Minutes of the
NIU Board of Trustees
Of Northern Illinois University
Ad Hoc Committee on Enrollment
June 15, 2015

1. CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL

The NIU Ad Hoc Committee on Enrollment meeting was called to order at 11:02 a.m. by Chair Marc Strauss in the Board of Trustees Room 315 Altgeld Hall. Recording Secretary Linda Odom conducted a roll call of the Committee members. Members present were Trustees Robert Boey, Robert Marshall, John Butler, Paul Julion, and Committee Chair Marc Strauss.

Also present were President Douglas Baker, Provost Lisa Freeman, Board Liaison Mike Mann, General Counsel Jerry Blakemore, Alan Phillips, Eric Weldy, Anne Kaplan, Laurie Elish-Piper, Jeff Reynolds, Carolinda Douglass, Harlan Teller, Dani Rollins, UAC Representative Greg Long, with a quorum present, the meeting proceeded.

2. VERIFICATION OF QUORUM AND APPROPRIATE NOTICE OF PUBLIC MEETING

Mr. Blakemore indicated that proper notification of the meeting has been provided pursuant to the Illinois Open Meetings Act and a quorum was present.

3. MEETING AGENDA APPROVAL

Trustee Boey motioned to approve the agenda; Trustee Butler seconded. The motion was approved.

4. REVIEW AND APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF MARCH 27, 2015

Chair Strauss noted there were minutes to approve from March 27, 2015. Trustee Butler made the motion to approve and Trustee Julion seconded. The motion was approved.

5. CHAIR'S COMMENTS/ANNOUNCEMENTS

Chair Strauss recognized the representative from the University Advisory Council Greg Long and asked if he had any comments at this time. Dr. Long had no remarks to make on behalf of the UAC but appreciated the concerns regarding enrollment by the committee.

6. PUBLIC COMMENT

Chair Strauss indicated there was one individual, Mr. Dan Porter, who requested to speak to the Committee. He noted he had five minutes and should be seated at the table for recording purposes. Mr. Porter came to the microphone to address the committee.

Dan Porter: My name is Dan Porter and I'm a recent employee, (inaudible) high school teacher, I'm also graduate from Northern Illinois University and I'm just going to get to the point that the reason why I'm here today is on April 7th I was employed by one of the student organizations here on campus, a charity function, in the Holmes Student Center. For absolutely no reason at all, the guest services staff after escorting me into the building, and I just want to establish that I did this free of charge. After being escorted in to the building, the guest services staff threw me out or tried to throw me out. NIU police intervened at my behest and this was a student worker, a belligerent student worker, that tried to take me out and I have everybody's music on my computer and I'm not very good at things like this, but what I'm trying to say is that ladies and gentlemen we have a problem here on campus and that is that certain

staff members are treating the NIU student and the public like garbage. This needs to stop. This is not an isolated incident and I know from my Facebook postings and from conversations with student body; I have about 1300 Facebook friends and the vast majority of them are members and alumni of NIU and NIU student organizations. We have been (inaudible) students, students are transferring out of here. As a high school teacher I can tell you that by way of conversation I have had about 150 students just this past semester, and none of them have plans that involve NIU after they leave high school. I did my student teaching at George Westinghouse High School and I had the same conversation with the students there as well and there is an increasing animosity towards the way the students are treated by certain staff members here. There is a problem and this problem needs to be addressed. There are people working here, like for instance in March I believe it was the campus activities board ask me to help out with the battle of the DJs and wanted to use some of my equipment. Well this didn't even involve me, it didn't even have anything to do with me. Guest Services allows the students into the Carl Sandberg Auditorium and then after allowing students into the Carl Sandburg Auditorium, guest services, while there were about 150 people in there warming up, going over their routines for their skit or whatever for the show, guest services threw everybody out in the foyer area for 20 minutes because of a contractual issue. Apparently they didn't have the room contracted until 5:30 and they were allowed into the room for some reason I don't know, a little bit after 4:00 and then thrown out. This is just one example and what I'd like to do, I have some things saved that I think all of you should look at and consider because there really is a problem. Students don't have the fortitude and I know that I didn't when I was an undergraduate to get up here and stand in front of all of you and raise this issue because it's a very perilous thing to do what I'm doing here today. I mean this could really cost me my neck or this is something that (inaudible) need to be made aware of.

Chair Strauss asked if there were any questions for Mr. Porter. Trustee Boey asked if this situation was primarily the Holmes Student Center or campus-wide. Mr. Porter responded his specific issue was with the Holmes Student Center. Chair Strauss asked Vice President Weldy to touch base with Mr. Porter and follow up on these items.

7. UNIVERSITY REPORTS

7.a. Policies and Practices that Affect Academic Program Additions/Deletions

Chair Strauss indicated Provost Freeman will begin with the first agenda item concerning policies and practices that affect academic program additions and deletions.

Provost Freeman began where she left off from the previous meeting regarding program prioritization. She informed the committee she would review the program prioritization timeline and give an update on items accomplished since the last meeting in March. In addition, she will talk about a new reporting item that IBHE notified us about at the end of April because it involves low enrollment programs and is very well imposed to program prioritization, and to the charge of their ad hoc committee. The final item will be campus process for particular changes including academic program additions and deletions.

Provost Freeman continued, you may remember that you stared exploring program prioritization as the process for our campus in the Fall of 2014. Over the course of the Spring semester of 2015, we established guiding principles, developed criteria with broad campus participation, nominated people to select members of task forces that would ultimately be charged with prioritizing both academic and administrative programs, and selected those members of the task forces. Since I last spoke to you we have also finalized the criteria for evaluating administrative programs and their weights. Although there are only five criteria for administration programs and eight for the academic programs, I think you'll note that they're very aggressive, similar to one another it's just that they tend to be vetted slightly differently. I do want to point out that the academic list of criteria that we have adopted are NIU's criteria, they are not identical to any use on any other campus to those published by Dickenson or Larry Goldstein. These are the ones that folks from our campus, members of the Academic Planning Council of Resource, Space and Budget Committee and selective others were able to formulate. As I just said, our academic and administrative program prioritization task force has planned the academic task force made up of tenured

faculty and instructors, in fact there are 19 faculty members and three instructors. There is at least one member from each college and the majority, as you might expect, are from the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences. The administrative task force has 21 members; four faculty members, five members of our operating staff and twelve members of our supportive professional staff and those will be public soon. These task force members were nominated by NIU faculty, staff and students. They were nominated with the idea that these were people who could have a steward or a trustee mentality. They could put the institution above their individual programs. Selection was done by a nine person group that mirrored the composition of the committee that advises the trustees. It included me, Vice President Phillips, Bill Pitney who was then the secretary of the University Council, President of the Faculty Senate; faculty selected by the faculty senate, student representatives selected by the student body and members of the operating staff council and SPS council selected by those faculties. Coming up this fall, we will be giving programs relevant data and they will be analyzing and creating a narrative around the data.

Provost Freeman indicated the task force review, which is still listed in 2015, will actually be moved into the Spring 2016 to enable us to have all of the work that the task force is focused on in the spring semester. Vice President Phillips has assured me that if we get the data and the prioritization to you by the end of April we will still be able to perform FY17 budget processes. This summer has been a lot of work behind the scenes. The data support team is very busy building the data system, working with people to map data elements, load data, and reporting. They've been doing individual meetings with the programs. We've defined 250 academic programs and a little bit more than that in terms of administrative programs. We are starting to finalize the task force training plan and we have a website that will be updated regularly. This is our program prioritization website. You can get to it from the NIU home page link and you can type program prioritization into any of the search functions, on the left are the latest news and updates, and the task force membership.

Provost Freeman continued, people will receive sufficient data to accurately reflect, describe and measure the screen program activities. They will be focused on metrics for key performance indicators that are typical to a discipline or to an administrative function. There will be both quantitative and qualitative data and we'll use the data that are easily accessible to us including the institutional data and the program data which will be coming from a variety of sources. When you think of institutional data we think of institutional resource and the curators of data. Certainly that is the unit that's responsible for external reporting, but in fact we have relevant institutional data all over campus. In the office of academic analysis and reporting, registration and records, assessment services, sponsored projects, human resources, finance and administration. We have a lot of people on campus who are engaged in our efforts to populate the templates for program prioritization with relevant and accurate data. I wanted to recognize Dan House, Jeff Reynolds, Celeste Latham, Dara Little, Greg Barker, Chris Parker and Al Phillips; because we don't often recognize a lot of these people and yet they play a key role in helping this process move forward. When we talk about having data that are typical through the discipline, what we really want are data that can be used to show how our programs compare to other programs on campus and how our programs compare nationally in terms of quality. For academic programs there are a number of collaborations that we have and standard organizations that we refer to when we're looking to do the type of comparative data or comparative analysis. We mention the Illinois Board of Higher Ed but the truth is IBHE really takes data that we submit to the IBHE and then it reports it back out to us. Now a days they align that data with other sources like integrated post-secondary education data systems or IPEDS. They no longer do an independent cost analysis because their cost data wasn't really very useful to us. When Vice President Phillips was still at the IBHE, he asked provosts and institutional research directors "is a cost study worth continuing?" and most of us said no. We get our cost data analysis elsewhere, places like the National Study of Instructional Cost and Productivity which is otherwise known as the Delaware Study, and we look at quality indicators for research and doctoral programs through other mechanisms like academic analytics or the HERD survey, the Higher Education's Research and Development survey. Basically, the Delaware Cost Study is a very large study that has broad participation from across the US of institutions of higher education that are for example, researched, doctoral, comprehensive, baccalaureate, liberal arts, and creates a large database that looks at teaching department size, student credit hour costs, infrastructure costs, research productivity, average faculty productivity, things that you kind of want to know at your institution and how you are

doing. It means are we doing this to the best of our ability given the mission of the unit, the department, it's staffing. So when you're looking at things in program prioritization, such as is this program over resourced or is this program under resourced, what's the opportunity analysis? If we gave this program more resources, what would they be able to do? This type of benchmarking and this type of knowledge is very useful.

Provost Freeman continued, we also use academic analytics specifically to answer questions about research productivity and faculty work outside of the classroom; an evaluation of research centers. Because it allows on the disciplinary level, the doctoral program level, for us to compare ourselves to like programs; not just at like universities, but programs we consider peers and aspirational peers to see how we rank in terms of faculty productivity, scholarly output, and national reputation. It takes into account things like size of the faculty. In addition to allow you to do the comparison, it also allows you to look at the plusses and minuses of adding different types of faculty. So it's also a useful tool for succession planning within a department. It also allows you to see where your most effective collaborations are; and so it's a very useful tool for sort of research planning and research assessment and looking at some of the qualitative and quantitative aspects of having to work outside of the classroom.

Chair Strauss asked how current is that data? Provost Freeman responded we provide data to them on an on-going basis, but basically they have their data set self-populated from all of the national publication databases. Jeff Reynolds continued it goes back five years and we're actually keeping it up to date now based on data tables and working in conjunction with the college to make sure tenure tracking faculty are mapped specifically to the discipline of departments. Departments are easy, but the discipline specific benchmark is important in this case. The next update actually is happening in two to three weeks and so we'll have this updated for program prioritization with data for fiscal year 2014-2015.

Jeff Reynolds continued, the Delaware study is based on the fiscal year. It looks at budgets within the fiscal year, but benchmarks to a fall semester as the typical semester. Productivity of student credit hours, faculty need and instructional staffing, as well as the type of organized class section so we can get a really good look at what a department or even a discipline, because there's multiple disciplines within some of departments or academic units, what that unit or discipline can do in term of productivity; and then you compare that in terms of benchmarking with the other peers. Current Delaware study, from one of our colleagues at Delaware, University of Delaware, indicated this is the largest submission that we actually have ever. Our data were just validated and ready to access and use in July and ready to inform program prioritization.

Chair Strauss asked, the plan is you'll have '14 data for both costs and quality and that's the basis that you're going to make decisions upon? Provost Freeman responded, yes, most of it is a five year average, but '14 will be the most recent year included in the documents. I wanted to show an example, of the Delaware data and where qualitative knowledge and qualitative data really come in. One of the things that program prioritization team if finding is there's a lot of fear that small, high-quality programs will be disadvantaged in an unrecoverable fashion by this study. The small jewels that make NIU what NIU is will never survive program prioritization. And I would say that's not true. I wanted to give an example, not from NIU, to show how a small jewel would fair very well using Delaware Cost study data in a program prioritization process. This is actually the Art Conservation Department at the University of Delaware. In the left hand column where you see 8894 and 8943, you have the University of Delaware's data for full time equivalent students taught for full time equivalent faculty; the direct instructional costs versus student credit hour taught; and the direct and special costs for full time equivalent students taught. The far right column you have national data. So you can see that at the University of Delaware in their art conservation program, there are fewer students taught for full time equivalent faculty and the direct and special costs regardless of how you calculate them are significantly higher than the national average. So if all you looked at were these numbers, you might say that's a very expensive program. It could be a very inefficient program. But it could also be very dissimilar from some of the national benchmarks and in fact, this is a very excellent, very unique program at the University of Delaware. It's largely graduate students and it's the only PhD in art conservation in the US and, we know from a large Delaware database, that graduate instruction is more expensive than undergraduate instruction. This is not a

typical art conservation program. They do a lot of other advanced analysis that involves expensive equipment; they collaborate with chemical engineering and chemistry. Chemistry is, by its nature, a more expensive discipline than art, so we have that filtering into the University of Delaware's data because you can't really segregate that from this very special program. Also there's a program with an international reputation, successfully placed alumni, and substantial philanthropic support. When you look at these other data elements, some of them would be quantitative, because if we were at Delaware we would know how much philanthropic support the program attracted. This is the type information we expect in the narrative, no matter the size of the program.

Provost Freeman continued, the IBHE is responsible for approving program additions and deletions and that we send forward to them; and also for program review. This is codified to some extent in Illinois Public Act 97-610 which states that each state university shall report annually to the board on programs of impression and public service that have been terminated, dissolved, reduced or consolidated. So when we take a program deletion to the Board of Trustees, we report it to the IBHE. In 2011 with the implementation data 2012 there was another caveat placed in the act that each state university shall also report to the board a trend in low performance and enrollments, degree completions and high expenses per degree and this shall go into an annual report submitted by the IBHE to the General Assembly. There's no uniform definition of how to submit cost data to the IBHE. So what we were asked to do was provide three things: an update on programs eliminated over the past decade; a description of the process that NIU will use going forward to identify low performing programs - that would be program prioritization; and then, status reporting on the low performing programs as identified by the IBHE. These would include undergraduate, masters, and doctoral programs. Now, although the initial request was for programs defined by enrollment, graduation rate, and costs; subsequently we've kind of settled on enrollment and graduate rate because of the challenges associated with cost data. This is the format the report that we will submitting to the IBHE. This criteria is currently used at Southern Illinois University to identify low performing programs.

Provost Freeman added, for an undergraduate program, average enrollment over a four year period of less than 25 degrees conferred and less than 6 degrees is a flag for a low performing program. For a master's program, less than 10 average enrollment, less than 5 annual degrees conferred and for doctoral program, less than 5 enrollments and less than 1 degree conferred. NIU has very few programs that fall into this category. For example, the bachelors in Russian, we eliminated it a while ago and so it has very little average enrollment and degrees conferred because we've eliminated it. We are teaching out the students who are currently in the program.

Provost Freeman added, the second example shows robust enrollment but very few degrees conferred. The reason for that is not that this is a very hard program that knock out all of the students, although that would be a possible explanation for this pattern, it's actually a program that was instituted relatively recently, so most of the students who are enrolled have not yet had an opportunity to graduate. In terms of our doctorate and masters programs, again we have some that are slated for elimination because we have recognized, just as IBHE has, that these are not robust in enrollment numbers. There will also be programs undergoing review because of the formal program review and program prioritization.

Trustee Butler asked, so this matrix would seem to fall into that potential category that you talked about earlier that just looks at numbers and not the qualitative data that you had mentioned earlier. Is this what the IBHE is asking for only?

Provost Freeman responded, in the explanation column, we can write as much or little as we want. The IBHE has communicated to us that they expect to see program already deleted, programs slated for sunset, program remediation plan, and more justification for what they would consider low performance. I don't have a feel for NIUs submission yet, but I'm very encouraged by the fact that we have very few programs that fall into low performance based on those categories. The ones that we have, there is good justification. It's a new program, people haven't had a chance to graduate. I think we will try to be honest and thorough this when we negotiate with departments about why the numbers look like this. We

will listen to what they say and we will have program prioritization on the horizon to allow programs to make the strongest case. But I do fear that the way this is constructed in the current environment, there's an opportunity to be less nuanced than what should be looking at the data. I very much share that concern.

Carolinda Douglass added, the request for this came at the end of April and is due June 30th and we're still getting information about what they want from the IBHE, so this is definitely IBHE initiated process at this point. It does look like going forward we'll be able to use program prioritization in some aspects of that as how we're actually going to look at low performing programs in the future. For this year there really isn't any alternative except to use the data as they've indicated that we should.

Trustee Butler asked, have they set the red flag level?

Provost Freeman responded, yes, in fact, at one point the red flag level for active programs was suggested to be three. As you can imagine, there as a lot of push back from all the research universities as to whether or not that was appropriate and with that feedback, the IBHE reverted to one which is SIUs standard.

Trustee Boey asked under the annual average degrees conferred, how do you get a number like 0.4, 0.8?

Provost Freeman responded, we're looking at a four year rolling average, so some years there could be zero, some years they'll be whole numbers and so we do the division.

Provost Freeman continued, I'm going to conclude by addressing the specific request of this committee and the board that is very relevant to the other two processes that I talked about. Anything that is recommended by the prioritization task force in terms of program priority, programs sun setting or deletion; and anything that immerges from the IBHE task force as a low performing program that we might terminate or discontinue, would still have to go through a peer review process that's part of our shared governance system, as do most changes in catalog language and all programs, additions, deletions or major revisions.

Provost Freeman continued, our graduate curricular revision process is relatively straight forward. We have the department curriculum committee recommending the change; an addition or deletion goes to the college curriculum committee, to the sub-committee of graduate council; to graduate council and then to university council and is taking ten to fourteen weeks to get to university council.

Provost Freeman added, when you look at our undergraduate curricular process, we're looking at something that's much more convoluted. We have the same process going from department to college curriculum committee, but depending on what the type of change it is, we will go to the undergraduate, committee on undergraduate curriculum, it might go to academic standards, it might go to academic environment, it might go to undergraduate improvements, general education, and possibly a couple of these before it goes to an undergraduate coordinating council, that's the equivalent of the graduate council and then to university council. So when you look at straight forward changes, limited admission, general education curricular changes, we're talking about a process that is very variable depending on how many committees it has to go through and whether the committees send it back and forth for clarification or wordsmithing, and we're talking about sometimes more than 20 weeks before a program actually gets to university council by following our process. Then once it gets to university council, it still has to go to the board of trustees. In some cases majors have to go to the academic planning council as well.

Provost Freeman continued, This is a variable because by the times things are merged from our curricular process to go to the board, it could be two weeks before an ASAP meeting, a committee meeting or a board meeting, or it could be two days after we had the last ASAP committee meeting or board meeting and then you'd have basically another quarter; and if you hit it at the wrong time of the year, you could actually add another year and then it can take up to 12 months at the IBHE. There is room to streamline

the overall process for the undergraduate curricular changes at multiple levels and, in fact, our faculty senate and university council have been working towards this end. Last year the vice provost worked very hard with faculty senate president Pitney to create a series of proposals that would consolidate committees, streamline proposals, streamline the process for curricular change to allow things to be more flexible; to allow us to get programs that might be in demand added more quickly, changes that would benefit students done in a more nimble fashion, programs off the books to satisfy the IBHE more quickly, and we had a vote at the last University Council meeting of 38-6-1 but because this was a change to the bylaws, we needed two-thirds of the eligible people who sit on University Council which is 40 to pass the motion so the 38-6-1 motion failed. However, our new faculty senate president, Greg Long, is very committed to trying again. He's been asking graduate assistants and a secretary of the faculty senate to pull data about the size of the university, the number of faculty at the time the committees were structured in this fashion, and to look at why we need to think about having fewer committees to achieve the same end and how to really create a process that's more flexible and adaptive while still retaining committee diversity as the representation and the things we really care about in terms of shared governance. President, Greg Long, will speak to the board about that come the fall. There is also an opportunity for this committee to think about what might be done in terms of board governance to try to accommodate changes that might come forward in less than perfect synchrony with the board meeting schedule.

Chair Strauss noted, I think we would have welcomed any proposals that you have in order to get us to a point where required board level activity was being considered and maybe that's something that you'll be prepared to do the next time this committee gets ready. Can you give me some sense as to how our process compares to that at other institutions?

Provost Freeman responded, I would say that our undergraduate curricular process has more securities, and is more fragmented than at the other institutions where I've been.

Anne Birberick responded, Bill Pitney had one of his graduate assistants look at some of the other processes at other institutions, and we do have many more committees and subcommittees and that influenced what we put forward to the University Council which was to have a process that would be the department, the college, and then one committee at the university level that would consolidate many of the activities done by independent some committees and that was much more in line with processes at other institutions.

Chair Strauss added, well, I certainly want to be respectful of the shared governance structure and the role that the faculty has in making determinations in this area, so I hope you'll continue to have these discussions and hopefully there'll be enough common ground that we can have a system that both produces a good result and is as timely as we can make it. I feel confident that the board would be anxious to listen to whatever board level policies are required once those consultations have been completed.

Provost Freeman responded, thank you first for respecting the time honored role of faculty ownership of the curriculum and I do want to say that I believe that our faculty stand ready to re-examine this in the fall. I think you can see by a vote of 38-6-1 that the faculty are aware that our process is time consuming and not always beneficial to the university. I think the faculty will be very excited as all of us are to hear that the board will also consider it.

Chair Strauss continued, by my quick math you had 15 people that didn't show up to that meeting to vote and that's not a challenge that's unique to that body. All bodies wind up with the situation and one easy solution may be to change the requirement to a super majority of those present instead of those who have a vote. I think that there are a number of different ways that you can tackle some of these challenges but as long as there are discussion that are going on about this, at least my personal view is that it would be good to let those conversations continue and hopefully they will arrive at a good resolution.

Provost Freeman responded, I think your point was driven home to everyone in the room when the motion following the failure of curricular consolidation initially failed with a guest load of 39 because the incoming faculty senate president was in the restroom and it was only the quick thinking of student leader, Dillon Domke, who allowed the motion to be reconsidered using his exquisite knowledge of Rutgers Rules to jump in to allow what was most uncontroversial passage of the day to go forward. So I think people are very much in that frame of mind.

Chair Strauss asked for other questions from committee members. He continued, I regret that it took us two meetings to be able to conclude your presentation, but I think we've had a healthy discussion particularly of the program prioritization process at our last meeting and also I've found the information that we received today to be very beneficial as well. I think it will help us to understand some of the issues that are going to come to this committee and then to the full board.

President Baker added, just one brief comment, it's to thank Lisa and the team she's working with. This is not something the university has done before; it's something we really need to do. But because we haven't done it before and because we're in an uncertain fiscal environment, it makes people nervous. I really appreciate your work and your communication on it and also the board's support of this work, and without that it would be a much harder road to hoe, so thanks to both.

Provost Freeman responded, thanks to the board committee for the opportunity to present.

7.b. Update on Admissions

Chair Strauss continued, now we're going to move on to some admissions matters and Vice President Weldy.

Vice President Weldy responded, I'll give an intro here. I've asked Dani Rollins, Director of Admissions, to come in to share information, give an update on undergraduate admissions and where we are. She's been on board for about five months and so she's been doing a lot from the standpoint of doing some restructuring and strengthening in certain areas. Her presentation today will look at four areas that make up the Office of Admissions - recruitment, systems and processing, communications, and events, tours and customer service.

Chair Strauss added, Dani I've had the chance to talk with you before, but it may be that other members of the committee have not, so if you'd also like to take a minute and tell us something about yourself, I think that would be appropriate too.

Dani Rollins responded, I have been in higher education for about 15 years. The bulk of my experience has been the University of Arizona and then, after finishing my doctorate in higher education administration and leadership, I moved on to Reed College for about two years and then to Northern Illinois University five months ago.

Dani Rollins continued, what I'm going to focus on today is organizational development so that we can move forward with a good foundation. As Dr. Weldy mentioned, there are four key areas with the office of undergraduate admissions; recruitment; tours, events and customer service; communications; and systems and processing. These are really new areas of focus for the office.

Dani Rollins continued, we restructured the office of admissions and collapsed some roles and created some other roles. In recruitment, in the past, we had two associate director or recruiter or recruitment position. One was specifically for those admissions counselors that focused on transfer recruitment and one was specifically focused on freshmen recruitment. We collapsed those two roles into one senior associate director position to allow us the opportunity to do a lot more cross training and to make sure that anyone that walks through our office can be served well by any of the counselors on duty instead of being routed specifically to a transfer counselor or specifically to a freshmen counselor. Of course for travel purposes, we do have the stratifications still, we have those focus areas as well; but in terms of

our day-to-day operations, this made things a lot more streamlined. We have regular staff meetings which is a change. The office had not met as a group, ever. They had individual meetings as part of recruiters, as part of processing, but recruitment and processing for example had never met, the call center had never met with recruiters, and so the cross training is something that we're really working hard on. We also hired several new admission counselors. A couple of those are fluent in Spanish. We're looking to grow that population, but we also want to do a lot in terms of cross training and in terms of cultural sensitivity training as well.

Dani Rollins added, we've also improved the on-boarding for our new staff. Again, in the past when an admissions counselor was hired they would receive a copy of the undergraduate catalog and a copy of the two page document describing the outline of admissions in general. That was the only training that they received. Now they get over two weeks of on-board training. Travel to different high schools and community colleges was solely focused on how many applications we received from that institution in the past. That's a good place to start, but of course we have some areas that we want to grow as well so that requires more visits to those areas. We are reimagining how we travel for both high school and community college and community based organization activities as well.

Dani Rollins continued, in our CRM, constituent relationship management system, we push out all of our e-mails, text messaging, letters and all kinds of things. Historically those territories while they existed on paper and operationally in terms of travel, they did not exist within the CRM and that limited reliability to reach out to students in a stratified way or in a way that makes sense for each counselor. Now those are created and maintained in connect. We're also revamping our on-line counselor profiles and that helps. If you've ever seen Colorado State's, they have some really fun profiles. If you look at NIUs right now we have a head shot and some general information about each of the counselors, which again is a good place to start but it's kind of static and it's much institutionalized. We want to be more friendly and accessible to our potential students and parents that are looking at our website. Colorado State is the model that we're using. For professional development, all of our full time counselors participated in the Illinois Association for College Admission Counseling Conference. That's really important for enrollment management, it is important to engage with our colleagues, to learn best practices, but also so that people know that NIU is still here and still engaging with our peers and still a player in the recruitment background. This year all of our full-time counselors attended that conference. All of our new hires will also attend a summer institute which is essentially like a recruiter boot camp. They go to the host institution, stay in a dorm, meet their peers, and every single day they're trained on the profession of higher education admissions. These are the four main systems in use by our system and processing department: CRM, on-line application for admission, on-base which is our imaging and document processing system which we process all of our transcripts and any written documentation or paper applications, and PeopleSoft which at NIU is known as My NIU.

Dani Rollins continued, all of the work that we've been doing in house CRM's connected really could be its own presentation. There are over 12,000 filters currently in the system. I implemented this system at the University of Arizona and we had about half that number of filters. NIU has been a user for a much longer time, and part of this is because we were not using the system to its fullest capability and we were doing a lot of duplicative efforts. So now some of these optimizations that we've incorporated, will cut down on that and just make the system a little cleaner and much more user friendly. We've also cataloged the most useful filters in one place so out of the that 12,000 filters, we probably really use a third of them over and over again, and some of them just existed for quick numbers and need to be deleted. Again, this CRM was really meant to be a territory management system and so our counselors need to be in the system using it. Historically we did not have good phone reports from on-campus systems or from the CRM system, solely through the Office of Admissions. Now all contacts that are coming through the system will flow throw a mock enrollment management file. Now we actually have the capability, depending on an action that a student has taken, i.e. filled out an inquiry card or come for a high school visit, and now will be assigned at the appropriate stage with a name on that file. One of the things that we're working on right now is that last bullet point, currently we confirmed in our CRM, but of course we want to know the full life cycle of the student and so we want to know when they actually enrolled. The student can confirm for one term and then not actually enroll. We want to know when they

actually enroll so we can see how long they sat in each stage and make some projections off of that. Historically that capability, while it existed in the system, was not employed. We're going to be passing information via interface with PeopleSoft and that's upcoming in the next few months.

Dani Rollins continued, so when a student comes into the system, if they are from Sycamore High School, the system automatically looks at their high school and home zip code and assigns them to the correct territory and the correct recruiter. It will be much easier for recruiters to send e-mails, for example, they might to e-mail everyone in specific territory about an upcoming event. That would be a one-line filter whereas historically it could have been about six or seven different filters. We've also built more innovation with organizational codes into the system. In addition to high schools and community colleges we have codes for GED and home schooled students. It makes it much easier for us to reach out to certain students. We also rebuilt several of our on-line interest pages.

Dani Rollins added, the admissions website required you hit click for more info to a parent page, an undergraduate page, a freshmen and transfer page. They were almost the equal length of our on-line application, so students were really getting to that page and having to request for more information. We shortened that and we also updated the branding so that everything was uniform. We had been requested as a speaker to the Hoffman's University Conference. I and my associate director, Crystal Garvey, have been asked to come and speak about all this work that we've done, and will be going to San Antonio to represent NIU and to discuss the changes we made.

Dani Rollins continued, now onto the on-line application. We've made several changes to the on-line application for fall '16, spring '17 this year. We have added a question about the primary language spoken at home so that we can get a better feel for our students who are coming in. We also added a direct link to the page for undocumented students. Again, it did not exist previously. We thought that was important for our population. We also updated the residency question with regard to the new tuition differential structure, and added the dynamic interfaces for those students as well. We also have acknowledgement set up, by submitting this application I acknowledge I'll be receiving e-mail from NIU. In addition, a complete visual refresh trying to make things look a little bit nicer and a little more accessible and friendly. Many applications fields, instead of being really hard edge fields, will be rounded so that you can see on Twitter and other social media. It's just a bit more user friendly and more familiar to the user as well.

Dani Rollins continued, our next focus is on-base in PeopleSoft. On-base is our system of a direct report in our document process and PeopleSoft is our record for all students, even current students. We're really trying to increase efficiency within our office and have people trained really well. Inquiry cards is something that we do every day and that we all kind of take for granted, but it's a huge part of what we do and this was a manual process. So if you ever see your admissions staff at their tables at their college fairs and see these little cards, we bring inquiry cards with us everywhere so that we can obtain student information. That entire process, thousands and thousands of cards, were a manual process. So I would bring my stack of cards back to the office to be scanned, after that we waited a week, pulled a report, implemented a report, assigned filters, which was hugely complicated for something that we use every single day and is an important of our admissions work. Now that scanning and importing will be automated soon. We also have an Outlook interface to on-base which means if I'm an admissions counselor and I can go and download a transcript from a high school or if a high school sends me a letter of recommendation, I will be able to index that to a student's file directly from Outlook, directly from my e-mail inbox. Again, instead of printing it, scanning it, and sending it, we have the college reviewer part in place this fall. There are some admissions decisions that are made outside the office of admissions with the various colleges, we can track it and to send e-mails to the college as reminders to give us updates.   We could actually have a good look and keep track of how many each college has and where students are in the process. Again, historically the infrastructure existed, but it wasn't put in place so that's something we can do now.

Dani Rollins added, the last thing we have is the query viewer app and it has something for all of our admissions staff. We're going to train each of our counselors to be true territory managers and to be able

to pull their own reports and gage where they are in terms of recruitment. We really felt like customer service was a focus that we wanted to be able to put at the prime of everyone's minds when thinking of recruitment and retention. So we created this position to incorporate that phrase, customer service, and Ted Campbell has done a wonderful job of updating our tours, and we have a tour presentation that will be launching in July. We have an on-line sign in for appointments and offer beverages to our guests as a small pleasantry to makes people feel welcome. The sign-in online in is done by iPads at our front desk, and using our CRM system, give the admissions counselor and the student an opportunity to update any contact information that might be out of date and will also send a trigger to our CRM to make sure that that student has a welcome message and a thank you for coming to the office. We have hired more students as Northern Ambassadors as tour guides and they also help us with administrative support in the office as well.

Dani Rollins continued, we have been cross training our counselors in event management for both on-campus events and regional events. We really felt that was important because we would like to do more for high school and community college representatives, maybe that means even hosting a small event at the community college or at the high school or inviting everyone to Starbuck and coordinating all of the details. We have call centers to include outbound callers, who also include students, and on average they can get out about 400 calls per evening. So they're a pretty productive group. We follow up daily checking the voicemails from overnight and then send them down to the admissions counselor on duty, and that counselor follows up with the callers that same day. Communications and marketing, this is the area that we're currently down most in. We are down a CRM analyst and an associate director of marketing and communication so we're partnering a lot with the Division of Marking and Communications group to centralize and also assist us with our social media, our web presence and our print publications as well. We're also updating the website in general, not just our admission counselor profiles. Again, just to be more friendly and more accessible for the students and the families who are visiting our page and we're set to go live on July 1st. Again, I just want to share a slide that sort of show our guiding principles. We really thought some of these things were fundamental things that were missing. The supportive training, general communication, access information, and service. Every student should be greeted like they are important, because they are. We follow up quickly and have accurate information. These are our guiding principles.

Dani Rollins continued, our next steps, include hiring five processors in our systems and processing department as we are down by 12 processors from historic level. The next step is to hire a CRM analyst so that we can optimize all of those changes that we made in the CRM system and to have someone oversee all of those different communication things that we'd like to build. We also want to develop some reports in dashboards in the CRM because the CRM and PeopleSoft actually speak to each other via an overnight interface and so to optimize all of that work that's been done behind the scenes, we would like to build dashboards for our counselors so they can actually see up to the minute where they are in their territories.

Dani Rollins continued, we're also going to have an all staff training July 22nd and 23rd. We're going to be doing this twice a year; once in the summer and once around Christmas to sort of bookend the recruitment cycle. We're striving to model those practices in terms of recruitment as well. We have a pilot going with the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences that's is based on the National Association for College Admission Counseling statement of principles of good practice. It talks about what a recruitment event is and what we mean when we say freshman transfer. For example, a recruitment event might be for the Office of Admissions with 200 juniors and seniors in high school coming on campus. However, if there are 200 sixth graders, that's not really a recruitment event for us but we might send a person over to discuss college culture. We want to be sure that we have an institutional wide definition that makes sense to everyone. We've also put forward approval to get our CRM tune up and training on an annual basis. Hoffman's offers a service whereby you can purchase buckets of hours and we have, if we do this on an annual basis then we can either use them for consulting to get through times where perhaps we're a bit leaner on personnel, but if we don't use all those hours for consulting then we can convert them to training. We could actually have a room of 100 people and they would do a webinar and they would train us on that. Another thing that we're talking in the office is trying to incorporate earlier student

engagement just to through our regular operations with possibly a student led call center in addition to the full time staff in our call center now. As people retire or move into other areas, we are refilling those positions with graduate assistants or with student assistants, so when students or parent calls in, they're talking to a current student instead of to an admissions representative. Historically we have had what we would call elephant communications where we just sent out these huge blasts, maybe 100,000-200,000 people and just blast everything. Now we want to shift our focus to communicate with smaller populations more often in a way that's more relevant and timely.

Dani Rollins finished her presentation with the next steps in terms of relations, moving towards those community colleges and high schools as partners. I am on a national board and in regular contact with ACT and familiar with things that they're doing relative to the redesigned SAT, relative to the ACT, and rebuilding their websites, as well and all of our MAC schools.

Trustee Boey commented on the great start being made in a new direction to get new students.

Trustee Marshall asked will the new hires will be based here every day as a starting point or are they going to be located regionally around the state?

Dani Rollins responded, we currently have three regional counselors in Chicago, but the new hires that I mentioned here are behind the scenes people. The processors are people that are here based in DeKalb in our systems and processing division who are processing the applications and matching up student credentials with the applications. In addition, the CRM analyst position and the associate director of strategic communications are also DeKalb based positions.

Trustee Marshall continued, my second thought is on the collaboration. I know of the collaboration with marketing, but are the recruiting activities of various colleges and programs going to be collaborated so we're not bumping heads on recruiting efforts?

Dani Rollins responded, we have some decentralization issues so what I'm trying to do is lay a good foundation in office of admissions and then rebuild that trust across campus to work towards that.

Trustee Marshall asked for information regarding recruitment and if there is a target GED set?

Dani Rollins responded, anytime we have any community based organization that reaches out to us, we will go and present to them. We may have high, medium and tertiary priorities and so maybe the high priority institutions we go to once or twice a month and really try to flush that out. But to add to your suggestion that we add those as well, that's something that we can do.

Trustee Butler asked, can you help the committee understand the role of colleges in the admissions process? In general, I mean assume we know nothing. Why are colleges involved? What do they do specifically and is that always the case?

Dani Rollins responded, it is generally the case that colleges and departments are involved in recruitment in tandem with the Office of Admissions. Again, I think historically at NIU that structure just didn't exist, there has been some decentralization that we're seeing as a byproduct of that. People were doing their own things with good intentions, but I think it is confusing.

Trustee Butler continued, you're talking about what colleges do to recruit students, I'm talking about what is the actual role of the college in determining whether someone's admitted?

Dani Rollins replied, so in the college review process if the student isn't automatically admitted based on their ACT, then there is follow up and the student records, that go out to the individual colleges for review. We in admissions are generalists but we really want to bring in the specialists in the program from application forward to help us deal with those students. Some colleges are recruiting and having great success. I'm really trying to focus on rebuilding that trust between others and the office of

admissions.

Vice President Weldy added, we have strengthening our relationship with the colleges is in regards to the enrollment operations committee. At no time were there any representatives from the colleges on that committee and so I am asking the deans if they could send a representative to serve along with members from admissions, scholarship, financial aid, housing and dining and other areas across campus to gives everyone an opportunity to find out what are we doing now from a standpoint of recruitment but also retention as well. It gives us an opportunity to understand what's going across campus and so how we can more together and more collaborative.

Dani Rollins added, we are starting some of that with a pilot with LA&S to decide when we should be involved, and working with everyone to show that we can work together and, also, getting it down in a tangible way that we can help to train our people and their people.

Vice President Weldy added, we're learning from the colleges as well because there's certain things that they do and do well from the standpoint of recruitment. We don't want to think that we know it all and we can't learn from each other.

Trustee Butler asked a second question as it relates to territory. Can you help me understand the methodological or disciplinary rationale for thinking in terms of territory and dividing up prospects in relation to territory?

Dani Rollins responded, it is so we can accurately assign a recruiter to presence because, of course, we can't be everywhere so we have to be able to assign a manageable territory to assist a specific person. We can then have them at college fairs and community college nights in that area. So it's a way for us to stratify how we do business and send people out into the field. Now that doesn't mean that if someone comes in and is not in my territory I wouldn't speak to them, it just a way for us to divide up our travel and then to breakdown what we're trying to do into smaller segments so that we can report on it as well.

Trustee Marshall asked for clarification with the depleted ranks of staff members, how close we're getting to filling that Fin.

Dani Rollins responded we're approved for five positions in admissions processing and that position is posted, it's out there now and we're just waiting for that position to close so that we can start interviewing people. For the CRM analyst, which is the next highest priority after the processors, we have a justification written and we have the job description written and so we just need to submit it for approval.

Chair Strauss commented, thank you for your presentation. We've heard a lot about challenges with regard to the nuts and bolts of the recruiting effort and so it's helpful for us to have this background. I'm afraid that in the day to day operation of this area there is not much that the board is going to be able to offer but I'm glad that you're sorting through these issues. I think the next challenge for us, like the one that I communicated to Provost Freeman, was are there board level policies that may relate either to financial aid, tuition, or other issues that we ought to put on our agenda for consideration, and so I'd like to see whether for our next meeting we can start to refine the issues that will be actionable by the committee. I believe that we've really gone a long way toward being able to increase the understanding of all the board members in relation to the various issues that impact admissions. Now I'd like to get down to our real work product if that's possible.

OTHER MATTERS

Chair Strauss commented he would like to request that we continue with our work as quickly as we can so if on the administrative side everybody could consult and see when it might be convenient given enough time to be able to come up with some proposed action items for us to get together again.

President Baker asked, that's on program prioritization or the development of approval processes for curriculum?

Chair Strauss responded, it would be the full gamut of the items that this committee has been considering. I don't know how many will come out of each area depending on how fully formed the proposals are when they come to us. We may or may not be able to finish all of the proposals in one meeting, because I'm not certain yet how many will manifest themselves. But I would like to advance the process at this point. I believe, unless my colleagues disagree, that we've had enough background information at this point and we ought to see whether we can get to some proposed action.

Trustee Boey asked for a follow up on the enrollment process, how we are improving on that.

Chair Strauss responded, he would be happy to have another report on it. In fact the full board may even want that report and they may want it periodically. Since this is ad hoc committee we want to get to items that require board level alterations in order to be able to support the goal.

NEXT MEETING DATE

The next meeting will be determined at a later date.

ADJOURNMENT

Chair Strauss asked for a motion to close the meeting. Trustee Butler made a motion and Trustee Julion seconded. The motion was approved. Meeting adjourned at: 12:33 p.m.

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.