University Senates Conference

2011-2012 Annual Report to the Board of Trustees

July 19, 2012

The University Senates Conference (USC) is the highest arm of shared governance at the University of Illinois and is charged by statute with acting as an advisory group for the President of the University and the Board of Trustees, reviewing appointments of University administration, reviewing activities of the Senates, resolving points of disagreements of and between the Senates, as well as more routine matters, e.g., classifying Senates actions, etc. The Office of the Vice-President for Academic Affairs provides budgetary and secretarial support for the USC. The Senates Conference holds ten regular meetings each year. It has a bicameral structure with an Executive Committee comprising two members from each campus and the larger Conference, composed of twenty members, based on the faculty demography of each campus. Members of the Conference are elected by their respective Senates for three year terms, whereas the Executive Committee is elected annually by members of the Conference. At present, the proportional representation is ten members from UIUC, seven from UIC, and three from UIS. The Executive Committee meets monthly to discuss University issues and processes and to set an agenda for the monthly USC meeting, to draft questions for the President and other guests, to discuss and address issues of immediate concern and to advise the officers of the Conference. The members of the USC Executive Committee elected by the Conference for academic year 2011-2012 were: Prof. Donald Chambers (UIC) chair, Prof. Nicholas Burbules (UIUC) vice-chair, Prof. Geula Gibori (UIC), Prof. John Martin (UIS), Prof. Carrie Switzer (UIS) and Prof. Matthew Wheeler (UIUC). In an unprecedented move, the UIS members of the EC resigned in February and were replaced by Profs. Peter Boltuc and Lynn Fisher. The third member of the Springfield delegation, Prof. Tih-Fen Ting, also resigned and was replaced by Prof. Jorge Villegas.

In the academic year 2011-2012, the USC held ten regular meetings, an organizational meeting and a retreat in September. In addition, the Conference members were invited to attend the Board of Trustees Retreat on July 18, 2012 in Chicago. University of Illinois policies, procedures, and other issues of concern were discussed with President Michael Hogan during USC monthly meetings until his resignation in March. Following President Hogan's resignation, President Designate Robert Easter met with the Conference in April, May and June. Topics discussed during these sessions included budget issues, enrollment management, health insurance, pension reform, regulatory burdens, shared governance, Dashboard data, the Academy on Capitalism and Limited Government Foundation, and plans for a cross-campus dialogue and Board of Trustees Retreat. Guests at Conference meetings included Chancellor Paula Allen-Meares (UIC), Dr. Charles Evans, Dr. Avijit Ghosh, Provost Lon Kaufman (UIC), Trustee Chairman Christopher Kennedy, Chancellor Susan Koch (UIS), Vice-President Christophe Pierre, Roopali Malhotra and Steve Veazie from University Counsel, and Vice-President Lawrence Schook.

Underlying all the work of the academy is the principle that this work welcomes, indeed requires, discussion, debate and disagreement. It is only when these activities lead to and result in malevolence that major problems arise. Such was the case with some of the interactions within and without the Conference during the last year. Some years ago in her annual address to Parliament, Queen Elizabeth II described her preceding year as an *annus horribilus*; so too can I, as USC Chair, characterize this last year which was unprecedented in the thirteen years I have served on the Conference. The year began on a note of discord when the nominating committee (Leslie Struble (UIUC), Michael Koronkowski (UIC), and Kathryn Eisenhart (UIS)) questioned whether the only available candidate for Vice-Chair from UIS, Tih-Fen Ting, should be slated unopposed. They decided to slate Prof. Nicholas Burbules (UIUC) in addition to Prof. Ting recognizing that the election of Prof. Burbules would mean abandoning the informal tradition of annual rotation of the leadership among the three campuses. Their conclusion was exacerbated by the fact that none of the other two available people from UIS seemed suitable for

nomination in that Prof. Martin was an untenured assistant professor still in his probationary period and Prof. Switzer had never previously served on the USC. Because Prof. Martin questioned procedure, Conference Chair Matthew Wheeler requested that the Conference go through the process of nomination again to ensure strict conformity to the rules and procedures for election. This required an additional meeting of the conference for the sole purpose of election. At that meeting, the USC voted by secret ballot thirteen to seven to elect Prof. Burbules as Vice-Chair. Although she was nominated unopposed to serve on the USC EC, Prof. Ting declined to run. During the same meeting, Prof. Chambers was elected Chair with no dissenting votes and one abstention.

In September, the USC held its annual retreat, but only one member of the UIS delegation, Prof. Switzer, attended. The Conference, very cognizant of a need to unambiguously state that the election did not represent a repudiation of UIS, but rather an issue with a specific candidate in the absence of UIS alternatives, unanimously passed a resolution to return to the rotation as soon as practicable. (In fact, that resolution has already been implemented with the election of next year's officers.) Of great import was the fact that the USC affirmed that its major function, which underlies all others, is to work for the greater good of the University of Illinois and its three campuses. As put to the group; when one campus bleeds, we are all affected. These discussions are embodied in the questions that the USC has put forth for a continuing cross campus dialogue (see Appendix I). Finally, discussion ensued about the confidentiality of the Conference's work and the importance of adhering to principles that would allow discussion of delicate issues. That discussion concluded with charging a committee chaired by Prof. Kenneth Anderson (UIUC) to review and develop clear criteria relating to confidentiality if needed (see Appendix II).

Many of the discussions that the Senates Conference had in the months from September to January were extraordinarily contentious, fueled by the UIS delegation's discordant attitude and by the inability of the USC to adapt to the more

autocratic style of President Hogan in contrast to all of his predecessors. These problems were highlighted by a number of defining issues: the FOIA of the USC's audio transcript of its October meeting by Prof. Martin presumably acting on behalf of the UIS Senate or its Executive Committee (see Appendix III); a feeling that the President had little regard to adhering to matters requiring statutory input by the USC; and contention coupled with admonition from the President accompanying the USC's review of the enrollment management document.

The issues focusing on enrollment management are known to the Board. The major concern was the potential conflicts between university centralization and accepted campus autonomy in determining enrollment management issues. In fact, the first draft of the EMR document included very limited campus input into enrollment management decision-making. The USC commissioned a tri-campus committee consisting of one member of the Conference from each campus, one member from each campus Senate and one person from each campus primarily responsible for enrollment management on that campus. That committee was chaired by Prof. Carol Leff (UIUC). In addition, the three campus Senates constituted their own committees to work separately from the USC committee to review the EMR. With the exception of the Springfield campus, who saw little problem with the document, it would be fair to say that although everyone was in favor and saw the need for improving enrollment management procedures across the University, there was no total agreement on specifics and much resistance by UA to alteration of the document. Suffice it to say that real progress was made only when Mr. Kennedy interceded by leading discussions that allowed us to elaborate our concerns, which led to constructive alteration and eventual approval of a more viable enrollment management document (see Appendix IV). Much thanks also goes to Special Assistant to the President, Avijit Ghosh, and Vice-President Christophe Pierre for their roles in actually producing the final document.

Much of the Conference's time in 2012 was spent in response to the effects of an incident that began late in the Fall Semester. During debates over enrollment

management issues, the Conference members received anonymous emails from a person claiming to be a member of the Conference. The anonymous emailer tried to persuade the Conference to not issue a report that indicated that the Conference was in general (though not unanimous) agreement that there were concerns with the enrollment management proposal. Prof. Roy Campbell (UIUC) a member of the Conference and a professor of computer sciences traced the emails to the computer of the President's Chief of Staff, Lisa Troyer, who denied sending the emails, but resigned from her position early in January. A University investigation and an outside investigation reported that the emails came from a lap-top that was in the possession of Dr. Troyer. In the report from the outside investigation it was also discovered that one of the Conference members had been sending USC draft documents and emails intended only for Conference members to Dr. Troyer. This USC member, Prof. Tih-Fen Ting, resigned from the Conference in late January, and the UIS Senate voted no confidence in Prof. Ting's leadership. Subsequently, Profs.. Martin and Switzer resigned from the Conference. The UIS Senate elected Profs. Boltuc, Fisher and Villegas to replace them and the Conference welcomed them warmly. Today, I am happy to report that the wounds of the past have healed and all of the Conference is working together in the spirit of harmony and collegiality.

Although President Hogan denied knowledge of the actions of his Chief of Staff, Lisa Troyer, Prof. Ting and others, he must have known that he was receiving and acting upon information acquired through improper channels. That situation was the impetus for the combined leadership of the USC and the UIUC and UIC Senates (Profs. Burbules, Chambers, Patston, Tolliver and Wheeler) to issue a statement of ethical principles that I read before the Board of Trustees at its January meeting (see Appendix V). Subsequently that statement was formally endorsed by the USC and the UIC and UIUC Senates. Ultimately, these and other issues resulted in the resignation of President Hogan which occurred with consultation of faculty leaders. We wish President Hogan well in his future endeavors and note that during his administration he was responsible for the appointment of some very talented

people including Vice-Presidents Christophe Pierre, JGN (Skip) Garcia, Larry Schook, and Chancellors Susan Koch and Phyllis Wise.

An item of greatest concern to faculty and to the viability of recruiting scholars to the University is the resolution of the state pension crisis and pension reform which came to the fore late in the last legislative session in May. Although these issues are in large measure a function of the state using set aside pension funds as stop gap measures for other initiatives, coupled with the inadequate fiscal resources to fund the pension fund as promised at predetermined levels, the Senates Conference expressed its opinion with a resolution (see Appendix VI) that we felt presented a viable solution to the pension problems and a plan for sharing the burden among all the participating parties. It is significant that this resolution was the first from any faculty group in the state and that it was promptly endorsed by our three campus senates, and the university leadership.

We applaud the appointment of Robert Easter as President of the University of Illinois and already have indications of his talents as an academic leader who can both seek consensus, but not shirk in making strong leadership decisions in the end and, importantly, explaining those decisions to constituents while listening and taking their concerns seriously.

During the course of the year, Senate Conference members worked hard to fulfill the functions of shared governance. To all, please accept my thanks and gratitude for your efforts. I want to express my appreciation to Prof. Burbules and to the USC EC for their support and advice during this difficult year. One person, above all, deserves special recognition. She is the person I lovingly refer to as 'Madame Conference', Connie Sailor, who has been the institutional memory and embodiment of the USC for two decades. Her wisdom, judgment, tact, and skill are irreplaceable and her role in the Conference mirrors that of Michele Thompson for the Board of Trustees. For all that and more, thank you Connie!

Finally, as I write this, we are at the dawn of the Board of Trustees retreat and at the beginning of across-campus dialogue which we hope will be the beginning of an interactive effort to make the University of Illinois 'as good as it could be'. For me, I hand over the reins of Chairmanship to Prof. Nicholas Burbules (UIUC) as the incoming Chair and Prof. Peter Boltuc (UIS) as Vice-Chair, confident of the Shakespearian adage; all's well that ends well.

Respectfully submitted,

Donald A. Chambers, Chair
University Senates Conference

OT-269
October 18, 2011
(presented to President Hogan)

PROPOSAL FOR A CROSS-UNIVERSITY DIALOGUE
(Revision of the Summit document)

While the past two years have seen great and rapid change for the University of Illinois, because of both external and internal factors, most members of the University community look toward a time of greater stability in which they can focus on the work they came here to do. We are now in a position to pause and reflect on how our University has changed, and how it might change in the future. To that purpose, the three campus Senates have endorsed Chairman Kennedy's suggestion for a summit that would include representatives of key constituencies of the University. The purpose of this meeting would be to engage in dialogue about the long-term goals of the three campuses and of the central University Administration; and, crucially, to clarify the process by which decisions leading to those goals need to be made.

1. What are the specific core objectives for the University of Illinois, and how can those objectives be achieved?

2. What are the decision-making processes that will lead us toward achieving those objectives, while maintaining a balance between the legitimate authority of the central administration, on the one hand; and, on the other, the proper scope of self-governance of the campuses, especially over academic policy matters? Specifically, how do we create a system with a strong President *and* with strong Chancellors who are the CEOs and leaders of their campuses?

3. How do we envision articulation among the three campuses in the future? What are the processes that will help maintain a balance between three separately-accredited and mostly independent campuses, *and* the greater strength that can be generated through cross-campus collaboration and synergies? Given that the current benchmarking project compares each campus with its respective peers, what role should such metrics play in cross-campus comparisons? Are the "dashboard" benchmark criteria sufficient to evaluate academic quality and centrality in a wider sense? What role must the campus Senates play in reviewing and approving any proposals that affect the academic profile of the campuses?

4. The uncertainty of state funding, including likely changes to the state pension system, have been a primary factor in the decline in faculty morale and recent departures or early resignations. While working to address these state policies, on the one hand, what can be done internally to sustain and encourage faculty enthusiasm about the university's future, moving forward?

USC CONFIDENTIALITY GUIDELINES

The goal of this document is to provide guidelines to USC members as to what they should and should not discuss with non-USC members in various situations. The Conference's advisory function to the president and the University administration in general carries with it a need to discuss topics that should not be made public and a responsibility to maintain the confidentiality of such discussions. Conference members should realize that no set of rules will cover all possibilities. There is ultimately no substitute for good judgement.

1. On Talking to the Press.

Nothing in an executive session of USC meetings should be discussed with the press. The press should be told that everything in the executive session is strictly confidential and you are not at liberty to discuss the content of meetings.

Discussions with guests may be mainly informational and noncontroversial, but in general conversations with guests should be treated with the same confidentiality as an executive session. Bottom line: Do not say anything that might embarrass a guest if it appeared in print. Do not say anything that might jeopardize the ability to engage in candid conversations with guests or within the Conference.

Actions and discussions at our business meetings are not "secret" and could be discussed with the press. However, always keep asking yourself whether you and your colleagues would be happy seeing what you are saying in print. You need not respond to press inquiries or initiate press contacts. Responses made in the name of the Conference should be made by the chair or the chair's designee.

2. On Talking to the University Community.

Many things--such as budget matters and policies under consideration--discussed at Conference meetings are not secret and can freely be discussed with colleagues. Remember that it is part of our job to be a liaison from the administration back to the faculty, to listen to faculty opinions and to carry them back to the administration. However, do NOT talk about anything that the president or a vice president has clearly labeled confidential, personnel matters, or similar sensitive topics. Honor members' reasonable requests to treat something as confidential and avoid identifying individual members with particular views.

3. On Reporting to Your Senate.

The guidelines here are not much different from those for talking to colleagues in less formal settings. However, remember that there are many witnesses, including the press, to what you say. If the report is written, you should remember that it is a public document and should therefore choose your words carefully. If you are asked questions that border on sensitive matters, invoke confidentiality before you get in too deep. Bottom line: If in doubt, be overly cautious.

4. Confidentiality of Draft Documents.

Draft documents are confidential and specifics of draft language and potential conclusions should not be shared beyond the Conference.* As indicated in items 2 and 3 above, the issue being discussed may be shared with others and input relative to the issue sought. To provide adequate time for review to enrich Conference discussions, ideally drafts should be shared with the Conference at least one week in advance of consideration.

5. On Being Overheard.

Do not discuss confidential matters within earshot of anyone who is not a member of the Conference.

* To comply with FOIA, the first page of the document should be labeled as "Privileged and confidential draft document for discussion purposes" and thereafter the pages should be labeled "Draft."

-----Original Message-----
From: Sailor, Connie [mailto:csailor@uillinois.edu]
Sent: Tuesday, November 15, 2011 5:15 PM
To: USC Members
Subject: Forwarding Message from USC Chair

(message from Dr. Chambers)

Dear Colleagues,

Lest we overstate our current problems, I point to some successes and progress in the last two months:

1. The Conference was aware of the problems posed by the election of the USC leadership and the temporary lapse in rotation and discussed them thoroughly at a meeting in September. That discussion resulted in a resolution adopted by unanimous vote endorsing the principle of rotation and a return to it as soon as practicable. In the related case of the UIS resolution concerning the Conference, we have sent it on, as normal procedure dictates, to the UIUC Senate and the UIC Senate for consideration and action.

2. The Conference has agreed on a format and questions for a cross-campus dialog with faculty, administration and the Board of Trustees and transmitted the document for consideration to the President and the Board of Trustees. The questions embodied in that document are central and we should be devoting meaningful periods of time to discussing them.

3. The Conference, in concert with the Campuses, is discussing expeditious responses to the request of President Hogan for faculty advice on the Enrollment Management Report.

In the matter of the FOIA request, Ms. Sailor had been asked by Prof. Martin for documentation, including her tapes, relating to Conference discussions about the UIS resolution ST-76. Ms. Sailor referred the matter to me as chair and I called a meeting of the USC Executive Committee to discuss this issue. At that meeting, Prof. Martin, acting for the UIS Senate, gave us the choice of surrendering the tape "collegially" or facing a FOIA request. The EC voted 4-2 to refer the matter to the next scheduled full Conference meeting. Approximately two hours later, University Relations notified Ms. Sailor of the FOIA request from the UIS Senate. Subsequently, when asked whether he would honor his original request for matters relating to only the UIS issues, Prof. Martin responded that the UIS Senate wanted the entire tape.

I want to stress the point that these tapes were not made or meant as archives of the USC meetings, rather as aids for Ms. Sailor to take minutes. Even though these are open meetings, a different dynamic takes place in the absence of visitors, thus colleagues may express themselves differently and more informally than as when others are present.

In my view, there was, and is, no immediate crisis or emergency that required preclusion of discussion by the entire Conference of the impending FOIA request from the UIS Senate, which was asked for in the spirit of collegiality, as demonstrated by a 4-2 vote by the USC Executive Committee.

Finally, we need to face these issues in a thoughtful productive manner and not rush to judgment and action!

Thanks,
Don

Dr. Donald A. Chambers
Professor of Physiology and Biophysics
Professor of Biochemistry and Molecular Genetics Professor of Biological Psychiatry Professor of Medical Education and Director of the GPPA Program, COM University of Illinois College of Medicine at Chicago

Chair, University Senates Conference and Vice Chair, UIC Senate

Physiology and Biophysics (M/C901)
835 S. Wolcott (Room:E-202 MSB)
Chicago, IL. 60612-7342
Tel. No. 312-996-1294
Fax. No. 847-673-1931

Office: A309 CMW
Lab. 206-207 CMW

Visiting Senior Research Fellow
Green Templeton College
University of Oxford
OX2 6HG
Tel. No. 011 44 (0)7583334441

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS
URBANA-CHAMPAIGN · CHICAGO · SPRINGFIELD

Strategic Enrollment Management: The Path Forward

One of the most important tasks for any university is to recruit and enroll a talented and diverse group of students each year and ensure that they successfully graduate with a degree. This task is the goal of enrollment management. There is widespread consensus across all three campuses on both the importance of enrollment management and the need for the University of Illinois to improve its enrollment management operations.

The University has made this a high priority, one that has been endorsed strongly by the Board of Trustees, beginning with discussions at its July 2010 retreat. At that time I suggested the importance of approaching the recruitment, retention, and success of students through strategic enrollment management and planning. Over the 20 months since the 2010 retreat, the Board endorsed the appointment of an executive director for enrollment planning and management, the commission of an external review of our enrollment management operations, and the report that was produced as a result of that review. I also requested that the campus chancellors and the University Senates Conference (USC) share with me any questions or suggestions they had with the report's recommendations to ensure that any concerns are addressed. Others have also weighed in with suggestions and opinions, which are welcome. In this document, I address how we will monitor these concerns as we move forward in this important area.

As a preamble, it is important to note that the goal of this implementation plan is to improve the efficacy of enrollment management efforts at each campus, recognizing that enrollment management must be student-centric. In other words, our goal must be to improve outcomes for students by ensuring that all qualified students have an opportunity to succeed on our campuses and to obtain a degree. As I have noted throughout the last several months as we worked to craft a strategic approach to enrollment management, there is not, and never has been, a plan to change the locus of decision-making regarding admissions decisions or financial aid offers for undergraduate students. These decisions will continue to be made at the campus and college levels following the processes currently in place. In the final analyses, the success of these efforts must be gauged in terms of student experiences and success, as each campus strives for excellence in student recruitment and enrollment.

ENROLLMENT GOALS (RECOMMENDATIONS 1, 2, AND 3)
The first step in implementing a systematic approach to enrollment management is to establish strategic enrollment goals in a timely manner *(Recommendation 1)* through a collaborative process involving program-, college-, campus-, and University-level decision makers *(Recommendation 2)*. The USC supported Recommendations 1 and 2.

To implement these recommendations, the vice president for academic affairs (VPAA) and three campus provosts will constitute an *Enrollment Management Policy Council*. Working together, they will recommend to the president and the chancellors a process and relevant mechanisms for setting enrollment strategies and annual enrollment goals for each college and campus. Two concurrent sets of activities must be performed to set these enrollment targets (it will be important to ensure that the first set of activities inform the second, and vice-versa):

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS
URBANA-CHAMPAIGN · CHICAGO · SPRINGFIELD

(i) First, each college, working with the provost, should establish strategic enrollment goals for the college. In establishing these goals the colleges should follow current practices regarding consultation with departmental and program administrative officers and faculty governance groups.

(ii) The chancellors and the president, on recommendation of the Enrollment Management Policy Council (EMPC), will establish overall University and campus goals and policies regarding first-year and transfer enrollment, student mix and diversity, program fields (viz. STEM), financial aid, and other strategic enrollment parameters.

Given the USC's support for establishing a formal goal-setting process, I expect that discussions will begin immediately so that processes are in place to set enrollment goals for the entering class in 2013. The outputs of the process will include targets for the size and composition of freshmen and transfer enrollment at each campus.

Recommendation 3 of the report addresses long-term enrollment goals at each campus. Decisions regarding long-term enrollment goals for each campus should, of course, be the result of a deliberative and consultative process. This process should involve the chancellors and provosts with input from deans, program chairs, and faculty and should be part of the overall goal setting process described in (i) and (ii) above.

STUDENT DIVERSITY (RECOMMENDATIONS 4, 5, AND 6)

Recommendations 4, 5, and *6* of the report emphasize the paramount importance of student diversity in the context of enrollment goals. They note the importance of setting clear goals, formulating plans for achieving those goals, coordinating the activities of enrollment professionals working toward those goals, and establishing clear accountability for results.

There is widespread consensus that student diversity is an important aspect of the University's mission. Each of our campuses and colleges is focused on improving student diversity. The USC also supports the goal of student diversity, and senators provided many valuable comments on this recommendation. For example, some senators urged that diversity be viewed more broadly than just ethnic diversity. Others noted that diversity should be an integral part of articulating what a class looks like. A key question was how department level input will be coordinated. Cost was another concern.

It has always been my position that student diversity should be an integral aspect in articulating enrollment goals. Thus, I believe that an effective process for establishing diversity goals (*Recommendation 4)* is to consider them as an integral part of the college-, campus-, and University-level goal-setting processes described in (i) and (ii) above.

Concern was expressed that any coordination of diversity recruitment across campuses, as suggested by *Recommendations 5* and *6*, may result in goals not consistent with those established by individual colleges or campuses. This concern is allayed by noting that the intent is to better coordinate diversity recruitment efforts so that the goals established by the campuses are more effectively achieved. Each campus is investing additional resources in diversity recruitment and retention. This is very encouraging. However, these separate efforts will be more effective and cost less with greater coordination. Successful

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS
URBANA-CHAMPAIGN · CHICAGO · SPRINGFIELD

examples of University-coordinated diversity effort include the recently enhanced President Award Program (PAP) and recruitment initiatives such as the Salute to Academic Achievement and attendant activities.

JOINING THE COMMON APPLICATION CONSORTIUM (RECOMMENDATION 7)

Recommendation 7 of the report suggests that the University join the Common Application Consortium. Over 450 schools nationally are now part of this consortium and over 750,000 students submit their college applications using the consortium's website. While a number of the senators felt that joining the consortium will likely be beneficial for our campuses, there was also concern that not enough data was available to make a conclusive decision at this time. Especially noted was the lack of information on the costs of adopting the common application—including the cost and feasibility of adapting existing information systems. The opinion was also expressed that we need to learn from those who have already adopted or are currently in the process of adopting the common application.

To answer these and related questions, I will charge a committee headed by the VPAA or his representative to conduct an assessment study. The committee will comprise the three individuals responsible for admissions at each campus, a dean from one of the campuses, a member of the USC, a member of the VPAA staff, and an IT administrator who is conversant with the Student Information Systems (SIS) and other enrollment data systems. The committee may seek the help of external consultants if needed. The committee will be expected to speak with representatives of the Common Application Consortium, selected institutions that have adopted the common application or are in the process of doing so and appropriate campus groups.

Once the study is completed, the president and chancellors, in consultation with the provosts and other stakeholders will be in a position to make a decision about whether we will adopt this recommendation, and, if so, how we can implement it most effectively.

ENROLLMENT INFORMATION SYSTEMS (RECOMMENDATIONS 8 AND 9)

Recommendations 8 and *9* of the report deal with information system platforms for enrollment management. The first called for providing permeable access to each campus' SIS for authorized enrollment management staff across all campuses. The second called for developing a University-wide strategy to support enrollment information systems in order to generate cost savings in the purchase, maintenance, and updating of the systems.

While supportive of investing in good IT systems, senators felt that a more detailed cost analysis was necessary, including the cost of abandoning legacy systems. In addition, the workload for the IT department and the impact on the implementation timetable of other IT projects should also be reviewed.

I will direct the executive director of information technology to prepare a report addressing the feasibility of implementing these recommendations, including a full cost benefit analysis, estimated time to complete the project, and potential impact on other IT priorities. This study will also look at the feasibility of facilitating data and information sharing among campuses without creating a new central data system. Once this report is completed, I will consult with the chancellors regarding if, when, and how to move forward in this area.

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS
URBANA-CHAMPAIGN · CHICAGO · SPRINGFIELD

Legal counsel as well as experts in privacy laws and data security will also be consulted to evaluate privacy issues pertaining to student data systems. The provosts and enrollment professionals at the three campuses will be consulted to develop the list of individuals who would have access to the system and in designing appropriate training and accountability for those individuals.

ADMISSIONS AND FINANCIAL AID PROCESSING SYSTEM (RECOMMENDATION 10)

The recommendation suggests that cost efficiencies can be gained by creating a shared service center for certain common processing functions performed by the admission and financial aid offices at the three campuses. For example, financial aid offices follow standardized processes to determine financial needs of admitted students. Providing these services through a shared service center could reduce cost of performing these functions. The viability of such a service center depends on having shared access to student information systems as described in the previous recommendation. Thus it is contingent on the results of the feasibility study outlined earlier. Once the structure of the IT system is clarified, the Enrollment Management Policy Council will make a determination regarding the nature and potential scope of the service center and questions regarding cost and personnel can be answered. The recommendation will be forwarded to the president and chancellors for a final decision. The design of the service center must be guided by the principle that all student admission decisions and financial aid offers—which have historically been made at the campus level—must continue to be part of campus operations. The service center will provide support services to facilitate the implementation of those decisions.

FINANCIAL AID PROGRAMS (RECOMMENDATIONS 11, 13, 14, 15, AND 16)

These recommendations propose measures to improve the effectiveness of financial aid and scholarship programs. There was broad support for the goal of increasing financial aid and scholarships and using those resources as effectively and strategically as possible. However, senators noted that the report currently lacked clarity in how these recommendations would be implemented.

We have already taken a number of steps to improve our financial aid programs. In June 2011, at my request, the University of Illinois Foundation initiated the *Access Illinois* scholarship program to raise $100 million in private gifts to support financial aid and scholarships for our students. These funds would be in addition to scholarships raised during the recently completed *Brilliant Futures* campaign. Each of the three chancellors has joined me in bringing the message to our friends and alumni in support of this important priority. We have also worked with the Foundation to develop a matching program under the *Access Illinois* initiative to leverage gift dollars, providing more incentive for donors to contribute to student scholarships. Consistent with suggestions in *Recommendation 16*, the matching program emphasizes scholarship funds at the campus level to accommodate students who are initially unaffiliated with a college and students who may transfer from one college to another.

Working with the VPAA and chancellors, I've also instituted mechanisms to improve the effectiveness of the financial aid programs at each campus. Given the importance of financial aid in ensuring that a broad cross section of students has access to a University of Illinois education, all three campuses increased their financial aid budget this year. My office also increased the allocation for the President's Award Program (PAP) from $4.5 million a year to $7.25M. PAP, which provides financial support to students from underrepresented groups from throughout the state, was significantly enhanced this year by

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS
Urbana-Champaign · Chicago · Springfield

increasing the monetary amount of the award, increasing award qualifications, and instituting a minimum GPA to retain the award. One suggestion made was that the University should adopt a broad view of diversity. The PAP is a good example of how to implement this suggestion. The PAP supports students from underrepresented ethnic groups, underrepresented Illinois counties, and low-income families.

Another important step I encouraged this year was to improve coordination between University (PAP)-, campus-, and college-level scholarship programs to provide each recipient with a consolidated award that is communicated through a single message, as suggested by *Recommendation 11*. This example of coordinated communication (as opposed to receiving separate letters from different financial aid offices) provides applicants with more timely and complete information and is typically more effective in improving yield. Parallel to this effort, I also asked the campuses to offer more multi-year awards as opposed to awards for only a student's first year as suggested in *Recommendation 15*. Multi-year awards, which are contingent on the student maintaining academic standing and tailored to his or her financial need, reduce financial uncertainty for students and their families and increase the likelihood of enrollment. Campus financial aid and admission offices are working closely with the colleges to expand both these efforts, and I will encourage them to continue to do so.

Given the important role that financial aid plays in ensuring that the campuses attract a mix of students that optimizes student opportunity and experience, the University devotes substantial institutional funds to financial aid programs (exceeding $51 million in 2011 and projected to be approximately $59 million this year). It is important, therefore, that we ensure that these resources are being used as effectively as possible. This is the intent of *Recommendations 13* and *14*. In essence the plan calls for careful analyses of the impact of financial aid in meeting enrollment goals, facilitating student success, and continuously improving the alignment of financial aid strategies with campus enrollment, retention, and graduation goals. Sophisticated approaches for such analysis have been developed and are available from external groups that specialize in these kinds of services. Therefore, at the appropriate time we may solicit Requests for Information (RFI) from potential providers of this kind of service.

I'll reiterate that decisions regarding individual financial aid and scholarship offers have historically been made at the campus level and that will remain the case. The term "centralized" in the context of these recommendations refers to the coordination of individual campus-level and college-level financial aid decisions. Such coordination, as noted earlier, would maximize the impact of those decisions and benefit prospective students. All campus level financial aid and scholarship resources will remain within the campus and continue to be part of campus operations.

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS
URBANA-CHAMPAIGN · CHICAGO · SPRINGFIELD

TUITION (RECOMMENDATION 12)

An important recommendation made in the report that enjoys broad support is that tuition decisions be made by the end of February or earlier, if possible. I am happy to note that with the concurrence of the Board of Trustees we announced tuition rates for new students in 2012 at the January meeting of the board, and I expect that we will follow this schedule in the future. In the past tuition decisions were made later, sometimes as late as June. The early tuition decision will allow admission and financial aid professionals to communicate financial aid offers earlier and will assist in providing prospective students and their families with information in a timely manner.

BRANDING AND MARKETING (RECOMMENDATION 17, 18, 19, AND 20)

The report recommended that enrollment efforts could be enhanced by capitalizing on the University's brand in communications to prospective students while retaining strong messages of campus identity. Based on the wide-ranging feedback I have received I want to reaffirm my earlier statement that all existing branding will remain unchanged and campus identities will remain as they are today. Any potential review of University and campus branding would be made outside of the current enrollment management discussions. Such a branding review, if pursued, would involve all campus stakeholders and would be led by a committee of campus leaders. There are no plans for such a review.

PATHWAY AGREEMENT BETWEEN CAMPUSES (RECOMMENDATION 21)

"Pathway" agreements provide the ability for students from one institution to transfer to another if they are qualified to do so and admitted. The arrangements are built around articulation agreements that allow credits earned by a student at one institution to be transferred to another. Each of our campuses has formal articulation agreements with many community colleges that have facilitated students from community colleges transferring to our campuses if they are admitted. The agreements also allow for the transfer of credits for certain courses, particularly at the lower division level (general education curriculum). This recommendation calls for similar agreements between our campuses, focusing on lower division curricular articulation and course transfer.

Each campus has a well-established process for formulating articulation agreements that involves input from departments, faculty governance, and deans, and ultimately is approved by provosts and chancellors. As noted, this process has led to many agreements with community colleges that have served us well. Any new agreement would follow the same process. It is also important to note that pathway agreements do not give a student the right to transfer. They simply make it possible for students to do so if they are admitted by a college through established admission processes. Each college may have a different standard for admissions as they often do for entering first-year or transfer students.

As a number of the senators and many others have noted, this is a very student-friendly recommendation. I am pleased to report that the VPAA and the campus provosts have initiated discussions on how to facilitate inter-campus agreements in accordance with established governance processes. Their work will focus on lower division curricular articulation and credit transfer. The group will also investigate the feasibility of faculty sharing among campuses as suggested by some.

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS
URBANA-CHAMPAIGN · CHICAGO · SPRINGFIELD

OVERALL APPROACH

As the preceding paragraphs reflect, a number of parallel activities will have to be undertaken to improve enrollment management practices and I have asked the VPAA to take responsibility for coordinating these activities. In doing so, the VPAA will work closely with the campus provosts and vice chancellors of student affairs. Faculty, deans, and department heads and chairs will continue to play the same role going forward as they have played in the past.

As noted earlier, in order to formalize this process of continuous improvement and facilitate inter-campus collaboration we will form an Enrollment Management Policy Council convened by the VPAA and including the provosts of the three campuses. Issues related to enrollment management—including policies and strategies regarding enrollment goals, admissions, retention, diversity initiatives, and financial aid—will be discussed at this policy council, with recommendations forwarded to the president and chancellors for a final decision. While student admission decisions and financial aid offers will remain as campus responsibilities and under campus authority, the council will oversee their implementation, share best practices, promote inter-campus cooperation, and initiate and oversee continuous improvement efforts. All three chancellors support the establishment of this council.

While the VPAA will have overall responsibility for coordinating enrollment management initiatives, he is likely to require assistance in fulfilling this obligation. For this reason the Board of Trustees had endorsed the appointment of an executive director of enrollment management, who would work with the campus enrollment management teams and the Enrollment Management Policy Council. The chancellors, the president, and the board chair had agreed that the heads of the campus enrollment management teams would report both to their respective vice chancellors or provosts and to the executive director. However, with the consent of the Board chair, and under the presumption that the Policy Council will perform effectively, I have decided not to create such a position. Instead, reporting lines currently in place for campus enrollment management teams will remain unchanged and, as the enrollment management initiative develops, a member of the VPAA office, such as an associate vice president, will be assigned to provide the required assistance to the VPAA. The individual in this position will work with the Enrollment Management Planning Council and with the campus enrollment managers to share best practices, promote inter-campus cooperation, and facilitate the initiatives of the council. As a member of the VPAA office, the individual will report to the VPAA.

I am grateful to the USC and others for the comments and inputs which have helped improve the proposal. I remain fully committed to continued dialogue with the USC and other stakeholders as we implement the proposals in this document. Specifically, I invite the USC to appoint one its members as a liaison to the Enrollment Management Planning Council to offer advice, counsel and feedback on matters discussed by the council. The VPAA will also periodically meet with the USC to update the full group on enrollment management initiatives, including activities of

the Enrollment Management Policy Council. In addition, the VPAA will constitute a faculty advisory group to provide advice and counsel on enrollment management and other academic matters related to that office. These steps will ensure continued faculty input during the implementation of these proposals.

The University of Illinois is a world-class institution. Each of our campuses strives to be best-in-class and each offers a unique learning environment and programming to provide qualified students with an opportunity to obtain an excellent college education. Our strength as a whole derives from the strengths of the campuses. Through greater coordination across our enrollment management operations we can leverage these strengths for the benefit of all. Synergies can also save costs, which can be reinvested in our students and our academic mission. As we move forward in this important strategic direction, we must remember at all times that the goal of enhanced enrollment management is to improve student opportunities, experiences, and success.

The following statement was made by University Senates Conference Chair Donald Chambers to the Board of Trustees on January 19, 2012.

PUBLIC COMMENTS TO THE BOARD ON THE ETHICAL DIMENSIONS OF LEADERSHIP

Thank you, members of the Board, for the opportunity to speak with you today, in the midst of one of the worst scandals ever to confront this university.

This is a time when faculty leaders must speak up about our commitment to ethical standards, as you have. I am speaking here on behalf of the current elected senate leadership of Urbana, Matt Wheeler and Joyce Tolliver; of the Chicago senate, Phil Patston and myself; and of the University Senates Conference, Nick Burbules and myself.

These have been long and difficult days for all of us, so I will be brief and direct.

We believe that the Investigative Report on Anonymous E-Mails contains evidence implicating a wider scope of involvement in the controversy than simply the question of who wrote the anonymous e-mails themselves.

Today, we want to articulate a number of principles:

First, ethical conduct means more than merely legal conduct; and there are things which may be legally permissible, but which are nevertheless ethically reprehensible.

Second, direct causal responsibility is not the same as moral responsibility; and responsibility for setting an ethical tone and promoting a culture of accountability is a central dimension of leadership.

Third, as Trustee Edward McMillan has so aptly articulated, leaders must accept responsibility for what happens on their watch even if they may not have personally directed or approved it.

No one can read the Investigative Report, including the Appendices, without being shocked by a widespread pattern of inappropriate, secretive, and deceptive behavior. The content of some of the secret communications is unbelievably mean-spirited and nasty. I am sure that readers to whom these individuals are just names would wonder, Who are these people? This pattern of sleazy conduct, now on open display, is as damaging to the university as the production of the infamous e-mails themselves.

In closing, I want to reiterate our central concern with this scandal. This pattern of behavior, including but not limited to the production of the anonymous emails themselves, is the most serious assault on the principles and processes of shared governance that has ever occurred in the history of this great university.

But beyond this, we speak to our concerns as educators, conscious of our role as models and exemplars to our students in how to conduct themselves. Our behavior, as professors or as administrators, is always on display to them; and when we fail to hold ourselves to the highest standards of behavior, we fail as educators as well.

Resolution on Pensions
University Senates Conference
April 27, 2012

The University Senates Conference (USC), in its role as a faculty elected advisory body to the President of the University and the Board of Trustees, recognizes that the funding basis for the State University Retirement System (SURS) is not sustainable in its current form. Previous underfunding of the system has made SURS unable to continue to pay out benefits indefinitely at current levels, even though participants have fully contributed their portion of responsibility for the system.

As has been documented, Illinois ranks 50th among the 50 states in adequately funding its public pensions. This situation cannot be allowed to continue; retaining and recruiting top faculty to our universities will be increasingly difficult unless this issue is addressed.

Today we face a reality in which sensible, equitable reforms are needed. The USC writes to acknowledge this reality and to seek a constructive way forward. Reforms will be needed in order to return the SURS system to a sound financial footing, and all stakeholders — participants, the universities, and the State — have a necessary role to play in such reforms. These reforms must be guided by certain agreed-upon principles, the most important of which is fairness to university employees who entered the system on the basis of certain understandings and commitments that need to be honored.

Other principles also seem to us reasonable and prudent as a solution is being worked out. Many of these principles are laid out and defended in the IGPA report authored by Jeffrey R. Brown and Robert F. Rich: Fiscal Sustainability and Retirement Security: A Reform Proposal for the Illinois State Universities Retirement Systems (SURS), *Institute of Government & Public Affairs, University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign. Chicago. Springfield,* Feb. 9, 2012.

- Any reformed SURS system must be financially sustainable for the State, the universities, and the participants, and it must respect existing constitutional protections of already-accrued benefits;
- All promised benefits to current participants and annuitants should be maintained, as guaranteed by the State Constitution (Article 8, Section 5 General Provisions);
- Existing unfunded liabilities must remain the State's responsibility, and the State must provide credible guarantees that future payments will be made on time (such as through a clause that state contributions to the system must have priority);
- In addition, the State should continue to make its contributions to the system at a level at least equal to the level of what it would be paying to Social Security (6.2% of pay) along with its contributions to health care;
- Any transfer of normal costs to universities must be nominal, and phased in gradually;
- Any reform must include improvements to the current Tier II program for new employees, as suggested in the IGPA position paper referenced above (this could include a hybrid plan combining some elements of defined benefits and an employee self-managed plan), and this revised program should also be available to Tier I employees;
- Any change in participant contributions must involve consultations with those affected.

The USC is ready to participate in further discussions in order to seek a constructive resolution to these issues.