

ACADEMIC PLANNING COUNCIL

Minutes of April 25, 2016

3 p.m., Altgeld 315

Present: Abdel-Motaleb, Coller, Douglass, Falkoff, Gordon, Howell, Hunt, Isabel, Jaffee, Molnar, Olson, Reynolds, Shortridge, Subramony and Winkler

Guests: None

The meeting was called to order at 3:05 p.m

Announcements: Program Prioritization Task Force Reports are being released Monday, May 2, 2016.

It was moved by Howell and seconded by Abdel-Motaleb to approve the minutes of March 21, 2016, and the motion passed unanimously.

Falkoff: Next item, our follow-up reports.

Douglass: There were several follow-up reports that were included in the materials for this week. Numbers one through five were all put on the consent agenda and I can tell you what those were:

M.S.Ed. in Curriculum and Instruction reported on program recruitment efforts and enrollments

M.S.Ed. in Special Education., also on recruitment efforts and enrollments

M.S.Ed. in Early Childhood Education was also on recruitment efforts and Enrollments

M.S.Ed. in Literacy Education, also recruitment efforts and enrollments

Math 430 was for the B.S. in Mathematical Sciences and we asked for a report on the change in pass rates.

The reason that I have suggested these may be on the consent agenda is they have all given reports and shown improvements in the areas that they were asked to report on.

Falkoff: Is everyone okay with it on the consent agenda?

It was passed unanimously to accept all items on the consent agenda.

It was moved and passed unanimously to approve the items listed on the consent agenda.

Douglass: The second set of reports we had expected were from the B.S.Ed. in Elementary Education and M.S.Ed. in Elementary Education. The B.S.Ed. in Elementary Education was asked for recruitment efforts and enrollments. M.S.Ed. in Elementary Education was asked for teach out plans. Actually both of them are in the process of being deleted from the catalog so it is no longer an issue for either of them. You might remember they came to us awhile back. Jenny Parker came to us about changing to conform with ISBE's requirements. It is not that they don't exist, they won't exist in this format. Therefore, we wouldn't expect a report from them. I don't know what you want

to say in terms of what we do about that? But obviously they are not going to give us a report if they don't exist.

Falkoff: These are reports we have not received?

Douglass: We did not receive them but the reason we did not receive them is because the programs no longer exist.

Falkoff: And we are not going to need it for the revised programs?

Douglass: We may need it for the revised programs, but I think we have to ask the revised programs for that.

Falkoff: Should we have some kind of...bring some finality to this in a way?

Douglass: I think we should.

A motion was proposed to rescind the APC request for a follow-up report from:

B.S.Ed. in Elementary Education

M.S.Ed. in Elementary Education

Molnar moved to pass the motion, Abdel-Motaleb seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously. The request for the reports was rescinded.

A motion was made to table the discussion for:

M.S.Ed. in Educational Research and Evaluation

Master of Public Administration

M.A. in Political Science

B.A./B.S. in Journalism and B.A./B.S. and M.A. in Communication Studies

This was done in consideration of Chris Parker being unavailable to provide needed additional information due to absence.

It was moved by Abdel-Motaleb and seconded by Collier. The motion passed unanimously.

Discussion of Program Review Dashboard.

Reynolds: This is a follow-up on the dashboard for Program Review. Carolinda and I have gone to many designee groups. The Provost and the CFO got their check on it. Recently, which I guess is a month ago now, we went to the Council of Deans. There was some good discussion there. They actually got a look at the dashboard just recently and this follows with metrics that we have agreed upon, at least in terms of a first date, to go ahead and assist with not only this body but also just to provide support for the program review overall. What I'm bringing up is a new portion to Office365 (O365) called Power BI. BI is basically business intelligence and this is something that was bought in the license for O365, so it is included in the online Microsoft suite. We do not have it available right now for the entire campus. What is it basically? It is a feature that allows for a pretty flexible methodology where you can visually process data in, for example, spreadsheets, as long as they're clean. There is a lot of scrubbing and cleansing of most data, and most of you know, and of course we always want to make sure the data are correct and quality integrated. Once you have the

spreadsheets and they are solid and ready to go, they're vetted, you can go ahead and basically upload these to a variety of different visuals. This doesn't necessarily help us with statistical analysis or forecasting or anything like that. It does help us with analytics. It helps with this body, APC, in terms of quickly taking a look at hey, what's happening here? Are the trends of enrollments going down here, if the enrollment is important? Is it headcount enrollment or is it FTE enrollment? What's the student to faculty ratio? What's cost per credit hour? I'm going to go ahead and show you very briefly some of these. Feel free to go ahead and ask questions if you see anything right away. I won't get into the details but behind these visuals are quite a bit of data, just for this one visual alone. What I am showing you is Biology. I asked Chris McCord if we could go ahead and use the department of Biological Sciences, because they're coming up for program review this upcoming fall. Also, they have a Bachelors, Masters, and Ph.D. That is useful in terms of having a department that really pushes the impetus of what we are trying to do. There is a lot of data behind it. Those data sets are made into reports. I'm not going to go into this nitty gritty stuff but ultimately these reports get pushed into a dashboard. What this dashboard basically is, is an agreed upon set of measures and metrics. These are the admitted to applied and enrolled to admitted ratios for new freshmen and new transfer students.

Gordon: Can I ask just one question? To me, I'm kind of used to working with dashboards. They're supposed to represent things I have control over or impact over. Now if I look at this, let's say I'm the Biology Department. I don't really have much control over what the admissions office does. I have some control over maybe admitted to enrolled for some actions if I call them, send them things, but even there it's more of a macro, it's more of a Northern picture there. I guess my question is, I can see it as a marketing because I'm more upper level. What happens when they get here?

Reynolds: Why should it be up there? No, 100% agree and so did the deans. So, why do we still have it up there? What we will look at for admission data is what's coming through the door in terms of demand and admission criteria that we had, but we won't have a KPI for it. Will we be held to a certain standard? Are you below a target? It's irrelevant for these admissions measures and metrics. I agree with you 100% on this. In economics, you might not discover economics in high school. You discover it when you're a sophomore or a junior in college, when you are already here. We want to see the trends as far as who is coming through the door, who would ultimately have the likelihood of, or some probability of, becoming an enrolled student in that plan or in that major.

Gordon: Well, I understand if there is a whole outward trend that everybody wants to major in business. That could close down my department but I still don't have control over it.

Douglass: Well I think from the last time Jeff came in and talked about the metrics and there was a conversation with Alan and Lisa. Since then a few have been solidified that we can actually roll out in fall. A couple of them including the one he is looking at right now is background which we really set the context but they aren't the ones that obviously people could be helping out on more, but others are.

Reynolds: Mind you, all of this that we are looking at today is a draft, a mock up. Visuals are important, and you want to make sure people are comfortable with it and make sure they can use it easily. You can go ahead and watch the cursor here. You can hover over different areas. What it's saying in fall 2013, my new freshmen applied ratios 63%, new freshmen enrolled and new freshman admitted 32%. We can see how that changes across different periods. That is one of the nice

features, it pulls out the data immediately. While this platform is not as powerful as something that I'm using in my area, the key with this is that we can go ahead and set the security and the access straight to deans, associate deans, chairs and directors. Additionally, therefore, all of you, as APC members can go ahead and have 140+ degree programs available to you. Now that sounds like a lot, and of course it is. The scale of operations of putting all this data online is challenging in and of itself. But hopefully we get to the point where once we get above and beyond that initial threshold of work, and then we just update it every now and then. Also, we can add whatever metrics or measures we want to go ahead and take a look at as well.

Douglass: I want to make sure we are visiting the same context, same page here. Remember we said that this coming year '16-'17 programs are going to give us program prioritization narratives, accreditation reports and answers to just a few additional questions. At the same time, we are building this dashboard. We are building this dashboard for future program reviews and going forward you all will be looking at things that are happening on the dashboard as well. Everybody is clear on that?

Falkoff: What you are showing us Jeff is the capabilities of this? The KPI's we can actually get up there?

Reynolds: There are no KPI's yet on this. There is data in visual form. A KPI is a target, so there are no targets just yet.

Douglass: With the data elements that would eventually create the KPI's?

Reynolds: Correct. We have the ratio trends, these are actual accounts in terms of admissions: applied, admitted, enrolled across the fall 2010-2014 period. We would have trends. Probably across a five year period. Where that would expand is, and I remember Jim Schmidt's question, perhaps I'm a historian and I am going to write a book. The expectation of a historian is one book about every five to six years. Of course we would expand the capture of book authorship activities if that's the data point. We could capture eight to ten years so we would get a good grasp on top of it. But pretty much five years for a lot of this is fine. And following from what Geoff said, this too would not have a KPI. Here now we are going to go to something that perhaps would have a target indicated, credit hours produced by derived course level. This is per fiscal year and as we hover over it you can go ahead and see the various levels. This is 300-level that I'm showing you right now for Biology. Here under 100-level would be the Biology 103 type courses. You get an idea about the ebb and flow of what's going on with this visual. Are they...not necessarily are they having local minimums or local maximums, it's not complex like that. It's more just what are the trends recently within the last near term time periods? We can break down credit hours, of course a whole slew of different ways. But what we agreed upon was with the Council of Deans was by derived course level and at least here I have it in fiscal year. We could do fall, spring, summer. Summer gets interesting just because of different programs and because summer is just interesting, as it is unlike fall and spring. We are using standards of these data as that what we did in Program Prioritization as well.

Falkoff: This tells you something immediately.

Reynolds: Well not only this, but what you can do...I just clicked on that, and this data, behind this data is the report. Behind that report you can download the spreadsheet. You would have the data if

you wanted it. You could have the little nice table, right? It's useful to have. It's useful to have data in tabular format for certain venues. With some quick visuals you get the gist of what's going on, relative to the underlying unit of analysis, you make a decision or you have some conversation, and you move on. When you're looking at 140+ degree programs you want to do that fairly efficiently. You also want to go ahead and have it efficient in the sense that perhaps the dashboard actually tells you "hey, red light, you need to look at this," "green light, don't even bother with this." Continuing, here is enrollment. What I use for enrollment in this example at the very top: enrollment Bachelors of Science: females, males, and then the total. The steady state is fairly well defined, right? Right around 600. Biology has had that trend for quite a long time. Enrollment for the Masters of Science and Biological Sciences, they had a trend down. Then Ph.D., doctorates of course you're talking about smaller numbers, but even here it's fairly significant amount on sum. Its representative of what most other doctoral programs and natural and physical sciences experience. These are head count enrollment. We are going to use two different types of enrollment: head count and FTE enrollment. The FTE enrollment of course takes into account credit hours. Any questions so far? Degrees, was an outcome measure that we are very much interested in. We also have two measures here: degrees per 100 FTE student and degrees conferred by ethnicity and sex. What I have here is degrees conferred by sex, another slice would be right below it, which we will take a look at as...in fact we can take a look at it right now, by ethnicity. You can see immediately it gets difficult to actually show, for the people in the back you can't even read this. When you're at your screen at your desk or on your mobile phone for that matter, white, two or more races, non-resident alien, unspecified Hispanic, Black, Non-Hispanic, Asian, Pacific Islander, American Indian, and Alaskan Native, it is all there. And, you can see the trends they are in. I look at comparison reporting, you know visual primers online on how to report this type of information. You get to the point where you just settle on something, but I would be interested in what this group wants in terms of visuals. One visual I thought was useful is here, so this is over a four year period. What I thought was interesting would be a five year average of ethnicity, right? Because then you can go ahead and basically get an approximation over time, in one visual. Other information we have is the alumni data. We had a lot of alumni data that I could have populated, I only populated two different types and you can see probably already why I only populated two tables. This is the "How positive are you in terms of your degree" question. Are you satisfied with NIU? Are you satisfied with your completion time? The same thing for the program itself. So this is for Biology, Bachelors, Masters, and Doctorate. This is for NIU overall. You can see that you really get to dig deep to see some changes there. I'm not really sure how we can get this information to pop, like the trends do, but that's inherent in the data sometimes. I might be looking at a couple different ways to put that up the line for you. We could do some tiles. Tiling, will show what the average across this five year period, say "Are you satisfied with the program?" What's the average basically, right? That might be useful enough because I don't think you get many spikes in this data/reporting, aside from the low ends.

Falkoff: The data that you have here, this is data that is going to be used because it has been requested by whom and for what exactly?

Reynolds: This is actual data.

Falkoff: Why that one for example? Who's going to be getting the dashboards?

Douglass: We are and also Deans, Program Department Chairs and Directors of schools.

Falkoff: This is with an eye towards keeping them informed consistently but also ultimately for our review, right?

Douglass: Yes, what we have been talking about is moving from the way we do program review now to utilizing an annual dashboard. On that annual dashboard there would be KPIs. They are not yet built, these are just the data which upon they could be built but what we have to do next fall is sort of look through these data and say how are we going to get people to commit to targets for KPIs for various pieces. That will come hopefully somewhat informed by what just happened in Program Prioritization and hopefully from discussions with various units.

Falkoff: With Alumni satisfaction, the data is there because we decided we still need to keep collecting it?

Douglass: That's still part of the table that we kept, yes. But it's also something that the Board of Trustees has asked to include and keep on their dashboard. Some of these are because they're also on other dashboards, some of these are because we need them, some of these are because they are required by the IBHE, but basically we do want to make sure that we have components on a regular basis. The alumni one is another one that HLC looks at, how do your alum feel about your programs. The truth is I think unless there is a real problem, results typically say you're doing great. So there is not much variation in the data which I think is what Jeff's point was.

Reynolds: Yeah, Marc here is where there may be variations so degrees M.S., right? In Fall 2011-12 I'm seeing a trend up to forty-one. So I might say if I'm thinking "wow I went from twenty to forty-one, that's a spike, I know it's going to be a spike." I'm not seeing anything past that period so I'm going to say twenty-five is going to be my target, so we will go ahead and put a KPI of twenty-five. I keep it because I think it's a decent level, about twenty-five M.S. coming out. So fiscal 2015 I've got twenty-five okay? I'm five down. If I am the chair, can I explain that? Yeah, I can explain it. We don't have enough people coming in or they need more skills at the introductory level, you know the first year graduate, whatever the reasons are. Lower GA levels, lower stipends, it could be a whole host of reasons. But it promotes the conversation, right? You know five down off of twenty-five for Masters is not that stunning. I mean that's not something that would be a big deal. If we went over here, it would it be, right. Again this is just head counts. But say we are talking about enrollment for Bachelor of Science. My target is going to be around six hundred; I mean that's pretty simple and straight forward.

Douglass: Unless you're trying to grow the program and have asked for more resources then you want it to be seven hundred.

Reynolds: Right, exactly! What do you want to do with the program? Is six hundred an actual KPI you want to go ahead and go with in terms of target or is it something you want to push for and if you fall short of it, that's okay. Why did you fall short? Well we're trying and it's a three year plan. Come back to us in the second or third year. That's one of the things you don't see up here is the targets are important in this. I used to do it with clients when dashboards were new like in the early nineties. When you look at your car, you turn it on, right? You've got all kinds of dials, it gives you a dashboard of what's going on at a given time period. That is what this is doing. It is the health of the program at a certain time period and we define that time period and the measures and metrics, obviously. One other thing I wanted to mention, is what I typically see...I've tried to start something like this, dashboard visuals and measures/metrics use, I think this is the fifth iteration at NIU. We

are actually going to get one this time. When you see dashboards start up in the use of visual analytics at an institutional level, you typically see lots of bubbling up of different types of dashboards. The reason I'm bringing this up is I want to make sure we all know that this is a program review dashboard. While it will be given access to deans, chairs and directors, or course, it is not necessary for their operational use. They actually indicated to us that it's not really what we want in this. They want it linked to program review just like the dashboard for the BOT would be the BOT dashboard. They are somewhat separable. There is overlap as Carolinda mentioned, but there is some separability between these dashboards that are all being planned on. FTE staffing... this is basically tenure, tenure eligible, instructor FTE, and other FTE. You can imagine instructor FTE could encompass more than just the typical union and non-union instructors, okay? Are clinicians in there? Are visiting professors in there? Whereas the other FTE measures are more straight forward. So some definitions are going to be needed in this as well, but generally your teaching staff and non-teaching staff, if you will, are well defined. The average, five year average as well, is available. I thought that would be useful as well. Some of the things are quirky in this visual because it doesn't show up all the time immediately and you have to refresh it, as I just did. So we are going to have things like the Academic Analytics data in there. That's just basically a tile and image of what we produced for Program Prioritization. Sarah and I are having the Academic Analytics research team populate that sheer amount of metrics. I mean it's a huge amount of benchmarking in one diagram. We are going to be doing that every single year, going forward, and they're going to be doing it for every single CIP code. We are fortunate to have that. To complement that, the InfoEd data is there as well, so we will update that as well. Finally, some of the other data we can review...this is one of the tiles that I mentioned. Let me go ahead and expand this for you so you can see. This is something we might want to go ahead and utilize in terms of showing a KPI or something along those lines. This is from the Delaware Cost data: instructional cost per FTE, instructional cost per credit hour. We only have two fiscal years so far and some of this we actually have the data already but when we populated this we didn't. We just went through the fifth iteration back and forth with our data checks with Delaware. We will soon populate this, but basically in terms of instruction cost per FTE student. So we can ask questions like, why did your cost increase a little bit? I can tell you why their cost increases, because we looked at 41 accounts closer in FY 2015 than we did in FY 2014. That's something we would put as a footnote. You might see some changes in terms of peer data but that would be explained for that per the peer data. Here is instructional cost per credit hour. I don't know if you remember, we would always have this long discussion when Institutional Research data provided program costs. Here it is presented cleanly and straightforward. So this is \$196 and \$198. Basically it is just under two hundred dollars per cost per credit hour in Biology. Is that high or not? Relative to our IPEDS peers, it is pretty good. Relative to our research high state peers, it is very good. They're much higher. So we are, if you will, a better bang for your buck; or at least with this peer set, within the neighborhood of our peers. Something like this was not possible with the program cost study because all it looked at was State of Illinois' institutions. In addition, those cost data, as Dan and I have probably said a number of times, were calculated in different ways. The Delaware Cost Study calculates cost the same way across the board. Personal expenditures and non-personal expenditures. Then, we work up the FTE relative to the credit hours. So that's pretty solid and since we are doing Delaware every single year from now on we will have that too. But that's kind of a tile version if you will. We can go ahead...the reason I'm showing this, is data like this can be displaying certain different visuals but this visual we can go ahead and say, do we need something like what's your target for credit hours? We can go ahead and just populate it like this and maybe that's easy enough for the subcommittees to take a look at, maybe it's not. We will have a different way to look at it. We will have to figure it out

moving forward but like I said, it is a first draft and you know it's a start to go ahead and at least make it a little more efficient, a little more friendly, and a little more meaningful in terms of the data.

Shortridge: It's hard to measure quality with these metrics. So while I think it is important to look at numbers and how many things you are publishing, it is hard to look at okay the reason my enrollments went down, maybe you would put this in your write-up, is because I decided to admit more high quality students and so that's why my enrollment went down. Or the reason I don't publish very many articles is because the articles that I do publish are in the top five journals that are available in my field to publish. Whereas another department might choose to publish in fifty different journals. It's hard to capture those difference so I just hope that in this process there is awareness of that.

Douglass: There has to be an opportunity for people to express that. What I'm hoping we can do is, over the next year, start to figure out as a group how we look at those, what types of pieces of information we need back from people, and how we can best use them that demonstrate not just the quantity but the quality. But obviously we are being pressured in terms of quantity by the state and others but we also don't want to lose the quality. This group is definitely the group that has the purview to work on maintaining the quality of academic programs.

Reynolds: One of the things that we could do right now for student success is first year grades, ACT averages, GREs, GMATs. That only proxies for quality, and I get what you're saying. It goes back to when I used to teach healthcare economics. You know everybody wants quality healthcare, of course they do. Okay how do you put that into a quantity measure and how do you derive an index for a price value, right? We are basically, doing the same thing here, it's only proxies.

Gordon: So will there be benchmarks or projections for the university? Like one of the things I'm always amazed at is I have no idea in two years what upper-level administration thinks the real enrollment will be, you know the projection. Everybody just always assumes it's up, up, up but we know that is not true. So it is kind of like for me I would love to know the marketing you know as I'm going to get majors and trying to develop an online program. How do I project against the university projections? Am I going to be seen as the growth vehicle in the university based on my KPIs and the university's KPIs?

Reynolds: You're bringing up a great point. There are three offices that I know of that does this. One is mine and I don't get into it all that much anymore. At least, I don't populate it for anybody on a regular basis. The other two are Testing Services, Greg Barker, and Institutional Research, Dan House. Institutional Research is used in terms of the official data and in terms of admissions. Testing Services is used in terms of week to week projections. If you're asking where are we going to be and how do you sync that forecast, I would respond, not with a projection. A statistical forecast, three years down the road, I would agree with that. On the back of the envelope I would say we need to take a look at what we have now, meaning that you can assume undergraduate forecasts going forward will be down. I mean this is just for now, the near term. Assume two percent down every successive year and then go ahead and forecast off of that. We don't do it on a multi-year basis, at least in terms of producing it for the institution. But yes, that's a really good question.

Gordon: It just comes down to in every APC report including my own I've ever written or whatever but it's rare to never see a department say hey we are going to be, our projection is we will be happy

with being down two percent. Everybody always projects more but the university is down, it may be good to be down only five percent if the university is down seven percent.

Reynolds: Right. Even that number, that figure, that count is almost x or y...even if it's per something, it's a novel count if you will, and how does that really help? What is it relative to the existing tenure, tenure eligible faculty? What is the existing level of research, relative to a benchmark or what it was when we were up five faculty members? Do you have your budget increases or decreasing? Where is your GA support? That all matters. Of the ten or eleven metrics that we have, only three of them come even close to that aside from Academic Analytics, as that is all baked in there. For Academic Analytics, we made sure for Program Prioritization to have per capita relative metrics. I'm just looking off of the list I have: FTE student, FTE tenure-tenure eligible faculty, instructional cost per credit hour, and instructional cost per FTE student. Nothing else at least right now, beyond that. Maybe the admitted to applied and enrolled to admitted ratios but that's not relative to resources that's for sure. You bring up a good point.

Douglass: I'm also wondering there is a leadership retreat coming up, I don't actually know what the topic is but there is a leadership retreat coming up May 12 I want to say. I mean these are the kind of questions that when people are all together that's really worth asking. If we are supposed to have a target for our program, what is the target for the university? Obviously they are related.

Gordon: Well I think obviously and I'll say you guys know a lot of what is going on out there then for me to try and project number of marketing majors. You guys know a lot more about college age students, migrations out of Illinois, etc. So that to me gives me a lot of guidance.

Douglass: You brought up a good point just a minute ago. You reminded me of something, Marc and I were in a meeting this morning with Al Phillips where he said "enrollments might be down in the fall, maybe up to five percent" but another public is projected to be down by thirty percent, and another down twenty percent, so it is all relative, not just within the university but within Illinois and the country nationally. It is hard to know.

Reynolds: We do statistical modeling, but we do very little of it. There is a reason for that. Institutional Research uses a Markov model for forecasting at an institutional level. That's the problem--it's at an institutional level, not at the programmatic level. So, it doesn't look at- I mean take aside doctoral programs forecasting, that is you might as well just go ahead and ask your graduate applications committee, where will we be. Then, that is what your forecast should be. For Master's, maybe you can take in some forecasting. For undergraduate definitely, especially when the program's size is decent enough and robust enough to allow said forecasting. Yeah, you can do a lot of forecasting there, but we don't do it, we never have there.

Abdel-Motaleb: So you have the model, but you don't do it?

Reynolds: We do it at the institutional level. New freshmen to new transfer level.

Abdel-Motaleb: What is the percentage error?

Reynolds: I don't do that. That is Institutional Research.

Abdel-Motaleb: You can also define it at the program level. At least with the last one for the department of such and such.

Reynolds: That is why I am bringing it up Ibrahim. When you do it at a programmatic level you're talking about at least 60 different runs and it's going to take some time. I think it should have been there years ago, okay? I used to do this in the college that I was in but it's going to take some resource allocation to implement. One of these offices has to be able to do it. But it takes time to just crunch it and interpret it. Actually to send it out to disseminate it is a very painful process too, especially through email. You know, am I hitting the right person at the right time? I mean some of you have gotten faculty list checks fairly recent just making sure we have the right faculty from HR data. We have to actually ask you specifically, are we sending the right information to the right people. It's mind numbing sometimes what we have to go through but yes, it's a resource issue. The other issue though that isn't resource is that some people can't and don't want to comprehend it to that level of analysis. They want a year by year, or a period by period, a percent difference. You could do that with the form. You can go ahead and work that down. But there is a tradeoff to both of those.

Abdel-Motaleb: But if you do this projection correctly.

Reynolds: Projection or forecast?

Abdel-Motaleb: Projection and forecast. I know they are different. Let's say that we do both. At least you will know what the factors are that affect. There are factors that are universal that will affect us too. There are factors that will affect us because NIU is in Dekalb in Illinois. So if we know these things at least we can plan to at least address the issues before they hit us and we found ourselves thirty percent down in enrollment, and then we don't have money.

Reynolds: We are probably getting too much into the weeds. The fact is that it's the factor analysis that IR services and my area has done in the past; that is certainly relevant. You can approximate what a new freshmen level is, the factors and determinants that make that new freshmen come to our door. But that is not going to be necessarily the same for the Bachelor of Science in program X as it is for that new freshmen coming in that door. We have to take a look at the programmatic determinants, right? Now some of them are going to overlap to be sure, but you're getting back to "it is a scale of operations" problem, in terms of the degree programs and the fact that we just never actually have done that. A lot of institutions, they don't run programmatic forecasting but I think we are at the point where we should start employing that more. I mean, it's not difficult; you just have to set it up.

Abdel-Motaleb: It is worth the cost. I think this is something we have to ask for because it'll make our lives easier.

Reynolds: Agreed.

Douglass: Thank you, Jeff. What you have shown us will obviously be refined and he will be starting, well him and others, will be starting to load information for next fall. Ultimately we will have to come up with targets and perhaps red, green, and yellow lights. Is there a way we could give this to them, I don't know electronically or hard copy, so that they may be able to give you back some feedback? Maybe take a closer look at it?

Reynolds: Yeah, what we can do right now per IT, this is Power BI, and is what you were looking at. It's the application of choice. The licensing is for the entire institution, this is going to sound nonsensical, but all of the institution doesn't have it yet. IT is working on that. I can send out a PDF on this, all the graphs that you have there. You'll have to magnify it in Adobe or wherever, but you can certainly take a look at it. Going forward, you'll be able to hover over it like I did there to see the numbers, and you'll get the gist of what is going on. I would love to hear comments.

Douglass: They can leave comments, questions, or suggestions? Thank you, I appreciate that. Any other questions for Jeff?

APC: Steven has agreed to be a chair for next year for subcommittee, but we still need a second. I'm not going to put anyone on the spot but it is going to be a lot easier next year. We have a simpler process, we have shorter reports, think about it. We have to figure out who it will be before we stop meeting for the year, our last meeting is next week. Anybody else have information for the good of the group?

Isabel: What kind of agenda are we going to have next week?

Carolinda: We have to finish up the follow-up reports and have some closing certificates and such that we give out. So it should be relatively short next time.

Subramony: If there is comments we will discuss those on the dashboard.

Reynolds: Yes, comment here or in email too.

Falkoff: If there is no new business then we have reached the end of the agenda and may adjourn.

Meeting adjourned at 3:55 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Jeanne Essex