CALL TO ORDER:

Chairman Jonathan N. Pinson called the meeting to order at 9:07 A.M. The public notice was posted and read. The agenda (Attachment 1) and supporting materials (Attachment 2) were previously circulated to the members, media and interested persons. Trustee Corbitt delivered the Invocation. The roll was called and the following persons were present:

Members Present: Chairman Jonathan N. Pinson, Vice Chairman John H. Corbitt, Secretary Robert M. Nance, Trustees Mrs. Linda Edwards-Duncan, Dr. Jackie R. Epps, Ms. Patricia B. Lott, Dr. Walter L. Tobin, Mr. Robert L. Waldrep, Jr. and Mr. Maurice G. Washington.

Ex-Officios/Administrators: Ex-Officios: Mr. Anthony Beckett, Dr. M. Evelyn Fields, Mrs. Kay Snider and Mr. Roger Leaks, Jr. for Mr. Jackie Steele / Administrators: President George E. Cooper, Executive Director to the Board Ms. Joyce Green, Vice President for Institutional Advancement Mr. Anthony Holloman, Vice President for Academic Affairs Dr. Joyce Blackwell, Vice President for Research, Economic Development and Public Service Dr. G. Dale Wesson, Vice President for Student Affairs Dr. Charles N. Smith, Vice President for Institutional Effectiveness Dr. Rita J. Teal, Athletics Director Mrs. Charlene Johnson, Vice President for Finance, Facilities and MIS Mr. John Smalls, Director of Public Relations Mrs. Erica Taylor, Executive Assistant to the President Mrs. Shondra Abraham, Administrative Assistant to the Board Ms. Eartha Mosley and Administrative Coordinator Mrs. Chrystel Rogers, as recorder.

Media: The Times and Democrat Newspaper Dale Linder-Altman and The Post and Courier Newspaper Diane Knich.

OPEN SESSION:

Trustee Corbitt moved, seconded by Trustee Tobin, to adopt the agenda. There were no questions. Vote: unanimously approved.

Savannah River Remediation presentation

Mr. Jim French, Savannah River’s President, presented Chair Pinson and President Cooper with a check for $10,000 for Nuclear Engineering Program scholarships. Savannah River’s Director of Public Relations Mr. Dean Campbell and Ms. Lessie Price, Director of Governmental Affairs, accompanied Mr. French. Mr. French shared that Savannah River continuously uses nuclear engineers so they made a donation to help feed scholarships in order for SC State to educate and graduate more students to have jobs in South Carolina. He noted that it seems natural that they would be neighborly and bring a donation for scholarships. Chair Pinson and Dr. Cooper thanked Mr. French. Dr. Cooper acknowledged that Savannah River has been working with SC State by providing student internship opportunities and providing staff’s assistance with some of our technology challenges. Again, Dr. Cooper thanked them for the check, for supporting the students...
and SC State. Mr. French declared that Savannah River would continue to support the University as they have in past years.

Approval of Minutes

The following sets of minutes were sent to the Board for review and were presented for approval. Chair Pinson called for questions on the following minutes:

- Board of Trustees, April 30, 2010
- Special Called Board of Trustees, May 24, 2010
- Special Called Board of Trustees, June 7, 2010
- Called Board of Trustees, June 15, 2010
- Annual Retreat Board of Trustees, June 27-30, 2010
- Called Board of Trustees, July 1, 2010

Trustee Washington advised that in the June 27-30, 2010 set (page 7, lines 19 and 20) Trustee Richardson was misquoted. The following sentence should be struck from the minutes “So make whatever…are a racist.”

Trustee Tobin pointed out that in the April 30, 2010 set (page 6, lines 1-3 and 13-14), the word building should be changed to auditorium.

Trustee Lott also pointed out that in the July 1, 2010 set (page 5, lines 36, 37 and 38), did not recall cautioning the Chairman or saying that she would. Therefore, the following sentence should be struck from the minutes “She said a conversation…time of his chairmanship.”

Chair Pinson asked if there were any other corrections. There being none, he asked for a motion to adopt the minutes. Trustee Corbitt moved, seconded by Trustee Edwards-Duncan, to adopt the minutes with the corrections as noted. Chair Pinson asked for questions but there were none. Vote: unanimously approved.

Trustee Washington commented that adopting the July 1st minutes approves the actions taken by the Board on June 15th (speaking of the expungement of the action taken by the Board on June 15th and the record). He indicated that the Board is approving the minutes as is. Trustee Lott stated that now that it is approved, this is the time it becomes effective and will be stricken from the minutes with the approval that we accept everything that is in it. Trustee Nance responded that had already been covered and showed Trustee Washington a copy of how it will look. The language will just be covered up with the word expunged affixed over it. Trustee Lott noted that this is the recording of it. Trustee Washington stated the question is can we expunge minutes from the public record. He reminded that Trustee Waldrep raised that issue on July 1st whether or not we could legally do so. Trustee Lott reminded that it is not being removed. Trustee Washington indicated that it is being altered to suggest that the Board acted illegally on June 15th in a public and open meeting and according to the Attorney General’s opinion, it is prohibited by state law that public bodies cannot expunge, alter or delete public records in any way. Trustee Nance asked whose opinion that was. Trustee Washington responded Henry McMaster’s. Trustee Lott asked if the Board had a copy of that opinion. Trustee Nance asked have we been sent that. Trustee Washington said he has a copy and cautioned that the Board should further explore before acting on this at this time. He then asked if they agree on that. Trustee Nance suggested having the minutes of June 15th and June 27-30th reviewed by legal counsel before we adopt them. Trustee Lott noted that July 1st was the one in
question. Trustee Washington indicated that they are all tied together. He continued that there are legal fines and punitive actions associated with expungements of public records the Board should be aware of and governing themselves accordingly. Chair Pinson stated that it is not going to be removed from the minutes. It will always be there in the public record. It will show that a body of the Board did not agree with it. It will still be there. You can read it and see it. It will just say expunged. Trustee Waldrep suggested using some other terminology than the word expunged. Chair Pinson indicated that this will be tabled in order to move forward with the agenda. We will research it and see if there are any angles coming in from the Attorney General’s Office because they have not received anything. From legal counsel’s advice he received, we were fine. There is no real direction as to what you can and cannot do and this is a legal action that you can take in a boardroom vote. Until we get it cleaned up, we are going to keep moving down the agenda and deal with this at a later time. Trustee Washington concurred and stated for the record that he would make a copy available. He further advised that the Public Records Act requires any minutes kept, recording actions taken by the Board, must not be {inaudible} or modified by the Board. Chair Pinson stated that they would not. Trustee Washington stated that it is unclear how the minutes reporting the actions of the Board with regards to the election and termination of the University’s President were expunged. He believes that any minutes taken with regard to the Board’s action must be preserved and must accurately reflect the Board’s actions. If more details are needed, he will have a copy available. Trustee Nance suggested to the Chairman that if our legal counsel could be provided a copy of that so he can have some discussions with the Attorney General’s Office. Trustee Washington agreed that was an excellent idea. Chairman Pinson agreed.

Chairman’s Report

The Chairman again thanked Savannah River Remediation for partnering with SC State. He shared that this is the kind of thing that gets him excited about being on the Board. There is so much good and the Board needs to get focused and move in the direction that will bring more corporations in to partner with the University.

Chair Pinson shared he attended the meeting held at Midlands Technical College with the Governor, higher education officials and public education officials. There was much discussion as to how to fund higher education, what is the role of higher education, and the ability to cut costs and raise money. The whole discussion was about what other states are doing and whether South Carolina higher education is being funding at the right level. Many believe that higher education in South Carolina is not being funded appropriately. The competition to stay competitive is growing. It is imperative to build and put emphasis on who our partners are and how we establish relationships so they become financial and resource partners. Savannah River’s contribution is an example of what we are trying to do. Hopefully, more companies will become partners and bring in additional checks.

Chair Pinson thanked everybody who kept moving the University’s mission forward this summer after the turmoil board retreat. Even with all the negative press caused by some colleagues, SC State kept enrollment up which speaks to everyone’s hard work at the University that stayed focused and drove the mission forward. In these hard economic times, we all play a pivotal role in the growth of this state. While we are looking to recruit companies and create jobs, recruiters are looking at what is in the papers. We have to continue forward and turn the tide of negative press into positive press. In addition, enrollment needs to stay up to keep moving the mission forward.
He also thanked the administration for launching the Honors College and said we look forward to seeing more exciting news coming out of the Honors College.

Chair Pinson recently met with President Cooper and his Cabinet and discussed how to progress from board meeting to board meeting. Agendas set a plan to keep the Board in line with what has to be done, thus making it harder to get distracted. We must stay focused to accomplish goals. Accomplishing goals will make it easier for folks to buy into our mission and rally around us. We are trying to move the University forward by driving our mission and making sure we have measurable accomplishments.

Chair Pinson discussed another example of moving SC State forward with EquaTerra, the IT group that is on campus. Many have heard the challenges students face because of SC State’s technology. Technology builds a foundation for great universities and great corporations. In today’s times, SC State must get its technology up to standards. EquaTerra will help SC State identify and fix the gaps in departments being able to read each other which will make SC State more efficient. EquaTerra will provide a report of their findings and make a presentation at the next board meeting.

Chair Pinson contends that this is the kind of thing he wants the Board to hang their hats on, i.e., what they did while they were here, how they changed the University and whether they left it in better condition than they found it in. There are many good things ahead and it is going to take all of the Board working together.

**President’s Report**

Dr. Cooper presented his report and provided the following comments (Attachment 3). Institutions of higher education are being challenged even more as the economy changes. There is a decline in support from all sources as we meet challenges in providing quality education. Those challenges are put in perspective in his report.

SC State’s mission is significant because we have been trying to express our Land-Grant mission but the Land-Grant mission sponsors programs in engineering. SC State expanded its mission from engineering technology to engineering and engineering technology. This was facilitated by Dean Kenneth Lewis’ efforts to upgrade our engineering program with support from the University of Wisconsin in starting a joint program in Nuclear Engineering. It has grown and is vibrant. It is the only one in the State of South Carolina and the only one among HBCUs. This has opened up opportunities for SC State to add appropriate degrees programs allowing SC State to accurately respond to the land-grant mission. At the next Commission meeting, it will be presented as a modification so that the program will be a standalone program which demonstrates a capacity among SC State faculty to carry this program. It responds to economic challenges our state is facing and the growth of the nuclear engineering industry as was confirmed with the check from Savannah River this morning.

President Cooper then shared SC State’s vision. The following are the things he considers important:

- Fully expressing our Land-Grant Mission;
- Teaching and learning will be our utmost priority (undergraduate and graduate programs);
- Be ranked among the top 25% of public HBCU’s (nationally);
- Be among the top 25% among 1890 Land-Grant Universities (regionally); and
• Be a respected partner among South Carolina institutions.

Dr. Cooper stated that there is a unique mission at SC State as it relates to access. It is important to stay focused responding to the needs of traditional students. Trustee Washington asked if the Board would receive some benchmarks. President Cooper responded that the recent Accountability Report indicates measures that were reported to the Department of Education and to the Commission on Higher Education that compares SC State to other South Carolina institutions as well as the standards we look at. Trustee Washington inquired where we rank now among public HBCUs. Dr. Cooper reported that SC State is 4th in public HBCUs. According to US News, we are 14th among all HBCUs, public and private. Trustee Epps pointed out that we are already in the top 25% and asked what the goal is. President Cooper confirmed SC State is already in the top 25% and shared that in 2006, the Board approved a strategic plan for SC State, the 2006 – 2011 goals. The strategic plan is in the process of being updated now. SC State has an Accountability Committee that will engage various constituent groups to update SC State’s strategic plan. Because SC State is at that level now, the goal is to take SC State higher among public HBCUs and 1890 Land-Grant partners. Trustee Washington asked if SC State is ranked 4th should we not be in the top 10% versus the top 25%. President Cooper agreed. Trustee Washington stated then the goal should be to maintain our public ranking among the top 10%.

President Cooper indicated that SC State has had to focus on things that really matter when looking at funds in the E&G budget and the Title III funds that come from the federal government. The continuing priorities for the University include:

• Investing additional resources in order to support the QEP (subject to SACS approval);
• Looking at additional support for the Honors College to make it a great Honors College;
• Investing in Student Success and Retention;
• Looking at improved use of technology to support the business process and teaching and learning;
• Supporting a new Communications Major that was implemented this year;
• Supporting high priority Program Accreditations;
  – NCATE
  – Music
  – NCAA, reaffirmation results to come in April 2011
  – SACS, reaffirmation status will come in December 2010
• Investing in Student Recruitment by adding 2 additional recruiters.

Trustee Tobin advised that he has heard issues related to technology, Banner and Razor’s Edge training and asked where are we with training, making sure that training is taking place and making sure everybody is on board. Dr. Cooper replied that the Board approved an investment to bring in an external consultant to look at how Banner is used in our business process. A report will be provided at the next meeting. The consultant’s report will identify the challenges SC State faces in order to communicate more effectively utilizing Banner, a $3.2 million investment made about 5 years ago. He added that Banner is also being looked at to support recruitment efforts. President Cooper met with the recruitment team to ensure that what is presented on the web is reflective of the challenges students face when being admitted to the University. There will be a draft report in terms of the recruitment, admissions and the registration process in hopes of changing the process. We have the architecture but we are trying to find out how to more efficiently and effectively utilize and make timely decisions.
Trustee Tobin asked what is being implemented right now to make that happen. President Cooper noted those things include working with the Registration Committee and using the technology for distance and on-line courses offered at the University. Trustee Tobin asked what is being done for the mid-level person who has responsibility for implementing and using Banner or Razor’s Edge but has not had the training. Chair Pinson stated that EquaTerra is currently doing an assessment of our whole technology system. It has been done wrong in the past by tackling one area. EquaTerra has everybody on freeze while they perform an assessment to see where everybody is. Then, they will report their findings. That report will not only include technology, but the talent-touch of that technology, where we are deficient and a plan to correct it. Subsequently, the Board will look at it and determine how to move forward with EquaTerra’s plan for SC State.

President Cooper reminded the Trustees that Razor’s Edge was purchased last year to engage alumni and other stakeholders in fundraising. The current database for alumni has been verified. As it relates to Banner, EquaTerra’s assessment will provide milestones and identify what we need to do better in terms of engaging our staff to use this technology. We are waiting for the assessment to come forward based on interviews with our faculty, staff and administrators of the things they use and intend to use. Trustee Tobin asked what if the department manager tells his staff to go to the training. Dr. Cooper feels assured that will be a part of the recommendation for efficient use. Dr. Charles Smith, Mr. John Smalls and Mr. Anthony Caldwell are a part of the assessment going on. Mr. Smith replied in reference to Trustee Tobin’s comment that they have that in their process. EquaTerra is looking at banner from beginning to end. The team is meeting with everyone. Once they finish, Banner will work from beginning all the way through. All of our information will be in the system. Everything our students do will go straight through the system so our students will not have to come to campus. They can do everything from wherever they are unless they have a major problem. All managers will be trained. Trustee Lott commented that they hear and have been hearing that but the thing is training. Once these persons get trained, there has to be some accountability. If you have not worked up to par, then you need to do otherwise. There is no need to keep getting new technology. We just need people to be able to operate the technology.

Chair Pinson pointed out the validation of what is being done. He attended a meeting with this CIO, University officials, the EquaTerra team and some other folk. The CIO applauded SC State for doing this assessment because that is what high level corporations do; bring in a firm like EquaTerra to do an assessment first. So many people tackle it by calling the software company. The software company comes and sells you something but you lack the talent to understand what was just bought and/or how to implement it. You must have somebody here that can assess your talent of people to find out who is the best person to be responsible for this talent and who can be in charge of getting folks trained. You can send folks to training but if they are not technologically inclined, they are the wrong persons to send so you are wasting time and money. When Razor’s Edge was purchased, they made sure unlimited training was provided so employees could take the training as many times as necessary. The first set of folks may not get it so you might need to send another group. EquaTerra is helping us put together a master plan across campus which has never been done at SC State. This is ground breaking. Getting validation from a CIO of a multi-billion dollar corporation affirming that we are on the right track that is how you do it. Once the assessment is completed, that will provide the landscape to see where the deficiencies are to plug those gaps.

Trustee Epps stated that is a great approach but there needs to be a sense of urgency. When we go through this assessment will there be an action plan, timelines of when it will start and be completed with key milestones? President Cooper indicated that when the assessment is done, an
action/implementation plan will be developed. The Board will be updated quarterly looking at implementing change with the use of this investment. Chair Pinson assured this would not be a situation where EquaTerra performs an assessment and it goes on the shelf. The administration is working to figure out funding for EquaTerra for another 12 months for implementation of these plans. They will not just say here is your plan, now go fix it. They are going to be here to walk us through page 1, 2, 3 and so on and coming back to their process to say here is where you need to hire key talent because you do not have them on campus or you do but they need a little more training. This is on a priority level. It is understood that we expect to be in a better place next fall than we have been in previous enrollment seasons. This will not be a situation where we got a report, we paid money and we do nothing. Those days are gone. We are going to have accountability. A team is in place and charged with moving this forward. The Board will get quarterly reports to make sure the University is staying on tasks and this gets implemented. There are going to be measurable results. It is being driven like a business model that is going to be implemented and we expect to see the results from it. President Cooper added that when the business process is in sync, they should be able to use the intelligence to do scenario plans like what if funding, what if enrollment, looking at changes in programs, setting priorities to allocate resources appropriately. The action plan, with timelines, will be shared at the December Board Meeting.

Trustee Washington commented that SC State can spend the money, make the investment but SC State has to have folks with the right skills and training to implement it. He stated that they did something similar with Banner where lots of money was spent, an analysis was performed, people were trained but the problem was that we still had people operating under the old system as opposed to the new system so it confused the financial numbers and yielded delays. It goes back to people’s knowledge skills and training. President Cooper affirmed that they will look at people’s skills. They are talking about the skills, the need for additional skills, and an implementation process for getting key people trained in using Banner. Part of what SC State does with Banner is on-line but some of it is off-line. If the administration was trying to make a quick decision, it would be nice to have a dashboard on the computer to look at the process so if asked for enrollment trends rather than having to go to an office to get a report generated, it could be seen on a dashboard. That is intelligence. Dashboard should link to the strategic plan and we should be able to look at those questions in real time but we are not able to do that. Trustee Washington stated that the President is on point with the dashboard concept. He shared that the University of Wisconsin has an excellent dashboard reporting system. Chair Pinson stated that the difference in bringing in EquaTerra is that they do not sell software so they are not bias to Banner, IBM, SAPP or Oracle. EquaTerra will give the best evaluation of SC State’s software to help make sure that its use is being maximized to the fullest. Banner was purchased and it sat here for 6 years and has not been used on this campus and nobody was held accountable to say this is year one, you just spent millions of dollars and you are not using Banner. That shows a lack of carelessness. EquaTerra is going to say you are not using it; you may need to look at your talent pool. They are going to make sure the University moves its mission forward. If you want this implemented, we are going to tell you where your human talent, software and/or hardware are holding you up. The Board will make those hard decisions when those recommendations come to ensure that they do not sit on them and put them on the shelf. The Board will have to make real decisions to move this forward. Trustee Tobin shared that it is critical that we move forward. He applauded the Chairman for making that kind of assessment. He further believes that if SC State puts that in someone’s evaluation that they are expected to be efficient in Banner by the end of the year that might be the way to get this implemented. Chair Pinson informed that they are going to have that conversation.
Dr. Cooper mentioned that SC State’s real goal now is transitioning from the current strategic plan to a new strategic plan which has to be completed by next fall. A campus committee was appointed. They will need input from the Board of Trustees, Faculty/Staff, Alumni, Students and Key Stakeholders. There will be a serving methodology used to help identify issues that are important for SC State to address as a Land-Grant University.

President Cooper stated that SC State’s Blueprint for the Future covers 6 areas: Academic Infrastructure, Administrative and Physical Infrastructure, Human Resources, Institutional Advancement, Research Development and Student Life. These themes come from the strategic plan developed by the Board in 2006. When we look at implementation of this, the critical piece is Planning, Management and Evaluation. Institutional Effectiveness is working on the evaluation strategy. The Accountability Report shows some of the statistics used to demonstrate how successful SC State is in academic instruction, research and graduation rate. SC State wants to create a culture that is data driven, not only looking at academic programs but the University’s administrative capacity as well, which will help us look at the questions being raised about use of investments, Banner and other University technology. SC State has framed some areas that allow us to be accountable. When we look at assessment, we want to understand what is being done and understand how we can measure the effect of these activities.

In terms of the Academic Infrastructure, SC State will look at the outcome measures that will be important as we go through this year and future years. To improve SC State’s Administrative and Physical Infrastructures, we should assess our bond indebtedness in building future budgets; become more efficient as the result of implementing the Energy Contract that will allow SC State to upgrade facilities and hopefully, in turn, reduce the cost of deferred maintenance; enhance and maximize the use of technology; and assess technology.

Institutional Advancement’s primary focus is now fundraising by looking at private sector partners and alumni. SC State is engaging federal agencies trying to increase giving. The real challenge is how to build an endowment. SC State has a $3 million endowment that is mostly restricted. We want to build it in an unrestricted way to have flexibility in how we allocate funds in the future.

Human Resources is developing a succession plan for individuals retiring or finishing the TERI program to support those priorities mentioned earlier. Training and customer service are also important.

Research Development is looking at growing grants. Dr. Dale Wesson released a growing plan set for $50 million by 2015. Faculty members are excited and engaged. Research Development will allow SC State to promote community service.

Student life is important for us as and if we compare ourselves with peer institutions, we must recognize we are in Orangeburg, South Carolina. We have to provide a quality of life in living and learning on campus and in the community. SC State is trying to improve its facilities as resources become available to make this a great environment for students to attend SC State.

Athletics continues to help brand the University. SC State is seeking NCAA recertification. The campus visit was last week. A preliminary report should be received within a week and there will be an opportunity for SC State to comment before it goes to the Commission for their review and action. The final report is expected in April 2011 and those results will be shared with the Board.
Chair Pinson shared that he met with the recertification team. They gave SC State kudos for the Athletics Department. The guy said he was blown away as to what we have at SC State, so kudos to the Athletics Department and that team. Dr. Cooper added that the utmost compliment was the graduation rate of our athletes compared to other institutions. The committee said whatever we do; we should bottle it up and keep it which means that folks in Student Success and Retention, our faculty and retention efforts by our Athletic staff are paying dividends for those students to attend SC State University.

Dr. Cooper pointed out that the 2010-11 accomplishments are outlined in his report. Copies of the 2009-10 Accountability Report were distributed (Attachment 4). The Accountability Report goes to the Commission on Higher Education and it is used by the Department of Education in assessing SC State’s strength as an academic institution. It is a great tool to help plan the future of SC State.

Trustee Tobin asked if the NCAA visit was a preliminary visit. President Cooper responded that it was final. They submitted the report to the NCAA. The NCAA brought in a team of peers to assess the plan for the University. That was final. We will find out in April, 2011 where we are in terms of NCAA recertification.

Trustee Epps acknowledged that it was a great update. A lot of positive things are happening but he asked where are we headed and when are we going to get there. He is concerned when he sees a vision that maintains. We need a roadmap for the future. Trustee Epps challenged the President to set a very aspirational plan to reach the top 10 overall within the next 5 years and within the top 5 within the next 10 years some aspiration so we are all focused and driven towards some aspirational goal. He stated if SC State needs to strengthen academics and increase fundraising then what is the plan to do that? We really need to accelerate progress. President Cooper agreed. We are listing outcomes under each of the goals that are important for us with these times as we wrestle with resources and as we plan to maintain and strengthen academic programs and grow. There will be some recommendations made later today about growth in academic programs. The Academic Affairs Committee will be looking at the use of our E&G budget as well as external resources. Another example, we have had 1890 programs for many years. We have a faculty member who is funded with 1890 Research doing research developing technologies for managing oil waste. This is a high priority for our University. We have faculty involved in Nuclear Engineering research funded by 1890. We have a faculty member who had a recent grant funded looking at insect control in package foods. It appeared with the recall of Similac. There are a lot of great things happening at the University and the vision allows us to report the accomplishments as we move forward. If the question you are asking is should we be at a hirer level in terms of vision among other institutions, the answer is yes. Should SC State allocate resources to accomplish those goals; the answer is yes. We determined that by the Accountability Report which shows we are making progress towards aspirational goals.

Trustee Washington stated that President Cooper announced in August the new position of Chief of Staff and asked what that position entailed because when he thinks of Chief of Staff, he thinks everything reporting up through that position. Is it Chief of Staff of your staff? President Cooper replied that it is Chief of Staff of his staff, not the University. This person helps facilitate communication with cabinet members, helps when communicating with the public, and helps him stay focus on priorities within the context of communication with his staff. This will allow him to spend time away from the University engaging in fundraising and winning friends for the University. Trustee Washington asked whether there was a change in salary. Dr. Cooper responded there was no
change in salary. Trustee Washington asked if the Special Assistant to the President position did not accomplish those things. Dr. Cooper stated that he did not believe so. Trustee Washington asked if there was a change in organizational structure. Dr. Cooper replied no. There is just a change in duties and responsibilities. Trustee Tobin asked if there was a line staff position or do other people report to that person. President Cooper indicated that the only people who report to that person are persons in legal affairs. The staff support for that function comes out of the President’s Office.

Trustee Lott piggybacked on Trustee Epps’ comments that accountability is important. We have heard about the nation’s state of education and where we are and the thread in all of this has been teaching. She believes that everyone should be more accountable because the classroom is where individuals are influencing the young people. This needs to be widespread. Trustee Epps mentioned President Obama’s “Race to the Top” initiative. He contends that SC State needs its own race to the top initiative and stated that he hoped Dr. Cooper will accept that challenge. President Cooper replied “will do”.

Dr. Evelyn Fields inquired as to where we are with approval of the Research Incentive Plan and is it being implemented. President Cooper advised that the Research Incentive Plan was approved and has been implemented. Dr. Wesson commented that the schedule for that implementation is between November and December. That is the research bonus plan. According to the rules in that actual bonus plan, the checks go out from November through the end of December.

Trustee Waldrep shared that he attended part of Governor Sanford’s education summit in Columbia also. He noted it was interesting but did not think much progress was made. While there, he picked up a few copies of the American Council of Trustees and Alumni’s brochure titled “Cutting Costs, A Trustees Guide to Tough Economic Times” (Attachment 5). Trustee Waldrep reminded the Trustees that there was a right spirited discussion about tenure in a recent Board Committee meeting. He pointed out from page 10 of the brochure that “Tenure is virtually a life-time commitment – costing institutions million of dollars in salary and benefits. Are there alternatives to consider? ...many young faculty are receptive to alternative employment structures. And multi-year contracts can offer institutions greater ability to respond to academic and research demands.” Trustee Waldrep presented this to the Board for consideration when going through the tenure process. Chair Pinson concurred that it is an issue. As this whole economic landscape has changed, Universities have to look at how they award. It is like a lifetime of employment. At the meeting, he heard lots of discussion on both sides of the table. The brochure is a good read. It is mind invoking and we have to start thinking about the future.

Trustees Tobin, Epps and Corbitt also attended this meeting. Trustee Tobin thought it was a good contingent at the meeting. Trustee Corbitt’s concern was that there were constant complaints that institutions are going up on tuition and fees and the state continues to go down on appropriations. It cannot go both ways and he does not know what alternative the Board has. Trustee Corbitt added it is painful for any board to have to vote to increase tuition and fees. Trustee Waldrep contends the fundamental problem is the universal definition of funding. It gets confusing. The Comptroller General was at the meeting and weighed in on. It will not be understood until there is a common denominator/common language. Trustee Tobin’s concern was that when using statistics, it is like one size fits all. There are some people who are interested in moving to a board of regions but with that each institution’s uniqueness is not taken into consideration. Each institution has a unique mission and SC State’s is more unique than the others. Trustee Epps thought it was a good discussion but does not think much will come out of it. An oversight was not having the corporate
side there and engaged in the dialogue. In this economic environment, dollars are short on the state budget side so we need help. They are part of the state and have our workforce. They can help.

Trustee Washington requested a copy of the University’s tenure policy. If it is a lifetime commitment, how often is it reviewed and has it been reviewed by outside counsel? Lifetime commitment means a lifetime financial commitment. If SC State is going to make a lifetime commitment, we need to make sure that teacher education and development training is a part of the equation because they are ultimately responsible for teaching and learning. Further, should tenure be tied to student outcome? Chair Pinson noted this had been discussed in the Committee Meeting about the customer service piece and how we monitor it and tie it to performance. He concurs that a person should not get tenure if he/she is not giving the performance or output to the students.

Dr. Fields also believes it a good idea to review the policy to see what exactly the requirements and expectations are because you will find that tenure is tied to performance and the outcomes. This is a very complicated issue being debated nationwide. You have to look at the complete process, what is universally accepted and how it will fair well in the competitive market relating to recruiting and retaining. Dr. Joyce Blackwell reminded that tenure and promotion is not just tied to teaching performance. In the academy, it is also tied to research and service. Academic Affairs intends to review the policy because she has noticed that steps in the process have differed from year to year. She attended a College Board meeting earlier this week with 12 HBCU’s Chief Academic Officers. There was great discussion on the tenure and promotion process and ways to make certain faculty understand the process from A to Z. We need to do a better job of communicating that here at SC State. This year, they implemented the Faculty Institute with some workshops on tenure and promotion. They have begun to make people aware they are up for tenure so they can get their portfolios together.

Trustee Epps asked if career experience plays a role in that also? When he was hired in 2005, his contract indicated he was Tenured and he did not know if that was based on his research experience at Kraft or what. He is curious about other factors that go into that consideration. Dr. Blackwell affirmed that career experience could certainly be a part of service if within the 7 year period. Dr. Fields added that SACS also takes into consideration your experience as it relates to whether you are qualified to teach in a particular area.

**Standing Ad Hoc Committee Reports**

**Academic Affairs and Faculty-Liaison Committee**

- Proposal for new majors

  Trustee Corbitt announced that the Committee is on task and works hard. Years ago, everybody majored in Math, English or Biology but that day has passed and they are looking for new programs. Academic Affairs has recommended 3 new majors: (1) Master’s in Energy and Environmental Science, (2) Master’s in Biorobotics and Biofabrication and (3) Bachelor’s in Civil Engineering Technology with emphasis in Design.

  As introduction to the Master’s in Energy and Environmental Science, Dean Kenneth Lewis passed around an artifact of biodiesel fuel that was manufactured from discarded chicken grease here at SC State. He advised that energy is the number one priority in this country from a
defense and economic point of view. SC State has to get involved in these technologies and introduce our kids to these technologies as well. SC State started doing that at the undergraduate level. In 2008, SC State received a grant from the Department of Defense in the amount of $251,000 which enabled them to form the Laboratory for Energy Study and buy most of the equipment needed to conduct state-of-the-art research. One of the outflows of that is that we have a provisional patent for work in hydrogen evolution of switchgrass. Dean Lewis indicated this program expands to the master’s level where they can train on an interdisciplinary basis. It introduces the energy production side and the environmental science part which go hand-in-hand as seen with the Gulf Coast oil spill. Energy sources have to be developed that are less likely to produce severe environmental impacts so the two have to be studied together. They are looking at solar energy, biodiesel production, wind turbines and other forms of energy including nuclear. It will be completely funded through a $3 billion grant that was awarded to SC State in 2009 from the Department of Education. From this grant, $300,000 may be used to develop a new master’s program at SC State. This will be the first stem program of this kind and it is cutting edge. Dean Lewis added that they applied for additional funding from the Department of Defense ($450,000) to cover the next 3 years and continue to develop this program while producing students who are publishing papers. Two students presented papers on alternative energy systems at the SC Academy of Science.

Dean Lewis explained that some students are already working in these areas through transportation, biodiesel. Most of the needed tools and faculty are in place. Chair Pinson asked if the grant allows for marketing the new degree. Dean Lewis indicated that once the degree was formed it allows for publicizing to attract students and offer incentives. Through this grant, they have 8 fully funded tuitions plus an $18,000 stipend/year for students that are recruited into this major. Dean Lewis built the stipend into the grant to conduct research. Trustee Lott asked for confirmation whether they are just asking for approval of the major since some of the classes are already in place. Dean Lewis confirmed that some of the classes are transportation classes. This is to allow students to look at other areas of transportation, alternative fuel so they can do their thesis on that.

Dr. Blackwell informed that one of Academic Affairs’ goals is to expand graduate study offerings. Another is to make SC State unique when compared to our competitors in the state. Once approved by CHE, we will either be the only institution with that program or we will be one of two institutions in the state. These are the kinds of things Academic Affairs would like to build upon in terms of the Race to the Top as mentioned.

Trustee Epps asked whether there were undergraduate energy and environmental programs in the state. Dean Lewis believes Clemson has an undergraduate Environmental Science major.

Mr. Robert Leaks asked if the biodiesel fuel was highly combustible and what type of engine will it be used in? Dean Lewis explained that it is less volatile than gasoline and it has to be used in a diesel engine. This year, the senior design project for our Engineering Technology students was for one group of students to produce biodiesel and the other group was to test it in a 6 horsepower diesel engine mounted on a cart. If another grant comes through, they will order a golf cart and actually power it with biodiesel for demonstrations.

Trustee Washington indicated that he just received the 3 new major proposals and asked if the Academic Affairs Committee had reviewed the process of the proposals. Trustee Corbitt
indicated that the Committee had looked at the process; however, the information was not provided at the time but they knew it was coming. Trustee Washington asked since it is grant driven, what happens when the grant runs out? Will the University absorb a new cost and if so, what role will the Finance Director play in this process? Dean Lewis explained that if they do a quality job, the same thing will happen with what is happening with Nuclear Engineering. As you build a compatible and quality program producing outstanding graduates, money will just come walking up to you like the example we saw this morning with Savannah River. The program will sustain itself. There is a $34 billion bill on energy and as SC State demonstrates its quality and compatible program we will attract some of these funds. Trustee Washington asked in the event the economy we are experiencing now takes a down turn, what is the University’s commitment to ensure these programs remain viable when the soft money (grant) runs out? Will there be a tie in on the E&G budget to ensure the continuation of the degree programs? Dean Lewis noted that they are not using any new faculty and there is no cost impact. President Cooper stated that the cost is primarily to support graduate students in the program. The way it is designed, the current and future facilities will provide laboratories and office space. If they did not have the faculty, the facilities and the program presence, they would not be making the recommendation because the state does not give monies to start new programs. Trustee Washington questioned whether program expansion comes at no cost to the University? President Cooper responded that there is a cost in courses offered by faculty currently employed. The grant provides release time and the release time is used to bring in additional faculty to teach the courses our researchers are released to do. There is a cost but the cost is covered through our E&G budget. The investment comes from the grant to the E&G budget through release time. Trustee Washington stated so there is some potential cost to the E&G budget as you just referenced. Dr. Cooper noted that there is no potential cost to the E&G budget based on the way it is structured.

Trustee Washington noted it is a substantial change whereby requires CHE’s action. President Cooper asserted that any new degree program must go through this process now. Academic Affairs proposes the program. The Board recommends the program and they make the case to CHE. Trustee Washington asked what happens if the pipeline of funds is choked off after the 5th year and no new revenue is coming in grant-wise to support it, how will we then support it going forward? Dean Lewis supported Dr. Cooper’s contention that the real cost would be students attending since they already have the faculty here. The grant provides release time so they can be released to do research which has already resulted in one provisional patent and they are working on more. He declared there will be no residual costs with regard to faculty. The worst thing would be if they were not able to get students. However, he noted that this is going to be the demand and they have to focus on energy and environmental impact that is generating that energy which is also tied to the economy.

Dr. Cooper shared that Santee Cooper is also involved in these kinds of initiatives and it is a great opportunity for supporting our graduate students. This is the same process also Universities go through when requesting new graduate programs. We do not get a pipeline of funds from the state so we have to be creative and innovative in terms of how we fund and support programs. Trustee Washington asked if we were looking at phasing out low producing programs as a way to save money. Trustee Corbitt indicated his continued support to look at production and if a program is not working to cut it out. Dr. Blackwell affirmed that they are looking at that. She went on to say that the current administration is committed to funding research in Energy and the Environment. She pointed out that with the $34 billion bill there is
going to be a need there which allows us to produce students/the potential employees for those industries. Further, it is going to be long-term, not short-term. She shared that in a recent meeting; persons were literally begging them to engage in research in that particular area to go after those grants. She noted that they can keep the Board informed in terms of funding and support of the programs moving along.

Dean Lewis then shared his perspective on the Bachelor’s of Civil Engineering Technology with emphasis in Design. It is a joint program with USC in engineering which he sees as a stop-gap measure transitioning from Civil Engineering Technology into Engineering. One requirement for this program is structure. Since we do not have the structure yet, we do not currently have the faculty at SC State. Therefore, we will look at Clemson or USC for persons who have expertise in that area. They now have articulation agreements signed with Clemson for Civil and Industrial Engineering and with USC for Civil Engineering. It is necessary because we want students to come here who have a desire and want to get their professional engineer’s licensure. We are forming a degree that is substantially equivalent to a bona fide PhD Engineering degree which will allow students to sit for their professional licensure exam four years after receipt of their practicum. Right now Engineering Technology is 8 years so they are making a degree basically as an interim stop-gap measure equivalent to a degree from Clemson or USC.

Dean Lewis briefly introduced the Master’s in Biorobotics and Biofabrication which is state-of-the-art cutting edge. He passed around two artifacts. We have a device that is capable of producing these artifacts. You program into the device and it will generate in 3 dimensions what you have programmed in. In this case it is a working wrench. We are using this for biomedical applications and that comes into the area of Biofabrication. They are also using it in other areas as well. This device is dual purpose but it is primarily for Biorobotics. Biorobotics is a cutting edge $22 million grant for the State of South Carolina; our portion is $1.5 million. The objective is to reconstruct tissues which are very difficult to construct. For example, if a person has thoracic cancer, it is very difficult to cure that and it usually results in a fatality. So, the Biorobotics intent is to fabricate that kind of vascular tissue using the person’s own cells to reduce the chance of rejection. Our portion of that is to look at Biorobotics activity. SC State has two biorobotic expert faculty members that develop devices like those passed around. In order to make this program happen, we do not have the expertise in-house on the biological medical side yet so we will have to enter a joint venture and use faculty members from MUSC. In the interim, they will be training our faculty on campus. Basically, we are expanding our faculty and expanding our capabilities.

Trustee Washington indicated that his questions pertaining to cost is for all 3 of the programs because he is hearing some potential cost to the E&G budget. President Cooper explained that the expertise from the other universities is being funded through the grant, not the E&G. The funds are for the specific purpose of starting the new degree programs. We recognize we have the infrastructure in our facilities and the interest and capacity among our faculty. Because of the specializations needed in these degree programs, we are partnering with other SC universities. During the preliminary period, they will provide additional training so faculty members can sustain the activity for the degree program once it is funded. Trustee Washington asked was the necessary cost analysis forecasted in the proposals. President Cooper indicated that the funding concept is there but the cost out for 5 years is not. He offered to provide the details of the cost for starting up, offering the courses and developing the partnerships with these other universities. Trustee Washington addressed Mr. John Smalls and asked if the cost analysis
would be a part of CHE’s interest and consideration. Mr. Smalls confirmed that it would be part of the submission to CHE. Trustee Washington then asked for the benefit of the cost analysis for clarity purposes. Dr. Blackwell noted that she recently spoke with officials from EPSCor which is part of this grant. Some of that funding will be used to hire new faculty. The key is building a quality unique program. There is no other graduate program across the nation which includes biorobotics so that alone will help attract students to SC State. It is a new and growing field where there are very few students of color. There will be funding to help us to hire some new faculty and we will still bring in persons from MUSC because they have the expertise. We have some incredible people on faculty with great talents that will be an asset through the training and faculty development. Trustee Washington stated that if cost is an important consideration as said once we elevate this to CHE, we should understand what the cost is associated with the degree programs. He believes this is a wonderful addition to our degree programs but we have to consider cost. If we do not at the subcommittee level, we have to at the board level. Dr. Blackwell pointed out that they are on a timeline but that does not excuse making certain that we are able to sustain this program beyond those 5 years. She believes we can simply because of its uniqueness that in turn will help with the E&G budget. Trustee Corbitt asked if we have a situation at hand that will sustain us for 5 years, do we have to make a decision beyond that now to get it off the ground now. We have the grants, faculty and staff to get it off the ground. To get it to 5 years, that is another decision down the road. President Cooper shared that we made an effort several years ago to approve a proposal that went forward to received federal funding. Part of that proposal was to develop the programs that were presented today. They have enough confidence in our faculty and our capacity as a University to address this. So what we are doing is taking the investment and growing it. The probability of getting state funds to start new academic programs is nil. We are looking for private sector partners and federal agencies to give SC State the ability to launch these programs. For the future, that makes sense. We can sit and do nothing or we can take advantage of partners who are willing to invest in SC State so we can do well based on the knowledge of our faculty and the need to train students in the areas mentioned. Nothing is guaranteed in the future but the investment and risk we are taking today is important for SC State. Trustee Washington asked how CHE would interpret the risk if the financial piece is an important part of their consideration. We can approve it but we still have to deal with cost at that particular level and if we have to, then that cost should be shared with the governing board. Dr. Blackwell mentioned that the proposal that goes before CHE, which is much more comprehensive than the internal one presented today, are mainly concerned about the # of FTEs that will be generated over a period of years. One reason for that concern is to make certain that over a period of years, you are able to generate revenue for these FTEs to support and sustain the program. At the end of the day, if it is a quality program that attracts students here, it is going to increase the number of students coming to the University and that means they will generate revenue to support the program. Trustee Tobin stated that we have respect for what Dean Lewis is doing in building the nuclear engineering program. What Trustee Washington is getting at is over extending ourselves and being able to do what we need to do in a quality way. Trustee Tobin does not see how it could not be cost involved because we are going to be offering courses and many of our professors already have full loads so somewhere there is going to be cost in the courses. He thinks it is great and applauds what Dean Lewis is trying to do. He pointed out that before we go farther, we need to be prepared to answer these questions externally from the University to CHE. We do not need to give speculative answers. He also mentioned that while it is a great initiative, it was not vetted in the Academic Affairs Committee meeting. That is what committee meetings are for and that is where these questions that are being asked today should have been asked but if call for a vote, he will raise his hand and vote.
because he has that much confidence in Dean Lewis with his reputation that has already taken place.

Chair Pinson asked about the timeline. President Cooper and Dr. Blackwell indicated that we have received the grant; we just need to get approval for the majors/classes. The Chairman indicated that we are all supportive of the degrees. Dr. Blackwell explained that this is a part of the EPSC or grant. They thought about proposing it at the next November Board meeting but it has to go before CHE by a certain time period and their next meeting is also in November. She took responsibility for not having these proposals at the Academic Affairs Committee meeting but the Educational Policies Council meeting was held on the same day and that was the first step in the process of approving and vetting on their level. Chair Pinson questioned whether it was the will of the body to get the cost analysis, to determine the impact, before we vote on this. Trustee Corbitt asked if we could move forward and get the cost analysis in the mean time. President Cooper noted that when we go from this step to the Commission, the cost analysis will be presented to CHE so they will know we can sustain this program. We can withhold approval which delays us for a year or as we expand the proposal and present it to CHE, we can submit it simultaneously to the Board for its review. Trustee Tobin noted that he was going to make that as Dr. Cooper indicated a motion but wants to make sure when the University goes before CHE that they have the information. Dr. Cooper assured that would be done. Trustee Lott suggested having the information emailed to the Board and possibly have a conference call on it. Chair Pinson agreed and stated that they could vote on it another time because they have until November. So, for everyone’s comfort level, the package should be put together, sent to the Board so they can vote on it over the phone. Dr. Blackwell noted that they have the information. It is just that it is very large. Chair Pinson then asked for a summary of it. Trustee Lott then mentioned that the Board has not been given the benefit of the doubt because if you look at some of the dates where it was signed off on earlier and they are just getting it the day of the meeting that is not fair. Dr. Cooper pointed out that he and Dr. Fields asked the same question. If it was signed in April, why does it come to them at this time? He assured the Board that he is tightening this process up. Chair Pinson stated to be clear to everyone that if it has not been vetted to the appropriate committee it cannot reach them on the day of the Board. The responsibility is back on the academy to do their part so it is not being thrust on the Board members at the last minute. Let it be known that we cannot even allow this information to be filtered through if it has not been vetted in committee. He is trying to get everyone to a point when they come for Board meetings they briefly discuss the matter and then they vote on it so things are moving and they are not rehashing information. Dr. Cooper agreed. Dr. Blackwell mentioned in support of those who have worked hard on this, that these dates are during the summer and none of the councils meet during that time but she does understand the Board’s position. Trustee Washington stated that whatever CHE needs, they need also. Trustee Corbitt then remarked that if the administration is comfortable with that, we ought to agree and ask Academic Affairs to send them that information and then have a conference call. Chair Pinson remarked that we support the program because they know the degree is strong. There are a lot of bio-diesel fuel plants trying to get into South Carolina. He believes that we should not have any problems filling the classrooms up with students if we market it and let them know the importance of these degrees. This is advancing the University forward and he commended everyone for their efforts. *We are going to get the financial backing for it so we can get some comfort level and we will be ready to move it forward; Trustee Corbitt so moved, seconded by Trustee Tobin. Questions were called for. Trustee Tobin asked for a summary of the*
financial information not the whole thing but if someone wanted to see the whole thing it could be made available to them for review. Vote: unanimously approved.

- Student Retention Report

Dr. Carl Jones presented a report in response to the Board’s inquiries on student retention data (Attachment 5). He began by discussing what retention is. In terms of national data, there are two major indices used with regards to retention rates: First-Year Retention rate (which is fall to fall, the Cohort) and Graduate Rate. Retention is a byproduct of how you manage your student enrollment. It is the growth in learning, how you value and treat your students on campus and how you meet the needs and expectations of students. Cohort is another important term to understand because when you look at sophomore, junior and senior data you have to be very careful because there can be various cohorts within those classifications. Cohorts follow each other. That is why when you look at national data they primarily focus on First-Year Retention and Graduation Rate because everyone should be focused on moving students to graduation. IPEDS (Integrating Post-Secondary Education Data System) data has to be reported for every institution that receives Title IV funds so there should not be any question where an institution stands in terms of retention and graduation rates.

Over the last five years, the overall retention of SC State has been consistent at 70%. Note there is a differentiation between undergraduates (average 72%) and graduates. Graduate students are very volatile because that is generally the working population so it depends on where they are in terms of career advancement. That is why it is critical to separate it.

The national data for attrition (opposite of retention)/reasons why students will leave the University is based on: academic difficulty; adjustment difficulty; uncertain, narrow or new goals; weak and external commitments. When we compare the SC State data to the national data it is very similar and those reasons are: academic, financial, transfer to another institution, decided to work or personal/social issues. Academic and financial are interrelated because one can return based on academics but because of their academics they are unable to get the financial aid needed to enroll. It has been reported nationally that one third of the high school population is not college ready and one-third of those that do go to college are not college ready. For this reason, it is important to look at the profiles of the classes coming in.

Dr. Jones then pointed out that SC State is at the top in terms of social mobility because SC State does a better job of aggressing them to graduation. Historically, no institution has done that better than SC State. A snap shop showing relative standing among public HBCUs was pointed out. He noted that SC State has been the top institution in graduation rates if you go back 10 or 15 years in IPEDS, bar none in terms of public institutions and there has only been a few private of the 105 that have been above SC State. The only Land-Grant institution that has been above SC State is Tuskegee and they are technically a private institution. SC State is and has been the top institution at graduating black males even higher than Tuskegee. Among the comprehensive teaching institutions in South Carolina, SC State has historically been ranked number 4 or 5 looking at the 10 year data behind the Citadel, College of Charleston and Winthrop. The 2003 Fall Cohort caused SC State to drop to 35.8% which causes you to have to go back and look at the Cohort to determine and understand what caused the change.
Dr. Jones noted that SC State was in the top 10 HBCUs according to the 2008 graduation rates. There are only two public HBCUs in the last four years, Elizabeth City State and North Carolina Central, which have consistently had graduation rates higher than SC State.

The Factors Influencing Retention and Graduation Rates are: Enrollment Size; Academic Profile of Students; Adequate Infrastructure/Resources; Student Financial Support; Instructional Effectiveness; Effective Support Services; and Quality Service. Trend data in terms of Enrollment, SAT Average and Retention was provided and briefly discussed. Dr. Jones indicated that the 1998 retention rate (68%) would have been the same as the 1997 rate (80%) had it not been for the six student deaths on campus. When the SAT scores were in the 870’s and 860’s, the rate was in the 70’s percent for first-year retention.

Student Success and Retention (SSR) developed the following strategies: Contain the size of the next three freshman classes to 800-1,000 (taking into consideration the financial impact on university programs, services and personnel); Increase the average SAT score of incoming freshmen to above the institution’s minimum requirement to 850 from 830; and Enhance retention strategies to improve first (freshman) and second (sophomore) year success of students, to include strategies to improve instructional effectiveness, academic advising, safety, and security, and customer service in general. While many institutions take the orientation process lightly, it should not be. It is important that every new student who comes to the institution should go through that process to make sure that all students look alike regardless of the different majors. The newest retention strategy being implemented is the Academic Success Academy. It will focus on the general education curriculum. Regardless of the major, they intend to make sure the students are exposed to the same general content in each course. Faculty will be provided training so they can become master teachers in teaching those particular courses. The first year is critical; however, they intend to focus on the first two years.

Dr. Jones noted that one of the SACS challenges is assessment of the impact the GEC has on student learning. He also shared that this is a CHE requirement as well. Therefore, SSR will perform a content analysis. There has to be a determination up front what levels our students are coming in at and making sure there is a relationship between where they are and the content they are being exposed to. Then, SSR will make some post assessment to see what the movement has been from where they came in at to where they are. North Carolina institutions are required to publish grade distribution which is a little controversial. They are saying, for public institutions, parents and students have the right to know where students are being successful. Dr. Jones is not suggesting that we should do that in South Carolina but he is suggesting internally, we need to know if there are certain sections for instance in terms of students progress that may be more challenges historically for students than others. Then SSR will customize and train to see if that structure will make any difference internally with effectiveness. It is all interrelated but the bottom line is, we just cannot say we have a GEC and there is no assessment in terms of how well students are learning and what that does in terms of retention and graduation. Dr. Blackwell assured that the GEC would be faculty driven through the SSR Office.

Mr. Anthony Beckett asked what the equivalent ACT score would be if the minimum SAT score was raised to 850. Dr. Jones responded that it currently is 1800 and would change very little because the increase is only 20 points higher. Mr. Beckett shared that last year’s freshmen
class SAT average was 864, 14 points higher than the minimum being proposed by SSR. Mr. Beckett continued by inquiring as to how are we going to ensure these strategies will be effective and seen through to make sure students are retained. Dr. Jones noted that the President has made this a priority. SSR will do the assessment and it will be presented to the President and Cabinet through Dr. Blackwell to make sure it is followed up and training is provided. SSR also sees the need to have more focus groups because better impressionistic information is gained by talking with students. SSR will also look at students interfacing with certain staff so there can be some interchange with what the problems are so that gives the information to know and customize strategies to act on and become the top institution retaining students, not 4th or 5th. Trustee Tobin stressed that implementing the QEP should be another strategy.

Trustee Epps asked what the target retention rate is, 80%. Dr. Jones indicated that SSR is trying to implement short-term, intermediate and long-term goals to get back to where SC State was. The short-term goal is an increase of 2% in the first two years and the intermediate goal is an increase of 5% in years three through five. The Academic Success Academy will help that. SSR has to make sure students are tracked and monitored their first year, second year and second thru junior year. Dr. Jones reminded that nationally, SC State has done a better job retaining students. In relative terms, SC State has done great but in absolute terms, SC State has not. Trustee Lott asked if there were goals and objectives for increasing it every year. Dr. Jones confirmed there are set goals and will provide if needed. He reminded that retention is a byproduct and so all the other elements have to be in place.

Trustee Washington asked if it was unrealistic to have a goal to graduate every student. Dr. Jones indicated that is certainly a vision and you have to treat it as such. Trustee Washington suggested that should be the message that if you come to SC State, we will graduate you and maybe not in 4 years but SC State will graduate you.

Trustee Washington stated that Dr. Jones touched on moving the GEC program over to the Academic Success Academy. He went on to remind that according to SACS, curriculum belongs to the faculty and we want to make sure we do not change that. Dr. Blackwell recognized that fact and shared that it is only being moved to the Academic Success Academy because of the direct correlation between the GEC and retention of students. Dr. Blackwell assured that faculty will be involved with the process because conversations had been held with deans and chairs, and they all understand that while the GEC is under the Academic Success Academy, it still has to be faculty driven.

Trustee Washington spoke concerning SC State’s GEC requirement is 48 hours since SACS only requires 32 and CHE only requires 30. He asked if 48 hours helps or hurts what we are doing and how. Dr. Jones believes this should be streamlined and even more importantly if comparing SC State with peer institutions and they only require 36. Also, the longer you keep students in those lower divisions, the less likely they can see themselves as progressing. Trustee Washington asked if we are seriously looking at that for a potential change. Dr. Blackwell affirmed that they will be looking at this across the board, the GEC and every major, to be more in-line with one another.

Trustee Washington commended Student Affairs for the growth in this year’s average SAT score to 880 and noted that Dr. Charles Smith is right on point watching the yield.
Mrs. Snider suggested beginning orientation in January or February as opposed to summer to provide a little more orientation for students which could help with the business and financial transactions so there will not be bottlenecks come Fall 2011. Dr. Jones replied that they would look at that. It is a balance and you have to be careful not to bring students on campus too early. This is also based on when students are accepted. Most schools do not do anything earlier than March.

Mr. Terrence Cummings closed out Dr. Jones presentation by commenting that SSR is focused on a student body by design and not by chance. SSR is targeting recruitment with the Honors program and all of these things will bring to SC State a design and not bring students in by chance. When by design, SSR can guarantee more that students will go from orientation to graduation.

Trustee Epps commented on how it all ties the University together by moving the University forward, improving SC State’s rankings and fostering retention efforts in order to attract those 1100+ SAT scorers. Chair Pinson agreed with Trustee Epps and thanked Dr. Jones for the presentation.

Trustee Corbitt noted that some NCATE information was in their packets and asked if they needed to discuss it. Trustee Tobin shared that he went on-line and saw that our reports were due September 15, 2010 and wanted to know if they had been done. He added that NCATE is about as important to SC State as SACS is in terms of our mission. Dr. Charlie Spell, Department Chair, advised that the SPAR reports were not done but that the new submission date is now March 15, 2011. Trustee Tobin advised that his understanding is when the report is submitted in March 2011 there is no review period; it has to be perfect because SC State will not get a chance then to make any corrections. Dr. Spell noted that this is a three year process; the reports were not ready for submission on September 15th because major revisions had to be made to the reports per the consultant’s advice but once the reports are ready, they will be sent forward. They would not wait until March to submit them. Trustee Tobin stated that SC State’s accreditation is in jeopardy because we missed the September 15th deadline.

Dr. Blackwell informed the Trustees that she requested, by letter and email, in October 2009, copies of the SPAR reports. She was told they were not ready and would not be ready until February 2010. She then asked to have them in hand February 2010. She did not receive them. In speaking with Dean Ronald Speight and Dr. Spell, she was informed the reports needed additional work before they could be submitted. She advised that she is fully aware of the importance of this and stated the consultant feels we are in a good place. She does not believe, with everything she has seen, that NCATE is in jeopardy. Dean Speight agreed with everything said and added that this process began in 2008-09 academic year. The committee has worked from that point to move us forward to where we need to be at this point. Most of the people working on the spar reports are the same people who worked on the last report. He noted he came on board in January 2010 and there was no NCATE coordinator. The dean and chair carry lots of responsibility for seeing good progress but every school has an NCATE Coordinator. The volume of work that must be done with keeping up with the timelines, demands a particular person’s attention that can oversee the process. Dean Speight indicated that he does not think SC State is in jeopardy.
Trustee Tobin indicated that he does not understand what the problem is if we knew three years ago we needed an NCATE Coordinator, we needed to submit our reports on September 15th, and we knew we still do not have one and the report has not been submitted yet. He asked if anybody present would say yes that our NCATE accreditation is not in jeopardy. Dr. Cooper said yes, it is not in jeopardy. Dr. Fields clarified that the NCATE Coordinator left in 2009-10 academic year because we cut her contract. At that time, she requested over and over again for an NCATE Coordinator. When it was clear, SC State was not going to hire one, she took on the responsibilities herself and became the NCATE Coordinator. An NCATE Coordinator usually comes from within any ways because that person needs to understand the process and the documents and data from your institution. Dr. Fields also noted that this is a public document and there are several misconceptions in the document including her credentials. Trustee Lott shared that she was disappointed that other Academic Affairs personnel did not say the NCATE accreditation was not in jeopardy and pointed out that it comes down to accountability. Someone should have said something. Over the years, they have been hearing about reports so what happened to those documents or whatever has not been done? Dr. Blackwell then declared that it is not in jeopardy and reminded that when she was hired in 2009, one of the first things she did was ask for the SPAR report. Chair Pinson summed it up stating that the ball has been dropped. The President and administration has to make this a priority and ensure we get this processed. Trustee Washington asked, as a governing body that has the ultimate authority and accountability on the issue, can it be assigned to the Academic Affairs Committee to monitor and report to the Board quarterly or when they have sent the report. Trustee Corbitt noted it would be put on their agenda for the next meeting. Dr. Blackwell also acknowledged. President Cooper indicated he would provide updates between now and the meeting.

President Cooper announced that he had copies of the textbooks available for review as requested.

Athletics and Student Affairs Committee

On behalf of the Athletics and Student Affairs Committee, Trustee Duncan extended commendations to the Athletic Department for the untiring work they have done. She mentioned that through the earlier discussions, they heard about building legacies, decreased state appropriations and the economic environment we are forced to live in and noted that there is a solution. The Committee offered some solution to increase finances and also offer some legacies through the Athletics Naming Rights Proposal.

Athletics Naming Rights Proposal

Trustee Duncan explained that it comes in the form of a proposal for SC State facilities. The amounts have been designated and any and all persons can take advantage of it. Mrs. Charlene Johnson briefly spoke to the Board explaining that Athletics explored some additional naming rights opportunities within their facilities. Mr. Anthony Holloman then addressed the Board reminding that the Board approved the Naming Rights Policy on June 9, 2006. After sitting with his committee and Mrs. Johnson, they looked at some modifications. A few of the specific proposed changes mentioned were as follows:

- President’s and Trustees’ box increase from $50,000 to $100,000;
- Athletics’ box reduction because of size, from $50,000 to $25,000;
- SHM’s media press box will cost $10,000;
- SHM’s locker rooms will cost $25,000; and
- Football field, $250,000, to sustain the facilities within the stadium.
Mr. Holloman pointed out that there are other facilities for review i.e., tennis courts. Mr. Holloman believes this will give great opportunities for partnerships where individuals and corporations can have their name in our facilities. Presently, the naming opportunities that exist on the campus total $13 million and this proposal is in addition.

Trustee Epps asked whether a formula was used to determine the football field’s amount because it seemed rather low to him. Mr. Holloman explained that the proposed prices were based on a review of peer and other universities around the state and that the value ranges at different levels. Mr. Holloman shared that SC State has a unique situation in regard to naming the football field. While there have been recommendations made to name the field in honor of Coach Willie Jeffries, he believes it should be named with a financial investment. So, they set a price this person could meet in order for this to be done with some immediacy if the policy is approved.

Trustee Washington asked whether that was current for a football field. Mr. Holloman further explained that SC State should not continue to name facilities without some type of value or compensation. SC State’s situation is that Coach Jeffries has been recognized for his accomplishments nationally over the last year. There have been recommendations made to the President to name the field without any fee. Athletics and the President’s Office have received some pressure to resolve this issue. Mr. Holloman recommends that some fee be associated to maintain the field. The proposed amount is a combination of recognition and coach Jeffries contributions to SC State.

Mr. Beckett asked if the proposed prices would be sufficient to maintain the field. Mr. Holloman noted that this will allow Mrs. Johnson to build an endowment of resources to maintain the facilities. Trustee Epps recommended setting aside Coach Jeffries and determining the amount if a corporation wanted to name the field to determine the starting value and then factor out what Coach Jeffries contributions would be. Trustee Duncan indicated the Board needed some wiggle room. Trustee Corbitt noted that nothing was being named without the Board’s approval. President Cooper confirmed.

Trustee Nance made a motion, seconded by Trustees Epps and Duncan, (1) to approve the naming rights for all of the facilities mentioned on the document as recommended by the Committee but excluding the football field; (2) to reserve the right for the Board to deviate from the naming guidelines in special circumstances and the Board will deem those circumstances (3) to add concessions stands and any other facilities or property that may have been left out of the original guidelines. There were no questions. Vote: unanimously approved.

**Budget, Audit, Facilities and Grounds Committee**

On behalf of the Budget Committee, Trustee Nance announced that the Committee met on September 16, 2010 at 1:00 P.M. He thanked the Budget Committee members for their participation in that meeting. Trustee Nance pointed out that there was a Reimbursement Resolution that needed action on.

- Reimbursement Resolution
Mr. John Smalls reminded the Trustees that the Board previously approved the University to enter into an Energy Performance Contract which allows SC State to update all HVAC systems. Final approval has to come from the State Budget and Control Board which is not slated to act on this until December or January of next year. In the meantime, there are items that SC State may need to implement as part of the Energy Contract. This resolution will allow SC State to be reimbursed from the Master Lease program once it is approved. The $17 million will come from the Master Lease program which is approved by the State Treasurer’s Office.

**Trustee Washington made a motion, seconded by Trustee Nance, to approve the resolution. There were no questions. Vote: unanimously approved.**

Trustee Washington stated that when the phone switch technology was discussed, the Board was not given the exact cost. The amount was stated as an estimate of $1.7 million. He added that the Board did not approve to borrow $1.7 million; rather, what was approved was to allow the process to move forward on it to meet the June 30th deadline. Before implementation, signing off on it given our current debt obligation, it should be brought back to the Board for final approval with the final costs associated with the switch.

Trustee Washington continued that in December of last year, the Board unanimously and correctly authorized an audit of our grants and contracts and student accounts receivables. He noted that Mr. Smalls agreed that a performance management audit was appropriate and something we should do. It was clear that the audit was done for purposes of improving our efficiencies in Grants and Contracts and Student Accounts Receivables which impacts the University’s cash flow. As a result of that process, the University experienced about $500,000 in release time funds which allowed the President and Mr. Smalls and the Board to agree to reduce the number of furlough days, originally 19 days but we challenged ourselves to reexamine some things. As the result, new discoveries were made which allowed reducing the number of furlough days to seven. It was not a witch hunt. They were interested in improving efficiencies and cash flow. Elliott Davis was unanimously approved. The report was completed in June and they were hopeful of having some discussion on the audit results when it was completed. The findings need to go to the governing body immediately even if not in final draft because that is how they build on improvement. Trustee Washington requested at the subcommittee meeting that a copy of the report be sent forward to the Board members for review, discussion and action as it relates to recommendations. He personally did not receive the copy as promised. It is a serious fiduciary responsibility, as governing board, to ensure that we do everything possible to protect and preserve University cash flow because of the implications if they fail to do something.

Trustee Washington noted *The Post and Courier* posted the results online and he received a copy that way. He questioned why he didn’t receive a copy of the report once the University received it. President Cooper responded that once he received the report he shared it with the Chairman and received his advice that it would be discussed today. Trustee Washington indicated that the Board should have been provided ample time to review it so they could have come prepared to ask intelligent/pertinent questions concerning the document. Chair Pinson advised that in light of the environment we endured this summer with information getting to the media before any of them had a chance to see it and because there are some personnel issues in the documents, the report would be discussed today in Executive Session as a body. The Board has to come together as a body and
realize that they get information pertinent to SC State and be able to vet and discuss it before it is released to the media. We do not have that policy right now. It has been like a renegade university i.e., documents going to the media before the Board gets them. There is an underlying current around here. Some folks are trying to create a damaging image to this University by releasing this information. That is why they want to talk about it today in Executive Session to hopefully come up with a game plan on how information is disseminated and when it is released to the media. That way, everyone is on the same accord and the media is not calling to give a heads-up by saying I have a document, can you tell me about it and you have to say no I cannot because I have not seen it. It is sad and embarrassing that the University has been operating that way. Trustee Tobin recommended that the documents just be sent to the officials who need to get it to begin with to avoid them being leaked in another manner. Chair Pinson noted that this was leaked before he even got it.

Trustee Washington referred to page 6 of the Budget versus Actual Statement dated September 22, 2010 and asked if the $41 million tuition and fees was net of institutional scholarships or grants (Attachment 6). Mr. Smalls indicated that the $41 million is the gross amount plus $3.5 million for summer school totaling $46 million for the year. Trustee Washington then referred to Athletics’ budget of $2.1 million and asked if Athletics has been charged to raise that. Mr. Smalls indicated yes and that it is based on historical data which represents 10% more than they raised last year. Trustee Washington clarified that it is soft money only in the sense it is not a designated fund such as what we receive from the state and what we receive from a set goal in terms of tuition and fees. This is something we have to raise just as the $1.9 million in donations/contributions. Again, it is a goal of soft money in that sense. Mr. Smalls agreed.

Trustee Washington believes we should be very mindful of what we have to deal with here, helping, as the governing body, the Administration move forward with the University’s vision. Then, what are the University’s institutional scholarships? Mr. Smalls noted that they are approximately $10 million. Trustee Washington asked so if we backed that out according to GAAP (Generally Accepted Accounting Principles) accounting, how would that impact the bottom line; what should the University be forecasting and looking at in order to mitigate any type of retention going forward? Mr. Smalls reminded that they budgeted $46 million, gross tuition and fees for the year, and that they have virtually received half of that at this point and should be at 50%. Scholarships are reflected in the expenditures so that is not net. They gross them because they include all the revenue and they budget the tuition and fees. The $20 million operating expenses is included in that figure. Trustee Washington then asked if salaries and wages should be a separate line item from fringe benefits as reflected in our comprehensive summarized form. Mr. Smalls said they just rolled it up in one figure because they are related but it can be made as detail as you want. The quarterly report that is provided to the Board is very detailed. This is just a summary. On September 30th, he will provide the detailed report which shows each line item i.e., fringe benefits, travel etc. Trustee Washington assured that would be more helpful in determining more clearly where we are financially as we approach the close out of the fall semester. He further added that we are looking at additional belt tightening as reported the other day. Mr. Smalls affirmed that they would provide the detailed quarterly report each quarter. He assured that we are at 50% and are doing well.

Trustee Washington stated that if you backed out the total revenue of $64,554,120 from the total expenditures of $64,003,559, it leaves a net of $500 and asked if that was an accurate read. Mr. Smalls affirmed. Trustee Washington commented that if we consider the $500 on the net, the $1.9 million donations/contributions as soft money, and Dr. Blackwell’s report on Felton which showed
income of $200+ based on enrollment and just 50% of what is reflected here, they should definitely then have serious and engaging conversation about net revenue, cash flow, things of that nature.

Trustee Epps inquired as to what was the budget assumption based on enrollment for the spring semester. Mr. Smalls advised that the budget was based on 4,250 FTEs for each semester. Trustee Epps then asked if we have been able to maintain that kind of enrollment from fall to spring. Mr. Smalls noted that some years they have been above that and last year, it was a little lower than that.

**EXECUTIVE SESSION:**

*Trustee Corbitt moved, seconded by Trustee Nance, to go into executive session to discuss personnel issues.* There were no questions. **Vote: unanimously approved. Motion carried.** President Cooper and Ms. Joyce Green were asked to remain. The Boardroom was cleared and the Board went into executive session. During discussions, the following persons were called in individually: Dr. Joyce Blackwell, Mrs. Charlene Johnson and Mrs. Evelyn Anderson.

**OPEN SESSION RECONVENED:**

While the Board was in executive session no votes or actions were taken and that only personnel matters were discussed.

*Trustee Corbitt moved, seconded by Trustee Nance, to accept the Academic Affairs Committee’s, President’s and Vice President’s recommendations for Emeritus, Promotion and Tenure.* There were no questions. Votes were as follows: I’s - Jonathan N. Pinson, John H. Corbitt, Robert M. Nance, Linda Edwards-Duncan, Jackie R. Epps, Patricia B. Lott, Robert L. Waldrep, and Maurice G. Washington. There were no questions. Trustee Walter L. Tobin abstained. **Motion carried.**

*Trustee Edwards-Duncan moved, seconded by Trustee Corbitt, to extend the multi-year contracts of Coach Tim Carter and Coach Doug Robertson for three (3) years.* There were no questions. **Vote: unanimously approved. Motion carried.**

*Trustee Edwards-Duncan moved, seconded by Trustee Corbitt, to reelect Mr. Samuel B. Glover and Mrs. Deborah W. Joseph and to appoint Mr. James H. Mulligan to the Real Estate Foundation Board.* There were no questions. **Vote: unanimously approved. Motion carried.**

**ADJOURNMENT:**

*Trustee Corbitt moved, seconded by Trustee Nance, to close the meeting.* **The vote was taken, unanimously approved and carried.** Chair Pinson declared the meeting adjourned at 4:06 P.M.

All referenced attachments are made a permanent part of these minutes.
Respectfully submitted,

Robert M. Nance
Secretary of the Board of Trustees

Chrystel Rogers
Recorder

Attachments:
1 - Agenda
2 - Supporting Materials
3 - President’s Report, September 29, 2010
4 - SC State University’s 2009-2010 Accountability Report
5 - Cutting Costs: A Trustee’s Guide to Tough Economic Times brochure
6 - Dr. Carl Jones’ PowerPoint presentation to the Board of Trustees
7 - SC State’s Budget versus Actual Statement, FY 2010-2011, dated September 22, 2010