

OLD DOMINION UNIVERSITY

BOARD OF VISITORS
Thursday, January 24, 2013

MINUTES

The Board of Visitors of Old Dominion University held its annual retreat on Thursday, January 24, 2013, at 1:00 p.m. at the Norfolk Yacht and Country Club in Norfolk, Virginia. Present from the Board were:

Fred J. Whyte, Rector
Jeffrey W. Ainslie
Kenneth E. Ampy
Frank Batten, Jr.
David L. Bernd
John F. Biagas
J. William Cofer
Dee D. Gilmore
Marc Jacobson
Pamela C. Kirk
Barry M. Kornblau
Frank Reidy
Ronald C. Ripley
Judith O. Swystun
Kevin Muchiri (*Student Representative*)

Absent were:

Luke M. Hillier
Andrea M. Kilmer
Robert J. O’Neill

Also present were:

John R. Broderick, President
Alonzo Brandon
Jane Dané
Robert L. Fenning
David F. Harnage
Mohammad Karim
Donna W. Meeks
Earl Nance
Jennifer Mullen

Susan Nelson, Perkins + Will
Ellen Neufeldt
Chrisanne Osterby, Perkins + Will
September Sanderlin
Deb Schreiber
Wood Selig
Carol Simpson
Beverly Wood, Perkins + Will
Harry Minium (*The Virginian-Pilot*)

The Rector called the meeting to order at 1:05. President Broderick stated that he included items on today's agenda items that he hoped would engage board members in decisions on long-term planning issues, such as enrollment management and the master plan.

FUTURE TRENDS IN ENROLLMENT

Ellen Neufeldt, Vice President for Student Engagement and Enrollment Services, and Deb Schreiber, Executive Consultant with Noel-Levitz, presented data on future enrollment trends. Vice President Neufeldt explained the importance of understanding future trends and opportunities for recruitment and establishing the infrastructure to support these students. Ms. Schreiber reviewed national demographics and enrollment data for the last 50 years, noting that enrollment growth peaked nationally in 2005. Old Dominion University enjoyed enrollment growth for first-time students during the last ten years by capitalizing on its market share, but strategic planning is now necessary in order to maintain that market share.

Ms. Schreiber reviewed the megatrends in higher education, which include slowing growth, demographic shifts, new learning modalities, changing economic models, and intensifying retention and completion pressures. Implications for Virginia are: a decline of high school graduates through 2015, the need to monitor community college enrollment for prospective transfers, an increasing number of students are choosing online as opposed to site-based instruction, and graduate program competition demands more courses through distance learning. She then reviewed a Strategic Enrollment Growth Matrix, noting that institutions in declining markets may need to consider market and program development strategies in order to avoid enrollment declines. Old Dominion University, which already has a strong infrastructure and quality programs for distance learning, should focus on growth in online enrollment as a replacement factor.

A discussion followed about ODU's distance learning program. Old Dominion receives strong evaluations regarding the high quality of online programs it offers and was commended during its recent reaccreditation for the strength of the program. The President commissioned an internal study group to look at the future of the distance learning program, which is in the process of gathering data on market share and market presence. A business plan is also being developed with a strong focus on service to students who never physically visit the campus.

President Broderick noted that with the economic model changing and the decreasing power of Pell grants and Stafford loans coupled with increasing level of student debt, Old Dominion stands at a competitive advantaged. Due to the Board's leadership, we have purposefully kept tuition down and ODU is nationally ranked for having the lowest amount of debt for Virginia students. In addition, Old Dominion has been praised in the way it packages its financial aid to meet the needs of students as much as possible. ODU also offers the Learn and Earn Advantage Program (LEAP) as well as the Monarch Millionaire Program, a student led financial literacy program.

In response to a question by the Rector, Vice President Neufeldt stated that the plan (which is still in development) will be shared with the Board at a future meeting.

MASTER PLAN

Chief Operating Officer David Harnage stated that the University engaged the services of Perkins + Will, an international architectural and planning firm, and the team working with ODU has a combined experience of developing master plans for more than 200 campuses both within the United States and internationally. The project started during the fall with a process of engagement to collect information that will be analyzed and then used to draw conclusions about options to consider. The initial process involved looking at the institution's space inventory, utilities, etc., and we're approaching the end of that analytical data process. The second process is engagement with the university communities and understanding their aspirations and ideas about the campus, finding commonalities, and then developing strategies to address them. We've been engaged in that process since the beginning of the calendar year, and to this point we've met with student groups, faculty groups, deans, department chairs and staff. Meetings have been held with the civic leagues surrounding the University. This process of engagement is very important and it informs us about what people believe are the important issues for the campus, the future of the campus, and the like. The purpose of today's meeting is for the team to seek board members' opinions, add them to the feedback already received from the other groups, and begin looking for those common themes that will inform the process moving forward.

The team members were introduced and Beverly Wood described the process and scope of the project. It is being approached in four phases: observation & analysis, concept & design, master plan and implementation strategies, and document decisions and final presentations. Mr. Harnage added that this process also involves the higher education centers. Ms. Wood described how the University is viewed in the university context, the city context, the neighborhood context, and the precinct context. The campus planning drivers include academic drivers, economic drivers, quality of life drivers, and legacy drivers.

A discussion followed where the consultants elicited the board members' opinions about the campus. The board members were asked what elements of the campus they would like to see preserved over the next 20 years and what elements should not be retained.

Mr. Harnage noted that since we are land-locked, we will be building up and not out. President Broderick said that they were listening to all of the constituencies in order to get varied input that will ultimately lead to a good plan. Mr. Harnage emphasized that the process will look for commonalities and master plan is not about building buildings, but a development of possibilities.

Mr. Ainslie suggested an approach that a utopian campus be developed with an overlay of the current campus, so we can see what is missing. He also suggested that a monorail be used for transportation to/from peripheral parking during regular hours and special events. Mr. Reidy noted that the armed services is a driving force in this community and the third crossing will eventually be built and will take the trucks off Hampton Boulevard. Eventually we will also get light rail. Mr. Harnage said that HRT representatives are engaged in this process. President Broderick added that he has gone on record that ODU should be included in future plans for light rail, and will work with the Rector to draft a letter from the Board to HRT noting its support as well.

Mr. Harnage thanked the Board for such a great discussion. He asked board members to call or email him with any additional ideas they may have. The goal is to identify overarching issues

and begin examining strategies to address them. The consultants will then go back to all of the groups who provided input in order to present with the options being considered. It will continue to be a very engaging process.

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN ATHLETICS, LEADERSHIP AND THE BOARD

President Broderick and Athletic Director Wood Selig briefed the Board on the Association of Governing Boards' Statement on Board Responsibilities for Intercollegiate Athletics. In 2012 the "Knight Commission on Intercollegiate Athletics" asked the AGB to explore board practices in athletics oversight and offer recommendations for improvement where necessary. As part of its Knight Commission report, AGB surveyed presidents and board chairs of Division I institutions to determine how consistently boards follow the 2009 statement's principles and guidelines.

AGB put forth three primary recommendations for governing boards: (1) the governing board is ultimately accountable for athletics policy and oversight and should fulfill this fiduciary responsibility; (2) the board should act decisively to uphold the integrity of the athletics program and its alignment with the academic mission of the institution; and (3) the board must increase its span of knowledge by educating itself about the its policy role and oversight of intercollegiate athletics. In addition, AGB developed a set of questions that "the board must ask."

The questions covered the areas of Policies/Oversight, Athletics Budget, Academic Progress/Curriculum, Highly Compensated Employees, and Conference Affiliation. President Broderick and Dr. Selig reviewed each of the questions and indicated how ODU's Board and the administration address each of the areas. He stated that graduation rates for student-athletes compared with the overall student body will be added to the Board's Dashboards.

Mr. Batten asked if the Athletic Foundation provides any sort of oversight for athletics. Dr. Selig responded that the Athletic Foundation is not an oversight body but is involved with fundraising and other philanthropic activities in support of ODU athletics, and the Athletic Director meets with Foundation's board on a regular basis.

President Broderick noted that responsibility for athletics is emphasized in the President's Annual Report and Goals & Objectives and he is involved with athletics in a number of areas. He meets with the President's Advisory Committee on Athletics and the Student Athlete Advisory Group, meets weekly with the Athletic Director, and monthly with the Director of Athletic Compliance. He said that he will continue to keep the Board apprised on this national issue and welcomed any questions or suggestions from members of the Board.

MOTION FOR CLOSED SESSION

The Rector recognized Mr. Kornblau, who read the following motion: "Mr. Rector, I move that this meeting be recessed, and, as permitted by Virginia Code Sections 2.2-3711(A) (1), we reconvene in closed session for the purpose of discussing the mid-year evaluation of the President of the University." The motion was seconded by Mr. Ainslie and approved unanimously by all members present and voting. (*Ainslie, Ampy, Batten, Bernd, Biagas, Cofer, Gilmore, Jacobson, Kirk, Kornblau, Reidy, Ripley, Swystun*)

RECONVENE IN OPEN SESSION AND FOIA CERTIFICATION

At the conclusion of the closed session, the meeting was reconvened in open session, at which time the Rector called for the Freedom of Information Act certification of compliance that (1) only public business matters lawfully exempted from the open meeting requirements under the Freedom of Information Act were discussed and (2) only such public business matters as were identified in the motion by which the closed session was convened were heard, discussed or considered. The certification of compliance vote was 14 in favor and none opposed. (*Ainslie, Ampy, Batten, Bernd, Biagas, Cofer, Gilmore, Jacobson, Kirk, Kornblau, Reidy, Ripley, Swystun*)

OLD/UNFINISHED BUSINESS

There was no old or unfinished business to come before the Board.

NEW BUSINESS

There was no new business to come before the Board.

With no further business to be discussed, the meeting was adjourned at 5:00 p.m.