

AGENDA

Urbana-Champaign Senate
December 5, 2011; 3:10 pm
Levis Faculty Center

I. Approval of Minutes—November 7

II. Senate Executive Committee Report—Matt Wheeler

III. Chancellor's Remarks – Phyllis Wise

IV. Questions/Discussion

V. Consent Agenda

These items will be distributed via www.senate.illinois.edu/111205a.asp. If a senator wishes to move an item to Proposals for Action and have copies at the meeting, they 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.12.13 Proposal from the Graduate College and the College of Agricultural, Consumer and Environmental Sciences (ACES) to Terminate the Community Studies and Outreach Concentration in the PhD Curriculum in Human and Community Development Educational Policy
(G. Miller, Chair)

EP.12.15 Proposal to Revise the Human Development and Family Studies (HDFS) Concentration within the PhD Curriculum in Human and Community Development Educational Policy

VI. Proposals for Action (enclosed)

CC.12.07 Nominations for Faculty Membership on the Search Committee for a Provost and Vice-Chancellor for Academic Affairs Committee on Committees 1
(B. Francis, Chair)

CC.12.08 Nominations for Student Membership on the Search Committee for a Provost and Vice-Chancellor for Academic Affairs Committee on Committees 5
(B. Francis, Chair)

EQ.12.01 Report on Certain Diversity and Equity UIUC Campus Issues Equal Opportunity and Inclusion 7
(H. Hilton, Chair)

GP.11.05 Proposed Statement on Unit Mission Statements and Activities General University Policy 11
(N. Burbules, Chair)

VII. Proposed Revisions to the *University Statutes* (First Reading; Information)

SP.12.07 Proposed Revisions to the *University Statutes*, Article II, Section 2 – University Senates Conference (Campus Rotation of Leadership Positions) University Statues and Senate Procedures 13
(W. Maher, Chair)

VIII. Reports for Information (enclosed)

HE.12.03	FAC/IBHE Report – November 18	A. Aminmansour	19
UC.12.02	USC Report – October 18	K. Graber	21
FB.12.03	Current Benefits Issues and Events	Faculty and Academic Staff Benefits <i>(J. Kindt, Chair)</i>	25

IX. Committee of the Whole

The Senate will discuss the Enrollment Management Task Force Report. Professor Michael Biehl, Task Force Chair, will give introductory remarks. After introductory remarks, comments and questions will be limited to 2 minutes each. 27

X. New Business

XI. Adjournment

Minutes
Urbana-Champaign Senate Meeting
November 7, 2011

A regular meeting of the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign Senate was called to order at 3:12 pm on the 3rd floor of the Levis Faculty Center with Chancellor Phyllis Wise presiding and Professor Emeritus Kenneth E. Andersen as Parliamentarian.

Approval of Minutes

11/07/11-01 The minutes from October 3 were approved as written.

Senate Executive Committee Report

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

Committee on Committees is seeking names for the Provost Search Committee. A massmail was sent to faculty and students requesting nominations be submitted by November 11.

The Enrollment Management Task Force that Matthew Wheeler, Chair of the Senate Executive Committee (SEC), commissioned to review President Hogan's Enrollment Management Report was announced. The Task Force consists of Michael Biehl, Chair of Committee on Admissions; Nicholas Burbules, Chair of General University Policy; Eric Meyer, Associate Professor of Journalism; Sarah Projansky, Chair of Conference of Conduct Governance; Gay Miller, Chair of Educational Policy Committee; Roy Campbell, Information Technology (IT) Committee; Nikita Borisov, University Statutes and Senate Procedures (USSP) representative. The Task Force will create a report and submit it to University Senates Conference. The report will also be the topic of the Committee of the Whole discussion at the December 5 Senate meeting.

Twenty names of nominees were requested on Roy Campbell's behalf as Chair of the IT Committee, to populate the IT Governance Committee. Names of nominees should be sent to Committee on Committees.

The Provost Office has requested nominations for the Promotion and Tenure Committee. A reminder email will be sent out, and nominations are due November 11.

The IT Security Policy is still being worked on, and will come back through the Senate Executive Committee once it is finalized.

11/07/11-02 Floor privileges were requested for Karen Carney, Associate Dean in LAS; Carol Malmgren, Registrar; and Abbas Aminmansour, Associate Professor in Architecture and previous Educational Policy Committee Chair to speak to EP.12.11, Revisions to the 2012-2013 Academic Calendar. Such privileges were granted with no objection.

Tellers for the meeting were Leslie Struble (ENGR), Peter Loeb (LAS), and Jim Maskeri (LAS).

Chancellor's Remarks

Chancellor Phyllis Wise announced that she had visited approximately four academic units on her Listening and Learning Tour to date. At the December 5 Senate meeting, if time permits, the meeting will end early and from 4:30-5:30 the Chancellor will hold a Listening and Learning Tour with the Senate. Wise wants to pose the following questions at that time: Why did you come? Why did you stay? What is it that you are totally passionate about? What does one of

the premier institutions look like in 20-50 years? What should we think about putting in place in 10 years? She went on to mention that the more immediate two year vision that was handled by Stewarding Excellence was a good project. She invited everyone to imagine what the University should look like in 20-50 years so that in the next 5-10 years a plan can be made to accomplish those goals.

Wise hoped that the University is not behind seasonally in starting a Provost search, but knows everyone involved in the process is working diligently. The Vice Chancellor for Research search is ongoing and the deadline for nominations is the beginning of 2012. The plan is to interview in February and March.

Wise noted that her first month has been filled with discovery, and has only begun to understand the depth and breadth of this University. She visited Krannert Art Museum and enjoyed the Faculty Art display. She also attended Krannert Center for the Performing Arts during their Corporate Night, and was pleased to hear local corporate entities speak favorably about the wonderful programs they provide.

Questions/Discussion

There were no questions, but Faculty and Academic Staff Benefits Committee Chair John Kindt (BUS) was invited to speak about the benefits items distributed at the door.

Kindt mentioned the massmail that was sent on November 1 from President Michael Hogan and gave his personal opinion that it was proactive of the President. The President and Interim Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs and Provost Richard Wheeler have written about concerns regarding Senate Bill (SB) 512. Kindt noted that shortly before the meeting, several hundreds of pages were added to SB512 amendment #2. An email with the link to this document will be sent from the Senate Office. Kindt applauded Katie Ross from the University Office for Human Resources for all her work putting together the benefits documents for the Senate packet. More information about these issues is available on the State Universities Annuitants Association website www.suaa.org.

Senator Kenneth Andersen noted that emeriti faculty members are not included in the faculty list that receives faculty massmails. Andersen wanted to make others aware in case it was assumed that emeriti receive faculty massmails. Chancellor Wise noted Andersen's concern and indicated that she would look into the matter.

Proposals for Action

- 11/07/11-03 CC.12.05* Nominations for Membership on Standing Committees of the Senate. Senator Bettina Francis (LAS), Chair of the Committee on Committees, moved approval of the nominations on CC.12.05. There were no floor nominations and nominations were declared closed.
- 11/07/11-04 By voice vote, the slate of candidates on CC.12.05 was approved.
- 11/07/11-05 CC.12.06* Approval of Nominations for the Athletic Board. Senator Bettina Francis (LAS), Chair of the Committee on Committees, noted that the Committee on Committees referred to last year's slate of nominees as this would be filling a vacancy from last year's nominations. She then moved to vote on two of the three nominees.

A count of the tellers indicated the following vote totals: Sarah Projansky 65, Robert Rich 42, and Michael Raycraft 41.

11/07/11-06 By ballot, Robert Rich (IGPA) and Sarah Projansky (LAS) were declared elected. Their names will be forwarded to Chancellor Phyllis Wise who will select one.

11/07/11-07 EP.12.11* Revisions to the 2012-2013 Academic Calendar. Educational Policy Committee (EPC) Chair Gay Miller summarized the committee's reasoning behind this proposal, and added that this is a trial to see if this solution might be used in future years when the time compression occurs again. Karen Carney, Associate Dean in LAS, and Charles Tucker, Associate Dean of Undergraduate Programs in the College of Engineering voiced their support for this proposal. EPC Chair Miller then moved its approval. Discussion of the proposal followed.

Student Senator David Huang (ACES) expressed his objection to Saturday final examinations and voiced concern for religious observances. He also mentioned that in his opinion the entire student population was not informed enough on this issue prior to today's Senate meeting.

Former EPC Chair Abbas Aminmansour (FAA) noted that the Student Code and Illinois State law requires the University to reasonably accommodate student religious beliefs, observances, and practices in regard to admissions, class attendance, and the scheduling of examinations. Professor Aminmansour voiced his support of the one-time change in this proposal. Faculty Senator John Wagstaff (LIBR) asked why the time constraint issue was not previously anticipated. Professor Aminmansour noted that this issue has not occurred since the guidelines were established in 2005.

Student Senator Chaya Sandler (GRAD) mentioned that in the past certain professors she had counted the best two out of three exams, but when she had a religious observance she was told that the exam she missed would count as the dropped exam and a conflict exam was not offered. Senator Sandler felt students should be made more aware of their rights in accordance with the Student Code and Illinois State Law.

Faculty Senator Bettina Francis (LAS) and EPC member reiterated the large number of scenarios and time spent reviewing the vast array of options, and noted this solution divides the burden as equal as possible. Large classes with essays will likely have more impact than others.

Student Body President David Pileski (FAA) noted his reluctant support of this proposal, but felt further review was needed for future years with the time constraints. EPC Chair Miller noted that the EPC is asking for reports from various stakeholders to determine the impact of this solution and if it is viable for future years with similar time constraints.

11/07/11-08 By voice vote, EP.11.12 Revisions to the 2012-2013 Academic Calendar was passed.

11/07/11-09 SC.12.08* Nominations to Fill a Faculty Vacancy on Committee on Committees created by the Resignation of Brendesha Tynes (EDUC). Senator Matthew Wheeler (ACES), Chair of the SEC, moved to vote for one of the two nominees on SC.12.08. There were no floor nominations and nominations were declared closed.

A count of the tellers indicated the following vote totals: Cris Mayo 51 and Lynne Rudasill 25.

11/07/11-10 By ballot, Cris Mayo (EDUC) was declared elected to Committee on Committees with a term expiring in 2013.

Reports for Information

The following reports were presented for information:

11/07/11-11 UC.12.01* - USC Report - September 21– K. Graber
11/07/11-12 HE.12.02* - FAC/IBHE Report – K. Andersen
11/07/11-13 FB.12.02* - Current Benefits Issues and Events – J. Kindt

New Business

Faculty Senator Al Kagan (LIBR) noted his appreciation for the information distributed at the door and moved to add discussion of SB512 and the Senate taking a position on this issue to the agenda as new business. Parliamentarian Kenneth Anderson noted that the Open Meetings Act (OMA) only allows discussion of items added to the agenda, but does not allow taking action on those items. Senator Kagan objected to this interpretation based on the way the Senate handled items added to the agenda in the past.

USSP member George Friedman noted that USSP is very intensely looking at the issue of whether the UIUC Senate is subject to OMA. If the Senate is subject to OMA, USSP knows what changes have to be made to the governing documents to be in compliance. Parliamentarian Andersen added that the Office of University Counsel should be consulted and that in his opinion it would be unwise to take action until clarification was obtained from University Counsel.

By voice, the Senate voted to add discussion of SB512 to the agenda as a new business item, and passed.

Faculty Senator Al Kagan (LIBR) made a motion to resolve that the Senate object to SB512. The motion was seconded. Several Senators agreed with the objection to SB512, but were unsure if a vote should be taken. Chancellor Wise reminded the Senate that a large amendment was added to this bill and that Senators may want to review the addition before taking a position. Faculty and Academic Staff Benefits Chair John Kindt (BUS) added that it would make a greater impact to object to SB512 individually within ethical regulations rather than pass a resolution as a Senate.

Faculty Senator Peter Loeb (LAS) made a motion to substitute supporting the President's communication that was distributed at the door for Senator Kagan's previous motion that was on the floor. The motion was seconded.

By voice, Chancellor Wise pronounced that the motion from Faculty Senator Loeb to support the President's communication had been substituted for Faculty Senator Al Kagan's motion to resolve that the Senate object to SB512.

Faculty Senator Bettina Francis (LAS) asked the Presiding Officer to determine if a quorum was present. By a count of the tellers, it was determined that a quorum was not present, and the meeting was declared adjourned at 5:00 pm.

Jenny Roether, Senate Clerk

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

**UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS
URBANA-CHAMPAIGN SENATE**

Committee on Committees
(Final;Action)

CC.12.07 Nominations for Faculty Membership on the Search Committee for a Provost and Vice-Chancellor for Academic Affairs

Background

Chancellor Phyllis Wise has asked the Senate to develop a slate of nominees for the search committee for the selection of a new Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs. According to previous procedures approved by the Senate, a Provost Search Committee will consist of 11 members: 8 faculty (5 elected by the Senate, 3 appointed by the Chancellor), 2 students (1 elected by the Senate, 1 appointed by the Chancellor), and 1 academic professional appointed by the Chancellor. One or more of the faculty appointees may have administrative appointments. The Chancellor will appoint a chair from among the 8 faculty members. This composition of the Search Committee is identical to recent provost searches.

Committee on Committees sent a massmail email to faculty, undergraduate students, and graduate students to solicit nominations. Numerous faculty and student nominations were received and evaluated.

Nominations

The following faculty members are nominated to fill 5 faculty positions. A bio-sketch of each nominee is included below. The 5 faculty nominees receiving the highest numbers of votes shall be elected.

James Anderson	EDUC
Karen Campbell	VMED
Leon Dash	MDA
Faye Dong	ACES
Jan Erkert	FAA
Placid Ferreira	ENGR
Samantha Frost	LAS
Prasanta Kalita	ACES
Barbara Minsker	ENGR
Catherine Prendergast	LAS
Joseph Rosenblatt	LAS
Bill Stewart	AHS

Committee on Committees

Bettina Francis, Chair
Damani Bolden
Harley T Johnson
Prasanta Kalita
John W Kindt
Jim Maskeri
Cris Mayo
Mary Ellen O'Shaughnessey
Chaya Sandler

Nominations from the floor must be accompanied by the nominee's signed statement of willingness to serve if elected. The statement shall be dated and include the name of the position to be filled. If present, the nominee's oral statement will suffice.

JAMES ANDERSON (EDUC)

James D. Anderson is Gutsell Professor and Head of Education Policy, Organization and Leadership. He has served as a member of the Executive Committee of the Graduate College (1988-1990), Chairperson of the Athletic Board of the Division of Intercollegiate Athletics (1989-1990), member of the Consultative Committee to Assist in the Selection of the President of the University of Illinois (1994-1995), Chairperson of Chancellor's Annual Conference Planning Committee (2001-2002), Chairperson of the campus Diversity Initiatives Committee (1999-2004), and member of the Editorial Board of the University of Illinois Press (2001-present). He also served as a member of the recent search committee for the Vice-President and Chancellor of the Urbana campus. He is the senior editor of the History of Education Quarterly and was elected to the National Academy of Education in 2008.

KAREN CAMPBELL (VMED)

Challenging times are also times of opportunity. The University of Illinois is among the very best in the nation because of the excellence of our faculty, staff and students. It is important for us to identify and recruit a provost who is committed to further strengthening the reputation of our academic programs and faculty. Also integral to enhancing the stature of the university will be providing support for research, scholarship and other creative activities that contribute to the advancement of knowledge and provide value to society. I have been a faculty member at the University of Illinois for 28 years and have been actively involved in college-level strategic planning. As a former 4-H member, I believe in the motto "To Make the Best Better" and would look forward to helping to identify a provost who shares that vision.

LEON DASH (MDA)

I served on the committee that selected Linda Katehi. I recognize the level of examination and scrutiny a search committee member must apply in selecting the very best candidate for our campus.

FAYE DONG (ACES)

I know that faculty members often ask "Why do we need a Provost and a Chancellor?" I served on the search committee for the Chancellor in 2004-05 and that question was discussed back then, and I still hear the question raised now. The Provost has the enormous responsibility of overseeing the campus educational programs, research activities, academic personnel, and budget while leading the charge to constantly improve the high quality education, superb research portfolio, and stellar reputation of the main Illinois campus during challenging economic times. These are huge expectations that will require an effective, intelligent, and perceptive Provost who will work in the best interest of the University. I firmly believe that a campus the size of UIUC needs a Provost who is an outstanding leader and who will work well with the administrative teams to make wise decisions. It is truly an honor to be nominated to serve on the search committee for the new Provost, and I want to thank you for the opportunity to submit a statement.

JAN ERKERT (FAA)

As chief academic officer, the Provost is crucial to maintaining and furthering the excellence and creativity of our faculty and the quality of the educational experience of our students. We will need the Provost to provide ethical, innovative and inspired leadership as we address the major challenges ahead, which include the unique autonomy of this campus, the changing landscape of teaching/learning, the dynamic interplay between teaching and research for faculty and students, interdisciplinary collaboration between our highly individualized units, utilization of new technologies, diversity as it relates to faculty, students and curriculum, and the continued development of shared leadership in all academic matters. As a Fulbright Scholar, Artistic Director, author, Teaching Excellence Awardee, and national spokesperson for innovative teaching/learning, I believe I have the experience necessary to be rigorous and open in the pursuit of an academic leader who will further the mission of this great University.

PLACID FERREIRA (ENGR)

Professor Placid M. Ferreira is the Head and the Grayce Wicall Gauthier Professor of Mechanical Science and Engineering at Illinois. From 2003 to 2009, he was Principal Investigator and Director of the Center for Chemical-Electrical-Mechanical Manufacturing Systems (Nano-CEMMS), a NSF-sponsored Nanoscale Science and Engineering Center. He has been on the mechanical engineering faculty at Illinois since 1987, serving as the associate head for graduate programs and research from 1999 to 2002. Professor Ferreira received NSF's Presidential Young Investigator Award in 1990, Society of Manufacturing Engineers' Outstanding Young Investigator Award in 1991 and the University of Illinois' University Scholar Award in 1994. He became a Fellow of the Society of Manufacturing Engineers in 2011.

SAMANTHA FROST (LAS)

Samantha Frost is Associate Professor in the Political Science Department, the Department of Women and Gender Studies, as well as the Unit for Criticism and Interpretive Theory. Her research focuses on theories of embodiment and politics. Frost is the author of *Lessons from a materialist thinker: Hobbesian reflections on ethics and politics* (Stanford UP, 2008) which was recognized as a Best First Book by the political theory section of the American Political Science Association. She co-edited *New Materialisms: Ontology, Agency, and Politics* (Duke UP, 2010). Her work has also appeared in journals such as *Political Theory* and *Theory and Event*. Frost recently received an Andrew W. Mellon Foundation New Directions Fellowship which enabled her to undertake a year and a half long course of study in biology. She subsequently received a Mellon Post-Fellowship grant supporting her composition of a book entitled *Biology for Humanists*. Frost's teaching covers various topics in political and feminist theory; she recently received the LAS Lynn M. Martin Award for excellence in teaching. Frost is a member of the Executive Committee in Gender and Women's Studies and is Political Theory field chair in Political Science. She is also serving as a member of the Gender Equity Council. With her penchant for cross-disciplinary research and her recognition of the importance of teaching, Frost appreciates the opportunity to work with her colleagues in selecting a provost who will respect and support the intellectual integrity of the research and teaching missions of the university.

PRASANTA KALITA (ACES)

Dr. Prasanta K. Kalita is a Professor and Leader of Soil & Water Resources Engineering program of the Agricultural & Biological Engineering Department. He has a well-funded research program both nationally and internationally, has published extensively in peer reviewed journals and currently serves as the Editor-in-Chief of a peer-reviewed journal. Dr. Kalita has won departmental, college, campus, regional, and national awards, and has been recognized with Distinguished Teacher/Scholar Award on Campus. In 2005, Dr. Kalita won the National Award of the USDA Higher Education Program for excellence in college and university teaching. In 2009, Dr. Kalita served on the Provost Search Committee. He currently chairs the Campus Committee on Race and Ethnicity (CORE), serves on the Campus Teaching Advancement Board (TAB), serves on the College of ACES P&T Committee, and serves on the Provost Advisory Group. He has served as co-chair on TAB, chaired the ACES Administrators Evaluation Committee, chaired the Engineering Grievance Committee, and chaired the Campus Study Abroad Advisory Committee. Currently, Dr. Kalita serves on both colleges of Engineering and ACES Executive Committees. He has served on numerous other campus, colleges (Engineering and ACES), department committees, and national and international professional societies and government panels. He recently completed the US Land Grant Institutions LEAD 21 Leadership Program.

BARBARA MINSKER (ENGR)

Barbara Minsker has been Professor in the Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering and Faculty Affiliate at the National Center for Supercomputing Applications since 1996. She recently completed a 3-year term as Associate Provost Fellow in the Office of the Provost, where she helped to launch the campus sustainability initiative, collaborating with the Chancellor, the Provost, the other Vice Chancellors, the Office of Sustainability, and hundreds of faculty, staff, and students from across campus. Through these appointments, she has a unique and broad perspective on the opportunities and challenges that the Provost will need to address and the workings of the Office of the Provost. She would welcome the opportunity to serve the campus in helping to identify an outstanding leader for this important position.

CATHERINE PRENDERGAST (LAS)

As a faculty member who has chosen to stay at the University of Illinois since 1997, I am invested in seeing our university recover from years of budget cuts and ethics scandals that have threatened its research and educational missions. My diverse service appointments, including membership on the University Scholar selection committee and the directorship of the first year writing program (4000+ students per year), have afforded me a broad view of the challenges that face the next Provost, who will need to ensure the infrastructure to support excellent scholarship and research, recognize the unique contributions and attributes of the Urbana campus, restore the morale and earn the respect of the faculty, and secure the accessibility of a University of Illinois education. With Admissions, Human Resources, and Financial Aid all reporting directly to the Provost, we must identify a candidate with a truly strong record for transparency and accountability.

JOSEPH ROSENBLATT (LAS)

Joseph Rosenblatt has been a Professor of Mathematics since 1988. He was at the Ohio State University from 1974-1994 before coming to the University of Illinois. He has served here as Chair of the Department of Mathematics from September 1999 to August 2004, and March 2006 to August 2006. He is currently on the Research Board. He has recently been a member of his department's Executive Committee and the Provost's Promotion and Tenure Committee. He has been on the LAS Executive Committee, the Graduate College's Fellowship Committee, the International Programs and Studies Executive Advisory Committee, the Coordinating Committee of the Beckman Institute, and the Computational Science and Engineering Steering Committee. He was a Program Officer in the Division of Mathematical Sciences at NSF from 2006-2008. He has taught courses at all levels in the undergraduate and graduate programs at three universities. He has published over 90 research articles, supervised 13 doctoral students, and obtained many grants to support his work.

BILL STEWART (AHS)

I am honored to be nominated to serve on the Provost Search Committee. The Provost is the chief academic officer of the University, and serves a critical leadership role in advancing campus educational experiences. I have played several roles over the past decade related to academic programs, including proposing new coursework as a faculty member, reviewing course and curricula proposals as a member of the Educational Policy Committee of Applied Health Sciences, implementing the recently established interdisciplinary Health program as its first Director, and serving as Associate Dean of Academic Affairs to oversee educational programs, student affairs, and teaching development in my college. In addition, I have served on the campus Gen Ed Board, co-chaired the campus Sustainable Education Task Force to integrate learning outcomes related to sustainability into campus curricula, and am currently facilitating the development of recruitment strategies for PhD students within AHS units.

**UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS
URBANA-CHAMPAIGN SENATE**

Committee on Committees
(Final;Action)

CC.12.08 Nominations for Student Membership on the Search Committee for a Provost and Vice-Chancellor for Academic Affairs

Background

Chancellor Phyllis Wise has asked the Senate to develop a slate of nominees for the search committee for the selection of a new Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs. According to previous procedures approved by the Senate, a Provost Search Committee will consist of 11 members: 8 faculty (5 elected by the Senate, 3 appointed by the Chancellor), 2 students (1 elected by the Senate, 1 appointed by the Chancellor), and 1 academic professional appointed by the Chancellor. One or more of the faculty appointees may have administrative appointments. The Chancellor will appoint a chair from among the 8 faculty members. This composition of the Search Committee is identical to recent provost searches.

Committee on Committees sent a massmail email to faculty, undergraduate students, and graduate students to solicit nominations. Numerous faculty and student nominations were received and evaluated.

Nominations

The following student members are nominated to fill 1 student position. A bio-sketch of each nominee is included below. The 1 student nominee receiving the highest numbers of votes shall be elected.

Miheer Munjal	ENGR
Franklyn Rocha Cabrero	GRAD
Megan Schaffer	LAS

Committee on Committees

Bettina Francis, Chair
Damani Bolden
Harley T Johnson
Prasanta Kalita
John W Kindt
Jim Maskeri
Cris Mayo
Mary Ellen O'Shaughnessey
Chaya Sandler

Nominations from the floor must be accompanied by the nominee's signed statement of willingness to serve if elected. The statement shall be dated and include the name of the position to be filled. If present, the nominee's oral statement will suffice.

MIHEER MUNJAL (ENGR)

Miheer Munjal is a junior in Materials Science and Engineering, graduating in spring 2013. He is interested in the Provost search committee as a culmination and application of his involvement on campus to date, and a way for him to express his opinions towards an important position on campus. He currently serves on 4 campus boards, and is an active leader in 4 RSOs; Student Alumni Ambassadors, Illinois Business Consulting, Materials Advantage, and Keramos. Miheer has vast experience with campus administration through his roles in SAA with the Illini Comeback program, and has shown success in coordinating large programs with high-level school officials. He wishes for the opportunity to tie together his wide-range of passions (engineering to political science) with his school experience, and his technical prowess. Miheer has the track record, the willpower to exceed the goals of the position, and the desire to make a lasting difference.

FRANKLYN ROCHA CABRERO (GRAD)

Born and raised in Mayaguez –a college town located in the western area of Puerto Rico– I am a first generation student from a disadvantaged background who fought his way to gain a higher education; values such as perseverance, dedication, and integrity have aided towards my goals. Science outreach, mentoring, and graduate school recruitment are some of many passions I pursue as part of my career; they are personally fulfilling in the midst of the academic rigors in my program.

I currently serve in committees/organizations that seek to diversify and retain students in UIUC, especially in STEM fields. I am independent and a team player, reliable, passionate, well known in my department, a critical thinker and open-minded. I am a fast learner, and with my background and experiences, I am certain I can contribute in to the Illinois student community and senate in the selection of a new Provost.

MEGHAN SCHAFFER (LAS)

Meghan Schaffer is a senior majoring in political science and communication with a minor in business. Currently serving as a Graf Intern for the Illinois Leadership Center, she is a member of the Student Alumni Ambassadors, and of Illinois Connection, an Alumni Association advocacy group striving to obtain support for higher education. These experiences have allowed her extensive professional development experience. A former resident adviser to the Garner LEADS Living Learning Community, she continues to participate in activities hosted by University Housing. Schaffer enjoys engaging with students, alumni and the campus community and is considering continuing these passions by attending graduate school for a master's degree in student affairs. Meghan is interested in serving on the Provost selection committee because she places great importance on serving her University, and as a graduating senior she feels as though it would be a great capstone experience to her time as a student.

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS
URBANA-CHAMPAIGN SENATE

Committee on Equal Opportunity and Inclusion
(Final; Action)

EQ.12.01 Report on Certain Diversity and Equity UIUC Campus Issues

1 – Annual Report for 2010. On April 26, 2010, the Senate Committee on Equal Opportunity and Inclusion presented to the Senate its Report on Diversity and Equity Initiatives (EQ.10.01). In the present report, the Committee wishes to identify and amplify additional issues and concerns.

2 – Stewarding Excellence. In a letter dated November 12, 2010, to then Interim Chancellor and Vice-President Easter and Provost Wheeler the Committee expressed its concern by stating that “The UIUC Senate Committee on Equal Opportunity and Inclusion (EQ) has noticed with profound concern that the Stewarding Excellence process has ignored the very important and ever present diversity question in its reports. This makes it appear that diversity is not a priority item from the Administration’s point of view to be sacrificed for budgetary expediency reasons.” While the Chancellor replied affirmatively the Committee sees no visible campus motion on increased efforts in retention and/or new hire procedures.

3 – The Strategic Plan of 2006-2011 commits the University to an increasingly extensive national and global constituency. However, with growth and expansion we have also increased the inequities in development opportunities provided to students by race, gender, socio economic status, region, and country.

Student Enrollments. It is critical that an analysis of the University's traditional entry requirements (all campuses) take place to align with our new commitment to cultivate justice, enhance social mobility, and improve the quality of life for all. Currently, the University's traditional entry requirements do not promote values that respond to local, national, and global needs equally for both traditional and non-traditional students at the undergraduate and the graduate level. For instance, enrollments for international students have increased, but domestic (Caucasian, African American, Hispanic, and American Indian) student enrollment decreased since 2005 (Hamer & Perez, 2010).

Strategic Goal V: Access to the Illinois Experience requires new entry policies that recognize knowledge learned through work experience and other nontraditional methods. Traditional metrics, curriculums, and methods of teaching should also be revised to hold the University accountable for a successful learning experience, hence successful graduation rates of all students.

References:

- Gutierrez, K.D., & Rogoff, B. (2003) Cultural Ways of Learning: Individual Traits or Repertoires of Practice. *Educational Researcher*, 32 (5), 19-25.
- Hamer, J.F., & Perez, V.H. (2010) *Elusive Equity: Graduate Education at Illinois' Flagship University*. Urbana: Center on Democracy in a Multiracial Society, University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign.
- University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign. (2010) *UIUC On-Campus International Students by Country and Gender Fall 2010*. Urbana: Division of Management Information.
- University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign. (2010) *University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign Strategic Plan Progress Report*. Urbana: University of Illinois Urbana-Champaign.
- University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign. (2010, April 11) EQ.10.01, Resolution on Diversity and Equity Initiatives. Retrieved from Academic Senate: <http://www.senate.illinois.edu.eq1001.asp>

4 –Student and Faculty Recruitment. The administration should affirm the importance of recruitment and retention of underrepresented minority and women undergraduate and graduate students, and the significance of a welcoming academic and community environment in achieving this goal. Apparently the Graduate School is moving back to a coordinated recruitment weekend for underrepresented minority admits, and the Committee concurs in this as a good way to welcome potential new students as long as ample time is made in the scheduling for those students to also have access to potential departmental mentors and graduate colleagues. Recruitment and retention of underrepresented minority and women faculty, with particular attention to the importance of mentorship of non-tenured faculty is of paramount importance. The protection of faculty, especially those hired in joint-appointments, from being overburdened with service assignments that might obstruct their time for research and teaching innovations is crucial to achieving tenure. Departments should be encouraged to think strategically about the importance of placing faculty from underrepresented groups on hiring committees.

5 – Ethnic Studies Programs. The most obvious issues surrounding the Ethnic Studies Programs (which include the Department of Latina/Latino Studies, the Department of African American Studies, the Department of Gender and Women Studies, the American Indian Studies Program, and the Department of Asian American Studies) are the following:

Space. It is clear that the office space is substandard, especially in comparison to the facilities provided to other units on campus. For example, in Latina/Latino Studies, TA's have their office space in the basement, with no windows. One concern in grouping the Department of Latina/Latino Studies, the Department of African American Studies, the Department of Gender and Women Studies, the American Indian Studies Program and the Department of Asian American Studies together in a new building is that this will further diminish their individual identity.

Faculty Diversity. The number of faculty of color is also a perpetual concern. Transparent and reliable data on tenure track and non-tenure track faculty is needed for a complete evaluation of diversity trends.

Diversity Initiatives. It is also apparent that the issue of diversity is cyclical and repetitive, that comes and goes with each set of administrators. It is never part of their permanent plan. It needs to be incorporated into a general plan, where goals, and achievements can be measured and evaluated.

Transparency. Issues related to developing advanced degree programs in the ethnic studies units need to be addressed by the units and supported by their deans. Though it is clear that these units need to start thinking about how they are to be providing PhD's in the future, the academic discussion has stalled, if not disappeared. Rumors abound on campus as to the physical amalgamation of the units, to the extent that the clear distinction between the support programs for Latina/Latino students, and the academic units, is again disappearing. This lack of transparency affects hiring, promotion, etc.

Distinction Between Academics and Support. The clear distinction between the support programs and the Departments needs to be maintained. The best way to maintain this distinction is the physical separation of the two types of units. Support Programs are under the Office of Student Affairs, and Departments are under the supervision of the department heads, academic deans and the provost.

Recommendation: The Senate Committee on Equal Opportunity and Inclusion recommends that the UIUC Academic Senate receive this report and that the Clerk of the Senate transmit the Report to Interim Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs and Provost Richard Wheeler, Vice President and Chancellor Phyllis Wise, President Michael Hogan, and members of the Board of Trustees.

SENATE COMMITTEE ON EQUAL OPPORTUNITY AND INCLUSION
Harry Hilton, Chair
Alejandra Aguero
Santos Gordils
Joy Malnar
Kathryn Oberdeck
Nancy O'Brien
Rolando Romero
Rosa Rosas

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS
URBANA-CHAMPAIGN SENATE

General University Policy
(Final; Information)

GP.11.05 Proposed Statement on Unit Mission Statements and Activities

BACKGROUND

Advocacy for particular views, supported by evidence and argument, is a hallmark of academic freedom in research and teaching. Academic freedom is a basic right of college and university teachers (see AAUP Statement of Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure:

<http://www.aaup.org/AAUP/pubsres/policydocs/contents/1940statement.htm>).

Academic units in public universities (colleges, departments, centers, programs, institutes, and so on), however, have a broader and more encompassing responsibility:

they are conducted for the common good and not to further the interest of either the individual teacher or the institution as a whole. The common good depends upon the free search for truth and its free exposition (AAUP, 1940).

Although academic units might “advocate” for some issue in the broad sense that by identifying it as a focus of study they consider it important, these units should not be organized around advancing specific views about such issues. To do so is inconsistent with the fundamental principles of free inquiry, open debate, and institutional intellectual integrity.

PROPOSED POLICY

The purpose of a mission statement is twofold. First, for external purposes, a mission statement provides a concise description of the priorities and goals of an academic unit (including, but not limited to, colleges, departments, centers, programs, and institutes). In specifying such goals and priorities, a mission statement typically constitutes a coherent and distinctive academic purpose that justifies the need for that unit (i.e., “Why do we exist?”).

Second, for internal purposes, a mission statement provides current or prospective members of that unit with a clear sense of how their work relates to the scope of issues and approaches suitable to that mission. There is a balance here between sufficient specificity to give the mission statement a distinctive character, and sufficient breadth to provide scholars within it a range of autonomy consistent with their individual academic freedom and the principles of free inquiry, open debate, and institutional intellectual integrity.

To this end, an academic unit’s mission statement, and the nature and scope of activities operating within it, must respect open-ended inquiry, debate, and diversity of views. Mission statements or policies that presuppose the unquestioned superiority of particular theories, doctrines, or “isms,” or are based on assertions that prejudice or restrict the outcomes of free academic inquiry, are inconsistent with the above-mentioned principles, to which the University of Illinois is committed.

GENERAL UNIVERSITY POLICY

Nicholas Burbules, Chair
Dayna Cueva Alegria
George Gross
Carol Livingstone
Mary Mallory

David Pileski
John Prussing
Joyce Tolliver
Barbara Wilson (*Ex officio designee*)

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS
URBANA-CHAMPAIGN SENATE

Committee on University Statutes and Senate Procedures
(First Reading; Information)

SP.12.07 Proposed Revisions to the *Statutes*, Article II, Section 2 – University Senates
Conference (Campus Rotation of Leadership Positions)

BACKGROUND

It has been a long-standing tradition of the University Senates Conference (USC) to rotate leadership positions of Chair and Vice Chair among the three campuses. This tradition has been superseded in rare instances due to special circumstances. For example, Luther Skelton from UIS was to become Chair in 1999-2000 and when he died, no other representative from UIS was available to serve in his place.

The UIS Senate approved a resolution to codify this tradition in the *Statutes*. Their proposed amendment is attached.

The USC has passed a statement preferring tradition to codification. The Senate Committee on University Statutes and Senate Procedures agrees with the USC. Codifying the tradition in the *Statutes* as proposed by UIS is too inflexible. For example, had this rotation been codified in the *Statutes* in 1999, no one available and willing to serve would have been eligible for election that year.

RECOMMENDATION

The Senate Committee on University Statutes and Senate Procedures recommends that the UIUC Senate vote to concur with the USC's September 21 statement to not support codifying this rotation in the *Statutes*.

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

Chicago • Springfield • Urbana-Champaign

University Senates Conference
377 Henry Administration Building, MC-348
506 South Wright Street
Urbana, IL 61801

October 21, 2011

Professor Philip A. Patston, Chair
UIC Senate Executive Committee
Dept. of Oral Medicine and Diagnostic Sciences
558 DENT MC 838

Professor Matthew B. Wheeler, Chair
UIUC Senate Executive Committee
Dept. of Animal Sciences
368 Animal Sciences Lab MC 630

Re: Proposed Revisions to the *Statutes*, Article II, Section 2 (University Senates Conference) –
Campus Rotation of Leadership Positions (USC ST-76)

Dear Colleagues:

The UIS Senate approved a resolution on September 9 which calls for changes to the *Statutes*. The statutory revisions proposed by the UIS Senate, along with the resolution, are enclosed for the consideration of your senates.

The University Senates Conference unanimously approved a statement at its meeting of September 21, which attempted to resolve this issue. The offer was not accepted by the UIS Senate. The USC statement is enclosed.

Please inform us after your senate has taken action on this item. Please be as expeditious as possible.

Sincerely,



Donald A. Chambers, Chair
University Senates Conference

Enclosures

c: Elizabeth Dooley
Michael Hogan
Jenny Roether
Kathy Rutherford
Michele Thompson
Tih-Fen Ting
Members, University Senates Conference

Deletions are ~~strikethrough~~
Additions are ***bolded, underlined, and italicized***

Approved
Campus Senate Meeting
September 9, 2011

**UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS AT SPRINGFIELD
CAMPUS SENATE 2011/2012
RESOLUTION 41-11**

**Revisions to the *Statutes*, Article II, Section 2 – University Senates Conference
(Campus Rotation of Leadership Positions)**

WHEREAS, the three campuses of the University of Illinois differ in size and orientation, and each has equally valuable educational and social roles to play in Illinois and beyond; and

WHEREAS, the University Senates Conference functions as an advisory, transmitting, and coordinating body on behalf of the University faculty and thus ought to share University-level governance among faculty from the three campuses; and

WHEREAS, the University Senates Conference has had a long tradition of rotating its leadership positions (i.e., chair and vice chair) among members of the three campuses; and

WHEREAS, the rotation was established to maintain harmonious relations within the University, to acknowledge a degree of parity among the campuses, and to exemplify shared governance at the University of Illinois;

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the rotation tradition of leadership positions in the University Senates Conference will be upheld with a UIS member assuming the chair position in Fall 2012;

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Campus Senate of the University of Illinois at Springfield approves the following revisions to the *Statutes* regarding the organization of the University Senates Conference.

BE IT FINALLY RESOLVED that the Campus Senate of the University of Illinois at Springfield transmits this resolution to the University Senates Conference, Vice President/Chancellor Susan Koch, President Michael J. Hogan, and to the Board of Trustees of the University of Illinois.

1 **Section 2. University Senates Conference**

2 **a. Organization**

3 (1) The University Senates Conference shall be made up of twenty members. The basic
4 representation shall be two members from each senate. Additional members shall be
5 apportioned to each senate, at least one from each senate, in numbers proportional to the
6 number of faculty members on each campus. The apportionment shall be recalculated
7 every five years. Each senate shall elect its own representatives from its membership.

8 (2) Senators whose senatorial terms expire before their conference terms expire shall
9 complete their conference terms. Any faculty senator or faculty senator-elect shall be
10 eligible for election to the conference. The term of office shall be three years beginning
11 on the first day of the next academic year following the election. Approximately one-
12 third of the conference members from each senate shall be elected annually.

13 (3) A quorum for conference meetings shall consist of a simple majority of the total
14 membership of the conference. If a quorum cannot be obtained otherwise, the conference
15 members from a senate may designate as many as two alternates from the faculty
16 members of their own senate to serve at a specific meeting.

17 (4) The conference officers shall be a chair and a vice chair, who shall be elected for one-
18 year terms by and from the conference and shall not be from the same senate. **There shall**
19 **be a rotation among the three senates for the chair and vice chair positions. The senate**
20 **that has its member elected as the vice chair by and from the conference shall have its**
21 **member elected as the chair the following year. The senate that has its member elected**
22 **as the chair by and from the conference shall not be eligible for either the chair or the**
23 **vice chair the following year.** The chair shall not be from the same senate in two
24 consecutive years.

25 (5) The executive committee of the conference shall consist of two members from each
26 senate: the conference chair, the conference vice chair, and four additional members
27 elected annually by and from the conference. The conference may authorize the executive
28 committee to act on behalf of the conference between scheduled meetings.

University Senates Conference

Approved September 21, 2011

The University Senates Conference affirms its tradition of rotation of leadership positions among the three campuses and supports the principle of re-establishing the rotation as soon as reasonable but does not support codifying this rotation in the *Statutes*.

USC Chairs and Vice Chairs since 1997

	Chair	Vice Chair
1997-1998	Richard Johnson, UIC	Geneva Belford, UIUC
1998-1999	Geneva Belford, UIUC	Luther Skelton, UIS
1999-2000	Elliot Kaufman, UIC	Frank Kopecky, UIS
2000-2001	Frank Kopecky, UIS	Thomas Conry, UIUC
2001-2002	Thomas Conry, UIUC	Gerald Strom, UIC
2002-2003	Gerald Strom, UIC	Pat Langley, UIS
2003-2004	Pat Langley, UIS	Michael Grossman, UIUC
2004-2005	Michael Grossman, UIUC	Elliot Kaufman, UIC
2005-2006	Elliot Kaufman, UIC	Pat Langley, UIS
2006-2007	Tarry Bodenhorn, UIS	Mary Mallory, UIUC
2007-2008	Vernon Burton, UIUC	Elliot Kaufman, UIC
2008-2009	Elliot Kaufman, UIC	Kathryn Eisenhart, UIS
2009-2010	Kathryn Eisenhart, UIS	Matthew Wheeler, UIUC
2010-2011	Matthew Wheeler, UIUC	Donald Chamber, UIC
2011-2012	Donald Chambers, UIC	Nicholas Burbules, UIUC

Report on IBHE Faculty Advisory Council Meeting
November 18, 2011
(Final; Information)

The [Faculty Advisory Council](#) (FAC) of the [Illinois Board of Higher Education](#) (IBHE) held a regularly scheduled meeting at Aurora University on Friday November 18, 2011 with 33 [member institutions](#) present. Guests of the council included Larry Frank, Research Specialist at Illinois Education Association and Timothy Harrington of Chicago State University, both members of the IBHE Performance Based Funding Steering Committee.

The meeting was called to order at 8:30 AM by Chair Aminmansour. Aurora University President Rebecca L. Sherrick welcomed the group to her campus and spoke about the benefits and challenges of having a university with campuses in Illinois and Wisconsin. She characterized her university as a private university with a public agenda. She also spoke about their Institute for Collaboration which tackles math and science education by empowering teachers through content mastery linked to student learning. President Sherrick noted that this program has been very successful and challenged the group to undertake similar programs.

Following reports of the Council Chair and IBHE Liaison, the three caucuses (Publics, Privates and Community Colleges) met separately and reported back to the entire Council. Much of the discussion of the caucuses focused on Performance Based Funding (PBF) mandated by the state as well as the [report](#) of the University of Pennsylvania's Institute for Research on Higher Education called "A Story of Decline: Performance and Policy in Illinois Higher Education."

A considerable portion of the FAC's [meeting agenda](#) was dedicated to discussion of [Performance-Based Funding](#) (PBF) mandated by Illinois [Public Act 97-320](#) (HB1503). The bill requires IBHE to establish metrics for performance-based funding of state's public universities and colleges beginning with the fiscal year 2013. IBHE has established a [Steering Committee](#) on PBF which [meets regularly](#) to develop a set of metrics for PBF for consideration by the Board in time for next year's budget proposal to the State.

IBHE Performance Based Funding Steering Committee members Larry Frank and Timothy Harrington participated in a discussion with council members on the latest developments in the Committee's efforts to implement PBF in Illinois. The discussion continued among Council members in the afternoon. Following the discussions of the day, the Council decided to articulate its recommendations on PBF to the IBHE Steering Committee via a [set of recommendations](#) (copy attached).

The Council discussed the [report](#) of the University of Pennsylvania's Institute for Research on Higher Education and its critique of Illinois higher education. In addition, the Council discussed the impending retirement of Don Sevenser as IBHE Deputy Director for External Relations. Sevenser was viewed by all as someone who served higher education in Illinois sincerely and very well. The Council plans to recognize Sevenser in a special way at its December meeting with the IBHE staff present.

The Council covered other routine business including approval of minutes of the previous meeting. The meeting adjourned at 3:20 PM. The next meeting of the Council will be held in Springfield with IBHE staff on Friday December 9, 2011.

Respectfully submitted
Abbas Aminmansour

Attachment

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS
AT URBANA-CHAMPAIGN



Abbas Aminmansour, Chair
Faculty Advisory Council
Illinois Board of Higher Education
c/o 117 Temple Buell Hall, MC-621
Champaign, IL 61820 USA

November 21, 2011

Dr. George Reid, Chair
Performance Based Funding Steering Committee
Illinois Board of Higher Education

Dear Dr. Reid:

The Faculty Advisory Council of the Illinois Board of Higher Education is deeply grateful to the IBHE Steering Committee for its continued efforts to establish metrics for Performance Based Funding in Illinois. We offer our strong support and look forward to seeing the Committee's recommendations enhance higher education in the state.

As you well know, the task of establishing fair and practical metrics for Performance Based Funding at the state level is both complex and challenging. Because one of the Committee's goals is ensuring that the metrics not lead to unexpected harmful consequences and because the Committee has a tight timeline, we respectfully offer the following recommendations for consideration by the Steering Committee.

1. Establish initial metrics for implementation of Performance Based Funding that are simple, basic, safe and not substantial in size and scope.
2. Continue to work beyond your upcoming deadline on further careful development of metrics to implement Performance Based Funding in a more comprehensive way in the following years.
3. Serve as a body for annual review of Performance Based Funding. We are impressed with the composition of the steering committee and earnestly hope its members, wanting to see their work bear fruit, will continue to serve the state in this capacity.

We recognize that items 2 and 3 above may require approval of other bodies. At the same time, it is our belief that these recommendations will help establish the solid foundation and the responsible oversight necessary for a model performance based funding program that will indeed enhance higher education in the state.

Many thanks again to the Committee both for the hard work it has already put into this project and for its consideration of our recommendations.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads "A. Aminmansour". The signature is written in a cursive style and is positioned above a horizontal line.

Abbas Aminmansour, Chair
Faculty Advisory Council, Illinois Board of Higher Education

cc: IBHE-FAC

University Senates Conference (USC)
October 18, 2011
Minutes
(Final; Information)

Present: Anderson, Burbules (Vice Chair), Campbell, Chambers (Chair), Erricolo, Francis, Gibori, Graber, Leff (via phone), Martin, Mohammadian, O'Brien, Patston, Shanahan, Struble, Switzer, Wheeler

Absent: Fadavi, Mallory, Ting

Guests: Charlie Evans, Avijit Ghosh, Lon Kaufman, Christophe Pierre, Lisa Troyer

Location: University of Illinois at Chicago

Chambers called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m. and thanked members for attending the dinner reception for Meena Rao. Chambers stated that the president has asked USC to nominate three individuals for the position of Executive Director of University Relations. Chambers indicated that every president he has worked with has consulted with USC. It is a process of reciprocal listening and accepting the nature of reasonable interaction. Chambers indicated that we need to work to have consultation with the current president. Discussion focused on how we can most effectively interact with the president.

At 9:50 a.m. President Hogan arrived and was welcomed to the meeting. He indicated that he brought Avijit Ghosh with him to the meeting since he is an expert in enrollment management. He stated that one year ago the Board approved the concept of enrollment management and that two consultants provided a written report to him related to enrollment management. He said that there were 21 recommendations, some of which he finds to be not even remotely controversial. Chambers asked if he has accepted all 21 recommendations. Hogan stated that he found all 21 acceptable but wanted to find out how others felt and whether concerns existed. O'Brien said that she liked the idea of packaging financial aid. Hogan said it is important to be very student friendly. Wheeler asked about how we can keep the best students in Illinois and whether it is a financial problem or different type of problem. Hogan said he felt it was largely a financial problem and that every Big 10 university is doing what they can to recruit diverse students. He feels Urbana has not done a good job of courting high ability or diverse students. He stated that we need to compete with other universities that are wizards at enrollment management. Wheeler asked who would recruit these students. Hogan said the Director of Enrollment Management would make sure we are doing a good job and that a policy council (chancellors, president, and others) would make sure they are getting the job done. Ghosh said we need to be more organized at recruitment than we are now. Hogan said that we need to be very active with high school counselors. Burbules asked Hogan why he felt Urbana is a less attractive college destination than it once was. Hogan said he felt it was because there is a perception that the Urbana campus is "arrogant." That we have been taking our success for granted. He believes our sports programs haven't helped us as much as they could and that we don't have a strong marketing arm or speak with a strong and consistent message. By winter break Hogan would like for a report from the senates on the

enrollment management report so that he can begin the hiring process for a director in order to hopefully fill the position by July 1.

Hogan would like to have a discussion of Dashboard by the January retreat. He said that if we have concerns we should go to our Chancellors and that we would also have an opportunity to express ourselves at the January retreat. Francis recommended that the denominators should be more prominent. He suggested that perhaps they could be in bold. Burbules emphasized that there were some things not in Dashboard that he thought were important and should be added. Hogan said he felt Burbules had an important point. Anderson said there is an opportunity to provide leadership related to the types of indicators that should be in Dashboard and that we should try to influence the dialogue.

Hogan discussed the possibility of folding the proposed summit into the June or July board retreat. He felt it was a good place for it because the entire board would be in attendance plus the entire leadership of the university. He said now we must decide how much time is needed in the agenda to cover the BOT agenda and our agenda. He hopes to sit down with Chairman Kennedy in the next few weeks to discuss this.

Hogan said he would prefer not to discuss unionization in Chicago other than to say that if the Chicago faculty decide to unionize that he would do what he could to make sure that a collegial and productive relationship exists.

Chambers said that based on the discussion with Hogan, he would wait for our report in December to make a decision about enrollment management. He said there also was support for the summit. He felt these were important outcomes from the meeting. O'Brien stated that she felt we should make sure to get the report completed in a timely fashion.

Lon Kaufman joined the meeting at 11:30. Chambers listed his accomplishments and stated that he has now assumed the role of Provost while also running a significant laboratory in plant biology. Chambers said that Kaufman truly understands faculty. Chambers asked how he perceives the challenges of UIC. He said the biggest issue is getting past what is happening at the level of the university and campus. He said that you need to ask how to keep conversations going in a city environment that is counter-intuitive to having conversations. How do you have a conversation between students and faculty when they go home in different directions and do not spend time at an advisor's house? How do you define community on a campus where it is difficult to define community? How do you make time for students in a lab so students feel faculty are paying attention to them? The single biggest challenge is defining UIC and understanding the difference between UIC and 99% of the other campuses in the world that follow a formula of describing themselves by three things (ACT, patients wanting service, amount of NIH dollars). He said another challenge is helping to understand the role of UIC within the University of Illinois. He will be having a conversation soon with Deba Dutta in relation to graduate student exchanges. The remainder of his visit was spent answering questions.

Charlie Evans joined the meeting to discuss how the performance funding initiative is unfolding. He distributed a list of potential performance measures. He said that performance based funding is not a new idea and that faculty should ask themselves how much funding should be performance based. He also stated that legislators tend to be excited about this type of funding because it helps with accountability. The Lumina goal is that 60% of the population will have a quality degree by 2025. This could be everything from an associate's degree to a bachelor's degree. To date, it has already been agreed that a small (1-5%) component of higher education funding will be performance based and

implemented with or without new money. It would be phased in over time beginning with FY 2013. He said we need representation on the commission to help influence the metrics. The new metrics will measure higher education institutions against themselves, not each other. Performance measures should be simple and account for the differentiated missions of institutions in the State.

Chambers asked for comments about the Executive Director of University Relations. Currently, Tom Hardy is the director. There was some discussion as to whether this was a position for a new director. We have been asked to provide the names of three people from the conference to serve on the committee and from which he will select one. Nancy O'Brien, Ken Anderson, and Kouros Mohammadian were suggested.

There were no action items for old business.

On September 9, 2011 the Springfield campus passed a resolution related to rotating leadership positions on USC because they felt they had been overlooked during the most recent selection cycle. In response, the USC drafted a statement that said it would like to return to a leadership rotation as soon as possible. Martin said that the statement was discussed by the Senate on the Springfield campus, but it would only be supported if a statement mandating rotation was added to the Bylaws, and if the overall size of the Springfield contingent was increased. This request was not supported by the USC, and the implications of the UIS resolution going to the different campus senates were discussed. It was determined that the resolution would be forwarded to the Urbana and Chicago campuses with a statement that the USC upholds the overall principle of rotation.

Several old business items were discussed. For example, the president has agreed that a university-wide summit is appropriate. The USC sub-committee on Enrollment Management will be asked for monthly updates. The proposed revisions to the USC organizations and functions item was delayed until the next meeting when enough time can be allocated for the topic. The next Board meeting will be in Springfield on December 2. Burbules requested that course articulation be permanently removed from the USC agenda since another group will be responsible for discussing that issue. It was agreed that we would postpone the issue of annual review of the president until the spring. The UIC representatives stated that union discussions are still ongoing.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:20 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Kim C. Graber

FACULTY AND ACADEMIC STAFF BENEFITS COMMITTEE
CURRENT BENEFITS ISSUES & EVENTS
(Final; Information)

HEALTH PLANS

- Christie Clinic contract termination with Coventry Health Care (formerly PersonalCare) is effective 1/1/2012.
 - a. Faculty and staff who use Christie Clinic received a notice from Christie Clinic in early November.
 - b. Coventry (formerly PersonalCare) will be mailing letters to HMO participants (and dependents) who have a Christie Clinic Primary Care Physician (PCP) on file. HR/Benefits will also send an email to the Coventry HMO members re: what they need to do if they have a qualifying event due to this contract termination.
- State Benefits Handbook for Employees dated 10/1/2011 was released by CMS on 11/16/2011.
<https://nessie.uihr.uillinois.edu/pdf/benefits/StateEmployeeBenefitsHandbook.pdf>.
- State Benefits Handbook for Retirees, Annuitants and Survivors dated 10/1/2011 was released by CMS on 11/16/2011 <https://nessie.uihr.uillinois.edu/pdf/benefits/StateRetireeBenefitsHandbook.pdf>.
- Quality Care Health Plan (QCHP) Benefits Summaries for employees and retirees dated 10/1/2011 were released by CMS on 11/16/2011.
 - a. QCHP – Employee: <https://nessie.uihr.uillinois.edu/pdf/benefits/QCHPEmployeeBenefitsSummary.pdf>
 - b. QCHP – Retiree: <https://nessie.uihr.uillinois.edu/pdf/benefits/QCHPRetireeBenefitsSummary.pdf>.
- In accordance with legislation, the State will offer a 'High Deductible/Health Savings Account' health plan option under the Quality Care Health Plan (QCHP) during next year's Benefit Choice period. Details will be provided when available from the State's Department of Central Management Services (CMS).

SURS

Money Purchase Factors Change

- Reminder: see SURS Fact Sheet and Decision Tree at <http://www.surs.com/pdfs/forms/MoneyPurchaseFacts.pdf>

Pension Reform Updates

- Pension Reform likely to be addressed in the Spring legislative session.
- SB512 (pension reform bill impacting current employees) – deadline extended to Nov 30. As of writing this summary on Nov 28, the State legislature is currently in session, but is not expected to take any further action on pension reform in the Veto Session.
- Crain's Chicago Business article:
<http://www.chicagobusiness.com/article/20111115/BLOGS02/111119880/big-biz-group-talks-peace-in-states-pension-reform-battle>

State Universities Annuitants Association (SUAA)

- Payment of membership dues by payroll deduction coming in early 2012 (\$33 per year; \$2.75 per month deduction).

STATE'S 457 DEFERRED COMPENSATION PLAN

- Deadline for deferral from January 2012 paycheck: for new or changed contribution amounts, form submission deadline is/was Nov 30, 2011.
- 2012 IRS Plan Limits: participants may defer up to \$17,000, and those over age 50 can defer \$22,500.
- For more info: CMS website at <http://www2.illinois.gov/cms/Employees/benefits/Deferred/Pages/DeferredCompensation.aspx>

UNIVERSITY'S 403(b) PLAN

- 2012 IRS Plan Limits: participants may defer up to \$17,000, and those over age 50 can defer \$22,500. This maximum is a combined total of traditional 403(b) and Roth 403(b) contributions.

**Academic Senate Enrollment Management Task Force
Assessment and Recommendations Regarding
The External Review of University Enrollment Management Report**

University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign

DRAFT v.5

November 15, 2011

Enrollment Management Task Force

Michael Biehl, Chair

Nikita Borisov

Nicholas Burbules

Roy Campbell

Eric Meyer

Gay Miller

Sarah Projansky

**Academic Senate Enrollment Management Task Force
Assessment and Recommendations Regarding
The External Review of University Enrollment Management Report
November 15, 2011**

DRAFT v.5

Executive Summary

It is the conclusion of the UIUC Enrollment Management Task Force (EMTF) that the most important recommendations contained in the external Enrollment Management Report and those that should be implemented immediately are EM Report recommendations (EMRR) 1, 2, and 12. In summary, EMRRs 1 and 2 call for each local campus to establish (and/or communicate) their 2013 strategic enrollment goals near term, followed by establishment 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. It is our conclusion that these activities/recommendations need to be achieved before recommendations 3-11 and 13-21 can be effectively implemented. It is only in the context of a collaboratively developed overall plan that the advisability, viability and most effective means of implementing the other recommendations can be evaluated.

EMRR 12 calls for tuition decisions to be completed before February 1 to enable timely financial aid decisions to be made. This EMRR supports the conclusion the UIUC EMTF has reached from numerous information sources: that financial circumstances, both on the University and student applicant level, have challenged the University and have led to perceived university “failures” in enrollment management. The realities of rapidly escalating UIUC tuition relative to public peer institutions, in conjunction with comparatively limited available financial aid and recruiting budgets, place UIUC enrollment managers in an increasingly non-competitive position when attempting to recruit both in-state and out-of-state highly qualified, exceptional students. This is not in itself a structural problem, but rather a resource problem. In addition, delayed tuition decisions result in delayed UIUC financial aid offerings to prospective students, frequently after enrollment decisions have already been made. It is the strong recommendation of the UIUC EMTF that these financial factors also be a prominent part of any discussions regarding enhancement of the overall enrollment management process.

It is our conclusion that institutionalizing EMRRs 1, 2 and 12 as a yearly process will be the most valuable and powerful single output of these extensive EM assessment efforts and will allow organizational realization of the primary efficiencies, synergies, and overall EM effectiveness rightly envisioned by the Board of Trustees and President Hogan. To summarize:

- We accept and recommend immediate implementation of EMRRs 1, 2 and 12.
- We recommend collaborative evaluation of EMRRs 3, 4, 5, 6, 9, 11, 13, 14, 15, 16, and 19 in the context of EMRRs 1 and 2.
- We do not support implementing EMRRS 7, 8, 10, 17, 18, 20 and 21 in their current form without extensive further collaborative evaluation and revision.

A foremost goal of all EM activities must reflect an eye toward the enhanced competitiveness of each campus in relation to their peer institutions. This focus will be most important in raising the profile of the University of Illinois as a whole.

**Academic Senate Enrollment Management Task Force
Assessment and Recommendations Regarding
The External Review of University Enrollment Management Report
November 15, 2011**

Introduction and Background

The UIUC Enrollment Management Task Force (EMTF) was formed on November 1 by Professor Matt Wheeler, chair of the UIUC Senate and the Senate Executive Committee, and charged with reviewing from a UIUC perspective the External Enrollment Management Report (EM Report) commissioned by President Hogan, including the report's 21 recommendations. We were asked to provide advice and input regarding the EM Report to be shared with the SEC, the Senate, and with the separately commissioned University Senates Conference Committee on Enrollment Management (USC-CEM). From November 4-15, the UIUC EMTF had four separate, 2 hour meetings. We invited campus enrollment management leaders to the initial two meetings to help us better understand some of the issues involved and provide us with their expert and experienced perspectives on the EM Report recommendations (EMRR). Our intent in this report is to provide a broad overall assessment and comment on the issues identified in the EM Report, and additionally, to identify those EMRRs that we feel are: 1) most critical, needing quick implementation; 2) reasonable, but require careful discussion and further benefit vs. cost of implementation assessment; or 3) widely viewed as problematic, for various specific reasons. In order to effectively communicate our views, we frequently will refer to or quote portions of the external EM Report prior to providing our perspectives.

The charge to the external Enrollment Management Review Team was to:

- Examine opportunities to improve recruitment and admissions, particularly when it comes to underrepresented students, non-resident students, and high ability students.
- Identify strategies to streamline, coordinate, and improve efficiencies in recruitment and admissions.
- Evaluate the relationship between admissions and financial aid operations.
- Suggest collaborative strategies to enhance student retention and graduation, and recruitment.

The UIUC EMTF generally agrees with these activities in principle as they likely reflect the enrollment management strategic goals present at most academic institutions. One of the most important aspects of strategic implementation is careful, collaborative discussion among key stakeholders and EM experts at both the campus and university administrative levels to ensure that the benefits of implementation warrant the costs incurred (including opportunity costs) and that current successful EM practices and operations are not harmed. Of course, these stated principles assume that stakeholder assessments occur in a timely, professional, productive and non-biased manner and that current practices will be enhanced by the proposed changes. They also explicitly imply that rapid, non-collaborative implementation without such assessment is not advisable and would likely be unsuccessful.

Based on discussions we have had with UIUC administrative leadership and enrollment managers, the UIUC EMTF believes the current enrollment management process is generally highly respected and “not broken”. The EM Report itself states:

“Clearly, enrollment managers on each campus, so far as they understand campus enrollment goals and strategies, are committed to enhancing enrollment (and the educational experience of students) through a competitive admissions process and appropriate financial aid packages.”

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 and have realistic benefits to both the individual campuses and the University as a whole.

Therefore, it is the recommendation of the UIUC EMTF that the most important recommendations contained in the external EM Report and those that should be implemented immediately are EMRRs 1, 2, and 12. In summary, EMRRs 1 and 2 call for each local campus to establish and communicate their 2013 strategic enrollment goals near term, followed by establishment 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. It is our conclusion that these activities/recommendations need to be achieved before recommendations 3-11 and 13-21 can be effectively implemented. It is only in the context of a collaboratively developed overall plan that the advisability, viability and most effective means of implementing the other recommendations can be evaluated.

EMRR 12 calls for tuition decisions to be completed before February 1 to enable timely financial aid decisions to be made. This EMRR supports the conclusion the UIUC EMTF has reached from numerous information sources: that financial circumstances, both on the University and student applicant level, have challenged the University and have led to perceived university “failures” in enrollment management. The realities of rapidly escalating UIUC tuition relative to public peer institutions, in conjunction with comparatively limited available financial aid and recruiting budgets, place UIUC enrollment managers in an increasingly non-competitive position when attempting to recruit both in-state and out-of-state highly qualified, exceptional students. This is not in itself a structural problem, but rather a resource problem. In addition, delayed tuition decisions result in delayed UIUC financial aid offerings to prospective students, frequently after enrollment decisions have already been made. It is the strong recommendation of the UIUC EMTF that these financial factors also be a prominent part of any discussions regarding enhancement of the overall enrollment management process.

Our Assessment of the EM Report Recommendations

A. Strategic Enrollment Goals

Recommendation 1: Establish strategic enrollment goals for each campus no later than the new fiscal year.

Recommendation 2: Establish a University-wide Projection Enrollment Plan through a collaborative process engaging the President, Vice President for Academic Affairs, Chancellors, Provosts, and Deans.

Recommendation 3: Stabilize freshman enrollment at UIUC; increase transfer enrollment at all campuses; increase international enrollment at UIS and UIC, and grow UIS enrollments to campus capacity. [See suggestion above]

As stated above, the UIUC EMTF strongly believes these are the pre-eminent recommendations contained in the EM Report. With regard to EMRR 1, we feel it is important that the “locus of control” remain with each campus as they are best able to define the appropriate academic composition of enrolled students and therefore, their strategic enrollment goals and targets. The EM Report agrees with this principle stating:

“Given their unique identities and missions, each campus can and should continue to develop admissions criteria and enrollment goals that support its distinctive mission.”

“.....with each campus establishing its own admissions criteria and making its own admissions decisions. This model of locally setting admissions criteria is common at multi-campus universities and we believe it is appropriate for the University of Illinois. After all, the University’s campuses are distinct in mission and, to some extent, in the students and community they serve.”

Once these local strategic goals are established, it is imperative that EMRR 2 occur as a collaborative exercise to enable assessment of potential synergies or conflicts between local campus and/or university goals and strategies. Action Plans for realizing synergies and remedying conflicts can then be jointly developed. Once this collaborative University Projection Enrollment Plan is established, realistic and jointly supportive campus and university EM targets and goals will be better understood, communicated, and where appropriate, will facilitate the most effective implementation of the remaining EMRRs 3-21. As the EM Report states:

“Although each campus has strong enrollment management practices, we noted a lack of clarity regarding enrollment goals. The campus-based enrollment management teams, along with admissions deans in the colleges and schools, expressed a desire for better-articulated enrollment goals in order to guide recruitment and yield strategies.”

“In order to allow for sufficient time to develop and implement recruitment and yield goals, we recommend establishing strategic enrollment goals for each campus as early as possible, and no later than the beginning of the new fiscal year. Doing this early in the recruitment process will allow admissions and financial aid operations time to develop thoughtful and data-driven models critical to building the freshman and transfer student classes. Understanding how enrollment goals are determined would benefit enrollment managers across all campuses. To fully leverage its three campuses, the University might consider developing a University-wide “Projection Enrollment Plan.” Doing so will require collaboration between multiple offices, including the President, Vice President for Academic Affairs, Chancellors, Provosts, and Deans.”

The topics described in EMRR 3 represent an agenda for collaborative discussion once EMRR 1 and 2 have occurred.

It is our conclusion that institutionalizing EMRRs 1 and 2 as a yearly process will be the most valuable and powerful single output of these extensive EM assessment efforts and will allow organizational realization of the primary efficiencies, synergies, and overall EM effectiveness rightly envisioned by the Board of Trustees and President Hogan.

B. Strategic Diversity Enrollment Goals

Recommendation 4: Establish clear goals with respect to underrepresented students on each campus, which together, map onto University goals.

C. Diversity Recruitment Strategies to Support Strategic Diversity Enrollment Goals

Recommendation 5: Develop a strategic diversity recruitment plan aimed at increasing enrollment for all undergraduate majors, led by a coordinator who would work with admissions and financial aid staff on the campuses.

Recommendation 6: Clearly articulate the roles and authority of campus partners and fully leverage their expertise and access to diverse groups to increase the enrollment of underrepresented students on the campuses.

Based on the information we have received, EMRRs 4 and 6 are all already ongoing on the campuses to some degree and generally acceptable dependent on the locus of control. With regard to EMRR 5, our position is that local underrepresented student enrollment targets are best understood and determined by the individual campuses with collaborative, central university coordination so as to realize potential synergies and efficiencies and minimize direct conflicts or negative results. Individual enrollment managers have stated this might be an opportunity to “step back” and see how we can be more strategic in our diversity efforts. The EM Report correctly states:

“A coordinated effort is needed to design a strategic plan to address the diversity aims of the University, its campuses and their schools and colleges. There appears to be good support for such an approach on the campuses.”

The campuses and individual colleges need to make a more concerted effort in this area, and in that context, local efforts will be more effective in achieving diversity goals.

D. Common Application Consortium

Recommendation 7: Join the Common Application Consortium.

While the UIUC EMTF can understand some of the perceived benefits that might be realized by an academic institution in general with participation in the national Common Application Consortium (CAC), some aspects of participation are conceivably not going to be present in the specific UIUC scenario and applicant pool, and may be clearly and specifically disadvantageous. On November 7, 2011, UIUC enrollment managers attended a day-long conference involving ~40 colleagues from numerous peer universities that are using or contemplating using the CAC. Significant information and institutional experiences with the CAC were obtained, including some important insights on the costs of implementation. Concerns regarding UIUC CAC participation include:

- Based on peer information, the cost of UIUC CAC implementation would be significant. In addition, aspects of CAC implementation would reverse efficiencies (e.g. less processing personnel) in the UIUC admissions process that have been recently realized (with significant cost investment) in the new Self-Report Academic Record (SRAR) process. Decommissioning SRAR or redesigning it to work in a CAC environment would incur significant additional costs and reintroduce inefficiencies in admissions records processing, including the re-hiring of additional personnel with potentially little/no gain in effective evaluation of applicants.
- One perceived advantage of the CAC is an increase in non-state applicants, especially highly qualified, exceptional students, thereby increasing our overall “selectivity” (e.g. a decreased ratio of admitted students to total applicants) and therefore our national selectivity standing among peer institutions. While the UIUC EMTF agrees that may be a likely outcome, it is not certain and may actually be an additional factor contributing to the UIUC declining enrollment “yield” (ratio of enrolled to admitted students). As the EM report states:

“It’s important to note that in the absence of clear goals, metrics like selectivity and yield have little meaning.”

If the desired significant increase in non-state, highly qualified applicants occurs, it is conceivable that we will be forced to “admit” them due to their exceptional qualifications. However, they will likely not ultimately “enroll” due to no real interest in UIUC, excessive UIUC tuition, our inability to provide competitive financial aid packages, and aggressive recruitment packages and lower tuition that peer institutions are able to offer. This scenario would actually result in a less advantageous impact on selectivity than anticipated (as we would be “admitting” them) and contribute to a continuing decline in “yield” (as we would add to our numbers of admitted students who don’t enroll). Part of the difficulty with emphasizing EM statistics such as these is that they are widely utilized in determining institutional ranking relative to peers.

- The CAC was originally a consortium of East Coast, largely private, academic institutions catering to a different student than those typically found at large, Midwest, public land-grant universities. The latter institutions have only recently joined the CAC. The best strategic option might be to monitor the actual experiences and potential benefits realized by the current Midwest CAC members prior to investment of the considerable resources necessary for UIUC participation.

In summary, we do not consider CAC participation a clear advantage for UIUC at this time. Implementation can only follow an extensive cost/benefit analysis by appropriate EM managers and campus/UA officials. If we are to participate in the CAC it must allow students to clearly select one or more of the UI campuses for admission.

E. Information Systems Supporting Enrollment Services

Recommendation 8: Provide permeable access to the SIS student data at all campuses for authorized staff in the admissions, financial aid, and the registrar offices.

There is significant concern about whether a cost-benefit analysis will show this recommendation to be advantageous as the costs of implementation will be substantial and raise significant potential conflicts. The latter include: 1) a concern over inappropriate cross-campus articulation without proper campus/academic department review and 2) federal restrictions on the cross-campus sharing of confidential applicant financial data. Additionally, there are highly focused, expensive databases of applicant demographic information that are used by the campuses for recruiting students. The databases used by some campuses may not be appropriate for the others. In addition, these databases are also not shareable since they are licensed to an individual campus. These concerns will need to be addressed prior to implementation.

Recommendation 9: Capitalize on the promise of the SIS through a detailed analysis of the current functionality of the system and the future vision of a fully developed CRM to support recruitment and enrollment goals on all three campuses, in conjunction with the University’s information technology leadership to generate costs savings in purchase, maintenance, and updating of the systems.

Based on information from UIUC EM leadership, this recommendation has the potential for significant university cost savings, but ONLY if the unified CRM system utilized is the Talisma® system currently employed by UIUC. It is admittedly different from that currently used by UIC and UIS, but it is considered ‘state of the art’ by EM professionals; UIUC could not justify decreasing their current high CRM capabilities and effectiveness for a less advanced system.

F. Admissions & Financial Aid Operations

Recommendation 10: Adopt a centralized admissions and financial aid processing system.

This recommendation is uniformly of major concern to UIUC EM officials for a variety of reasons. The intent and perceived benefits, efficiencies and synergies of the recommendation are understood and agreed to from a centralized processing standpoint. However, it seems EMRR 10 needs significant discussion by EM experts and campus and university officials prior to implementation to identify and solve potential strategic issues and concerns. The EM report concludes and we agree:

“Centralizing the current scholarship process is desired by some at the University; however, we recommend the current decentralized program remain in place and encourage financial aid to continue developing strong partnerships with each school or college to maximize available funds to entering students.”

G. Financial Aid Packaging Philosophy & Scholarship Awarding Practices

Recommendation 11: Retain campus-specific financial aid programs, but encourage stronger partnerships across awarding units to (1) maximize available funds to entering students, and (2) consolidate award communications to the extent possible through a single letter/e-mail.

Recommendation 12: Ensure that tuition decisions are made by the end of February (preferably in January) to allow admissions and financial aid offices to develop and communicate financial aid packages to students.

Recommendation 13: Analyze the cost of attrition to inform packaging formulas, so as to ensure that the financial aid packaging philosophy for each campus is aligned with University and campus enrollment, retention, and graduation goals.

Recommendation 14: Use financial aid modeling tools to assist with determining price sensitivity of new in-state and out-of-state students, with particular models designed to examine needs of Chicago area students.

Recommendation 15: Redesign the current freshman scholarship programs to increase competitiveness in recruiting and enrolling high achieving and diverse students by offering more four-year scholarships and framing communications to highlight a four-year package.

Recommendation 16: The University’s enrollment leadership should work with the President and Vice Presidents/Chancellors to increase central scholarship funds and continue building strong relationships with the University of Illinois Foundation and advancements units to obtain more funding for student scholarships.

We have already described the consensus view that EMRR 12 is critical for any of these recommendations to succeed.

EMRRs 11, 13, 14, 15 and 16 are believed to be reasonable goals and activities that are already ongoing to some degree, but the main questions seem to be “What do they really mean?” and “How do we best achieve enhancements of these activities?”. Specifically what practices would be most beneficial, most efficient and derive the most synergies, and at what cost? We return here to our opening observation that until EMRRs 1 and 2 are completed, it is impossible to make informed decisions about whether and how to implement these others. In addition, it is critical that the individual identities and characteristics of each campus and its applicants be appreciated. It is clear that implementation of these recommendations, as with EMRR 10, require further discussion with responsible and knowledgeable campus EM professionals.

H. University Brand & Campus Identities in Marketing Messages

Recommendation 17: Capitalize on the University's brand in communications to prospective students to emphasize the University as a whole, while retaining strong messages of campus identity.

Recommendation 18: Consolidate the marketing and communications related to enrollment management services across the campuses to both better capitalize on the strength of the University of Illinois brand, while promoting individual campus distinctiveness, strengths, and missions, and reducing costs.

Recommendation 19: Develop mechanisms to share best practices in development of print and e-materials across campuses to identify opportunities to improve campus communications with students, work collaboratively, and manage costs.

Recommendation 20: Incorporate messages about the value of a University of Illinois degree in all messaging in a consistent manner across all campuses, as a complement to campus specific highlights and points-of-pride.

The UIUC EMTF does not agree with the intent of EMRRs 17 and 18. It seems that these EMRRs suggest that in communications to prospective students, including high achieving, exceptional individuals, the UIUC would position itself as only one distinctive campus of the greater University of Illinois. Based on the information we have received, this is not the EM practice of other highly ranked peer institutions (e.g. the University of Texas at Austin, the University of Wisconsin at Madison, the Ohio State University) and is not believed by enrollment industry experts to be an effective and productive strategy, especially with high achieving students. We fully endorse the message that the University of Illinois is a premier academic institution that can appeal to ALL prospective students in the state of Illinois and elsewhere through three individual campuses with distinctive strengths, missions, and student characteristics and needs. However, UIUC also has an existing distinct and favorable national and international reputation which is effective in attracting both out-of-state and international students, especially high achieving students. It would be counterproductive to dilute this existing, recognized UIUC "brand" in order to establish an overall University "brand." We feel strongly that distinct UIUC recognition and strength should be maintained and fostered, albeit in association with development of a broader message recognizing and communicating the overall excellence of the University of Illinois as a whole. We agree with the EM report which states:

"These identities are important to the campuses and to the overall strength of the University as a whole. They are also an asset in recruiting students because, when approached as a whole, they allow the University to address a broad variety of student needs and interests..... Each of the University's campuses has different admissions criteria, which provides opportunity for a highly prized University of Illinois degree for any qualified student."

We recognize that the differentiation between our perspective and EMRR 17 might be viewed as subtle by some, but we feel the message, and especially the emphasis, are critically important and distinctive.

With regard to EMRR 18, from the information provided to us by our EM professionals, the current UIUC marketing and promotions efforts are considered exemplary within the industry. Anecdotally, we are told that at recent national EM conferences, UIUC presentations on EM marketing practices have been "standing room only" events. It seems that again, collaborative discussions between campus EM professionals and university officials to more strongly incorporate the overall University message while not losing the distinct UIUC brand are recommended.

ERMM 19 is generally believed to be a valuable recommendation regarding the enhanced sharing of best communications and marketing practices between campuses. Any efforts to share best practices to

improve the EM successes, efficiencies and reduced costs of each campus and therefore the University as a whole is advantageous and should be encouraged. As the EM Report states:

“We believe that the path to such improvements lies in greater sharing and coordination of best practices, resources, and information systems across the campuses.”

EMRR 20 raises concerns in relationship to ERMM 17 and 18. It is significant that this issue is one that UIUC students and alumni seem to be most concerned about. The position embraced by these individuals and most faculty is that degrees are conferred by the faculty of each campus. UIUC students and alumni are emphatic that their degrees are distinct from those conferred by other campuses.

I. Pathways between the University of Illinois Campuses

Recommendation 21: Create pathway agreements between the three University of Illinois campuses to facilitate transfer arrangements as well as course- and credit-sharing.

There are already processes in place to facilitate student transfer and course articulation between the campuses. UIC, for example, is already the #2 “feeder” school for UIUC. Without question these can be improved and streamlined; for example, there is a major effort at UIUC to reduce the time it takes to have courses reviewed and approved for transfer. If “facilitate” means to streamline and simplify these processes, we can support this recommendation; however, if “facilitate” means removing barriers, such as reducing the campuses’ ability to selectively screen transfer students and/or evaluate courses for equivalent transfer, then it is problematic. The proper basis for these judgments must rest in colleges and departments that best know their requirements and course content. This argues for such decisions to be held closer to the level of faculty expertise, rather than creating additional levels of review distanced from faculty.

Summary

In conclusion, we embrace the overall goals of making our enrollment management processes more efficient and effective in serving individual campus and overall University interests. We agree that these activities can likely benefit from some level of strategic central coordination and more extensive campus-to-campus collaboration in order to realize possible synergies and efficiencies which would have realistic benefits to both the individual campuses and the University as a whole. We also agree with the goal of being even more aggressive in recruiting students in an increasingly competitive, higher education marketplace, especially as it pertains to the most academically talented students and those students who add intellectually and socially valuable diversity to our student population. The greatest single impediment to improving our performance in this area is a lack of adequate financial aid, and any proposals must be evaluated in relation to costs that divert resources away from this primary area of need.

Many of the recommendations contained within the External Review of University Enrollment Management Report may have potential benefits. However, we believe the primary, over-arching EM Report recommendation was clear; specifically, to initiate collaborative and broad-based planning and goal-setting processes with regard to enrollment management. Central University Administration coordination through an Executive EM Director may help achieve this goal, but only after the campuses, along with University administration, have identified key goals, targets and synergies through a collaborative and broad-based discussion and agreement. As the EM Report states:

“We believe, however, that these resources would be better leveraged through stronger sharing and coordination, as well as more clearly articulated strategic goals. The University’s distinctive campuses, each with unique identities and missions, are its greatest strength. But the potential to truly realize that strength is undermined by a tendency for the campuses to act independently in how they manage enrollment services”.

In that regard and in that spirit, it is the strong recommendation of the UIUC EMTF that the most important recommendations contained in the external EM Report and those that should be implemented immediately are EMRRs 1 and 2, which call for each local campus to establish and communicate their 2013 strategic enrollment goals near term, followed by establishment 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. We have outstanding expertise on our campuses, and any review process will benefit from involving those individuals and their viewpoints on what can work, what can work better, and what won’t work within our system. The evaluation of these recommendations should also be informed by a review of “best practices” at peer institutions. It is our conclusion that these activities/EMRRs 1 and 2 need to be achieved before EMRRs 3-11 and 13-21 can be effectively implemented. It is only in the context of a collaboratively developed overall plan that the advisability, viability and most effective means of implementing the other recommendations can be evaluated.

Therefore, to summarize:

- We accept and recommend immediate implementation of EMRRs 1, 2 and 12.
- We recommend collaborative evaluation of EMRRs 3, 4, 5, 6, 9, 11, 13, 14, 15, 16, and 19 in the context of EMRRs 1 and 2.
- We do not support implementing EMRRS 7, 8, 10, 17, 18, 20 and 21 in their current form without extensive further collaborative evaluation and revision.

A foremost goal of all EM activities must reflect an eye toward the enhanced competitiveness of each campus in relation to their peer institutions. This focus will be most important in raising the profile of the University of Illinois as a whole.