1. Call to Order—Dr. Domke-Damonte at 6:01 p.m.

2. Approval of the Minutes

Dr. Domke-Damonte requested a motion to approve the minutes of the meeting of October 8. The motion was made by Dr. Byington and seconded by Mrs. Fain. Motion passed.

3. Old Business

Dr. Domke-Damonte asked about the progress of the subcommittees and reviewed the process for developing initial reports. No challenges were noted for data gathering, except that timing was tight for processing. Ms. Mee and her team in institutional research were recognized for their ability to identify and provide access to data on areas requested by the committee. Dr. Domke-Damonte requested that committee members continue to review materials loaded to the Resources page of the strategic planning website as feedback from focus groups and other inputs (surveys) would be posted as they were available.
4. New Business

Subcommittee reports were requested to present overview of the preliminary draft reports presented to committee members. The following observations were made/added to each:

*External trends subcommittee report (made by Mrs. Fain, Subcommittee Chair)*

Five key areas of focus were identified:
- Funding and affordability
- Educational trends
- Academic trends
- Marketing/image
- External accountability

Discussion followed with the following issues raised for further attention by the subcommittee:
- Political landscape (public policy, financial, diversity, upcoming and future legislative priorities likely, increase in non-funded mandates from multiple levels of governance, credentialing to prove to external parties value) (Dr. Domke-Damonte)
- STEM opportunities and focus (Dr. Ruse)
- Common Application use (Mrs. Bowie)
- Co-curricular programming and space on transcript (Mr. Lawless)
- Competency-based education and its push (Dr. DeCenzo) and potential for application through new core (Dr. Ruse)
- Fundraising (Dr. Domke-Damonte)
- Technology changes and security issues and use as well as policies/processes to support (Dr. Domke-Damonte, Dr. Byington, Dr. Barnes)
- Student preparation and faculty service of the needs of students (Dr. DeCenzo, Dr. Barnes)
- Different learning preparation by students coming to university today (Mr. Lazarus)
- Timing and assumptions about course offerings (Dr. Byington, Mrs. Bowie, Mr. Lawless)
- Community engagement
  - Mismatch of CCU product and business needs in the area in some cases and great fit in other areas (Mr. Wade)
  - Image of CCU is not clear as more negative gets mentioned than positive celebration of successes and rankings (Mr. Wade)
  - Opportunities to target non-traditional student population in the area for degree programs offered in novel timing and formats, and to engage more actively the retiree community in the region (Mr. Lazarus)
  - Limited outreach and media reach into counties other than Horry in the area (that don’t cover CCU in their news)
- Legislative matters
  - Pressures will likely increase with the state not having enough money to fund teachers for the new schools that are being built/opened and this could take funding away from post-secondary support (Mr. Lazarus)
  - Flood affected costs for South Carolina this year too, so allocations likely to suffer (Dr. DeCenzo)
- Fundraising
  - Foundations are in great position to do more fundraising so this is helpful to future programming efforts but as a young institution, CCU will need to identify new models to raise endowment resources including those outside the area (Mr. Wade)

*Peer and Aspirant Institutions Subcommittee Report (made by Ms. Mee, Subcommittee Chair)*

Summary indicated that on several areas of comparison, CCU was below peer and aspirants, including retention, % graduate students to total student ratio, median SAT scores. Areas we don’t do well in include:
- Don’t celebrate or collect or archive effectively what students and faculty are doing
- Not promoting or identifying flagship programs to help demonstrate direction we are going (e.g., 10% of university is marine science, 8% management, 5.5% psychology, 4% national intelligence and security studies)
- Lower apparent percentage of faculty with terminal degrees (note: This was questioned with focus on the way in which the data was being reported and commitment made to recheck and review)
- Lower number of degree programs than peer or aspirants (ranging from 51 – 226 for undergraduate programs to CCU’s 68 and 28-159 graduate programs to CCU’s 16)
- Innovative programming in some critical areas:
  - Radford calls its undeclared program pre-majors with better retention than CCU
  - Student recruitment information on webpages of peer and aspirants seems to demonstrate clearer guidelines for admission than CCU.

Discussion followed with areas of further comparison suggested including:
- Transparency of cost of education
  - Financial coaching might be helpful to CCU students and that CCU has hired a firm to lead this process (Mrs. Bowie)
  - Cost related to area noted as spot on for CCU costs (Mrs. Fain)
  - Comparison for competitor schools for cost of living (Dr. DeCenzo)
  - Class 101 from Kentucky school noted as example of providing this perspective to students in secondary school already (Mrs. Johnson)
- We make great success with students in the 950 – 1100 SAT range, so we need to consider that as we interpret outcomes. (Dr. Byington)
- Q courses have helped CCU a lot and modular type learning may assist even more (Dr. Viso)
- Targeting adults may be helpful (Ms. Mee) – CCU offered 931 distance learning sections in 2014-15 versus 227 in 2010-11 which may provide more access
- Admission yield versus peer/aspirants seems low (Dr. Viso) but may be influenced by way data is being gathered/reported (e.g., take out incomplete applications to get to more accurate calculation) (Dr. Byington)
- Comparisons for procurement authorizations also different among state institutions with CCU still capped at $200,000 (Dr. Byington, Mrs. Johnson)

Internal Review Subcommittee Report (made by Dr. Bunton, Chair of Subcommittee)

Summary indicated several areas of strength for faculty (including faculty salaries comparable to state institutions, FTE numbers, competitive increase of budget, high impact experiences for students and support for faculty (Credit banking), professional development of faculty among the nation’s best through CeTEAL with through rate at twice the national average). Areas of weakness for faculty included effectiveness measurement, increasing responsibilities of department chairs, faculty through teaching associates not aligned to mission, hiring lags, and enrollment cycle. Areas of strength for staff included: opportunities for staff training through Feel the Teal Program, tuition assistance program, salary/benefits offerings. Weaknesses for staff included wage compression and lack of child care. Student support centers were noted, with learning assistance use up, faculty limited so growth has limits on service provision, difficulty of assessment of learning centers. Weaknesses included a shift to group advising (and reduction in personal advising), processing change in majors, and difficulty of assessing first-year experience due to decentralization. Miscellaneous issues were also noted, including historical growth of CCU favors the target rates, relationships with alumni were noted as strong, students were happy with their instructors overall, but not happy with their relationships with one another, and low morale on campus. All committee members were concerned with admissions standards, retention, and morale and staying on mission.

Discussion followed noting the request to also review:
- Student success (multiple committee members)
- Communication with staff (suggestion to call for communication audit) (Dr. Bunton)
- Financial management (Dr. Bunton)
- Morale issue was discussed and clarification provided through feedback thus far from focus groups with faculty and staff noting that staff felt like they were getting more and more placed on them without adding additional colleagues to serve needs (Dr. Domke-Damonte), and faculty (esp. instructors/lecturers) were feeling pressure to be serving multiple needs but not being regarded as a part of their departments/programs.
Both noted a strong desire to review and eliminate bureaucratic challenges through increased efficiencies to make work less stressful and time consuming for seemingly simple tasks.

- Post-graduate evaluation was noted as very important to the future of higher education (Dr. DeCenzo)
- Question asked about role of Staff Advisory Council on addressing and bringing to the forefront staff concerns to be resolved potential for governance input role compared to current role (Dr. DeCenzo, Mr. Lawless)

5. **Identification of Additional Needed Materials and Analysis and Upcoming Reports to be Posted to Resource Pages for Consultation**

Dr. Domke-Damonte summarized activities planned and currently underway to gather more direct feedback into planning areas, including alumni survey (to be complete by middle of next week), student survey (planned to close by late the week of November 2), and 17 focus groups being offered to gather faculty and staff input with open and invited sessions held with randomly selected colleagues from each faculty (Tenured, Tenure-track, Instructor/Lecturer, Sr. Instructor/Sr. Lecturer, and Teaching Associates) and staff (Grounds/Facilities, Professional, Support, Time-limited, Part-time, Temporary) groups. She asked committee members to review website to read through these summaries as they became available and were posted.

6. **Charge to the Committee as a whole and Subcommittees specifically**

Dr. Domke-Damonte asked that each subcommittee revise reports and provide a summary by November 10 to showcase updated evaluations and assessments and to prioritize/weight strengths/weaknesses/opportunities/threats from each report. She was asked to provide a framework for these reports, and committed to doing so on Friday, October 30.

7. **Announcements**

Committee members were reminded of the next meeting time and place to take place in HTC 207, LeForce Hospitality Suite, with dinner beginning at 5:30 and the meeting beginning at 6pm.

8. **Adjournment**

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 8:37pm.

Respectfully submitted,
Darla Domke-Damonte
November 2, 2015