Report of the

USC retreat and meeting

(October 15 and 16, 2012)

The retreat was an opportunity for the members of USC to discuss substantially a set of issues proposed by USC's executive committee.

I.   Long term funding trends

Based on interactions of the USC with the board of trustees as well as our own experience with the state, funds from this source will be flat at best in the near future. Another problem is that federal resources have plateaued or are going to be reduced in the future. Further, Chairman Kennedy as well as President Easter believe that tuition increases are not a viable solution since we are already becoming inaccessible. Also if tuition is increased financial aid needs to increase as well. Possible sources of increased revenue are:

1. Dramatic fundraising increase.
    The fundraiser arm of the university as well as its alumni association need to coordinate better their efforts in order to maximize the potential. This topic was explored later in the retreat.
2. Find new models of relationship between corporations and the university. UI Labs is one of the responses of the university.
    The News Gazette has published a couple of articles on this new initiative.
    a. 10/16/12: http://www.news-gazette.com/news/education/2012-10-16/ui-exploring-multimillion-dollar-rd-lab-chicago.html
    b. 10/22/12: http://www.news-gazette.com/news/education/2012-10-22/chicago-lab-idea-gaining-ground.html

    Dr. Schook presented the following day an update and clarification of what UI Labs is.

Many members of USC welcomed this initiative yet there was consensus that is important to protect the academic enterprise from undue influence of corporations since it could lead to the dangerous corrosion of faculty autonomy. Also there is the need to protect disciplines that do not benefit from this kind of relationships. The AAUP recently published a Recommended Principles & Practices to Guide Academy-Industry Relationships. The full document is available at: http://www.aaup.org/industryall.pdf

Besides the conversations of these plans and initiatives, it was stressed that the university required more long-term planning and budgeting. Another approach designed to address the financial situation of the university is the reduction of costs.

II.   University Administration review and cost reduction

President Easter requested William Adams (recently retired Associate Chancellor and budget expert) to head an effort to review the university's UA in terms of its structure, size, and function. This work is expected to reduce the cost of UA around 7%. This effort will have input of faculty members who will be part of one of seven committees that are mapped to UA's areas. The representative from UIS is Prof. Laurel Newman (Management).

Two relevant issues that were discussed were the essential role played by UA in serving the campuses' requirements for external entities such as the state and federal government and the need to monitor how these savings will be traced back to the campuses.

III.   Improving advancement

Even though the university has a considerably sized alumni base, fundraising results are underperforming compared to peers. Some members of the conference believe that the return on investment of the Alumni association and Foundation is low. Possible reasons for this underperformance are the lack of coordination between these independent fundraising organizations, their policies that reduce the autonomy of faculty and departments as fundraisers, and an incoherent communication strategy. There have been some personnel changes at the Foundation that suggest an improvement of this vital activity.

IV.   Campus diversity issues

Diversity issues will always be important for USC since minority students will constitute increasingly a larger share of the number of students as well. Creativity, agility, and hard work through shared governance will be required in order to develop alternate approaches to admissions and how to address the Supreme Court's possible decision on affirmative action. Social justice in admissions might have to be reframed in terms of social class. UIS is proud of its efforts on the successful recruitment of minorities, although more work is required on the diversity of its faculty and staff.

V.   Working with community colleges

Members of USC consider that it is important to focus our attention to articulation agreements with community colleges as feeder schools instead of trying to facilitate the transfer of students between campuses. Members of the USC consider that there are no major obstacles for students to transfer. Any plans to cooperate between faculty or help students take courses in other campuses should be discussed and implemented through shared governance at the departmental and college level, rather than from above. Online courses are a great method to explore teaching opportunities between members of the three campuses as well as for students interested to take courses in different campuses.

VI.   Alternate approaches to admissions
VII.   Building up the campuses

These two topics were briefly discussed since UIC's challenges include collective bargaining issues. A topic that proved to be of relevance for the three campuses.

VIII.   UIC challenges and opportunities

The future of UIC is extremely important for the university since its revenue and expenses are a significant share of the university's budget (1/4 of UI's budget goes to UIC's health center?). Another important reason to understand the Chicago campus is its current situation in collective bargaining (discussed in the next section).

Probably the most urgent issue for UIC is to decide what its inspirational model is. One of the possible goals is to become an AAU institution (A UCLA-kind of institution: An urban research 1 institution). See a good discussion about this issue in the report from the Board of Trustees' retreat in July. The discussion of UIC's future is informed by its urban mission, health-related programs and challenges, diversity, and its close relationship with the economics and social dynamics of the city.

The main challenges of UIC are:

a. Not to compete with UIUC.

b. Determine clearly the roles of UA, the Chancellor and her team, and the faculty in governance.

c. Reduce the divide between the college of medicine, the hospital, and the rest of the university. The differences are geographical (East vs. west) as well as opinions on collective bargaining.

IX.   Collective bargaining and shared governance

Although the members of USC had a lively discussion on collective bargaining, we tried to keep this debate exclusively in the realm of its impact on shared governance. According to Prof. Burbules, there seems to be two models where a faculty union and senate need to co-exist

1. Peaceful coexistence: In this model both bodies address different issues that are not conflictive. For example, a senate works in curricular issues while a union leads salary negotiations.
2. Collective bargaining is the foundation of all faculty activities: In this model the senate becomes a weaker entity since most of the issues are addressed by the union and university administration might be unwilling or unable to talk about most issues with the faculty.

USC concerns in collective bargaining include the following:

1. UIUC members are worried that there are only a handful of AAU that are unionized.
2. Faculty contracts usually stipulate that any budget discussions between faculty and administration needs the presence of a union representative. This could be problematic for Senates and USC.
3. Administration and members of the Board of Trustees might have to reduce their communication with senates and USC.
4. Finally, and more importantly, some members of USC believe that unionization leads to a shift from a faculty perspective to an employee one that might led to irreconcilable differences between administrators and faculty as well as infringements of faculty autonomy by the union. Robust shared governance assumes that administration and faculty have an ultimate shared

goal that leads to good will between the members of the university. Perhaps, collective bargaining might lead to no sense of shared goals.

USC meeting – October 16, 2012

9 AM – Discussion

Prior to the meeting with President Easter and VP Pierre, the members of USC reconvened to recap the fruitful conversations of the previous day. Among the issues addressed were the need to seek recognition of the Board of Trustees and President of the new structure of USC based on four subcommittees. There was also a recommendation to request VP Schook to speak to the Senates of the three campuses to clarify UI Labs structure and objectives since corporate partnerships are important in the future yet they are sources of skepticism or alarm to some faculty members and campus administrators. UI Labs as well as other initiatives like UIUC's participation in Cursera require a balance between delicacy and transparency

10:00 AM – 12:00 PM President Easter, Dr. Adams, and VP Pierre.

After the Chair of the USC presented a detailed summary of the discussions of the retreat, President Easter responded to the issues raised. He believed that the new subcommittee structure makes sense since this new structure will create a sense of how everything affects all of us, and it should help increase awareness of USC's interests and objectives among the members of the Board of Trustees. The President will or already did talk to VPs and BoT.

President Easter also agreed that long term planning should be done. He also mentioned the less than ideal relationship between the Alumni association and the Foundation. This problem is difficult to address due to the organizational structure of both autonomous entities. President Easter also mentioned the importance of innovative coordination between community colleges and the university. For example, the President mentioned a program at UIC where members of the program advises community college students from the start of a cohort until they graduate at the campus. This particular program can be seen as mostly job-related training. The President acknowledge that the nature of the relationship between the VP of Health Affairs and the University of Illinois Hospital & Health Sciences System is a work in progress.

After these remarks, President Easter introduce Dr. William Adams as the leader of the University Administration review. This reviewing task force is divided in seven committees that are mapped out as UA's organizational chart. In the initial stages of this review, Dr. Adams visited the three Chancellors, all the reviewed members were debriefed about the nature of the process, and the members of the committees were selected.

This reviewing process should go beyond cost reduction and address organizational issues. These objectives are important since current budget practices are not sustainable and the current portfolio mix

of the different members of UA is not optimal: Size of tasks between units is different and structure and reporting lines are not consistent.

Some of the issues that are going to be investigated or proposed by this task force are:

1. Compare the percentage of the budget dedicated to UA to administration offices of other universities?
2. What is the accountability of UA units?
3. UA units should be evaluated annually by their customers.
4. Budget should be allocated based on specific justifications.
5. What are the functions and costs of each area

The reviewing process consists of the following steps:

1. Initial conversations with constituents
2. Seven committees will be formed. These committees will be led by a Dean and consist of faculty members and at-large members of UA.
3. Each committee will receive a letter of charge in the near future.
4. In approximately eight weeks each committee should have a report and recommendations.
5. UA units will be able to respond these reports.
6. Provosts will decide which recommendations go to the Chancellors.

The task force will have a website that will include all the reports.

VP Pierre informed the USC that the Institute of Government and Public Affairs is looking for a new director. One of the main challenges of the selected director is to develop a sustainable center. Although the institute is an important research center of the university, it is not easy to sustain it since it doesn't generate tuition. A search committee will be formed in the near future and it is planned to have a director in place for next summer.

Another important issue presented by VP Pierre was Academic program review. The office of the VPAA is moving slower in some issues such as academic review since its staff is very thin. Other reasons for the thoughtful pace of this review are the dynamic nature of the review and the need to get it right. The aim is to have a set of metrics or evaluative procedures that allow to determine a program's rank or efficiency on its use of resources. The metrics would be used to identify anomalous programs that might require attention. Campus should take responsibility and final decision: improve or close. This review should be seen by all programs as a resource to measure their accountability to the institution.

1:00 PM Meeting with Dr. Schook, VP of Research.

Dr. Schook spent most of the conversation with us during lunch and the meeting explaining UI Labs. This initiative responds to the vital question on how can UI connect with business and government in ways that benefit the university, business and government. The city of Chicago is a very important element of UI Labs but should not be seen as the only state player in this organization. According to Dr. Schook's vision UI Labs should be a vehicle for things that can't be done in the university. It's driven by faculty

need as well as industries needs. The structure of the organization is planned to be under 501c3 (an independent not for profit). UI Labs would have to sign an affiliation agreement that will include a renewal clause. VP Schook acknowledged that UI Labs is still an idea in flux that requires the input of all the members of the university. He understands well that this initiative needs to address all stakeholders' needs as well as to protect the academy. The plan will be presented to the BoT in its January meeting.

VP Schook also answered some questions submitted by USC. Please see attached file: SchookHandout.pdf). Regarding the question of cross-campus collaboration, VP Schook mentioned different potential cross-campus research collaboration such as UI Labs, the Cancer center, and UI Research Council.

Another question addressed by VP Schook was related to the current state of research funding of the federal government. The most current data suggests that the university's research portfolio continues its growth trend despite all kinds of challenges (such as federal funding cuts). The university federal expenditures reached $535 million dollars (UIS share was $5.39 million dollars) in FY 2011. The VP is planning a task force to investigate areas of improvement in pre and post awards processes.

The final question answered by VP Schook addressed the challenge of communicating the university's research to different constituents. He mentioned different strategies as well as praised Chicago Ideas Week (http://www.chicagoideas.com/). In this event the university was the education partner and the research done at UI was predominantly showcased.

What is the role of the senate and USC in UILabs?

2:00 PM Regular agenda

The following were the issues discussed in this part of the meeting:

1. Minutes were approved
2. A slight change of the bylaws was approved: Ex-officio membership for senate chair statement changed the word "elected" to "not a member" of USC.
   a. It was mentioned that this ex officio position does not come with voting powers.
3. Committee of presentations to the BoT (Chambers, Struble, Fisher).
   a. The committee presented a presentation proposal at the BoT meetings:
      i. The first and last one presented by the USC chair and the other four should be used by the subcommittee chairs to present pressing issues of their specific subcommittee. This proposal allows for flexibility.
4. The USC is monitoring the configuration of the VP's advisory faculty committees. Some are more developed than others.
5. Statutes revision by the Board of Trustees
   a. If possible the proposed changes will be classified in editorial vs. substantial and perhaps a middle group. This will help move faster the changes by separating problematic statutes from the ones that just needed clean up.

<div align="right">Respectfully submitted by Jorge Villegas</div>