Amendments to the Statutes and The General Rules Proposed by the Board of Trustees
Frequently Asked Questions
(10/15/2010)

What are the campus senates and University Senates Conference being asked to do?
• The Board has proposed some amendments to the University Statutes and to The General Rules of the University. Following the process required by the Statutes and The General Rules, the Board has transmitted the proposed amendments to the University Senates Conference for review and the Conference has, in turn, transmitted them to the campus senates for their review as well. The Board is not asking the various senates to reach a consensus, and no formal votes are required by the Board, the Statutes, or The General Rules. What the Board would like to have is an inventory of what the campuses see as the benefits and risks of the amendments for the Board’s consideration at their meeting on November 18.

What led to these amendments?
• The Board wants to see:
  o Improvements in our research and clinical missions;
  o More coordination across campuses in our research, teaching, clinical care, and outreach missions;
  o Less redundancy across the campuses – especially in back-office operations, with the savings invested in the University’s core academic missions;
  o More cooperation and less competition for faculty, students, political support, fundraising, and other resources.

• In short, the Board feels that a “silo mentality” has overtaken our campuses, and as a result, we are incurring unnecessary costs and losing opportunities to advance our research and teaching missions.

• From the Board’s point of view, the recent decline in our national rankings, barriers to cross-campus research, the rising cost of tuition, administrative overhead that is greater than it needs to be, and the lack of a unified University vision all require the changes being proposed. Our University, they believe, can become more than the sum of its parts, if we build more complementarities and simplify, rather than duplicate key services.

Why does the Board want to add “Vice President” to the Chancellor’s title?
• The Board is convinced that our chancellors must pay more attention to their role as University Officers, which entails:
  o Working with the President & other University Officers to establish a University-wide vision; and
  o Contextualizing the unique strengths and distinct missions of their own campuses within that vision.

• The Board also wants to situate the Chancellors clearly in the University’s chain-of-command, which must proceed from the Board, to the President, to the Vice President/Chancellor. This chain-of-command has become murky in recent years, leading to confusion, inappropriate administrative competition, and ultimately a leadership crisis that embarrassed the University.
Does this “Title Re-Alignment” reduce the Chancellor’s authority on their campuses?

• No. It’s important to distinguish between authority and autonomy. The Chancellors will have the same rights and powers they currently have as documented in the Statutes and The General Rules. Indeed, the Board seeks to re-empower the Chancellors, whose authority has too often devolved to lower levels of the campus administration, which has created more administrative overhead than is desirable or necessary. In a period of acute fiscal crisis, the Board believes that our Chancellors should be more engaged as managers of their campuses.

• In sum, the title re-alignment:
  o Clarifies the chain-of-command within which the Chancellors are situated for both internal and external constituencies;
  o Empowers them with respect to their authority over their own campuses;
  o And signifies the important responsibility they have to work with the President and other University Officers to establish the University-wide agenda in which the campuses function.

Why does the Board want to add “Research” to the title of the Vice President for Technology & Economic Development?

• Another area of concern to the Board is research: Indeed, we should all be alarmed that our Urbana-Champaign campus slipped 10 places in the rankings for federally funded research expenditures since 2004. Our Chicago campus also slipped -- by eight places. The Chicago campus is now out of the top-50, and the Urbana-Champaign campus is one of only two Big-10 institutions that dropped in these rankings (Iowa fell by just two places, and Michigan State fell by one), while all others improved by 1-6 places.

• We lack a coherent, unified voice for research, particularly at state and federal levels. Legislators and funding agencies, who want to help us, are confused and frustrated by the lack of a coherent research agenda for the University and wonder why they receive competing proposals from our campuses.

• Faculty who want to collaborate with colleagues on a different campus are hampered by inconsistent policies and processes.

• And, we’re not doing as well as we should when it comes to identifying promising innovations and inventions early, and translating them into patents and licenses – we’ve left millions on the table over the years, in part, because there’s a chasm between research and economic development.

• The Board believes we need someone charged with coordinating the work going on across all of our campus, pulling it together in a unified fashion, eliminating unhealthy competition in favor of collaboration, breaking down barriers that impede cross-campus research, and helping us participate in setting the state and national agenda when it comes to research.
**Why does the Board think we need a Vice President for Health Affairs?**

- The Board recognizes the importance of enhancing our clinical mission and addressing serious issues that adversely affect our clinical operations. After all, this enterprise accounts for nearly 1/3 of the University budget. In the Board’s view:
  - We are not generating and leveraging clinical revenues to the extent that we could to support our research and academic missions;
  - We have a hospital in Chicago that desperately needs renovation;
  - Our clinical mission is not as connected as it should be to our research and teaching missions.

- The Board recognizes that this is not just a concern for our Chicago campus or our College of Medicine – we have faculty practice plans in different colleges, at clinical sites across the state and region, and we have partnerships with healthcare providers and agencies throughout the state. Managing this complex clinical enterprise, at a crucial time for the future of our healthcare programs, is essential to our future and the state’s future. Part of this involves developing a path forward for our hospital in Chicago and building stronger partnerships with other hospitals in the Illinois Medical District and beyond. These are University-wide endeavors and should be overseen by a University Vice President, as is the case at about all of the major academic medical centers.

- The Vice President for Health Affairs (VPHA) will oversee our clinical enterprise, including our faculty practice plans in our health science colleges and schools (except Veterinary Medicine). The VPHGA will report to the President, with a dotted-line reporting relationship to the Chancellor on our Chicago campus, and will play a lead role with the President, Hospital Director, Chancellor of UIC, and deans of the healthcare colleges and schools in developing a plan to address the needs of the Hospital. The reporting relationship to the UIC Chancellor is critical, because UIC is home to most of our health science programs and because our clinical mission is inextricably tied to our academic and research missions. The VPHA will also work closely with the Vice President for Research, Technology & Economic Development, the Chancellors, and the Vice Chancellors for Research to enhance our clinical and translational science efforts and funding opportunities.

**How can we afford an expansion of the administration at this time?**

- The University RAMP administrators (Deans and above up to the President) are the most stable and leanest sector of our administration – indeed, it’s among the leanest in the country. We’ve hovered between 69-72 RAMP administrators over the last dozen years, and the changes signified by the Board’s proposed amendments will not take us above that 72 threshold. The Vice President for Health Affairs is the only new University Officer contemplated and it’s important to note that a key responsibility of this position will be to enhance our clinical revenues. Through this revenue growth, along with the potential for revenue growth in clinical research, the position has the potential to more-than-pay for itself. In addition, the Board has mandated that administrative restructuring result in a 5%-10% reduction in administrative overhead, compared to 2010, much of which will occur through natural attrition and leaving current vacancies unfilled. The fact is that the greatest growth in the administration has not occurred at the upper-levels of the University. It’s occurred
elsewhere on the campuses, in part because of unnecessary duplication and even triplification of operations and services across the University.

**Is the Vice President for Health Affairs a first-step toward re-directing the reporting of the University of Illinois at Chicago West Campus to the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign?**

- No; while it is the case that the clinical enterprise is a University-wide and state-wide enterprise, the health science colleges and schools are part of the distinctiveness of the University of Illinois at Chicago, alongside and integrated with the distinct and distinguished urban mission of our Chicago campus. In fact, the health science programs are a major component of the budget on our Chicago campus and must be healthy, or the whole campus is at risk. An important part of that health is a robust clinical enterprise, integrated with the academic and research missions of the health science colleges and schools, which the Vice President for Health Affairs will be responsible for developing and maintaining. Without quick, strategic action on our clinical mission, the Board is concerned that we will have a crisis on our hands and that crisis will adversely affect the University of Illinois as a whole.

**How will these positions be implemented?**

- The Board and President are ready to launch searches for new Chancellors at the University of Illinois at Springfield and the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign. The Vice President title will be included in those position descriptions and the search firm already working with the University of Illinois at Springfield has indicated that the title will substantially enrich the candidate pool. The Vice President for Health Affairs and the Vice President for Research, Technology, and Economic Development will require national searches (for which internal candidates may apply). We will use our normal processes for the appointment of University Officers, including the appointment of interims, if the Board deems that appropriate.

**What obstacles to collaboration currently exist and why do we need to change the title of the Chancellor to make such collaboration more effective?**

- The Board has observed that campuses are not sharing best-practices. For instance, the Board has been presented with outstanding efforts to increase diversity on one campus that are not shared with another campus. On-line and blended learning provides another example, where each campus seeks to reinvent the wheel, when a successful model already exists. Other examples the Board has observed include the campuses competing for federal funds, legislative support, foundation grants or private partnerships, leaving it to these agencies, rather than the University, to set University priorities. On the research side, particularly when it comes to the health sciences, the siloing of the campuses means that every effort to organize collaborative, cross-campus research requires painstaking negotiation that raises obstacles to progress. From the Board’s point of view, we need a University-wide officer who thinks of the whole, as well as the parts, and who can help our teachers and researchers overcome the barriers to positive collaboration. This is the rationale behind the new Vice President for Research, Technology, & Economic Development, and the addition of “Vice President” to the Chancellor’s title, the latter to remind us all of the words in paragraph 2, of Article 1, Section 1 of The General Rules:
“The campuses of the University of Illinois share common goals, even though each makes a highly differentiated contribution to the University's mission. The campuses are assisted and strengthened by intercampus cooperation and by University-wide services, while carrying out their academic functions with a high degree of delegated authority. The campuses are expected to achieve intercampus cooperation, to avoid unnecessary duplication, and to develop missions responsible to their particular orientation and setting, and to build upon and to foster faculty and staff strengths and initiatives.”

• The Board wants the Chancellors to fully realize these aims as University Officers working with other University Officers and the President to establish a University-wide vision and to contextualize their own campuses within that vision. By adding “Vice President, University of Illinois,” to the Chancellor title, the Board believes that the Chancellors’ role and responsibility at the University level is clearer.

How does the President view the role of the Chancellor in the governance system? How will these changes affect this role?

• Let’s remember that the amendments are being proposed by the Board of Trustees and rephrase this question in terms of how the Board views the role of the Chancellors in terms of University governance. In these terms, the Board recognizes that The General Rules explicitly state that campuses are not independent and autonomous. They are part of an “organic whole” that constitutes the University of Illinois. As the chief executive officers of their campuses, Chancellors have a role to play in advocating for their campuses, but must also contextualize their roles and that of their campuses as part of the “organic whole.” The changes reaffirm this important responsibility.

How will the function of each of the vice presidents be different under the proposed changes in relation to the individual campuses? How would articulation with the campuses change?

• The Board has not proposed amendments that will change the existing vice presidents’ functions, other than the Vice President for Technology & Economic Development. In this last case, the Board would add “Research” and make the office responsible for coordinating the research enterprise across campuses.

To what extent might the collaboration between units, which have a high profile on one campus, but not another, result in the overall lowering the prestige of the former?

• Let’s be cautious not to denigrate one campus vis-à-vis another. Good work is occurring on all of our campuses. All campuses benefit from the successes of one another and all suffer when opportunities on any campus or across campuses are lost. Each campus has distinct and distinguished missions, which together, contribute to the overall reputation of the University of Illinois. As the unique missions of each campus gain stature, the stature of the entire University and all its campuses rises.

• There’s no reason to believe that one campus would intentionally enter into collaborations that might damage the prestige of another; nor is there any reason to believe that administrators or the Board would allow that to happen, or that it is even contemplated under the proposed changes. As noted above, the Board’s proposed amendments seek to reaffirm the importance of intercampus cooperation and the avoidance of unnecessary duplication in
order to promote the organic whole. Achieving that goal is perfectly compatible with recognizing, even advancing, the unique strengths of each campus -- even while promoting the kind of complementarities that can enhance particular strengths on and between the campuses.

**With respect to the effect of the proposed changes on the role of chancellors, how might the more top-down structure this change signals affect shared governance in general?**

- This is not “more top-down.” To the contrary, the Board proposes to add just one additional University officer. Otherwise, it proposes to more clearly delineate the chain-of-command always envisioned in the Statutes and *The General Rules* of the “organic” University.

**Will the President consider reversing the titles of Chancellor and Vice President in order to reflect the role of Chancellor on each campus?**

- Let’s remember that the amendments are proposed by the Board and have been transmitted to the University Senates Conference by the President on behalf of the Board. The Board may choose to consider this, so long as it squares with the Board’s goal of delineating a clear chain-of-command within the University.

**Is the addition of “vice-president” to the chancellor title intended partly as a mechanism to avoid the chancellors circumventing the President and interacting directly with the Trustees? If so, why couldn’t this be handled as a personnel issue rather than through a change in titles and a change in Statutes?**

- It is true that there have been cases of inappropriate and problematic circumvention with prior Boards and administrations. The Board seeks to avoid this through title changes that clearly delineate lines of authority and reaffirm the chain-of-command as articulated in *The General Rules*. “Good fences make good neighbors”; so it is that clearly delineated lines of authority help to avoid difficult personnel issues.

**If centralization is the goal, how does the removal of power at the campus level improve education?**

- Centralization is not the goal and the Chancellors, as noted earlier, will retain all the authority noted in the Statutes and *The General Rules*. The goal is to restore clear lines of authority, improve operating efficiencies, eliminate unnecessary duplication, and advance our core missions in education and research.

**Can the President explain his reference to "a cultural transformation" on page 3 of the rationale, providing specific examples? The President also states that "positions and titles alone are insufficient to bring about this change." If a change in positions and titles is relatively unimportant, why is it necessary to make these changes in the Statutes and General Rules?**

- Let’s be clear that the amendments are proposed by the Board and are transmitted by the President to the University Senates Conference on behalf of the Board. With this in mind, we’ll rephrase this question in terms of the Board’s perspective. The Board believes it is important to change the way campuses have come to recognize, conceptualize, value, and enact their distinct missions within the University as a whole, while avoiding unnecessary duplication and promoting intercampus cooperation. That is, they need to focus as much on
their contribution to the University as an organic whole as they do on the their contribution to
their own campuses. By cultural transformation, the Board means learning how to balance
the needs of the campus with those of the University as a whole. The Board has not stated
that positions and titles are “relatively unimportant.” Indeed, they are important symbols and
reminders of the roles and responsibilities of Chancellors.

**With respect to the addition of “Research” to the title of Vice-President for Research,
Technology and Economic Development, how would that position impact research in those
disciplinary areas that are unrelated to technology and economic development?**

- Most universities like ours have a Vice President for Research whose portfolio also includes
economic development and technology transfer. The Board is proposing that the University
of Illinois Vice President overseeing this domain have all three functions articulated in the
position title. In addition, at universities like ours, the Vice President for Research or Vice
President for Research, Technology, & Economic Development is responsible for promoting
and facilitating research in the arts, humanities, and social sciences, as well as in disciplines
that compete for larges sponsored research grants and contracts. This is what the Board
envisions in its proposed change.

**How would access to funding agencies by individual faculty be affected by the Vice President
for Research, Technology, & Economic Development?**

- An important responsibility of the Vice President for Research, Technology, & Economic
Development will be to develop stronger relationships with funding agencies, sponsoring
institutions, and foundations that support all forms of research, scholarship, and creative
work. These relationships will open more opportunities for faculty to work with these
agencies, institutions, and foundations and facilitate access to them.

**How does the portfolio of the Vice President for Health Affairs relate to clinical areas on the
Urbana-Champaign campus (e.g., Speech & Hearing Clinic, Veterinary Medicine Clinic,
McKinley Health Center)?**

- The above areas would not be a part of the portfolio of the Vice President for Health Affairs.

**What is the anticipated budget, including staff support in setting up the Vice President for
Health Affairs and expanding the role of the Vice President for Research, Technology, &
Economic Development, and how would that be funded?**

- The Vice President for Research, Technology, & Economic Development will not require
much additional staffing, if any, beyond those that exist in the current office of the Vice
President for Technology & Economic Development. The Vice President for Health Affairs
may require a new appointment, and potentially additional staff, some of which could be
addressed through the re-allocation of personnel/positions from existing offices with a role in
clinical affairs. It’s important note, however, that the Board believes that the changes
signified by its proposed amendments will result in new revenues that will more than cover
the costs of the changes.
Can the President define what is meant by “enrollment management”? What information can the President give us on the impact that centralization of enrollment management might have on student services?

- The Board is not contemplating amendments to the Statutes or The General Rules related to enrollment management. The Board has suggested that the President take steps to improve the management of our recruitment, admissions, transfer, retention, and financial aid policies across the University, in order to foster greater diversity and to ensure that students have better access to the University of Illinois campuses and are successful in obtaining their undergraduate degrees in a timely manner. When it comes to student services, of the sort provided through the office of student affairs on each campus, no changes are contemplated.

Can we hear more about Human Resources centralization? This function of the University has been reorganized four times over past years; why is more centralization necessary?

- The Board is not contemplating amendments to the Statutes or The General Rules related to human resources. The Board has, however, pointed out that there are not consistent processes and entry paths for individuals interested in working at the University; that there are no or incompatible career paths for staff and academic professionals in some areas within and across campuses; that there are different, duplicate, and incompatible human resources systems and policies across campuses that are costly and impede career advancement by employees; that collective bargaining policies and processes lack coordination. Following the ARR Report recommendations, the Board has encouraged the President to examine how better coordination and consistency, as well as consolidation of systems and processes, might address these deficiencies. Further, human resources has not been increasingly centralized in recent years. It was de-centralized in recent years, with the results that are noted above.

What are the budgetary implications of the proposed changes?

- The changes are designed to cut costs and increase revenues.

Has a cost/benefit analysis been done for the proposed changes?

- Benchmarks with peers and aspirants indicate that we are underperforming in our research and clinical missions. We are also unnecessarily duplicating back-office operations in many areas as documented in the Administrative Review & Restructuring report and campus-level studies (e.g., the “Stewarding Excellence” reports). The Board believes these changes will improve our performance in these areas.

Given the reduced State funds, how would these changes improve the perception of the University among legislators and by the public?

- Legislators, corporate partners, and external advisory boards have conveyed their frustration to Board members and administrators over the lack of a coherent, unified University vision and our failure to consistently communicate a clear set of University-wide priorities; several have expressed support for the efforts of the Board to address these frustrations by developing a more coordinated and streamlined administrative structure. In short, external constituencies will welcome a more unified and coherent University, and the cost savings that will go with it.
How does the UA administrative structure advance interaction with students; how does it promote research; and at what level is the funding of UA most efficient to carry out the UA functions?

• It does so in the same way as our campus administrations. The Board seeks an administrative structure at all levels (not just UA) that improves efficiencies, reduces costs, and enhances revenues. Through such efficiencies, savings, and additional revenues, more resources can be directed to increasing research opportunities and the student experience. The Board believes that the most effective way to achieve these aims is by a better coordination of our University-wide research, teaching, clinical, outreach, and economic missions.

Can the President tell us more about his intentions in forwarding these proposals? If the intentions are to save money, could he provide specific details about the proposed reduction in overall administrative positions?

• Let’s be clear about the process that’s being following: The Board is forwarding the proposals through the President to the University Senates Conference. The Board has indicated its expectation that administrative overhead will be reduced by 5%-10% across the entire University over the next few years as a result of implementing these changes and those outlined in the ARR Report.

Has the Board considered doing away with the UA infrastructure and channeling resources toward campus operations?

• The Board is not considering such an action at this time. At times, in the past, there have been discussions of combining the University Administration and the President’s Office with the Urbana-Champaign Chancellor’s office and reaping the savings such a move would bring. While this is common at other universities (e.g., Indiana University, University of Michigan), the Board is not currently planning to take such action at the University of Illinois.

Some recommendations of the ARR report have been accepted by the President and others have been rejected. Can he give us more details about how he has decided which recommendations to accept and which to reject?

• Again, the Board is forwarding the amendments to the University Senates Conference through the President. The Administrative Review & Restructuring report has many recommendations, some of which are still being reviewed by the Board and the President. The only recommendation that has been reconsidered is the recommendation to combine the positions of Vice President for Academic Affairs and Vice President for Technology & Economic Development into a new Executive Vice President. Many faculty voiced deep concerns over the elimination of a Vice President for Academic Affairs. After considering these concerns, the Board and the President decided to keep the two positions intact, though adding “research” to the portfolio of the Vice President for Technology & Economic Development. The latter change recognized that technology-transfer and economic development are inextricably tied to and depend upon cross-campus coordination of our research efforts.
Could we have more information on the reference to the substitution of the term “Provost” for “Provost or equivalent officer” in the proposed amendments to the Statutes? (There is no mention of this change in the Rationale.)

• As the Board contemplated amendments to the Statutes and The General Rules, it was pointed out that The General Rules, early on call for each campus to have a “vice president for academic affairs and provost or equivalent officer.” In subsequent articles and sections in The General Rules, duties corresponding to this position only reference a “provost.” Thus, it was noted that this discrepancy should also be corrected to afford the opportunity to use an alternative title, as long as the duties and responsibilities of the officer were not changed.

How would a more centralized vision of the University affect the value of University degrees, specifically from the Urbana-Champaign campus? How would this vision affect the public perception of the institution?

• Let’s be clear that all of our campuses bestow a degree from the University of Illinois (i.e., there is no “at Urbana-Champaign,” “at Springfield,” or “at Chicago” that follows that designation of the degree source). The amendments the Board is proposing will not change this. A University of Illinois degree is of great value because it reflects the greatness of the whole University, which arises from the distinction that each campus brings to the entire University of Illinois. To the extent that individual campuses succeed in their distinct missions, the value of all University of Illinois degrees increases. As noted above, the goal is not centralization; it is to position the University of Illinois to realize its greatness in both challenging and plentiful times, which will have a positive affect on the value of a University of Illinois degree.

Using the College of Engineering as an example: some years ago, there was less administrative infrastructure and the rankings of the College were higher. Now, there is a more robust administration, and faculty members are being cherry-picked. Assuming there is a causal relationship between the quality of programs and less robust administration in general, can the president explain how a greater administrative structure would help to advance units like these? Further, can he give us some specific information about the cost of those changes?

• As noted in the rationale transmitted by the President on behalf of the Board, the number of RAMP administrators (administrators at the level of dean and higher) under the Board’s proposal will remain within the range that’s existed over the last dozen years or so. The Board does recognize that, in many cases, other parts of the administration have grown. Further, this growth has, in many cases, reflected an unnecessary duplication of roles and functions across campuses, colleges, and units. The diversion of waning resources from our core academic and research missions to duplicative administrative operations is not effective. The Board recognizes that these core missions will be compromised if resources are unnecessarily diverted from them to replicate functions and operations, which can be delivered through coordinated and shared services at less cost and more efficiently. By eliminating such unnecessary duplication, costs will be reduced. Indeed, the Board has mandated a 5%-10% reduction in such administrative “overhead.”