

APPROVED

Minutes of the Work Session for the
398th Meeting of the
Illinois Community College Board
Richland Community College
Center for Sustainability and Innovation
3351 N. President Howard Brown Blvd
Decatur, IL 62521

March 23, 2012

Roll Call

Vice Chair Suzanne Morris called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m. Ann Knoedler called roll with the following members present: Guy Alongi, Randy Barnette, Michael Dorf, James Dumas, Suzanne Morris, Tom Pulver, Jake Rendleman, and Joshua Beneze, Student Board member. Chair Alexi Giannoulis joined via conference call at 10:00a.m. The following members were not present: Victor Henderson. Ann Knoedler declared a quorum was present.

Comments

Vice Chair Morris explained that she is chairing this meeting due to Chair Giannoulis being out of the state. He arrived back early this morning and is in the process of driving down for the Board meeting.

Vice Chair Morris thanked Richland Community College President Dr. Gayle Saunders for inviting the Board to the college for this month's meeting. Because Dr. Saunders will be speaking at the Board meeting in the afternoon in her capacity as President of the Council of Community College Presidents, she focused her remarks on Richland Community College. She thanked the Board for choosing to meet at Richland and welcomed everyone to the college. Dr. Saunders explained that the building the meeting was being held in is unique. The Center for Sustainability and Innovation opened in 2009, and she stated that all the energy for this particular building is produced on campus. She also stated that they have the first wind turbine on a community college campus in Illinois.

Vice Chair Morris also welcomed the new student trustee, Joshua Beneze. Joshua is finishing his second year at Kankakee Community College. Joshua stated that he is honored to have been elected by the students to serve on the Board. Next month he will be pursuing the position of international president of Phi Theta Kappa.

Vice Chair Morris announced that the Board would be receiving their Statement of Economic Interest forms in the mail soon. All Board members, with the exception of the Student Board member, will need to fill it out and send it in to the Secretary of State's Office. She reminded the Board that they will be fined for every day that their statement is late. The deadline is May 1, 2012.

Also, all Board members, with the exception of the student Board member, will need to complete the Open Meetings Act on-line training by December 31, 2012. Steve Morse, Associate Vice President for External Affairs, will send out the information again to all the Board members.

Item #2 – Fiscal Year 2011 Annual Student Enrollments and Completions in the Illinois Community College System

Dr. Karen Hunter Anderson, Vice President for Adult Education and Institutional Support, gave a brief explanation of the content in the enrollment report. She stated that there are no big surprises in this year's enrollment report. Enrollments have been very steady. However, it is important that the annual enrollments and completions are reviewed every year.

At the national and state levels, policy makers are looking much more toward accountability, and one of the factors of accountability is completions. Because of this, the reporting has been more attentive to what is happening to not only what kind of students the community colleges get when they come in, but also what the community colleges do with the students and where the students go from here. Dr. Anderson noted one other detail the reports try to focus on, not just completions, but advancement, how students are advancing from one level to another and what is their intent as they come in to the community colleges.

Dr. Anderson stated that Lieutenant Governor Sheila Simon called for a Consumer Report for community colleges. As the ICCB starts building some of the framework for those kinds of reporting formats, it is very important to look at where our students are as we participate in Complete College America. Dr. Anderson stressed that the system must ensure that we are recognized for how we are advancing our students and not just the kinds of degrees they are receiving.

The ICCB's Institutional Research and Policy Studies staff has over a million records that they look at every year. With that being said, Dr. Anderson introduced Dr. Scott Parke, Senior Director for Research and Policy Studies, who spoke briefly about some of the more specific things to be found in last year's enrollment numbers.

Dr. Parke started off by acknowledging the hardworking staff members who collaborated on this project: Nathan Wilson, Director for Research and Policy Studies, Michelle Dufour, Assistant Director for Research and Policy Studies, and Candy Tempel, IT Technical Associate, Information Technology. The Fiscal Year 2011 Annual Report on Student Enrollments and Completions in the Illinois Community College System is based on individual student records that the colleges provided at the close of the fiscal year (July 1, 2010 through June 30, 2011). Dr. Parke stated that there are eight Career and Technical Education programs that account for about 40 percent of all career enrollments statewide.

Those are Engineering Technologies, Associate Degree Nursing (RN), Health Professions and Clinical Sciences, Criminal Justice Technology, Child Care Provider, Nurse's Aide (CNA), Business Administration and Management, Auto Mechanics Technology. Dr. Parke explained that the information completed by the colleges for the Associate Degree Nursing (RN) reflects everyone who *wants* to be a registered nurse, not those who have actually been admitted into the program. The process is changing and people will start reporting who has actually been admitted into the program.

Agenda Item #14.1

June 1, 2012

In terms of who the community colleges in Illinois are serving for the Fiscal Year 2011 credit enrollments, Dr. Parke noted that the largest area is the transfer programs. Transfer programs which accounted for about 40 percent of credit enrollments. Career and Technical Education is the second largest with over 25 percent of credit enrollments. In terms of the population, minorities represented more than 38 percent of the credit student population and about 55 percent were female, which is slightly up from last year.

In terms of who the community colleges in Illinois were serving for the Fiscal Year 2011 non-credit enrollments, Dr. Parke noted that the largest area was the personal and social development courses. They accounted for nearly 60 percent. Professional development and business/industry training combined to account for almost 30 percent. Minorities represented 30 percent of the non credit student population and about 55 percent were female.

Board member Jake Rendleman questioned how many students were involved with the professional development and business/industry training. Dr. Parke responded that it was right around 87,800. Dr. Parke went on to explain when the economy downturned a lot of companies cut back on training and professional development, but this report shows that it seems to now be recovering.

In regards to annual completion, Dr. Parke noted that this was the first time completions are greater than 60,000. He concluded that the colleges are doing an excellent job of getting students through their programs. A lot of progress has been made; it is up about 4,600 from last year. The majority of completions are for degrees and certificates from the Career and Technical Education transfer programs. About 33 percent of the students completing last year were minority students and about 57 percent were female.

Board member Michael Dorf asked if there is a distinction between completer and graduate. Dr. Parke responded that it is the same thing. Mr. Dorf questioned whether the report includes students who did not get a degree but did transfer to a four year school. Dr. Parke replied that the survey does not include those students. This report is summarizing data on only the students that have just graduated.

Mr. Rendleman stated that John A. Logan College has shown a decrease in student enrollments. To figure out the cause, the college conducted a survey asking why these students stopped coming. They found that many of the students did not have the money to pay the tuition.

Dr. Parke was asked if he knew how Illinois compared to other states. Dr. Parke stated that the ICCB is currently working on another study with the Complete College America that will compare Illinois with 33 other states that are participating in the study.

Overall, for both fall 2011 and spring 2012, both headcount and full-time equivalent (FTE) enrollments were at their third highest level in over a quarter of a century. However, fall 2011 and spring 2012 enrollments have slightly decreased from recent record levels. Highlights of the Fiscal Year 2011 Enrollment Report show a total combined enrollment for both credit and non credit to be 949,819 students, an increase in online courses, and an increase in the number of African American students enrolled in credit courses.

Agenda Item #14.1

June 1, 2012

In addition, the number of community college completions in fiscal year 2011 is the highest count ever reported for the third straight year. Both the number of completions in Career and Technical Education (+8.8 percent) and Baccalaureate/transfer degrees (+4.7 percent) increased over fiscal year 2010.

Item #6 – Economic Impact Study Update

Dr. Karen Hunter Anderson, Vice President for Adult Education and Institutional Support, stated that in May, 2007, Northern Illinois University Center for Governmental Studies (NIUCGS) produced a report for the Illinois Community College Board (ICCB), “The Economic Impact of Illinois Community Colleges.” The report covered such issues as community college student-generated tax revenues, the return on investment of our graduates, and the impact on workforce development.

The Illinois Community College Board has received two proposals to produce an updated economic impact report: one from the Labor Education Program, School of Labor and Employment Relations at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign (UIC) and one from Northern Illinois University’s Center for Governmental Studies (NIU).

The ICCB Institutional Research and Policy Studies staff was in the process of analyzing the two proposals to find out how to best enhance the next study through a stronger focus on the return on investment of a community college education, including adult education, and how the community colleges are responding to the state’s changing demographics.

Dr. Anderson stated that pros and cons were found relating to both of the proposals. Both proposals were similar. The staff found that each proposal demonstrated how taking courses at an Illinois community college pays off for the student in immediate and lifetime earnings and how a community college education improves the local community and the state through a more educated and skilled workforce, through the generation of local and state tax revenues, and through a better business environment.

Dr. Anderson stated that the NIU proposal built on the previous work that they had already completed. They also included some additional components. They made use of the cohorts so the colleges could compare their outcomes to a similar cohort. They included workshops for colleges on how to study their results and had some best practices. They also suggested the use of an advisory committee to monitor the progress. The biggest advantage with NIU is that ICCB has already established a great working relationship with them.

Dr. Anderson stated that the UIC proposal had some advantages which included quantitative and qualitative analysis. It took a look at primary and secondary data. It gave a fuller analysis of the economic contributions of the State.

Dr. Anderson recommended going with the NIU proposal. Through the use of the advisory committee, the ICCB will try to implement some of the ideas from the U of I proposal into the NIU proposal. Both proposals cost about the same amount also. Currently, funding sources are being reviewed, including some grant money ICCB has received for the Longitudinal Data System as well as some other sources. ICCB has also had discussions with the ICCTA as well.

Agenda Item #14.1

June 1, 2012

Dr. Anderson then requested some feedback from the Board on how to proceed. Dr. Anderson stated that such a report is critical at this time of increased accountability as we move to implement performance-based funding, increase our completion and advancement rates, and design a community college consumer report. Vice Chair Sue Morris asked if any of the other people we want to partner with to help fund to see if they are interested. Dr. Anderson replied that they had in fact already had discussions and there is interest.

Board member Michael Dorf asked what the reception was of the 2007 NIU report. Dr. Anderson responded that she thought it was very positive. There was some training with the colleges and the ICCB wanted to expand on that so the colleges would make better use of their individual economic impact reports.

Board member Randy Barnette explained that when Joe Cipfl was president of the ICCB, they hired someone from the national organization to do the first economic impact study, which ended up costing the system around \$300,000. In that study, most of the questions and information provided did not seem very relevant. So, the second economic impact study done was with the Northern Illinois University for so much less.

Mr. Barnette went on to say that the study was used for opportunities to do press conferences around the state and to talk with marketing people about not only the statewide economic impact but also what the colleges bring to the local economy. It was very successful.

Dr. Anderson concluded that everyone was happy with the outcome. The economic impact has been looked at from two different perspectives: the economic impact on the community that the college has in terms of employment and in terms of providing employees to the community. The economic impact was also looked at from the perspective of the students who receive a degree or certificate or additional training.

Ellen Andres, ICCB Chief Financial Officer, added that the General Assembly passed a bill last year that basically says the state has Budgeting for Results (BFR). Ms. Andres went on to say the economic impact study would help out greatly with the BFR because the ICCB can show if you put a certain amount of money into the community college system and are advancing students, the Board would have proof that it saves the State this amount or it puts this amount into the economy. This is a nice option because not very many places can do that.

Vice Chair Morris clarified that the next step is for the Board to give authority to the staff at ICCB to go ahead and sign a contract for the economic impact study to be done. This would have to be done at the Board meeting scheduled later this afternoon. At that point, a motion will be made.

Item #1 – Recognition Update

Item #1.1 – Recognition Stakeholders Work Group Report

Dr. Elaine Johnson, ICCB Vice President of Academic Affairs and Workforce Development, updated the Board on the work of the Recognition Stakeholders Work Group.

Agenda Item #14.1

June 1, 2012

It was decided at the last Board meeting that a group would be put together to discuss recognition, the possibility of changing the ICCB recognition time schedule, and what should be done differently with recognition, if anything.

A meeting was held Monday, February 27, 2012 in Springfield. Scott Lensink, President of Lake Land College, was nominated as the work group's chair. Dr. Johnson stated that a discussion occurred in this meeting on changing the current timelines of ICCB's recognition from five to seven years to align with the Higher Learning Commission's (HLC) Academic Quality Improvement Program (AQIP). HLC oversees all of the community colleges in the state. It currently provides two programs for maintaining accredited status: The Program to Evaluate and Advance Quality (PEAQ) and the Academic Quality Improvement Program (AQIP).

Dr. Johnson outlined the details of the two different programs. The PEAQ uses a comprehensive evaluation process to determine accreditation status. The program consists of an institutional self-study, an evaluation by a team of trained peer reviewers, and final decision-making by the HLC through three panels. Every accredited community college in our state using the PEAQ process must be reaffirmed no later than ten years following each subsequent reaffirmation. However, that evaluation can occur sooner if the HLC deems it to be necessary.

The AQIP is a seven year program that provides an alternative evaluation process for organizations already accredited by the commission. AQIP is structured around quality improvement principle and processes and involves a structured set of goal-setting, networking, and accountability systems. When a community college formally becomes a participant in AQIP, the date of its next reaffirmation or accreditation is set seven years from the date of the official action admitting the organization into AQIP.

Dr. Johnson went on to explain that HLC is now developing a new model of evaluation called Pathways. An Open Pathway and Standard Pathway processes are being proposed. The Open Pathway model will separate the continued accreditation process, as currently carried out through PEAQ, into two components: the Assurance Process and the Improvement Process. For most institutions on the Open Pathway, the Assurance Process will involve the review of information and data the institution already collects or prepares and contributes to an Evidence File.

This process will take place twice in a ten-year cycle. In the fourth year of the ten year cycle, peer review of the Assurance Process will be carried out at a distance through electronic means. In year ten, a second Assurance Review will include a visit by a team of peer reviewers. The HLC determines whether an institution may participate in the Open Pathway. Eligibility for the Open Pathway is based on a range of factors, including the institution's past relationship with the HLC and the current context and capacity of the institution.

Agenda Item #14.1

June 1, 2012

The Standard Pathway is a ten-year cycle with year four and year ten requiring comprehensive reviews and visits. Throughout the ten-year cycle, reports and focused visits are more likely to be required in years one through three and years five through nine. The work group will meet again after they have met with HLC and at that time will also review the "Reporting Requirements by Organization" document looking for gaps in any of the audit review processes.

Dr. Johnson also noted the discussion that took place about moving from the ICCB five year cycle. The consensus of the work group was that future discussion should occur with the HLC to determine their timeline in moving to the Pathways Process. On Sunday, April 1, 2012, Sylvia Manning, from the HLC, will present information to the agencies. After the HLC meeting, the work group will reconvene for more discussion. No definite decisions or recommendations were given to the Board at this time.

Board member Jake Rendleman requested some feedback from Dr. Gayle Saunders, who is currently the President of the President's Council. Dr. Saunders stated there have been several conversations on the possibility of trying to get all the accreditation systems to align with one another. This will allow the colleges to report information in the same formats for each of the accrediting/auditing entities. Colleges will be required to gather identical information and reporting it in various different formats. Dr. Saunders went on to say that if we were to go with the seven year cycle which is similar to what is being done in AQIP, then every three years, or so, the college's would be forced to keep their systems and processes accurate and up to date. At the same time, it would take some of the pressure off the ICCB to keep up with a five year recognition cycle. She commented that, not every college is a part of the AQIP process. Those who are part of AQIP are required to submit a results report every year, a significant report every three years, and a final visit and recognition report every seven years.

Board member Michael Dorf questioned how much overlap is there in the recognition reports versus the accreditation reports? Dr. Johnson replied that there is a lot of overlap, about 70 percent. She responded that the accreditation is much more thorough; however, the ICCB is interested in information not reviewed in the accreditation report. Dr. Johnson stated that all this information will be brought to the work group to discuss and will continue to move this issue forward. Any of the changes that will eventually take place will be requested a year before the next cycle. It will take time to get all the time schedules lined up.

Item #3 – Proposed Changes

Item #3.1 – Associate in Science Degree

Dr. Elaine Johnson, ICCB Vice President of Academic Affairs and Workforce Development, explained that modifying the Associate of Science Degree (AS) has been discussed several times in recent years by the Chief Academic Officers, the Chief Student Services Officers, and others. Dr. Johnson explained that she is updating the Board because a recommendation for change will be coming to the Board from the Council of Presidents and Chief Academic Officers as soon as all the details are worked out and agreed to.

Agenda Item #14.1
June 1, 2012

The issue being discussed is the fact that the current ICCB Associate of Science Degree (AS) does not provide for courses that serves students in science fields. The requirements for the AS degree are identical to the Associate of Arts Degree (AA). Students follow chose from primarily the same courses, regardless of their intended major, or transfer institution. Dr. Johnson stated that the Chief Academic Officers took this request to the Presidents Council Curriculum Committee, and they supported the idea to change the two degrees.

Dr. Johnson introduced Dr. Rick Pearce, Chief Academic Officer at Illinois Valley Community College, to explain the necessary changes to the degrees. Dr. Pearce gave a brief synopsis of the proposal. Although the colleges have attempted to distinguish the AA from the AS by requiring specific course work such as additional humanities courses for the AA degree or additional math or science coursework for the AS degree. The missing course components of the current AS degree create an untenable situation for the students assuming they will be transferring into a third year of a baccalaureate program in some science or mathematics fields.

Dr. Pearce explained that these students are faced with three options: 1) take all the appropriate courses in math and science to be on-track for the baccalaureate program, but transfer without having completed the AS degree; 2) complete the AS degree without completing all the appropriate courses, and therefore; transfer with the disadvantage to native students and with the possibility of being one to two semesters behind; 3) complete the degree with the additional courses necessary for transfer and accumulate substantially more credits then will be accepted by the receiving institution. He estimated this to be around 70-75 credits, or 10-15 too many.

The proposal is to modify the AS degree and shift six credits from two General Education categories into two specific categories. The resulting degree will allow students to be able to take the appropriate course sequences for transfer and to complete the Associate of Sciences Degree.

Dr. Pearce reiterated that the Chief Student Services Officers, the Chief Academic Officers, and the Presidents Council support the proposal. A week from today the Board of Higher Education Academic Leadership Group will be meeting, and the representatives from the community college Chief Academic Officers will make a formal presentation to them.

Dr. Johnson concluded that this information would be taken back and discussed within the Board's Academic Affairs Committee before the final recommendation is brought back to the Board.

Item #3.2 – Credentialing of the General Education Core Curriculum (GECC)

Dr. Elaine Johnson, ICCB Vice President of Academic Affairs and Workforce Development, briefly spoke on the General Education Core Curriculum (GECC) Package. The GECC Package is comprised of Illinois Articulation Initiative (IAI) approved general education courses from five academic disciplines.

Agenda Item #14.1

June 1, 2012

In order to complete the IAI GECC, students are required to take at least 12-13 courses (37 to 41 semester credits) that are considered an essential foundation for a well-rounded education. No more than two courses from any one discipline can be used to fulfill GECC requirements. Successful completion of these core courses at any participating college or university in the State of Illinois will facilitate transfer to any other participating associate or bachelor degree programs.

Dr. Johnson explained that many of the students leave the community college before they graduate because they have received the necessary education prior to transfer. Many students attend a community college to get the general education core and then transfer without receiving any credentials. Dr. Johnson went on to say that since the GECC is not being tracked statewide. A current proposal is to track these students or somehow credential the GECC.

The Illinois Transferable GECC became effective statewide in the summer of 1998. If the student does not complete the full package before transferring, each receiving college or university decides how each individual course is or is not applied towards the student's final degree. Colleges encourage students to complete the Illinois Transferable GECC package before transferring so they will be guaranteed full general education credit. Any student completing 30 semester credit hours of college level coursework and transfers to an IAI participating institution will be given the option of completing the IAI general education or receiving the institutions lower-division general education core requirements.

Dr. Johnson went on to explain an ongoing issue surrounding the GECC credentialing. The Chief Academic Officers are proposing a GECC certificate. Currently the only certificates over 30 hours approved by the ICCB are occupational programs. The ICCB rules state that if a student earns a certificate, in the career and technical field, skills must be enough for success in employment. Therefore, Dr. Johnson is opposed to approving a GECC certificate. However, Dr. Johnson is not opposed to approving a GECC credential for these students.

Dr. Johnson stated that the colleges want to document students who have completed their GECC as a "completion" before they transfer; however, she does not want to give the students the idea that this certificate is a terminal degree and they are prepared for employment. Others in the system would believe that the students have "soft skills"-reasoning, writing, and speaking skills which are necessary and sought out by employers.

In the near future, Dr. Johnson stated that the Board will have to decide if there will be a GECC certificate, credential, or no change to the current policy. Any change will require a change in the ICCB administrative rules and maybe legislation.

Vice Chair Sue Morris asked if this would allow students seeking a bachelor's degree to transfer sooner. Dr. Johnson responded yes. Geoff Obrzut, President/CEO of the Illinois Community College Board, asked what other states were doing on this subject. Dr. Johnson explained that some states are credentialing and some are giving certificates.

Agenda Item #14.1
June 1, 2012

Dr. Karen Hunter Anderson, Vice President for Adult Education and Institutional Support, added that her staff has researched this in depth as it pertains to student completions, and there is no uniformity across the nation in terms of the difference between a certificate and a credential. She stated that there are no standard definitions, so the terms certificate and credential mean different things nationwide.

Dr. Anderson's staff has also engaged Complete College America in discussions on these definitions because they have very specific requirements on completion data. Ellen Andres, Chief Financial Officer, added that during the performance based funding meetings, there were lengthy discussions about counting certificates in the performance metrics. Universities give very few, if any, certificates. The Illinois Board of Higher Education (IBHE) originally gave a minimum number of hours that they would accept for a certificate to be counted in performance funding. The community college system successfully argued for certificates to be counted if they are industry based. When the decision of whether GECC will be a certificate or credential, Ms. Andres stated that the Board and system must ensure that these students are counted towards community college performance completions. Dr. Johnson stated that this information would be taken back to the committee for further review.

Item #5 – Legislative Update

Steve Morse, Associate Vice President for External Affairs, gave an update on the recent legislative activity. Mr. Morse stated that in the Governor's speech, there was mention of the \$2.7 billion dollars he wants to make up in Medicaid payments next year and he wants a pension reform.

Mr. Morse went on to say that the pension reform is the biggest non-bill out there. There have been discussions of the school districts, community colleges, and state universities all having to pick up half of the state's portion of the payment into the pensions. It is still unsure if this will actually take place. Vice Chair Sue Morris requested that Ellen Andres, Chief Financial Officer, give her comments on this situation.

Ms. Andres stated that ICCB staff was invited to a meeting with Jerome Stermer, Acting Director of the Governor's Office of Budget and Operations, Senate President Cullerton, and Speaker Madigan. Also attending were Dr. Gayle Saunders, president of the Presidents Council, Terry Bruce, CEO of Illinois Eastern Community Colleges, Mike Monaghan, Executive Director of the Illinois Community College Trustees Association (ICCTA), Tom Ryder, Legislative Counsel to the ICCTA, and Liz Brown, the Presidents Council lobbyist.

The Senate President and the Speaker of the House were informing the system that pension reform is going to happen. Ms. Andres reported the attendees representing the community colleges went into the meeting with two plans: 1) explaining how unaffordable it will be for the community colleges, and 2) if it was going to happen, the system would like it to be phased in. The system would like it to be slowed down because it will cost \$125 million annually.

Ms. Andres went on to say that Mr. Stermer referred to a secondary group of House and Senate Democrats and Republicans that have been appointed to work out the issue. The community college representatives were invited to meet with the appointed pension reform committee.

Agenda Item #14.1

June 1, 2012

Ms. Andres stated that the Speaker and Senate President made it clear that they believed that community college employees are not state employees; and therefore, the state should not have to pay for their pensions. It was also stated that raising taxes in order to help with the pension reform was not going to be part of the final solution.

Mr. Morse commented that the legislative pension reform committee will report back to the General Assembly in the middle of April. Another working group established to discuss the Medicaid issue will also be reporting back in the middle of April.

Mr. Morse stated that as of right now, in order for community colleges to receive equalization they are supposed to be within 85 percent of the statewide tuition average. The ICCB had a bill a couple of years ago that was passed by the Senate then got delayed within the House. Last year it started in the House and is now in the Senate. This bill is meant to lower the percentage from 85 percent to 70 percent of the state wide average. He is hoping to get that bill passed. Mr. Morse went on to say that the House bills that are in the Senate at this point are supposed to be reported out of the committee by May 4.

Mr. Morse then briefly touched on bills that some of the community colleges initiated within the legislature. City Colleges of Chicago initiated a bill in the House and the Senate. It was passed by the Senate and is on the second reading in the House. This bill would allow for community colleges to be able to use donations given to them by other institutions with more leniency, similar to how universities currently do it.

Mr. Morse went on to say there are a couple of bills that may be up in the Senate hearing within the next week sponsored by Senator Lightford, the College Completion Report Card Act, which is a suggestion presented as part of the Lt. Governor's recent report on community colleges, and the other was an articulation bill received from Women Employed.

Geoffrey Obrzut, President/CEO of the Illinois Community College Board, commented on a bill the President's Council is pursuing. Mr. Morse went on to explain the two bills the President's Council initiated, one in the House and one in the Senate that would make it a requirement that one of the 11 Board members of the Illinois Community College Board would be a community college president. The bill passed the Senate and is now in the House. The House version of the bill is on its second reading in the House.

Mr. Obrzut also stated that the ICCB had their appropriation hearings with both the House and the Senate a week ago. It is believed that the hearings went well.

Board member Randy Barnette asked if Mr. Morse had spoken about the College Insurance Program (CIP), the health insurance program for college retirees. Mr. Morse explained briefly to the Board the background on CIP. Last year there were discussions within the legislature to eliminate state funding from the CIP, which is currently partially funded by the state. However, Mr. Morse went on to say that he has not heard anything more on the issue.

June 1, 2012

Item #4 – Business Relations/Partnerships Committee Update

Dr. Elaine Johnson, ICCB Vice President of Academic Affairs and Workforce Development, gave a brief update on Chair Giannoulis' new committee the Business Relations and Partnerships. The committee met last week with Board members Randy Barnette and Sue Morris in attendance, and with Chair Alexi Giannoulis participating by phone.

The original vision was to create a statewide advisory council for the Board. Dr. Johnson distributed to the Board members a list of potential names to serve on an advisory council. She stated that the list includes companies in Illinois that are hiring the most people and would make a good partner for the system. Staff received assistance compiling the list from the Chicago Chamber and Careerbuilders.

Dr. Johnson was asked to make a list that shows business partners already working with the community colleges. The ICCB staff requested from the Illinois Community College Trustees Association (ICCTA) a list of community colleges who had submitted their business partnerships nominees for the ICCTA award. Names of partnerships were also taken from the business and industry reports and case studies. Dr. Johnson then requested input from the Board on where the committee should go from here.

Chair Giannoulis stated that he does not want this committee to get in the way of any work the community colleges are already doing. However, he believes overall a larger scale committee should be created. Chair Giannoulis went on to say that he envisions having mostly business committee members. Dr. Johnson will be working with Chair Giannoulis to create this committee. Chair Giannoulis stated that the next step would be to get the statewide committee appointed by the next Board meeting, which is June 1, 2012.

Item #7 – Committee Updates

Item #7.1 – Ad Hoc Committee Update

Vice Chair Morris briefly updated the Board on the Ad Hoc Committee report. The ICCB Ad Hoc Committee met on Thursday, March 15, Room 9-039, James R. Thompson Center, Chicago, Illinois. Present were: ICCB committee members Tom Pulver, Michael Dorf, Suzanne Morris, CEO/President Geoffrey Obrzut, and Assistant to the President Ann Knoedler. Participating by phone were ICCB Chair Alexi Giannoulis, ICCB Vice Presidents Elaine Johnson, and Karen Hunter Anderson, and ICCB Chief Financial Officer Ellen Andres. Also calling in was Terry Bruce, CEO of Illinois Eastern Community Colleges.

Vice Chair Morris went on to say that the minutes provided from the committee meeting was a good summary of the work the ICCB does. In addition, the committee was formed by the ICCB Board Chair to review the recognition process and other issues brought to the Board to assure proper time for the Board to review issues prior to Board action.

Vice Chair Morris stated that the committee also wanted to review the possibility of other items being brought to the Board for their approval even though they have not been in the past, and maybe some items no longer need to be brought to the Board for their approval.

Agenda Item #14.1
June 1, 2012

The following is a list of committee recommendations:

1. There will be a routine agenda item on recognition dealing with approval, extensions, manuals, schedules and other topics related to recognition.
2. Extension certificates for recognition would continue to be granted at the discretion of the ICCB Board Chair but would be brought to the ICCB Board for ratification at the meeting following the Chair's action. Extension certificates will be provided in a timely manner to schools when the certificate expires.

A discussion among the Board members took place regarding the above second recommendation. Board member Guy Alongi confirmed that extensions being given on the certificates have in the past been at the discretion of the Board Chair with the ICCB staff; however, with this recommendation the committee is proposing, another step has been added to this process.

Mr. Alongi then questioned what would happen if the Board Chair granted the extension, but the Board doesn't want to ratify it at the next meeting. Vice Chair Morris stated this was debated at the committee meeting and was decided that no one could imagine a scenario where the Board would not approve that action. Mr. Alongi then posed the question, why even implement this extra step of Board ratification of the certificate extensions?

Vice Chair Morris stated the fact of the matter is if recognition requires approval from the Board then perhaps extensions would require some type of action. Board Member Michael Dorf explained that it is intended to be more of an acceptance of what the Chair had done, rather than taking a total re-review of what was behind the Chair's decision.

Vice Chair Morris stated that this is an issue that can be debated. It could possibly be a notification to the Board and the Board just accepts it. Vice Chair Morris went on to explain that the Board would like to be able to acknowledge the extension has been granted and has had the opportunity to discuss.

Mr. Alongi stated his concern that one of the issues the Board originally had with Recognition was that as Chair, Mr. Alongi's signature was auto-penned onto all the certificates. Mr. Alongi suggested that there be a recommendation that all certificates are hand-signed and not auto-penned. Geoff Obrzut, President/CEO of the Illinois Community College Board, and Dr. Elaine Johnson, ICCB Vice President of Academic Affairs and Workforce Development, stated, which Mr. Obrzut agreed with, that this had already been agreed on by the ICCB staff.

Mr. Obrzut, along with Mr. Alongi, stated that this agreement by the staff was accidentally left out of the December 2011 Board meeting minutes. Let it be known that ICCB staff has agreed to no longer auto-pen the signatures of the Chair or President/CEO of the Illinois Community College Board on the Recognition Certificates. These must be all hand signed.

Agenda Item #14.1
June 1, 2012

Mr. Alongi suggested that instead of having the Board ratify each extension, a memo will be sent out to the Board members from the Chair notifying them of the extensions being granted. Vice Chair Morris agreed that the Board is looking for a notification of some kind of when the extensions are given. She requested input from Chair Giannoulis if he was okay with the extensions being brought to the Board as information items and not require any Board action.

Chair Giannoulis agreed that was the best way, those extensions should be more of an advisory item. Chair Giannoulis requested the other Board members thoughts if they felt differently.

Board member Randy Barnette expressed his thoughts on what that the Board was really interested in is receiving notification before the approval from the Chair takes place on the extensions rather than after.

Mr. Barnette went on to say that in order to have an extension, there must be a reason; therefore, the Board at least needs to know what the reasoning is for the extensions. Mr. Barnette explained that he is not saying the Chair cannot actually make the approval in emergency situations; however, he believes the Board should be informed of what is happening. Vice Chair Morris suggested that the Board put together a list of items they would like to be informed of so ICCB staff has a clearer idea.

3. Any contract that needs Board approval (those over \$20,000), Intergovernmental Agreements, and grants will be presented to the Board as an information item at least one meeting prior to being an action item needing approval. This will allow the Board ample time to carefully consider contracts, grants, agreements, and pursue questions or concerns. The Board will continue to be notified of all contracts as an information item, but those under \$20,000 will continue to be approved by the Board Chair.

A discussion between the Board members took place regarding the above third recommendation. Vice Chair Morris explained that if there is a contract that the Board would need to vote on, Board members would like to be able to review the information ahead of time, which is one meeting prior to when the contract is going to be an action item. Mr. Alongi posed the question; for staff is there at any time where a grant or intergovernmental agreement can come between Board meetings that will require quick action?

Dr. Johnson stated that for intergovernmental agreements especially there is a very quick turnaround. For example, as of right now, there are no documents for these two intergovernmental agreements to show the Board; however, currently in the works is an intergovernmental agreement between the ICCB and the Illinois State Board of Education (ISBE), who will be giving the ICCB one million dollars to increase the College and Career Readiness projects.

There is also currently in the works another intergovernmental agreement between the ICCB and ISBE, who will be giving the ICCB \$250,000 to host a series of workshops across the state between now and June 30, 2012.

Agenda Item #14.1

June 1, 2012

How the process usually works between state agencies is with a quick turnaround, and when the contracts are ready ISBE will want the ICCB to roll the funds out to the community colleges quickly. If the ICCB has to wait a long period of time to accomplish this, ISBE could possibly end up giving the funds directly to the colleges instead of going through the ICCB.

Vice Chair Morris suggested that the appropriate Board committee meet and view the contract prior to the Board, then it be passed on to the Board. Mr. Alongi suggested if there is a timeframe to work within the Board on the contracts, but if it is an emergency situation, then the Board Chair should make that decision. Chair Giannoulis agreed with Mr. Alongi.

Dr. Karen Hunter Anderson, Vice President for Adult Education and Institutional Support, stated there needs to be clarification on what kinds of grants and intergovernmental agreements need to come to the Board since there are so many that are different. Ellen Andres, Chief Financial Officer for the Illinois Community College Board, suggested the ICCB staff inform the Board on what agreements/contracts are coming up before the Board is asked to review them, and every couple of weeks inform the Board on routine decisions that are taking place and what is being signed just to make the Board more aware.

Board member Michael Dorf stated it is important that the Board committee members become experts in their committee areas so that the Board can rely on the expertise of the committee and have confidence in their recommendations. Mr. Dorf went on to say there needs to be more time allotted for the committee meetings in order to be able to have appropriate discussions and work with the staff. Mr. Dorf suggested the committees be restructured based on what the individual committees are, how many members should be on the committees, and how many committees should members should serve on.

Chair Giannoulis posed the question, is Mr. Dorf suggesting there be fewer Board members serving on the committees or the Board committee members specialize more? Mr. Dorf explained he believes the way the Board committee members can specialize more is if they not be a member of every committee, so they can develop an expertise.

Vice Chair Morris also suggested the committees needing more time to review and discuss an important item schedule their meeting on a different day altogether instead of meeting the night before or on the morning of a Board meeting.

Dr. Anderson stated there needs to be consideration given to the number of committees already established. Dr. Johnson also stated the committees now are going to need to be more involved; therefore will need more time for discussions. Board member Tom Pulver stated that the Open Meetings Act requires a quorum even for committee meetings. Vice Chair Morris stated she would like to relook at all the committees along with the ICCB staff and come up with a way to combine some of them.

Mr. Obrzut suggested the ICCB staff work with Vice Chair Morris and Chair Giannoulis on reorganizing the committees. Chair Giannoulis questioned if it was against the Open Meetings Act for two Board members to just have a conversation. Adding on to the Chair's question, Vice Chair Morris posed the question, if a committee was made up of five (5) Board members, could two (2) of those members have a conversation?

Agenda Item #14.1

June 1, 2012

Steve Morse, Associate Vice President for External Affairs, replied yes, the two Board members could in fact have a conversation if the committee they were on was made up of five members.

Board member Randy Barnette had posed the question, if it was allowed in the Open Meetings Act for the committees to have a purely information meeting. Mr. Morse replied that all the rules of the Open Meetings Act apply to Boards as a whole; therefore, would apply to the committees of those Boards. Mr. Morse went on to explain that yes two Board committee members could have a conversation between each other; however, they have to be careful of what they address during their conversation. If the conversation relates to operational issues it probably would not be a problem; however, anything to do with policy is more of a gray area, so you would want to lean towards the law rather than away from it.

Mr. Alongi then suggested having the committee meetings in the evening; though, Mr. Obrzut clarified that it was more an issue of getting the members in one spot geographically. Vice Chair Morris stated when reworking the committees the geography of the members should be kept in mind.

4. Most reports the staff presents at Board meetings are statistical and informational. These will continue to be informational agenda items. But some reports that set policy or statewide agendas would require Board approval. For example, the Adult Education State Plan is an item that may be considered for Board approval. There is a distinction between a policy-making item that requires Board action and other agenda items that are provided for informational purposes. The CEO should work with the Board Chair to make sure policy-decisions are presented as action items in a timely manner.
5. The finance report regarding funding that is routinely presented to the Board will include not only the current budget information, but a comparative figure that would reflect what full funding of the community college system would be.
6. To make both the committee system and the Board meeting more effective, there should be a review of the committee structure, purpose, and method. The current system of short committee meetings just prior to a full Board meeting often requires committees to adjourn before full discussion can take place. The number of committees to be scheduled, the schedule of Board members, and the limited number of board meetings per year make this a challenging goal. This needs further discussion.

Mr. Alongi, questioned the ICCB Manuals discussion in the Ad Hoc Committee minutes. Mr. Alongi stated that he did not see in the Illinois Community College Act where the “guidelines are required by statute to be set by the Board”, as stated in the Ad Hoc Committee minutes. Mr. Barnette read from the Illinois Community College Act, 805/15 under Recognition, “the state Board shall set the criteria by which the colleges shall be judged”. Board member Tom Pulver questioned outside of recognition, what about the policies in general.

Agenda Item #14.1
June 1, 2012

Mr. Alongi asked, for just general policy set by the “Board”, does that mean the Board as in the Board members or does it mean the ICCB staff? Mr. Barnette responded that with state law, the Board sets the policy certainly with input from the staff; still, the Board is the one that sets the policy. Mr. Alongi stated he believes there are different interpretations for this issue. He also stated there is a fine line between the Board setting policy and micromanaging all the day-to-day operations.

Mr. Alongi went on to say that put the Board in a situation where it gets to the point of being hard for the staff to operate on a day-to-day basis. Vice Chair Morris stated everyone’s concerns will be taken into account. It has gotten to this point because some things happened that the Board thought they should have been notified; in spite of this, none of the Board feels they want to micromanage.

Item #7.2 – Alumni Relations Committee Update

Dr. Elaine Johnson, ICCB Vice President of Academic Affairs and Workforce Development, gave a brief update. Board member Victor Henderson is the Chair of the committee. The ICCB staff created this committee as directed by the Board. The committee is made up of college presidents, college development officers, college trustees, college faculty members, and college students.

To date, the committee has met three times. Dr. Johnson went on to say the ICCB staff has met with many groups relating to the community colleges to receive input and feedback, a SWOT analysis was conducted of what should be done in marketing to the alumni, and created a state wide alumni relations campaign slogan, Illinois Community Colleges “A Million Reasons Why”, for the Board’s consideration.

At this time a video presentation of community college students and graduates interviews was viewed. Dr. Johnson went on to explain the committee’s action plan create an awareness through social media, create promotional products, target and publicize to local media and ongoing ICCB college and community events, and to continue to investigate and determine long term cost of traditional marketing tactics. Dr. Johnson requested Board support to activate the Illinois Community College Facebook, Twitter, LinkedIn, and YouTube accounts.

The first step the committee would like to do is video record Board Chair, Alexi Giannoulis, as he talks about being the Chair of the Illinois Community College Board and when finished the Chair would use the slogan, “Illinois Community Colleges: A Million Reasons Why”, kicking off a social media campaign. Then the ICCB staff would monitor the social media sites for growth and awareness. The budget for this first step with social media sites is zero dollars.

The next step would involve creating promotional materials, such as banners for state and community events and T-shirts. The promotional budget is still being determined. The committee will continue to meet and discuss more options and ideas.

Agenda Item #14.1
June 1, 2012

Dr. Johnson then requested support from the Board to move ahead with the committee's desired concept of, "Illinois Community Colleges: A Million Reasons Why." Board member Tom Pulver suggested that the Board put their full support behind the concept by making a motion during the Board meeting taking place later today.

* * * * *

Work Session ended at 12:10 p.m.

Suzanne Morris
Vice Chair

Geoffrey Obrzut
President and Chief Executive Officer