

Steering Committee October Meeting

10/22/18

Attendees:

- Susan Poser, UIC
- Bill Colvin, Shorelight
- Neal McCrillis, UIC
- Kevin Browne, UIC
- Janet Parker, UIC
- James Sheehan, Shorelight
- Dan Grace, Shorelight
- Kali Heifetz, UIC Global
- Sandra Moklak, UIC Global (meeting minutes)

Previous Business:

- Vote on previous Steering Committee minutes 7/13/18
- Unanimous vote in approval

Fall 18 NSE's:

- 54% applications
- 448 (check) visas
- 367 arrivals
- Review of college break down
- Review of Fall percentages in comparison to last year
- Increase in LATAM 500% but that does not result in many students, does represent increased focus on LATAM region, MENA also a focus along with US onshore
- BC added trends consistent for SL portfolio, LATAM up significantly, China a bit soft
- KH added this was above NSE budget
- BC mentioned LATAM typically takes off 2-3 years after start of partnership to gain confidence and knowledge of university

Pipeline Spring:

- Spring is looking flat, SE Asia and S. Asia conditional offers are low but do anticipate will meet budget of 119 for Spring
- Direct to Consumer (D to C) looks positive

Fall 2018 Net 12 Analysis

- NM distributed document UIC Global diversity scholarships/discounts by students
- Aim to reduce scholarship or discount compared to FA17 for overrepresented demographics at UIC
- NM stated has gone down slightly but would like to see go down much further in future rounds
- BC after 4/30/18 all overrepresented population scholarships, as agreed, were capped but, as anticipated, dramatic decrease in population was not expected due to timeline in enrollment period
- BC brought up that had projected then that Pakistan would be at 15% as it came out to be and that overall discount would be around 50% (distributed document shows 51%)
- SP asked about percentage of UIC Global students that are Pakistani, versus Indian, etc.
- Pakistan is 12%
- India 50%
- Vietnam 4th in rank
- UIC is significantly over-represented in India and Pakistan
- BC asked KB if this population went up or down from last year, KB explained graduate enrollment significantly went down, expects trend to continue, undergraduate outside of SL went up
- BC brought up if we close off a pipeline for Direct will be very difficult to open back up
- Ratio at UIC is 3.7 and 3.9 above national average percentage of international student population for India and Pakistan
- BC brought up would it be helpful to look at peer and public stem institutions to look at the data
- SP brought up aim of diversity scholarship is to diversify campus so not applicable to look at national averages
- BC brought up that large urban campus will be a draw from these countries so might be different than looking at national average
- JS brings up if we look at it for gearing up for next Fall intake
- NM pointed out looking at peer institutions might bring the average slightly but not significantly, would like to diversify
- SP brings up we need to follow current Net 12 process for a year to see outcome
- Engineering concerned about high number of students, male population, current efforts to drive female population
- JS asked do we want to think about opening up to women but NM stated can't incentivize by gender
- DG said from marketing perspective will analyze data, talk to recruitment
- JP brought up we are calculating the Net 12 scholarships on progression and this is particularly problem with high attrition in PSE
Most PSE students are not getting scholarships, then not going into the main population due to PSE Progression and Attrition concerns. Result is that these students are not mixing into the base population progressing out of accelerator programs, balancing out the ID students who have scholarships from overrepresented countries
- 31% of Fall 2017 students from PSE are still in PSE programs
- Only 20% progressed from Tutorium from Fall 2017

- Jason Romano has been talking with Global about how can we integrate these students more to increase motivation
- Attendance is an issue, average is 2-3% for attrition across partnerships
- NM shared feedback from J. Romano, came back from conference with other SL partners and said persistence and progression rates reflect typical pattern, that partnerships struggle in first year, become more successful in years 2-3, adjust for age difference, etc. changing ways work with students, fairly common pattern gets better after about 2 years
- Brought up the level 3 recommendation possibility, 2 students matriculated through this way.
- BC stated Net 12, brought up that if you model out the percentage not progressing from TIE would balance it out more

Grad Direct:

- Revisit of assistantship and tuition assistance for UIC Global students
- SP brought up issue of tuition waivers are part of graduate student union contract, need to review
- JP added up that have to be careful not to offer assistantship and then revoke, this is main concern for the colleges
- SL would put into terms and conditions, would not be predicated or stated on visa
- JP said could put some language into contract that students are excluded from being included into graduate assistantships should be covered
- SP asked if asked for legal opinion, will look at, graduate hourly possible but not tuition waivers
- NM asked JP whether as long assistantships not offered should be okay, but SP brought up someone is going to make mistake, if they offer, etc.,
- BC brought up that each partnership handles differently. Most public universities pretty explicit about it
- JP asked if they have unionized grad students, BC said could connect to CFO at other partnership Dayton or can also look at other partnerships
- SP added would be good to learn what other partnerships do and how handle.
- JP said that probably best to get legal opinion related to this
- KH introduced next topic, academic detail worksheet for Grad Direct and updates
- 1st and 2nd phase primarily completed but we are now at a standstill before moving to phase 3, due to differences over the language about qualifying degrees
- COE expected by Nov. 1st, School of Education potentially accelerator programs, Management, Evaluation and Statistics has potential to be attractive to broader array of students
- JP brought up that it has a different tuition structure.
- Pricing discussions: KH asked when does that discussion typically happen or need to happen?
- BC said could happen simultaneously and needs to begin to be ready by January, everything needs to be completed by January if going to launch for Fall 2019
- First question KH brought up is about the 30 SLA, asked NM if 5 days for OIS is included in the 30 day timeline
- NM stated that it is outside so would be 35 days
- NM stated that don't want to have different timeline for different colleges, better to be consistent, some colleges will need full 30 days

- DG brought up that doesn't work in the market based on feedback, SP asked why, further clarification
- KB brought up British universities do on the spot admissions, KH brought up that typical is 10-15 days, BC and DG agreed
- SP asked whether other research one universities able to turn it around in that timeline
- USC, UMass Boston, KU, Auburn. SP said maybe good to connect and ask how they do it
- KB brought up they delegate to committees authority, said this might be good opportunity to work with K. Colley Grad College to test this process out in this situation
- NM volunteered to contact USC to find out how they approach at other partnership with timeline
- DG said CBA would be good as a test run for shorter timeline
- BC asked about just launching with those who could launch with 15 days.
- NM mentioned made a commitment that we would launch all those that committed not just most lucrative, aim to launch all programs at the same time
- OGE and Grad College Admissions would like 30 days, SL would like 15 days.
- BC asked for compromise of two buckets, one for those could do shorter timeline of 15 and one bucket for those who can't
- NM asked for clarification if 30 days refers to calendar or business, some confusion about this
- NM will go back and talk with S Kragon but does want OIS to be on a separate timeline
- KB asked whether possible to say colleges have 20 working days, admissions has 5 working days, OIS 5 days, based on 30 day timeline
- BC brought up that still not meeting the competitive 15-day timeline
- Second issue is some language initially in document had in Academic Details Worksheet (sample provided)
- BC brought up last one is language in (options 1-3 language in Qualifying Undergraduate Degree and Acceptance Criteria) is very industry standard
- KB asked for "industry" to be removed, KB brought up AACRAOEDGE ECE language should not be there
- NM brought up that grad college strongly recommended the language.
- KB clarified that this is more of a marketing question, admissions may raise a red flag but colleges still have oversight
- BC brought up that G2 document governs what is agreed to as 4 year degree or equivalent
- SP brought up that UIC put in word industry which would fold in AACRAOE Edge, etc., but KB brought up "industry" might exclude agencies

Subcommittees

- NM brought up that there are very different people in a grad committee
- NM suggests that we create a new and separate committee that is a combination of AQAC and MESAC, S. Kragon should be co-chair
- Contract says can create other committees as needed
- Everyone agreed committees should start in January or February

- Undergrad committees constantly changing, new guests, etc., so will keep Steering Committee updated on as people join or are added, changed
- NM asked committee if that was supported, updated group on some recent changes with Student Services Committee

Progression process and timeline

- Kali introduced the overview of the timeline
- BC walked through SEVP policy in terms of length of program to make the process a bit easier within the guidelines
- BC referred back to previous discussion where aim was to streamline and realized that this has not resulted in streamlining but making it more complex
- BC brought up that I-17 document was originally a SL document that was then sent to committees but has not been shared or seen since, sharing it is valuable for transparency and to understand the nuances that are leading to different understandings
- BC has been told it's a proprietary document
- BC brought back to why are we restricting the access to a partnership document (addendum) if this was originally a SL document
- BC added the process around the extensions is an additional but separate topic to the I-17 addendum and new language finalizing the extension length of each program
- JP asked members what is rationale of UIC not wanting to share the document
- Rationale is that a lot of work was put into it, college feedback, could be shared with other institutions.
- BC brought up that we have referenced several best practices being shared as part of partnerships and that is part of benefit
- SP brought up that sharing best practices is different than sharing a document that has a lot of work put into it
- BC brought up that understanding what the changes were would prevent us from continually discussing the extension process, helps to make strategic decisions
- BC gave example, "up to four terms" is a critical nuance, more productive to have whole document rather than pieces of language

Summer programs:

- What SL can do to recruit students to come on campus for summer term, taking a four week program, possibly coming back, etc.
- KB brought up UIC has had a part B of Fall Spring terms such as Dentistry for quite some time, would be helpful to use this not only for SL students but also all UIC students.
- NM brought up that the colleges would want to weigh in, colleges do not have faculty, may need to look at financial structure
- JP requested that Thomas Warfield be included in any discussions, KB brought up potentially looking at LAS Online pathways, etc.
- DG brought up that have been looking at these models, cultural programs in summer as pipeline across market

Renovations 1253 S. Halsted:

- KH asked if there a final go ahead to move forward?
- JP said if SL would cover costs to do renovations directly it would be approved but she needs to do amendment to contract
- 778 rentable sq. feet for IDOT space, KH confirmed IDOT is moving out, would like to take the IDOT space.
- JP said UIC Global amenable for walls being removed but will take out 3 of private offices.

Malcolm X:

- Fallback and Access program: recruiting students who are below a 2.5 to bring into Malcolm X for 1-2 semesters and then have them matriculate with criteria into the accelerator program
- Staying in housing, possibly paying fees to UIC, similar to PSE paying fees
- Fees such as rec center, built into the tuition, JP said we can consider something similar to an Engineering program from Urbana
- Access program is a very different set up, recruiting on a UIC contract for students who will not go to UIC, will go first year to Malcolm X.
- SP wants to try to find the students who can do the work, working with these students and supporting instead of finding students who aren't meeting and finding a new option for them (access)
- NM brought up that this may create concerns with the colleges,
- JP requested confirmation of what needs to be included as amendment to the contract
- Have to add Grad Direct, lease agreement, IDOT, Malcolm X won't do anything yet, Net 12

Engineering and Capacity:

- Engineering concerned that in CS, UIC Global population at current rates for continued growth would probably be about a ¼ of total population for their undergrad, potentially skewing the gender make up
- Gender make up of non-UIC Global international students is 25% for COE, so international student population is exacerbating the gender issue
- Engineering brought up to SP and NM, they will have conversation with COE and at some point there may be a cap or concern
- KB brought up request to Engineering to look at a pre-__ engineering track with required courses before moving into COE or certain engineering tracks, requested from J. Muench Engineering
- Net 12 Scholarship distribution for global students
- JP approved Accelerator scholarship being an academic year scholarship and thus applied to only the Fall and Spring semesters, otherwise the first year would receive an excessive discount. This effectively makes it consistent with what you already do in years 2-4, but it is a change to how we did things last year when all prices were the same for year one.

