

**AGENDA**  
Urbana-Champaign Senate  
April 30, 2012; 3:10 pm  
Levis Faculty Center

- I. **Call to Order** – Provost Richard Wheeler
- II. **Approval of Minutes**—March 26, 2012
- III. **Senate Executive Committee Report**—Matt Wheeler
- IV. **Chancellor’s Remarks** – Provost Richard Wheeler
- V. **Questions/Discussion**
- VI. **Consent Agenda**

*These items will be distributed via [www.senate.illinois.edu/120430a.asp](http://www.senate.illinois.edu/120430a.asp). If a senator wishes to move an item to Proposals for Action and have copies at the meeting, he/she must notify the Senate Office two business days in advance. At the meeting, any senator can request that an item be moved from the Consent Agenda.*

- |          |  |   |
|----------|--|---|
| EP.12.24 | Proposal from the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences to rename the BALAS in Rhetoric as the BALAS in Creative Writing  | Educational Policy<br><i>(G. Miller, Chair)</i> |
| EP.12.25 | Proposal from the College of Media to revise the B.S. in Advertising in the Charles H. Sandage Department of Advertising | Educational Policy<br><i>(G. Miller, Chair)</i> |

**VII. Proposals for Action (enclosed)**

- |          |  |  |    |
|----------|--|--|----|
| GP.12.10 | Policy Governing Electronic Surveys and Questionnaires                                     | General University Policy<br><i>(N. Burbules, Chair)</i>             | 1  |
| SP.12.09 | Re-Authorizing the Campus Student Election Commission to Conduct Student Senator Elections | University Statues and Senate Procedures<br><i>(W. Maher, Chair)</i> | 5  |
| SP.12.10 | Revisions to the <i>Senate Elections for the Student Electorate</i>                        | University Statues and Senate Procedures<br><i>(W. Maher, Chair)</i> | 7  |
| SC.12.14 | Senate Comments on the “Strategic Enrollment Management; The Path Forward” document        | Senate Executive Committee<br><i>(M. Wheeler)</i>                    | 23 |
| SC.12.13 | 2011-2013 Senate/SEC Calendar  | Senate Executive Committee<br><i>(M. Wheeler)</i>                    | 25 |

**VIII. Reports for Information (enclosed)**

FB.12.07	Current Benefits Issues and Events	Faculty and Academic Staff Benefits <i>(J. Kindt, Chair)</i>	27
UC.12.06	USC Report – March 27, 2012	K. Graber	29
HE.12.07	FAC/IBHE Report – April 10, 2012	A. Aminmansour	31
SUR.12.01	SURSMAC	K. E. Andersen, H. F. Williamson	33

**IX. Executive Session**

All visitors will be asked to leave before the Senate considers nominations for 2013 honorary degrees from the Senate Committee on Honorary Degrees.

**X. New Business**

**XI. Adjournment**

**Minutes**  
**Urbana-Champaign Senate Meeting**  
March 26, 2012

A regular meeting of the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign Senate was called to order at 3:15 pm on the 3<sup>rd</sup> floor of the Levis Faculty Center with Chancellor Phyllis Wise presiding and Professor Emeritus Kenneth E. Andersen as Parliamentarian.

**Approval of Minutes**

03/26/12-01 The minutes from February 27, 2012 were approved as written.

**Senate Executive Committee Report**

Faculty Senator Matthew Wheeler (ACES), Chair of the Senate Executive Committee (SEC) gave the following report.

On April 9, 2012, the SEC will discuss the revised Enrollment Management proposal document from President Hogan, and will be on the April 30 Senate agenda. The special meeting with the President on March 30 was cancelled. Item XIII on the Senate agenda is a consultation with the Senate on Statutory Procedures, specifically Article IX, Section 6 of the *University Statutes*. This article requires the campus Senate be consulted when setting campus procedures for severe sanctions less than dismissal. Provost Richard Wheeler will present this item, and then a vote is anticipated.

Floor privileges were requested for Elizabeth Lowe, Associate Professor and Director, Center for Translation Studies School of Literatures, Cultures and Linguistics to speak to: EP.12.22 Proposal from the Graduate College and the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences to establish a new Master of Arts (MA) in Translation and Interpreting in the School of Literatures, Cultures, and Linguistics. Floor privileges were also requested for Skip Frost from the Division of Public Safety and undergraduate student Ahmad El Khatib to speak to the Committee of the Whole Discussion on Unofficial St. Patrick's Day.

03/26/12-02 Hearing no objections, Chancellor Wise pronounced that floor privileges had been granted as requested.

**Chancellor's Remarks**

Chancellor Phyllis Wise noted that it has been a very interesting and challenging time. She believed President Hogan had the same goal, which is to make the University better. The level of the faculty support that has been shown towards the Chancellor has been moving. Distractions aside, the University can move forward with what it was meant to do; making the best education experience possible. The University has to be able to change and manage that change. In the end, the University of Illinois will be one of the premier public institutions. Wise looks forward to working with President Designate Robert Easter.

Wise added that she looks forward to working with the Senate. She especially thanked Matthew Wheeler, Joyce Tolliver, and Nicholas Burbules for the work they have done in educating her and leading discussions on the recent campus issues.

Two videos from the Board of Trustees Campus Insights presentation were shown; Nathan Gunn from Music and Jonathan Naber from Engineering Illini Prosthetic Technologies (IPT). Most faculty members that were invited to speak did so in person before the Board. Gunn and Naber were unavailable so videos were made for the Board meeting. Campus Insights gives each campus the opportunity to showcase faculty that symbolize some of the greatest offerings from each campus.

**Questions/Discussion**

No questions were asked.

**Consent Agenda**

Hearing no objections, Chancellor Wise pronounced that the following proposal was approved:

- 03/26/12-03 EP.12.22\* Proposal from the Graduate College and the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences to establish a new Master of Arts (MA) in Translation and Interpreting in the School of Literatures, Cultures, and Linguistics

**Proposals for Action**

- 03/26/12-04 CC.12.11\* Nominations for Membership on Standing Committees of the Senate  
Faculty Senator Bettina Francis (LAS), Chair of the Committee on Committees, moved approval of the nominations on CC.12.11. There were no floor nominations and nominations were declared closed.
- 03/26/12-05 By voice vote, the slate of candidates on CC.12.11 was approved.
- 03/26/12-06 CC.12.12\* Nominations for Membership on the Athletic Board  
Faculty Senator Bettina Francis (LAS), Chair of the Committee on Committees, moved approval of the nominations on CC.12.12. There were no floor nominations and nominations were declared closed.
- 03/26/12-07 By voice vote, the slate of candidates on CC.12.12 was approved.

**Reports for Information**

The following reports were presented for information:

- 03/26/12-08 FB.12.06\* Current Benefits Issues and Events  
John Kindt, Chair of the Faculty and Academic Staff Benefits Committee spoke about item FB.12.06. There are over 37 items of legislation that could affect the University of Illinois. Kindt suggested having an education advocate. He encouraged state wide action and to reach out to other colleagues on other campuses to get more people involved. Kindt encouraged attendees to visit the NESSIE website to monitor pending legislation. It was also noted that the Faculty Advisory Council to the Board of Higher Education (FAC/IBHE) is very involved with legislation impacting education, and that many bills have been changed by the work FAC/IBHE has done.
- 03/26/12-09 UC.12.05\* USC Report –February 21, 2012
- 03/26/12-10 HE.12.05\* FAC/IBHE Report – February
- 03/26/12-11 HE.12.06\* FAC/IBHE Report – March

**Consultation with the Senate on Statutory Procedures**

Interim Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs Richard Wheeler presented information on the campus procedures for proceedings under Article IX, Section 6 of the *University Statutes*. The document that was distributed outlines the procedures for implementation of Severe Sanctions Other Than Dismissal for Cause for Members of the Faculty. The document was

reviewed by William Maher, H. George Friedman, Matthew Wheeler, and Kenneth Andersen. The document was drafted in accordance with the minimum provisions of the *University Statutes*.

A clarification in number 5 of the proposed procedures was requested. The text should make it clear that if a hearing is requested that a written response shall be submitted. Provost Wheeler indicated the clarification would be made.

03/26/12-12 As Chair of University Statutes and Senate Procedures, William Maher moved that the Senate advise the Provost and the Chancellor to adopt the procedure for implementation of Article IX Section 6 as outlined in the document presented under Agenda Item VIII, with the understanding that it will be reviewed in the future if so requested by the Senate or the Senate Executive Committee.

03/26/12-13 By voice vote, the motion was approved.

#### **Committee of the Whole**

03/26/12-14 SEC Chair Wheeler made a motion to move into a committee of the whole discussion on Unofficial St. Patrick's Day. The motion passed by voice.

Faculty Senator Mark Roszkowski (BUS) opened the discussion by reading RS.06.01 that was passed on April 3, 2006. This document was distributed at the door. He noted that it appears that there is increasingly costly law enforcement to ensure safety, but that the event has not been terminated. Roszkowski wants to see the bars closed over the weekend that this event is held. He added that this event disrupts a class day. He felt the action going forward should be to stop the event, and not to police it to make it safer. The liquor license holders do not pay any of the costs that the university and the city assume.

Skip Frost from the Division of Public Safety noted that 70% of actions taken by local police are persons not affiliated with the University of Illinois, and the advent of social media has increased attendance by non-University affiliated persons. The increased patrols at businesses have forced activities to unsupervised private parties along with increased packaged liquor sales. Those patronizing the businesses tend to be alumni that are of age.

Other comments were made stating that attempting to end the event would only create additional problems. There is a need to move forward and continue to work as a community to change this event in a positive way. Collaboration and a holistic approach were reiterated by several of those making comments. The proactive notification of consequences was a new effort this year and some felt it aided in reducing the number of incidents.

#### **New Business**

No new business was discussed.

#### **Adjournment**

The meeting adjourned at 5:02pm

Jenny Roether, Senate Clerk

\*Filed with the Senate Clerk and incorporated by reference in these minutes.



Policy Governing Electronic Surveys and Questionnaires  
Directed to Students, Faculty Members, or Staff of the  
University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign

**1. Purpose**

Electronic surveys are cost-effective tools for conducting research and for obtaining feedback to improve campus services or to inform campus administrators.

Unfortunately, when the same populations are surveyed repeatedly, response rates decline and the accuracy of survey results becomes questionable. This policy is intended to balance the need of members of the campus community for survey-based research and for feedback with the growing demands that electronic surveys make on the valuable time of students, faculty, and staff. Additionally, limits on the numbers of surveys distributed to the same individuals should improve the response rates and effectiveness of each survey. Finally, this policy contains provisions designed to protect the confidentiality of the respondents.

**2. Scope**

This policy applies to all unsolicited web-based or e-mail surveys and questionnaires sent to a group of students, faculty, or staff by a member of the university community as part of his or her administrative duties, as part of a research project, or as part of a thesis or class assignment. It also applies to surveys of campus students, faculty, and staff conducted by external groups or persons; however, these surveys may be subject to additional requirements and conditions. It does not cover surveys sent by voluntary associations to their own members; for example, a registered student organization may freely poll its own members, and members of an e-mail list may send queries out to the list. It also does not cover electronic collection of information required for employment or matriculation.

**3. Oversight provided by the campus Institutional Review Board (IRB)**

This policy does not change the oversight required by the IRB. While some surveys do not constitute human subjects research, any that do must be either reviewed by the IRB or explicitly exempted by IRB staff from a full review. See <http://www.irb.illinois.edu> for the process of obtaining IRB approval or exemption for a survey and for information on mandated training for all human subjects researchers.

**4. Administration of this policy**

An Electronic Survey Administration Committee, reporting to the Chancellor, will be appointed to administer this policy. The Director of the Division of Management Information will chair the committee, and one additional member will be appointed annually each by the Chancellor, the Provost, the Dean of Students, the Dean of the Graduate College, the IRB Office, the Urbana-Champaign Senate Executive Committee, and the Council of Deans. The committee should meet at least annually to evaluate the effectiveness of the policy and, if needed, recommend revisions.

Where noted, exceptions to provisions in the policy may be granted by a campus, college, or unit administrative officer whose scope of responsibility includes the full group being surveyed. For example, a dean may approve a full-population survey of any groups within that dean's college or the Associate Provost for Human Resources may approve surveys of various employee groups.

The Division of Management Information shall publish a record of approved campus-wide surveys which should include the purpose of the survey, the population or sample surveyed, the survey dates, and the approving officer. Any exceptions made to this policy should be noted. Colleges are encouraged to maintain similar records or to submit their survey information for inclusion on the campus-wide survey record maintained by Management Information to permit monitoring of the numbers of surveys that are underway at any point in time.

#### **5. Sampling vs. full population surveys**

Rarely does a survey require distribution to a full population to obtain valid results. Examples of a "full population" include all students, all juniors, all faculty members, all academic professionals in one college, and all female staff employees. Unless an exception is approved as described in Section 4, surveys may not be distributed to a full population. Instead, surveys should be distributed to a random sample of the desired population. The Division of Management Information can assist in creating random samples for survey projects, and the Survey Research Lab can advise about appropriate sample sizes and sampling techniques (fees may apply). The annual Senior Survey and the Instructor-Course Evaluation System surveys conducted by the Center for Teaching Excellence are examples of full-population surveys that are approved.

#### **6. Restrictions on sample selection**

- a. Students who have notified the Registrar that they wish to suppress all directory information under the provisions of the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA) should never be included in a sample that is provided to a surveyor.
- b. By law, no person under the age of 18 may be surveyed without permission of a parent or guardian. All survey sample selections, including approved full-population surveys, should exclude such persons. If it is not possible to exclude them from the invitation (e.g. when using a campus Mass Mail facility), the survey consent form must include a statement requiring the respondent to be at least 18 years of age.
- c. Permission from the Associate Provost for Human Resources is required for any survey exclusively targeting employees covered by a collective bargaining agreement.

#### **7. Confidentiality issues**

- a. Samples based on private information  
When a survey sample is drawn based on non-directory information for students (see FERPA policy at <http://www.registrar.illinois.edu/staff/ferpa>) or sensitive or confidential information (for faculty and staff), the identities of the persons sampled

may not be provided to the surveyor. Examples of private information include samples based on race/ethnicity, gender, age, and grade point average.

b. Ensuring the confidentiality of respondents

Surveyors must obtain IRB approval for procedures to ensure the confidentiality of respondents. When an IRB-approved informed consent agreement promises that responses will be confidential, the surveyor must aggregate responses to ensure that no individual responses are identifiable. In addition, the surveyor must ensure that all electronic records are secured adequately and access is limited to a small number of persons who understand the confidentiality requirements.

Where respondent identity is collected, e.g. by requiring the respondent to enter a unique code or using an authentication method such as network id and password, the identities of the respondents should be maintained separately from the responses. Unless the approved research design requires on-going contact with the respondents, respondent identity information should be destroyed after the survey is completed.

Free-form comments must be screened and parts of any comments that identify a respondent or other person must be redacted before publication.

Any promise of confidentiality may be superseded by a legal duty to take action when a survey response reveals a potentially dangerous situation or illegal activity or is the subject of a legal process. Surveyors should consult University Counsel in such situations.

c. Incentives: Incentives such as prize drawings or giveaways can improve survey response rates but may compromise the confidentiality of the responses. Surveys should follow procedures for incentives approved by the IRB Office such as redirecting users to a second web site to register for or receive the incentive.

d. Anonymity

An anonymous survey would require that the surveyor have no way to link the respondent with his/her responses. The security logs maintained by most modern computers make it almost impossible to guarantee anonymity. Unless extraordinary measures are taken to eliminate electronic traces, surveyors should not promise anonymity.

**8. Other use of samples or lists**

Lists of e-mails or other contact information provided to surveyors may be used only for the one approved survey. Any other use is strictly forbidden. E-mail lists should be destroyed as soon as the survey is complete.

**9. Timing of surveys**

Surveys of students (other than course evaluations) are not permitted during the week before final examinations or the week of final examinations.

**10. Use of outside contractors or services to collect survey responses**

a. Participation in surveys managed by other organizations

With IRB approval and the approval of an administrator as described in Section 4, a unit may collaborate with an external agency to administer a survey to individual Illinois students, faculty members, and staff. A contract ensuring that the external agency will adhere to the provisions of this policy should be drawn up with the advice of University Counsel and signed by the Board of Trustees of the University of Illinois and the external agency. No confidential information may be provided to the external agency.

b. Use of external web survey services

Campus faculty, staff, and students should exercise caution when considering the use of an off-campus web site to design and administer a survey. Surveyors are encouraged to seek the advice of the University Office of Business and Financial Affairs Purchasing Division, CITES, and University Counsel before using such a site for any University-sponsored survey. The managers of the survey site must guarantee that the responses to survey questions will not be used for any other purpose, e.g. data mining or marketing. Survey respondents should not be subjected to inappropriate or annoying ads. Lists of University e-mail addresses may not be provided to these services unless there is a signed contract with the Board of Trustees ensuring that the e-mail addresses will not be used for any other purpose. No confidential information held by the university may be given to these services under any circumstances.

**11. Reminders to non-respondents**

After the initial invitation, only one reminder should be distributed to the survey sample. Any additional reminders are rare exceptions, which must be approved by the IRB and an administrator as described in Section 4.

**12. Opt-out list**

The Division of Management Information shall maintain a list of e-mail addresses of persons who do not wish to receive any campus-wide surveys and shall not include them in any campus-wide survey samples created by the Division. This list may be shared with other persons who create lists for surveys. However, it is not possible to exclude such persons from surveys which are sent to entire populations using the campus Massmail facility.

**13. Contact information**

Questions about this policy should be directed to the Division of Management Information ([dmi@illinois.edu](mailto:dmi@illinois.edu)).

Date issued: \_\_\_/\_\_\_/\_\_\_

Approved by: Office of the Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs

**UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS  
URBANA-CHAMPAIGN SENATE**

Committee on University Statutes and Senate Procedures  
(Final; Action)

SP.12.09, Re-Authorizing the Campus Student Election Commission to Conduct Student Senator Elections

**BACKGROUND**

In October of 2011, the Illinois Student Senate passed Resolution IA.2011.05, which created an ad-hoc committee on student elections. This committee was charged with evaluating the status of student elections on campus, including inconsistencies between Student Senate policies and the Student Election Code.

The *Senate Election Rules for the Student Electorate* outlines two processes by which the election of student senators may be conducted. First, college election and credentials committees may conduct the election of student senators from their respective students. Second, the USSP and the Senate may authorize the Student Election Commission (now the Campus Student Election Commission) to conduct the election. For at least the past twenty years, the Student Election Commission has conducted student elections.

During the course of the committee's investigation, it was discovered through discussion with former Senate Clerk Bob Damrau that authorization of the Student Election Commission to conduct student elections was granted over twenty years ago, and has not been reviewed or renewed since. Senate records do not include a copy of this authorization.

The Student Senate's committee on student elections conducted a review of the relationship between the ISS, the UIUC Senate, and the Student Election Commission, and determined that it would be appropriate to continue the relationship and authorization of the Commission to conduct student elections. Additionally, the committee recommended that authorization be renewed by the UIUC Senate. The Illinois Student Senate concurred, through the passage of IA.2012.02.

The Illinois Student Senate, by way of ISS Resolution IA.2012.02, requests the UIUC Senate vote on the endorsement of the resolution included below.

**RECOMMENDATION**

The Senate Committee on University Statutes and Senate Procedures recommends approval of the following re-authorization of the Campus Student Election Commission to conduct student senator elections.

**PROPOSED RE-AUTHORIZATION OF THE CAMPUS STUDENT ELECTION COMMISSION**

- 1
- 2 Resolved, that the Campus Student Election Commission be empowered to conduct
- 3 Student Senator Elections under the authorities laid out in the *Senate Election Rules*
- 4 *for the Student Electorate*, while remaining subject to the rules and regulations of
- 5 the UIUC Senate and the Committee on University Statutes and Senate Procedures,
- 6 and let it further be
- 7
- 8 Resolved, that this authorization shall remain in effect unless action is taken by the
- 9 Senate or the Committee on University Statutes and Senate Procedures, and let it
- 10 finally be
- 11
- 12 Resolved, that the relationship between the Campus Student Election Commission
- 13 and the Senate be reviewed and periodically renewed by the Committee on
- 14 University Statutes Senate Procedures.

UNIVERSITY STATUTES AND SENATE PROCEDURES

- William Maher, Chair
- Nikita Borisov
- H. George Friedman
- Piyush Gupta
- Melissa Madsen
- Anna-Maria Marshall
- Jim Maskeri
- Ann Reisner
- Charles Evans, *Observer*
- Sandy Jones, *Ex officio (designee)*
- Jenny Roether, *Ex officio*

**UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS  
URBANA-CHAMPAIGN SENATE**

Committee on University Statutes and Senate Procedures  
(Final; Action)

SP.12.10, Revisions to the *Senate Election Rules for the Student Electorate*

**BACKGROUND**

In October of 2011, the Illinois Student Senate passed Resolution IA.2011.05, which created an ad-hoc committee on student elections. This committee was charged with evaluating the status of student elections on campus, including inconsistencies between Student Senate policies and the Student Election Code. Several documents and interpretations comprise what is considered to be the Student Election Code, including the *Senate Election Rules for the Student Electorate*, relevant sections of the ISS constitution and bylaws, as well as the Campus Student Election Commission's bylaws and *Rules & Regulations*. Any changes to student election policy requires collaboration with the Illinois Student Senate, the UIUC Senate, and the Campus Student Election Commission; each entity controls pieces of electoral policy, all of which need to correspond with each other.

The ad-hoc committee on student elections proposed several changes to specific parts of the Student Election Code, most of which were adopted by the Illinois Student Senate and the Campus Student Election Commission.

During the 2011 Spring Student Election, the student body approved a new set of governing documents for the Illinois Student Senate. These new documents explicitly bound the ISS to conform to the UIUC Senate's *Rules for the Student Electorate*, while simultaneously making other changes which placed the *Rules* at odds with the new ISS rules. The ad-hoc committee recommended several remedies, and the Illinois Student Senate endorsed multiple changes to the *Senate Election Rules for the Student Electorate* through the passage of ISS Resolutions IA.2012.01, IA.2012.02, and IA.2012.07. The recommended changes are attached for UIUC Senate approval.

ISS Resolution IA.2012.01 recommends amending section 16.3 of the *Rules*, so that the appointment of students to fill senate vacancies is consistent with the new ISS constitution. Specifically, the ISS recommends the removal of the special election process, and places the authority of filling vacancies in the hands of the ISS Internal Affairs committee, rather than the ISS Vice President Internal.

ISS Resolution IA.2012.02 recommends amending the *Rules* to change all references of the Student Election Commission to the Campus Student Election Commission. This change in name is consistent with the new ISS constitution; the CSEC has already moved to alter their bylaws to reflect this change in name.

ISS Resolution IA.2012.07 recommends amending section 14.7 of the *Rules* to require that student candidates for office must conform to relevant sections of the ISS bylaws. The Illinois Student Senate has had issues in the past with write-in candidates not filling out the appropriate certification paperwork before being sworn into office. In order to rectify this issue, the ISS has adopted bylaw changes to outline this requirement – this corresponding change to the *Rules* will give the USSP the authority not to certify individuals who do not conform to these basic requirements.

### **RECOMMENDATION**

The Senate Committee on University Statutes and Senate Procedures recommends approval of the attached revisions to the *Senate Election Rules for the Student Electorate*.

For convenience, a bar appears in the left margin next to any text revisions.

#### UNIVERSITY STATUTES AND SENATE PROCEDURES

William Maher, Chair

Nikita Borisov

H. George Friedman

Piyush Gupta

Melissa Madsen

Anna-Maria Marshall

Jim Maskeri

Ann Reisner

Charles Evans, *Observer*

Sandy Jones, *Ex officio (designee)*

Jenny Roether, *Ex officio*

## Senate Election Rules for the Student Electorate

### 1. Short Title; Purpose

- 1.1 *Short Title*. These Rules will be referred to as the Senate Election Rules for the Student Electorate.
- 1.2 *Purpose*. The purpose of these Election Rules is to establish orderly procedures and rules for the election of senators from the student electorate to the Senate of the Urbana-Champaign campus.

### 2. College Committees

- 2.1 *Creation*. College elections and credentials committees are created pursuant to paragraph 2, Part C, of the Senate Bylaws. Under the Bylaws, these committees may perform whatever duties are delegated to them by the Senate Committee on University Statutes and Senate Procedures (USSP).
- 2.2 *Delegation of Power*. The USSP will delegate various duties to the college committees by way of rules and guidelines it adopts and publishes. These Rules and Guidelines may be added to, amended, or repealed at any time by the USSP.
- 2.3 *Specific Powers*. The USSP hereby delegates to the college committees the following duties, subject to any limitations set forth in rules and guidelines of the USSP.
  - (a.) *Apportionment Plan*. In colleges entitled to more than one student senator, the college committee will prepare an apportionment plan for submission to the USSP, which in cooperation with the Clerk of the Senate, will establish voting units from which student representatives will be elected.
  - (b.) *Conducting Elections*. In the Colleges of Law, Medicine, and Veterinary Medicine, the college committee will conduct nomination and election procedures under the supervision of the Clerk of the Senate. In all other colleges, the college committee will conduct nomination and election procedures under the supervision of the Clerk of the Senate unless the Senate has authorized the Campus Student Elections Commission (CSEC) established by the Illinois Student Senate Constitution to conduct student Senate elections. (See also Rule 4.2.)
  - (c.) *Priority of Existing Plan; Amendment*. Where an apportionment plan establishing student election units previously has been put into effect, that plan shall remain in effect until otherwise determined by the USSP in cooperation with the Clerk of the Senate. The procedures for amending an apportionment plan shall be the same as those employed in adopting a new plan.

- 2.4 *Restriction of Power*. All activities of the USSP and of the college committees shall conform to the relevant provisions of the Constitution and Bylaws adopted by the Senate.
- 2.5 *Resolution of Conflicts*. Any conflicts concerning election rules and procedures which may arise whenever the CSEC is authorized to conduct student Senate elections shall be resolved by joint consultation between the CSEC and the USSP no later than November 30 preceding the elections.

### 3. Election Units; Apportionment

- 3.1 *Data*. All student apportionment plans and amendments thereto shall be based upon and derived from student data supplied to each college committee by USSP.
- 3.2 *Student Evaluation of Plans*. No college student apportionment plan or amendments thereto should be submitted until it has been considered by an organization or organizations recognized by the college as representative of the student body. Ordinarily, this should include the Illinois Student Senate.
- 3.3 *Open Hearings*. No student apportionment plan or amendments thereto should be submitted until the college committee has held open hearings where students may express their views.
- 3.4 *Report of Alternative Plan*. Each apportionment plan or amendments thereto should be accompanied by a report of the college committee explaining how and why the plan or amendments were adopted, and what alternatives were rejected. The report should include copies of any substantial objections to the plan or amendments that were received by the committee.
- 3.5 *Copies to Senate Clerk*. The report and plan or amendments must be sent to the Senate Clerk for submission to USSP.
- 3.6 *Senators per College*. The USSP will determine the number of student senators to be apportioned to each college based on the total number of student senators (as near fifty as practicable).
- 3.7 *Voting Units*. Student voting units shall be determined in the following manner:
  - (a.) *Unit Structure*. In each college entitled to more than one student representative, the student body should be divided into as many voting units as there are student representatives to be elected. One senator will then be elected by each voting unit. If it is impossible to use single-representative units and at the same time meet other requirements set forth in these Rules in Sections 3.7 (b,c,d,e), a college may be divided into voting units which elect more than one senator, or all senators may be elected from the college at large.

- (b.) *Size Limitation*. Not more than five senators may be elected from one voting unit unless that unit is comprised of students from one college which elects all its senators at-large. If a plan or amendment for multi-representative units or at-large election is submitted by any college committee, the committee must also submit the best possible single-representative unit plan and explain why it was rejected.
  - (c.) *Departments Remain Intact*. Each voting unit must be made up of one or more full departments. Departments may not be split.
  - (d.) *Related Subject-Matter Guideline*. Each voting unit should consist of departments in areas of related subject matter.
  - (e.) *Equal Size College Units*. Each single-representative unit within a college should have a student population substantially equal to other single-representative units. Where multi-representatives are used, the ratio of population to representatives should be substantially equal for all units. Departure from equality of voting power for each student should be avoided.
- 3.8 *Tenth-Day Figures*. Student senator apportionment will be based on the most recent tenth-day enrollment figures of college membership.
  - 3.9 *Absentees Counted*. Members of the student electorate absent from campus will be included in the statistics used to apportion seats.

#### 4. Time and Duration of Elections

- 4.1 *Duration of Elections*. The elections shall be held on two consecutive weekdays.
- 4.2 *Time of Elections*. Elections for the Colleges of Law, Medicine, and Veterinary Medicine shall be conducted by those colleges at such times as shall be specified by the USSP. The election of all other student senators shall be held at such times as shall be specified by the USSP unless the Senate authorizes the Campus Student Elections Commission (CSEC) established by the Illinois Student Senate Constitution to conduct the election of student senators concurrently with the other student elections the CSEC conducts. Such authorization, which does not extend to the Colleges of Law, Medicine, and Veterinary Medicine, must be given by the Senate no later than the last regularly scheduled meeting of the spring semester for the following year's elections. Once given, this authorization will remain in force unless it is rescinded by Senate; such action must take place no later than the last regularly scheduled meeting of the spring semester to be effective for the following year's elections. If the CSEC is authorized to conduct student Senate elections and agrees to do so, the election shall be held in the week containing the first Monday in March. If this week contains a general campus holiday, the election shall be held in the preceding week. If the preceding week also contains a

general UIUC holiday, the election shall be held in the week containing the second Monday in March.

- 4.3 *Senate Approval of Changes in CSEC Election Calendar.* If for any reason CSEC-conducted Senate elections Cannot be held in accordance with the above schedule, the CSEC will notify the Senate no later than September 30 prior to the scheduled election, at which time the Senate shall determine whether to authorize the CSEC to proceed with the conduct of said election or to delegate the responsibility to the college elections committees.

## 5. Electorate Qualifications

- 5.1 *General Qualifications.* The Constitution, Article IV, Section 1, provides: The student electorate shall consist of all persons actively pursuing a degree on this campus who meet the eligibility requirements for voting and who are not members of the faculty electorate. Eligibility for voting shall require that the student be:
  - a. In residence,
  - b. A candidate for a degree.

In addition, members of the student electorate eligible for nomination and election to the Senate shall be:

- c. Undergraduate students, taking a minimum of 12 hours for credit; or
  - d. Professional students, taking a minimum of 8 hours for credit; or
  - e. Graduate students, taking a minimum of 2 units for credit, or be registered for thesis credit, or taking fewer than 8 hours but more than 0 units for credit and having at least a one-half time appointment to the campus academic staff.
- 5.2 *Professional Students.* Graduate students in Law and Veterinary Medicine will vote with the electorate in the Graduate College system, rather than with their affiliated colleges. All other eligible professional students in Law and Veterinary Medicine vote within their affiliated colleges.
  - 5.3 *Undergraduate and Graduate Students.* Undergraduate students who are eligible to vote, as defined in Section 5.1, may vote for candidates in all Senate student elections within their respective colleges. Graduate students, including graduate professional students, may vote only for graduate student candidates.
  - 5.4 *College of Medicine Student Electorate.* The student electorate of the College of Medicine at Urbana-Champaign shall be entitled to elect voting members of the Senate. The provisions of these Rules shall apply to these members.

## 6. Candidate Qualifications

- 6.1 *General Qualifications*. A student candidate must satisfy the requirements of membership in the student electorate and intend to remain a student in residence during their expected term of office.
- 6.2 *Satisfactory Progress*. At the time of nomination and election a student candidate must be making satisfactory progress toward a degree as certified by their academic dean. "Satisfactory progress" means that the candidate is not on academic probation or drop status, and is fulfilling the requirements of a degree program within the voting unit. No additional or different standard may be employed.
- 6.3 *Correction of Certification*. A college committee can correct mistakes made by a dean in the certification process.
- 6.4 *Current Membership in Unit*. A student candidate must be a member of the unit in which the student is running for election and making satisfactory progress toward a degree at the time of the election. An undergraduate student who is a member of more than one unit may choose the unit in which the student will run for election provided the student fulfills the requirements defined under Section 5.3 and 6.2..
- 6.5 *Single-Seat Limitation*. No person can be a candidate for more than one Senate seat. This rule specifically prohibits a candidate from running simultaneously for a district seat and an at-large seat.
- 6.6 *Terms*. The terms of student senators shall be one year, with a maximum of six consecutive terms. Student terms begin on the first day of classes of the fall semester following their election. The election of a student senator in a regular election constitutes a full term regardless of whether or not the student senator resigns. A replacement senator elected prior to January 1 shall be considered to have served a full term.

## 7. Notice of Election; Publicity

- 7.1 *Election notice* Each college's elections and credentials committee, or the CSEC if authorized to conduct student elections, shall distribute information concerning the nomination of students for student elections and information regarding the dates of election.
- 7.2 *Method of Notice*. The recommended method of informing persons about the elections is a mailing via hard copy or electronic means to all constituent members of the respective voting units within the college.
- 7.3 *Announcements*. Announcements may not be made in college classes.

- *7.4 Campaign Display Materials.* Campaign signs may be displayed only on university- or college-approved bulletin boards or Illiosks with correct authorization, and in private establishments with consent of the owner. All campaign material within 50 feet of a public access University-owned computer on an election day must be removed when the polling begins. Distribution and display of campaign materials must be in accordance with rules and policies specified by the CSEC in their General Elections Packet, subject to review by USSP.
- *7.5 Methods of Voting.* The Notice of Election (Section 7), Publicity (Section 7), Nomination Procedures (Section 8) and Election Procedures (Section 9-14) are detailed as indicated. These activities can be carried out either via hardcopy (requiring mail or hand delivery to the polling place as described below) or via electronic means. Whichever method is used, there must be: a) a reasonable time frame observed for the vote to occur, b) a confidentiality about voting and authentication, c) a stated process by which ties are resolved, and d) a reasonable retention period for the relevant records.

## 8. Nomination Procedures

- *8.1 Written Nomination Statement.* A student wishing to be a candidate must submit a written nomination statement. The nomination statement form will be provided by the college elections and credentials committee, or the CSEC if authorized to conduct student elections. For any election that is conducted by the college elections and credentials committees, the form will be available to students at their college offices and students are to return the completed form to the Dean for certification of eligibility. If the CSEC is conducting the election, the student nomination form for undergraduate and graduate students will be included in the CSEC General Elections Packet and the completed form is to be turned in according to instructions included in the packet.
- *8.2 Intent to Remain a Student.* When submitting a nomination statement to the college elections committee, the student must affirm in writing that the student expects to remain a student in residence during the term of office for which election is sought.
- *8.3 Dean's Certificate of Progress.* In order to comply with Section 6.2 of these Rules, a nomination statement must include certification by the dean that the candidate is making satisfactory progress toward the degree. The Dean must also verify and indicate on the nominating form the voting unit to which the candidate belongs.
- *8.4 Determination of Eligibility.* The elections committee of each college shall determine whether its student candidates are eligible for election.
- *8.5 Notice.* For any election that is conducted by a college elections and credentials committee, the college elections committee shall notify its student nominees of their eligibility, and shall also forward a copy of each qualified student's nominating

statement to the Senate Clerk. If the CSEC has been authorized to conduct student Senate elections, it shall forward each undergraduate and graduate candidate's petition to the appropriate dean for certification of eligibility. Upon confirmation of each candidate's eligibility, the CSEC shall also forward a copy of the certified candidate petitions to the Senate Office. Regardless of who conducts the elections, the Senate Office and college offices must keep a copy of each eligible candidate's petition until election results are officially certified.

## 9. Ballots

- 9.1 *Responsibility for Preparation*. Each college elections committee is responsible for preparing ballots for its own student voting units unless it has been notified in writing by the Clerk of the Senate that the Senate has delegated authority to the CSEC to conduct student Senate elections.
- 9.2 *Model Ballot*. If elections are to be conducted by the college elections committees, the ballots shall conform as nearly as possible to the model ballot prepared by the USSP.
- 9.3 *Contents*. The ballot shall contain the following:
  - (a.) name of the college;
  - (b.) designation of the election unit and number of senators to be elected;
  - (c.) the names of the nominees by unit; and
  - (d.) directions on proper voting procedures.

In the designation of a candidate's name on the ballot, the candidate's surname shall be used. In addition, any combination of the following designations may be used at the discretion of the candidate as space dictates: the candidate's given name, the candidate's initial(s), and/or a nickname by which the candidate is commonly known. No designation may be used in addition to the candidate's surname which suggests or implies possession of a degree or title.

- 9.4 *Random Order of Names*. The ballot order of names for each Senate position within each unit shall be random.
- 9.5 *Proofing the Election Ballot*. Candidates shall have the opportunity to proof the election ballot, or a facsimile thereof, on which their names appear, at least 48 hours before the election.

## 10. Conducting the Voting

- 10.1 *Voter Identification*. Each voter will be required to provide identification deemed appropriate by the body conducting the elections. Voting may be conducted by secure electronic ballot.

- 10.2 *Voter's Signature*. If the election is being conducted by written ballot, each voter will sign their name on a numbered line on a signature sheet. The election judge will enter that number opposite the voter's name on the list of eligible voters. If the election is being conducted using an electronic voting system, the college elections committee, or the CSEC if conducting the election, shall have a way to ensure only those eligible to vote can participate and that those eligible to vote can vote only vote once. Confidentiality of all votes must be ensured at all times. If the voting procedure links any identification with votes cast, this information must not be referenced during the tallying or reporting of the votes nor saved with the election results.
- 10.3 *Initialing of Ballot*. If the election is being conducted by written ballot, each ballot shall be initialed on the back in the upper left-hand corner by an election official immediately before the ballot is given to a voter.
- 10.4 *Campaigning at the Polls*. No campaigning (solicitation of voters, posters, etc.) is allowed within fifty feet of a public access University-owned computer during the hours of voting. College committees may adopt additional reasonable restrictions on campaigning in the vicinity of public access University-owned computers if they are conducting the elections. If the C-SEC is conducting the elections, campaigning is expressly prohibited at the following locations on election days: (a.) on the first floor of the Illini Union, in the Southwest and Southeast foyers of the Illini Union, or in Illini Union elevators; (b.) inside the University undergraduate library tunnel, on its stairways or entrances or within fifty (50) feet of them; and (c.) on any public access University-owned computer or within fifty (50) feet of them.

## 11. Polling Places

- 11.1 *Responsibility*. Each college elections committee is responsible for establishing and operating the number of polling places it deems necessary for its electorate unless the CSEC is conducting the elections. Polling sites for student Senate elections which are conducted by the CSEC shall be determined by the CSEC. If hardcopy methods are used, then Sections 11.2-11.4 shall be followed.
- 11.2 *Hours*. Each polling place must be open and operating between the hours of 9:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m. on election days if the college elections committees are conducting the elections. Poll hours for student Senate elections which are conducted by the CSEC shall be established by the CSEC.
- 11.3 *Notice of Location*. During the election period the location of polls and their hours must be posted by the committee in the office of the college.
- 11.4 *Equipment*. Ballot boxes, and other supplies (such as tables and chairs) for elections conducted by the college elections committees may be obtained from the campus facilities and services. For any Senate student election to be conducted by the CSEC, the

| CSEC shall be responsible for obtaining equipment it needs to conduct elections in a timely and efficient manner.

- o 11.5 *Electronic voting*. If the election is being conducted using an electronic voting system, the polling locations shall include *any* public access University-owned computer for the purposes of Section 10.4. Members of the campus community shall not operate *ad hoc* polling locations. The college elections committee, or the CSEC if conducting elections, may enforce further restrictions for non-University owned computers operating as *ad hoc* polling locations.

## 12. Election Expenses

- o 12.1 *Signed Statement*.
  - (a.) For elections conducted by college elections committees. On or before the last day of the election, each student candidate shall file a signed statement of election expenses with the elections committee of their college. The statement shall include all expenditures known to have been made by any person for or on behalf of the student's candidacy. The college has no obligation to reimburse students for their election expenses; the purpose of requiring filed statements is solely to monitor any limitation (see Section 12.2) set by the college committee.
  - (b.) For elections conducted by the CSEC. All candidates for Senate student positions shall adhere to the provisions of the CSEC General Elections Packet.
- o 12.2 *Limitation*. Each college elections committee may establish limits on the amount expended by or on behalf of any student candidate under its jurisdiction if it is conducting the election.

## 13. Requirements for Election

- o 13.1 *Automatic Election*. If for elections conducted by college elections and credentials committees the number of students nominated and willing to serve is exactly equal to the number of senators to be elected, no election need be held; those nominated and willing to serve may be declared elected automatically.
- o 13.2 *Plurality Election*. Seats available in each voting unit will be filled as follows: the candidate receiving the highest number of votes will be elected first, the candidate receiving the second highest number elected second, and so on, until all available seats are filled.
- o 13.3 *Ties in Election*. If a tie exists among the candidates eligible for the last seat(s) open in a voting unit, the body conducting the election shall determine the winner by drawing lots.

## 14. Returns; Counting; Certification

- 14.1 *Removal of Ballots*. If hardcopy methods are used, ballots shall be removed only by designated officials. These officials are responsible for protecting the ballots from loss or tampering until the election results are officially certified. If electronic means are used, the report of the election shall be obtained at the end of the voting period and the file stored in a safe place.
- 14.2 *Counting*. The body conducting the election shall provide for counting the ballots immediately after the polls close. No candidate shall participate in the counting process. Any member of the electorate may be present during the counting process, within reasonable limits of space. If ballots are counted manually, the results of the count shall be entered on a tally sheet signed by those who counted the ballots. If electronic means are used, there shall be a process by which the results can be certified if challenged.
- 14.3 *Write-in Ballots*. No write-in ballots submitted in an election conducted by the CSEC are to be counted unless the candidate(s) in question have fully complied with provisions of the CSEC General Elections Packet for write-in candidates.
- 14.4 *Doubtful Ballots*. Intention of the voter should be the only standard for interpreting doubtful ballots. If the intention can be determined, the ballot should be counted in accordance with the intent. If the intention cannot be determined (e.g., three candidates marked for only two seats), then the ballot shall not be counted.
- 14.5 *Certification by College Committee*. If the elections have been conducted by the college elections committees using hardcopy methods, the tally sheet and all ballots shall be delivered or made available immediately to the appropriate college committee. If using electronic methods, the results sheet shall be delivered to the appropriate college committee by an appropriate method, including electronic means. The college committee, after satisfying itself that the vote shown on the tally sheet is correct, shall so certify on forms provided by the Senate Office and deliver said certification immediately to the Senate Office. The college committee shall arrange for the preservation of all ballots, tally sheets, or electronic files for that academic year.
- 14.6 *Certification by the CSEC*. If the elections have been conducted by the CSEC, the CSEC shall certify, on forms provided by the Senate Office, the results of each election as soon as those results are certified as official. The CSEC shall deliver the completed forms to the Senate Office at or before the time results are made public. The CSEC shall arrange for the preservation of all ballots, tally sheets, or electronic files for that academic year.
- 14.7 *Certification by Senate Committee*. The USSP shall certify election results to the Senate at the organizational meeting of the newly elected Senate. These results shall be entered in the minutes of that meeting. The USSP may delay certification of candidates

whose elections are in doubt or may certify the election of such candidates upon appropriate conditions. The USSP shall not certify write-in candidates as elected if they do not conform to the appropriate provisions outlined in the Illinois Student Senate's bylaws; certification of vacancies in these instances is allowable.

- 14.8 *Formal Reports*. All formal reports to the USSP should be addressed to the Senate Clerk.

## 15. Grievances and Appeals

- 15.1 *College Committee Jurisdiction*. The college election committees shall have original jurisdiction over the following unless further delegated to the CSEC if it is authorized to conduct student elections:
  - (a.) adding names of qualified voters to the voting lists;
  - (b.) determination of a student's satisfactory progress toward a degree;
  - (c.) determination of college membership for electoral purposes;
  - (d.) certification of successful election of candidates; and
  - (e.) any other matters arising within their colleges.
- 15.2 *Appeal to University Statutes and Senate Procedures Committee (USSP)* Any aggrieved person may appeal to the USSP a decision of a college committee; actions and decisions of the USSP may be appealed to the Senate by any senator.
- 15.3 *Procedure for Unlisted Persons Claiming Electorate Status*. If a student whose name does not appear on the official listing desires to vote and claims the right to do so, the validity of that claim shall be decided by the chair (or designee) of the appropriate college committee before the end of the voting period. If the claim cannot be so decided, the student shall be provided a ballot after signing a statement that the student is a qualified member of the electorate in the particular voting unit involved. The signed statement and vote shall be kept separate and shall not be counted with the other votes; both shall be delivered to the appropriate college committee along with the other ballots and tally sheets. The college committee will decide whether the person is or is not entitled to vote. If the voter is so entitled, the chair of the committee will add that vote to the tally sheet.
- 15.4 *Grievances with the CSEC*. For any election conducted by the SEC, students may file complaints in accordance with procedures specified in the CSEC General Elections Packet.

## 16. Resignations and Vacancies

- 16.1 *No Nominations*. If no one is elected to a Senate seat from a voting unit during the general election, then the college in which that voting unit resides shall have the option of electing an eligible member of the student electorate to that seat in the fall. Election procedures shall be developed by each college elections and credentials committee and shall be subject to approval by the USSP.
- 16.2 *Disqualification from Electorate*. If a senator fails to satisfy the requirements for membership in the electorate during their term of office, the Senate shall determine whether the senator may remain seated.
- 16.3 *Vacancies*. A vacant student Senate seat may be filled in either of the following ways:
  - ~~(a.)~~ By a special election (which shall, as far as possible, comply with the Rules applicable to regular elections); or
  - ~~(a-)(b-)~~ By appointment by the Illinois Student Senate.
  - ~~(b-)(c-)~~ In selecting the replacement, replacement for an undergraduate a student senator, priority should be given, in descending order, to:
    - (i) The first runner-up (if any) in the appropriate election unit;
    - (ii) The successive runners-up (if any) in the appropriate election unit; and
    - (iii) candidate(s) selected in a search conducted by the Illinois Student Senate's Standing Committee on Internal Affairs and its Internal Vice-President in consultation with the Clerk of the Senate, and as to graduate representatives with the advice and consent of the Committee on Graduate and Professional Student Affairs.
  - ~~(d.)~~ In selecting the replacement for a graduate or professional student senator, priority should be given, in descending order, to:
    - ~~(i)~~ The first balloted runner up (if any) in the appropriate election unit;
    - ~~(ii)~~ The successive balloted runners up (if any) in the appropriate election unit; and
    - ~~(iii)~~ candidate(s) selected in a search conducted by the chair of the Illinois Student Senate's Committee on Graduate and Professional Student Affairs and the Illinois Student Senate's Vice President Internal in consultation with the Clerk of the Senate at the Urbana-Champaign campus.

- 16.4 *Change of Unit*. If a senator changes voting units after the election, the senator will continue to represent the original unit.
- 16.5 *Recall of a Senator*. A student senator can be recalled by a vote of two-thirds of those voting in the recall election.



**UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS  
URBANA-CHAMPAIGN SENATE**  
Senate Executive Committee  
(Final; Action)

- SC.12.14 Senate Comments on the “Strategic Enrollment Management; The Path Forward” document  
An Assessment and Recommendation regarding the “Strategic Enrollment Management: The Path Forward” document conveyed by President Hogan to the University Senates Conference on March 19, 2012

**BACKGROUND**

As charged by Professor Matt Wheeler, the Enrollment Management (EM) Task Force of the UIUC Academic Senate has completed a review of the “Strategic Enrollment Management: The Path Forward” document conveyed by President Michael Hogan to the University Senates Conference (USC) on March 19, 2012. *From this assessment, it is our consensus view that this document generally addresses the major faculty concerns with the original external Enrollment Management Review Report (August 2011).* These concerns were outlined and discussed in our original UIUC EM Task Force report, and subsequently, the USC EM Task Force report (both issued December 2011), and in a special USC meeting (January 2012) with Board of Trustees Chairman Christopher Kennedy, President Hogan, Vice President of Academic Affairs Christophe Pierre, and Presidential Special Assistant Dr. Avijit Ghosh. We want to acknowledge and express our appreciation to all those individuals for listening to and considering our concerns in a collaborative manner and co-authoring “The Path Forward” document. We believe this current document represents an “evolutionary progression” from the original external EM report and provides, along with the previous UIUC and USC EM Task Force reports, a better framework for further collaborative discussions among university and campus administrators and faculty regarding the enhancement and optimization of enrollment management on all three campuses.

**RECOMMENDATIONS**

It is our recommendation that this Path Forward Document serves as a stimulus and framework for initiation of further discussion. As previously stated, our UIUC EM Task Force believes the current enrollment management process is well respected and not “broken”. That being said, most individuals recognize that there are opportunities for more strategic EM coordination across the campuses that can realize possible synergies and efficiencies (e.g. the recruitment of underrepresented students). As we advocated in our prior report, *the most important recommendations contained in the external EM Report and those that we believe should be implemented immediately, and repeated on an annual basis, call for each local campus to establish and communicate their 2013 strategic enrollment goals near term, followed by consideration of a University-wide Projection Enrollment Plan through a collaborative process involving the input of key*

*campus academic and University administrative leaders and enrollment managers.* Benefits to both the individual campuses and the University as a whole are likely to result from such a collaborative dialogue. In order to implement these recommendations, The Path Forward document describes a process including the establishment of an Enrollment Management Policy Council (EMPC) consisting of the Vice President for Academic Affairs (VPAA) and the three campus provosts. Additional aspects of the process include: 1) local campus strategic EM goal-setting by local administrators and faculty and 2) overall university EM goal-setting by the chancellors and President based on EMPC recommendations. The importance of ongoing, effective and synergistic communication between these two processes is also stressed. In addition, the Path Forward document recommends that long-term EM goals be established through a “deliberative and consultative process....involving the chancellors, provosts, deans, program chairs and faculty”. The UIUC EM Task Force endorses these goal setting processes.

In summary, the UIUC Enrollment Management (EM) Task Force supports the “Strategic Enrollment Management: The Path Forward” document as an appropriate response to faculty and UIUC administrative concerns regarding the initial external EM report. We recommend that this document and the prior UIUC and USC EM Task Force reports serve as a starting point for further collaborative discussions about how best to optimize enrollment management within and across campuses. We recommend that the UIUC Senate Executive Committee and the Academic Senate also support this document and our call for further discussions about how to enhance our enrollment policies and practices.

**UIUC Senate Enrollment Management Task Force**

Michael Biehl, Chair

Nikita Borisov

Nicholas Burbules

Roy Campbell

Eric Meyer

Gay Miller

Sarah Projansky

**UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS  
URBANA-CHAMPAIGN SENATE**

Senate Executive Committee  
(Final;Action)

SC.12.13 Senate and Senate Executive Committee (SEC) Calendar for 2012-2013

Senate Meetings and the Annual Meeting of the Faculty are held on the 3<sup>rd</sup> floor Levis Center; SEC meets in 232 English Building. All meetings begin at 3:10 pm.

Senate Packet deadlines are at 12:00 noon; Senate Agenda Item deadlines are at 5:00 pm on the business day prior to the regular SEC meeting.

<u>UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS</u>	<u>SENATE</u>	<u>SEC</u>	<u>Packet</u>
<b><u>2012</u></b>			
Instruction Begins, August 27		August 27	
	September 10		September 4
		September 17	
	October 8		October 1
<i>Annual Meeting of the Faculty</i>	<i>October 29</i> November 5	October 15	October 29
Thanksgiving Vacation November 17-25		November 12	
	December 3		November 26
Final Examinations, December 14-20 <sup>1</sup>		December 10	
<b><u>2013</u></b>			
Instruction Begins, January 14		January 14 January 28 <sup>2</sup>	January 28
	February 4		
		February 11	February 25
	March 4		
Spring Vacation March 16-24		March 11	March 18
	March 25		
		April 8	
<i>2013-2014 Election and Organizational Meeting</i>	<i>April 22</i> April 29		April 15 April 22
Final Examinations, May 3-10 Commencement, May 12		May 13 <sup>3</sup> June 10 <sup>4</sup> July 15	

<sup>1</sup> Includes a one-time exception to hold final examinations on Saturday, December 15, 2012

<sup>2</sup> Special Meeting with the President

<sup>3</sup> Includes an Executive Session with the Chancellor to evaluate the Vice-Chancellors

<sup>4</sup> Includes an Executive Session with the President to evaluate the Chancellor



FACULTY AND ACADEMIC STAFF BENEFITS COMMITTEE  
CURRENT BENEFITS ISSUES & EVENTS  
(FINAL; INFORMATION)

**HEALTH PLANS/FLEX SPENDING ACCOUNT**

1. CMS-hosted Benefit Education Sessions originally scheduled for April are **canceled**, and will be rescheduled when more information is available.
2. Benefit Choice will open on May 1<sup>st</sup>; however, Flex Spending Account enrollment and changes may be the only choice available at that time. Two Benefit Choice periods, or one long one, may be expected.
  - a. Rates and plan design changes are subject to negotiations between the State of Illinois and the State's AFSCME council. As negotiations are still in progress, rates and plan design changes are not known at this time.
  - b. A complete list of health plans and counties of availability will not be ready May 1<sup>st</sup>, but will be released as soon as possible.
3. The Flex Spending Account (FSA) Medical Care Assistance Plan (MCAP) limit effective 7/1/2012 is \$2,500. The new FY2013 FSA booklet will be available online on May 1, 2012.
4. Watch NESSIE's home page at <http://nessie.uihr.uillinois.edu/> and CMS Benefits website at <http://www.benefitschoice.il.gov> for updates.

**BENEFITS STATEMENTS FROM CMS**

CMS mailed Benefits Statements to covered employees, stating benefits coverage as of 3/1/2012. Includes employee cost, state cost, dependent info, Medicare info, FSA contribution, and imputed income for non-IRS dependents. CMS plans to make the Benefits Statement available online in May.

**PENSION LEGISLATION/PROPOSALS**

1. Governor Quinn proposes "Public Pension Stabilization Plan" – see press release online: <http://www.illinois.gov/PressReleases/ShowPressRelease.cfm?SubjectID=2&RecNum=10188>
  - a. See President Designate Easter's message: <https://illinois.edu/emailer/massmail/23245.html>
  - b. See SURS Fact Sheet: <http://www.surs.com/pdfs/facts/GovQuinnPensionPlan.pdf>
2. **H-4996 (Rep. Biss/Sen. Steans)** (Amendments 1 & 2) *Limitations on return to work* - Amends the State Universities Article of the Illinois Pension Code concerning annuitants who return to employment. Requires notification and documentation of persons receiving a retirement annuity who are employed by university and community college employers. Defines "affected annuitant" as a person who, while receiving a retirement annuity, has been employed by a university or community college employer for more than 18 paid months and has received earnings of more than 40% of his or her highest annual rate of earnings. Provides that the employer must pay to the System an employer contribution equal to the annuitant's annual annuity. Provides procedures, payment deadlines, and penalties for noncompliance. Provides an exception for an annuitant who is paid only from federal, foundation, or trust funds. Authorizes the System to audit employers. Extends from 90 to 180 days the period in which a participant in the portable benefit package may elect an optional form of retirement benefit. Also makes administrative and technical changes and corrects terminology relating to participants and annuitants, disability and disability retirement benefits, calculation of interest, and termination of employment. Effective July 1, 2012. **Progressed to 1<sup>st</sup> Reading in Senate; in Pensions & Investments Committee**

**OTHER PENSION/RETIREMENT**

A retirement planning/preparation seminar presented by SURS will be held on May 24 at Wohlers Hall, Room 141 from 2:00pm-3:30pm. Target audience is employees who are within 5 years of retirement. Register online at [https://nessie.uihr.uillinois.edu/cf/benefits/index.cfm?Item\\_ID=139](https://nessie.uihr.uillinois.edu/cf/benefits/index.cfm?Item_ID=139)

**DEFERRED COMP/457 PLAN**

State of Illinois Board of Investments is planning to allow participants to take a loan from their 457 account; however, no date yet on when this will be available. It will not be effective before July 1. CMS will communicate when the loan provision becomes available.



**University Senates Conference (USC)**  
Tuesday, March 27, 2012  
(Final; Information)

PLACE: Room 407 Illini Union, Urbana

PRESENT: Andersen, Boltuc\*, Burbules (Vice Chair), Campbell, Chambers (Chair), Fadavi\*, Fisher, Francis, Gibori, Graber, Leff, Mallory, Mohammadian, O'Brien, Patston\*, Struble, Villegas

ABSENT: Erricolo, Shanahan, Wheeler

GUESTS: Christine Des Garennes, Roopali Malhotra, Christophe Pierre, Steve Veazie

\*Attended by phone

Chambers convened the meeting at 10:05 AM. Chambers welcomed members to the meeting and emphasized that we must work toward the greater good of the university. The minutes from the USC meeting on February 21, 2012 were unanimously approved. Chambers then asked to move into executive session to discuss a personnel matter. The Conference returned from executive session at 11:20 AM. Upon returning, the Senate minutes for Chicago, Springfield, and Urbana-Champaign were unanimously classified. Mohammadian agreed to server as the Observer to the Board of Trustees on May 31 in Chicago.

Andersen thanked members of the ad hoc Committee who reviewed and recommended changes to the existing USC Confidentiality Guidelines (Andersen, Graber, and Mohammadian). The existing guidelines were reviewed by the ad hoc Committee in order to be in compliance with the requirements of the Open Meetings Act (OMA) while also helping members understand what topics could be considered confidential. Legal counsel suggested that draft documents contain the phrase "privileged and confidential draft document for discussion purposes" until draft documents are approved and become a public document. Professor Andersen moved to accept the new version of the Confidentiality Guidelines with a few minor changes, and the motion passed unanimously.

Steve Veazie, Deputy University Counsel, and Roopali Malhotra, Assistant University Counsel, discussed the Open Meetings Act to help members better understand the implications. After providing a general overview, they answered a series of questions that had previously been forwarded to them.

- a. It is possible to tape record a meeting without disclosing that one is doing so. When a meeting moves to closed session (e.g., to discuss personnel matters), there must be a verbatim recording of the meeting.
- b. The Board of Trustees is considered a public body.
- c. Meetings where there is an intent to conduct business are subject to the OMA.
- d. Standing committees of USC must adhere to the OMA, however, ad hoc committees might not have to adhere if membership does not represent a quorum of the USC membership.
- e. Soliciting information into a draft document is not a violation of the OMA.

- f. If discussing public business electronically, OMA regulations would be in effect. Electronic discussions of draft documents that will be brought to a public meeting, however, do not qualify.
- g. A quorum of members present must exist before members can attend a meeting by phone or video.
- h. If the Executive Committee holds a conference call in relation to planning the agenda for upcoming meetings (and not in relation to public business), the OMA does not qualify.
- i. Members of a public body must complete OMA training.

Vice-President Pierre joined the Conference at 1:30 PM. After a brief executive session, he discussed the President's Award Program which is designed to increase student diversity and give the university the ability to recruit and retain high-achieving in-state students. The program began in 1985 and is primarily for minority students but also addresses those with financial need (e.g., those from rural, low economic communities). In recent years there has been a decrease in black students but an increase in Hispanic students in the program. Six-year graduation rates, however, have improved significantly in the past few years. In 2012, the program was enhanced in order to increase student quality, yield, and retention. Overall, there was an increase in the GPA minimum and overall student qualifications in order to be accepted into the program. In turn, annual awards were increased as long as students maintain a minimum GPA. In the funding model, campuses make the decision to admit the students and University administration matches campus funding. The award has been raised to \$5,000 for four years. The program began with 110 students, and there are now over 1,000 new freshman students in the program each year.

Vice-President Pierre briefly commented on a report related to underrepresented minority faculty. There has been an increase in faculty numbers, however, this has taken 20 years to occur. The proportions of minority faculty are in sync with the number of individuals enrolled in doctoral degrees. We have approximately 10% of minority faculty (which reflects the percentage of those enrolled in doctoral programs), but everyone competes for these candidates, and we often lose them to higher paying private universities. Unless the numbers change in relation to minority students in the pipeline (undergraduate and graduate school), we will continue to struggle in relation to recruiting and retaining higher numbers of minority faculty. In the STEM fields, we are making better progress. Overall, we have made good progress and university administration is working on the campuses to the degree that they can.

As soon as possible, Chambers would like to invite the three campus chancellors to an upcoming meeting along with the other university vice-presidents.

Andersen moved to adopt the *USC Guidelines for Conduct of Business*. After brief discussion he withdrew the motion and postponed action until the next meeting. He requested members to forward additional suggestions to him.

After discussing old business items, such as developing a framework for a University-wide summit on Organization and Governance and hosting guests at future meetings, the meeting was adjourned.

Respectfully submitted,  
Kim C. Graber

# Report on IBHE Faculty Advisory Council Meeting

## April 10, 2012

(Final; Information)

The [Faculty Advisory Council](#) (FAC) of the [Illinois Board of Higher Education](#) (IBHE) held a regularly scheduled meeting at [Harry S. Truman College](#) on Tuesday April 10, 2012 with 27 [member institutions](#) present. The Council had a lunch meeting with members of the Board. In the afternoon, the Council joined a regularly scheduled meeting of the Board as has been the tradition for April meetings of the Council and the Board.

In the morning, the council held a discussion on topics to raise with the Board during lunch. In addition, the council discussed what its priorities for activities should be in the upcoming year.

The Council recommended to the Board that a fellowship be established for member institutions to send faculty with expertise that would complement the IBHE staff to join the staff for a period of one or two semesters as fellows. This would be a great opportunity for some faculty to spend their sabbatical leaves. Specifics of such arrangements need to be agreed upon between the IBHE Staff and the faculty member's home institution. Board members were very excited about this proposition and offered their strong support. It was planned that the Council Chair will meet with the IBHE staff over summer to develop a more detailed plan for consideration and approval by the Board at its August meeting. It is hoped that Faculty Fellows may be able to begin their work in January 2013.

The second issue raised with the Board was to ensure that quality education remains at the center of all higher education discussions. There was a mention of a number of recent state bills that were lacking adequate assurances for quality education. The Council expressed concerns about the metrics used in higher education Performance Based Funding (PBF) and reiterated that quality measures must be included in any plans that affect higher education. It was specifically noted that the Council had previously recommended that the ratio of tenure-system to nontenure-system faculty be used as a measure for PBF. The Board appreciated and agreed with the Council's emphasis on quality.

The third item raised with the Board was concerns about college readiness of some students graduating from high schools. It was noted that the situation causes delays in graduation of affected students and costs the State millions of dollars each year in offering remedial courses to a large number of students. The Council felt that the State's P-20 Council should address this issue more rigorously.

Finally, the Council brought to the Board's attention a number of concerns relative to the State's [Monetary Award Program](#) (MAP). It was specifically mentioned that the method and schedule for distribution of MAP funds disadvantage community college students. The Council felt that there needs to be a rigorous review of MAP funding and administration of the awards. The Board agreed that the issues should be addressed.

Board Chair Carrie Hightman thanked the Council for its discussions and noted that the group is highly organized in terms of presenting its positions rationally and clearly compared to other group the Board meet with.

The meeting adjourned at about 12:45 PM after which Council members joined the meeting of the Board. The next meeting of the Council will be held at SIUC in Carbondale on Friday May 18, 2012.

Respectfully submitted  
Abbas Aminmansour



**UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS**  
**URBANA-CHAMPAIGN SENATE**

State Universities Retirement System Members Advisory Committee  
(Final; Information)

SUR.1201 Report of the SURSMAC\* meeting on December 3, 2011

SURSMAC met December 3, 2011 at the SURS headquarters in Champaign from 10:30 a.m. to 2:00 p.m. The focus was on informational presentations by SURS staff followed by a brief business meeting.

SURSMAC chair, Jake Baggott, SIUS, welcomed the participants with the members introducing themselves followed by approval of the minutes for the meeting of April 5, 2011.

Jeff Houch, Legislative Liaison, provided a legislative update starting with a summary of the provisions of SB 512 and its two amendments which have not received a floor vote. The bill would increase the responsibility of the employee to contribute to the defined benefits pension plans. One aspect would increase employee contributions from the current 8% to 15.31% of salary in fiscal year 2014. It would then be recalculated every three years. Houch did not feel the bill currently has the support needed to pass. When asked whether there any alternative bills being considered, he replied that he knew of none but there is continued interest given the seriousness of the pension funding problems. He also noted that the next issue to be addressed is most likely to be changes in the health insurance plans for SURS annuitants.

There was general discussion of the impact of recent changes in the system: e.g., the change for new employees starting January 1, 2011; the changes for calculating the annuity for those using the money purchase formula after July 2, 2012; and the changes being proposed by the bills being considered by the legislature. One effect of such changes is a spike in the number of retirees. For example, in states where pension reforms have been explored in the past, retirement numbers have increased by 35-40%.

For SURS, for example, retirement claims in June 2011 rose to 580 compared to a range of 390 to 480 in June the previous four years. There could be a significant increase in claims in the next year given that 26,000 individuals are eligible within the year. For those wanting to retire before the change for those using the money purchase formula, at a minimum the paperwork requesting the retirement must be on file by June 30, 2012. Those making the request close to that deadline should expect delays in receiving their first annuity payment while the usual 60-90 day period for processing such requests takes place.

There was also discussion of the fact that these changes are making and will make it more difficult for our Universities to hire and keep their best faculty and staff. For example, a senior faculty member with 15-20 years in SURS is likely to find it more attractive to accept a position offering a more stable retirement plan while becoming an inactive SURS member.

The major point of the investment report from Daniel Allen was the excellent performance for fiscal year 2011. The Fund's investment portfolio experienced a 23% return, the highest in 25 years. The most significant changes planned for fiscal year 2012 were to move closer to the policy targets approved by the Board such as a minor shift from U.S. to non-U.S. equities and an increase in real estate.

William Mabe, the Executive Director, reported on the achievements of the past year which included hiring a new General Counsel (Michael Weinstein) and strengthening our legislative representation. He stressed the importance of countering the negative reports in the media about, for example, defined benefits plans. An example was a report prepared by the investment consultant firm, Callan Associates, providing talking points for promoting public defined benefit pensions. He reported that there was an increase from \$980 million to \$1.4 billion in the funding request that SURS made to the state this year. This request is appropriate if the state is to meet its required goal of having reaching 90% funding by 2045. For the short term, the focus will be on getting through this period where investment returns have lagged and the number of retirees has increased.

The final agenda item was the concurrent meeting of the Benefits and Legislative Committees followed by brief reports from each Chair.

Ken Andersen  
H.F. (Bill) Williamson  
UIUC Senate Representatives

\*SURSMAC is the State Universities Retirement System Members Advisory Committee to the SURS Board of Trustees. Its members are faculty and staff representing the various institutions and agencies affected by SURS such as public universities and community colleges, state surveys, and retiree organizations. It normally meets twice a year in October and April at SURS headquarters at 1901 Fox Drive in Champaign.