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Executive Summary

As President Hogan's September 27, 2010 Transmittal to the University Senates Conference and his October 15, 2010 "FAQ" acknowledge, this is a challenging time for the University of Illinois. Several years of budget cuts, uncertain state funding, faculty and staff furloughs, key faculty losses, and a growing uncertainty about the future, have combined to damage the morale of faculty, students, and staff. As participants in shared governance and partners committed to protecting and serving this institution, we are prepared to have serious discussions about reorganizing, restructuring, and rethinking the University to adapt to this "new normal." But such reforms must be formulated and carried forth in a way that understands the sources of faculty, staff, and student uncertainty and concern.

We cannot accept these proposals in their current form, for three primary reasons, documented in the full response below. First, while quoting selectively from the Statutes and General Rules to support a vision of a single, unitary University of Illinois, the proposals neglect, and in important respects contravene, statutory language specifying the degree of independence that the campuses actually do have, and must have, within our system.

Second, the proposals lack sufficient detail about implementation and costs to fairly evaluate their implications for the institution. In several instances, the proposals and their rationale contain internal contradictions, further exacerbating faculty, staff, and student concerns about just what is being proposed, and why.

Third, without questioning the intentions of the Board of Trustees and President Hogan - who, we believe, certainly have the very best interests of the institution in mind in putting forth these proposals - we conclude that some of these proposals will have questionable, and in some cases harmful, effects on the quality of the campuses, and therefore also upon the University as a whole. Because we do assume the good intent of all parties concerned, we hope that raising these concerns will slow down the process of implementation, and open up a further conversation about what we are trying to accomplish and how it can be achieved more effectively.

We share nearly all the aims described in the proposals coming from President Hogan and the Board. It would be foolish to argue against the virtues of saving costs through shared services, achieving greater administrative efficiencies, and encouraging more cross-campus cooperation. Where we differ with the proposals is whether these particular changes are necessary for achieving these aims, and whether these proposed
changes entail other unintended consequences that will be harmful to the institution we all care about and support.

Finally, we must ask: If we do need, as President Hogan contends, a “cultural transformation” across the institution, is this the way to achieve it? The hurried formulation of these proposals and their presentation to governance bodies with an unrealistically short time line for deliberation; the lack of consultation in developing the proposals themselves; and the tone with which they have sometimes been presented and justified to faculty, staff, and students, have so far achieved the opposite of a “cultural transformation.” They have increased anxieties and suspicions about what is intended, and have exacerbated the very difficult morale issues that the campuses already face. More than one faculty member has cited these proposed changes as a reason for pursuing career options elsewhere, saying that this is not the university they came to work in.

A true “cultural transformation” model would take the time to engage relevant actors, explain and modify proposals in light of legitimate concerns, and pursue formal organizational changes as the last stage of implementation, not the first. We fully recognize the severity of the challenges we face and the need for prompt action, but there simply is no benefit in making even sensible changes if they are done in a counterproductive way. This is the situation in which we currently find ourselves.

We strongly encourage an expedited process to revise these proposals, clarify some of their key details, and better explain their implementation and consequences, in response to the questions and concerns raised below. These revisions and clarifications would greatly assist us in making a final recommendation on their possible merits.
Centralization/decentralization

We believe that the proposed reorganization plan is not compatible with the nature and traditions of the University of Illinois. Taken as a whole, it represents an excessive centralization of authority; it expands administrative positions and responsibilities beyond what the Statutes envision; and it threatens the quality and distinctiveness of the three campus universities.

Centralization and decentralization are equally legitimate organizational principles. Each has advantages and disadvantages. The challenge for any complex organization is to keep these imperatives in balance with each other. Yet times of difficult budgets almost always produce a response of greater centralization and consolidation, threatening the values of local control and initiative that, within the academic enterprise particularly, are essential to innovation and success.

On this issue, the Statutory model of the University of Illinois reflects a both/and philosophy. The three campus universities are both parts of a larger institutional whole, and largely self-sufficient university campuses, each with a distinct mission and role, serving broadly non-overlapping segments of the state and of our wider society and world. Each university campus has achieved distinction in its own realm; they are not simply parts of a larger whole. Administrative tendencies in the past that have pulled the centralization/decentralization balance too far in one direction, or the other, have been ultimately bad for the campuses and bad for the University as a whole. Let us not repeat that mistake.

We find that the present proposal represents an unprecedented shift of power in a centralizing direction. The argument that we should do so because it is how other universities do things does not persuade us; and in some cases the examples that have been presented of strong central offices are not schools we would recognize as peer institutions. Several universities with strong centralized functions encounter the opposite problem – that decisions are made too far away from the locus of initiative and responsibility, creating one more layer of review and actually reducing flexibility and capacity for rapid response. Let’s not merely replace one set of problems for a different set of problems. Recent experiences with Banner and the Global Campus make people across the campuses extremely leery and mistrustful about the next wave of UA expansion.

There are several alternative models in this regard, including ones that delegate greater autonomy to the campuses: the University of California system, for example. The fact that UC schools are outperforming the University of Illinois in the US News rankings right now, despite even more severe state funding problems, suggests that we ought to at least be considering the virtues of greater decentralization rather than greater centralization. Decentralization could also significantly reduce administrative costs, but in ways that bolster campus morale and lead to greater productivity.

“One University”
We believe that the proposed changes overemphasize the language in the Statutes and General Rules that talks about the University of Illinois as an “organic whole,” and underemphasize the important degree of independence that the campuses do have. The FAQ (p. 5) says that “the General Rules state that the campuses are not independent and autonomous,” when what the Rules actually say is that the campuses are not “totally independent” – a crucial difference, implying that the campuses are in fact independent to a significant degree. The campuses have a “high degree of delegated authority” over their affairs, the Rules also state. The central question, therefore, which is a management issue rather than a statutory one, is how much independence and autonomy the campuses need to have in order to maintain their quality and distinct missions. That is the issue we ought to be addressing.

In our system, the university campuses are both parts of an institutional whole and largely self-sufficient institutions unto themselves. The Transmittal and FAQ use the pejorative metaphor of the silo to characterize this conception of the campuses, but in fact the current model has served Urbana, Chicago, and Springfield extremely well over the years, allowing each to achieve national recognition as a distinct type of university campus. Nothing should be done that would jeopardize what the three campuses have accomplished. Unfortunately, while we do not believe it is intended, the proposed changes would do just that.

It is true that the three campus universities have not collaborated in some areas where there are real opportunities for doing so. There are indeed synergies and efficiencies yet to be pursued. And if there are barriers to accomplishing this, whether they be barriers of policy or tradition – they should be identified and changed, in a manner that respects campus prerogatives, rather than through a process of top-down direction.

This is one area in which mixed messages have increased confusion about what is intended. In response to a student question about the value of a UIUC degree, the FAQ (p. 10) states, “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’).” This is, in fact, not true; each diploma refers to the recommendation from the Senate of the individual campus and bears the signature of the campus Chancellor. Furthermore, the FAQ adds that a “University of Illinois degree is of value because it reflects the greatness of the whole University.” This is also wrong. No student chooses a University of Illinois campus because of the greatness of the whole; they come to a campus because of the distinct qualities and reputation of that campus. This is even more true for faculty. The comments cited reflect a fundamental misunderstanding of what makes this institution great: it is great because of its individual parts, not because of an abstract whole of which the campuses are merely parts.

President Hogan, in comments to the Senate at UIUC, said that the proposals are not intended to promote homogenization across the campuses. Yet the FAQ states, for example (p. 4): “On-line and blended learning provides another example where each campus seeks to reinvent the wheel, when a successful model already exists.” The reference to “a successful model” (emphasis added) strongly suggests that the campuses are expected to converge around a single model. We just had that argument, with Global Campus, and we do not need to have it again.
President Hogan has expressed concern about the falling rankings of the Urbana campus in the US News rankings; but it is far from clear how the proposed changes would improve those rankings, for any of the campuses. In fact, if it were true that there were only one UI degree; and if there were greater transferability and cross-campus consolidation in academic processes and activities, the logical consequence would be that we become simply one institution from the standpoint of US News rankings. Would that help or hurt the ranking of the new “whole”? This question has never been engaged.

President Hogan has said that there should be only one email and web domain name. He has repeatedly spoken of “one university,” and the Transmittal (p. 2) refers to the impact of distance learning and high speed rail as creating, in effect, a single institution with real and virtual commuter campuses. Yet President Hogan also displays, on his web site, a Strategic Plan that emphasizes UIUC as “the nation’s preeminent research university,” UIC as “the nation’s premier urban public research university,” and UIS as “one of the nation’s top five small, public, liberal arts universities.” Even apart from the designation of these three as “universities,” and not only campuses within a single larger university, these statements express confusing and mixed messages.

While it is certainly true that there is no contradiction between distinct identities and excellence across the three university campuses and greater collaboration and interaction among them, there is a contradiction between the strongly integrative vision of the university as a single “organic whole” presented in some of these proposals and a vision that accords with three premier campus universities maintaining distinct brands and identities. We believe that the commitment to maintaining the distinct identities and excellence of the three university campuses must be prioritized above the discourse of “one university.”

This is probably the area that is causing the greatest consternation among faculty, staff, and students. Here is the crucial fact: the faculty and students who have come to each of these three campus universities did so not because of the identity or quality of some larger “organic whole.” They came to each university campus because of its distinctive strengths and reputation. They see themselves within a distinct tradition of excellence, not just as pieces of a whole that is “greater than the sum of its parts.” And many of them see these changes as fundamentally threatening the quality and distinctness of the campus of which they feel part.

As we have emphasized here, it is not necessary to implement a strongly integrative “one university” vision to promote efforts of synergy and collaboration that truly could lift all boats. Nor are most of the proposed changes to the Statutes and General Rules necessary for this to happen.

The Chancellors as Vice Presidents

The proposal to retitle the Chancellors as Vice Presidents was considered and rejected by the Administrative Review and Restructuring (ARR) committee. We believe that was the right
decision, and we are dismayed that a proposal that has been a longstanding point of contention between the campuses and the university administration has nevertheless arisen yet again.

In many ways, the role of the Chancellor is the nexus of the “both/and” character of the campuses. In the same way that campuses, in our Statutes and General Rules, are both independent, to a significant degree, and parts of a common whole, the Chancellors are both the leaders of their campuses and members of a university-wide team. Again, there is no need to change the Statutes or General Rules to establish this point.

Specifically, according to the Statutes, the Chancellors are the CEO’s, chief executive officers, of their campuses, in the same way that the President is the CEO for the institution as a whole. In other words, their roles are parallel in terms of respective power and authority. While the Transmittal speaks of “empowering” the Chancellors, it defines this empowerment in terms of “managing” their campuses while reporting to the President. The result is a negation of the executive powers granted by the Statutes to the Chancellors, and a diminution of their leadership authority. We need a system that has room for a strong President and strong Chancellors.

The Transmittal and FAQ both assert that the President is the President of the University and the President of each of its campuses. This language occurs nowhere in the Statutes or General Rules, and in our view it goes substantially beyond what they authorize, and beyond what is good for the campuses. The Chancellors already are part of the President’s cabinet and work “under the direction of the President,” according to the Statutes; they already have a defined role to serve the interests of the institution as a whole as well as the interests of their campus. We see no reason for further changes, except that making them VP’s subordinates them to being merely “managers of their campuses” and “advisors to the President” (who is supposedly the actual head of their campuses). We believe that this change is outside the spirit of the Statutes and General Rules, and would be deleterious to our capacity to recruit and retain top Chancellor candidates who are attracted by the prospect of leading one of the “nation’s premier . . .” university campuses, not to working as a staffer under the President’s supervision.

In truth, there is no way that a President can be, in any substantive way, the actual President of three distinct and diverse campuses. He/she cannot be familiar enough with their inner workings, their staff, their personalities, their traditions, their locations and settings, and their needs to lead them all effectively. Conversely, the campuses need strong leaders, and not just “managers” – a point that the statutory title “CEO” for the Chancellor is meant to express.

Finally, the proposal to add the title of “Vice President” to the Chancellor’s title creates a serious ambiguity over the appropriate search procedures for new Chancellors, since the Statutes describe two different processes for Vice President and Chancellor searches. We strongly insist that the process described in the Statutes for Chancellor searches be followed.

“Chain of command”
A phrase that is repeated without comment or explanation in the current discussion, and which again has no basis in the Statutes or General Rules, is “chain of command.” We believe that this reflects a view of governance that departs from the traditional roles of President and Chancellor in our system.

The FAQ (p. 6) document says, in response to a faculty question about the chancellor proposal, “This is not more ‘top-down.’ . . . It proposes to more clearly delineate the chain-of-command always envisioned in the Statutes and the General Rules.” This response asserts that the Statutes are built upon a strictly hierarchical vision of the University and the campuses, an interpretation with which we vehemently disagree. Neither the Transmittal nor the FAQ offer any attempt to support this interpretation with argument. The phrase “chain of command” clearly does assume a model of “top down” authority, one that the Statutes do not support.

While there have been failures on the part of some previous Presidents and Chancellors to develop an effective, collaborative working relationship, in which they both understand and respect the distinct responsibilities and scope of authority of one another, the present proposal constitutes a pendulum swing too far in the other direction. Any system that has strong Chancellors and a strong President, as ours must, is going to have to struggle with that tension. But it is a tension resolved by hiring people who can and will work together, not by creating a structural subordination that diminishes the role of the Chancellor and reduces his/her authority to lead.

An alternative reading of the Statutes and General Rules plausibly inverts this relationship, emphasizing that the role of UA is to act in support of the campuses and to take on only those responsibilities that the campuses cannot handle as effectively or efficiently themselves, or where a single office or point of contact establishes cross-campus efficiencies that truly do benefit all. Otherwise the campuses should be largely self-determining.

Would a strong chain of command model be better for this university? While it may be an effective model at some other universities, we have yet to hear arguments for why it would be the best model for the University of Illinois. And there are many reasons to think it would not. A successful knowledge enterprise requires a high level of buy-in in the enterprise goals. There is a high risk that the current hurried process for changing the Statutes and Rules of Operations will do more to alienate the university community than gain their trust. In many commercial knowledge enterprises, flexible, flat management structures, free flow of information, extensive networking and distributed decision-making are increasingly replacing rigid hierarchical structures with clear chains of command.

For all the reasons we have cited so far, we believe that a strict top-down management model goes beyond the language of the Statutes and would be severely detrimental to the vitality and quality of the university campuses - and therefore for the University as a whole.

Vice President for Academic Affairs
While there are no formal changes proposed for this office that require amendments to the Statutes or General Rules, we believe that the language of the Transmittal and FAQ portend a significant expansion of this office’s duties. In light of the discussion of “one university,” expressions such as “coordination of faculty policies, coordination of curricula across campuses, coordination of articulation agreements,” and so on, have raised faculty concerns about consolidation, integration, and homogenization.

As we have said repeatedly, there is a significant unfulfilled potential for greater cross-campus collaboration in academic areas. The question is why this potential has not yet been fulfilled. Vision A is one that sees the campuses as “silos,” “denigrating” one another and avoiding collaborative initiatives that need to be led and if necessary driven from above. Vision B is one that sees that there is collaboration happening, and that there could be much more, but considers that collaboration must occur because of opportunities emerging out of “bottom-up” initiatives, not out of command-driven imperatives.

It is difficult to be specific about this because the comments about the VPAA position have been oblique. But combined with the proposal to establish a university-level Executive Director of Enrollment, and disparate comments about one common degree, increased articulation and transferability between campuses, and cross-campus mobility that will make courses and instructors portable, the vision behind the proposal seems to be one of increasing integration around a single unified instructional program. We see this model as a radical transformation of the university, one that needs much more careful thought, and public deliberation, than it has received so far. It certainly cannot be established by fiat.

Similarly, we hear talk about cross-campus “redundancies” and the need to reduce or consolidate duplicative academic units and programs. President Hogan has said that this is not being currently contemplated, but here again mixed messages have been increasing (rather than assuaging) faculty concerns across the campuses. Saying that something is not being currently contemplated raises the specter that it might well be seriously considered in the (near) future. After all, if we truly were one university in the strong integrative sense sometimes expressed, with distance learning and high speed rail connecting the campuses, why would we need separate colleges and departments across all of them? At a session with the UIUC Senate on October 18, President Hogan said that of course the campuses would each need to offer a complete curriculum at the undergraduate level; but he conspicuously did not make the same assertion about graduate and professional programs. In the present climate, and in the context of other comments, such silence is deafening.

**Vice President of Research**

*If the University were to add a UA-level coordinator of research, it might be more sensible to envision a Vice President of Research, whose portfolio could include technology transfer and economic development, rather than just adding “Research” to the current VP’s title. The joint title “Vice President of Research, Technology, and Economic Development” implies that only*
research relevant to technology transfer and economic development would be prioritized. Yet research at this university is much broader than that, and this needs to be captured in the title and job description. We believe that too many issues connected with the proposal to change this position are still unclear, and so we cannot support it.

First, there is no indication in any of the documentation or even in the President’s public statements that the campus Vice Chancellors for Research played a role in the formulation of this proposal. Indeed, there is no indication that their advice was even sought. Since in any conceivable model, collaboration between university and campus administrators would be essential, we find this omission, if true, disturbing. Here again it appears as if centralization and a top-down command model is being adopted for its own sake, or because “other universities do it this way.” The fact is, some do and some do not: at many leading research universities, for example, the President is the leading spokesperson and advocate for the research mission.

The desire to create a “central unified voice for research” may or may not be beneficial for the university as a whole. Would this person become the primary or sole representative interacting with government agencies, corporate sponsors, and other funding sources? How much latitude would campus VCR’s have to pursue independent initiatives, and how would this VPR interact with them? Here, as in so many other areas of the proposal, the suggested implication is that a single university-level administrator needs to set policies and priorities for the campuses.

The FAQ states that important research opportunities are being missed because of a lack of cross-campus collaboration. Yet while greater collaboration is certainly a good thing, it encounters the same top-down versus bottom-up question as we described in the context of academic collaboration generally. Would two campus units be required to submit a joint proposal for a grant, rather than submitting separate “competing” proposals? Who would decide that? The Transmittal document talks about avoiding “harmful competition,” but sometimes competition is beneficial. Will requiring one campus unit to involve researchers from another UI campus actually weaken some proposals? Will units be expected to collaborate internally within the university instead of identifying external partners from other universities who might offer more to strengthen the overall proposal and improve its prospects for funding? All of these questions are raised by this proposal, but not examined, and need to be answered before this proposal can be properly considered.

If there are barriers to effective, voluntary collaboration within the university, we should eliminate them; that is arguably a legitimate UA function. But defining research priorities and promoting collaboration must reside closer to the areas of expertise where scholars know the opportunities and the problems to be investigated. The fact is that many potential funders prefer to deal with the campuses directly because of the specific strengths they see there. Will this be prohibited in the future?

Intellectual property is a key issue in this discussion. We have some experience with trying to centralize research efforts and IP with the current Office of Technology Management. There is widespread skepticism among researchers about what “value
added” is provided by this office, rather than working through their own Vice Chancellors for Research.

Then there is the question of funding. The FAQ says that this new position will generate so much new research that it will “more than cover its costs.” This is an encouraging slogan, though it is short on specifics. Would ICR flow through this office? Specifically, would a greater percentage of ICR be held at the university level, to fund this office and its initiatives, rather than being held at the campus levels where the research is being done? By what other mechanisms would this office pay for itself?

Vice President for Health Affairs

Given that this new vice president position would manage a very large and important part of the university portfolio, it is very surprising that the materials provided tell us so little about the position, its powers, and how it will be paid for. It is widely rumored that the decision has already been made to promote the Dean of the College of Medicine at UIC to this position. As in other aspects of this proposal, crucial details are simply not provided – whether because they haven’t been fully thought through, or because disclosing them would exacerbate criticism and opposition, we do not know. But we do know that decisions of this magnitude and consequence require much more extensive and thorough justification and discussion.

It is important to note that the ARR report did not recommend the creation of this vice president position. We share the sense of the authors of the ARR report that health affairs, and a greater coordination of efforts across the campuses, constitutes a major area of opportunity, especially in integration with research capacities in the basic sciences. Yet it is important to point out that the colleges of medicine are not always the hubs around which such collaboration occurs. And such collaboration, particularly between UIC and UIUC, is already happening. Hence it is not clear what problem this reform is meant to address, nor whether this is the right way to address it.

Given the stated goal of achieving “greater integration with the academic and research missions of the health science colleges and schools,” it is not clear how pulling clinical practices out of the campuses would promote “greater integration.” The proposal that the Dean of the UIC College of Medicine (if he is the person chosen) have a “solid” reporting line to the President and a “dotted” reporting line to the UIC Chancellor creates just the kind of “chain of command” ambiguities that the reports elsewhere seek to avoid. In this model, would the Dean of Medicine (if he is the new VP) be situated above the UIC Chancellor, be co-equal to her, or continue to act as a Dean under her authority? What does the “dotted line” relationship actually entail? (In many contexts “dotted line reporting” requires only that one inform someone about what they are doing.)

Would this proposal pull the hospital and attendant activities out of the UIC budget, and if so what would this do to the rest of the campus? Would its revenues now flow to UA, along with ICR from the projects it sponsors? Here again we encounter the phrase that the VPHD would “more than pay for itself.” By what mechanisms would it do so? And what would be the costs of setting this up as a new UA unit?
Two New Executive Directors

While we are told repeatedly that the proposals only create one new university-level position, there is in fact also a proposal to create two Executive Directors, for Enrollment Management and for Human Resources. These would achieve, presumably, the kind of cost savings through consolidating “back office operations” that the ARR report calls for. And this may be so. But what we have not had explained is how centralizing these functions might impede or replace campus operations in these areas, or – more significantly – how we might anticipate other policy changes (such as unified applications and admissions, common enrollment, articulation and transfer processes across the campuses) that are substantive and not only cost-related in their effects.

Provosts

The proposal to replace “Provost” with “Provost or equivalent officer” is nowhere explained in the Transmittal. It is widely believed that this change is preparatory to eventually eliminating the Provost position or merging it with another office, but this proposal has never been formally put forth or debated. Without such a debate, this proposal is unmotivated and unexplained, and hence unnecessary.

Giving the Chancellors budgetary authority and emphasizing their role in “managing” their campuses internally is, in effect, achieving the outcome of merging the Chancellor and Provost roles, without saying so. While giving the Chancellor budgetary authority is, in this narrow sense, “empowering” them – and while this may or may not be the right thing to do – the increased workload and responsibilities placed upon them would likely make it harder for them to carry out some of the traditional activities they have played in representing their campuses externally. This would clearly be detrimental to the leadership role of the Chancellor.

Moreover, eliminating this position, if it were to be made a recommendation, would make us an anomaly among AAU universities.

Nor is it apparent to us that the configuration of the Chancellor/Provost relationship needs to be exactly the same for all three campuses. What should be indisputable is that the proper model for governing the campuses, whatever it is, is a central campus responsibility, and that any decision regarding a change to the Provost role must be made at the campus level. Until those decisions are made, however, we see no justification for this proposed amendment to the General Rules.

Cost

The ARR Working Group, whose recommendations triggered some of the proposals being considered here, was established to find ways to promote cost savings through efficiencies and shared services. We are very concerned that purported “cost cutting” is being used as an opportunity to implement a sweeping centralization and shift of administrative power within the university, without due consideration on its merits.
The proposed changes are continually justified in terms of cost savings, but curiously the supporting documents offer no detail about their costs, let alone hypothetical future savings. These proposals involve creating one new VP and two new Executive Directors, while conducting national searches for, and expanding the operations of, two other VPs. What would this cost in terms of salaries for the four or five positions being filled? If other recent UA hires are any indication, the salaries for these positions would be set at levels well above current levels. What would be the size and costs of office staff needed to take on the new duties entailed by these new positions and/or their added responsibilities? What accommodations would need to be made to provide office space for these new administrative officers and their staff? How will these changes be achieved on top of the Board of Trustees' demand to see a reduction of 5-10% in administrative costs? We are not told.

Instead, we are told that key positions will “more than pay for themselves” in the long run; or will be paid for by cuts (at the campus level) of unspecified size or consequences to campus operations. This lack of specificity for a proposal of this magnitude and consequence is inexplicable. We are being asked to provide our advice on a plan to spend unspecified but considerable amounts of money up front, with no indication of where the initial funding would come from. Questions about how these changes will be funded in the long term are met only with assurances that new revenues and unspecified cuts further down the road will make up for these expenses.

We do know, however, that the ARR recommended reducing the number of VP’s and cutting UA administrative expenses. These proposals, taken all together, do exactly the opposite.

At the Urbana Senate meeting on October 18, President Hogan alluded to a possible $300 million reduction in General Revenue Funds from the state over the next two years. If that were to transpire, campuses would be subject to even more severe cuts, over and above the cuts needed to fund this proposed expansion of UA and to meet the Board’s target goals. Hence any putative savings would immediately go toward covering the shortfall in GRF. In short, it appears that there will be no savings, and none of the attendant benefits of reallocating the money “saved” through administrative cuts to other urgent needs (such as faculty salaries or increased financial aid).

If such massive reductions to GRF do occur, and if the vision presented in these proposals is implemented, then it appears that the costs of UA administration will have to be taken off the top of GRF funds, reducing even further the amount of GRF available to the campuses.

Conclusion

We share the broad goals outlined in these documents: to seek new efficiencies, to streamline administration, to encourage connection and collaboration across the campuses, and to help promote better coordination and shared ownership around a common mission for the university. The challenge is to do these in ways that are compatible with maintaining the excellence and distinctiveness of the three university campuses.
We do not think that these proposals, presented as a package and judged overall, maintain this balance adequately. On the contrary, we believe they would be counterproductive, reducing the flexibility and discretion of the campuses to seek excellence, each in its own way.

Beyond this, we believe that the way in which these proposals have been rolled out and justified to the campuses has exacerbated uncertainty, anxiety and a loss of morale at what is already a very vulnerable time. The diverse sorts of excellence and ambitions of the campuses might have been presented as a plus; instead they are called “silos.” Chancellors might have been championed as strong leaders and advocates for their campuses; instead they are portrayed as obstructive influences who need to be brought to heel under a top-down chain of command. The diversity and independence of the three campuses might be defended as one of the strengths of this university, over many years; instead, we are presented with a vision of “one university” that claims to preserve their distinct characters but which in its particulars undermines them.

The lack of detail, lack of explanation and rationale, lack of time for a deliberative consultative process, and lack of information on financial matters, all signify to us a proposal that is too rushed, insufficiently considered and discussed, and therefore underdeveloped. The proposal recommends implementing major organizational changes to drive a “cultural transformation,” when all the literature on organizational change says to do the very opposite.

We are not saying no to any changes, or even to some of these changes, developed and implemented in a different way. But we are saying no to them in this form and at this time. We believe truly and with good reasons that they will do harm to this institution, and to the campuses, at a time when external forces are already working to their detriment. We strongly encourage a process of revision and clarification, addressing the issues outlined in this response, which would facilitate a final recommendation on the possible merits of the proposals.