

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 Strategic Planning

August 7, 2015

The Ad Hoc Committee on Strategic Planning of the University of South Carolina Board of Trustees met at 1:35 p.m. Friday, August 7, 2015, in the 1600 Hampton Street Board Room.

Members present were: Mr. A.C. "Bubba" Fennell, Presiding Chairman; Mr. Chuck Allen; Mr. Thomas C. Cofield; Mr. William W. Jones Jr.; Mr. Miles Loadholt; Ms. Leah B. Moody; Mr. John C. von Lehe Jr.; and Mr. Thad H. Westbrook. Members absent were Mr. William C. Hubbard and Mr. Mack I. Whittle Jr.

Other Trustees present were: Mrs. Paula Harper Bethea; Mr. Toney Lister; Dr. C. Dorn Smith; and Mr. Eugene P. Warr, Jr., Board Chairman.

Also present were faculty representative Dr. James H. Knapp and student representative Lindsay Richardson.

Others present were: President Harris Pastides; Secretary Amy E. Stone; General Counsel Walter "Terry" H. Parham; Chief Operating Officer Edward L. Walton; Interim Provost Helen Doerpinghaus; Chief Financial Officer Leslie Brunelli; Vice President for Student Affairs Dennis A. Pruitt; Vice President for Information Technology William F. Hogue; Vice President for Human Resources Chris Byrd; Vice President for Facilities and Transportation Derrick Huggins; Vice President for Development and Alumni Relations Jancy Houck; Chief Communications Officer Wes Hickman; Vice President for System Planning Mary Anne Fitzpatrick; Palmetto College Chancellor Susan Elkins; Chancellor USC Beaufort Al Panu; Associate Vice President of Enrollment Management Scott Veryzl; Executive Director of Audit & Advisory Services Pam Doran; Executive Director for the Office of Economic Engagement William D. "Bill" Kirkland; Director of Strategic Planning Cameron Howell; Institutional Research and Assessment Executive Director Donald Miles; College of Arts and Sciences Interim Dean Roger Sawyer; USC Aiken Executive Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs Jeff Priest; USC Aiken Vice Chancellor for Finance and Administration Joe Sobieralski; Chief of Staff, President's Office, J. Cantey Heath Jr.; University Technology Services Production Manager Matt Warthen; and Board staff members Debra Allen and Ina Wilson. Vice President for Research Prakash Nagarkatti joined the meeting by telephone.

I. Call to Order

Presiding Chairman Fennell called the meeting to order and welcomed everyone. There were no members of the news media in attendance.

Presiding Chairman Fennell 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. Academic Dashboard, USC Columbia Update

Presiding Chairman Fennell called on Interim Provost Helen Doerpinghaus to present the agenda items. Dr. Doerpinghaus said that she would be presenting an update on the dashboard, which was created five years ago. She began by reminding Trustees of the dashboard metrics: Total undergraduate enrollment (headcount) and first-time, full-time freshman enrollment; SAT score; freshman-sophomore retention rate; six-year graduation rate; student-to-faculty ratio and student-to-tenure- and tenure-track faculty ratio; research expenditures and research expenditures per tenure and tenure-track faculty; faculty productivity index; and doctoral degrees produced. Dr. Doerpinghaus also noted that the comparison groups remained the same. The peer group was composed of Rutgers University, University of Connecticut, University of Georgia, University of Kentucky, and University of Tennessee. The peer-aspirant group was Indiana University, University of Maryland, University of Missouri, University of North Carolina, and University of Virginia.

Using multiple graphs to illustrate her points, Dr. Doerpinghaus said that undergraduate enrollment was tracking steadily upward. When looking at the target enrollment of 25,156, she said the University is close to what it was aiming for five years ago, with the actual estimated at 25,000. The increase in undergraduate enrollment was being driven by an increase in the number of new students enrolling – the larger freshman class, as well as more transfers. The University's retention also had improved. First-time, full-time freshmen enrollment also has tracked upward. The target was 4,500, while the University estimated 5,200 for Fall 2015 in this category. To continue this trend, more attention would be needed to the merit- and need-based aid that was offered.

Under the SAT category, she said that the University was tracking upward relative to the target SAT of 1227, with an estimated fall SAT of 1209. Factors affecting the SAT included the number of in-state versus out-of-state applicants accepted since out-of-state students had higher scores and the necessity for more need- and merit-based aid to improve the recruitment of top students. She also noted that the ACT is now the national test of choice and the top students who take it are not included in the SAT

averages. Dr. Doerpinghaus said that if ACT scores for USC freshmen were converted to SAT scores, the SAT average for Fall 2015 would be 1232 instead of 1209.

In response to a question from Chairman Warr, Dr. Pruitt indicated that the national reporting agencies do not allow institutions to convert SAT scores to ACT scores. He said that the University would need to start reporting both scores. He added that in South Carolina, ACT obtained a contract so that every high school junior took the ACT. This year, he said that about 46 percent of University students were admitted under the ACT instead of SAT. Dr. Pruitt said the US News also would have to make adjustments since ACT had been more aggressive in developing the market. There also would have to be adjustments made to deal with this year's new SAT test in comparison to previous scores. Associate Vice President of Enrollment Management Scott Veryzl said that the SAT test changed periodically and that the most recent change was to make it more relevant to what was being taught in the classroom and to be a better predictor of college success. Dr. Doerpinghaus responded to a question about the difference in scores of out-of-state students compared to in-state students, noting that the average SAT for in-state was 1178 and out-of-state was 1242.

Dr. Doerpinghaus went on to address the 2014 freshman-sophomore retention rate for which the target was 89.1% and actual was 88%. She noted that the University had achieved remarkable, positive change over the years. This was because of different programs that were in place to promote student engagement. The University needed to continue to expand initiatives like On Your Time graduation, experiences like study abroad, undergrad research, career planning and internships, need-based aid initiatives, academic advising, Education Advisory Board Student Success Collaborative allowing early identification of high-risk students, and policy review to eliminate unnecessary roadblocks to timely degree attainment.

The six-year graduation rate also is trending upward, Dr. Doerpinghaus said, with a negligible difference in the actual rate of 73.04% and the target rate of 73.4%. New trends such as On Your Time initiatives, more students living close to campus, and more students utilizing the Student Success Center will continue to make a difference in this rate. The University's graduation rate has gone up about 9.2% in the past 10 years.

The student-to-faculty ratio has varied over the past five years, Dr. Doerpinghaus said, causing everyone concern about how to reverse the rising student-to-faculty ratio. Steps to be taken include aggressive hiring to match enrollment growth, target in-demand disciplines where student enrollments are growing, assess salary bases and start-up packages for research. Asked for his comments, President Pastides

said that the University wanted to reverse the rising student-to-faculty ratio and was investing in new faculty. The Board's monitoring of the dashboard would help keep the administration on target. "Measured growth is the right pathway," he said, "not just measured growth in students, but measured growth in the infrastructure."

Research expenditures show a flat trend, which is true for the University's peers and peer-aspirants, she reported. Actual research expenditures for fiscal year 2013 is \$203.4 million versus a target of \$220.7 million. This number has improved from \$130 million in 2005, according to National Science Foundation data. Continued activity is needed to help grow research expenditures. Dr. Doerpinghaus said that these include hiring faculty who are research active and training those here to get them fully engaged in pursuing grant opportunities and focusing on particular areas of strength where the University has a competitive advantage. In response to a question from Trustee Moody, Dr. Nagarkatti explained that research expenditures are calculated differently than research awards, with only a portion of sponsored awards funding being identified as research expenditures. Currently, the University's sponsored awards have reached about \$242 million he said, a number that has been relatively flat due to the economy and that almost 30% of research is federally funded. This was a situation faced by all of higher education, making funding of research highly competitive.

In response to a question as to why the University lags behind its peers and peer-aspirants in research expenditures, Dr. Nagarkatti said that total research expenditures depend on a number of factors. Among these are the size of the University in terms of the number of faculty members, as well as institutional support, state support and industry-sponsored research. Dr. Doerpinghaus said that when the data is controlled for tenure and tenure-track faculty, the University is closer to its peers in terms of research expenditures.

She next discussed the faculty productivity index, data that is provided by Academic Analytics from its national database allowing more realistic comparisons. This index is controlled for the size of faculty across institutions and examines faculty publications, books and journal articles, citations, conference proceedings, federal and foundation grants, professional honors and awards. In this comparison, the University falls in the middle among its peer and peer-aspirant groups, with no change over last year.

The final metric addressed by Dr. Doerpinghaus was doctoral degrees awarded. For 2014, the actual number awarded was 325 versus a target of 292. She said the tactics that enabled this growth included initiatives such as the Presidential Doctoral Fellows program, the Provost Teaching Fellows program,

research and travel grants for graduate students, as well as the provision of dissertation defense incentives to departments.

Dr. Doerpinghaus called Dr. Howell forward to present the spring 2015 institutional data that is provided to external groups.

III. Spring 2015 Institutional Data

Before beginning, Dr. Howell said that much of the data to be presented was supplied to the U.S. News and World Report every spring for publication in the fall. He noted that the new U.S. News and World Report rankings would appear in the second week of September, confirming that for undergraduate rankings this is the publication that most people reference. Dr. Howell reminded Trustees that he was presenting the data supplied to the publication, but that 35% of any institution’s score in the rankings overall are created by U.S. News and World Report itself. Those numbers cannot be predicted since they are things like reputation that are based on surveys conducted by the publication. He presented the following graph of data, with a horizontal line denoting stability and arrows indicating positive (up) change and negative (down) change.

METRIC	Summary of Spring 2011 Submission	Summary of Spring 2012 Submission	Summary of Spring 2013 Submission	Summary of Spring 2014 Submission	Summary of Spring 2015 Submission	Delta Spring 2015 Versus Spring 2014
Graduation rate	68%	70%	72%	73%	73%	↔
Expenditure per student	\$17,151	\$17,133	\$17,216	\$18,423	\$19,414	↑
SAT 25th and 75th percentiles	530-630v & 560-650m	540-640v & 560-650m	540-640v & 560-650m	540-630v & 550-650m	550-640v & 560-660m	↔
SAT/ACT counts and averages	2926@1187, 1512@26	2842@1198, 1766@26	2916@1199, 1688@27	4309@1207, 3145@27	2895@1210, 2056@27	↔
Average faculty salary	\$88,846	\$92,830	\$96,021	\$97,875	\$99,305	↑
% of classes under 20	38%	36%	36%	33%	39%	↑
Percent alumni giving	17%	17%	19%	17%	14%	↓
Average freshman retention	86%	87%	87%	88%	88%	↔
% of freshmen in top 10% of graduating class	28%	28%	30%	30%	29%	↓
Percent of faculty with highest degree	86%	84%	83%	83%	83%	↔
% of classes over 50	11%	10%	15%	16%	16%	↔
Acceptance rate	70%	63%	61%	64%	65%	↑
Student/faculty ratio	19/1	17/1	17/1	18/1	18/1	↔
% of faculty full-time	88%	87%	87%	87%	84%	↓

In response to a question from Trustee Fennell, Ms. Houck said that several factors impact the percentage of alumni giving. She said that thousands of new alumni are graduated every year which increases the base on which the percentage is calculated. Even if the number of donors remained steady, the percentage would decrease as a result of continuing to graduate new alumni.

Trustee von Lehe asked the President to comment on the chances of the University ever getting into the Association of American Universities. President Pastides said that he thought the University would gain membership, but that he did not know when. The organization is composed of only 65 member institutions and for another to be added, one must leave.

Presiding Chairman Fennell noted that this strategic plan concludes with 2015 and that Chairman Mack Whittle would be scheduling a meeting of the committee in October to start looking at the next five years, or longer. He noted that this was a good time for the new provost to be coming on board. Board Chairman Warr and Trustee Smith both spoke in favor a strategic plan of more than five years.

III. Adjournment

There being no other matters to come before the committee, Presiding Chairman Fennell declared the meeting adjourned at 2:20 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Amy E. Stone
Secretary