The Ad Hoc Committee on Strategic Planning of the University of South Carolina Board of Trustees met at 3:30 p.m. Tuesday, December 17, 2013, in the 1600 Hampton Street Board Room.

Members present were: Mr. Mack I. Whittle, Jr., Chairman; Mr. William C. Hubbard; Mr. William W. Jones, Jr.; Mr. Miles Loadholt; Ms. Leah B. Moody; Mr. John C. von Lehe, Jr.; Mr. Eugene P. Warr, Jr.; and Mr. Thad H. Westbrook.

Other Trustees present were: Mr. J. Egerton Burroughs; Mr. Thomas C. Cofield; Mr. A.C. “Bubba” Fennell; Mr. Hubert F. Mobley; and Dr. Mitchell M. Zais.

Also present were faculty representative Dr. James H. Knapp and student representative Chase Mizzell.

Others present were: President Harris Pastides; Secretary Amy E. Stone; Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost Michael D. Amiridis; Chief Financial Officer Edward L. Walton; General Counsel Walter “Terry” H. Parham; Vice President for Human Resources Chris Byrd; Interim Vice President for Communications Wes Hickman; Vice President for Student Affairs and Vice Provost for Academic Support Dennis A. Pruitt; Palmetto College Chancellor Susan Elkins; Senior Vice Provost and Director of Strategic Planning Christine W. Curtis; Associate Vice President for Business and Finance Leslie Brunelli; Associate Director of Planning and Assessment Cameron Howell; Interim Dean, Darla Moore School of Business, John McDermott; Senior Associate Dean for Research and Academics, Darla Moore School of Business, Brian Klaas; Special Assistant to the President J. Cantey Heath Jr.; University Technology Services Production Manager Matt Warthen; and Board staff members Debra Allen and Ina Wilson.

Chairman Whittle called the meeting to order and welcomed everyone. Mr. Hickman introduced members of the media in attendance: Andy Shain, The State; Thad Moore, The Daily Gamecock.
Chairman Whittle stated that notice of the meeting had been posted and the press notified as required by the Freedom of Information Act; the agenda and supporting materials had been circulated; and a quorum was present to conduct business.

II. Overview

Chairman Whittle called on Dr. Curtis who said the University has been measuring its performance strategically for the past three years and is steadily improving as compared to its peer and peer aspirant institutions. Selected by Provost Amiridis, assistant provosts and deans, these benchmark institutions were constantly seeking ways to improve.

Dr. Curtis said that the administration also is looking at faculty-type parameters, the research expenditures for those faculty members who are engaged in the areas where there is extramural funding; the student/faculty ratio; and the University’s PhD projection. She said Provost Amiridis would address the faculty parameters later in the meeting when he updated the Board on the University’s engagement of Academic Analytics and the academic parameters of the scholarly productivity of the faculty.

Dr. Curtis explained that there would be three presentations: the President would talk about his vision, addressing four key areas in which the University was moving forward; Interim Dean McDermott would address academic dashboard parameters, specifically those important for the Moore School of Business; and Provost Amiridis would present information about Academic Analytics.

III. President’s Vision

Chairman Whittle called on President Pastides who said he would briefly reiterate the strategic vision and priorities that he had expressed in the State of the University address on September 14, 2013.

The importance of it, President Pastides said, was that everything the Board should hear from Provost Amiridis and the deans ought to emanate from the vision. Nothing strategic, he said should be outside the bounds of the following four components. First, the University is a globally recognized, high-impact research university. Second, the University is recognized for a superior student experience. Third, the University is committed to developing flexible new models for college access and affordability. Fourth, the University is a vital part of South Carolina’s economic and overall well-being.

These are the four drivers of the University’s identity and vision, President Pastides said, as he commented further on each.

As a globally recognized, high impact research university, he noted Provost Amiridis would speak to how USC was using Academic Analytics and recruiting the most talented faculty. He said that the
University was actively involved in developing globally relevant partnerships and that it had started the Ronald E. McNair Center for Aerospace Innovation and Research as part of its effort to develop best-in-class research centers.

In the second area, President Pastides cited the success of the University’s leadership development programs, its Capstone Programs and the Honors College, noting that applications were up because of high student satisfaction. A recent survey showed the University well above national standards with 94 percent of freshmen stating at the end of their freshman year that they would re-enroll. Upon graduation, 87 percent of seniors said they would re-enroll. Those numbers validate the University is providing the experience that it hopes to provide.

In the third area, President Pastides said the University is relentless and will be recognized nationally for continuing to develop models of affordability and access. He said he had been invited to the White House as one of several universities to preview what was being done in this area. President Pastides said On Your Time Graduation would be highlighted, noting that part of the reason the December commencement was the largest in school history was because students were graduating in three and a half years.

Finally, he said the University continued to work with the Governor, the General Assembly, with Secretary of Commerce Robert Hitt to do all it could to contribute to job creation. A Moore School of Business report indicated that the University has an annual economic impact of $4.1 billion.

Chairman Whittle asked that the agenda be taken out of order and for Provost Amiridis to address the Academic Analytics database that the Board had approved purchasing.

V. Academic Analytics Update

Provost Amiridis said that it had taken about three months to verify the list of faculty members to insure that the quality of data about the faculty being placed in the database was exactly what the University wanted. The database now includes all of the University’s faculty members. Academic Analytics has been very careful in discussions with the University, noting that in the first year of using the database the University should emphasize using it appropriately and to avoid trying to do too much with it. Four individuals have been trained to use the database, he said. During the first year, the goal was to make individual program comparisons, discipline by discipline. Comparisons would be made as part of the whole, as well as by peer and peer aspirant groups. Academic Analytics addresses the scholarly productivity of the faculty members within a department – productivity in terms of publications, grants where appropriate, citations by others of articles that have been published by USC faculty, and awards.
Provost Amiridis underscored that Academic Analytics is a strategic planning tool, not an evaluation too. It will help identify areas in which improvement can be made. So far, he said the data indicates there are clearly gaps in some areas while other areas are clearly over performing. For example, he said, there is one unit in which grant applications are up to 80 percent but in terms of grant dollars received the unit is at 40 percent, which means they are going after small money not big grants. There may or may not be a reason for this, he said, but the issue has be identified so it can now be discussed. Another discussion that had been identified was why faculty in a unit were not being recognized for their work when they were very productive in terms of publications. These are the types of information that the University wants to obtain from the database, he said. By February 2014, Provost Amiridis said he hopes to have reports in hand that can be turned over to the deans to work unit by unit to address the findings. A substantive update about the findings and recommendations should be ready toward the end of Spring 2014.

Provost Amiridis confirmed Chairman Whittle’s summarization that this phase of using the database will create a benchmark that the administration can use to go back to the academic units on a periodic basis to determine the progress that has been made against the benchmark.

IV. College Dashboard

A. Moore School of Business

Chairman Whittle called on Darla Moore School of Business Interim Dean John McDermott to provide an overview of the business school. He reminded committee members that they first had looked at how to improve certain matrixes that had been established as goals for the undergraduate population and now they would begin reviewing the matrixes of individual schools for how they planned to improve.

Dr. McDermott began by listing the peer and peer aspirant schools for DMSB. Peers were Connecticut, Georgia, Kentucky, Pittsburgh, Rutgers and Virginia Tech. Peer aspirants were Indiana, Minnesota, Ohio State, Purdue, Texas and Virginia. He addressed undergraduate student enrollment and student outcomes, discussing the numbers of entering freshmen and their average SATs followed by information about freshman to sophomore retention rates. He discussed graduation rates and projected graduation rates, the average salaries of business school graduates, overall student satisfaction levels, and rankings. Dr. McDermott said that the DMSB has a higher undergraduate enrollment than the comparison schools and that its freshmen had higher SAT scores, with graduation rates at 80 percent. He said
undergraduate enrollment level is expected to remain consistent over the next five years. As for rankings, he said DMSB is lower than its peer aspirants, but well above its peer institutions.

The strategies for the undergraduate program in the area of enrollment included the creation of distinctive and visible programs to attract students to USC, the success of which would be validated by placement outcomes and rankings. Retention and progression would be addressed by ensuring capacity for course availability; staff training in at-risk students; identification and outreach for at-risk students; and student engagement initiatives. The benchmarks for student satisfaction and student outcomes were faculty and curriculum quality, early exposure to career management, and opportunities for student engagement.

Dr. McDermott then summarized efforts in the area of faculty and research. He reviewed the Financial Times research rankings, in which the DMSB was ranked along with its peer aspirants, while its peer institutions were not ranked. He reviewed student to faculty ratios, which were high compared to peer and peer aspirant institutions. However, he said, a major effort was made through the Faculty Replenishment Initiative (FRI) program that had allowed DMSB to hire 26 new full-time professors, half of whom were tenure-track. The strategies for faculty and research include enhancing the research environment through faculty teaching loads, research funding and support, and faculty retention and attraction; utilizing FRI opportunities; and balancing tenure-track with clinical faculty.

Dr. McDermott then addressed graduate student enrollment and student outcomes, discussing enrollment levels, average GMAT scores and work experience of full-time MBAs, the average GMAT of full-time professional MBAs, the 90-day placement rate of MBA graduates and their average salaries. He said DMSB graduate enrollments were lower than its peer and peer aspirant institutions. The GMAT scores were good and rising, better than DMSB peers and getting close to the peer aspirant institutions. He also addressed graduate student satisfaction levels and the graduate rankings of U.S. News and World Report.

He cited graduate program strategies for graduate enrollment, student satisfaction, and student outcomes that included enhanced internship/placement opportunities, investment in career coaching and student services, world class facilities and instructional technology, increased investment in digital marketing and enhanced recruiting processes, enhanced delivery of distinctive programming and marketable skills, and curriculum innovation. As for strategies for the doctoral program, Dr. McDermott said, an enhanced research environment would be benchmarked on faculty teaching loads, research funding and support, and faculty retention and attraction. Other factors to be considered included
partnerships with international institutions, streamlining requirements for completion of degrees, and enhanced doctoral student support.

Dr. McDermott concluded his presentation noting that DMSB undergraduate tuition levels were in line with its peer and peer aspirant institutions, while the percentage of total operating budget received from state allocations for the University was less than all its peers and peer aspirants except for Ohio and Virginia.

Chairman Whittle said that Dr. McDermott’s report would be received as information. The committee echoed Mr. Fennell’s thank you to Dr. McDermott for his service as interim dean.

B. School of Medicine

Due to the lateness of the day, Chairman Whittle said the presentation from the School of Medicine would be postponed until a future meeting.

VI. Other Matters

There were no other matters to come before the committee.

VII. Adjournment

There being no other matters to come before the committee, Chairman Whittle declared the meeting adjourned at 4:15 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Amy E. Stone
Secretary