

Minutes of the
NIU Board of Trustees
Of Northern Illinois University
Ad Hoc Committee on Enrollment
November 14, 2014

CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL

The meeting was called to order at 3:55 p.m. by Committee Chair Marc Strauss in the Sky Room at Holmes Student Center. Recording Secretary Susan Oppenborn conducted a roll call of Trustees. Trustees Robert Boey, Robert Marshall, Student Trustee Paul Julion, Board Chair John Butler, and Committee Chair Marc Strauss were present. Also present were President Douglas Baker, Vice President Eric Weldy, Provost Lisa Freeman, Vice Provost Anne Birberick, Board General Counsel Jerry Blakemore and Board Liaison Mike Mann.

VERIFICATION OF APPROPRIATE NOTICE OF PUBLIC MEETING

Committee Chair Strauss asked Mr. Blakemore to confirm that appropriate notification of this meeting had been provided. Mr. Blakemore indicated that appropriate notification of the meeting had been provided pursuant to the Illinois Open Meetings Act.

MEETING AGENDA APPROVAL

Committee Chair Strauss called for a motion to approve the agenda. Board Chair Butler made the motion to approve the agenda and Student Trustee Julion seconded. The motion was approved.

CHAIR'S COMMENTS/ANNOUNCEMENTS

Marc Strauss: I'll try and keep my comments brief. I want to thank those of you who attended today and especially my colleagues on the Board. I think we're all aware that the central focus that we have is building a sustainable financial model and that admissions plays a very key role in this and so does retention and so the purpose of this committee is to focus on enrollment and to see at the board level the areas in which there might be policies that the board could pass that would provide direction and also support strategic initiatives that are on the plate for the administration. In the conversations that I've had so far with President Baker and Mike Mann especially, I've been able to identify several areas where it seems likely that we can have a productive discussion and without knowing what direction our conversation will go in, I included these areas in the discussions that I had with Board Chair Butler so that we could include those items in the charge for this committee. In no particular order, they included a consideration of policies governing the setting of tuition and fees which is a board function that we started the process of dealing with for the coming fiscal year at our meeting last week. Issues that relate to academics and specifically that relate to the board's function in dealing with program additions and deletions, the alignment of the system of awards and recognition to institutional objectives and capital commitments that would extend beyond the presidential authority which could include contracts for basic admission and counseling functions as well as capital items that would relate to student life, residence halls, recreation, etc. So I'm certainly open to adding other general topics. So I'm certainly open to suggestions either during the course of the meeting or outside for other topics that we might want to add to the agenda but those four are the areas that I've already got in the works for there to be some preparation and for us to address in future meetings. Now given the heavy workload that was involved on the administration side getting ready for the committee meetings last week and wanting to get started with this important work, there hasn't been enough time to prepare adequately the materials that would deal with the topic that we intended to address first, that being tuition and fees. Instead, what we do have today is some background information that will help advise us about enrollment background trends, certain recruitment and retention efforts that are currently underway, and some initial information

regarding scholarship and in a moment I'll turn this over to Vice President Weldy for him to be able to lead us through those items. Now you haven't had the opportunity to review these presentations, nor have I. We're all suffering from the same challenges presented in the preparation of the materials. I think it will be productive time anyway so that we can get a base pass at some of the information that will be useful to us. I also hope that after we receive this information, we may be able to provide some guidance as to other general background information that we'd like to receive and we can also then talk some about our program of work going forward. I would like to solicit some input today as to scheduling desires, how frequently the committee might want to meet, and when so that we have the opportunity to provide some guidance to our liaisons to this ad hoc committee. The charge from Chair Butler was that we get this work done as quickly as possible. My personal preference is that we try to find a schedule that will allow us to finish within a year. Obviously the intention was that this not become a standing committee, so we need to do our work and put ourselves in a position where we can make any recommendations we wish back to the full board.

Marc Strauss: I see a representative from University Council, so welcome. Anything that you'd care to add to our conversation at this point?

Bill Pitney: I think just that I really appreciate that the board's taking on this work with the ad hoc committee. I think as a faculty member, I speak for a lot of us by saying that we're in this because we really want to make a difference in our student's lives and if they can't be retained and continue their education then that's a lost opportunity, so I think this is a good initiative.

Marc Strauss: I appreciate that comment and obviously the faculty is vitally important to this enterprise as well. To the extent that as we continue with these conversations there are things that we ought to know about I hope you will let us know about those.

Bill Pitney: Absolutely. And I was struck in terms of the high impact practices and I drafted an earlier e-mail to Dr. Freeman, you have not sent it yet by the way. But it related to our need to look at some of our criteria related to evaluating faculty in terms of teaching and service. There is some language related to engaging students, but it's not real explicit and I think perhaps looking at that in terms of a high impact practice lens so that faculty are being rewarded for engaging in those things would be an important endeavor.

Marc Strauss: Thank you, Mr. Pitney. So are there any other questions from the committee members before I turn it over to Vice President Weldy?

PUBLIC COMMENT

Committee Chair Strauss asked Board General Counsel Jerry Blakemore if any members of the public had registered a written request to address the Board in accordance with state law and the Board of Trustees Bylaws. Mr. Blakemore noted that no timely requests had been made to address this Special Board Meeting.

UNIVERSITY RECOMMENDATIONS/REPORTS

Information Item 6.a. – Enrollment Background/Trends

Eric Weldy: Thank you very much. I'm very excited about having an opportunity to share some information with you. I know that over the course of the past year I've had opportunities to present on enrollment, enrollment trends and so forth, so some of this information for those of you who have sat through a few of those presentations will not be new, but for some of you it may be, and so I look forward as well to get to the part of having discussions and responses to the information that's shared. What I'll do is I will focus on some enrollment background, trends from the standpoint of where we are, where we've been, as well as identifying a few recruitment and retention efforts. One of the things that I'm excited about is I've had many opportunities to collaborate with Academic Affairs and various

divisions throughout the university. So this truly has been a university collaborative effort in addressing the recruitment and retention issues and so I have a colleague or two who will also be able to present some information and then we'll share some scholarship information and obviously if there is some other discussion items we can definitely address those. So I'll open up and I apologize from the standpoint of the size and difficulty to see, but this first chart really gives us an indication of where our total headcount enrollment has been since 1968 to the present time. The next slide will show a lot of details in regards to actual numbers of where we have been over the years, but if you go back to that first slide, I just want to identify a few things for you. Obviously, during the 1980's we were doing very well with total enrollment reaching over 25,000 students. It isn't until the early 1990's where we begin that process of having a dip in our total enrollment. And I always say that one of the significant differences between the drop in enrollment then and today is that we knew that there would be an upsurge of students coming later on and that had to do with many more students being in the pipeline graduating from high school, and so there really wasn't anything special that we had to do in order to have a recovery, although I'm sure that there were certain new initiatives that we had brought forth. I noted the difference today is there are no new students, large student pool, in the pipeline which means that as a university we're going to have to take it upon ourselves to put forth new initiatives in order to attract and retain new students and so here as I noted is a perfect example. Next slide please. This next slide is a really good slide because it identifies from the standpoint of where we have really excelled and where we have struggled in regards to our total enrollment numbers. This particular chart shows undergraduate enrollment from fall semester 1995 to 2014. It shows total headcount enrollment for undergraduate students, graduate students, and law students and also full time equivalent enrollment. One of the unique things about this, and you know we've have lots of discussions with regards to undergraduate enrollment and trends and where we are, but one thing that I like to emphasize is from the standpoint of our declining enrollment is that it has occurred not just at the undergraduate level, but at the graduate level and the law school level as well and so I think that's something that we need to keep in mind as we have our discussions.

Marc Strauss: Do you prefer to take questions while you're going through this or do you want to get through this?

Eric Weldy: I prefer to take questions as we go through. I mean if there's too many questions then we can cut it off.

Marc Strauss: I'm curious and I'm sure you won't have the information today, but I'm curious as to what the breakdown here is not just with the headcount of students but if we could see how many students we have in residence on campus, how many in the DeKalb/Sycamore megalopolis not residing on campus and how many commute and then also what the credit hour production looks like from those populations.

Eric Weldy: So we're looking to get information on number of students residing on campus, number of students off campus, and also credit hours for both groups?

Marc Strauss: Yes although I think it's possible that it might make a difference off campus whether people are within what you would assume to be very proximate off campus residential use so that they would be more likely to use some types of facilities on campus as opposed to those who are commuting from long distance, whatever we might be able to develop statistics on.

Eric Weldy: Yes I'm sure that it will be easy for us to gather that information.

Marc Strauss: And it may also be useful to take a look at if there's a breakdown that would show attendance at the non-DeKalb facilities in addition to the DeKalb facilities.

Robert Boey: I'm curious in terms of the impact of tuition increases versus enrollment. I go back to 1996 because that's when we last had state contributions over 52% and today it's 20%. As a result the tuition fees keep rising. Do we have a sense of where the curve is that really impacts the enrollment as well?

Eric Weldy: In speaking in terms of NIU, the students that we recruit are heavily need-based and so to say that or to ask the question if increases in tuition have an impact on enrollment, I would have to say yes from the standpoint of the students, the majority of students that we recruit. I don't have the specifics on that, but I can definitely say with confidence that it does have an impact.

Robert Boey: The reason I ask is because it's not that we like to see tuition increases but the state depreciation on their part of it really impacts us period. I mean it affects everybody but especially us I think.

Eric Weldy: Yes, very much so.

Robert Boey: Thank you.

Marc Strauss: If I could follow up on that, I think it would also be interesting to take a look at what the average debt load for our graduates is and has been if we're able to get that information historically and also if we could take a look at a measure which would show what the cost is per credit hour over some time so we have an idea about what the trend is in that regard.

Eric Weldy: Yes, we can definitely get that information. That brings up another thing which is something that we've been tracking is from the standpoint of our students default rate on loans which obviously when you're recruiting students that heavily need based, the default rate on loans really increases and so forth, so that's information as well that we can gather for you. Other questions? Okay, next slide please. I thought it would be good to include a slide on NIU retention rates of new freshmen cohorts but also I have on this chart retention rates for sophomore to junior year and junior to senior year, but obviously one thing that we've been excited about this past year us from the standpoint of our new freshmen cohorts is that our retention rate increased five percentage points from 66% to 71% and that is something that is really not the norm nationally having such a drastic increase as it relates to retention rates. If you look at this chart over the years that we have fluctuated between any increases of either one percentage point or two percentage points and so that's really the norm nationally. But I do think that our efforts as it relates to our retention efforts this past year I do believe had some impact on our first to second year retention rates and so it will be interesting to see as we create new initiatives and really become a little bit more organized and increase our collaboration of various projects of where our retention rates will be across the board in the next few years.

John Butler: I'm wondering whether we've been engaged in any kind of polling of the students who've returned to determine what some of their decision factors are, to determine whether or not we are seeing a relationship between some of the programs and policies we're putting in place, the improvements that we're engaged in, and that increased retention rate. Are we doing anything to determine some of the thinking?

Eric Weldy: Vice Provost Birberick, would you mind sharing a few words her?

Anne Birberick: Sure. That's a good question. I don't think that we have engaged in any specific polling of students who returned to NIU where we have developed a measure for that, but what we do use is the MAP-Works tool and that is very effective in terms of giving us a sense of what the concerns are for students. At the same time, we also ask students why they withdraw from the university and that provides us information as well and then if you look in some of the appendices there's one, I'll give you the letter for that, H where it talks about the events that tie and connect students to the institution and the impact that that has. So we have gotten at the answers to that question but through multiple means.

Lisa Freeman: If I could add one thing that just might more directly address Board Chair Butler's question about what we've assessed from new initiatives undertaken under President Baker, obviously we're very early there so there's not a lot we could assess, but we have done a preliminary assessment of the interventions that were done in the first year composition where we instituted peer mentoring, alerted our instructors to resources on campus, tried to use the writing projects within that course to create

greater connections and understand our student's narratives better, and as a result of that analysis we've documented an increase in retention of the students who participated in first year comp versus historical data. And we did identify a composite variable that really reflects connectedness. So we hope that these data taken forward with further analysis and increasing numbers and strengths in the comparisons and assessments will inform us further but it does look like the assumption that students who engage in activities, who have peer mentors, who have closer connections with the instructors, the things that have emerged from the Bold Futures workshop, are actually making a difference in terms of retention. We're also hoping that the variable that we've identified can be used as an early predictor of students at risk of not being retained so that we can intervene earlier as a result of this new knowledge.

Marc Strauss: I'm very pleased to see that the first year retention rate went up obviously, and I'm hopeful that we'll see some more increases next year between first and second year and then following between second and third year. One of my questions is, and I know that some of the programs that we've attempted represent no additional cost, they're just differences in approach with the same resources, but I am curious as to whether there are additional costs that have gone into academic support as well as what the academic profile of our admitted students look like so that we could maybe get some sense as to other factors that might influence the predicted success rate and wonder whether at some point that would also be information that we could receive.

Robert Boey: Eric, have we been able to clarify what was the reason for this sharp increase after the first of the year the 17%? I'm trying to get a better handle on it.

Eric Weldy: I have at least one theory and Anne please respond if I'm not on point. I think the dip to 66% had a lot to do with bringing in that particular cohort group during, how should I say this, the later you admit students in the admission process, when you get into July early August, you end up admitting students that are – the chances of performing strongly academically and moving on drastically decreases. And so those who apply early for admission and financial aid gain better opportunities or chances for success and so I think that we ended up admitting students a little bit later in the process and maybe to reach certain numbers and I really think that hurt us. But I think that part of the recovery that we had was obviously bringing in maybe a little bit stronger group academically, but also I think it has to do with a lot of our retention efforts.

Robert Boey: So you think that the major reason from 66% to 71% is the fact that we're able to get the enrollment in earlier?

Eric Weldy: I think that from the standpoint of the cohort group that we recruited, yes. Even though we had dropped in numbers in regards to the number of students that we enrolled for new freshmen that particular year, I do think that it was maybe a little bit stronger group. But like I said, I don't have the different, the data in front of me, but just based on just my experience and some of the things that we've been doing over the past year.

Robert Boey: I'll be anxious to see the results repeat itself this coming year.

Eric Weldy: I tell you what – if that happens, no one will be happier than me. Well maybe a few people.

Robert Boey: I think there will be a few people.

Eric Weldy: I will be ecstatic, yes.

Robert Boey: Great. Thank you.

John Butler: Eric, let me see if I can't summarize what I think you just told us. When we went from, is it fair to say 70% was the FY13 cohort? 71% is the FY14 cohort.

Eric Weldy: Actually 71% is the 2013 cohort and 66% is the 2012 cohort.

John Butler: Well you're talking about the fall that they entered?

Eric Weldy: Yes.

John Butler: Okay, I'm talking about the fiscal year. Okay, so if that's '13 and then 66% is '12 and then 70% is fall 2011. So you're saying that the drop from 70% to 66%, that cohort's behavior could have a good deal to do with some structural dynamics that were in place at the time in which that group came in and how they came in.

Eric Weldy: Yes and like I said I can only speculate, I was not here, but my guess is that the push to reach a certain number and this happens at universities around the country and I'll be frank that probably roughly 70% of universities around the country had declining enrollment this past year, so we're not the only ones in this situation, but in this particular case and I've seen it happen before where you want to reach certain numbers and you want to bring in and so that means you go later into the summer heading towards fall and admitting students and sometimes more times than not this is what you get.

John Butler: So with some structural changes and some diagnoses of some of the structural issues involved we're able to reverse that trend.

Eric Weldy: Yes.

John Butler: Dr. Freeman, if I could follow up on your observation about connectiveness, and I'm not challenging this at all I'm just curious. What sort of methodology do we employ to come to that determination?

Lisa Freeman: Well I'm not the analyst who did the statistical analysis but certainly we could bring that forward at a future meeting. Essentially it was the type of analysis that was done on survey data using standard statistical methods for analyzing qualitative data and ranking step wise cumulative effects and the data that we got out of the cohort using a standard validated instrument that looks at engagement and connectedness across environments including higher ed showed that we were able to generate a variable using the sum of those data that corresponded to an overall emphasis on connectedness. Things like my teachers care about me, somebody notices me in the residence halls, those type of items. In addition, we have analysis done elsewhere on campus looking at the effects of high impact practices and I believe this is in the handout and you'll have a chance to look at it, but those types of things that engage students in service learning, in research, and extracurricular activities, also create connections to the institution and data gathered through the office of Student Engagement and Experiential Learning show convincingly on our campus, as has been shown in other campuses, that one, two, three high impact practices you get to a certain threshold and you really have a dramatic input on student completion, connection, etc. So I don't think any of these findings are completely novel or surprising, but what we found in the first year of comp class spoke specifically to the question of did what you did this past year make a difference and so that's why I wanted you to be aware of it.

John Butler: So I guess my question is are we serving that cohort of students with a survey instrument or are we deriving that conclusion through a sophisticated reading of the work that they're producing?

Lisa Freeman: So our intervention involved focusing their writing assignments on specific things related to their feeling, their self-efficacy, their connectedness to the institution, and allowing our instructors who interfaced with the students to have knowledge about resources they could direct the students to if certain feelings of loneliness or homesickness or lack of efficacy emerged in the writing. But when I say that having a chance in first year comp including peer mentoring, including the new emphasis in writing assignments, the additional meetings with instructors, we assessed the efficacy of that compared to historic retention rates in that class using a specific survey instrument. The survey items align relatively well with what we see in Map-Works and nationally validated instruments for this purpose.

Marc Strauss: Thank you. This discussion suggests to me some other information I might be interested in looking at. Not because they necessarily have a causal effect, but I'm interested in how much of our faculty resides in the immediate area so they would be more available for contact as well as how much of the faculty is tenure track and presumably teaching more classes on campus as opposed to adjuncts or other temporary faculty that might not be as fully available to students.

Lisa Freeman: We can certainly generate that information and I believe some of it would only be update from what was presented as part of the Vision 2020 benchmarking exercise. I will say that I'm not sure it's a fair assumption that our non-tenure line faculty are actually less engaged with the students. I believe our instructors who teach the entry level courses are highly motivated by teaching and student connections and I wouldn't want that assumption a priority in our analysis.

Marc Strauss: Yes, I wouldn't make it I just think it's useful information to form a discussion about it but I certainly haven't drawn any conclusions about any of this. We're at such an early stage now, but it might be useful to take a look at that information so that we could have a better conversation about it.

Robert Boey: First of all, I think freshman first time on campus and just moved in, the fact that if somebody happens to recognize and say "Hi, John" knowing his name will go a long way. And I'm saying all that I'm going back to the convocation center first night when they're all there and you're leading the rah, rah, rah that was a nice move, but my point being Eric who had that idea too? Thank you.

Eric Weldy: A lot of changes went into that program, a lot of collaborative support with the colleges and so forth.

Robert Boey: Absolutely. That was a very nice program and next year we can improve on the sound system and that will really work.

Eric Weldy: Yes.

Robert Boey: I'm kidding. That's the least of the worries.

Eric Weldy: I've already had a meeting about that looking towards next year.

Robert Boey: I think what we're all talking about is an extra effort on campus to recognize, especially the freshman I mean even the upper classmen, but to be recognized by the upper classmen of the freshmen or maybe even the faculty members or the trustees or whatever the case is, will go a long way to making them feel at home. That's the point I'm trying to make.

Information Item 6.b. – Recruitment & Retention Efforts

Eric Weldy: Okay, if we could go to 6B, recruitment and retention efforts. By the way, part of the package is the fall 2014 student profile booklet. It's pretty thick but it has a lot of good information and data and so when people tell me how come I don't have access to this information or that information, it's all here and so anyone can have access to it and so I believe this is made available to everyone. So I just want to stress that because I think in going through it, it will definitely generate additional questions and discussions. In regards to recruitment, obviously I just want to share that from the standpoint of recruitment it's a collaborative effort involving not just admissions, but also faculty, staff, students, alumni and community partners. Specific recruitment activities for most freshmen transfer students are obviously coordinated through undergraduate admissions and so we do college fairs, we visit high schools, we also have special kinds of programs and initiatives to really attract students. One example would be for the first time last fall, and this was just before our transfer open house in March, we had what I called an overnight stay for transfer students giving them an opportunity to stay on campus. They had an opportunity as well to attend a concert at the convocation center, and so we're doing that again this year but there's a number of special initiatives, new things that we tried to attract students. And obviously we do campus tours every day, we take walk-ins and so forth, and so we do a lot of those things that every admission office does, but I want to share with you just some things that I had shared

with the board I believe maybe a few months ago right after the ten day count information went out, but I focused in on some new or expanding recruitment activities or strategies that we were looking at in enrollment management as it relates to increasing enrollment and so forth and so I just wanted to highlight some of those for you here. One is we're looking into expanding recruitment initiatives beyond the Northern Illinois region. Obviously most of our students come from Northern Illinois, but we really have no presence in other parts of the state, central and southern Illinois. And I believe at one time when we were doing quite well that we did have regional recruiters that would recruit in those areas and these are areas as I noted before where we just do not recruit. When I first arrived here I was looking at all the different schools and then the students who had applied and who had enrolled and obviously I looked at where I grew up in Peoria and I looked over the past few years, and we've probably had no more than five to ten students from the Peoria high schools that actually applied and very few ended up enrolling, probably a handful, and I was thinking we're really losing out on opportunities such as that. And so we're expanding our recruitment initiatives beyond just the Northern Illinois region. And I don't have to tell you that the state of Illinois exports high school graduates to other colleges around the country. Like I said, we're probably in the top two, I know New Jersey is there and some other states, but that is something that just cannot happen or cannot continue to happen for us not only as an institution, but also as a state. Some other initiatives really begin the process of establishing relationships with some of the charter schools in the Chicago area. I recently attended a KIPP Charter Schools national conference in Houston, had an opportunity to converse with other colleges who were recruiting students through the KIPP schools which are all over the US predominately the south, northeast part of the country. But I really think that that's an opportunity for us there. Obviously we're reexamining our current merit scholarship structure and I'll talk a little more about that later. We need to enhance our relationships with both the Latino and Asian American communities in the Chicago area and so those are things that we really haven't had what I call a really focused effort in recruitment in underrepresented students in the City of Chicago which is a little bit surprising to me considering how many universities around the nation recruit in the Chicago area. And other things as well is developing new initiatives that will utilize NIU alumni and friends in Illinois and across the country in recruitment efforts and so whenever I hear the president talk about the 200,000 plus alumni and I think about how we have not really tapped into our alums and friends of the university as a resource to help us in our recruitment so there's, as the president likes to say, a lot of low hanging fruit for us. I'll open it up to any questions in regards to the recruitment before we begin to the retention information.

John Butler: Eric, could you help us unpack 2+2, 3+1 and if you could also speak to what might one find in an MOU with a charter school that would advantage our recruitment efforts?

Eric Weldy: Okay, I will address the second part of the question if Provost Freeman or Vice Provost Birberick will address the first part.

Anne Birberick: Thank you. 2+2 agreements are articulation agreements that help smooth that transfer from a community college into specific programs here at NIU. Pretty much most of the programs have these agreements and what in effect they do is they say student X at a community college would like to enter the College of Business. And so in order to do that in an efficient way without sustaining extra credits or loss of credit, here's the best course of study that that student should follow while at a community college and if that course of study is followed, then that transition to NIU in the College of Business in Program X will be fairly seamless. And the 3+1 functions the same way. So it's working closely with our community college partners program to program and making sure that articulation and sequencing of courses happens in a deliberate way and we can add to that, Provost Freeman reminded me, that maybe this is also a good moment to talk about reverse articulation agreements which we've begun and that's where you have community college students who come to NIU and they haven't completed their associates degree and they're just generally a couple of courses shy of that and so we have developed MOU's with some of the community colleges and we're continuing to develop them and what we do is we work with the community college partner, identify the student, reach out to the student and say you know if you take these courses that you're missing at the community college here at NIU, we'll transfer them back, that's the reverse transfer piece, to your community college and your community college will accept them and then allow you to get your associates degree and you can

continue moving forward so you will have that credential and we've done about a half a dozen of them now and we've done some public signings and they've been very successful and the students have really appreciated this on both ends, both students who are already here at NIU and are thinking about coming to NIU because they know they have this as an option for them and we've got more in development.

Marc Strauss: Well Eric's going to answer the second part of the questions if that's alright Bob?

Robert Boey: Before he answers the second part I have a similar question for Eric. Eric, you and I have had prior conversations on this whole charter school business and I guess what I'm trying to bring forward is, in your discussions with charter schools will you also tell us the various steps you're taking to better understand charter schools and the qualities in it because this goes not to just enrollment but to retention as well in terms of the students we're getting so if you could include this. Thank you.

Eric Weldy: Thank you. In regards to the memorandum of understandings that we end up writing or signing off on with the charter schools, there's a few areas of focus. One is the charter school's promise to seek to enroll a certain number of students at NIU and so I have spoken about specific numbers of students as well and we look at the history of how many students from the charter school have actually applied and were admitted and enrolled at NIU and so we kind of go from there in identifying numbers. Other things that we looked at, we look to provide certain services to the students and their families, really giving them the red carpet treatment as it relates to the admissions process and walking them through that and having a special visit to the campus community, walking the families and the students through the application, the FAFSA application and so forth. Also from the standpoint of offering to waive application fees as well would be included in that. Some other things is providing academic support throughout their education, their time here at NIU. And so usually we really get down into to the weeds in regards to what we're offering, but it's not just solely on us because many of the charter schools they keep in contact with their alums who go off to college and so we continually work with them and collaborate with them and so while we're working with the students, the charter schools continue to work with the students as well.

Robert Marshall: My question is actually on the 2+2. Are we getting any feedback from the transfer students coming in as well as the transfer coordinators that represent each of the community colleges in the state on how well we're doing with the 2+2?

Anne Birberick: Yes, we are getting feedback and we're making good progress. We're working very closely with the community colleges on various initiatives. There's been a kind of reinvigoration with the relationships with the community colleges and the articulation tables are being looked at and revised and then we are also working with some really specialized programs so there are five community colleges kind of to the north of us and we're doing a special pilot program with them on a program in business administration and the idea is to teach that actually out at the Hoffman Estates campus. So I think there is very positive feelings and feedback from all parties.

Lisa Freeman: If I could just add to that, we know that we have about eight community colleges that count for about 80% of our transfer students, they're our top feeders. And we actually supply to those community colleges through a collaboration of academic affairs and outreach engagement and regional development, the success rates of their students in specific programs. We generate that data on an annual basis and we use it to start a discussion about continuous improvement and better communications between the community college partner and us. We've been doing that for at least the past year with our top feeders and I think we started in a pilot with one or two before that.

Robert Marshall: Do you think that we should go beyond those eight since we've got a lot of state to go into for communication?

Lisa Freeman: I think our goal would be to generate the type of data sharing and dialog with as many partners as possible. With the community colleges that only send us one or two students the validity of the analysis is not as robust as to the community colleges that send us large cohorts.

Marc Strauss: This has been a good conversation about some of the techniques. I don't take what's listed in this report to be exclusive of the things that we're doing and the things that we're talking about also won't directly involve board policy level decisions, so I don't want to stop us talking about these things. Obviously the board is interested in seeing that these items are being addressed and I think from the listing here the only thing that struck me is that I hope that they're – I know that there are some efforts being made regarding the recruitment of international students and there's nothing directly in this list that talks about non-traditional students. I don't want to take a lot of time today to talk about those efforts, only to say that obviously we have an interest in seeing that all of the market segments, and I know that everybody shares our interest in seeing that all of these market segments are addressed through creative thinking. And if there are no other comments from the committee members then perhaps we can move on from here.

Eric Weldy: At this point I'd like to ask Vice President Birberick if you could share information in regards to highlighting just some of the retention efforts and then I will at the end focus on a few highlights, some collaborative things that we have done including the retention summits and some others.

Anne Birberick: So I'm not going to go through everything that's listed here, but I think there are a couple that we have used over a course of time that have shown us some good data. And so the first one that I would like to talk about is MAP-Works. We've done that now for multiple years and you have in one of your appendices some data about MAP-Works and MAP-Works is a really collaborative effort. It spans all of the different offices and units on campus from the residence halls to a first year composition program to Communication 100 to honors programs to academic advising to UNIV 101, so everyone is involved. And I will say as a result of the university-wide conversations we've been having over this past year, retention has really become everyone's interest and everyone's business and I think that that represents a huge cultural change and a very important one and that's recognized by the fact that the usage on MAP-Works has increased and not only the usage of the students taking the survey but also the usage of the individuals who are authorized to go into the MAP-Works system and look at the data and in the ways that we're reaching out to the students. I don't want to go through the data, but you can see through the chart in the appendix, that students who take MAP-Works perform better academically are more likely to persist and we even have data that indicates that over the course of time they enroll in more credit hours which helps them get through the program. So MAP-Works is one of those programs, yes?

Marc Strauss: Other than the time required from people to enter the data and track the results in MAP-Works are there other resources that are required in order to continue this program or expand it?

Anne Birberick: Yes. Right now MAP-Works is for new students and we then expanded it after a couple of years to first year transfer students and there's a lot of conversation going on about MAP-Works being given to sophomores, second year students and perhaps third year students and that would require additional resources because after a certain point we pay according to how many students take the survey. And we have entered into conversations with some of the different colleges about how we can mine the data in MAP-Works and tailor our findings that will be of specific benefit to their needs. Does that answer your question?

Marc Strauss: Yes, you may not have an answer now but if at some point we could get an idea the order of magnitude of the expense that might be something that would be appropriate for us to consider then.

Anne Birberick: Sure.

Marc Strauss: Thank you.

Paul Julion: While we're on the MAP-Works topic, Dr. Birberick can you just mention how many students roughly are involved with the MAP-Works – you said mostly incoming freshmen and first year transfer students but a rough number.

Anne Birberick: I have to go back and verify from the chart because I don't want to get this wrong, but we have seen an increase in students and I think we're over, we're close to 70%, maybe even higher for that. Yes, so this is great and I do want to say that this is really a collaborative effort. We have benefited greatly from the involvement of the freshmen comp instructors, the UNIV 101 instructors, we made MAP-Works a mandatory component of UNIV 101 and then the CA's in the residence halls have been very, very helpful and they have that advantage of having access to students and being able to connect with the students.

Paul Julion: And it went up to 90%?

Anne Birberick: Yes.

Marc Strauss: Did that answer your question?

Paul Julion: Absolutely. Thank you.

Anne Birberick: Provost Freeman talked about the first year comp program so I'm not going to talk about that. She mentioned in addition high impact practices. There are ten of them and one of the things that we did is we did a statistical analysis just using the data from the Office of Student Engagement and Experiential Learning, and we just focused on the ones that you see there and what we discovered was again if you can get students engaged in the classroom, outside of the classroom, in multiple ways because students have diverse interests, not every student wants to do the exact same thing or is able to do that and again that speaking to the ability to reach out to our non-traditional students, our commuter students, not just simply the students who live in the residence halls or in the DeKalb/Sycamore community and what we've discovered is that students who engage in more than one high impact practice end up having a greater persistence and greater graduation and what's interesting about the data is if you engage in one you improve so much, if you engage in two you improve even more, and if you engage in three you improve even more, so one of our goals is to make sure that students engage in high impact practices throughout their time at NIU. This is something that's really going to speak to retaining students beyond the first year, but improving second year, first year into second year, second year into third, third into fourth, and ultimately graduation. And one of those high impact practices that's not listed here is internships. So there are ten of them and study abroad is another.

Marc Strauss: So this might potentially be another area where additional resources would be required for program expansion?

Anne Birberick: Yes.

Marc Strauss: So my question here is basically the same as well to the extent that we have something that's of a magnitude where it would require board approval for the expenditure.

Anne Birberick: Okay, we could look into that, absolutely. The student's success collaborative is a partnership with educational advisory board. We're gearing up to launch that, full steam ahead. That offers us a variety of potential; it offers us the opportunity to do advising in a very deliberate way. A lot of times the focus isn't on what educational advisory board calls the murky middle, those are the students in the middle that present the possibility of being at risk and so an intervention with them, catching them, making sure they're on path, making sure that they understand the importance of passing and being successful at a certain level in key gateway courses. The other thing that the student success collaborative offers us is the opportunity to mine student data and make interventions in curricular decisions and how curriculum is constructed and how pedagogy in teaching takes place in the classroom as well. And then one last effort that I will highlight and they go together, it's EARS and the absence tracking pilot. And the absence tracking pilot was new this fall semester. It grew out of a leadership retreat that we had over the summer with different groups, individuals representing different groups on campus were all sitting around the table and they were talking about how retention is everyone's

business so how can we work together? And what they came up with was the pilot for the absence tracking. We know nationwide that students who don't go to class are more likely to drop out. It's a little bit of what Woody Allen said that 90% of success is showing up and that has been borne out by national data so we want you to show up to class. It's also something that we stress at the orientation period when we have the parents in front of us. We talk about what it means to be successful as a student and that's probably the first thing we say is you should go to class, and we're really talking to the parents at that point so that they will be involved. And then after the absence tracking what kicks in is the early alert referral system (EARS) and that is following up to see how students are succeeding and it takes place around the fifth week and again if you look at some of the figures, we've had a 600% increase in faculty participation in this program. The OSAS office which oversees the program, they were phenomenal. They stepped up, they were so pleased that people were taking advantage of what they had to offer, and I think that speaks to the fact that there has been a true cultural shift, a true paradigm shift in thinking on NIU's campus and that retention is being viewed by everyone as everyone's business.

Lisa Freeman: Trustee Strauss didn't ask about resources for the student success collaborative but I'm going to compliment Vice Provost Birberick for negotiating aggressively to keep our subscription price under the board approval threshold going forward for a significant period of time.

Marc Strauss: That sounds like a very good thing. As is going to class. Back to you then Eric?

Eric Weldy: Yes. In closing out in regards to retention initiatives, there's just a couple of things I'd like to share. One, in fall of 2013 Anne and I got together and discussing retention and really wanted to get a sense of what was happening in regards to retention efforts across campus. We really wanted to bring everyone together, see if we can create some collaborative opportunities to address retention and so we've over the past 15 months or so we've held four retention summits and I must say each one gets better and better where we have involved the academic department chairs, we have involved staff as well in the summits, and so we are able to highlight some of the new initiatives, we're able to discuss and really kind of talk about how, what works and what does not work as it relates to impacting student retention. It's something that I felt, we both felt, was really needed, really necessary because this is a very large campus and so many times the right hand doesn't know what the left hand is doing and so it has been very interesting. This past retention summit we really started discussing from the standpoint of establishing setting goals, retention goals, for the university. And so when we talk about wanting to retain let's say 400/500 students. Well if I think about that as an individual, it seems overwhelming, but if we break it into pieces, this department says okay we're going to retain 10 more students or that department says we're going to retain 15 more students, then it's – you've heard the saying "How do you eat an elephant? One bite at a time" and so that's the approach that we've been using and so I really look forward to this initiative as it relates to really being a collaborative effort campus wide in addressing retention.

Robert Boey: This summit, who participated in it? Was it the faculty members, the administrative members? I'd like to have a better feel for it. Are we talking about 20 are we talking about 100?

Eric Weldy: We probably had at this latest one I want to say 70 or 80. When we originally started out we had a number of staff members, I think a few students, and a few faculty members, but we really felt like we wanted to engage the chairs of the academic units, academic departments and they came out in large numbers and in fact we held a separate summit for the chairs and they felt after we shared information, we shared data, they were like okay what do we do now, what's next and so we were very encouraged by that.

Robert Boey: Paul, especially the upper classmen, are they engaged in that kind of activity?

Paul Julion: That I don't know. I haven't attended any retention summits. This is actually my first time hearing about it. Dr. Weldy, how many students did you say sat in on this?

Eric Weldy: We've had just a few students. I know that this last one we had a student panel and so we invited five, six students and had an opportunity to hear their thoughts as it relates to why they love NIU, what they like about NIU, what they don't like, but for the most part it was very positive, but I think that we picked up some good information.

Robert Boey: Especially if they represent the university as interfacing with the freshmen class or whatever the case is. Paul, I can see that being a great help.

Eric Weldy: The final thing that I want to note is that I attended a national retention symposium in Louisville, Kentucky a few weeks ago. And this conference was probably about 500 or so participants from all over the country and so you had representatives from small private institutions, large public institutions and we were able to pick up some wonderful, some new ideas of things that we could possibly implement here. But what intrigued me is that even those institutions that maybe they were very successful with a particular program, there were other areas in which they really struggled and so there was a lot of networking and discussing programs and initiatives and you had universities that had no issue from the standpoint of spending money on their retention initiatives and you had others that were also successful and had very little money to spend, but it was our first time attending the retention symposium and so like I said I think that in order for us to progress, that we really have to think outside the box, we really have to engage to find out what's happening nationally and what are some things that we can learn and bring to our campus community.

Marc Strauss: Are we ready to move on to scholarship now?

Eric Weldy: I think so.

Marc Strauss: Alright.

Information Item 6.a. – Scholarship Information

Eric Weldy: I wanted to give some background, some history in regards to scholarship strategy. I know that a lot has happened over the past few years in regards to our merit scholarships, but this is definitely a good time to have a discussion. In 2011 NIU committed or set aside about ten million dollars towards merit scholarships. And I know that this was a vast increase and I think this was probably a part of the Great Journeys initiative is my guess.

John Butler: I'm having trouble recalling this as a milestone.

Eric Weldy: Are you? Okay.

John Butler: Of any significance in terms of us learning about it as a board. I don't know if Marc recalls. I do know that we put in place what I would call for lack of a better word, a bridge program, some sort of way to address needs for students who were close to graduation, but I don't recall this. This to me is a very large commitment and I don't recall it as a moment in time.

Marc Strauss: I don't recall a specific authorization for this, but I know that there was money that was set aside as part of the Vision 2020 process and there were competitive proposals, this might have been one of the competitive proposals. I guess my question goes further because whether the year in which it occurs or what the dollar amount was, I guess it does evidence a commitment to scholarship, but my more fundamental question is normally we hear about affordability it's when we get to the point where we're setting a tuition rate. I'm not sure that that tuition rate represents what the average student actually pays after an effective discount that comes as a result of scholarship money, nor am I sure how much of that gets paid in cash and how much gets paid as a result of loans. So I'm curious to try to get some context for what the actual cost is for students and which of those funds are available from other sources, scholarship or grant. And I'm hopeful that when we come back to this again maybe we'll have some additional data that will give me the context to be able to more thoroughly visualize this. This is

surely an area where the board may be asked to consider whether there's an additional financial commitment that ought to be made, but part of that conversation also has to be how are the resources that we already have being targeted. I know that's part of what you're going to talk about today and we may or may not have a complete conversation about that but I think we're going to need some data to have the sort of rich conversation that I hope we'll eventually be able to have about this area.

Eric Weldy: Yes. And as I note I just really want to give some background. My understanding of it in regards to these dollars and it was directed towards obviously attracting students, high school class in the top ten percent of their class, but also there was an emphasis of really attracting students, getting them in the door. Most of the scholarships were two year scholarships versus four year scholarships. That's a topic that we've been discussing. Obviously we've had no levits come it. Looking at financial aid leveraging where some of the information has been very helpful, but in looking at information that no levits the work that they have been doing for us, one of the things that we're looking at is from the standpoint of the use of an academic index that would allow us to weight GPA, students GPA, at 65% and ACT at 35% and the rationale is that obviously many of us believe that the data proves that GPA is a higher predictor of academic success for students versus ACT and so this has been very relevant. You probably heard some institutions and some decisions that have been made focusing more on student GPA versus student ACT or SAT scores.

Marc Strauss: Other questions? Trustee Butler.

John Butler: What are the structural barriers, if any, to making that the policy of the institution?

Eric Weldy: I think from the standpoint of the academic index, I think for us it really comes down to dollars and return on investment for us, but I do think that – I know I may be stepping on some toes here, but in regards to ACT scores, I mean it's a good predictor of how students will do probably their first semester of college, but after that it's really from the standpoint of how well that they've done academically within the classroom and their overall GPA.

Marc Strauss: So help me understand and maybe this is a question for Provost Freeman as well, is there a planning group or a council that advises admissions or sets strategy for what are the entrance criteria for the university.

Anne Birberick: There's the APASC group which is a committee and they are charged with setting standards so they do look at ACT criteria; recently admissions came before them and indicated that there needed to be an adjustment in the catalog to reflect accurately what was happening. So they're a curricular committee that is involved with academic standards.

Marc Strauss: And APASC, academic planning...

Lisa Freeman: Admissions Policies and Academic Standards Committee.

Robert Boey: Help me with the consideration to increase two year scholarships to four years. In theory, mathematically, that's doubling so where's the money going to come from?

Anne Birberick: I really can't answer the question about scholarships.

Eric Weldy: That's exactly what we're looking into right now. For example, there's a certain pool of money that we offer students, merit scholarships and need based aid that come out of financial aid and my scholarship office. But we also offer student scholarships through the NIU foundation and through the academic departments and so one of things that we're looking at is how we can better utilize how we spend those scholarship dollars.

Robert Boey: I think that as a suggestion a discussion of this sort will of the foundation board in one of their meetings will go a long way towards them understanding the direction we're looking at and the help

that we're looking at from them, because right now all the talk has been dollars but nobody knows how the motion is where we're hitting it, but if you go into this kind of discussion, if you are one of your staff, go to the foundation meeting the next one that's coming up especially the red and black that's important, that would be a great time because all the major sponsors are there and that will be a great time to really bring this up. I'm talking about the red and black on the foundation because all the major sponsors come in and that's the time to hit it and give them examples of this what we need to get to.

Eric Weldy: I think something that's very helpful, I know for me if you know from the standpoint of connecting with a potential donor, you know as much flexibility we can have with the funds in which they would like to give to the university, the better we're able to meet students' needs. So heavy restrictions on donor funds, it really puts us in a bind.

Paul Julion: Yes, I was just going to mention while we're on the topic, a great way to bring this all together will be to involve the students who are getting directly impacted by these scholarships, these different donors, endowments, and things like that. It would be very impactful and then they could probably see with their own eyes how this is really making a change in people's lives. I'm here off scholarship as well for my freshmen year of need base and that's because I had a high GPA, but most of the times when students meet the people that are helping them it's a really good feeling and it may put pressure on others, and a good pressure is that to donate as well and maybe get a scholarship in their names, they definitely help out. Many students use those resources.

Marc Strauss: Every two or three years now the foundation does an event where people who have endowed scholarships meet with the current recipients. It's a lunch event. It's really a good one and it accomplishes exactly that purpose, but I think that there are many of these that don't come from endowed funds. The scale is smaller. But every opportunity we have to be able to put a student in front of people who are potential donors to tell their story, the university is doing that. Now I do think Trustee Boey to your point, that it is important if we can get to the level of confidence where we have institutional priorities for fundraising that are important to our trustees, that we engage in a conversation with the foundation leadership and try to make sure that our interests are aligned. They're an independent body and they have different constraints on the way that they want to attack donors and there are some donors who have a real predisposition to give for a particular purpose, but I think to the extent that we're able to be able to define this and work with President Baker to be able to announce a set of priorities that we ought to be able to engage in a conversation with them about it.

Robert Boey: Precisely the point and that's why I'm saying that because our next major fundraising project is coming up and I think that this is where President Baker really can articulate as to the type and style of fundraising that would benefit us. It doesn't mean we'll get it that way, but it's up to foundation members obviously. But if we don't get them leading points, and Doug you're very good at those things, I think the more they understand of how to help us, the better we'll all be because the effort is there, it's just a matter of how to help us, and Doug your good at those things.

Marc Strauss: Trustee Marshall.

Robert Marshall: Just an interest in getting at a near future date some idea of let's say the pile of money that goes into merit scholarship versus the pile of money which may be a little smaller for needs based, and to maybe look at some of our priorities beyond that.

Eric Weldy: We definitely have that information. That's the end of my formal presentation but also would definitely like to open up to other discussion items.

Information Item 8.a. – Other Discussion

Marc Strauss: Thank you. Before we talk about the substance for our future meetings, let me talk about one thing regarding form that I'd like to see us do a little bit differently. It's a challenge because we don't ordinarily meet in this room and we haven't had an ad hoc committee meeting before where we were

attempting to engage in some informal conversation, but obviously it's difficult for me to constantly look in both directions and I think this would be a lot easier if we did it around a round table for the participants or if we had a long table where I could look straight down and see people on both sides that administratively would be easier for us. And I want to make this informal for us so not only will the table help but then if the audience can be spread out in a way we may also see if they've got input we'd be more readily be able to receive it. I think our intention here was that this really be a working session and I think those modifications would really help us. In terms of substance, I'd like to solicit some input from the members of the committee as to whether in my opening remarks I touched on the topics that people have an interest in seeing. If there are others perhaps we could hear about them now and then if there is some discussion about which topic you'd like to take first if there's any difference from wanting to look at tuition first, I'm happy to accommodate that. So could I have some input on those two questions? Trustee Boey.

Robert Boey: Don't get me wrong, I love you all, but I love my wife better. Friday is a very important evening for us. So I'm just asking you to think about maybe moving it up if you can.

March Strauss: Yes, duly noted. I think everybody has a different preference. We didn't set out in order to schedule it at four o'clock on a Friday afternoon, this was the time that allowed us to get together earliest. I don't have a dominant preference for doing this. Some of us have work during the middle of the day and it makes it difficult and we'll try to accommodate everybody from time to time and we probably won't wind up with a fixed time, but your point is certainly noted and we'll do our best. Trustee Marshall.

Robert Marshall: At a future time I would actually like to look at some of the new and very innovative strategies that are being developed for the areas of bringing students in, keeping them, and possibly graduating them.

Marc Strauss: I think we'll make as much time as the committee members would like to hear those stories. I would like to try to keep our conversation focused on developing those items that require board action in order to implement. I want to resist the temptation to get into the mechanics of the blocking and tackling required to get students here. That's what we've hired the administration to do, but I want to get you as much information as you need in order to have comfort that the right things are being done. So we can certainly come back to that at some point until you're satisfied.

Robert Marshall: I am not throwing the word immediate in. We are just coming together and we are just starting to get the ball rolling but somewhere down the line as we see more and more success on it I'd certainly love to get some of that info. Thank you.

Marc Strauss: Trustee Butler.

John Butler: So I have a few things I want to talk about. So in your original four Marc, I believe it would be ideal for us to talk about our structure of tuition and fees in this context. I know that we struggled a bit in the Finance and Facilities Committee to have that discussion. That seems to me to be one of the ideal things that this group could do is talk about that structure and even if we go forward, which we will likely do with the recommendation in December, I think we can begin almost right away to talk about whether we have the structure in place going forward that's ideal to meet our recruitment and retention goals. The other things that I want to talk about is I'd like an update on searches that relate to recruitment and retention. So we have an Associate Vice-Provost or President for Enrollment Management, is that correct? An Associate Vice President and then we also have a Director of Admissions opening and obviously the Board does not vote on either of those, but I would like an update just to be sure that I know what structure we are putting in place and any reforms to that structure that might be interesting for the board to know.

Marc Strauss: Could I interrupt you for a second here just for clarification? Would you like a broader conversation about the organization of that area not just on the two searches?

John Butler: It would be interesting for me to know that. I'm not arguing that that is an obligation of the administration to present that to me, but I think it would be interesting to know what that structure is. We've at least approved a search firm for one of those and so to learn more about it I think would be useful. I want to talk a little bit about...

Douglas Baker: Do you want that answer now?

John Butler: That would be fine.

Eric Weldy: A couple of updates, in regards to the AVP for enrollment management search; I did hire a search firm. We brought in a total of four candidates. We posted the position twice so we brought in three candidates on campus. One candidate was unacceptable; another candidate withdrew after interviewing on campus. I made an offer to the third candidate, who ended up being the top candidate and the candidate decided not to take the offer due to family reasons and other reasons. We reposted the position and we identified three candidates that we extended an invitation to come on campus and two of those candidates ended up getting positions at other universities and so we had one candidate that we ended up having on campus. We received feedback from the search committee in regards to that candidate. Not very positive from the search committee but very positive with other key stakeholders on campus. But after speaking with that candidate, the decision was made to go in a different direction and so I've been working with President Baker to look at other alternatives at this time.

Marc Strauss: And Director of Admissions?

Eric Weldy: Director of Admissions, we have three candidates, two actually have been on campus the past couple of days, very strong pool and both candidates did very well and I've been getting very good responses, positive responses, from staff and others. After meeting with both candidates the past couple days at the end of their interviews, they are still very much interested in the position and I have a third candidate that is coming in on Monday and I feel very confident after these first two candidates. It's the kind of candidate pool that I wished that I had with the AVP search, but I feel really good in regards to getting a candidate who will accept an offer and be able to be on campus as soon as possible.

John Butler: Thank you. So the three other things I wanted to mention that I think could be subjects for this committee. When we attended the Association of Governing Boards Committee workshop one of the things that I learned about enrollment committees is they discuss who do we compete with? And one of the things that I've noticed in the history of the board's consideration of how we're doing in terms of pricing and so forth, is we continue to see a comparison of our costs with other state universities, which to me is more of a political calculation and less of a market calculation. I'd be interested in knowing what, who do we compete with and how are they priced and how do we determine who do we compete with?

Marc Strauss: I think that's a good set of data for us to take a look at unless you feel to the contrary we ought to do that as part of the tuition and fees conversation so maybe we can get some input as to what the administration views as an appropriate competitive set and we can have some conversation about that. Next is the issue of programming and I keep using the term structural barriers and here what I'm interested in is are there things that you can bring to this task force that can begin to mitigate structural barriers in terms of programming that might permit, particularly innovative and entrepreneurial faculty who are interested in new curricular designs in programming to move rapidly to a stage of offering that programming to students and for the university to market that programming. Are there things that we can do as a board in conjunction with the University Council and other stakeholders to make the process simpler? Maybe not for all curriculum, but maybe there's a fast track method that we might employ in some cases.

Marc Strauss: Can I suggest a couple of approaches we might take to that. One is when we talk about academics as it's related to enrollment, we can certainly get some background information as to what's happening with program review which might impact some of those things that would be board level decisions. As to whether there are barriers or there are not barriers, we can have a conversation about

that. I don't know whether any of those rise to the level where there are things that you're going to want to deal with in the ad hoc committee on governance. I don't know whether they're institutional or whether they're practical, but maybe between you and Provost Freeman you can have a conversation about that and to the extent that they belong here I'm happy to entertain those and I think our conversation for those would be in the session that we'll have planned for the academics and programming.

Lisa Freeman: I look forward to following up with Chair Butler on that.

John Butler: The final issue concerns this sort of difficult issue of reward and regard and Dr. Pitney opened the door to this when he mentioned language related to teaching and service. Certainly I think that to the extent that the board has a role in altering the universities documents and to the extent that we might aid in that process, this would be a good format to have that discussion if we can help in that regard, if there are actual things that we would need to vote on and changes to the board regulations that might really send the message in a strong institutional manner that these are valuable activities for faculty.

Marc Strauss: Duly noted. Again, I want to make sure that we're on regard that it's not our intention to interfere with the decisions about tenure, but the structure involved to the extent that there are item that need to have some time spent on them, I'm happy to entertain that discussion here and there may be components of this again that you want to deal with in the ad hoc committee on governance. You're relinquishing the floor now?

John Butler: I am.

Marc Strauss: Alright. Trustee Julion.

Paul Julion: As I look at some of the high impact practices, most of the work was through the OSEEL office, I just want to know is there anything student involvement should do to help with retention as well because I know they work with a mass amount of students.

Eric Weldy: Some of the things in regards to retention related efforts and student involvement and leadership development; heavy focus on leadership development and leadership training for our students and it's something that I strongly emphasize and it's something that has been a part of the department for a long time, but I also think that other activities that students are given to participate whether through student organizations and so forth, I do consider those retention efforts from the standpoint of getting students involved, getting them engaged, but I can gather up and speak with the director and get some additional information as it relates to very specific retention efforts for you.

Paul Julion: Thank you.

Marc Strauss: Just for clarification, Trustee Julion, is in the nature of an inquiry or would you like to spend some time talking specifically about student issues.

Paul Julion: Well not necessarily student issues, it's more of the student's sometimes and this may seem kind of really redundant, but most students really don't know all the opportunities they have and I think sometimes we have a lot of programs that could sometimes even work in collaboration or in some ways give task to other departments in some sort. Seeing that the OSEEL office does a lot of amazing work with more seems like first and second year students and then the Leadership Development Office works with the older, more experienced students that probably are going to stay here until graduation, I would think it would be some type of, I would think, would be a great effort if both offices kind of did some type of program together to continue on retention increases.

Marc Strauss: That sounds like a good idea. Is this a conversation that you can have with Dr. Weldy? It doesn't really require any full board action right?

Paul Julion: Absolutely.

Marc Strauss: Thank you. Trustee Marshall.

Robert Marshall: Mine might also deal with a short conversation, but as we look at shall we call them mini-cohorts that we could have as say athletics or veterans, are we looking heavily at the untapped cohorts that are out there such as high scoring persons taking the GED say in the 300 point range, is there an exploration of looking for new cohorts to go after?

Eric Weldy: We are definitely looking at efforts and looking at new cohort groups. I had a meeting earlier today speaking with a couple of my staff members that are doing some internal reviews and one of the things that we talked about was the emphasis really on attracting non-traditional students and meeting non-traditional student needs. I know that I'm in the midst of evaluating my off-campus non-traditional student services office and looking at new mission, new vision, and then also the possibility of merging with another area; but the focus for example of that particular department has been on commuter students and not true non-traditional students and so I think that's an added effort there that we're taking a look at and I think as well we're at a point now where we're reevaluating looking at how do we go about recruiting student vets. Obviously we're reevaluating the services that we provide for them but there are definitely more opportunities for us to recruit certain student populations that would be considered non-traditional.

Robert Boey: Eric, non-traditional students, the one I think about is community college students, especially now with our two year and four year combination that we have with the system. Is that what you're thinking about in terms of non-traditional? I'm trying to get a better understanding of your definition.

Eric Weldy: When I speak of non-traditional students, yes a non-traditional student could be an older transfer student, but also a student that has a family, a student that is working full time and trying to go to school as well, and so I have a large, more diverse definition of non-traditional.

Robert Boey: Okay, thank you.

Marc Strauss: Let me see whether I can summarize it and move us here in the right direction for what we'd like to do next. I hear several comments where there's interest that concerns getting some background information on various techniques that are being used in order to aid in the enrollment effort and perhaps we should spend a little bit more time on that at our next meeting, but I'd then like to get off of that track as soon as possible. So maybe we can devote a half an hour and satisfy everybody's interest in getting the rest of the background information and get whatever questions answered. And I think from the tone of the discussion today there's probably some guidance on the areas where committee members have expressed some interest and to the extent that you could provide information that would further that understanding that would be advisable. And then I'd also like to just make sure that the committee would then be on target for considering the cluster of issues related to tuition and fees then at our next meeting. Does that generally meet with everybody's approval? Alright so we'll try and do that next.

John Butler: Marc, the one thing that I would slightly amend in terms of background information, I would like a little bit more and I think we just scratched the surface on this, I would like a little bit more information on the way in which financial aid packages are put together.

Marc Strauss: We're going to get that as part of the tuition and fees background. I was talking about information regarding techniques for managing enrollment because I've heard a couple of comments from Trustee Marshall and one from Trustee Julion, there were questions that Trustee Boey asked regarding that topic and I'd like everybody to feel comfortable that they have some sense that there are management efforts that are being made, but again what I'd like to do is to keep us away from spending

all of our time talking about more pedestrian day-to-day interests. Not that they don't produce results that aren't important to the success of this effort, but I want to have us focus as much as we can on getting to the result of recommendations to the full board for things that require full board action instead of injecting ourselves into these day-to-day decisions that are being made. Alright so the date for our next meeting then will be announced as soon as we determine if we get a couple of alternatives. I'll circulate those for approval into the membership and the sooner we undertake that effort the better and in deference to Trustee Boey maybe we'll try to meet earlier in the day next time.

OTHER MATTERS

Marc Strauss: Is there any other matter to come before the meeting today?

John Butler: I just want to express my gratitude for everyone coming to this meeting and all of the input and testimony that's been provided. Thank you very much for spending some of your Friday with us.

Douglas Baker: And let's go to the women's basketball game.

NEXT MEETING DATE

Marc Strauss: Now in keeping with our charge to get done with this as rapidly as possible, my hope was that we might have the opportunity to be able to schedule another meeting right after the first of the year. It's unlikely that we'll do any better in terms of getting material and digesting it before our meeting if we try to schedule it before this year ends, but sometime shortly after the first of the year. First, would that generally be consistent with what the committee would like to do? Second question I guess is administratively is that something that sounds like it would be feasible and don't commit to something that we can't do.

Douglas Baker: It will be more feasible than trying to do it before the end of the year I think so I think we can pull most of that material together for you by that time and get it to you in time for you to read too. So we'll need maybe a little bit into January so we can get it to you in a readable time. We still don't know how many of us will be at bowl game at some point and if we knock it out of the park it could be January 4th when we're at a bowl game.

Marc Strauss: Alright, we'll just avoid January 21st to the 25th because I'm planning on being away.

(Later determined to be January 16, 2015 at 10:00 a.m. in the Board of Trustees Room, AL315)

ADJOURNMENT

Committee Chair Strauss called for a motion to adjourn the meeting. Trustee Boey motioned and it was seconded by Trustee Marshall. There was no discussion and a call was made. All agreed and the meeting was adjourned 5:53 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Susan Oppenborn
Recording Secretary

In compliance with Illinois Open Meetings Act 5 ILCS 120/1, et seq, a verbatim record of all Northern Illinois University Board of Trustees meetings is maintained by the Board Recording Secretary and is available for review upon request. The minutes contained herein represent a true and accurate summary of the Board proceedings.