

The official minutes of the University of South Carolina Board of Trustees are maintained by the Secretary of the Board. Certified copies of minutes may be requested by contacting the Board of Trustees. Office at trustees@sc.edu. Electronic or other copies of original minutes are not official Board of Trustees' documents.

University of South Carolina

BOARD OF TRUSTEES

Ad Hoc Committee on Advancement

November 17, 2005

The Ad Hoc Committee on Advancement of the University of South Carolina Board of Trustees met on Thursday, November 17, 2005 at 11:30 a.m. in the Capstone House Campus Room.

Members present were: Mr. Miles Loadholt, Chairman; Mr. William C. Hubbard; Mr. William W. Jones, Jr.; Ms. Rita M. McKinney; and Mr. M. Wayne Staton. Members absent were: Mr. Toney J. Lister; Mr. Mack I. Whittle, Jr.; and Mr. Herbert C. Adams, Board Chairman. Mr. Othniel H. Wienges, Jr. was also present.

Others present were: President Andrew A. Sorensen; Secretary Thomas L. Stepp; Vice President for University Advancement T. W. Hudson Akin; Vice President for Human Resources Jane M. Jameson; Vice President for Information Technology and Chief Information Officer William F. Hogue; General Counsel Walter (Terry) H. Parham; Vice President for Student Affairs Dennis A. Pruitt; Vice Provost and Executive Dean for Regional Campuses and Continuing Education Chris P. Plyler; Senior Director of Advancement Administration, Division of University Advancement, J. Cantey Heath, Jr.; Executive Director of the Alumni Association Marsha A. Cole; Vice President for University Development, Division of University Advancement, Michelle Dodenhoff; Representatives from Lipman Hearne, Inc. Hap Bryant and Rob Moore; and Director of University Communications, Division of University Advancement, Russ McKinney, Jr.

Chairman Loadholt called the meeting to order and invited those present to introduce themselves. Mr. McKinney indicated that no members of the media were in attendance. Chairman Loadholt 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.

Chairman Loadholt announced that Chairman Adams' mother had died this past week. On behalf the Board, he expressed heartfelt sympathy and condolences to the Adams family. The Board observed a moment of silence in memory of Mrs. Adams.

I. Division of Advancement Report: Chairman Loadholt called on Mr. Akin, Vice President for University Advancement. Mr. Akin introduced Dr. Rob Moore, a representative from Lipman Hearne, Inc. in Chicago, to summarize preliminary

findings based on research and interviews which had been conducted. The company had been selected six months ago following a national search process to assist the University with positioning and branding efforts. Previously the company had worked with universities such as UNC Chapel Hill, Georgia Tech, and the University of Miami.

Dr. Moore stated that it was a pleasure to have worked with members of the University community during the past six months. He introduced his colleague, Mr. Hap Bryant, who had conducted the focus groups and a majority of the research. A detailed report will be submitted to the University in the future.

Dr. Moore stated that he would give an overview of the project; review the competitive profile among a number of institutions both from analytic and perception viewpoints; examine the current University profile; and discuss the preliminary positioning framework.

Dr. Moore stated that Lipman Hearne had been asked to develop a comprehensive communications framework, based on a distinctive brand concept, to set the University of South Carolina apart in the marketplace.

Dr. Moore discussed the following components of branding:

- Captures complicated identities/entities in immediate form
- Reflects the actuality of the institution (You can't make a promise you don't fulfill, its has to be deliverable)
- Connects with stakeholder/constituency values
- Provides context for sustainable competitive advantage (how you can continue to move the institution in the direction you want).

Dr. Moore explained that branding in higher education was more complex than in a commercial environment. The mission was divided into at least three parts: research, education and service and, in some instances, economic development. He noted that higher education operates in a highly decentralized environment and the competitive interests of markets would have to be balanced in order to meet the institutional mission.

The project will be completed in the following three phases:

- 1) Analyze institutional communications and marketing environment
(August-October)
- 2) Conduct constituent research with target audience groups
(September-October)
- 3) Develop and present strategic brand platform and marketing plan
(November-March)

Dr. Moore gave an overview of the survey results conducted with alumni, prospective students and corporate recruiters.

Alumni - The rate of participation from Alumni responding to the survey online was excellent; 95 percent responded that they would recommend USC; 90 percent had indicated that they were proud to be USC alumni; most said they favored affordability and location in choosing a college; and more than half ranked job creation and undergraduate education as the two top priorities for higher education.

Prospective students - Individuals in this category described the decision as extremely personal. For example, students emphasized the importance of feeling at home on campus. Prospective students did not emphasize prestige and intellectual challenge. In addition, they considered location important but did not favor Columbia or South Carolina. Many of the students noted the reputation of the Honors College and the Moore School of Business; others had very little knowledge of the University, particularly those students living in the Atlanta area.

Dr. Sorensen stated that efforts were underway for web development so that prospective students will be able to conduct a virtual tour of the campus.

Corporate recruiters - These individuals were interviewed by telephone. The firms focused on the institutional response to specific industry and business needs; relied on past performance of graduates; and expressed preference for diverse student bodies and drew favorable comparisons with Clemson, Georgia, NC State, and Tennessee. One of the real strengths that the firms observed at USC was the diverse student body.

Dr. Moore conducted a competitive profile of other schools based on students' perceptions and how USC competed with these universities on different levels. The research findings were as follows:

Clemson University

- Land-grant and service heritage
- Engineering prominence
- Student selectivity
- Cultural camaraderie
- Homogeneity
- Football heritage
- ACC linkage to Duke, North Carolina, Virginia

University of Georgia

- Historic and traditional
- Claims of global impact
- Strengths in liberal arts, communications, and veterinary science
- Quintessential "college town" location
- Large female undergraduate population
- Football heritage
- SEC linkage to Alabama, Auburn, Florida, Kentucky, South Carolina

University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill

- Long-standing and elite
- Strengths in undergraduate liberal arts, medicine, and public health
- Vanguard of the New South
- Influence in myriad areas of service
- Impressive research profile
- Highly selective
- Basketball heritage
- ACC linkage to Duke, Virginia, Wake Forest

Furman University

- Privileged
- Highly selective
- Priority on undergraduate education

- Strengths in education and liberal arts
- Excellent preparation for graduate school
- NCAA I-AA status

Dr. Moore looked at the University's profile from three different perspectives: the way it was presented, perceived and desired.

As USC had historically presented itself:

- Attractive campus
- Attention to athletics and student life
- Football prominent
- SEC linkage to Alabama, Auburn, Florida, Kentucky
- Comprehensive programs but specific programs have not risen out of the pack, with the exception of the International Business Program
- Indistinct academics overall
- Reluctance to trumpet accomplishments

As perceived (Perception of the Institution):

- Focus on athletics and "Gamecock Pride"
- "Urban" in character which can be a positive and negative
- Attention to undergraduates (Honors College, University 101)
- Prominence of business school
- Diverse student body
- Not perceived to be as selective as primary competitors
- Equivalent to state profile

As desired (Where you want to go):

- Originator of innovation, For example INNOVISTA, University 101
- Integral to business and government goals
- New model of engaged public university
- Player on the national stage
- Improved enrollment profile

Dr. Moore discussed the elements of the Preliminary Positioning Framework.

Dr. Moore stated that positioning was basically composed of three elements: capacity and vision; marketplace competition; and marketplace perception. Positioning was defining and living a sustainable competitive advantage. He discussed how USC worked with the legislators and other leaders across the state to create innovations that would benefit all of South Carolina and would improve economic development in South Carolina. He reported on the following vital and livable Elements, Authentication and Characteristics of USC.

Elements

- Engagement with the issues of our time
- Southern values of loyalty and community
- Commitment to progress for all residents
- Contribution to legislative vision of the state
- Instigator of solutions through consensus

Authentication:

- Location in mid-sized city
- Reflection of society's diversity
- Shaper of future trends
- Focus on relevant issues
- Public Health
- Energy independence
- Sustainable environment
- Economic development
- Technology transfer
- Global business

Characteristics:

- Tradition
- Graciousness
- Service, responsiveness
- Intelligence
- Pride
- Attentiveness
- Analysis
- Confidence

Dr. Moore stated that the next step in the process was to develop a strategic brand platform and marketing plan in order to articulate the benefits of positioning framework; hold group discussions and meetings with faculty, staff and current students on campus to be sure that promises were being made that the University could keep; and, finally, clarify marketing strategy, key messages, and tactical array on how USC reached out to alumni, corporate leaders and the national higher education audience.

Ms. McKinney asked how long the next steps would take. Dr. Moore responded that the marketing plan development process should be completed by early spring; the external focus groups will be conducted in February and the marketing plan developed in March.

Dr. Sorensen stated that he wanted the Board to be involved in the evolution of this plan because it will define the University over the next decade.

Mr. Hubbard commented that a national board of legal professionals had recently visited the University; they were very impressed with the campus and the work that was being conducted.

Since there were no other matters to come before the Committee, Chairman Loadholt declared the meeting adjourned at 12:35 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Thomas L. Stepp
Secretary