Executive Summary

This committee was charged with exploring the possibility of structural or organizational changes with regard to four academic units with under 40 faculty members, “to realize budgetary savings” while “preserving and even enhancing the intellectual and academic mission of the units.”

Our charge did not include an evaluation of the academic strength or necessity of these units, nor did it include any consideration for discontinuing academic programs.

We met regularly as a committee to discuss our charge, methodology, findings, documents, and factors universally impacting the four units. We divided into four subcommittees (one for each unit under our charge) whose members studied relevant documents; interviewed unit leadership, executive committees, key personnel, and stakeholders; and assessed the competitive and professional environments in which specific units operate.

We did not find empirical evidence that confirmed the intuition that there would be significant administrative efficiencies from consolidation or merger among these four units. In addition, for some of the units, there could be significant harm to their program quality, professional identities, and competitive standing if consolidation or merger resulted from anything other than “bottom-up,” in-depth planning and examination of intellectual and academic synergies from among faculty.

Following our methodology of weighing potential risks with potential benefits, we did not find evidence that the benefits or rewards from consolidation among the four units or some subset of them would clearly exceed the present costs or risks.

The committee found that questions of possible mergers and consolidations for reasons of intellectual alignment are entirely valid, even important, to consider for these and a much broader group of academic units on campus; however, the impetus for such alignments should stem from the University’s mission and strategic plan.

Our committee identified several steps for effectively considering questions of consolidation and merger in the future, and we provide those within this report.
I. Introduction

On March 5, 2010, Interim Chancellor and Provost Robert Easter, Interim Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs Richard Wheeler, and Dean of the Graduate College Debasish Dutta appointed a committee (our names are included at the end of this report) to advise them on matters pertaining to four academic units — the College of Media, the Graduate School of Library and Information Science (GSLIS), the School of Labor and Employment Relations (LER), and the School of Social Work (SW). Our charge letter identified these four units as “independent schools and colleges with fewer than 40 faculty members: the Graduate School of Library and Information Science [has] 23.5 tenure system FTE faculty, the School of Labor and Employment Relations [has] 15.5 FTE faculty, the College of Media [has] 30 FTE faculty, and the School of Social Work [has] 18.5 FTE faculty” and 4.0 FTE clinical faculty. The letter charged our committee with exploring the possibility of structural or organizational changes “to realize budgetary savings” while “preserving and even enhancing the intellectual and academic mission of the units.”

In order to explore this issue, the committee engaged in several activities. First, we held several meetings to clarify and better understand our charge. These included a meeting with Interim Vice Chancellor Wheeler and Graduate College Dean Dutta and meetings with campus budget officials. Second, the committee reviewed various documents supplied by the Provost’s office concerning the budget and structure of these units. Third, the committee sought to better understand academic restructuring processes. For this purpose, we read several pertinent research articles, which we reference later in this report. Fourth, we broke into four subcommittees, each of which focused on one of the four academic units. These subcommittees gathered information from the units through interviews with the Deans, faculty and staff members, and other stakeholders of these units, and through review of documents supplied by the units. Fifth, the committee reviewed budgetary analyses that compared costs and outputs of various different units on campus. Sixth, the committee met with an outside advisory committee, who provided perspective from their experiences with other academic institutions.

We are grateful to the administrators, faculty, and constituents of the four units reviewed for their earnest conversations and correspondence that helped us to understand their academic goals, their administrative structure, and their ways of connecting the two. Each of these units shared with us detailed plans for responding to current budget challenges while still maintaining the quality of their programs.

There are several steps this committee identified as being beyond its charge, and beyond what could be accomplished through this type of review. First, we did not attempt to evaluate the academic merits of the units or gauge their importance to the University. We deemed such an evaluation to be beyond our scope. Certainly there is evidence that each of these units has a distinguished history and a strong national reputation in its field or fields. However, without specific expertise in each of these areas, the committee felt it could not measure the relative merit of these units with regard to their peers or with regard to other units on campus.

Second, we were guided by the specific questions in our charge letter, which asked us to consider intellectual synergies, unique elements of the four small colleges and schools, and potential loss of value if these units were consolidated (with each other or with other units). In the ab-
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1 The appendix lists the people whom each of our study teams interviewed and the various documents that we read and discussed.
sence of a consensus about the accuracy of the financial metrics provided by the administration and in the face of many competing interpretations of efficiency and productivity, the committee felt that it could not make specific determinations about the efficiency of these units. Thus, in discussing the potential financial benefits of consolidations, we adopted a risk-reward framework.

The report is organized as follows. In the following section we explain the financial background of our inquiry and the academic context within which we conducted that investigation. In Section III we address the specific questions put to us in our charge letter and present some conclusions. In Section IV we outline some additional, general questions that we believe any inquiry into consolidation and merger in an academic setting ought to answer. We also propose some additional steps that we believe should be taken in order to go beyond the explicit charge given to this committee but get to some of the broader questions that motivated this inquiry.

II. The Financial and Academic Context of the Problem

The dire financial situation of the State of Illinois and the University presents problems for the campus that go well beyond the expedient of cutting expenses by a fixed amount for a year or two. The situation of the last decade – in which a significant portion of University operating expenses can no longer be covered by state funds but must be covered by tuition and other sources of revenue – has placed the University in a difficult situation and represents a dramatic change in the relationship between the University and the State of Illinois. Specifically, the State’s operating budget includes a structural deficit of approximately $7 billion to $10 billion, and the State’s commitment of general revenue funds (GRFs) to the University is expected to decrease in coming years. As a result, the University administration has taken bold action in anticipation of expected reductions in State support.

A. The Financial Context

Like other units on campus, these four units are absorbing FY11 reductions in GRFs through two voluntary separation programs (VSIP/VRP) and non-reappointment of faculty and staff. The units are also exploring ways to increase tuition revenue through limiting tuition waivers for master’s and PhD students, expanding class sizes, and increasing enrollments in tuition generating online and master’s programs. Finally, the units are exploring other possible revenue generation or cost savings through sharing such activities as online education, budgetary services, personnel services, and external grants and contracts.

For example, LER has planned for a reduction in its use of GRFs through direct budget cuts — for example, nonreplacement of some faculty and staff who are leaving (for retirements or other reasons) and greater tuition revenue through the tuition differential, reduced tuition waivers, summer school offerings, and offering online continuing education courses.

Social Work also has planned for reductions in GRFs through holding administrative and faculty positions open. In addition, Social Work, as part of their revenue generation plan, will begin an undergraduate major in the fall of 2010 with significant recruitment from community college “pre social work” programs. SW has also sought to reduce reliance on GRFs by increasing external funding and hence faculty buy-outs. In 2009, the sponsored research expenditure per tenure track FTE for SW was $216,000.00, second only to the College of Engineering ($344,000.00 per FTE).

GSLIS is planning for a reduction in GRFs for the next fiscal years (through faculty and staff reductions through voluntary retirement and separation) and seeks to increase revenues through
larger enrollments in its online master’s program, and through the introduction of an undergraduate major.

In addition to a $500,000 savings from reorganization under the VSIP/VRP programs, the College of Media has developed a short-term plan with 11 points for raising tuition income through larger classes, differential tuition, certification programs, and increased out-of-state enrollment.

B. The Academic Context

The context for the problem is larger than financial constraints. Budget realities need coupling with academic goals. Although progress has been made in the past decade, financial and academic functions of a university traditionally have been addressed in separate arenas of decision-making. Because of this chronic disconnect, many institutions of higher learning are struggling to negotiate a balance within their broad array of goals and their financial and administrative structure. This often results in these institutions evolving in ways that accumulate administrative structures rather than integrate, share, or seek synergies.

Healthy institutions of higher learning are ones in which academic goals and administrative structures co-evolve. Making the connection between academic and administrative functions creates not just a leaner institution, it also creates a distinctly different institution – one more flexible, more able to focus investments, and simpler in its organization. The charge of this committee is not one that explores the singular theme of “doing more with less.” Rather, of necessity, this committee was charged to consider the issues of the University’s teaching, scholarship, and public service missions.

Clarifying goals and setting academic priorities facilitate decision-making. Without a shared vision and clear understanding of institutional purpose, re-structuring becomes dominated by a language of technical efficiency. However, demands for greater efficiency without concomitant discussion of goals are often received by stakeholders as threats to academic identity and scholarly legitimacy, resulting in such unintentional by-products of re-structuring processes as
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5 Gumport & Pusser, supra n. 3.


discontinuity, disorder, and distraction.\textsuperscript{9} We recognize the broad array of competing academic goals that have emerged in the past decade, and our investigations into these four units provided insight on the importance of clarity of goals and academic priorities of the university.

The charge of our committee led us to explore connections between academic goals and administrative structure (about which we are more explicit in the following section). Our findings reflect the state-of-the-practice of connections between administrative structures and academic goals at the University of Illinois. Framed in terms of rewards and risks, the rewards generally were reported as intellectual synergies, cost savings, or expense reductions. Risks were often characterized as loss of income, or detractors from identity, prestige, and academic and professional legitimacy.

III. Consolidation and Merger of These Four Units

This section addresses the central questions that were contained in our charge letter. We recognize that these are important questions that have a larger context within this University. We, therefore, endeavored to answer all those questions as completely as possible given the time and information constraints under which we worked. We also found evidence of issues that require a broader outlook and further consideration. That larger context is addressed in Section IV, where we suggest some additional questions regarding consolidation and merger of academic units.

A. Our Approach: Risk vs. Reward

In this brief section we outline the approach or methodology that we adopted to evaluate the information that we gathered. We believe that the most sensible manner in which to approach the questions raised in our charge letter was through a risk-reward analysis. Indeed, we believe that in its articulation of the questions that we should answer, the charge letter required us to follow that approach. Thus, we tried to calculate the rewards that could come from administrative restructuring and to set those against the risks that such restructuring carried.

Relatively late in our process, we were able to discuss our work up to that point with an external advisory team. This team included: Larry Faulkner, former Dean of the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences and Provost at UIUC, former President of the University of Texas-Austin, and current President of the Houston Endowment; Professor Edie Goldenberg, former Dean of the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences at the University of Michigan, and Professor of Political Science and Public Policy at the Gerald R. Ford School of Public Policy at the University of Michigan; and Jane Donaldson, graduate of the College of Media, co-founder of Phillips Oppenheim (a nonprofit executive search firm), and incoming head of the University of Illinois Foundation Board. The external committee met with Interim Chancellor Easter, Interim Vice Chancellor Wheeler, and Dean Dutta, with heads of the four units we were reviewing, and with our entire committee. Our frank discussion with the external committee helped us to clarify our analysis and, most importantly for us, they encouraged our choice of methods of inquiry and helped us to focus and reexamine the tentative conclusions that we had reached at the time.

B. The Questions Posed to the Committee

We organize this section so as to address the particular questions posed to the committee in the charge letter.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How were the units established and were there specific objectives identified by statute or Board of Trustees action that require consideration?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

We consulted Board of Trustees minutes and documents from the *University of Illinois Archives* to investigate this question. Those documents demonstrate that the creation and evolution of the College of Media, Graduate School of Library and Information Science, and the School of Social Work were accomplished by standard Board of Trustees transactions without specific objectives identified by statute that would require consideration before alternative organizational structures are explored. The School of Labor and Employment Relations was established by statute as noted shortly.

**College of Media**

With the changing of the status of the School of Journalism and Communications in 1957 to the College of Journalism and Communication, the office of the Dean of the College was formed. In 1968, the college changed its name to the College of Communications. In 2008, the college changed its name to the College of Media. The dean is the chief executive officer of the college, responsible to the President for its administration. He is the agent of the college faculty for the execution of the college education policy. Other duties of the dean include calling and presiding over faculty meetings; making appointments, reappointments, or promotions of the faculty; overseeing registration of the students and serving as the medium of communication for official business of the college with campus authorities, students, and the public.

The College of Media houses academic and professional education units offering three bachelor of science programs (advertising, journalism, media and cinema studies), two master’s programs (advertising and journalism), and one doctoral program (communication & media); one research institute; and Illinois Public Media. Instruction in journalism and advertising began in 1902 in the Department of English. In 1927 Governor Len Small signed into law a bill calling for the formation of a “college of journalism.” The resulting school, which included advertising instruction, opened the same year. The Department of Journalism was founded in 1945, and the first Department of Advertising at a U.S. university was founded at Illinois in 1959. In 1947 the Institute of Communications Research was founded, housing the first doctoral programs in communications in the country. WILL (then known as WRM) pioneered public broadcasting with the launch of the first public AM radio station in 1922. Public broadcasting has been associated with the College of Media since 1949. Currently Illinois Public Media houses FM and AM radio stations, TV stations, and online streaming. More recently, the Department of Media and Cinema Studies was created in 2009 as a merger between Media Studies faculty housed in the ICR and the Unit for Cinema Studies in the College of LAS. Agricultural Communication
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10 Board of Trustees Transactions, 49th Report, June 20, 1957, p. 435.
11 Board of Trustees Transactions, 54th Report, January 17, 1968, p. 875.
12 Board of Trustees Agenda Items, March 26, 2008.
moved into the College of Media from Agricultural, Consumer, and Environmental Sciences in 2009.

Graduate School of Library and Information Science

The Library School of the University of Illinois was founded in September 1893 as the School of Library Economy, and was housed at the Armour Institute in Chicago. In September 1897 the School was moved to the University of Illinois. In December 1902, degrees of Bachelor of Arts in Library Science and Bachelor of Library Science were approved. The bachelor’s degree program was discontinued in 1951. The Ph.D. program in Library Science (and later, Library and information Science) was established at GSLIS in 1948 and is the oldest extant Ph.D. program in this discipline in the United States. In 1950 the Library School was placed under the Dean of the Division of Communications but regained its independent status in 1954. As of September 1, 1971, the School, which was responsible to the Dean of Library Administration, began reporting directly to the Chancellor. In 1962 the Advisory Council of Librarians was created, composed of leading librarians in the state, representing each of the major types of libraries. The name of the School was changed in 1959 to the Graduate School of Library Science. In 1981, the name was changed again to the Graduate School of Library and Information Science. School goals are to prepare librarians and information scientists for professional work through essential basic studies and specialization by course choices and independent studies; to promote and conduct pure and applied research; and to provide public service such as continuing education, publications, and consulting. GSLIS is also a member of a growing international consortium of iSchools.

School of Social Work

In 1944, the University established a graduate curriculum for professional training in social work as part of the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences. In 1946, the Trustees transferred the program to the newly established Division of Social Welfare Administration, to be administered as part of the Graduate School, and the two-year degree was accredited by the American Asso-
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ciation of Schools of Social Work (now the Council on Social Work Education). In January 1949, the Division achieved independent status. Its name was changed to the School of Social Work in 1951. During the following year, permanent offices for the School were established at 1204 West Oregon Street, Urbana. In 1961, the School was renamed the Jane Addams Graduate School of Social Work in honor of the early Illinois social worker. Under a May 20, 1970, reorganization, the Chicago program, originally part of the Urbana campus, became a separate school affiliated with the Chicago Circle campuses. The two schools had a single director who reported to both chancellors, and both schools had the same executive committee. The director had an associate director on each campus. The undergraduate BSW major became part of the School in 1972 and accredited by the Council on Social Work Education in 1974. That undergraduate program was closed in 1996 because of budget concerns. In 1970 the doctorate program was approved with its center to be in Urbana-Champaign. The Master’s degree in social work has five specializations: children, youth, and families; health; mental health; school social work; and advocacy, leadership, and social change. The School has taught an off-campus MSW program since 1970 in underserved communities around the state. This program continues to meet the needs for MSWs in small communities and rural areas and is a source of revenue. The School has had an important partnership with the Illinois Department of Children and Family Services for many years; that partnership led to the creation of the School’s Children and Family Research Center in 1996.

The name of Jane Addams was dropped from the C-U campus but retained in the Chicago Circle School of Social Work (Campus Report Vol. 9, No. 3, Nov. 1975, p. 3). Social work is a profession, not a discipline, and the School of Social Work prepares professional social workers for positions throughout the State of Illinois, particularly in rural and other underserved communities.

School of Labor and Employment Relations

The School of Labor and Employment Relations (originally the Institute for Labor Relations) was established through a state appropriation in 1945, as described in the March 9, 1946, BOT minutes, with specific objectives articulated. Those objectives should be considered but do not necessarily preclude the adoption of an alternative organizational structure.

The School, as originally chartered, is responsible for fostering and coordinating education, extension, and research activities in labor and industrial relations, including advisory research and information services. The current mission statement of the School reads as follows: The
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School of Labor and Employment Relations is dedicated to excellence in scholarly research, teaching, extension, and service — advancing theory, policy, and practice in all aspects of employment relations.” In 1946, the name, Institute for Labor Relations was changed to Institute of Labor and Industrial Relations. The School offers a longstanding professional master’s degree (Master’s of Human Resources and Industrial Relations, MHRIR), two joint professional degrees (the MHRIR-JD with the College of Law, and the MHRIR-MBA with the College of Business). The School also offers a PhD program, which prepares students mainly to take faculty positions in research universities. In 2008, the Institute was redesignated the School of Labor and Employment Relations and the title of the unit executive officer changed from Director to Dean. It offers graduate, professional and extension training for labor, management and civic groups. The Chicago Labor Education Program was established as part of the broader labor extension mission centered on workers, union leaders, and communities (with a focus on the area of highest union density in the state). In 2008, the School launched the first online undergraduate minor on the Urbana-Champaign campus, which is in the field of global labor studies. The Center for Human Resource Management is a joint venture of LER and the Colleges of Business at UIUC and UIC, focused on research, roundtables, and a certificate in “HR Excellence” targeted at small- and medium-sized operations.

Could the college forge intellectual alignment with another college or school, with synergy in values, goals and missions and enhance their intellectual and academic mission?

Several faculty members and administrators in the College of Media discussed potential scenarios for mergers based on intellectual alignments with other campus units. The set of conversations with the interim dean, department heads, executive committee, and key academic professional employees, revealed a range of possible organizational configurations ranging from maintaining the current structure of the College of Media through possible dissolution of the College by placing its four units (Illinois Public Media, Departments of Advertising, Journalism, and Media and Cinema Studies) into various other administrative or academic units on this campus. Examples of potential alternative organizational structures that College of Media interviewees mentioned include (1) creating an über-college of media, arts, and information to include Media, GSLIS, FAA, the Department of Communication in LAS, and possibly some areas of Computer Science; (2) merging Media and GSLIS; and (3) moving existing units in the College of Media to other colleges. There was not unanimity among faculty members on the wisdom of such alignments, nor have all parties to such scenarios been involved in discussing the particulars that include curriculum, strategic goals, promotion and tenure procedures, and the like. The fact, however, that significant ideas for combining campus programmatic emphases in media, arts, and information are under discussion is reason to argue that these discussions should continue under the leadership of senior faculty in the College. At the same time, it is essential to note that the marked variety of recommendations for possible alternative organizational structures suggests the need for a possible intervention by an impartial facilitator who can guide members of the College in fruitful discussions about its future. While we learned that some discussions have taken place between some department heads on this topic, these discussions have not led to col-
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lege-wide planning. In the current and anticipated climate of declining state funding, we are concerned that the status quo (that is, lack of unified planning within the College of Media) could hasten a forced reorganization, but we are optimistic that with some assistance, the College of Media could chart a positive course for its future.

GSLIS faculty have research collaborations and shared interests with faculty in a variety of areas across campus, but these shared interests are not housed within any single particular unit. GSLIS engaged in discussions with the College of Media concerning a potential merger but voted as a faculty not to continue such discussions after determining that such a merger would not be in GSLIS’s best interests. GSLIS has as a core mission the education of library and information professionals. This mission would be jeopardized by a merger with another unit that did not share this orientation towards professional education, as has been demonstrated by such mergers that have occurred in other universities. GSLIS therefore does not envision a viable merger with any single campus unit.

In investigating intellectual synergies between LER and other campus units, the committee spoke not just with administrators and faculty in LER, but also with administrators and faculty of other units identified as having potential intellectual connections to LER. None of the contemplated mergers including either of the entire school with other units or of portions of the school (thereby destroying the integrity of the school’s offerings) seemed desirable. For example, LER’s Labor Education Programs are an important part of its mission and provide a unique service to the State of Illinois. This program would not fit comfortably in any of the other units considered, resulting in an inability to maintain the integrity of LER’s professional and academic mission and identity. Moreover, while there were some intellectual connections between some aspects of LER and some other units, such as LER’s human resource emphasis and the College of Business, there was no other unit on campus that would comfortably house the entirety of LER’s mission and intellectual and educational activities.

Faculty in the School of Social Work (SW) come from many disciplinary background, although the majority of faculty have degrees in social work. SW practitioners operate in diverse professional spheres, such as education, health care, public policy, family services, child welfare, mental health, government, and non-profits. SW faculty engage in both research and educational collaborations with a variety of people across campus. For instance, over the last three years, SW faculty have been successful in collaborative grants with faculty from a wide range of departments and disciplines.\(^{36}\) SW has several courses cross-listed with other units. However, although many other units align with some of SW activities, no units align with all or most of their activities. More importantly, SW views its status as an independent unit as essential to its ability to recruit and retain top flight faculty and students. Social work professional identity is widely and intensely shared among social work scholars and practitioners.

One model that may make sense intellectually and administratively—although it is unlikely to result in cost savings—is a college of social welfare that encompasses programs with similar social missions but different areas of professional practice. Programs that might align with the College of Social Work in this way include Human & Community Development and the Child-
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\(^{36}\) For example, SW faculty have collaborative grants with faculty and others in Human and Community Development, Educational Psychology, Psychology, Kinesiology and Community Health, the College of Medicine, Animal Sciences, Food Science and Human Nutrition, the Department of Communication, the Division of Biomedical Sciences, the Center on Democracy in a Multiracial Society, Spanish, and the Institute of Government and Public Affairs.
ren and Family Research Center (which has been, since its inception in 1996, part of the School of Social Work).

Are there unique elements of this college that necessitate continuing as an independent, free-standing academic unit?

Among peers schools of the College of Media, there are multiple successful models organized under a “Communications,” “Information,” or “Media” umbrella. Among the best financially endowed and academically rigorous Colleges are Ohio University, which houses undergraduate and graduate programs in the Scripps College of Communication (Journalism, Information & Telecommunication Systems, Communication Studies, Media Arts and Studies, Visual Communication); Penn State’s College of Communication, which houses undergraduate and graduate programs (Advertising/Public Relations, Film-Video and Media Studies, Journalism, Telecommunications); and Syracuse University’s SI Newhouse School of Public Communication, which houses undergraduate and graduate programs (Advertising, Broadcasting, Communication Management, Graphic Design, Arts/Magazine/Newspaper Journalism, Documentary and Film History, Media Management, Mass Communication, Media Studies, Public Diplomacy, Photography, Public Relations, Radio-TV-Film, Journalism). More recently Florida State University’s College of Communication and Information was created to house undergraduate and graduate programs (Advertising, Communication Science and Disorders, Information Technology, Media/Communication Studies, Media Production, Public Relations, Professional Communication). Some College of Media faculty and department heads appear very open to (and even excited about) the prospect of collaborating with other academic units on campus – possibly in a different organizational structure – especially if this results in the creation of intellectual synergies in line with top public university Colleges of Communication. Criteria for professional accreditation in advertising and journalism must be considered but are not necessarily threatened by alternative organizational structures where departments are kept intact.

GSLIS is the only state-supported university offering a Master’s of Science in Library and Information Science degree in Illinois. The degree is an important credential for a variety of professions including archivists, librarians, information managers, and data curators. Of the top ten competitors for faculty and students in the scholarly areas covered by GSLIS, only one university has merged LIS with the Department of Communication and Department of Communication Science and Disorders – Florida State University’s College of Communication and Information. Seven of GSLIS’s self-identified competitors for faculty and students offer LIS degrees and seven do not have LIS programs. The professional Master’s program at GSLIS is ranked number 1 in the country by *US News & World Report*. Consolidation or mergers could pose a threat to the professional identity of faculty and students and adversely impact the national reputation of the program.

Among the top ten social work programs in the country (as identified in *US News & World Report* rankings), all but one (the 10th-ranked school) are freestanding. Thus, as in the case of GSLIS, consolidation or mergers could pose a threat to the professional identity of faculty and students and impact the national reputation of the program. The School of Social Work, much like Law, Medicine, and Business, is a professional school with a distinct professional identity,
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37 See response to the charge letter of the Academic Unit Review Committee by John Unsworth, Dean of GSLIS. This response can be found at: [http://webdocs.lis.illinois.edu/comm/gslis.se.response.pdf](http://webdocs.lis.illinois.edu/comm/gslis.se.response.pdf).
code of ethics, and body of skills and knowledge that it aims to cultivate in its students. Thus, if we accept that cultivating a specific professional identity is one criterion for determining whether there are “unique elements” of any given college that necessitate its existence as a free-standing academic unit, the School of Social Work, along with other professional schools on campus, meets this criterion.

While some of LER’s peers are freestanding units (Cornell University and Rutgers University) and others are departments within larger colleges (Michigan State University and University of Minnesota), LER’s identity as a top-ranked program is in substantial part based on its independence. In addition, as discussed above, significant portions of LER’s mission, most notably, the Labor Education Programs, would not likely be supported were LER merged with another unit. Such action would significantly undercut LER’s identity, strength, and mission.

| Could the administrative infrastructure of the College [or unit] be reduced through organizational changes or consolidations? Could personnel costs be reduced? What would be the economic benefits of possible mergers involving this and other small colleges/schools in the short and long terms? |

This question is, in an important way, at the heart of the committee’s inquiry. The intuition that there are economies of scale to be realized in academic units — by means of which administrative costs per FTE faculty or student or both would be lower in a larger academic unit — seems to be a sensible conjecture. But the committee felt that like all plausible hypotheses, this hypothesis should be supported by sound data.

The Provost’s Office, the Budget Office, the four units, and other campus units provided us with a wealth of data pertinent to the issue of administrative efficiency. We looked at all those data with assistance from Pat Hoey, who had been thoughtfully delegated to our committee in order to help us with these matters. We also requested, but did not receive, data on prior consolidations and mergers of academic units at UIUC.

The most revealing information came from two analyses that compared the costs and productivity of the units under review against that of other units on campus – one conducted by Eric Meyer, Associate Professor of Journalism in the College of Media, and the other conducted by Craig Olson, Professor of Labor and Employment Relations. We provide a concise review of the aims, methods, and conclusions of each study.

**The Meyer Study**

Meyer addresses concerns with an evaluation of academic unit efficiency prepared by the Office of the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs (OVCAA) for consideration by the Council of Deans. The Meyer report discusses the validity of simple descriptive indicators of efficiency such as expenditures per full time equivalent (FTE) academic professional (AP) on state funds, academic professional FTEs as a percent of total FTEs (on state funds), civil service FTEs as a percent of total FTEs (on state funds), and student and paid instructional units (IUs) per tenure system faculty FTEs. Meyer compares those measures to the OVCAA’s indicators of efficiency, namely total staff (headcounts) and total expenditures per academic professional.

In an effort to assess the relative cost of administering units of varying size, the OVCAA added up academic professional staff listed for the central administrative unit of each college as reported in the Division of Management Information (DMI) database and calculated total expenditures per AP staff member. On this measure, efficiency figures range from $4,455 for the
College of Engineering to $269 for GSLIS (higher numbers imply greater efficiency in the OV-CAA analysis). Among the 13 major campus units, the four units under review rank as the least “efficient”: Media (10th), LER (11th), SW (12th), GSLIS (13th). However, the Meyer analysis points out that for several of the larger colleges, support staff serving multiple academic departments are listed under separate cost centers and therefore are not captured in the central administrative unit figures in DMI. For example, the central administrative function in the College of Business employed 20.4 FTE academic professional staff in AY 08/09 according to the DMI database. Yet there were an additional 35.94 FTE staff members in other administrative units in the College in sub-units such as Business Career Services, Development, the Executive MBA program, the Office for Information Management, and MBA Program Administration. In general, small colleges are less likely to have independent cost centers and thus their relative central administrative staff levels may appear inflated vis-à-vis larger colleges when the central administration category is the only category measured.

Comparing expenditures per all FTE academic professional on state funds, excluding ancillary services (museums and performing arts centers, WILL, and extension), Meyer found that the differences in unit efficiency on campus were much narrower than suggested by the OVCAA’s figures (ranging from $1,360 in Engineering to $456 in GSLIS). Three of the four units under review still appear to be the least “efficient” on campus by this measure—LER (11th), Media (12th), and GSLIS (13th)—but the fourth, SW, ranks as the 2nd most “efficient” unit. Furthermore, Meyer argues the better measure of efficiency is the ratio of staff devoted to overhead activities to total staff. For example, computing the ratio of AP FTEs to total FTEs (on state funds) finds the four units under review ranked as follows: SW and Media (tied for 4th), LER (12th), and GSLIS (13th). Including civil service staff in the numerator of the ratio ranks Media 4th, SW 5th, LER 9th, and GSLIS 10th. Meyer concludes that there is insufficient evidence that small college size is associated with inefficiency since both SW and Media rank as more efficient than Engineering and Business when both AP and civil service staff are considered as a proportion of total staff on state funds.

The Olson Study

Olson’s chief assumption is that any consolidations or mergers would leave the size and structural characteristics of the units unchanged except for their placement under a larger administrative entity.

The Olson study uses multivariate regression analysis to compare the cost efficiency of the four units under review against the efficiency of 18 units embedded within larger units, and he controls for differences in the structural characteristics of compared units that might account for variations in unit cost and efficiency and yet not be affected by various potential consolidation or merger scenarios. The comparison is conducted for the nine-year period, AY 2000-01 through AY 2008-09. The dependent variable, which is to be explained, is efficiency (measured in different model runs as real cost per instructional unit, instructional units per total FTE, instructional units per faculty FTE, instructional units per AP and civil service FTE, and AP and civil service FTE as a proportion of total FTE). The independent or explanatory variables are dummy variables for the small units as a group and individually and a set of variables intended to control for key structural differences and characteristics of the units that may influence cost but, by assumption, would not be affected by any mergers or consolidations.

Olson attempts to address the data reporting problem identified by Meyer—the fact that staffing levels for individual departments exclude the (overhead) staff support they receive from their
respective colleges—by using the administrative staffing profile of the College of Business (the estimated ratio of administrative staff to total FTE) to adjust the estimated efficiency parameters for comparison units downward. Olson then constructs estimates of implied “excess” staffing costs for the four smaller units. This method suggests that consolidating Media and SW would generate no savings; that embedding LER in a larger unit would save less than $100,000 annually (before taking into account any potential lost revenue or increased costs were LER to be consolidated or merged); and that the best way to increase the efficiency of GSLIS is not through consolidation but rather by increasing average class sizes, something that could be furthered through its planned institution of an undergraduate major.

**Key Takeaways from the Meyer and Olson Studies**

Overall, both the Meyer and Olson studies find little evidence of a strong relationship between academic unit size and efficiency and both conclude that the savings that might be achieved through unit consolidation are likely to be modest. Although neither report claims that no efficiencies can be gained in the small units under review, both suggest that the best route to such gains is not likely to be through consolidation or merger.

Although informative, neither study estimates costs borne at the campus level from administering more rather than fewer units; each study evaluates only unit-level expenditures and inputs. In addition, a fundamental assumption of the Olson study is that the core characteristics of GSLIS, LER, Media, and SW—the features of the units represented by the control variables in the regression—would remain unchanged in any consolidation or merger scenario; the only factor that varies is the unit’s designation as independent or embedded. In effect, such an assumption envisions only the narrowest of unit realignments, ruling out a hypothesis of intellectual synergy and associated fundamental restructuring through merger or consolidation. This begs the question. Any evaluation of the cost savings that might be achieved through consolidation is contingent on a specific consolidation scenario. If the issue is whether small independent units are highly administratively inefficient relative to larger ones, the answer is probably “no.”

All of the current existing cost analyses also point to the importance of improving the set of data available to administrators at all levels of the campus. A serious problem with the OVCAA, Olson, and Meyer analyses is the inconsistent measurement of staff effort devoted to administrative (overhead) tasks versus teaching and research. Both the Olson and Meyer studies make adjustments for selected colleges to account for problems in specific administrative staff measurement issues of which the authors were individually aware. Adjustments were not made for all comparison units because to do so would have involved considerable effort and time. It is the case that members of the academic professional staff in particular vary widely in their mix of duties, especially between administration and instruction. Yet current campus data systems combine AP staff into one category. Likewise, faculty members serve in administrative roles to varying degrees. To consider all AP staff as administrative overhead and all members of the faculty as instructional is simply invalid, as are selective adjustments to the DMI data. If the University were to develop valid measures of unit efficiency for comparison and planning purposes, it is essential to prioritize the proper measurement of FTE effort by function (instructional, research, and administration).

**Pulling it All Together**

In the end, we did not find empirical evidence that confirmed the intuition that there would be significant administrative efficiencies from consolidation or merger among these four units.
To be more accurate and following our methodology, we did not find evidence that the rewards from consolidation among the four units or some subset of them would clearly exceed the risks.

We also considered these issues in our analyses of data from each of the units. The College of Media is already very lean with one person in development, one in communications, and one in the budget office. Thus, partnering with another unit that has capacity in such areas might result in a cost savings, but the risk of diminishing “coverage” for Media departments in these critical areas of revenue generation (for example, in development) and management (for example, in communications, budget and resource planning) may outweigh benefits. Our College of Media study team did not observe any areas of inefficient, redundant, or under-utilized academic professional staff, but we did receive anecdotal feedback that support staff could be reorganized for greater efficiency.

We recognize that the College of Media has prepared a plan to manage its operations following the decision of some faculty and staff to participate in the voluntary separation programs. The interim dean estimates that the net annual savings will amount to approximately $500,000. The College appears open to considering other cost-saving initiatives, such as participation in a shared service center, to minimize the likelihood of a more disruptive organizational restructuring that would result from continued reductions in financial support from the state or mandate from campus administration.

For SW, estimation of the short- and long-run economic gains of consolidation or merger cannot be properly evaluated without a specific restructuring scenario. One model the campus might explore in depth is the creation of a college of social welfare that might include SW and Human and Community Development. Such a unit could potentially generate important synergies for both units and provide an opportunity to share services, potentially introducing some administrative cost savings. However, the latter are likely to be modest in both the short- and long-run, unless decisions were subsequently made to reduce faculty FTEs in one or the other programs. First, SW and HCD, while both focused on social and community welfare concerns broadly, serve significantly different professional audiences and student markets, which limits the degree to which programs might share teaching and advising. In addition, under social work accreditation standards, HCD faculty members’ participation in the teaching and advising of MSW students would be very limited. When asked to consider this option within our meetings with SW, there were mixed feelings on this topic, including some strong resistance. Discussions regarding alignment would need to be initiated with faculty from SW, HCD, and other relevant faculty prior to any movement in this direction.

Second, the small size and limited internal administrative functions of HCD, coupled with the relatively high efficiency of administration in SW, mean that comparatively few staffing redundancies would be introduced by bringing SW and HCD together in some fashion. SW’s administrative structure and personnel include a dean, an associate dean (who serves as MSW program director and also teaches, advises students, and conducts research), and three assistant deans (for student affairs, administration, and development). Assisting SW administrators are eleven additional civil service and academic professional staff. Those head count numbers would appear to suggest that SW’s overhead functions are high relative to the size of its faculty (18.5 tenure system faculty in AY 08/09), the number of its majors (approximately 314), and total instructional units generated (10,715 in AY 2008/09). However, 2.5 civil service and AP positions are supported by grants. faculty and staff serve in administrative roles, and some administrators also serve instructor or research-based roles. As suggested by the Meyer study and our own calculations, SW ranks toward the top or middle among the thirteen campus colleges on
several summary measures of administrative efficiency (including state budget per state-funded civil service and academic professional staff FTE, majors per state-funded civil service and academic professional staff FTE, and instructional units per state-funded civil service and academic professional staff FTE).

GSLIS has developed an administrative structure that has enabled it to increase productivity in terms of grant acquisitions, tuition income, and donations. Over the past seven years, it has doubled generation of ICR and nearly doubled grant expenditures per faculty FTE. Enrollments have also increased, boosting net tuition. It is also worth noting that, unlike in many larger units on campus, GSLIS’s two Associate Deans are also faculty members who continue to teach, advise students, and conduct research. This change over time demonstrates that a reorganization that decreased the level of administrative support would likely also decrease the income that GSLIS is able to generate and would thus not result in cost savings.

As with SW, it is not possible to evaluate the potential gains from a consolidation or merger involving LER without a specific plan for such reorganization. We investigated several possible partners for LER, but none seemed a feasible match. With the encouragement of the LER Dean, faculty grant writing activity has increased substantially, which already has generated three National Science Foundation grants since August, 2009. Similarly, like GSLIS, LER has one Associate Dean position, which is held by a tenured faculty member who teaches a normal course load, advises students in both the master’s and doctoral degree programs, and conducts research. It is likely that a consolidation would actually decrease LER’s productivity and income.

Would the campus as a whole lose value through consolidation or merger of [these four units] with other units, if the educational and scholarly pursuits of the units are maintained?

Given the limited time the committee had to complete its report, we were unable to generate any objective data that would speak directly to this issue. Whether the university per se would “lose value” depends on determining, first and foremost, what the value of each unit is to the collective reputation of the campus, and we had no criteria against which to render such a determination. The larger question of “value” has to do with a clear understanding and acceptance of the strategic mission of the university as a land-grant institution and, subsequently, the role that each of these units plays (and is expected to play) in that strategic mission.

Who are the stakeholders, internal and external, and how is their perspective to be considered?

The vested interests of GSLIS’ external stakeholders are many. GSLIS graduate students play a primary role in staffing for the University Library. GSLIS maintains strong relationships with its alumni (of about 7,000 worldwide). GSLIS faculty and students collaborate with the College of Engineering, College of Liberal Arts and Sciences, College of Fine and Applied Arts, and College of Media, among others. Proposals for inter-college and collaborative degrees in informatics at the BS, MS, and PhD levels could also be detrimentally impacted by merging GSLIS into a larger unit, given that these programs have been planned with multiple partners that each retain their autonomy. Externally, GSLIS collaborates in multi-million dollar projects with Johns Hopkins ($20 million); the Andrew Mellon Foundations, the Library of Congress, the Nation Endowment for the Humanities, and others.

The more than 6,000 alumni of the School of Social Work are an important constituency for the University. Most graduates become practicing professionals in the provision of social servic-
es to the most vulnerable individuals and families of society through their work in schools, hospitals, mental health centers, community organizations, child protective services, and public agencies. They serve a diverse set of rural, suburban, and urban populations. MSW alums serve in leadership roles throughout the state including as directors of the Crisis Nursery, Champaign-Urbana Public Health, Champaign County Mental Health Center, Cunningham Children’s Center, Champaign County Court Appointed Special Advocates, Catholic Charities of Peoria region, and Lawrence Hall in Chicago. PhD alums from SW are placed at major universities nationally and internationally, including ones in Japan, Taiwan, Korea, and China. Other stakeholders of SW include deans of peer schools and the leadership of major foundations, such as the Pew Charitable Trusts (with whom SW has a two-year $5 million project), that have looked to Illinois SW and its Children and Family Research Center over the years to lead national initiatives. The discussion about SW merging or consolidating has prompted several stakeholders to express concerns for a weakened professional identity and concerns for gender bias at the University. They communicated their concerns directly to the SW faculty.

The College of Media has an active National Advisory Board consisting of advertising, journalism, public relations, corporate communication, and creative media professionals and alumni. With the help of more than 14,500 alumni and friends, the College of Media has achieved 80 percent of its Brilliant Futures Campaign Goal of $50,000,000, of which more than $30 million has been raised by Illinois Public Media. In phone calls directly to the committee as well as multiple e-mails sent to both the Stewarding Excellence email address and directly to committee members, College of Media faculty, alumni, and stakeholders expressed strong sentiment in support of retaining the college’s current organization. More specifically, respondents warned of diminished value should units within the College be dispersed.

In addition to students, faculty, and alumni, LER has a wide range of external stakeholders. They include corporate contacts, such as Alcoa, General Electric, and PepsiCo, and federal government agencies such as the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission and the National Labor Relations Board with whom LER arranges internships, fellowships, and other valuable contacts. LER also has relationships with labor unions and workforce organizations, such as AFSCME and UAW, and with workplace government agencies at local, state, and federal levels (for example, at the federal level, the National Mediation and Conciliation Service). Other stakeholders include practitioner associations, such as the Midwest Hazmat Consortium, and scholarly associations, such as the American Bar Association, the American Psychological Association, the American Economics Association, the American Sociological Association, the Academy of Management, the Labor and Employment Relations Association, the United Association of Labor Educators, the Industry Studies Association, and the Society of Industrial and Organizational Psychologists. Like GSLIS and Social Work, LER maintains strong relationships with its alumni (approximately, 2,500 worldwide). LER’s endowment, for substantial building enhancements such as new faculty offices and student career center, student scholarships or fellowships, and faculty research support is growing at a rapid pace. LER exceeded its goal in the Brilliant Futures Campaign, approximately two years before the campaign is set to conclude in 2011.

C. Conclusions

Our basic methodology in evaluating the questions that we were charged to address was to gather and evaluate information according to a risk-reward criterion. We must, however, acknowledge the limitations that we experienced in obtaining data on some of the central issues regarding consolidation and merger among some or all of these units or of some of these units
with other existing colleges. Nonetheless, on the basis of the information that we have before us, we do not believe that the case has been made that the rewards of consolidation or merger of any of these units with all or some of the other units here exceed the risks. There simply is not any strong evidence that the potential savings are significant, yet the risks in terms of intellectual vigor and professional standing appear quite significant.

Let us be clear: We are not saying that there is no conceivable realignment of these units that might not generate significant intellectual synergies, cost savings, and financial flexibility. But the evidence we have reviewed suggests that any cost savings would be far outweighed by academic and financial risks. Consider some instances that, while incomplete, illustrate the complexity of the issues. All of the units we examined have conducted reconnaissance missions with other colleges or schools to see if there is any mutual interest in some sort of affiliation. None of those discussions has so far resulted in any enthusiasm for realignment. And in several instances we perceive potential dangers. Specifically, there are some portions of these units that are of potential value to other units on campus, such as the Department of Advertising to the College of Business or the Communication Department in LAS, or some of the Human Resources Management faculty in LER to the College of Business. But our sense is that if the Advertising department were to leave Media, undergraduate and graduate academic excellence in professional media education might suffer from the lack of intellectual synergy, and the College would likely experience greater financial distress and threats to academic quality. Our study strongly suggests that dealing with that difficulty would be painful, time-consuming, and deterring from the normal course of business. Similarly, losing that portion of LER that is valuable to Business might enhance the College of Business, but it would greatly undermine the mission of LER — again, causing difficulties that would be painful and time-consuming to address.

IV. Conclusion: Future Studies on Consolidation, Merger, and Related Matters

Although we have discharged the matters in our charge letter of March 5, 2010, we believe that there is much more for us to say on the matters of consolidation and merger in the academy. We believe this to be an important issue that the campus should address and address quickly.

In a difficult budget situation, there is an imperative need to tie financial decisions to strategic planning. The University of Illinois as a whole needs to decide what things it does well and where it needs to grow, as well as what things it should consider no longer doing. This issue needs to start with a look at the mission of the University and at a wide range of units and activities.

In order to make these kinds of decisions, several items are necessary. First, there needs to be a clear strategic planning process, taking into account the mission of the University and the changing realities of both education and the workforce. Second, the University, and unit heads within it, requires valid context-appropriate as well as cross-campus metrics for evaluating performance and planning budgets. Third, stemming from the strategic plan, it will be important that consistent and clear goals be set against which individual units on campus can measure performance. Such goals would enable academic units to see for themselves where mergers or consolidations might be useful. It has become clear from our discussions with the four academic units under study that consolidation or mergers should generally come from the “bottom up.” That is, consolidation should typically emerge from discussions and intellectual kinship among units themselves, who recognize that there are, for example, intellectual synergies that could be realized from closer working relationships.
The question of consolidating, merging, and reconfiguring academic units is a critical one for all public universities facing significant changes in their state funding. The central issue is not whether such changes are likely to occur, but how they will occur.

Environmental demands have shifted from asking the university to do what it does for less money to asking the university to change what it does. The contemporary question is not whether higher education can continue “business-as-usual” given adaptation to increased environmental turbulence; rather the question is what sort of universities will emerge from adaptation to these inexorable demands.  

It is not news that universities are continually faced with the task of managing the co-evolution of knowledge and academic structure and designing (and redesigning) bureaucratic and programmatic arrangements that support the core functions of the university – the delivery and production of knowledge through teaching and research. This task, however, is made more urgent in the current financial climate where the pressing concern is one of realizing budgetary savings through program reduction and organizational realignments.

This immediately pressing concern can overshadow the merits of longer-term, strategic thinking in which the university examines the organization of traditional discipline-based and professional-school oriented intellectual resources and programs. In so doing, the University would be well served by exploring how it can best marshal and realign resources to support programs of teaching and research that are more responsive to the changing nature of skills and knowledge demanded for citizenship and adaptive to the evolving demands for integrative research and problem solving in an increasingly complex and global world. To engage effectively and profitably in such activity across disciplines and fields requires more than intellectual creativity. It also requires:

- Partnering with knowledgeable outsiders to conduct external reviews of program quality (evaluations that would include not just rankings but also assessments of program inventiveness and program responsiveness to changing professional demands and knowledge requirements);
- Examining how to incentivize such reorganization and realignment of academic resources;
- Redesigning the promotion and tenure process to facilitate and reward the cross-discipline and cross-field work that such reorganization and realignment requires;
- Taking steps to create a less hierarchical and more lateral organization of academic units—one that is more nimble and able to respond more quickly to demands for integrative studies;
- Developing new budget models that reflect the inevitability of cross-subsidy and support reorganization and realignment of resources; and
- Using new and emerging technologies as an integral component of designing new organizational arrangements.

---

38 P.L. Gumport & B. Pusser, Restructuring the Academic Environment, National Center for Postsecondary Improvement Stanford University, 1997, p. 4.

We would not be surprised if some units on campus were already engaged in such discussions. However, at present we critically need a university-wide, systematic, and unified way of tackling these matters.

Respectfully submitted

Abbas Benmamoun, Linguistics (CAC liaison), *ex officio*
Brett Havens, MBA student
Paul Ellinger, ACES
Ed Feser, FAA
Wendy Lea Haight, Social Work
Pat Hoey, UI Budget Office
Lori Kendall, GSLIS
Joe Martocchio, LER
Tracy McCabe, Business
Isabel Molina Guzman, Media
Alexander Scheeline, Chemistry
Tom Schwandt, Education
Bill Stewart, AHS
Tom Ulen, Law, Chair
Appendix

Process Overview
The Academic Unit Reviews Project Team met regularly throughout the months of March, April, and May 2010. Four subcommittees were also formed in order to facilitate more intensive study of each of the units under review during the months of April and May 2010. Extensive information was gathered from a variety of sources, as outlined below.

Interviewed Guests

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Full Committee</th>
<th>Interim Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Richard Wheeler</td>
<td>Stig Lanesskog Assoc. Provost, Strategic Planning and Assessment; Assoc. Dean, MBA Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deba Dutta</td>
<td>Larry Faulkner External Consultant, President of Houston Endowment; President Emeritus, The University of Texas at Austin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edie Goldenberg</td>
<td>External Consultant, Professor of Political Science and Public Policy, University of Michigan; former Dean, College of Liberal Arts and Sciences, University of Michigan; and Director of the Michigan in Washington Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jane Phillips Donaldson</td>
<td>External Consultant, Co-Founder of Phillips Oppenheim</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Subcommittee: Graduate School of Library and Information Science
| John Unsworth | Dean, Graduate School of Library and Information Science |
| Executive Committee | Graduate School of Library and Information Science |

Subcommittee: School of Labor and Employment Relations
| Joel Cutcher-Gershenfeld | Dean & Professor, School of Labor and Employment Relations |
| Larry DeBrock | K. Peter Kuchinke Associate Professor, College of Education |
| Craig Olson | Professor, Labor and Employment Relations |
| Bob Bruno | Associate Professor, Labor and Employment Relations |
| Aparna Joshi | Associate Professor, Labor and Employment Relations |
| Nell Madigan | Assistant Dean & Director of Career Services, Labor and Employment Relations |
| Becky Barker | Director of Student Services, Labor and Employment Relations |

Subcommittee: College of Media
| Walt Harrington | Interim Dean, College of Media (two interviews) |
Jan Slater  Professor & Advertising Department Head, College of Media
Mark Leonard  WILL General Manager & Director of Broadcasting
Brian Johnson  Professor & Journalism Department Head, College of Media
Michelle Wellens  Assistant Dean for Advancement, College of Media
Angharad Valdivia  Professor & Media & Cinema Studies Department Head & ICR Interim Dir., College of Media
Tom Galer-Unti  Director of Budget and Restructuring Planning
Executive Committee  College of Media

Subcommittee: School of Social Work
Wynne Korr  Dean, School of Social Work
Executive Committee  School of Social Work

Documents Reviewed

Full Committee
Charge Letter, Project Team: Academic Unit Reviews
2009 Annual Report of Strategic Plan Progress
Historical Origin Report (GSLIS, LER, Media, Social Work)
University of Iowa Task Force Report on Graduate and Professional Education
GSLIS FY2010 State Budget Analysis
GSLIS FY05-10 Charts (Inst. Funds Balance, Budget, Staffing, Enrollment, Residency, Expenditures)
GSLIS Financial and Profile Summary (all funds, FY05-10)
GSLIS FY2009 Financial Statements and Management Report
LER FY2010 State Budget Analysis
LER FY05-10 Charts (Inst. Funds Balance, Budget, Staffing, Enrollment, Residency, Expenditures)
LER Financial and Profile Summary (all funds, FY05-10)
LER FY2009 Financial Statements and Management Report
Media FY2010 State Budget Analysis
Media FY05-10 Charts (Inst. Funds Balance, Budget, Staffing, Enrollment, Residency, Expenditures)
Media Financial and Profile Summary (all funds, FY05-10)
Media FY2009 Financial Statements and Management Report
Social Work FY2010 State Budget Analysis
Social Work FY05-10 Charts (Inst. Funds Balance, Budget, Staffing, Enrollment, Residency, Expenditures)
Social Work Financial and Profile Summary (all funds, FY05-10)
Social Work FY2009 Financial Statements and Management Report
Several emails from interested parties
Subcommittee: Graduate School of Library and Information Science
Response to Charge Letter, by John Unsworth
Budget Reduction Plan for 5%, 10% and 15% Reductions
Organizational Flow Chart
Administrative Budget Report
Executive Officer Interview Transcripts (7 Executive Officers in merged and non-merged LIS peer units)

Subcommittee: School of Labor and Employment Relations
Strategic Review Report: Aligning LER with Stewarding Excellence @ Illinois
2010 Organizational Chart
Administrative Salaries Report

Subcommittee: College of Media
Board of Trustees Minutes (1957-Present)
College of Media Brilliant Futures Campaign Report
2010 College of Media Strategic Planning Calendar
College of Media National Advisory Board Overview
College of Media Organizational Chart
College of Media By-Laws
“The State of the College of Media” Report
Addendum to “The State of the College of Media”
Professor Valdivia’s Notes to the Review Subcommittee
Olson Report
Financials and Graphs provided by the Provost’s Office; April 2010
Charge Letter; March 5, 2010

Subcommittee: School of Social Work
Response to charge letter by Dean Wynne Korr
Proposals submitted for external funding, 2009 – 2010
Overall-state-of-the-unit – revised – 2010

1. **Interviews Considered in College of Media Review:**
   - Committee Meeting with Richard Wheeler, Deba Dutta, Stig Lanesskog; April 4, 2010
   - Interview with Interim Dean Walt Harrington; April 13, 2010
   - Interview with Advertising Department Head Jan Slater; April 19, 2010
   - Interview with WILL Director of Broadcasting and General Manager Mark Leonard; April 20, 2010
   - Interview with Journalism Department Head Brian Johnson; April 20, 2010
• Interview with Assistant Dean for Advancement Michelle Wellens; April 21, 2010
• Interview with Media Executive Committee; April 23, 2010
• Interview with Media & Cinema Studies Department Head and ICR Interim Director Angharad Valdivia; April 26, 2010
• Interview with Budget Director Tom Galer-Unti; April 26, 2010
• Second Interview with Interim Dean Walt Harrington; April 26, 2010
• Committee Meeting with External Review Team; May 3, 2010