested that the group be held constant throughout next year.

Dr. Lacy concluded the meeting by thanking Dr. Shirley for sharing his knowledge, and thanked Dr. Hallman for his presence at that meeting.

The next meeting date has been set for Feb. 15 at 2:00 p.m. in Room144/B&E. At that time, the committee will begin to review a draft of the matrix as they begin to develop a mission/vision statement.

Respectfully submitted,

Brenda Hill
Administrative Support
Present: Elaine Lacy, Deb Kladivko, Mike Lemons, Tom Hallman, Sandra Field, Bill Claxon, Jeff Jenik, Dave Jaspers, Tony Ateca, Mike Hosang, Tom Boyd, Patti Cook, David Harrison, Christine W. Beyer, Allen Dennis, Blanche Premo-Hopkins, Ginger Steel, Deidre Martin, Charmaine Wilson, R. L. Andrews, Jack Goldsmith, Randy Duckett, Jane Tuten, Bill Pirkle

Elaine Lacy distributed a DRAFT matrix that she and Randy Duckett compiled from the working group reports (Values, External Political-Legal, External Social-Demographic, External Technological-Financial, External Competitive- Educational, Internal Campus Climate/Culture, Internal Human Resources/ Physical Plant/Finances). She explained that she and Randy Duckett had included on the matrix only the specific actions to be undertaken or recommendations that appeared in the reports. She also reported that last fall she and Randy had spoken with Chancellor Hallman about meeting with as many people on campus as possible about the strategic planning process and getting their input. Dr. Lacy has scheduled and will be visiting faculty departments and Randy has been meeting with the administrative office staffs. These meetings should be completed within the next few weeks, and ideas/suggestions that come out of those meetings will be presented to the Steering Committee in the form of an Addendum Report. Elaine stressed that the reason for these visits is to get as many people on campus as possible involved, the reason is NOT because the reports from subcommittees are considered inadequate. She then asked specifically if people on the Values subcommittee had any objection to she and Randy asking if anyone had anything to add to the campus values. Patti Cook, chair of the Institutional Values Committee, stated that there had been good representation at the focus groups that her group held on campus. She felt their group had a good handle on the values expressed, but was open to further discussion.

Dr. Lacy then said that the issue had arisen of whether faculty or staff should be able to read the working group reports before these visits to campus units take place. She asked for the steering committee's opinion/vote regarding whether or not the reports coming out of the subcommittees should be made public at this point. She said that Dr. Shirley had suggested that the reports be placed on reserve in the library, but she felt it was the SPC's decision whether or not to do so. A lengthy discussion followed, leading to a motion that draft reports be put on reserve in the USCA library with a disclaimer that says something to the effect that "These are internal drafts to Strategic Planning Steering Committee and are for your information only."

Any revisions to the reports should be made by next Friday (Feb. 22nd) and sent to Elaine and Randy so that the reports may be put on reserve.

Chancellor Hallman challenged the group that this strategic planning effort is the most
important thing to be done for USCA's future. The world is changing, and it is no longer enough to do just enough to be comfortable. This process will show us what sorts of changes will be most beneficial to the students we serve and how well are we contributing to their development. This is the first step and is of critical importance to the University. It will shape how we live in years to come.

Regarding Mission Statement revision: Elaine proposed that the SPC have about six volunteers from the committee to work on drafting a mission statement from the reports submitted. The draft would then be taken to the entire steering committee for discussion/further revision. The following members volunteered to serve in this capacity: Elaine, Randy, Charmaine Wilson, Tom Boyd, Jeff Jenik, Bill Pirkle, Tony Ateca and Christine Wernet Beyer.

This sub-committee (rather than the entire steering committee) will meet next Friday, Feb. 22 at 2:00 p.m. in H&SS 210. In the meantime, Elaine asked committee members to look over the matrix and make any additions, if needed.

Respectfully submitted,

Brenda Hill
Strategic Planning Steering Committee

March 8, 2002

Present: Elaine Lacy, Mike Lemons, Bill Claxon, Blanche Premo-Hopkins, David Harrison, Tom Boyd, Bill Pirkle, Jeff Jenik, Sandra Field, Mike Hosang, Christine W. Beyer, David Jaspers, Deb Kladivko, Jane Tuten

Dr. Lacy opened the meeting of the steering committee by reminding everyone that the next step in the process (once the Mission Statement has been approved) is to add to the matrix anything in the reports that is not now in the matrix. The matrix will be used to begin to craft a vision statement. At the same time, the committee will begin to devise strategic initiatives. The manner in which this step in the planning process proceeds will be open to discussion; in some cases, planning groups divide into teams to develop plans.

The task at hand is to discuss the draft of the Mission Statement as written by the steering committee subcommittee. Elaine expressed her thanks and appreciation to those 8 individuals who drafted the document for their hard work. She said that this process was not easy and much thought and effort had gone into the document. Elaine then distributed a document submitted to her earlier that same day from the Assessment Committee chair, Dr. Jim Yates. Dr. Premo-Hopkins, who is ex-officio on the Assessment Committee, explained that that committee has concerns that some of the statements of values that appeared in the draft report of the Institutional Values Working Group are too "lofty" to be included in a mission statement. One of the duties of the Academic Assessment Committee, she explained, is to figure out ways that Mission Statement components may be measured or assessed, and if some of the aforementioned values are included in the new Mission Statement, the committee will find it difficult to measure them. There must be a simple way to assess how we are helping our students attain certain values and goals. If we cannot show how our students are progressing towards these values or goals, then the statements should not be included. Elaine stated that just before the meeting she had spoken with the consultant, Dr. Robert Shirley, about the problem of measuring such statements, and he said that some institutions use what he calls "surrogate measures." He said that institutions must of necessity include "lofty" statements in their mission statements, because they don't want to be an institution that does NOT include such values or goals.

Elaine stated that the sub-committee took into consideration CHE guidelines when developing the mission statement. They also included items/issues/goals that emerged from the Institutional Values group reports and other draft reports. The sub-committee also examined mission statements from other institutions. At that point the committee began to discuss the draft mission statement, and by 5 pm had reached a consensus on a draft. The draft will go on to the University Planning Committee for its approval.
Strategic Planning Committee Meeting

March 22, 2002

Present: Elaine Lacy, Randy Duckett, Deb Kladivko, Bill Claxon, Jane Tuten, Patti Cook, Ginger Steel, David Jaspers, Charmaine Wilson, David Harrison, Mike Hosang, Bill Pirkle, Mike Lemons, Blanche Premo-Hopkins, Jeff Jenik, Tony Ateca, Jack Goldsmith, Christine W. Beyer, Sandra Field, Allen Dennis

The purpose of today's meeting was to review and make any additional changes to the mission statement as revised by the University Planning Committee. Elaine distributed a copy of the mission statement that is used in the College of Charleston's Strategic Planning Report as an example of the length that other institutions are using. After much discussion, several changes were made to the current USCA document. This revised draft will be sent out to UPC members today for their comments. The mission statement will be on the agenda for the Faculty Assembly meeting set for March 27th.

The next SPC meeting is scheduled for Tuesday, March 29 at 2:00 p.m. and will be in Room 216/ Penland Bldg. (This is a change from the original location listed in the Spring list of SPC meetings.) At the next meeting, the SP Committee will begin looking at the internal reports, starting first with Campus Image/Climate/Culture.

Respectfully submitted,

Brenda Hill
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Strategic Planning Committee Meeting

March 29, 2002

Attending: Elaine Lacy, Jack Goldsmith, Mike Lemons, David Jaspers, Bill Pirkle, Mike Hosang, R.L. Andrews, Tony Ateca, Randy Duckett, Tom Boyd, Bill Claxon, Christine Beyer, Charmaine Wilson, Jane Tuten, Ginger Steele, Jeff Jenik, Patti Cook, Deidre Martin, David Harrison, Allen Dennis, Brenda Hill

The meeting began at 2 pm. Elaine stated that she had invited Dr. Pirkle (chair of UPC) back to continue discussion on the draft Mission Statement. She displayed a copy of the College of Charleston's and CHE's definition of the word "comprehensive." She also stated that Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching has classified baccalaureate colleges into three areas: 1) Baccalaureate Colleges - Liberals Arts, 2) Baccalaureate Colleges - General (this is our classification according to their definition), and 3) Baccalaureate- Associates Colleges. The College of Charleston categories, which they have developed based on the Carnegie classifications AND their own research, range from the Liberal Arts College on one end of the spectrum to the Research University at the other end. College of Charleston has labeled themselves a "Public Liberal Arts Institution," a term increasingly in use today by institutions that are much like USCA. The CHE has 4 categories: 1) research, 2) 4-yr teaching, 3) 2-yr teaching, and 4) state technical & comprehensive.

Time was spent on reviewing the mission statement and defining what we are. A vote was taken and it was decided that the Strategic Planning Steering Committee would recommend that USCA also choose to define ourselves as a "public liberal arts" institution, largely because the term "comprehensive" implies more graduate offerings than we have here at USCA. This category is described in the guidelines published by an organization called COPLAC (Council of Public Liberal Arts Colleges) (http://www.coplac.org).

Elaine stated that she would send out the revised mission statement, along with the documents from College of Charleston and CHE. It was decided that an amendment to the mission statement would go out with the documents as well.

The remainder of the meeting was spent discussing and working on the matrix beginning with the Image/Culture/Climate Working Group. The next SPC meeting is scheduled for April 3rd.
Strategic Planning Steering Committee

April 26, 2002

Present: Blanche Premo-Hopkins, R.L. Andrews, Vin Feudo, Sandra Field, Tom Boyd, Jodi Herrin, Ginger Steel, Tony Ateca, Mike Hosang, Davis Jaspers, Mike Lemons, Deb Kladivko, Dave Harrison, Jane Tuten, Elaine Lacy, Randy Duckett, Bill Claxon, Patti Cook, Jack Goldsmith, Charmaine Wilson, Brenda Hill, Christine Beyer, Robert Shirley

Dr. Shirley began the meeting by distributing copies of 'A Strategic Planning System for Colleges and Universities.' He discussed the overall framework for the strategic plan, and reminded the steering committee members that the matrix is the magic component that will bring all the information together. Once it is complete, we analyze its contents and come up with recommendations in 5 areas: 1) institutional mission, 2) clientele, 3) program/service mix, 4) comparative advantage, and 5) strategic objectives. A campus-wide process will then begin, in which plans will need to be made to fulfill recommendations in all the areas mentioned. Campus-wide strategies to implement the decisions will also have to be made. At the individual unit level, decisions will have to be made as to how to do what needs to be done in that particular area.

Time frame: Dr. Shirley discussed our new timeline for completing Phase I of the process. He said that our initial timeline would have us submitting the complete report to the Chancellor by end of spring semester, but that timeline did not work out for various reasons. Therefore, the 'new' date for a DRAFT report to be sent to Dr. Hallman is May 15. Dr. Hallman will then review reports with members of the administration, and he will then send copies of the report along with a cover letter to home addresses of all faculty and staff over the summer for their response.

Elaine stated the need to have several additional meetings in May in order to complete the draft report by May 15. Meetings have already been set for May 1, May 3, and May 10 at 2:00 p.m. Two additional meetings were set for May 8 and May 13, also at 2:00 p.m. All meetings, except May 10 will be held in Room 110/Penland. The May 10th meeting will be held in Room 216/Penland. Elaine added that information from the Addendum Report will be added to the matrix in time for the next meeting.

The steering committee then went to work, pulling information out of the matrix to identify goals and objectives. The first step is to identify “issues” from the matrix that need to be discussed. An issue may or may not become a goal or objective. Elaine identified four levels of information that come out of the matrix:

1) Background information (much of this will be included in the report to the Chancellor)
2) Issues to be discussed (examples)

- Non-traditional student recruitment issues
- Technology on campus

3) Goals: several categories seem evident already, including

- Enrollment services
- Learning environment
- Facilities
- Faculty/staff recruitment & retention
- Technology infrastructure
- Community relationships/partnerships
- Development
- Governance & organizational structure
- Marketing

4) Information gathered but extraneous to the process

A format for the reports will include 1) Introduction (section on mission), 2) Clientele we want to attract, 3) program/service mix, 4) comparative advantage, and 5) strategic objectives.

The committee members then went through the “clientele” column on the matrix and identified issues, background information, and extraneous information. She asked that before the next meeting everyone identify issues from the remainder of the matrix.
Present: Elaine Lacy, Randy Duckett, Mike Lemons, Mike Hosang, Tony Ateca, Patti Cook, Sandra Field, Vin Feudo, Jodi Herrin, Jack Goldsmith, Christine Beyer, Blanche Premo-Hopkins, Allen Dennis, Jane Tuten, Deb Kladivko, Tom Boyd.

The meeting began at 2 pm. Elaine presented the steering committee with an agenda for the remaining meetings and into the early fall semester (based on the assumption that the committee will have draft goals and objectives in place by May 15).

Discussion continued on identifying issues or objectives from the matrix. The SPC will meet again on Wednesday, May 3 at 2:00 p.m. in Room 110/Penland. The meeting was adjourned at 5 pm.
Strategic Planning Steering Committee Meeting

May 3, 2002

Present: Elaine Lacy, Christine W. Beyer, Charmaine Wilson, Deb Kladivko, Jodi Herrin, Dave Jaspers, Randy Duckett, Patti Cook, Mike Hosang, Bill Claxon, Mike Lemons, Jane Tuten, R.L. Andrews, Deidre Martin, Sandra Field, Brenda Hill

The meeting began at 2 pm. Discussion continued on issues listed in the remainder of the matrix.

Before the meeting was over, Elaine made some comments regarding the reports, which are due next week.

- Read the reports carefully
- Committee members may not agree on all the recommendations made by other committee members. This group will discuss and modify if necessary.
- The discussions could be potentially awkward for some members of the steering committee, who may feel reluctant to speak out because they fear their comments may be interpreted as “turf protection.” Elaine said that the steering committee is discussing the program recommendations within a broader context, and people here have information that may not have been provided to the program working groups, so everyone should feel free to speak up and bring information to the steering committee.
- At this level, we are merely offering recommendations, which will then go to the Chancellor for his approval.
- The program task forces’ reports will go on reserve in the library
May 8, 2002

Present: Elaine Lacy, Dave Jaspers, Jodi Herrin, Patti Cook, Deb Kladivko, Mike Lemons, Christine Beyer, Charmaine Wilson, R.L. Andrews, Bill Claxon, Dave Harrison, Vin Feudo, Tom Boyd, Mike Hosang, Tony Ateca, Allen Dennis, Jeff Jenik, Sandra Field, Deidre Martin, Ginger Steel, Jane Tuten, Randy Duckett, Brenda Hill

Elaine expressed thanks to Dr. Claxon and Dr. Boyd for their group's hard work on the reports. Hopes are to get through one of the reports today.

Bill Claxon distributed 2 handouts that are to be included with his committee's Athletics/Student Services Program Report: 1) Priority List of Recommendations for Enhancement, & 2) Peach Belt Conference Budget Comparison. A lengthy question and answer session regarding the program reviews followed.

Because of time constraints, Tom Boyd gave a brief overview of the Academic Programs Report. He mentioned that the cover sheet lists general comments about patterns that came out as the group made their recommendations. Elaine asked that members read the report carefully and be ready with comments and questions at Friday's meeting. Plans are to begin discussion of the Administrative Programs Report on Monday.

Two additional SPC meeting were scheduled for next week: Tuesday, May 14 @ 1:00 pm and Wednesday, May 15 @ 1:00 p.m. Both meetings will be held in Room 110/Penland.

The meeting was adjourned at 5 p.m.
Strategic Planning Committee Meeting

May 10, 2002

Present: Elaine Lacy, Randy Duckett, Tom Boyd, Sandra Field, Jodi Herrin, Dave Jaspers, Mike Lemons, Deb Kladivko, Vin Feudo, Patti Cook, Jane Tuten, Dave Harrison, Mike Hosang, Charmaine Wilson, R.L. Andrews, Christine W. Beyer, Tony Ateca, Blanche Premo-Hopkins, Jeff Jenik, Allen Dennis

The meeting began at 2 pm. The bulk of the meeting was devoted to a discussion of the Academic Program Working Group report on USCA’s academic programs. Chair of that committee, Tom Boyd, reviewed their recommendations, and a lengthy discussion followed. The meeting was adjourned at 5 pm.

The next meeting is scheduled for Monday, May 13th at 1:00 pm in Rm 110/Penland.
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Strategic Planning Committee

May 13, 2002

Present: Blanche Premo-Hopkins, Charmaine Wilson, Allen Dennis, Sandra Field, Elaine Lacy, Dave Jaspers, Randy Duckett, Ginger Steel, Mike Lemons, Mike Hosang, Tony Ateca, Patti Cook, Jeff Jenik, Deidre Martin, Deb Kladivko, Christine Beyer, R. L. Andrews, Jodi Herrin, Bill Claxon, Jane Tuten, Brenda Hill

The meeting began with discussion of the Administrative Programs Report. Dr. Dennis stated that his group was able to come to a consensus on every program that was reviewed. He then went over the different administrative programs his committee reviewed and answered questions and made comments about the group's findings.

After an in-depth discussion of the issues cited in the Administrative Programs Report, discussion then centered on the best way to begin the planning process. It was agreed that the best way to proceed was to look at the list of issues and goal categories gleaned from the matrix and articulate the goals and objectives therein. The first issue considered was USCA's clientele, and the type of image we want our marketing efforts to convey to the public. Discussion continued from that point.

The next meeting is set for Tuesday, May 14th at 1:00 p.m. in Room 110/ Penland Building.
Present: Elaine Lacy, Charmaine Wilson, Randy Duckett, Jane Tuten, Patti Cook, Mike Hosang, Dave Jaspers, Deidre Martin, Jodi Herrin, Blanche Premo-Hopkins, Sandra Field, Tony Ateca, Allen Dennis, Deb Kladivko, R. L. Andrews, Christine W. Beyer, Mike Lemons, Bill Claxon, Brenda Hill

The meeting began at 1 pm. Elaine reported that she and Randy met with Chancellor Hallman earlier today. The report from the SPC was due to the Chancellor by May 15, 2002. With the impossibility of meeting that deadline, Chancellor Hallman has graciously extended that deadline until September 15. Over the summer, Elaine and Randy will write the introduction, which will be presented to the steering committee for approval in August. Elaine stated that this committee will have to meet immediately after the fall 2002 semester begins and thereafter until the report is finalized.

The committee then returned to the task at hand, which is revisiting issues that we earlier identified from the matrix (and listed under broad goal categories). Elaine reminded everyone that in this stage of the process the group is stating “what” we want to do in the next five years or so, not HOW to do it. That stage comes next. Discussion continued on Goals 1 & 2. Some changes were made for clarification.

The discussion then moved to Program Goals list. Elaine stated that there would be some recommendations coming from the program working groups that SPC would endorse, and some that this committee would not endorse. Elaine then directed everyone's thoughts to the programs listed on the matrix under "Enhance" and asked for comments, and discussion. Some of the areas were moved to other categories, including maintain, modify, or eliminate. There was extended discussion regarding how to rank programs that should be enhanced. The committee then turned to the question regarding graduate vs. undergraduate programs.

Elaine asked members of the committee to bring their calendars to the next meeting so that August meetings could be set. The meeting was adjourned at 5 pm.
Strategic Planning Committee

May 15, 2002

Present:  R.L. Andrews, Blanche Premo-Hopkins, Dave Jaspers, Jeff Jenik, Jodi Herrin, Tony Ateca, Randy Duckett, Patti Cook, Ginger Steel, Mike Lemons, Jane Tuten, Bill Claxon, Elaine Lacy, Christine Beyer, Deb Kladivko, Allen Dennis, Charmaine Wilson, Deidre Martin, Brenda Hill

The meeting began at 1 pm. Elaine began by stating that she thought it would be better not to rank the "enhanced" list of programs, but to come back to the programs discussion in August. Discussion then began on the other nine goal categories, focusing on how the committee wished to state the goals and objectives. By 5 pm the steering committee had a draft of nine strategic goals and objectives. The group will stay in touch over the summer and will continue to reflect on the future of the institution before resuming their meetings in August. The schedule for August and early September meetings are as follows:

August 15, 9-3 pm (retreat mode)

August 19, 9-12 pm

August 23, 1-4 pm

August 29, 3-5 pm

August 30, 1-4 pm

September 5, 3-5 pm

September 6, 1-4 pm

September 12, 3-5 pm

September 13, 1-4 pm