MINUTES – BOARD MEETING
April 10, 2012

Submitted for: Action.

Summary: Minutes of the April 10, 2012, meeting of the Illinois Board of Higher Education held at Truman College, Chicago, Illinois.

Action Requested: That the Illinois Board of Higher Education approve the Minutes of the April 10, 2012, meeting.

STATE OF ILLINOIS
BOARD OF HIGHER EDUCATION

MINUTES - BOARD MEETING
April 10, 2012

A meeting of the Illinois Board of Higher Education was called to order at 1:05 p.m. in the Larry McKeon Building at Truman College, Chicago, Illinois.

Carrie J. Hightman, Chairwoman, presided.
Cindy Kolley was Secretary for the meeting.

The following Board members were present:

Jay Bergman	Proshanta K. Nandi
Frances G. Carroll	Santos Rivera
Michael Dorf	Ari Shroyer
Heba Hamouda	Elmer L. Washington
Allan Karnes	

Also present by invitation of the Board were:

G. W. Reid, Executive Director, Illinois Board of Higher Education
Geoffrey Obrzut, President/Chief Executive Officer, Illinois Community College Board
Eric Zarnikow, Executive Director, Illinois Student Assistance Commission
Vinni Hall, Board Member, Illinois State Board of Education

Presidents and Chancellors

Al Bowman	William Perry
Rita Cheng	John Peters
Sharon Hahs	Jack Thomas
Elaine Maimon	

Advisory Committee Chairpersons

Marie Donovan, Faculty Advisory Council
Peg Lee, Community College Presidents
Susan Friedberg, Propriety University Presidents
Elaine Maimon, Public University Presidents
Tom Thompson, Disabilities Advisory Committee
Paul Frank, Private University Presidents

I. Call to Order

1. Call Meeting to Order, Chairwoman Carrie J. Hightman

Chairwoman Carrie Hightman called the meeting to order. A quorum was present.

Chairwoman Carrie Hightman said, "Okay, Board Members Heba Hamouda and David Anderson are unable to attend today's Board meeting in person due to employment complications, but they are hopefully both going to be joining us by phone. I know right now Heba is on, David is not on yet. I would like to get a motion from the Board allowing them to attend the meeting via conference call. Is there a motion?"

The Illinois Board of Higher Education, on motion made by Dr. Frances Carroll and seconded by Dr. Elmer Washington, unanimously approved Board Members Heba Hamouda and David Anderson to participate via conference call.

Chairwoman Hightman said, "Welcome, everyone. First of all, I want to thank President Romali and her staff for hosting this meeting of the Illinois Board of Higher Education (IBHE) at Truman College. It is great to be here. The facility has been great and we truly appreciate your hospitality. President Romali, would you like to come up and talk to us a little bit about your institution and welcome us."

2. Welcome by Dr. Reagan Romali, President, Harry S Truman College

Dr. Romali welcomed everyone to Harry S Truman College.

3. Welcome and remarks by Chairwoman Carrie J. Hightman

Chairwoman Hightman said, "I want to also, before we get to the meat of the meeting today, I want to first of all thank the members of the Faculty Advisory Council (FAC) for being here today and for joining us for lunch. We had a great conversation. I was late to the meeting because my other side job got in the way a little this morning, but it was a great conversation with a hearty agenda and I want to thank you all. In fact, all the members of the committee here please stand up, because there are a lot of you who actually came to the lunch. Thank you again.

"I also want to mention, and Cindy alluded to this, that Michael Dorf is here in the place of Alexi Giannoulias, representing the Illinois Community College Board (ICCB). Thank you for being here. I also want to welcome Eric Zarnikow. Eric is the new Executive Director for the Illinois Student Assistance Commission (ISAC), and it is too bad that Kym Hubbard is not here today, but you are here so you are going to report back to her about everything we did, I suppose. We value the work ISAC does on behalf of Illinois students and we look forward to your interaction with the IBHE. Congratulations on your new role and we wish you luck. In any way we can help you we are happy to do. I am sure that is true of all the people sitting around you as well, so thank you and welcome.

"I want to turn to just a couple of topics before we get to the first items on the agenda. First, I want to talk a little about longitudinal education data system, because one of our key speakers this morning will be addressing that issue. Let me just give us a little bit of background in anticipation of her comments. As you probably will recall, Public Act 96-0107 created the P-20 Longitudinal Education Data System (LDS), which will enable us to follow students' performance throughout their formal school experience. And as you probably know, starting July

1 of this year, the IBHE will begin collecting and maintaining data from non-public colleges and universities that receive Monetary Award Program (MAP) funds – and you know we already do that for public institutions. Through the new governance structure, we will determine ways to link various databases to include information from other organizations, such as the Illinois State Board of Education (ISBE) and ICCB, but the whole goal is that by June 30, 2013, we will have a searchable, longitudinal data system that will provide data that can be used for research and for reports to the Illinois General Assembly. It will also assist us in evaluating program effectiveness. This system will also link student, college and career planning data and will facilitate the electronic submission of transcripts, scholarships and financial aid. Successful execution of the LDS will take a coordinated effort. In fact, the ISBE – and Vinni Hall is here, our representative for the ISBE – has responsibility for establishing a data warehouse in cooperation with us, the IBHE, and the ICCB, as well as other stakeholders. The LDS is a diverse, robust plan that will be beneficial in helping us achieve the goals of the *Public Agenda* and specifically will produce the information needed to help us bridge the existing prosperity gap in the state. So, George and Paige Kowalski, who is our guest speaker today from the DQC, will discuss the LDS in more detail in a moment but I did want to give us some more context for that conversation.

"I next want to turn to the state budget, which I always do in every one of these meetings, and it is always a sad story. My report today is no different. We are painfully aware of the State's dire financial circumstances and the two issues that are really squeezing the budget the most, which are pension costs and Medicaid spending. Pension costs accounted for six percent of the budget in Fiscal Year 2008 and now are 15 percent of the budget for Fiscal Year 2013. As you probably know, the Governor has convened a working group to examine ways we can analyze our pension system. Many of you are participating. Many of you are the focus of one potential solution to the problem as you know. Medicaid spending is another item on the legislature's agenda, with the Governor stating that $2.7 million must be cut to avoid the increase in the state's backlog of overdue bills, so a lot to come on this. We were all pleased, though, to see that the Governor's budget proposal maintains funding for K-12 and higher education with $20 million over Fiscal Year 2012 for early childhood education and $50 million over Fiscal Year 2012 for MAP funding. However, not surprising, the House passed a spending bill that limits the budget and calls for a decrease in higher education funding, from the Fiscal Year 2012 appropriations level. Both the House and Senate appropriations committees are holding hearings with universities and higher education agencies and advocates to receive testimony at the budget request. I think we all know this dance very well. We know it is going to take some time. It will probably go to the end of the calendar for this session. Maybe that calendar will get extended. Who knows? We have a long road to go down before the legislature's work concludes this legislative session and I encourage everyone to contact their legislators and tell them about the detriments of funding cuts for higher education. I know you all agree, and so the best thing to do is to let your elected officials know.

"With that I am going to turn it over to Dr. Reid for the Executive Director's report."

4. Remarks by Executive Director G.W. Reid

Dr. George Reid said, "Thank you, Madam Chairwoman. Let us take a look at the slides. I hope everyone can see one or the other slides. Since July 1, 2011, the staff and I have been working on a new strategic one-year plan which will end on June 30, 2012. This plan is designed to drive us closer to achieving the goals of the *Public Agenda*. The *Public Agenda* is the ten-year strategic plan for higher education in Illinois; we are in year five of that plan.

"Slide 3 indicates our five goals that we are pursuing. I hope that you can see those goals: philanthropic resources, dual credit, performance funding, advancement branding strategy, and accountability. And the one criterion that we used to select these goals is that they had to pursue the *Public Agenda*. So, I want you to see a crosswalk that we have created. On the left side of the crosswalk you can see the goals, our five goals that we are attempting to accomplish this year, ending June 30, 2012. On the right side of the crosswalk is their complementary relationship to the *Public Agenda*, to the goals, to the recommendations, to the strategies of the *Public Agenda*, which ones of those we are trying to achieve at this time.

"Members of the Board, if I were to give an estimate as to how far we are down the road to completion of the one-year plan I would say we are about 80 percent there. We will follow up this work, this one-year plan, with a three-year plan I will introduce to the Board in September 2012.

"In August 2012, the senior officers, who will give you a progress report today, will give you a fuller report in August, ending that one-year plan. At that time, Madam Chairwoman and Members of the Board, I may ask that the showcase, the update may be suspended so we can have enough time to go to the internal one-year plan.

"I do not believe that my Board report today should be more than that right now because I do not want to foreshadow or overshadow the report that we are going to get, the update we are going to get by the five deputies. I do want to say one or two things. There are so many – and Madam Chairwoman, I alluded to this in our conversation – there are so many goals that we could be pursuing in the *Public Agenda*. It is such a wide-ranging document that one of the problems with strategic planning is goal selection. And often goal selection comes down to whether you have expertise and interest that intersect and that is where you can have a goal. So, even though we have been working on this one-year plan, your staff – theses ladies and gentlemen behind me – have been doing a magnificent job with their regular work. They have a full time job – you know this – even though they have a new plan. This is nothing new to you. It is called multitasking. I know you all are aware of how to do many things with the small amount of time that you have. So, we are very proud today to present to you a progress report on our one-year plan, which we call 'The Number One Agenda.'

Chairwoman Hightman said, "So, I guess at this point those were George's remarks. What we are going to do now is turn to Item Five of the agenda, which is the *Public Agenda* update."

II. The Illinois Public Agenda for College and Career Success

5. *Public Agenda* Update

Dr. Reid said, "Thank you, Madam Chairwoman. So, today's update will be a series of short presentations. You can see on the PowerPoint, there, the five goals. I hope you are close enough so you can see. Now do not forget that the strategic plan is called the Number One Agenda. It is pursuing the *Public Agenda*. It is guiding us almost inexorably toward the *Public Agenda*.

"Now the way we created the five goals – and I hope you can appreciate this, those of you, of course, that have staffs and so on – is that we met several times. We had so much to cover. In the process what we had to do was have compromises, make compromises about what

are the five things that are most important that we want to pursue at this time. And so, those were the five goals that we came up with. So, it was compromise and working sessions and finally we were all on the same page, we were all agreed that these were the five goals.

"So, let me introduce the team and have them come forward in the order in which I am going to call them. First, I would like to take Arthur Sutton. Arthur Sutton's work will concentrate on trying to raise money, because in his first 90-day plan, Arthur concluded that the number one reason why kids drop out of college is that they do not have the money to stay in college. His goal is to raise money. And, if you will give me just a second, Arthur, let me get to this while you are there. Bob Blankenberger, who will come up behind Arthur, is working with the entire state to try to develop more dual credit programs. He is working with the four-year institutions and with the ICCB leadership in doing this. Al Phillips, no secret to anybody, has been working hand in glove with the Performance Funding steering committee and with me to create a formula called Performance Funding, which you as a Board approved on February 7, which the Governor articulated in his budget address on February 22, which the legislature is now considering as it moves toward the end of the session. Jonathan Lackland has realized something that you all have talked to me about, even when we interviewed we talked about it, why do not people know exactly what the IBHE does? So, we have asked Jonathan to look into that problem and he is going to develop a branding strategy for IBHE. When you look at a certain brand you automatically say 'IBHE' and it will be a positive connotation and it will be our brand that we will bring before you for adoption. That is along with all the other legislative stuff he is doing. And finally, Karen Helland will come before you to talk about how well we are doing in the *Public Agenda*. She is going to give us an accountability report on one more of the goals. So they are: Arthur, Bob, Al, Jonathan and Karen."

Dr. Arthur Sutton said, "Good afternoon, Board members, Madam Chairwoman. We were asked to be brief so I am going to be brief. The one-year project was designed basically to identify philanthropic resources that would assist the students that have been identified as needing to complete degree programs. What we have done as far as diversity and outreach, we have identified organizations that have projects and ideas that are fundable, similar to what we are doing. We have developed talking point projects, we have developed different concept meetings that we have had to work on ways that we can seek and/or develop funding to cover the opportunity for students to get back in school and complete degree programs.

"Just as identifying, we established fundable ideas with corporations, we presented some draft proposals, and we talked through some suggestions and some opportunities to do some things. So, where we are at this point is we are developing and implementing a plan for proposals that will actually be fundable at some point. Again, as this is a project in this industry, we are moving forward to further develop things. Again, conversations, meetings, planning and developing proposals. Again, the idea of being able to ultimately work with universities on this, areas of student services, to identify and further the progress of the one-year project forward. So at this point, just develop the concept, we have identified the concept organization, we have put a written proposal together and we are working to see that those things are implemented as far as funding at some point as we move forward."

Dr. Reid said, "Bob."

Dr. Robert Blankenberger said, "The update continues. I apologize for my voice today. I am a little under the weather.

"My goal was to promote and increase the number of high-quality dual credit degree programs that will benefit students preparing for college and career. I had four sub-goals: work with colleges and university leaders to add at least three dual credit programs; further the implementation of the Dual Credit Quality Act (DCQA) by adding a new procedure; prepare a research article presentation on the expansion of dual credit; and prepare and deliver a presentation that justifies the benefits of expansion of dual credit.

"In working on these the dual credit programs are, in fact, really the implementation of dual credit opportunities with institutions. We worked with a few different folks but the actual decision to implement programs lies with the institutions. At the academic leadership presentations, I introduced the concept of expansion of dual credit. I had a responsive audience. We also have been working with the Chicago public schools on dual-credit expansion. I cannot take credit for this. This is a program that they had full interest in doing. We are providing information to support that. Working with the ICCB, particularly Dr. Elaine Johnson, we have provided support and information. You will note they have launched a website for promoting their dual-credit options and in fact we just had a question yesterday that we responded to so we are trying to facilitate this in any way we can. We are also helping them to align this with the Illinois Articulation Initiative standards.

"Last year, as you know, we had the first review of dual-credit offerings by private institutions and, as a result, we had the opportunity to review and to give implementation of new rules governing these offerings. What we found was the biggest gaps in institutions failing to meet requirements of the DCQA were, in fact, in qualifications and integration with existing academic degree programs. We have followed up with letters to institutions regarding what appears to be insufficiency in their meeting the standards and then we will follow up again with the survey to them this year and see whether they have made progress along those lines.

"As to related research requirements and presentations, I have done several of those, so I will just go through those relatively quickly. The Lieutenant Governor's Joint Educational Leadership Committee presented an opportunity for us to try to advocate on behalf of expansion of dual-credit. Dr. Elaine Johnson, of the ICCB, and I did a presentation September 22, and we have followed up almost every meeting with a brief discussion. I am sure they are tired of my mentioning dual-credit. On March 8, I did another presentation with an update for opportunities for expansion. We did discuss with some of the democratic staff the possibility of adding funding again, but this is not a year to be adding new funding. We talked about the restoration of grant funds for the community colleges that offer dual-credit programs but those have been off the books for a couple of years and there does not appear to be an opportunity to follow up at this time.

"The presentations that we worked on I had just at a Higher Learning Commission (HCL) meeting last week – it seems like a month ago, but now it was just last week. I did a panel presentation for colleagues from the Missouri Department of Higher Education and HCL as well as the National Alliance of Current Enrollment Partners. We followed up the panel presentation at the HCL meeting with an information exchange session.

"I have another presentation on results of a study we are engaged in with the Illinois Education Research Council. We are presenting those results at National Center for Education Statistics in Washington, DC, April 30 through May 2. I am not sure what date our presentation is. But we have been successful in finding that dual-credit actually has a disproportionally positive impact in time of degree and on success, particularly for underrepresented students. This

is a finding that has not been replicated before and we are very proud of that. We have received a number of requests to follow up on that information.

"That has also resulted in a request to attend and present at the Association for Institutional Research's Annual Forum in New Orleans. We will be doing a few presentations."

Dr. Reid said, "While Al is coming up, I just want to say that I was in attendance at Bob's presentation to the Higher Learning Commission. He and Dr. Allison Witt did a wonderful job."

Dr. Alan Phillips said, "I believe performance funding might be a subject that most of you are somewhat familiar with at this point in time, so this should not take me very long to go through. The basis for performance funding or the framework is the *Public Agenda* as well as Public Act 97-320, which basically talks about rewarding institutions based on performance and, to the extent by which we serve underserved and underrepresented populations. This is very simple, and it is hard to see, this is all the steps in the model. We developed the model and as a result of the model, we have based it on these performance measures and subcategories. The effort was in fact successful, which was evidenced by the fact that our performance recommendations were included in the Governor's Fiscal Year 2013 budget submission.

"Since that time, we have established a refinement committee, as you know. We did the best we could given the time we had available and the data we had available, but there is much more work to do. We have established a refinement committee. All of the public universities as well as the ICCB, the Illinois Education Research Council (IERC) and the Lieutenant Governor's office are all members or are all represented on the refinement committee. We have met once and the focus of the effort is to identify ways that the model itself can be improved. As you all remember, when we came to the discussion of scaling that probably created the most discussion, so we are looking at better ways to normalize our scale to data. We are going to refine definitions. Some of them were proxies for what we were really after because we did not have the data, so we are looking to refine the definitions, identifying more current data, better data, and also taking a look at adding appropriate measures to some categories that are listed here. We are next scheduled to meet at the end of June and work is ongoing amongst members of the committee. The intent is to have a refined performance funding model by next fall that we can use to develop recommendations for the Fiscal Year 2014 budget submission."

Dr. Reid said, "I will also say to Al's credit – Dr. Allan Karnes, who is a member of this Board, is a member of the subcommittee that is working to require the performance funding formula and Dr. Karnes, Dr. Phillips, Karen Helland, and I will get together several times this summer for presentations to national groups about what we have done here in Illinois regarding performance funding. We seem to have done a good enough job that people from around the country want to hear how we did, so kudos to you.

"Jonathan."

Mr. Jonathan Lackland said, "Good afternoon. When tasked with looking at a specific advancement strategy pertinent to branding and who we are, etc., for me at least, being new to the agency, it was important for me to at least understand who our stakeholders are. For me, the obvious choice, the number one choice, is our taxpayers. But when we also look at the students, the families, that knowing they actually utilize our higher education system, they are very, very important. The other group of stakeholders will be our higher education institutions themselves, colleges, universities, etc.

"The next set of stakeholders is community groups, and it is very interesting because when I think of community groups I think of the Business Roundtable, for example. I think of the Illinois Committee on Black Concerns in Higher Education (ICBCHE). I think about the Illinois Latino Council on Higher Education (ILACHE). But I think of another organization called Women Employed, and I bring that up simply because this shows you how our community groups have a vested interest in higher education. For example, this legislative session, Women Employed actually was a key catalyst for two major pieces of legislation: Senate Bill 3803, which is the College Completion Report Card Act; but, then also Senate Bill 3804, which is the Articulation and Transfer Bill. But when you look at the fact that our community groups have the vested interest that they have, we also know that they are key catalysts also for our next group of stakeholders, which are the legislators themselves, the Illinois General Assembly, which we are extremely reliant upon.

"Our next group of stakeholders is our constitutional officers, our Governor, Lieutenant Governor, who have been key supporters of higher education and education in general. We have sister state agencies, and when I think of sister state agencies I think about ISBE, ICCB, ISAC and there are many, many others, but also, for example, when we look at other agencies that may not be within our realm of thought, per se, such as the Department of Human Services (DHS) or the Department of Commerce and Economic Opportunity (DCEO), strictly because they are working with us on LDS. The last stakeholder is our local, state and national media.

"As it stands at this point, those pieces of information that IBHE has that we use for advancement purposes, first and foremost are the IBHE Data Book. The Data Book is an extensive database on Illinois colleges and universities that has such characteristics as tuition and fees, financial support, student composition, etc. The next is the reports and studies that we have. Again, it is an extensive set of pieces of information concerning Illinois higher education, teacher education, affordability, access and diversity, etc. Our next group of pieces of information that we have is the directory of Illinois higher education; our News Digest, different clips that we get relative to news taking place within our colleges and universities; the Friday Memo, which is a great piece for us because it is basically a weekly e-newsletter that discusses those trending topics within higher education; but also the visual piece that we have is the Illinois *Public Agenda for College and Career Success* banner, that is actually directly in front of you. This is a great opportunity and a great talking point. We bring it to Board meetings but if we have respective meetings, we have realized that this is actually an opportunity to open up topics of conversation.

"Now, when we are looking at the benefit of brochures and signage, specifically when we are looking at a true advancement strategy, first and foremost, a professional brochure is a great leave-behind, a great leave-behind where, if we are talking with a legislator or if we are talking with a prospective group, once we have finished our conversation we are still on their minds – that is key. These types of pieces of advancement, if you will, have a great shelf life. Again, it is something that they can remove off the shelf and they are always thinking about us. Second, it allows us, as IBHE, to further articulate our goals, our agendas, who we are, what we do, what are our statutory responsibilities. The running joke that I have is that when I first came to IBHE I would tell people that I am on staff here and people consistently would say, "Oh, yeah, I know that, yeah – ISBE!" And ISBE does phenomenal work but the fact is, sometimes there may be an issue with distinction between IBHE and some of our sister agencies. But the most important piece that I think that lends well to the benefit of brochures and signage in terms of who we are, is the fact that it allows us transparency to the taxpayer. Again, that is first and foremost. We have a great core of individuals in this state, when we are looking at our constitutional officers that are very supportive of us, specifically to the aspect of making certain that we are maintaining our transparency and accountability.

"This is strictly just a template, just a real quick idea of what a brochure could potentially look like, just two examples. What we utilize at this point is when we do speaking engagements, if we are meeting with legislators, is we actually have this folder. It has great information in it but we are looking for ways to dress it up a bit that is cost effective, that is cost efficient, but also thinking outside the box. So, I just wanted to leave you with that. I definitely look forward to more dialogue and more interaction with this because we want to make certain that we do get your input."

Chairwoman Hightman said, "I know that you are new to the agency and I wonder if you have seen the materials we have already developed. First of all, we have the glossy version of the Executive Summary to the *Public Agenda* and I wondered how we can use what we already have, not necessarily only to create new material."

Mr. Lackland said, "Sure. That is a great point. I think what that would do for me, specifically being new to the agency, is to look down the line. Again, this is not a situation where we want to jump in head first and make these drastic changes, but what we want to do is to look down the line to see how can we improve, how can we improve the messaging. We may want to look at changing the look of whatever materials that we have. This is strictly just a template. It is strictly just an opportunity of looking down the line."

Chairwoman Hightman said, "I guess I am not sure if I understood what you said. You had a chance to look at the Executive Summary of the *Public Agenda*, because it actually has the logo, I believe, and so I am curious if you think that is in some way insufficient?"

Mr. Lackland said, "To answer your first question, yes, I have looked at the Executive Summary. Second of all, do I think it is sufficient, it is, but again, for me and the agency, based on conversations I have had with Dr. Reid, it is just next steps, making certain whether or not this is meeting our needs, which it is at this point, but as we look down the line, what can we do differently, if anything."

Chairwoman Hightman said, "One last question on the website – that was an area of focus of your predecessor. We did some work to try to really roll out a robust website. I am not sure if you referred to that even in your examples of information used, so maybe you can talk a little bit – and maybe it is too soon, so if it is, that is fine – but the use of the website."

Mr. Lackland said, "Exactly, that is an excellent point. As a matter of fact, when I focused on this presentation, I did strictly just print. But I know Dr. Phillips and I and other staff have discussed the website, making certain, for example, something as small as the information we do have captured on our website is not buried, is user friendly, so we have begun that conversation. I could not give you a timeline in terms of when that would be completed but I can assure you the conversation has begun."

Chairwoman Hightman said, "If you do not know the answer to this question, that is fine, but do you think we have the internal resources to optimize the website?"

Mr. Lackland said, "Honestly, at this point, I would say no, just because at this point we are looking at bringing in other staff, so that is why I would definitely tell you that it will take some time."

Chairwoman Hightman said, "Thank you."

Mr. Lackland said, "Thank you."

Dr. Reid said, "Karen Helland is next."

Ms. Karen Helland said, "Last but not least, we have the fifth goal. This has to deal with the accountability report and this is something that you are familiar with. You have seen this before. If you go to the website www.1illinois.org, you will find the four goals along with the performance measures and the documentation we have put together regarding different charts and data. This is just a partial screenshot. As you can see, there are four goals in four columns. The reports for Goals 1 and 2 have been completed and are on our website to check on. Goal 3 is the one that I am working on and will have ready at the June Board meeting.

"This is just the timeframe. Goal 1 we did in 2010 with the accountability report. Last June we did Goal 2 in regards to affordability. Goal 3 is the one that we are going to be doing this year: increasing the number of high-quality postsecondary credentials to meet the demands of the economy in increasingly global society.

"When we do these accountability reports we are looking at basically three things: where we were, where we are today and where we want to be at in 2018 in regards to the end of the ten-year period of the *Public Agenda*.

"Each goal has a number of performance measures and benchmarks. There are 12 of them for Goal 3 and you will see that they are a combination of different things. For instance, student completion ties into Complete College America. The student pass rates for different licensure exams, whether it be nursing, welding, whatever kind of criteria, accounting. And then also looking at the number of student transfers, which is something we are trying to get a better handle on. Of course with the LDS we will be able to do that. Completions in critical fields: nursing has been a critical field for a number of years.

"And then also we benchmarked, and that is a little bit different aspect of the *Public Agenda*, that we are looking how Illinois as a whole compares with other states. We look at it one-year, five-year, ten-year. We also want to look at our competitor states, which we consider our most populous states – California, Texas, New York, Pennsylvania – and then also our neighboring states. How are our neighbors doing in comparison to what we are doing? So that in a nutshell is what is coming up for Goal 3."

Dr. Reid said, "Thank you so much. Members of the Board, the process that we use is I first start out with a conversation with our Executive Assistant, Cindy Kolley. She is key to keeping our record of what we are doing. I have a conversation with her and tell her where we are going with the plan. Then we have the individual meetings. After we have each individual meeting, I will sit with Cindy again and summarize what we have come up with as conclusions on decisions in each of these meetings. She will send them back out to the respective deputies, so she is just a good person and we would not be able to do this kind of tracking, this kind of strategic planning without her valuable help."

"Madame Chairwoman, Members of the Board, this concludes the *Public Agenda* Update. I will now go into the Showcase."

Chairwoman Hightman said, "It is all on you, sir."

6. *Public Agenda* **Showcase**

Dr. Reid said, "We are in for a treat today. We have with us Paige Kowalski. Paige is the director of state policy initiative. She supports people like us, policy makers in the state. She is with the Data Quality Campaign (DQC) and she directs that initiative. She also is involved with training teachers, trying to create more effective teachers in more schools, elementary and secondary schools. She has worked with the Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO), which is the national organization for superintendents and others. She worked for them from 2006-08. She has worked with the Department of Education, helping in a technical way the Department of Education to make some decisions about LDS and what it is the Department would like to see in LDS across the country. She holds a Bachelor's degree in International Relations from University of California at Davis and she has earned a Master's degree from George Washington University. As she comes up – come up, Paige – as she comes up we want to thank her for traveling to Illinois to be with us today to give us information about something that is so important to the development of our future, the LDS. Thank you, so much, we look forward to your presentation."

Ms. Kowalski said, "As George said, I am Paige Kowalski and I am the director of state policy initiatives for DQC. I would like to thank the Board for inviting me here and George, whose kindness I have been getting to know and working with him over the last couple months on this issue. I am going to try to make this as exciting as I can for two o'clock in the afternoon to talk about data, but I do not know if it can get more exciting than listening to your own City College President talk about the critical role that data played in helping her increase her graduation rates here and helping them personalize attention. I believe the word was 'magic bullet' and we believe that at DQC.

"DQC is about seven years old. I have been working with states for about seven years in developing and using their data systems. We are not a technical organization. We are a nonpartisan, non-profit advocacy organization, so we work with state policy makers to help them understand the critical role of data, just as you heard in getting those wonderful stories out and putting that human face on it, but also in helping them understand, helping folks just like you understand what role you have to play in making this happen and supporting women like that and getting that work done and, scaling it up so everyone in Illinois has the advantage of tapping into that kind of data.

"What I am going to talk a little about today is just some big picture stuff around these data systems and then dive into a little bit of what George had asked me to talk about, which is P-20 data governance.

"What DQC does is – our goal is to change the culture and the conversation around data use. What we have had in the past – and what largely still exists today – you will recognize this kind of graphic, when data is collected at the local level and it moves up for compliance reasons and is filed away and not used, as it goes from the local to the district to the federal level. And when it is used it is used as a hammer. We know that the quality is not very good when you are collecting something because somebody says to do it. You are not going to pay a lot of attention to detail and make sure that it is right. What our missions is, is to get something like this on the right. It is to use the data as a flashlight, to really shine a light on what is working, what is not working. We want to get data tailored specifically toward stakeholder use, whether you are the president of a City College or you are in the eighth grade trying to understand what kinds of courses you need to take in high school to take you on the path to go where you want to go. And

also, to look backwards so that we can understand what did work and what was successful so we can help kids earlier and earlier.

"We want to be able to have trend data. We want to be able to really get to continuous improvement and that is really the vision of the future and what we think is the point of building these data systems. In education, we use dart boards. We do not really have a data-driven enterprise in the education sector like many other sectors do, whether it is business or health care or law enforcement and we make our decisions sort of blindly, without a lot of good information. And really getting from where we are today where we are using it sort of in that hammer way, to getting to where we want to be tomorrow. It is really about having policy makers lead that culture change and realizing that this is not an information technology (IT) project. This really is changing the way we do business.

"So, when we talk about data, we are not talking about test scores. Test scores is one piece of data, an important part of data and probably a piece that is not going away anytime soon. But this conversation has largely been shaped by test scores and a lot of the guard that folks put up when the word "data" comes into play is about those test scores, those standardized test scores. When DQC launched in 2005, we launched with a set of ten essential elements. Of the statewide longitudinal data systems, one of those elements is state-wide test scores, but it includes many other things, including demographics and enrollments, student outcomes, college prep tests like Advanced Placement (AP) and American College Testing (ACT) scores, getting courses and grades – all the rich transcript data – anything that is going to really help stakeholders understand that huge picture that goes around test scores is not solely defined by a test score.

"At DQC we think are most useful when it is longitudinal and we are looking at data over time, when the data is actionable, so when you receive the data there is something you can actually do with it and not just go, 'Hmm…that is interesting.' It is contextual, so whether it is a test score or anything else it is part of a bigger picture. And the data is interoperable, so it is linked to cross-systems in an efficient and effective way.

"So, on an annual basis – oh, and I mentioned the ten essential elements – that is a significant piece of the legislation that the Chairwoman mentioned earlier when she opened, that you all passed a few years ago and DQC was excited to work with several folks in Illinois to get that language and get some of those key elements embedded in there.

"Every year we do survey states on their data systems, on those ten essential elements. We also have these ten state actions that get to putting the policies and practices in place that support effective data use. You have in front of you a few of our materials. You have your state profile that we produce every year on the elements and actions. You have our annual report to give you a bigger national picture. You also have a P-20 primmer that just sort of lays out some of these connections across the P-20 and workforce pipeline. And then you have this spiral-bound, very pretty document that sort of initially explains and gives you a lot of good language, because 'state-wide longitudinal data system' does not roll off the tongues of most of the people you are going to come in contact with. So, it gives you a lot of good language about, 'What is interoperable and why do I care about that?' and just some good imagery to talk about why this is so important and how it helps people to really do their jobs.

"So, on these ten state actions, this is our 2011 data of where we are. It is kind of hard to see up there. We are here, particularly, to talk about today is developing cross-agency data governance, which sounds incredibly wonky, I know. We have got 36 states right now reporting that they have this in place, including the State of Illinois, but what we know about where these

states are is that they are kind of doing the stuff of governance. They have the Memoranda of Understanding (MOU) to share data across. They have got these committees that meet and talk about how to do it. They have got policies in place to protect privacy. They have got all this stuff in place to make it happen, but what we know that they do not have is this policy level guidance, and this alignment with the policy and the priorities. All the folks who talked before me laid out all of these wonderful goals and these policies that you are putting in place and striving towards, but if that set of goals, you can imagine that there is a similar set of goals in all the sister agencies you mentioned. There is ISBE, and there is DHS, and there are the Governor's priorities. Then you have got over here this data system that is really being run and designed and managed by the IT folks and the data folks and the chief information officers, sometimes researchers, and it is not aligned or governed in any way by folks like you who are actually held accountable and responsible for meeting those goals. So, part of what I am here to talk about is to help you understand what your role is in ensuring that the system is designed to meet your needs so you can hit those goals.

"I know that is a little hard to read, but basically this is a graphic, a visual representation of what this cross-agency governance looks like. So you have got your agencies and every agency, you know, you work in these silos, it is how we are all sort of structured as humans, but going across this you really need these data stewards and those are the folks what really get into the weeks around data definitions and standards and all that stuff, what is actually collected, and then you have got a higher level group that gets more into the policy stuff. But then you have got to have this policy leadership pieces at the top and that is the piece that almost all states are missing but they are getting there, because what were finding is that when we are talking about sharing data, when it was very theoretical, we could kind of get some of the stuff done, but now, states are actually sharing and we are starting to see more of the data come out. We are starting to actually see it flow between agencies and that is when people start getting really interested, right? When it is all theoretical you kind of say, 'Yeah, we have this system in place to do it,' but once it actually starts happening people start paying more attention and problems start arising. You start getting issues of turf and concern about privacy and 'what are they going to use it for?' and back to that hammer. Are they going to use it against me?

"So, I know this is impossible to read. I cannot read it either, but I just want to use this version here. But, when thinking about those silos and what we are talking about and why it is so critical to have that policy leadership in place, as you can imagine. Early childhood on the left, postsecondary/workforce on the right, with K-12 in the middle, and we are trying to link it all together, and we have got these critical questions around college and career readiness that we are charged with answering. How do you increase school readiness at the early childhood level? How do you inform postsecondary and workforce accountability in continuous improvement? How do you improve teacher preparation programs and decrease college remediation rates? Right now, the data systems that are being built, the data that is being collected, the data that is shared across how the models, the real weedy details, are all being determined by your IT folks, your CIOs, your data managers who are working really hard and looking for guidance about well, 'How do I prioritize this work? What needs to be shared now? How do we know this is the right way all that stuff is linked together?' Whether the systems are truly integrated or you are going out to a third party to get data, all of that is going to be driven by how do you intend to use it? Do you want teachers and stakeholders and parents, do you want university presidents, who is going to have access to this? That is going to determine how timely it is. What is going to make it actionable? And that is going to drive the development of this system.

"So, we know that the hardest things here when we are talking about working cross-agency, we get to these thorny issues around turf, trust, technical issues and time. These are our

four Ts; this is our catchy way of saying all the hard stuff. Policy makers and policy leadership is critical to getting through some of these things. We know we have got these turf issues once the data starts to flow back and forth and having these P-20 governance bodies where there are representatives from the leadership of every agency involved, the data owners. It gives them a forum to build relationships and really have these open discussions about the access and getting to trust around access and reassuring folks that we are going to work together to figure out who needs to access it what is going to be linked, what standards are we going to use, for what purpose is this going to be done. The technical issues that the policy leadership folks do not have to figure out but when the technical folks come to you and say, 'We can go buy higher education data from the National Student Clearinghouse for this amount of money every year, but we cannot get key pieces of it or we can actually invest now and integrate our systems so that we have it forever on our own kids.' That is a huge upfront cost and it may sound nice to go do something and buy it on a contractual basis but you miss the richness and you sort of miss the fact that the state of Illinois owns all this data, you just have to put the pieces together. And time – when you have folks cross-agency in a leadership position that come together they jointly act to allocate the time and resources to prioritize these solutions.

"So, I have this graphic that the State of Minnesota kindly developed, because the earlier graphic does not really, it is hard to internalize what it is really saying. If you can see it, it sort of shows how you have got this policy body at the top and how the work is sort of organized out into the data work and the IT work and the research work, and I think what may interest you all in particular is how much higher education involvement there is in this. It is largely a K-12 system, that is the bulk of it, the bulk of where the funding comes from, the bulk of the goals of the state is ultimately trying to improve K-12 with these systems, but really there is so much higher education involvement, because you cannot really understand those outcomes later in life without being able to connect to that data.

"We do you have some other state examples. This is primarily accomplished through legislation; we have a few executive orders out there. We found that when states try to do this on a voluntary basis it came together for the right reasons. There is a lot of initial buy-in but as you get turnover at that leadership level they may not have the buy-in and if there is not something there like legislation that sort of drives them to be at the table it is difficult to keep that momentum. It is difficult to get that sustainability that you worked so hard to create.

"We have a lot of great documents from Minnesota. Maryland is really the best example we have out there right now. They have a piece of great legislation that really establishes this data governance board. I have been to those meetings; they are actually really exciting. That might just be my perspective, but to have the governor's senior advisor sitting there with a senior staff person from the University System of Maryland (USM), the USM Chancellor, the state K-12 chief, the Career and Technology Education (CTE) head, the head of DHS, they are all there including some university presidents, there is district folks, but the data owners are there at the table and they are making critical decisions for how this data is going to come together and who is going to have access.

"Again, really hard to see, but one of the first things they sat down to do – and one thing that DQC recommends that these policy leaders sit down to do – is to develop the policy questions that the state media needs answered and start to use that as your guiding document of why you are building this system, how you are going to communicate to folks, what is this being built for, how are we going to use it, what are we trying to do with it. There are also a lot of people out there who think that you are collecting this data for the fun of it and that there is no real reason for it. And this starts to get at here is why we need this data and what we are going to

do with it and it starts to also lay out, here is the data we do not have. Maybe you need some critical pieces of data that you are not currently collecting and adding data collections is expensive and timely but if you can show to somebody, 'here is what we cannot answer about our kids and their pathways for success," you can start to make that case a little bit better.

"This is the Hawaii High School Feedback Report that was developed by their P-20 Council. This is the kind of thing that needs to sit with the P-20 data governance group. You need all the data owners in on this one because you are talking about higher education outcomes, you are talking about workforces outcomes, you are talking about linking it back with high schools and trying to develop something that is accessible to the public, to high school principals, to higher education, you need all the voices there and you need that feedback mechanism so that you can sit down again and say, 'This is not working for this constituency. How do we come together and fix this?'

"This is a framework. When you think about having policy leadership sit down to talk about data governance, it sounds like it is going to be very technical and what can we get through? But this is really a framework to help you think about the kind of issues that you are going to have to really struggle with and come to consensus on as a multiagency body. I know it is hard to read but access – who is getting access to the reports and is it actually actionable by those stakeholders? I mentioned earlier the example when you think about linking systems, matching data sets, sharing data – those are three distinct pieces and each of them has components of trust and privacy and technical solutions that go with them, so there are a lot of issues, really, to work through, that most states have not really begun to struggle with.

"DQC will be putting out a primer in the next couple of months around engaging policy leadership and helping them understand their role in P-20 data governance. Right now, our four draft recommendations are around, ensuring that this P-20 governance body has the right structure with the right people involved, particularly hitting that high-level policy leadership, ensuring that they have the authority to make the decisions. Again, if you have something that is voluntary, where folks come together and they develop a charter or a MOU to guide their work, it is not very binding and as leaders turn over you are going to see that sustainability ebb and go away over time. So, again – sustainable, so states need to think about legislation. Some states have gone down the road of an executive order but a lot of times that is not viewed very well, particularly by folks who may be in the other party. The folks who are appointed to those may not necessarily be the right people. Legislation can start to lay out who whose folks should be and then ensuring that their held accountable. So, if it is laid out, whether it is an executive order or if it is voluntary, there is documentation out there of what this group is charged to do and someone needs to hold them accountable for doing that work in a timely matter.

"So, that is it for me. I am happy to take any questions now and I am happy to have any of you email me or call me offline to talk about anything else on the agenda that you want to talk about."

Chairwoman Hightman said, "So, do any of the Board members have any questions or comments on the presentation?"

Dr. Reid said, "I did want to make a few comments. Paige came down when we first discovered that we needed the governance structure and impressed the data owners, they were ICCB, ISBE, IBHE, ISAC, DHS, DCEO and a couple of others. From that meeting we made a report to the Joint Education Leadership Committee, chaired by the Lieutenant Governor. And the Lieutenant Governor wrote a recommendation to the P-20 Council that the P-20 Council take up this matter and develop a governance structure in IL. The P-20 Council has taken it up. The

P-20's Data Quality and Assessment Committee, headed by Robin Steans and Max McGee, are meeting with us, the data owners. We have had our second meeting; we look forward to our third meeting on April 16, at which time we are trying to decide the matter Paige ended up with: whether or not we would have a governance structure that is set through law or would it be set by interagency agreement or just an informal agreement. Right now the thinking is that we will try to do the legislation. I did want you to know that we are well on our way to putting into place the recommendations that Paige went through just a moment ago."

Chairwoman Hightman said, "So, what is the biggest mistake that you have seen states make? Can you tell us now so we can make an effort to avoid that?"

Ms. Kowalski said, "In terms of governance?"

Chairwoman Hightman said, "Yes, or anything else but I think governance in particular."

Ms. Kowalski said, "Well, the biggest mistake is not to have policy leadership over it. We have always talked about this but even as we initially went out to initially measure whether states have that state action three, and, again, now we have got 36 states that are doing it, we were more focused on, 'Is the stuff happening? Are you protecting the data? Is there a group that gets together that is cross agency?' And that was really the thinking three or four years ago when we first developed that but now it is very clear that with more and more states – especially with the stimulus funding and the Race to the Top that has really pushed this on a much faster timeline than anybody expected, least of all us – that it is going to start to go, not quite off the rails but you are just not going to get the outcomes that you want from this system if it is not aligned. What we see, even in some of our best states, and I have heard this described here in Illinois – and we are actually working on a graphic to show it – there is sort of the K-12 statewide longitudinal data advisory that has cross-sector folks and then there is the P-20 data committee that has got it and then there is the higher education data committee that has cross sector.

"I have heard it in states, well, very recently in a state a higher education and said, 'Oh, we are doing a high school feedback report. We just hired a full-time staff person to go engage with all the districts. What do you think of that and what advice do you have?' And I thought that my first advice is to call the Department of Education, because I guarantee they are probably doing the same thing and you guys need to work together. The other thing is one of the things we survey on this – does the state have a high school feedback report – and we were getting back 25 states saying yes. But because they are usually posted publicly, we just went out and Googled and found ten other states that had them and did not know they had them. They were usually done one-off, usually in a College of Education. Maybe it was something someone wanted to do when they got transcript data at the higher education level so they can match it back to high school. So, they just do it and post it and nobody knows. Here is this wonderful resources, there is resources going towards it, there is data going towards it, somebody's time is going towards it and it is not being used. It is not aligned with other work that may be going on to get it done. This is really a way to bring it together and get the data owners together and the right constituents and stakeholders together to ensure that this is all done and it is aligned with the policies of the state."

Dr. Proshanta Nandi said, "Ms. Kowalski, you said 25 states are using it without knowing it?"

Ms. Kowalski said, "As far as the high school feedback reports? The number was something like that. I am pulling it a little bit out of my head. I think we are at 35ish states that

have high school feedback reports that report having them that are publicly posted, but when we first got our survey results in we went to look them all up, because we wanted to see what these reports look like. We were finding them in states that had said, 'No, we do not do that.' Usually, it is just the left hand not talking to the right hand."

Dr. Nandi said, "So has anybody documented how these data are received, the success or failure or whether they have reached their target or are on track? Has anybody figured that out? How long has the experience been so far?"

Ms. Kowalski said, "Some states have been building it – Florida has had their system online for twenty years – but the majority of the states have been building their systems for five years or so. The federal government started funding the data systems in 2005, so that really kind of kicked it off and then it got a giant push with the Race to the Top. They are pretty new systems. When you think of the cohort graduation rates that the National Governor's Association (NGA) laid out and the 50 governors came together and said, 'Yes, we agree that this is how the graduation rate will be calculated,' most states are just now able to calculate that, because you need four years worth of student level data at the state level to calculate that so you are seeing a lot come out right now about those rates. In fact, Washington, DC, just published their first cohort graduation rate last week. So, they are pretty new systems. We do not have a lot – and, in fact, one thing we are focused on this year is getting that evidence of impact, just like your Truman College president has great stories to tell. We want to collect stories and figure out how is it being used, how are lives changing. We want to hear that it is making people's jobs better because everybody says, 'How is this sustainable? There is no money?' Well, everything is sustainable if it is useful. Nobody is talking about pulling the plug on the internet when funds go down, because you can remember trying to find movie times before you had the internet. We want people to not remember how they did their job – whether it is in the classroom or it is you all or it is parents trying to understand what classes their kids are supposed to take, teachers looking at student level data and having access to early warning systems – we want them to not remember how teachers could ever do their job before the data system came along."

Dr. Nandi said, "I assume you are involved in this in a very big way?"

Ms. Kowalski said, "Well, I work for the Data Quality Campaign, which is at the national level, so I do not do it at the state level, but we work with states to advocate for doing this, putting the policies in place, whether it is legislation or not. Not every state is legislative-friendly!"

Dr. Nandi said, "Thank you."

Dr. Reid said, "And, for us, for the Board here, one of our charges in the *Public Agenda* is for us to become one of the top five performing states in the country. This is one of the elements, how a state handles its data. If you have your chart here, the one with the map of the United States, the title of it is, '2011 National Landscape.' You will see that Illinois is in that shaded area of four to five actions so far that we have accomplished. Our goal – and you see, also, that Florida, Texas, and Arkansas – are states that have accomplished eight or nine of the ten actions. So, if we want to be among those better states, as good as Arkansas – in terms of this data collection and dissemination – Texas, and Florida, you will have to have this governance for longitudinal data so we can do things like number seven: create longitudinal data reports. So, when we get there, then I suspect we will pick up more of these actions that we will be able to do."

Dr. Allan Karnes said, "George?"

Dr. Reid said, "Yes?"

Dr. Karnes said, "Can we not do things until we get the governance system in place?"

Dr. Reid said, "No, no. I think that we can, as Paige alluded, can continue. There are silos that are – I mean, I do not want to call silos necessarily a negative – but there are data areas that are working as we speak. Now, our proposal is not to ask them to stop working. Continue what you are doing, but at the same time we will put in this governance over it and when the governance is there then the governance can begin to speak to the linked data and the data from ISBE, linked with the ICCB, linked with the Board of Higher Education, then this governance structure would be able to say, 'This is how to disseminate, this is what the research ought to be, and so on and so forth.' So, yes, they will continue to do what the silos are doing but also at the same time put into play a governance structure which will eventually govern all of those silos."

Dr. Karnes said, "Because you are going to seek a legislative solution?"

Dr. Reid said, "We are, at this moment, the P-20 Council is, at this moment, I think, thinking about, more than any other solution, the legislative solution."

Dr. Karnes said, "But you are not going to meet until August, is that correct?"

Dr. Reid said, "No."

Dr. Karnes said, "I thought you said August 16. That was your date."

Dr. Reid said, "No, April 16."

Dr. Karnes said, Oh, okay."

Dr. Reid said, "April 16. Did I say April? April 16, that is next week."

Ms. Kowalski said, "And would just add on that, yes, the work can definitely continue and we see a lot of great activity in a lot of states that do not have this solution yet, but what we do see is that once these solutions are in place, this work happens a lot faster, more efficiently, without a lot of waste of resources. You start getting real priorities. The quality is there. You get much higher quality when there are people actually being held accountable and people that are responsible. Right now, my colleague Laura helped us phrase it as, 'Right now, when everyone is in charge, no one is in charge.' So, if you have a group in charge, they are going to get it done and it will be done a lot better than when everybody is running around at cross purposes."

Dr. Reid said, "I hope to bring a progress report to the Board in June, maybe in the form of the showcase, if we get that far, a report from the P-20 Council committee, which I serve on, as to where we are with this governance structure."

Chairwoman Hightman said, "Did any other Board members have any comments or questions? While we have you here, if there is anybody in the audience that actually has a question or a comment, we are more than happy to entertain it. If you do, come up to the podium. If not, then I want to thank you on behalf of the Board and the staff for coming here and for all the work that you have done to support this effort and for all your work around the country,

which is great. We would like to be number one but until we get there we have to look at what others are doing and try our best to catch up. Thank you very much."

Ms. Kowalski said, "Thank you."

Dr. Reid said, "Thank you, Paige."

III. Action Items

7. New Units of Instruction at Public Community Colleges

Dr. Blankenberger briefly outlined the contents of this item. There was no discussion following his presentation.

The Illinois Board of Higher Education, on motion made by Dr. Elmer Washington and seconded by Dr. Santos Rivera, hereby unanimously grants to Heartland Community College Authorization to grant the Associate in Applied Science in Administrative Office Professional subject to the institution's implementation and maintenance of the conditions that were presented in its applications and that form the basis upon which these authorizations are granted.

And grants to McHenry County College Authorization to Grant the Associate in Applied Science in Graphic Arts and the Associate in Applied Science in Robotic Systems Engineering Technology subject to the institution's implementation and maintenance of the conditions that were presented in its applications and that form the basis upon which these authorizations are granted.

And grants to Spoon River College Authorization to grant the Associate in Applied Science in Paramedicine subject to the institution's implementation and maintenance of the conditions that were presented in its applications and that form the basis upon which these authorizations are granted.

8. New Operating and/or Degree-Granting Authority for Independent Institutions

Dr. Blankenberger briefly outlined the contents of this item. There was no discussion following his presentation.

The Illinois Board of Higher Education, on motion made by Dr. Proshanta Nandi and seconded by Mr. Ari Shroyer, hereby unanimously grants to Lindenwood University Authorization to Grant the Bachelor of Science in Biology in the Southwestern Region subject to the institution's implementation and maintenance of the conditions that were presented in its applications and that form the basis upon which these authorizations are granted.

And grants to Maryville University of Saint Louis the Certificate of Approval and Authorization to Operate and to Grant the Master of Business Administration in the Southwestern Region subject to the institution's implementation and maintenance of the conditions that were presented in its applications and that form the basis upon which these authorizations are granted.

And grants to New Leaders the Certificate of Approval and Authorization to Operate in the Chicago Region subject to the institution's implementation and maintenance of the conditions that were presented in its applications and that form the basis upon which these authorizations are granted.

And grants to Northwest Institute of Health and Technology the Certificate of Approval and Authorization to Operate in the North Suburban Region subject to the institution's implementation and maintenance of the conditions that were presented in its applications and that form the basis upon which these authorizations are granted.

And grants to Valparaiso University the Certificate of Approval and Authorization to Operate and to Grant the Master of Business Administration, the Masters in Health Administration, and the Masters of Ministry Administration in the Chicago Region subject to the institution's implementation and maintenance of the conditions that were presented in its applications and that form the basis upon which these authorizations are granted.

And grants to Midstate College Authorization to Grant the Bachelor of Arts in Law and Social Justice in the Central Region subject to the institution's implementation and maintenance of the conditions that were presented in its applications and that form the basis upon which these authorizations are granted.

9. New Units of Instruction, Public Service, and Research at Public Universities

Dr. Blankenberger briefly outlined the contents of this item. There was no discussion following his presentation.

The Illinois Board of Higher Education, on motion made by Dr. Proshanta Nandi and seconded by Dr. Santos Rivera, hereby unanimously grants to Governors State University authorization to establish the Doctorate of Education in Interdisciplinary Leadership in the South Metro Region subject to the institution's implementation and maintenance of the conditions that were presented in its applications and that form the basis upon which these authorizations are granted.

And grants to the University of Illinois at Springfield authorization to establish the Bachelor of Arts in Environmental Studies in the Central Region subject to the institution's implementation and maintenance of the conditions that were presented in its applications and that form the basis upon which these authorizations are granted.

10. Adopted Amendments to Rules: Private Review (Private Universities and Colleges)

Chairwoman Hightman said, "Moving on to Item 10, 'Adopted Amendments to Rules', and I would say that actually, this is an item that more naturally would go in the consent agenda because it is the last step of a, I think, two-year process required under the Illinois statutes for adoption of a provision of the administrative code. But we put it on the agenda just to give the staff an opportunity to explain what happened and to talk a little about what happened here."

Dr. Blankenberger said, "Thank you. Items III-10 and III-11, these items request approval for the Amendments to the Administrative Rules for Private Colleges and Universities and to the Administrative Rules for the Public Universities.

"As you no doubt recall, this work has been in development for nearly two years. The process began in April 2010 with a public working session by the Academic Affairs Committee of the Board under the leadership of Dr. Washington to discuss private institution oversight.

"As a result of the meeting, Dr. Washington was charged to work with Board staff to review the Board's policies governing institutional oversight and approval processes. In August of 2010 we met with Dr. Washington to discuss a general framework for improving oversight and making revisions to the rules. The framework for the rule revisions was structured around four themes: tightening requirements prior to approval through use of more specific definitions; increasing transparency and accountability through new specific requirements related to consumer information disclosure and essential data elements; tightening and publicizing the post-approval review process; and administrative procedural changes.

"A Notice of the Board's intention to propose amendments to the rules was posted in the Regulatory Agenda for Fiscal Year 2011 in December 2010. The Academic Affairs Committee of the Board held additional working sessions April 6, and May 18, 2011, regarding proposed changes. The proposed amendments have been vetted with numerous stakeholders such as the public institution Academic Leadership Group, the Federation of Independent Illinois Colleges and Universities, the Faculty Advisory Council, and the Proprietary Advisory Committee. The proposed amendments were published in the Illinois Register in December 2011. After receiving and responding to additional comments, the proposed amendments were then reviewed by the staff and members of the Joint Committee on Administrative Rules (JCAR). The proposed amendments in the items were considered and certified by JCAR at the March 6, 2012 meeting. The rulemaking is now ready for Board adoption.

"I now present these items for consideration."

Chairwoman Hightman said, "Is there a motion?"

Dr. Nandi said, "So moved."

Dr. Washington said, "Seconded."

Chairwoman Hightman said, "I wanted, before we vote, actually, to thank Elmer for all the work on this. When did you start doing this?"

Dr. Washington said, "It is been a couple of years, has it not?"

Chairwoman Hightman said, "It seems like an awfully long time and so we appreciate all the time you contributed to this and your knowledge of the issue."

Dr. Washington said, "It was easy."

Chairwoman Hightman said, "It seems easy after you are done!"

Dr. Karnes said, "A question for Bob, now. Will the information you provide us in our Board booklets when we have new programs, will it show the data that we are requesting?"

Dr. Blankenberger said, "Yes, any data requested that are attached to one of the administrative rules. You will see the new administrative rules headings as you see them currently. The new ones will be in place."

Dr. Karnes said, "Okay."

Chairwoman Hightman said, "Any other comments or questions? If not, all in favor?"

The Illinois Board of Higher Education, on motion made by Dr. Proshanta Nandi and seconded by Dr. Elmer Washington, hereby unanimously adopts the amendments for Private Review (Private Colleges and Universities) (23 Ill. Adm. Code 1030) as detailed in the document provided.

11. Adopted Amendments to Rules: Approval of New Units of Instruction, Research and Public Service of Public Institutions

Dr. Blankenberger briefly outlined the contents of this item. There was no discussion following his presentation.

The Illinois Board of Higher Education, on motion made by Dr. Proshanta Nandi and seconded by Dr. Elmer Washington, hereby unanimously adopts the amendments for Approval of New Units on Instruction, Research and Public Service at Public Institutions (23 Ill. Adm. Code 1050)) as detailed in the document provided.

IV. Consent Agenda

Chairwoman Hightman said, "Now, the consent agenda. Is there a motion to approve the consent agenda?"

The Illinois Board of Higher Education, on motion made by Dr. Allan Karnes and seconded by Mr. Jay Bergman, unanimously approved Item Nos. 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18 and 19.

12. Board Meeting Minutes – February 7, 2012

The Illinois Board of Higher Education unanimously approved the minutes of the February 7, 2012, meeting.

13. Fiscal Year 2012 Financial Report as of February 29, 2012

The Illinois Board of Higher Education unanimously approved the Fiscal Year 2012 Financial Report as of February 29, 2012.

14. Public University Non-instructional Capital Project Approval

The Illinois Board of Higher Education unanimously approved the non-instructional capital projects included in this item.

15. Proposed Rules: Private Business and Vocational Schools

The Illinois Board of Higher Education unanimously approved the proposed rules for the Private Business and Vocational Schools (23 Ill. Adm. Code 1095) as detailed in the document provided for publication in the Illinois Register.

16. No Child Left Behind Act: Improving Teacher Quality State Grant Program Fiscal Year 2012 Grant Allocation

The Illinois Board of Higher Education hereby unanimously approved allocating fiscal year 2012 grants totaling $2,449,598 for the No Child Left Behind - Improving Teacher Quality State Grant Program to the institutions specified and in the amounts shown in Table 1. In the event that funds are not requested by a partnership in their entirety or additional funds become available, the Executive Director shall have the authority to re-allocate funds to other partnerships.

17. Illinois Cooperative Work Study Program Fiscal Year 2012 Grant Allocation

The Illinois Board of Higher Education hereby unanimously approved allocating Fiscal year 2012 awards totaling $1,230,000 for Illinois Cooperative Work Study grants as detailed in Table 1. The Board authorizes the Executive Director to withhold payment or adjust a grant allocation, if necessary, to conform to existing statute, rule, or available funding or to assure compliance with any previous grant agreements.

18. Executive Session Minutes and Verbatim Recordings

The Illinois Board of Higher Education hereby resolves:

Resolved, that the Illinois Board of Higher Education hereby unanimously finds that the need for confidentiality exists for the minutes of the IBHE Executive Sessions of June 2, 2009, July 28, 2009, August 10, 2010, December 7, 2010, April 12, 2011, and December 6, 2011, and that such minutes shall continue to remain confidential; and further

Resolves that the destruction of verbatim recordings for all Executive Sessions held prior to September 30, 2010, be authorized.

19. Technical Correction to Item # IV-13, Nursing School Grant Program, February 7, 2012 Board Meeting

The Illinois Board of Higher Education hereby unanimously approved the technical correction to Item # IV-13, Nursing School Grant Program, February 7, 2012 Board Meeting.

V. Information Items

20. Fiscal Year 2013 Governor's Higher Education Budget Operations, Grants, and Capital Improvements

21. Legislative Report

Mr. Jonathan Lackland presented a brief summary of proposed legislation on the College Completion Report Card Act and the Articulation and Transfer Bill. There was no discussion following his presentation."

VI. Public Comment

VII. Other Matters

Chairwoman Hightman said, "Our next meeting is June 5 at Illinois Math and Science Academy and our featured lunch guest will be the Independent College Presidents."

VIII. Executive Session

Chairwoman Hightman said, "The Board will now go into executive session. Under the Open Meetings Act, there must be a motion in open session to authorize this executive session. A quorum must be present and a motion must be approved by a majority of the quorum with a recorded vote. The Chair observes that a quorum is present.

The Illinois Board of Higher Education unanimously approved adjourning the open session and authorizing the executive session.

The Board moved into executive session.

There being no further business to come before the Board, Chairwoman Hightman adjourned the meeting at 3:42 p.m.

Respectfully submitted by Cindy Kolley, Secretary to the Board.

Note: Copies of all items referred to in the minutes (i.e., letters, statements, reports, etc.) are on file with the official minutes of the meeting.