STRATEGIC PLANNING STEERING COMMITTEE - MINUTES
Thursday, February 4, 2016 (Sixth Meeting)
Atheneum 105

Chairperson: Dr. Darla Domke-Damonte

In Attendance: Jennifer Altiere, Associate Professor, Spadoni College of Education
Brian Bunton, Chair, Faculty Senate / Ex-officio Member, Horry County Higher Education Commission
J. Ralph Byington, Provost and Executive Vice President
David A. DeCenzo, President
Margaret Fain, Director of Core Curriculum / Librarian
Carlos Johnson (via teleconference), Member, Board of Trustees / Board Member, CCU Student Housing Association
Rose Marie Johnson, Coordinator of Risk Management and Strategic Planning
Charles Jordan, Community Member, Western Horry County / Board Member, Coastal Educational Foundation
Dan Lawless, Chair, Staff Advisory Committee
Arlise McKinney, Director of Graduate and Executive Education, E. Craig Wall Sr. College of Business Administration / Associate Professor
Christine Mee, Associate Chair, Executive Director of Planning and Research
Michael Ruse, Associate Dean, University College / Director University Honors Program
Richard Viso, Assistant Director, School of Coastal and Marine Systems Science / Associate Professor
Dennis Wade, Business Leader / Board Member, Coastal Education Foundation

Absent: Aneilya Barnes, Director of QEP / Associate Professor Edwards College of Humanities and Fine Arts & QEP
Stacie Bowie, Vice President and Chief Financial Officer
Jonathan Bruenn, Student Government Association VP of Finance
Woody Ford, Alumni, Class of 2005 / Director, Coastal Carolina University
Honorable Mark Lazarus, Chairman, Horry County Council / Ex-officio Member, Horry County Higher Education Commission

I. Call to Order – by Dr. Domke-Damonte at 5:57 PM.
II. Approval of the Minutes

Dr. Domke-Damonte requested a motion to approve the minutes of the meeting of January 14. The motion was made by Brian Bunton; seconded by Arlise McKinney. All were in favor; motion passed.

III. Old Business

None

IV. New Business

A. Update on Task Force Process

Dr. Domke-Damonte thanked all for their participation and execution of the Task Force Process effort and gave a synopsis as to where the task forces are right now.

Over the course of the last three weeks, 16 task force meetings have taken place. At each one, we have spent time not only identifying the constructs within each task force statement, but also the key goals in each one. Much progress has been made, as noted below:

**Task Force 1: Academic Excellence and Instructional Quality**: Four goal statements have been identified. Jennifer Hughes is now on this task force, replacing John Marcis, who is on scholarly reassignment.

**Task Force 2: Student Excellence**: There has been feedback received on strategy statement, and we are reviewing it. We have framed the attributes and came up with four areas to focus on. Excellent discussion around the constructs has brought great consensus of the group.

**Task Force 3: An Engaged Staff and Faculty**: This task force has had interesting discussions about how much can be done between and for all staff and faculty and how much and what needs to be done for each. One goal has been agreed upon and others are being developed along with discussion of objectives.

**Task Force 4: Accessibility, Inclusion, Diversity**: We have started to identify framework and organizing around working environment, learning environment and campus climate. We have made great advances as of today, but not settled upon any specific goal statements yet.

**Task Force 5: Telling the CCU Story Effectively**: Task force has made a motion to change the name to “The CCU Story” and adding ‘s’ after ‘contribution’ in the
Strategy Statement. This group has identified three key goal statements and will be looking through a large range of draft objectives which have been forwarded.

**Task Force 6: Financial Stability and Infrastructure:** There has been much listening on this task force, as we have heard perspective on how enrollment management is working, where our funding sources come from, and ERM and associated issues. We’re trying to help people better understand how we should plan for enrollment and have a master plan available. There has been a process of consideration and why decisions are made, as well as the impact it has on individuals in the campus community.

Motions:

**Task Force 1: Academic Excellence and Instructional Quality.** A grammatical clean-up motion was proposed by Michael Ruse to the strategy statement; seconded by Margaret Fain and Dan Lawless. All were in favor. The new statement now reads:

Foster academic excellence through a teacher-scholar model with enhanced and supported effective teaching and scholarly/creative endeavors, expanded learning opportunities, and engagement of all campus community members.

**Task Force 5: The CCU Story.** Motion to approve name change and adding ‘s’ to ‘contribution’ and changing the tag line from “Telling the CCU Story Effectively” to “The CCU Story” was made by Michael Ruse; seconded by Bruce Bunton and Margaret Fain. All were in favor of changes proposed; motion passed.

B. Process of Planning, Budgeting, Assessment and Use of Information

Chair Domke-Damonte then turned discussion to the focus of exploring the current process of planning, budgeting, assessing, and utilizing for action. President DeCenzo talked about the current process and where we have been effective and areas where we can improve. It’s difficult to answer now with what has been happening with higher education and what we are seeing in Columbia. There will be much greater emphasis put on accounting that we are going to have to demonstrate; i.e., how we are, no tuition increase, and using our funds correctly, while assuring students are prepared for their chosen fields, able to graduate on time, and not overwhelmed with debt. This can be monitored through our linking of the budget to the strategic process and how it fits with the master plan of the institution. There is the need to show an effective link and we’re probably light years away in terms of how we analyze our financial and academic/non-academic areas. Teal Online is shaping up to be the prototype and we’re in a good position to take a lead; everything we do will be focused on the bottom line. What we charge in tuition and increases is a national issue right now, and there will be discussions on how to stop these increases and roll back some of the costs.
There was a discussion about the Liberal Arts degree giving students the ability to think, speak and help a lot of other different skill sets. This is a tougher sell as it is not as immediately visible how it translates to outcomes that are likely to be measured. It is hard to get through with what is happening politically, and CCU has to demonstrate that we're using monies wisely and student aren’t leaving here with astronomical debt or defaulting on their payments. It will be incumbent upon us to define and link this to our strategic plan and initiatives. Dr. Byington mentioned focusing on core competencies in our QEP.

**Teal Online**

Chris Mee gave an update a Teal Online, a depository for student learning outcomes and objectives. The current system was put in place in 2007 to get ready for the 2012 accreditation. There has been much ongoing research in the last six months to have all documents in one place. The assessment needs to be more robust for sharing of assessments that will help with continuous improvement, and you will be able to see what other units are doing. We can look at continuous improvement instead of a process, and we will have concrete data, know what students are doing and accessibilities. We will be able to roll course evaluations into the system so data can be used for promotion and tenure. We will now have a dashboard and analytic systems helping in all aspects of financial data. Dr. Byington added that we need new software that will do student learning outcomes/assessments and questioned how do we tie that in to this new system and how will the new assessments be generated. Chris explained that the new assessment document needs to be rewritten from 2007 since it will now complete the entire circle. Dr. Byington noted that when these adjustments are made, this is when they should be tied to the budget system.

Arlise McKinney posed how the measurement of student learning outcomes affects the budget? Dr. Byington stated that if certain resources to achieve that goal are needed and it is decided to put in new goals and activities, then resources will be needed to achieve those goals and will have to be entered.

There was a discussion on what is needed to be able to move programs forward and have a more creative edge. President DeCenzo noted that we need to have a way to assure that SLOs and approaches to programs retain their currency in an ongoing manner. Provost Byington stated that ties of funding to goal achievement and program objectives is far more important in the future. There will be a need to add a number of resources in order to help in achieving goals and to grow programs – something cutting edge; that is the information that will need to be included as well as cost.

**Program Review/Assessment**

All 114 units should roll up to the strategies and goal with our strategic plan. There is a connection between those goals and the SLOs.
President DeCenzo noted that it may not be a by-product. We sometimes have a tendency to focus on additions to be more effective and more efficiency. He posed the question of what don’t we need to do anymore and what can we get rid of? This piece now allows us to get rid of things we don’t need that are not adding value. Dr. Byington would like to see a mid-year budget review. This could take place in the middle of the year where we can look and evaluate what we didn’t do or may not do until next year. We can then take those assessments and re-do some allocations or wait for a complete new year. A key area is to know are we doing what we said we were going to do.

Programming planning is in February/early March. Teal Online is coming up and due March 15, rolled forward with the assumption you can amend. Coming up on the same time is budgets and getting them finalized early to mid-March. The next timeline depends on when the Board makes its decision and it could be late April until we have an idea of what the budgets may be, assuming no problems from the state. October 1 is when assessment plans are due from the previous year with final approval November 1. This is when Chris’s team can define what the stories are and it may take three months to roll up, which means a shorter time line and may be late November until a story can be told, then mid-December to the campus community. We are now close to February when it is time for the process to repeat.

- Back in 2007, it used to be July 15, then went back to October.
- Budgeting is by line item
- Don’t have in the budgets the faculty salaries, hard to show efficiency measures
- Perhaps move to a planning cycle to be in February after initial review of current year’s progress; budget requests in early March based on plan; reporting of assessment result plans in July; reporting to campus community on achievements of previous year (opening of new academic year); evaluation by strategic planning steering committee for advocating retirement of some goals/objectives, further efforts toward some goals/objectives, and addition/prioritization of others.

Efficiency reports need to be part of the information provided in the process to the department. Departments need to know where they are from a usage standpoint; from revenue generations. Chris will check with vendor if departments can build access from their data. Dr. Byington made mention that CCU is not a true zero-based budget and suggested that July 15 timeline might make sense but we need to identify other departments’ expectations (and Dr. Ruse noted chair responsibilities with focus on other reports due).

There was mention that if we’re going to move reporting cycle to July, there will be the need to know what the department chairs have to be doing by the end of June, July. There may need to be a different timeline since all college are on a calendar year.
Dr. Ruse noted that linking of budget for chairs is a scale issue. Questions were asked about the difference between linking student learning outcomes (SLOs) for major programs of study versus departments or colleges. Dr. Domke-Damonte noted that the layers could look like an egg for assessment purposes (and budget requests).

There could be goals and requests for funding to support any of the levels in the figure to the left.

Dr. Domke-Damonte proposed restating what needs to be done based on feedback received thus far and Provost to ask deans for their ideas. We can then start to have a piece to come back to next time and then talk with colleagues about their concerns, followed by debate/discussion. This will give us other parameters and perspectives from an administrative structure, and share this at Provost’ Council meeting in March for further feedback. Dr. Domke-Damonte asked Chris Mee and Rose Marie Johnson for their assistance in the process of bringing those resources together.

We can then come to a conclusion late March. This leads to what is a long-term, viable strategic plan integration allows for updating, adding, and retiring after completed (or no longer relevant). As goals are met, what are the ideas for retiring and putting others forth? With subcommittee members associated with objectives, it could keep the initiative alive. A committee should be University-wide allowing a better assessment. It was suggested to make finance strategy as a subcommittee since finance overarches all of these.

President DeCenzo questioned if we have a central location where we have all the reports of what we have to do and where they are. It might be a good idea to see what other departments have to do and come up with a timeline to ensure we’re not changing things and all that has to done. We can then know when things are due and go from there. If things are changed, what effect will it have on everything else? Provost Byington mentioned that we must consider that we have a “controlled carryover” budget process. He further indicated that we must tie facilities and technology requests to requests for new programs so that all are approved and budgeted together, and follow through occurs. Moreover biggest goal has to be to move to a completed new core in Fall 2017.
Mrs. Johnson and Mrs. Mee to assemble information with Chair Domke-Damonte and work with Susan Talbot on the academic deadlines to have information for the next subcommittee meeting to identify what the questions are, and moving things around if required.

Chair Domke-Damonte then raised a question about how to organize continuing evaluation/assessment and improvement of the strategic planning process at CCU post-process? The Strategic Management Committee has been meeting 4x per year. Mrs. Fain noted that it might be possible to adjust the Strategic Management group’s charge to review tasks and checked off to see what has been changed each year in the Strategic Plan.

Mrs. Mee noted that small groups will keep objectives alive. The charge of the strategic management committee was then discussed and it was determined to ask Chair Domke-Damonte to identify and propose how the charge should change. Mrs. Johnson Mrs. Mee will gather information about compliance reports and deadlines and share at the next meeting.

For next meeting, have list of all reports. Think about the strategic meeting committee as it stands; will get charge and current members out.

We will redraft what was talked about with respect to bringing everything into better alignment. Enrollment is linked between all these reports. What do we need to know and how we’re getting information we need from multiple sources/projects.

V. Meeting was adjourned at 7:32pm. At February 25 meeting, we will be joined by task force leaders who will provide updates on initiatives achieved and deliberate further on the cycle of plan/budget/assess/tell the story.