ISSUES RELATED TO FACULTY-WIDE VOTING OUTSIDE OF MEETINGS
(Referred to as "absentee voting" in the points that follow)

Pros and cons of absentee voting
These are some opinions I have heard expressed over the years whenever this topic arises – this list is only a starting point for discussion--PS

A. Pros:
   May increase faculty participation
   Those who cannot attend on the day of a meeting will not be disenfranchised
   It is more democratic
   Convenience
   Allows for a longer voting period
   There is currently no authentication of voters at all

B. Cons:
   May not increase faculty participation
   Faculty should hear the give and take of debate
   Those who are physically present for the debate are more knowledgeable
   Could decrease attendance at University Faculty meetings
   Technical problems
   Always the possibility of voter fraud

Possible ways to conduct absentee voting

A. Paper ballots

   A ballot would be mailed out to each faculty member. Each faculty member would receive a ballot and two envelopes, one unmarked and the other identifying the faculty member. The ballot would be sealed inside the unmarked envelope, which would then be placed inside the envelope bearing the faculty member's name. When delivered to the Senate office, the name would be checked against a list of eligible faculty and marked to show a ballot received. The outer envelope would then be discarded and the unmarked sealed envelope kept. All sealed envelopes would be opened and the ballots counted when the voting period is over.

B. Polls set up at multiple locations on campus

   Ballots would be available at various locations on campus. Faculty would present an ID and have his or her name checked off. Ballot would be marked and sealed. All sealed ballots would be counted when the voting period is over.

C. Electronic voting

   At the March 11, 2003 University Faculty meeting, Dr. Cindy Brunner gave a report as chair of an ad-hoc committee to study electronic voting. She listed four requirements that electronic voting must have:

1. There must be an authentication process to ascertain that the voters are credentialed
2. There must be a way to prevent multiple votes from being cast by any individual
3. There must be ballot secrecy and ballot integrity
4. There must be accurate vote tabulation
5. The system must be user-friendly

   In February 2003 we tested the electronic voting system developed by OIT when the faculty were invited to rank budget priorities. Requirements 1, 2, and 4 were met. Ballot *secrecy* (Requirement 3) is not guaranteed

by this process because it is possible to know if someone voted. We do believe that we can guarantee ballot *confidentiality* as we do now.

Dr. Brunner noted last March that Requirement 5, a user-friendly system, was not met. OIT and the Faculty Officers received numerous complaints. I have discussed this matter with OIT and the authentication issues cannot be resolved easily because we do not have a centralized computer network for the campus. Engineering, ACES, and the College of Veterinary Medicine have their own networks. Faculty from these areas had particular difficulty with authentication because they do not use the IDs or passwords associated with OIT. The problems which existed in February still exist.