

Minutes of the  
**NIU Board of Trustees**  
**Of Northern Illinois University**  
**Ad Hoc Committee on Enrollment**  
March 27, 2015

**1. CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL**

The meeting was called to order at 9:33 a.m. by Chair Marc Strauss in the Board of Trustees Room, 315 Altgeld Hall. Recording Secretary Linda Odom conducted a roll call of Trustees. Members present were Board Chair John Butler, Trustee Robert Boey, Trustee Robert Marshall, Student Trustee Paul Julion and Committee Chair Marc Strauss. Also present were President Douglas Baker, Executive Vice President & Provost Lisa Freeman, General Counsel Jerry Blakemore, Vice President of Administration & Finance Al Phillips, Board Liaison Mike Mann, Anne Kaplan, UAC Representative Bill Pitney, Amy Franklin, Chris McCord, Jeff Reynolds, Denise Schoenbachler, Danielle Schultz, Harlan Teller, Kelly Wesener-Michael.

**2. VERIFICATION OF QUORUM AND APPROPRIATE NOTICE OF PUBLIC MEETING**

Mr. Blakemore indicated that appropriate notification of the meeting had been provided pursuant to the Illinois Open Meetings Act.

**3. APPROVAL OF PROPOSED MEETING AGENDA**

Marc Strauss suggested we add to the published agenda a closed session between items 9 and 10 and then entertain a motion containing any other proposed changes or to adopt the agenda with that modification.

John Butler made a motion to adopt the agenda with that modification and Robert Boey seconded. Marc Strauss asked if there was any discussion and there was none so motion carried.

**4. REVIEW AND APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF JANUARY 16, 2015**

Robert Boey made the motion to approve the minutes of January 16, 2015 and Paul Julion seconded. Marc Strauss asked if there was any discussion and there was none so motion carried.

**5. CHAIR'S COMMENTS/ANNOUNCEMENTS**

Marc Strauss said after a brief comment from President Baker regarding what's happening with the Lipman Hearne engagement, we'll be focusing today on the academic side of the issues that were to be considered by this committee and Provost Freeman. She probably will not finish with all of the questions that we raised at our first session that related to the academic side, but hopefully today we will get a start. The centerpiece of this conversation today will center around the program prioritization effort that's already been under discussion. We will shortly hereafter be in touch to schedule our follow-up meetings. We want to continue with whatever speed we can to get through the issues that still are in front of this committee and then get down to some action items in the form of recommendations back to the full board. That concludes the comments that I have of an introductory nature.

Marc Strauss recognized the University Advisory Council representative Bill Pitney and asked if he had any statement at this time. At this time he did not however, he said he would be happy to answer any questions as conversations come up.

Marc Strauss said if he had comments during the presentation that would be perfectly acceptable too.

President Baker continued to talk about Lipman Hearne. Eric Weldy had been scheduled to be here today to talk about these issues but is home sick. Working with Lipman Hearne we have broken up into a number of task teams. Some of the people in this room are participating on them and they're really

focusing on Fall 2015 enrollment. This is more of a tactical planning and execution group than it is a long range branding or strategic planning group. We're looking at a variety of segments in potential enrollment for first time incoming freshmen, students that have stepped out, students that are transferring, graduate students, and we're also working outside of the Lipman Hearne area on international students aggressively and adult learners. We've got a number of task teams working aggressively ranging from better communications to advising to financial aid to programming. I'm really quite excited about the opportunities, the impact those efforts may have in the fall. Retention is another area that is critically important to our overall enrollments. Last week I met with the freshmen who had a 3.5 or better. There was a big celebration and that was a wonderful event down in the First Year Experience in Altgeld 100. One of the things many of the students talked to me about was the peer mentoring system that's been put in and University 101 as well as first year comp and they're finding that to be very helpful in the social integration and finding their way around the university academically and socially. I was at a mentoring event a couple days ago at the McDonald's Restaurant Headquarters, and we had a number of our mentors and mentees hooking up for the first time introducing each other and there was a lot of energy in the room. J.D. Bowers and I both spoke at that event and it looked like another good stepping stone and Laurie Elish-Piper is now working with a group of four other people to develop an expanded and integrated mentoring and internship program we can scale up. We're finally taking strong action there. Enrollment is critically important to our mission and it's critically important to our revenue. Revenue from the state is critically important too and we've spent the last two weeks in Springfield, Lisa, Al, I, Mike, Christine Black and a number of students have testified in front of the House and Senate Appropriations Committees. We were very well received. Lisa and I intended to speak the most and then the students spoke. In spite of Lisa's brilliance, it was the students who they remembered. In fact the students received applause at the end of the hearing yesterday from both the legislators and the audience in the room. That's the first time I've heard legislators applaud at the end of an appropriations hearing. That was an exciting step for us. We talked about a variety of things that we're doing to enhance student's success and one of the things that we talked about in the session and with legislators was legislation for dreamers on student loans and we know with Representative Pritchard's support that's passed out of the House Committee on to the floor and I think will be heading to the Senate. I appreciate his support and the conversations around that. We are working hard on recruitment and retention and I'd like to thank Mike for getting this ready to go down there and our MJS consulting crew as well.

Marc Strauss thanked President Baker for the update and asked the Trustees if they had any questions for President Baker? There were none.

## **6. PUBLIC COMMENT**

Mr. Blakemore noted that there was one request made to address this Ad Hoc Meeting. Marc Strauss responded that he had a request from Lizabeth Roman.

Lizabeth Roman and Sara Briseno Co-coordinators of Dream Action NIU: good morning everyone my name is Sara Briseno. I'm one of the co-coordinators from Dream Action NIU and just to save us some time, Dream Action NIU has been an organization since 2009 and we have provided an overview and a history of actions as well as accomplishments that we have created here at this university. Hi, good morning, my name is Lizabeth Roman and I'm the other co-coordinator of Dream Action NIU and so thank you again for having us here and giving us an opportunity to speak to you this morning. So to begin with we can to discuss some of the issues that some undocumented students have faced on our campus. There has already been a lot of initiatives to point to undocumented students and a lot of these issues have been addressed, however we still seem to find that there are some problems that they are facing. And to begin with HB60, House Bill 60 allowed undocumented students to have in state tuition in the state of Illinois as long as they had been in school for three years. The legislation states that they were supposed to attend school for three years does specify high school and when they are – so these students are applying, they're being accepting to NIU, however when it comes to their MY NIU they are still are seeing an out of state tuition. This is because the university is awaiting for their senior transcript which states their graduation date and often times they are not able to provide this until they graduate

high school. So they are still are seeing out of state tuition costs on their MY NIU. What this is doing is scaring a lot of families saying we cannot afford this institution and so they are going to other institutions or even considering community college. This is affecting enrollment because these students are not coming to NIU. Potentially students are going to succeed, they're going to graduate, but they cannot attend because of that number that is showing up there. So that is something that we had mentioned and a way to solve that is to either create a letter some type of statement that says that when you show your transcript that we will be able to – that this is the tuition that we're going to pay because often times parents are not even knowledgeable that that is going to happen. Also, we need to provide an affidavit which states that they are residents of Illinois. So again, there has been some issues regarding the affidavit because they don't know that they need to file this affidavit, so students are unaware of this. A way to solve this is to have a liaison, an undocumented student liaison, that would be able to inform the students and families of the things that they need to do when applying and enrolling to NIU.

Sara Briseno continued, adding to that, President Baker you just mentioned that enrollment is very critical to revenue, and when we were talking about that, undocumented students are bringing in that revenue but they are not aware of certain resources, we are not providing enough resources and we don't have a point person to direct them to certain resources and how to work with undocumented students. We're pushing that revenue elsewhere. We're pushing that revenue that could be very critical to NIU and you know we can definitely talk about undocumented students in regard to retention. We're trying to retain those students and keep those students. Because when we're talking about that, it definitely brings in revenue. And then President Baker had also mentioned legislation. Right now House Bill 3528 would amend House Bill 60 that Lizabeth just talked about and it would just allow undocumented students access to state funds such as scholarships or MAP grants. This is very critical for our students because as you know undocumented students do not have access to those funds and so they have a very hard time knowing if they're going to be coming back next semester; some drop out, some take five to six years to finish off. They're going back and forth trying to figure out how to pay for their tuition. We are aware that this definitely creates a bigger (inaudible) for accessing those state funds, but when we have been investing undocumented students from pre-K all the way to their high school and it just does not make sense for us to continue that investment. And so right now we're at a critical for NIU to definitely be the role model on how they are supportive with undocumented students. So many other institutions and used our undocumented student guidebook that we provide at this institution. Other universities have said that NIU has been very undocumented friendly, but we definitely know that there can be a lot more done and definitely to retain those students, to enroll more students. As a person who has been working with undocumented students and immigrant rights advocacy, I hear horror stories of students dropping out because they were not aware of certain resources that this university has. So appointing an undocumented student liaison and supporting this bill, HB3528, would allow us to retain those students; would allow more students to come to the university.

Lizabeth continued, and again referring back to the undocumented student liaison, some of the things that this person would be able to do, is not only be a support system for these students, but be a resource, a resource for scholarships, a resource for other opportunities at this school which will be able to help them pay their costs, creating a safe space but also listening to their experiences; letting them know that there is – encouraging them, that there is a way for you to stay here at NIU. So pretty much this person will be able to be knowledgeable in relevant policies and legislations like the HB3528 and be knowledgeable on HB60 and be knowledgeable on these bills, they're important to the success of these students. Again, this is only an option and hopefully this is able to be pursued in the future just because it is really needed. I think a lot of students reach out to even some of our – or other people on this campus looking for answers and they're not able to find it on the website, they're not able to find it from other counselors or advisors here. So I think it's crucial that we have a person that is very knowledgeable in this topic just because, again, we want to make sure they we're accepting, you know these students have already been accepted. They already have shown commitment to this school, yet the cost is not allowing them to and money should not be the reason why they're not pursuing higher education. Again, we stress the importance of having this person and serving this community, serving this population because they are part of this community, they are a part of this school already and I feel that it's only fair for them to be given the same resources as other students here at NIU.

Sara continued, like I had mentioned, we're at a very critical standpoint where this institution can definitely be a role model for other institutions and other – we have a vision for NIU and that vision is that NIU is an undocumented friendly campus and so with your support and with everyone's support for HB3528, we can definitely push that vision forward.

Marc Straus asked if there were any questions from the committee members.

Paul Julion had a couple of questions. How big is the community here at NIU for undocumented students?

Sara responded that they do not have an exact number. That can be very shaky just because of the affidavits and international students can get mixed into that pool so we do not have an exact number and we wish we did right especially as students who work with undocumented students, if we had that number we definitely would have a more strategic plan of how to work with these students, but unfortunately we do not.

Paul Julion asked if they could guesstimate what would it be? They don't have to be exact.

Lizabeth said it would have to be a couple 100 or even more, we're unsure.

Sara said she has friends who are undocumented, I'm documented myself, but she has a friend that just received a scholarship and he was still listed as an international student. It can be very shaky as far as knowing which students are undocumented and which are not.

John Butler said so you're saying that the current law provides for in state tuition if a student has been a student for three years prior to application to Northern but there is a request from us for a transcript that shows the completion of high school, why would that be? Why would we want to know that someone completed high school in order to transition them to an in state student?

Sara said to make sure that they are a resident of Illinois and again that's what the affidavit is for. I do know that even some students that are residents, or are citizens, are given extended amount of time to turn in those transcripts. So students are able to attend their fall semester without even turning in those transcripts and their deadline is until the spring semester. So personally I think that is just to prove that they have finished high school.

Mike Mann said that's one of the requirements for in state tuition.

John Butler said, what you're asking for is some way to bridge the gap so that the student isn't just simply receiving a bill or a letter that says they're considered an out of state student.

Sara said yes because it can be really confusing when – some students aren't really knowledgeable either about the difference between out of state or in state so I think just having a letter that will state you are considered an in state student, right now you're being charged this out of state tuition but this will change when you provide us proof that you have graduated from an Illinois high school.

Robert Boey responded that he was sympathetic to what they were both saying. He explained that he came as a foreign student and is fully documented. There are barriers to get through to understand how to get from point A to point B alone is monumental and he still remembers after the first year in the summer time, trying to get a summer job and someone said show me your social security number and he said what is that. When you don't know the system, you begin to find out, by the time you're finding out all the obstacles, the summer is over. That's part of the problem. It sounds like you're asking for a mentor to help the students, he is sympathetic to understanding that issue.

Robert Marshall responded, understanding that quite often money, tuition are automatic roadblocks, is there any exploration going along with the community colleges to at least get a start and still get to NIU?

Sara responded, I knew that financial difficulties were always going to be there; coming from a low-income family and then my undocumented status added to that. There is definitely something to explore as far as partnerships with community colleges in the DeKalb surrounding area, Waubensee, Elgin Community College, we have seen a lot of Elgin Community College students choosing NIU. So I think there's definitely ways that we can explore partnerships with other community colleges in order to also bridge that gap and have students come to NIU.

Robert Marshall noted in the document that was given that there's a mention of scholarships being awarded. Am I incorrect in saying that those scholarships are raised by the students outside of NIU for the source?

Lizabeth asked, The Connection NIU Scholarship? We do mention NIU scholarship, the funds are raised solely by members. These are students currently attending NIU.

Marc Strauss thanked Lizabeth and Sara.

## **7. INTRODUCTORY COMMENTS - EXECUTIVE VP & PROVOST LISA FREEMAN**

Lisa Freeman noted, I want the board to have an opportunity to engage to the extent possible, so I would encourage questions during the presentation. My goal would be to get to the end of the PowerPoint that you have and if the other items need to be deferred or condensed, that would probably work very well.

## **8. UNIVERSITY RECOMMENDATIONS**

### **8.a. Program Prioritization at NIU**

Lisa Freeman continued with her presentation, it's really a pleasure to be here today to address the Ad Hoc Committee on Enrollment about the program prioritization process that's unfolding at NIU. That will be the overriding topic. It will flow naturally in to information about academic program additions and deletions and our current processes for accomplishing those, because those shared governance processes occur all the time and will have to continue to occur from recommendations that arise out of program prioritization. Faculty where productivity and accountability are things that will be reflected in some of the metrics that are used in program prioritization. These issues which have arisen during the earlier meetings in the Ad Hoc Enrollment Committee pull together nicely in the order that they're presented on the slide. This is the right committee to talk about program prioritization because as Trustee Strauss has pointed out so many times, this committee is cross-cutting and enrollment is the most important thing. It's very clear that program prioritization is important to enrollment because understanding how we resource the academic and administrative programs that create the student experience, the co-curricular and the curricular experience, is part of what contributes to our enrollment and attracts students and parent and keeps students at NIU. Program prioritization does not itself align well with any one of the other committees. Certainly there are academic programs, student affairs and personnel issues related to program prioritization. There are also financial issues because this is essentially a resource reallocation process and I would say that research programs are also part of program prioritization so LARI is going to be an intersection and CARL is not left out Trustee Boey because when you think about enterprise risk management and assessing how to manage risk on campus, that affects resource allocation, health, safety, and compliance which are also an important criteria in program prioritization. Program prioritization is a way to respond to the changing fiscal and other environment at NIU and I think it's also important to remember that as we deal with issues we've discussed so many times in the previous months, the decline in our state appropriation, the declining enrollment that we would really like to change, the changing demographics or graduating high school seniors and community college students in Illinois, it's important to remember that this is a national landscape that's changing just as the NIU landscape is changing. And when I wanted to make this point, I didn't have to look very hard for the

quote to make the point. I probably could have chosen from among 400 quotes that would arise on Google in the literature that I read regularly, but the quote on this slide and on the next slide, or the words on this slide and the next slide actually arose from the AGB Conference that Trustee Strauss and many others here attended along with me and the president. It's a time of challenge and change. You just can't count on annual growth in enrollments and revenues and so you have to adjust your way of doing business accordingly. Institutions that are going to continue to thrive and be sustained in this environment are going to be very clear about their values and align their mission and values with resources, with processes. They are going to be cognizant of results and be accountable. They're to track benchmarks and methods and they're going to be cognizant of demands, internal and external demands and meeting those as they move forward.

Marc Strauss asked if he could ask a couple of questions.

Lisa Freeman said absolutely.

Marc Strauss asked at the 30,000 foot level, the process ultimately has to be able to allow for prioritization as against some guiding principle. The university's mission is to promote excellence and engagement in teaching and learning, research and scholarship, creativity and artistry, and outreach and service. It's not clear to me judged against that mission how you would judge priorities. This may be something that your prioritization process is going to grapple with. If that's the case I'm curious as to how that conversation might unravel.

Lisa Freeman answered, I will get to that in a couple of slides but let me say that I think that's an excellent point. If you read the literature on program prioritization, many institutions have a very broad and encompassing mission that needs to be functionalized a little more specifically for program prioritization to work. I believe that the document you have in your hand, to some extent, helps us do that. Because we've looked at changing the focus of our mission to the cornerstone goal of student career success building then on the three pillars, but then looking at the triangle framework as the game board or the map to guide what we do. We have used that framework to articulate the principles that we use for vacancy control. Making sure that health and safety come first, but really thinking about students in the center, student career success, focusing our investment on things that leverage the important relationships between students, academics, alumni and the world, reflect our engagement mission. We will have very specific criteria as we go along during program prioritization. I have an update for the PowerPoint that you have because we have selected the academic prioritization criteria, but the task forces are going to have to fill in details underneath there in terms of the specific questions and the data elements that are used under each one of the adopted criteria. That will be a way of functionalizing our mission in terms of what we say is important to us in the prioritization process.

Marc Strauss continued, as I have reviewed these materials and thought about the process, and also items that we've discussed before in the Academic Affairs, Student Affairs and Personnel Committee, there's an ongoing theme about trying to be able to determine what the appropriate measures of success are and how they are evaluated. There are some standard sets of data that we're using and there's other data that's available and you're all smart people and I'm sure that you're going to use the data that's available. There may be objections though for which we don't currently collect data and I'm not sure what the relevant criteria are for measuring success. As an example which may not be scientifically precise or fully inclusive, let me say that at various times I think we've talked about whether you can display the knowledge within your major, whether or not you've acquired critical thinking or other specific skills. You could talk about whether you achieve economic success, whether you've developed as a person over some period of time and some combination of those things I imagine would be in the ideal world what somebody would claim was success for a student that came from NIU. And we would try to measure we had a positive impact on doing that. As we get down to these specifics, what I'm interested in again is how do we determine what those measures of success look like and then how do we measure whether we're making progress, because I think ultimately that's what you try to do with this program prioritization process correct?

Lisa Freeman continued, I will tell you where we are on that journey and I have a representative from our data subcommittee in the audience who may want to contribute either now or when I talk more about data elements in the course of the presentation. I'll start out by saying I agree completely with what you're saying. This is a challenge that has been faced by every institution that does a formal program prioritization process or every institution that is cognizant of benchmarks and accountability. There are some things that I think are relatively standard and quantitative. Qualitative measures are more challenging but there are things that people have used to show this. When you speak specifically about some of the issues such as critical thinking skills or engagement, there are national examination strategies, there are alumni survey and employer survey issues that we do. There's an inventory of things out there that are possible. What we're doing right now is working with all of the academic programs and administrative programs to find out what they currently capture. So what's readily available or the things they currently capture or the state of Illinois captures or the Delaware study captures for us or we can access through academic analytics or national databases publication, etc. Which of those do they think are relevant. That's an information gathering or cattle prodding exercise because until we have the criteria selected, we can't really say which of those would align with the criteria. As our data subgroup was going around and talking to all the units, they're also saying what's really important to you that we don't currently have a metric or a measure for to figure out is it something that can be captured over the time frame that program prioritization will evolve using the tools that we have and the tools that can be implemented reasonably quickly and financial reasonable cost? Or is it something that might have to be a longer term goal and we have a different surrogate now so we are doing an inventory, looking at what's available, looking at the hard work that was done under Vision 20/20 when there were indeed benchmarks and metrics agreed upon in the context of several of the things that are important to the university and its mission and those questions and the drill down I think will occur over time and it's something we're going to have to revisit. This is a boat we're building as we sail it. That's not unusual, no one is ever prepared going into program prioritization for everything that might arise. Program prioritization itself will be a process that's revisited on a regular basis, three to five years, and as a result we'll have a formal assessment attached to program prioritization so that we can look for continuous improvement and adjust as necessary because this is the first time we're doing it, we're trying to be very inclusive and to listen to feedback to incorporate emerging viewpoints as we move forward to the extent possible and to the best of our ability.

Marc Strauss replied, I know that it's an incredible burden and it's not something anybody would want to do every year, but I would suspect that you will find data sets that don't exist, or don't exist in the form that you want to use for this cycle. If we identify them and start the process of gathering that data now then they'll be available when we revisit this in whatever time period is an appropriate one to do it again.

Lisa Freeman said, I'm really happy to hear you say that as you heard former Vice President Suttentfield say it and Al Phillips and I who are going to be working very closely together on everything as we move forward. We are committed to having a culture of accountability, clarity, transparency, and sustainability and we're also committed to being a data informed culture. We will allow time between program prioritization cycles, 3-5 years is typical. We haven't made a firm commitment, so that programs can meet their benchmarks and that when we revisit a second round and then ultimately a third and a fourth round, we have the culture of looking at where we are compared to where we want to be, fine tuning in between and then assessing on a regular basis. As I said earlier, President Baker really reframes the lens that everyone on campus looks at in terms of student career success being our keystone or cornerstone goal. Supported on principles of thriving communities, financial and program viability, and ethically inspired leadership and through an inclusive campus process involving the bold futures workshops and conversations, the triangle framework shown on the right immerge. It takes our mission, teaching and learning, and outreach engagements, and says that it's most meaningful for this campus and this campus leverages its relationships and resources most effectively when we use those essential elements of our mission to connect the academics and our students to the world, our alumni and when we value the supporting services that enable those connections and our overall mission to move forward. This has been a framework that has informed planning at the unit level and I see that two of my deans are here and they both use the framework to create plans within their unit. I think everybody who was in the room when Dean McCord wheeled in the three-dimensional tetrahedron with the individual plants on it

and those are being assessed out in the units. But I think what you were saying and I totally agree with you, is if we agree on our broad mission, and we agree on the triangle framework, and we all want high quality, student centered education that includes research and engagement to be what we do at NIU and we have all of our units that contribute to this. The academic units shown in red here and the administrative units shown in black, using the triangle framework to inform what they do, we still need a way to pull it all together to integrate the plans and priority so that we can allocate resources accordingly and measure success. That's really what program prioritization is about on our campus and on others. I've made a list of the things that I think are essential elements of our action plan going into creating and implementing a program prioritization process. That is we need to pursue strategic roles despite our fiscal distress. And that means we need to focus on things that are important like enrollment, like having relevant academic programs and students who have an integrated curricular and co-curricular experience. We need to understand that part of doing that is confronting the real issues that face us. We can do across the board cut and continue and manage decline. We need to use data to inform planning and management. Resources need to be integrated into planning. Another way of saying that is our plans need to be operationalized by linking them to our budget process. The Higher Learning Commission pointed that out to us. Our trustees have pointed that out to us. It was a robust part of the discussion with presidential candidates during the presidential search. I think that this is a way that we move to that very important role. We have to stay within scope; scope of our resources, scope of our mission, and program prioritization is a way to do that. If we're doing something well and it's not related to our mission and resources are being invested in it, it's time to question that. I think this is the hardest part. We need to quite doing some things. We need to stop doing things that aren't working because they become obsolete. We need to quit doing things because it's the way we've always done them. We need to quit doing things that aren't supported by cost benefit and risk reward analysis. That's not saying that every program has to float itself on its own boat, but we have a big risk debate in our Faculty Senate and I act on the planning commission and a faculty member said "I don't think it should matter how much a program costs if it's a good program" and another faculty member said "If that program uses 75 percent of the resources we have available to support academic programs, it's not the direction we should be investing in."

Marc Strauss said, these things all make very good sense, but given the environment in which we're operating, it's a disrupted industry. There are challenges on the revenue side, but there are opportunities on the cost side. You can take a look at current costs, but I think you also should avail yourself of the opportunity to take a look at what the potential costs are because there may be different ways of doing things that would reduce the cost for the delivery of program. That could embrace a different pedagogy or alternative ways to be able to deliver a course of material, and if we have a way to measure, if we can define what the desired results are and measure them, we may find that we get better outcomes at a lower cost. I would only suggest again you may well have figured this out for yourself that we take a look at not just what the current costs are but if we have proposals that could result in lowered costs, because ultimately that's the long-term, sustainable business model is to continue to be able to locate those opportunities for reducing costs and producing the same quality for output.

Lisa Freeman said, absolutely and let me say that when campuses do program prioritization and this will become apparent, but recommendations that come out of the prioritization task forces group the programs into quintiles; and it's not increase investment stay the same and decrease investment which would assume that the cost issue that you bring up isn't there. There are often categories like restructure, revise, and in the submission form, in the matters, we expect those things to happen. There are some things like payroll, which may not be as efficient as it is, but it's an essential service, we're not going to get rid of payroll. People are going to continue to get paychecks. Vice President Philips has a background in lean, he is an expert on process re-engineering. It's something we know we need to do at some levels and we will start that process before we finish program prioritization because things like, and I'm not picking on payroll, but I think everyone here would say payroll is important, is there anyone here who doesn't like getting their paycheck?

Marc Strauss commented, that was a good example.



Lisa Freeman said, we can probably start to look for efficiencies and cost savings in those essential series, start understanding the culture of process re-engineering, and then as the task force makes recommendations that may look like this is a really important program but in its current form it's not generating enough revenue because it's not reaching the correct audience, or it's structured in a way that is too heavy on administrative salary and we need more salary on boots on the ground, or with a small investment in marketing we have big opportunity for growth. I think these types of things will actually come out of program prioritization. It has happened on the other campuses that have done this process. That is certainly my goal. So now I'm actually going to talk about where we are at NIU and I think I've said that this is the process that is very important. Data informed is four strategic goals, and for most goals our excellence and our values. It enhances our reputation and it promotes the value proposition which is very critical to enrollment, to tuition, and to the issues that this community cares about. Academic impact, this is just sort of a higher ed think tank. The survey in 2013 was that a 115 institutions of higher ed, this include publics and privates; two years and four years; and 75 percent of them were at some stage along the way of program prioritization. I was in a session at a meeting and they said how many provosts in the room are doing program prioritization, it was a room full of provosts, and there were like five people who didn't raise their hand. This is not something we're doing by ourselves. Program prioritization is basically peer review process. So it has the same elements that any peer review process has. When I talked to faculty who are in disciplines where they submit grants that are reviewed by peer review panels, and this is essentially what goes on. You have guiding principles, you have an inventory of programs that are being assessed, you have criteria through program evaluation, a data template or submission format so that you're comparing at least the narrative and the data in a familiar template to make the reviewer job easier. You have a review panel who is there because they have a graph of perspectives and the necessary expertise, but are not there to be biased in favor of their home discipline or their home grant system. You have some system that's agreed upon for ranking the programs or rubric that's used and then you have processes for connecting findings to actions steps. What comes out of the task force here are only recommendations. They've been moved to our normal shared governance processes to be incorporated into program addition/deletion, budget planning processes, etc. Our prioritization process, you try to include stakeholders. It's been facilitated by a coordinating team with risk expertise and I'll recognize the folks in the room who are on that in a minute, guided by evaluation criteria that was developed based on input from the entire campus community. We took, as a straw man, the ten criteria that have been put forward by Bob Dickinson and Larry Goldstein, put them in a survey that went out to all of our faculty and staff, and panels have been taking that feedback and using it to create NIU specific criteria, and weighting four of those criteria. The prioritization will be conducted by two task forces, one for academic programs and one for administrative programs. The academic task force will be comprised of tenured faculty and instructors; and the administrative task force will be composed of people from all of our staffing categories. There will be specific formal opportunities for students to react to the task force recommendations without having students sit on the task forces. The reason for that is that this is an extremely time consuming process. It's a process also where decisions are being made that will affect people and we wanted to protect people who are in potentially vulnerable reporting relationships, such as non-tenured, tenure-line faculty, and students from the potential to be influenced or put in awkward positions because of that. After the task force, negotiated, I had a wonderful conversation with our student government about how students should be included. They are included in the nomination process for the task forces, and the task force's recommendations will be reflected to students in some type of innovative form that we haven't quite gotten fully developed, but we're looking forward to publishing about this because students are much less involved on other campuses and we're really happy we're able to involve them on our own. Alumni are included in the sense that they're able to be part of the nomination process for the task forces and alumni will be polled to put their feedback into the submissions that come from the individual programs as I get poured in that. So right now we're in the task force nomination process and I'll describe that a little more as we go on, and we're taking nominations that have alumni as references, etc. as part of the nomination process when the programs do the piece that's really their advocacy, their analysis. They have their data template. They explain why they're a program that deserves to be invested in more heavily. They talk about their potential, they talk about their success. They will site alumni data, alumni voices will be part of that. But alumni will not be part of the overall task force. When the recommendations come out of the task force, we're gonna have a very specific forum for student voices,

but our alumni voices as we've envisioned the process to date, so we're flexible in looking at other opportunities, would be really part of our normal shared governance process. So as we go through commentary on program additions and deletions for example, we always hear from alumni in the course of those types of processes. We don't generally invite alumni to be part of our budgeting and planning process in a formal way. They're not normally part of our shared governance system, but that doesn't mean our task force wouldn't be open to hearing for additional ideas about involving the alumni association.

Robert Marshall said, a number of the alumni, from the alumni board in particular, served on university wide committees including a strategic planning process as well as Vision 20/20 so they have not been excluded in the past.

Lisa Freeman added, this is an issue that we probably need to discuss at more length. I don't feel that we're excluding alumni here because they are contributing to setting the goals, advocating for programs, but if we're sending a message that we don't value alumni opinions, that would not be our intention and we could certainly look at having a formal opportunity for alumni to react to the task force recommendations if that would be useful.

Robert Marshall asked looking at a particular program, how far back do we go for a timeline to take a look at that program thinking of some programs or offices that have been recently reorganized where an accurate measure would have to be based on a very short period of time. Do we have a general time line that we go back to get somewhat of a drift of where we've been?

Lisa Freeman said it might be easier to address that question as we start looking at criteria, but I guess I would say overall we are not setting a rigid timeframe for all programs have to be looked at in the scope of this epoch. There were opportunities within the criteria that were proposed for the history of the program to be a consideration. In some cases the data elements that we'll look at will be constrained in time by the fact that we only had systems to capture certain types of data since people saw it was implemented for example. So we're talking about the longest possible time frame being the time in which these data were available. Programs that have been restructured, or would like to restructure, whether it's moving forward to a new structure or going back to a previous structure, will have an opportunity in their narrative submission to say these are the data that was supplied and they show how we functioned over the last three years. I'm just making this up. If they came back to us and said we would like this part of our narrative to have a similar data set from the three years previous to those three years. If those data were capturable, either by the program or by us who are going to be helping to populate the template, we wouldn't pull back that data. They would be able to show that data and say look we were more profitable, we were more efficient, we were affective in 1996 to 1999 than we were in 2000 to 2003 and we would like to go back to this practice of this structure. That would be part of what the program looked at. Does that make sense? Does that help?

Robert Marshall responded, Yes.

John Butler asked about the students reaction to the task force recommendations. What would the implications be if the students found something particularly problematic. There are some programs that are, for all practical purposes, student governed, student run, the students are the major stakeholders. There are people who provide some of the peer coaching and those kinds of things.

Lisa Freeman responded, let me parse that question into a couple different places. This particular formal opportunity was designed to address the fact that we didn't feel it was okay for students to serve on the task forces because we needed to protect their time and vulnerability. The bullet on this slide is a specific opportunity for students to reflect on the task force recommendation. Students will be in charge of submitting the documentation for their programs. No one else is going to write up a student run program. The students are going to be writing that up. So they will be making the case for their programs and they will have a chance to react in a special forum to the reactions of the task force and that feedback will be shared along with the task force feedback to the senior leadership of NIU. All of that

said, nothing that the task force says is binding. The task force feedback, the voices of students, the voices of alumni, whether they're in a special forum or whether we hear from them as we often hear from them because they care so much about this campus and the programs, that will feed up to senior leadership and that senior leadership recommendations related to budget allocation and/or program disinvestment, will feed into our normal shared governance processes the way they always do. We can't add a program that's suggested in program prioritization or delete a program that's targeted for deletion in program prioritization without going through the normal chain of curriculum committees. University Council, Academic Planning Council if it's relevant to that type of program, Graduate Council if it's relevant to that type of program; and coming to the Provost, President and Chair of the Board of Trustees. At every one of those steps, just as we heard from students this morning, if there was something that made it all the way to the Board of Trustees that students were still upset about, they would have a voice at every point in time. I think there are multiple opportunities for student voices. This is not meant to be the only opportunity for student voice, but this was in response to their concern about not having membership in the task force. It doesn't really matter what my vision is, it matters what the vision of the task group subgroup and the Student Association is. They are going to work together to design that step in a way that the students feel comfortable with.

Marc Strauss said, with respect to program elimination or addition that goes through a shared governance process.

Lisa Freeman responded, yes and I have those slides at the end of the presentation.

Marc Strauss responded, there are resource reallocation questions though that don't follow.

Lisa Freeman said, yes, we do those things now.

Marc Strauss said, we do those things routinely, but we haven't traditionally done them on the scale that may result from this process. So my question is whether there's been any thought given to whether there should be a different process because of the difference in scale for the reallocation? Should there be a different process followed or what is contemplated for how those decisions ultimately wind up being made?

Lisa Freeman said, I'm going to defer to Bill Pitney. I haven't gotten yet to the slide of who's on the committee to introduce everybody. I probably should have moved it to the front, but the Faculty Senate President and Executive Secretary of the University Council is an active member of the program prioritization task force, I would feel more comfortable with him talking about that.

Bill Pitney asked to clarify the question.

Marc Strauss responded, the question relates to the process that would follow after there were recommendations that would simply result in resource reallocation. I think we're clear on how shared governance operates with respect to a program addition or deletion, but here we're looking at the potential for resource reallocation that would be at a scale different than we're accustomed to on campus.

Bill Pitney said, after the recommendations are made, I can probably speak best in terms of the academic criteria, the academic programs. The way I've explained it to our faculty is that this program prioritization process that is currently moving forward, is not replacing any of our current curricular processes as we now know them to add, change, modify, or delete any of those programs. We still have that in place. Once recommendations are forwarded from the task force to the president and provost, those recommendations will be examined and then forwarded to the appropriate divisions, departments and colleges. From that point forward, I think as it relates to the actual programs that maybe impacted, I think there's perhaps three potential things that could occur at that point in time. I think a program could look at the recommendations and say yes that makes a lot of sense and we need to do that and then they will make the appropriate curricular changes and move them through from the department to the college to the university levels and make the changes. And the other, I suppose, a program could say we

really don't agree with that and they could stand their ground and say we're not going to make that change. I think there's perhaps a middle ground. A program might look at a recommendation and say you know we get where the recommendation is coming from in terms of what it means and why it was put forth, but understanding the nuances, perhaps this is a better change that we can make to restructure or otherwise modify the way we operate to address the concerns, be more efficient, and move forward and then they can perhaps negotiate at that point in time.

Lisa Freeman asked, Do you want to comment on the change in structure of the Resource, Space and Budget Committee to make that committee which deals with the resource, space and budget allocations not just the curricular process more robust to deal with all of the challenges we're facing not just program prioritization.

Bill Pitney said, Al Phillips and Lisa Freeman spoke to the Resource, Space and Budget Committee, we also folded in the Faculty Senate Executive Committee, and what was expressed was given the magnitude of the proposed state budget and its potential impact on higher education. We saw a need to change our processes so that we can act, give advice in the spirit of shared governance outside of the academic year. The reality is our current committee structures are such that we operate over a nine month period of time and getting anything done in the summer is problematic. Once that group heard that we had some great discussions about how we can address that. From there we had some recommendations about creating a more nimble subcommittee. That morphed into a discussion from Resource, Space and Budget about two changes. One to the duties so that we recognize the responsibility of the Resource, Space and Budget to not just set budget priorities, but also be an advisory body for time sensitive budget issues which we're obviously going to face here in the upcoming months. The other change was to request from the University Council, the first reading will be this Wednesday, to allow that body to work outside of the academic calendar without a quorum providing there are at least five members from that group, the majority of whom must be faculty so that they are on the ready, available, to give advise examining budget issues and that sort of thing. So that's an example of some of the changes.

Marc Strauss said, I should probably know the answer to these two questions, but I don't. So with regards to the academic side, if we weren't going to eliminate a program, but the recommendation was that we reduce this budget by 75 percent, just for the sake of discussion and not presuming that that's actually going to happen to anybody, but just for the sake of conversation; that decision winds up going through the Resource, Space and Budget committee for consideration?

Lisa Freeman said, there would be a lot of people involved in that conversation. The Resource, Space and Budget committee would be involved at the 30,000 foot level, the deans and the college and the college councils and the department heads would be involved. But truthfully, it's not that those types of decisions don't happen now, and really much more with the lower level of conversation as well as a higher level of conversation. We have had, in the time that I've been provost and we all know that hasn't been that long, at least one department choose to repurpose a faculty position in a way that meant a certain masters program would no longer be viable and the program hasn't gone through deletion, we're teaching out the students, but there was a recognition that there was a single faculty member being hired just so we could have a master's program with four students in it and that wasn't a good direction for the department. That didn't have a whole campus wide discussion, but it was consultative and it was in Dean McCord's college. I'm going to ask the deans if they want to chime in here on how they see a need for more structure.

Chris McCord responded, I actually would advocate not to have necessarily more structure. In many cases we have too much structure institutionally to be able to be nimble and change on a dime when we need to as all of us know and Provost Freeman is correct, we're continuously reviewing and doing some of this at different levels and the structure we have in place to demand that certain things come up to a higher level. We certainly respect that and through that process, but I think we need to be able to be a little bit more nimble and trust leaders that are appointed and that are given responsibilities to make some of those recommendations and some of those decisions along the way with the support of course

above, but I would advocate for much more structure.

Darryl Block said, I would agree with that. I think the budget structure appropriately involves Faculty Senate through the Resource, Space and Budget committee in a high level budget picture and I think it's not healthy for the institution to bring the shared governance process down into the tactical level of budget decisions. So I think when we get to that level, and yes I understand it's a much larger scale, but having done this at another institution, I'll say I really think there's a point where I'm going to agree with Denise, you need to trust your leadership to have heard all the voices it needed to hear, and make responsible decisions based on that.

Al Phillips responded, we have this happening already at a local level. Decisions were made already for certain programs, just hearing about the state budget and that this process is starting, this is happening already in some of my units. So I agree that we don't need more structure.

Marc Strauss said, I appreciate that input. On the business side I'm curious as to whether we have an analogous process.

Al Phillips said, actually the process is more hand and glove because as you know many of the financial decisions are much more short term basis. A lot of the program prioritization is much longer term. However, the work that they are doing informs the decisions that we make and as you just heard, a lot of decisions that we have to make inform what they're doing. So we work very closely together as we deal with these issues and as Provost Freeman said, we're working hand in hand to make sure that any decisions we make are well thought out and certainly take everything into consideration, but it's a symbiotic relationship. Right now we're dealing with some FY15 issues which have to be resolved very quickly and we're working with various departments to figure out how best to address them.

Marc Strauss said, the reason I've asked this last series of questions is to search for what the Board's appropriate role is. So it's clear that if we're going to delete a program, we've got a process, that comes back to the board. The analogous situation on the business side is, and again I'm not presuming it's going to happen, there could be a recommendation to outsource a particular function, and it's not clear to me at that point that the Board has a role in that. I don't know whether the Board thinks that it's appropriate that it ought to have a role, but I think all I'm trying to do is to make sure that in today's discussion we understand what those parameters are and then we can think about it some and determine whether there's anything else that needs to be finished. There are structures on the academic side that thoroughly vet this through all of the people who have an interest in that decision. Do we have a similar structure with regard to the business side then?

Al Phillips said, I don't think there's a formal structure. I'm working on some of those things.

Lisa Freeman responded, we do certainly have Operating Staff Council and SPS Council on the Resource, Space and Budget Committee. That committee along with the Academic Planning Council have been involved at every single step along the way in setting criteria.

Al Phillips said that Provost Freeman comes to many of my meetings and I have been going to many of her meetings to ensure that we make sure that everything is thoughtfully considered.

Lisa Freeman continued, we really have bought in hook, line and sinker to the guiding principles that we have shared responsibility for the university budget and how it's linked to our overall goals.

Robert Boey responded, I enjoyed the conversation because it reminded me when I have a manufacturing company that – Fortune 500 companies are great, but know your place where you are. Don't try to operate at the bottom of the Fortune 500 like a Fortune 100. Know where you are within the parameter and then try to follow the principles of it. I've been a trustee here for a long time. I will not even claim to understand and know everything that goes on here. So many of colleagues on the Board of Trustees do the same way, but we have to understand what are the important issues that we need to

look at and along the way I think staff can be a big help to use because we get lost sometimes in many of those issues and we depend on in many cases what you folks think is important to bring to our attention. Sometimes we'll pick up our own along the way, but most of the time we depend on your assistance. I think that's what we're all talking about here Chair Strauss.

Lisa Freeman added, as we're talking about shared governance committees, the University Advisory Council to the Board of Trustees or the UAC is comprised, I think I'm going to get this right, the President of the Faculty Senate who also serves as the Exec Secretary of UC; the President of the SPS Council, the President of the Operating Staff Council, and three faculty members who represent the teaching, research and service mission of the university. That's a group that I think could be used very vigorously to interact with the Board and have the appropriate dialog feedback mechanism as specified in our constitution and bylaws as we move through the program prioritization process. In Fall 2014 we did this type of process and we talked very briefly about that. We identified members of a coordinating team and we had our preliminary communications with the campus community. This semester we established guiding principles where in the process of developing criteria with broad campus participation, those criteria aren't finalized but I put a check there because the campus wide survey is completed and the joint committee of the Academic Planning Council, Resource, Space and Budget Committee has been working towards finalizing those criteria. We are in the middle of our task force combination process and I believe we have close to 100 nominations at this point for people to serve on those task forces. We have not yet done the task force selection. We will be working over the summer, especially on data elements and administrative programs because we will be able to do that easily. In fall 2015 we'll be providing programs with relevant data, programs will be able to be analyzed by faculty and staff. These will obviously be iterative process with a lot of that as we go forward. All of their nice little bullets there, they will be a little more blurry as we carry them out. The task forces will begin to review the data and narratives submitted by the programs and prioritize the programs into five categories or quintiles. In spring 2016 we will start to use what comes out of those program prioritization process to inform our FY17 budget. Our process here has been guided by what we consider to be best practice based on over a decade of experience. We attended a conference in Chicago where two of the keynote speakers were Bob Dickenson who was really the father of this type of process starting first on the academic side and moving on to the administrative side, and Larry Goldstein who is well known for his work on university budgets, he's speaking at NACUBO and we were also privileged to hear a provost and some faculty who were engaged in program prioritization and talk about how the process evolved on their campus. This slide shows people who attended the conference with the dash; people who are members of the data team with a single asterisk; people who are members of the criteria team with a little hat; and people of the communications team with a double asterisk; and I'm just going to ask people to stand as I indicate who's here. But these are the folks who attended the conference and who have been really part of this coordinating team which is a facilitory body. We have Jeff Reynolds who is on the data team, he's from the provost's office. The analysis unit, Ibrahim Abdel-Motoleb, is the chair of Electrical Engineering is the chair of the Resource, Space and Budget Committee currently. Sue Mini Vice Provost for Resource and Planning from the provost's office. Bill Pitney, shared governance, Faculty Senate President. Brett Coryell went on only because we thought it was great to have his perspective as IT but representing the cabinet level division. Marc Falkoff who is the chair of the Academic Planning Council and faculty member from the College of Law. Denise Shoenbachler was the elected representative of the deans and you'll note that she's on the communications team and that's because her marketing background is going to be really helpful. It has been and will continue to be helpful to us. Andy Small who is a former chair of Operating Staff Council who is part of the State University Civil Service structure right now; he's been part of the team since inception. Kelly Wesener representing Student Affairs and giving a different perspective; critical member of our communications team. We could not do this without her. Dillon Domke recently added. He did not attend the conference but he is representing SA on this team. And then Carolinda Douglass the Academic Planning Vice Provost is really the main facilitator of the process and I'm there just because I'm the provost and went to the meeting. The coordinating team is really there not to make any decisions or have any influences, but to facilitate the process. We really are sort of a two-way portal for information to flow in and out. We've organized ourselves into these teams that are responsible for data, for implementation, our initial subcommittee for implementation was the criteria subcommittee. They will probably be repurposed once the criteria are decided on, and then we have a communications

subcommittee of the coordinating team, but just because we're there that doesn't mean that we're not using all of the marketing and communications support that's available to us on campus. Harlan Teller has been wonderful. Melanie Magara has been very helpful in setting up the website that I'll show before we leave today. We have people who are the stewards of data on campus, working with us from Institutional Research, from sponsored projects from all the places you would expect. And then obviously we need broad perspectives. We tried to build our coordinating teams with perspectives that reflect the campus community, but we are always looking to get more feedback, and as you can imagine people are happy to provide it. We're having very robust conversations about the process going forward. Guiding Principles, these are the three guiding principles that are forming our program prioritization effort. When I say no sacred cows what I'm saying is every program, administrative or academic, as identified on this campus will be part of this process. We're not holding any program harmless. On some campuses there's been arguments about athletics vs. academics. I can assure you that on this campus, Sean Frasier has been a wonderful participant in this process helping us identify the programs and being pleased to help make the case for their value to the campus. Another part of saying no sacred cows or no one gets a pass is that every program will have data used to inform the decision. There will be no program that gets to pull on the heart strings without also being accountable in data. We will honor employee contracts. Tenured faculty will remain tenured faculty. Operating Staff and SPS contracts will be honored. That doesn't mean that all employees will be doing exactly what they did before program prioritization after program prioritization. I think that as programs evolve, employee and roles will need to evolve and I think that's an opportunity for our employees to grow in advance and that's a good thing. We will also, as we always do if we eliminate an academic program or modify an academic program, guarantee that students will be taught out. This is something I know the Board is very familiar with because we had this conversation when we've deleted an emphasis or changed an educational doctorate to a PhD. I believe we eliminated Russian a couple of years ago at my time at NIU.

Paul Julion asked, is that usually the practice followed by the colleges usually when a program is deleted, to teach out the students?

Lisa Freeman answered, One hundred percent of the time.

Robert Boey responded when you say honor our employee contracts, does that imply that sometimes we don't honor them?

Lisa Freeman answered, in some program prioritization efforts on other campuses, there has been a guiding principle of a certain percentage reduction in force. That is not a guiding principle of our program prioritization effort.

Robert Marshall said, Lisa, I noted in some of the literature that it talked about cross training. Do we have any provisions to put that in place if it's needed?

Lisa Freeman answered, absolutely. In the program prioritization criteria for administrative programs, they will have an opportunity to talk about the cross training that already occurs in the unit and the cross training that might occur in their unit. At this point in time, I would be the first to say and I can say this because Human Resources reports to me, we need to have a more robust employee training function. I think many of you had heard me say that one of the things that made a big impression on me in the last couple of years is I visited State Farm. We had a presentation from Human Resources there and they have three percent attrition, three percent turnover and they are the largest employer in Bloomington Normal, larger than ISU. Bloomington Normal is not a large metropolis, just as DeKalb is not a large metropolis, and they have three percent attrition. I think in part because of their attitude and their slogan in HR is if you have a good attitude we will find a place in this organization for you. If you initially come in to a place that's a bad match, we'll work to make something a good match between your skills, aptitude, and knowledge on the job. If you have a bad attitude you can't work at State Farm. I think that our employees and I hear this from members of our Operating Staff Council and SPS Council are hungry to be trained, to be crossed trained. We have the best employees, they want to contribute to the university and they want to see a way to advance. A lot of them are really eager to build on their skill

sets and be repurposed and I think that this is an opportunity to move us more in that direction, move our culture more in that direction and should be seen in that light. So the answer is yes we do that now, we do it more at a unit level and we have a real opportunity and Vice President Phillips and I are going to work together on this to make sure that we have a good function for doing that going forward.

Paul Julion asked if that is student employees too.

Lisa Freeman answered, yes absolutely. In fact we were in Springfield yesterday talking about using student jobs as internships and the legislature and the Lieutenant Governor really were quite taken with that idea. Taking advantage of the students we employ on campus and incorporating learning outcomes into those experiences. That wouldn't happen if the supervisors of those employees, who are members of our staff and operating staff, weren't also excited about helping students learn workplace behaviors and skills. I think it's exactly what you're suggesting. One of the things that becomes very confusing as you start down the road of program prioritization is that program is not always aligned with our organizational structure. The definition of program is any activity or collection of activities that consumes resources, be it dollars, people, space, equipment, or time. A program is not a department. So we are not going to be reviewing departments. When we're talking about academic programs, the definition is typically anchored by a simple classification of instructional program. That's the type of numerical designation that we use to report our programs in terms of workforce, survey, data; in terms of IPG requests, it's universally understood across higher ed and workforce development. Academic programs primarily consume course, faculty or academic resources. They conduct teaching, learning, research, scholarship, creativity, artistry, outreach and service. They're distinguished by the fact that they're actually conducting these activities. The programs that are in the division of academic affairs and that we very typically when we're walking around, not with program prioritization, think of as academic are not academic programs in program prioritization. So the library is an administrative program, or programs within the library are administrative programs. But programs with the Vice Provost's office for the most part are administrative programs. Things like advising offices and things like that. Administrative programs are typically anchored by their human resources department ID and financial costs centers. They generally are pulled together as programs because they have discreet well planned activities and responsibilities. They primarily support directly or in an auxiliary or ancillary mission of the university including that of student success. So when we designate a program as administrative we're not saying they're outside of the university mission, but they're not conducting the teaching, learning, etc. They're supporting the teaching, learning and etc. This is not an easy thing to do. We have dispatched the data team to talk to all of the cabinet level divisions and academic affairs and college level data people to help define what our programs are. Sometimes it's quite obvious. Degree programs and research centers are clearly academic programs, they're anchored CIPCO, we all know what they are. There are some programs that straddle that border of academic and administrative and we're working out through negotiation and figuring out how they're going to appear, what they are. And in the administrative programs, Jeff Reynolds and the rest of the data team have been interviewing the Vice Presidents and coming and looking at the budget. Vice President has been part of this to help define what programs are. Jeff didn't we say what'd we have 160 something academic programs defined?

Jeff Reynolds responded, yes. Based on the list from the IBHE the starting point, we map up what we operationally do, so a list of perhaps 650 distinct type of majors or minors, boils down to about 160 or so well-defined discreet activity and academic program. On the administrative side, as many around the table know from conversations with me or my team, it's a little bit more difficult. What we do is try to basically, we might start with your org chart as a weak proxy for where things are and they bend and what discreet activities or functions or responsibilities are captured in certain functional areas and narrow it down relative to that definition and with the help of – in terms of data elements and HR Department IDs and budget codes will basically - more or less well defined areas in each division or area defined as an administrative program. Some other things that Lisa hinted on, you will have admin programs that, sorry you will have programs on the "academic side" that maybe look, smell, act like academic, but they might be defined as administrative and that's okay. It's a program prioritization definition. The reverse doesn't happen all the time but I've seen perhaps three or four of them actually on the administrative side. For instance, the libraries, the majority, I've talked to Patrick Dawson in the library, he is very



helpful. Without question university libraries overall administrative program, they actually do teach though. Those areas where those courses are, those would be defined as academic programs.

John Butler asked, why does it matter to distinguish whether they're academic or administrative? What are the consequences of that label?

Lisa Freeman answered, the criteria that are used to benchmark them would be different. Obviously to ask an administrative program to use a metric like student credit hours produced would be nonsensical. Sometimes campuses choose large bucket criteria that are similar and then have the questions under them differently. It will probably look like that. But also the task forces will be different. In keeping with the AAUP and shared governance principle, that faculty own the curricula, the academic programs task force will be comprised 100 percent of faculty. They'll be tenured faculty and our instructors. The administrative program task force will have some faculty representation, but it will be heavily staff. And so you want the people who understand actually what those programs do and understand the metrics. So I would say that I don't think most of our staff necessarily understand credit hour production or the value of student co-authored publications or external sponsored research metrics as well as the academic people do. I would say that I think the academic folks don't understand some of the business metrics related to customer relations and time to contract execution as well as our business people do. And so we want the people who really understand what's going on to be on the task force. Having one task force is not tenable because of the number of programs and so this has evolved as a best practice doing program prioritization on other campuses and we feel comfortable with it now. Right now we're doing academic and administrative programs on the same cycle. And I think you can get an appreciation for the fact that when I say we're building the ship as we're getting ready to set sail, there's a lot of things you have to do the first time you do this. Get the definitions and the groundwork done that may be tweaked going forward, but will never require this much effort again and we're at that point now. It's possible going forward that we may choose to do academic programs every three or four years and administrative programs in an odd, so we might not always do them in the same year after it's time just to manage the process a little more facile but we'll worry about four years from now when we get to four years from now.

John Butler said, so there are programs that seem to me to be clearly administrative, so the Alumni Association is an administrative program. The Art Museum is an administrative program.

Lisa Freeman said, actually that one is a little – but there's a museum studies educational activity embedded in there that might actually be broken out to be an academic program.

John Butler asked, what about Research Rookies?

Lisa Freeman responded, Research Rookies is an administrative program. But the faculty research program would be an academic program. So you can see that parsing this out is so that we don't have excessive redundancy, we're really prioritizing everything and not excessively double counting. It's a big effort. Our data team has been doing an unbelievable job. On the academic side, there was some work done and it's not just the data team or colleges and their data representatives are amazing, I mean because we participate in the educational advisory board and academic analytics and the Delaware cost study, so we have a culture of people wrestling with these questions. We don't always have consensus but we usually get to a point where we're relatively satisfied and we've been doing that for a couple of years so there are data integrity questions that are already answered. We haven't had as much accountability benchmarking, etc. on the business side and so we're very lucky to have a provost who has a background in this to help. In some of the business units, they're uber prepared. IT has a lot of normal things they track in terms of the time a change order ticket comes in to the time that they address it. They have a lot of metrics that they normal use. Other units not so much, but does that kind of help you?

John Butler said, yes that helps me a lot. Thank you very much.

Robert Marshal asked, from the definition of programs or areas where they lined up, I'm thinking of the general graduation part, are those going to be looked at also?

Lisa Freeman said, those are not a program because the general graduation requirements is not a collection of activities that in and of itself consumes resources. The courses that are offered consume resources, but just listing the graduation requirements doesn't meet this definition of a program. Does that make sense?

Robert Boey asked, Lisa, who makes the final call between academic and administrative? I'm getting lost in that?

Lisa Freeman answered, it's negotiated. There are many where it's absolutely clear. In the case of where we're a little bit blurry around the edges, we're having a discussion with the program about where would you feel more comfortable, what type of data are you most used to reporting and I think in the worst case scenario we may get one to go all the way to a task force and the task force say we're not really comfortable evaluating this and either we'll have both task forces look at it and take that data, or we'll move it. I think we have to be flexible, but I think that would be small. I don't want those programs to feel disadvantaged, so we will do everything possible to make sure they're treated equitably.

Jeff Reynolds said, I think Lisa characterizes the administrative programs just fine. With regards to my teams that are here, I will beg their forgiveness because I know I'm a week behind in actually getting a list, but that's an iterative conversation as well. One e-mail this week had very good questions with regards to those out of margin cases and those were actually on our radar as well to have a conversation with that college. With regards to administrative programs, it's very iterative. We're just about to get the second round of conversations with them. I anticipate three or four conversations with each division area. His team worked out, just like IT, a solid list of probable and actionable measures and metrics that are already there. For other divisions and areas, it's more difficult. We've never done this before so what we can proxy, what we can work with, we will.

Lisa Freeman continued, I just want to add that new programs are eligible for this process. We have academic departments and administrative departments that are proactively, as Dean Block indicated, restructuring or reconfiguring to be more competitive in this process and to be better consumers or resources and so we're going to have to catalog those as we go forward as well.

Marc Strauss said, Provost Freeman, you've done a good job of trying to expedite this but notwithstanding your effort, we're in some time constraints. If there is a way we can get the essence of what you're doing but see whether there are some slides that may not be completely essential because I know we want to get to a conclusion on this matter.

Lisa Freeman responded, I can flip relatively quickly through the next several. This is the starting point that was used in the survey for academic criteria. It was taken verbatim out of Bob Dickinson's book. These are the criteria that our campus has finalized after looking at the survey data for our academic programs and they will be continuing to work together to weight these. But as I said previously, and the good thing is we've covered a lot of this previously, the questions in the metrics that are imbedded under these will actually be determined by the task force in collaboration of the coordinating committee. But you can see quality of outcome both faculty and students, financial efficiency, program potential relative to the university mission, external and internal demands, and the products contribution to diversity are what we felt as a campus based on this wide feedback were the things that we wanted to consider when we looked at programs. This was the starting point for the administrative criteria. Again, it came exactly out of the Larry Goldstein/Bob Dickenson materials. That group has met once, is that correct, or not at all? They're meeting Monday so we have all the survey data back. We expect in this case, as in the case of the academic criteria, that what we finally have going forward won't look exactly like this. I think we've talked a lot about program data elements and expectations even at the beginning, so I don't think there's anything on here that we haven't already said. I guess the one point I would like to make because it's really one that keeps coming up over and over again, is that when we talk about data, we talk about data

we talk about both qualitative and quantitative data and we are not going to ignore program quality and we are certainly going to spend a lot of time on the narrative. I think we've talked about the task forces already. There are two things I actually want to say about the task forces. The first is that while we want broad representation to reflect perspectives and knowledge of the campus. What we're really looking for is the trustee mentality; people who will put the institution first and really look at the best programs and the future of NIU. Our initial plan was for this task force to be selected from among the nominees by senior leadership; presidents, provosts, vice-presidents for administration, finance, and the executive secretary of the University Council representing our shared governance. This is nice because it doesn't create any conflict of interest, but some people feel that there's not enough expertise there. We're exploring other structures right now because we want to be sensitive to emerging concerns and we'll get back to you. It sounds like it should be easy to create a larger body, but actually when you start thinking of not only sort of tactical and logistical concerns related to conflicts of interest, opportunities for pressure, how we will actually negotiate the time for these people with their units because we're going to have to do that, it's not as easy. What we've put on the table and is the current plan of discussion, is that a structure similar to the University Advisory Council might be used to help select the task forces and we're still not sure where we're going. Is that a fair assessment? That was really the point I really wanted to get to before we closed.

Marc Strauss responded, thank you for your work and your presentation. It was informative, but that doesn't preclude that there are members of the committee who might have other questions. If there are other questions, let's entertain them. If not, we have an action agenda item on this and I would entertain the motion.

Paul Julion responded, I know you mentioned Student Association would be heavily involved. Dillon Domke the speaker of the Student Association is involved.

Lisa Freeman said, there is a graduate student too but he was just added, it took a while to identify a graduate student representative. But that also came out of the SA.

Paul Julion asked, so would it be in two different task forces, one on academic, one on administrative? Will students be on both of those, just administrative or those programs that immediately just effect students?

Lisa Freeman responded, students will not be sitting on the task forces at all, and that's because of their vulnerability in terms of time and in terms of just power dynamics on the campus. Students will have a separate protected opportunity to reflect on the prioritization task force recommendations and students will be designing that opportunity along with us in an innovative way. With respect to all of the other pieces of the process, students are sitting on the task forces that are selecting the criteria. Students are nominating members for the task force. Students are members of the Resource, Space and Budget Committee and the Academic Planning Council who are choosing the criteria and are the two key shared governance bodies going forward. Kelly's departed, but Bill is here. Am I leaving anything out?

Doug Baker responded, the shared governance.

John Butler said he had two questions. The first is you mentioned earlier that the recommendations will be placed into one of five categories or quintiles. Can you help us understand what those are?

Lisa Freeman responded, the task forces will be actually naming their quintiles. We've been gathering as a coordinating team exemplars of what other campuses have done to name those quintiles. We don't know what our quintiles will be, but it's typical to see programs that are suggested to be diminished or revised; programs that are suggested for additional investment; programs that are essential programs with opportunities for efficiency.

Bill Pitney said, maintenance, keep it as is.

John Butler said, so presumably you might say this is a valuable program, but it's a structural mess so we give you six months to provide some sort of reform plan or something of that nature?

Lisa Freeman said, I think there'd be a suggestion that there are areas for improvement and there'd be a plan to address those with an appropriate time line and benchmarks. Trustee Strauss brought up an example of different modes of instruction offering different, I mean that's a type of recommendation that often comes out based on the experience of other campuses.

John Butler continued, okay, my second question concerns student organizations and the Student Association in general. It's a program, it's an administrative program, the Student Association, but it also has a programming budget that allocates funds to a number of student organizations and those organizations are organically tied and integrated to the academic programs as well. So you've got forensics which I know a lot about; you've got the black choir, you've got these groups that have various resources that are academic in nature but they don't have academic outcomes, they're not teaching classes. Part of their budget's funded by the student activity fee. How do those get sorted out?

Lisa Freeman asked, Jeff are you negotiating with the Student Association on these issues yet or has that meeting not occurred?

Jeff Reynolds answered, that meeting has not occurred. You have pointed out – it's a difficult map so we want to approach it very carefully.

John Butler said, because it's a product of a lot of careful and thoughtful entrepreneurial thinking that even began in many cases before the formation of the Student Association, but certainly throughout the last 45 – 46 years has been a way for departments and interdisciplinary groups to come together and create programs that have been very valuable to the institution, but now they've got to fit into this structure somehow. I'm confident that you're doing the kind of thinking that you need to do, I just wondered if there was thoughts on how that would be because that's where the student participation portion becomes really important. I think if I was a member of the Student Association, I would wonder how can I not be on the task force that's evaluating my activity and I wondered if when you're actually looking at a student organization if there isn't some modification to your task force structure. Because in that case they would willingly want to participate, they would willingly want to invest the time.

Lisa Freeman responded, the task force is not where you advocate or make the case. That happens in the submitted program narrative. The task force is there to be trustee mentality and so I think that students have to really trust the fact that the people sitting around the table appreciate the value of student activities to the overall mission of the university will be exercising that trustee mentality of prioritizing programs on their overall value. Be attentive to the case that is made by the students in the program narrative. So whether the program narrative is for forensic specifically, the Student Association, I think the mapping question is one that we need to pay attention to. The people who are impacted are going to have the opportunity to make their case. When the priorities come out of the two task forces, we will be going to a dedicated student panel who will then have the opportunity to say I challenge that. I think this aspect wasn't appreciated and that set of feedback will come back. I think that part of peer review is really trusting in the people who are appointed to the panel. And in the nomination form, I didn't show you that, we're asking for people who have been familiar with the institution for a long time. People who have demonstrated their ability to serve the institution at this level to carry the water. I think these are people who will have gone to the events put on by the Black Choir, been aware of the medals received by the forensics' team; understand the value and the importance of student voices on this campus. And so I'm confident that that will be okay. We're not letting somebody from German fight for German at the task force level. That happens at the program narrative level and at the task force level, it's a program that has data that said we contribute in terms of the students we teach, the prestige we bring to the university, etc. in that way and those are the types of comparisons that are being made.

Marc Strauss asked, can I get a motion on the table and we can have further discussion if it's appropriate. But the recommendation is that the Ad Hoc Committee on Enrollment endorse NIU's

program prioritization initiative and ask that the president forward a similar resolution by means of the President's Report to the Board of Trustees for approval at its next meeting.

Robert Marshall made a motion

Robert Boey seconded.

Marc Strauss asked if there was any discussion on the motion.

Robert Marshall asked if this is a final action on the initiative or will the board be required or need to approve the final finished product?

Marc Strauss responded, as I understand the recommendation, this would be a final action of this committee, but there would still be approval by the full board being sought. This has nothing then to do with the outcome of the process, only the support for the initiation and then the processing of the program prioritization process.

John Butler replied, we would be saying, when this goes to the full board, the full board would be saying we're confident this is a thoughtful process. It's well informed by research, it's best practices. We have faith in the various adjustments that have been made to deal with concerns. We endorse it. But that's all we'd be saying. At that point then we would come back into the process when we were brought into the shared governance portion of it say when a program was going to be deleted, we'd be back in the process again, but we're being asked to endorse this process, if I understand correctly.

Marc Strauss said, Correct.

Marc Strauss asked for any discussion. There was none, the motion was passed.

## **9. UNIVERSITY REPORTS**

Marc Strauss continued, I regret we're not going to get to the other schedule items we had talked about before. We're going to need at least one more session regarding the academic issues. Again given the hour rather than to try to negotiate now, maybe we can precede as we have in the past where there are some suggested dates circulated to the committee members after the administration figures out what works, and we'll pick another date. I'd like to do this sooner rather than later, but I am mindful that there is a number of other priorities as well, so with that guidance if we can proceed.

### **9.a. Policies and Practices that Affect Academic Program Additions/Deletions**

### **9.b. Policies and Practices that Affect Faculty Work, Productivity and Accountability**

## **CLOSED SESSION**

Marc Straus added, we will be going into closed session and would reconvene in no more than one hour. We do not plan to take up any business after the closed session. Can I have a motion to close the public meeting to conduct a closed session to discuss the following subjects authorized by the Illinois Open Meeting Act; personnel matters as generally described under sections 2(c)1, 2, 3, and 21 of the Open Meetings Act.

Robert Boey made a motion to go into closed session. John Butler seconded.

Marc Strauss called for a roll call to close the meeting.

Roll Call Vote was conducted by Linda Odom.

Trustee Robert Boey: HERE

Trustee Robert Marshall: HERE

Trustee Paul Julion: HERE

Board Chair John Butler: HERE  
Committee Chair Marc Strauss: HERE

Marc Strauss continued, The motion is approved. The meeting is now closed and will be reopened at the conclusion of the closed session for the purpose of adjournment. No public or business will be transacted upon our return to this room to formally adjourn our special meeting. Thank you.

Adjourned to go into closed session: 11:30

## **MEETING RECONVENED**

### **The meeting reconvened at 12:15pm**

Returned from the closed session.

Linda Odom performed roll call.

Trustee Robert Boey: HERE

Trustee Robert Marshall: HERE

Trustee Paul Julion: HERE

Board Chair John Butler: HERE

Committee Chair Marc Strauss: HERE

## **10. OTHER MATTERS**

None

## **11. NEXT MEETING DATE**

Actual date/time: TBD

## **12. ADJOURNMENT**

Marc Strauss asked for a motion to adjourn the special meeting.

John Butler made the motion.

Robert Boey seconded

Marc Strauss asked if there was any discussion, there was none.

Meeting adjourned at: 12:20

Respectfully submitted,  
Linda Odom

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.*