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I. INTRODUCTION

This is the evaluative report of the comprehensive visit for the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign for the purposes of continued accreditation by the North Central Association of Colleges and Schools. The consultative report accompanies this report.

The University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign is a charter member of the North Central Association, and has been continuously accredited since 1913. The University itself is much older, having been established in 1867. It is the flagship and largest campus of the three-campus University of Illinois. Each institution (Urbana-Champaign, Chicago, and Springfield) is separately accredited.

The institution's self-study is an innovation because of its reliance on evaluative background documents and data made available to the team on the world-wide web. Because of the distinguished programs of the University, it sought and received permission from the Association to devote much of its self-study to a progress report on its strategic planning efforts, described in the 1995 document, A Framework for the Future. Consequently, the team of consultant-evaluators divided its efforts more self-consciously than usual.

A three-person subgroup, designated “the evaluative team,” did much of its work in advance of the visit by considering the General Institutional Requirements and the Criteria for
Accreditation in light of the materials made available on the web and in printed documents.

Specific follow-up questions were pursued during the visit by two members of the subgroup. The third member did not make the visit to campus by design.

The majority of the team was designated as "the consultative team" and focused their attention on the self-study section entitled "A Reality of Achievement: Building on A Framework for the Future." Their meetings on campus were designed to enable the team to give helpful advice to the institution regarding the on-going implementation of its strategic plan.

This is the report of the evaluation of UIUC for continued accreditation. A companion report contains the findings and advice of the consultative team. The evaluative team found the institutional self-study (both the evaluative report and the Framework document) and web-based materials to be useful but somewhat limited in preparation for the visit. While the evaluation report is attentive to the patterns of evidence in support of each criterion for accreditation, the evaluative team found that it had to go to unusual lengths to find information normally obtained through face-to-face meetings. Thus, the experiment with the web was only partially successful.

During the team visit, members interviewed all campus level administrators and school/college deans. In addition, open meetings were held for faculty, staff, and students. The team also met with members of the Board of Trustees (the University of Illinois has a single Board for all campuses), and the University of Illinois President. These meetings provided ample opportunities for the team to become familiar with the University of Illinois at Urbana-
Third Party Comments. Prior to the team visit, the Commission received an unusual and probably unprecedented number of comments through the third-party process. Because of the magnitude and significance of the third-party comments, the full team dealt with this issue. Its analysis is presented in Section V of this report.

II. RESPONSE TO THE 1989-90 VISIT

The 1989 Team Report identified seven concerns, to which the institution has responded. The 1989 concerns fell into three categories: facilities (Concern 1), diversity issues (Concerns 2, 3 and 7), and resources — both educational and financial — (Concerns 4, 5 and 6).

Physical Facilities: At the time of the 1989 visit, team members observed an accumulated need for maintenance and renovation of physical facilities, and that these needs were having a “functional impact” on instruction. Since then, the university has invested in classroom upgrades, including the remodeling of large lecture halls and attending to improvements in laboratory and classroom space. Upgrades have emphasized technological improvements as well as developing computer facilities, which were not mentioned in the 1989 report. As will be seen in the discussion of Criterion Four, some concerns regarding continued funding of repair and maintenance projects still linger; however, this concern has been addressed
Diversity Issues: Six “key” deanships were in transition at the time of the last site visit; the team noted that the university was presented with an opportunity to expand the diversity of its middle-management level in filling these positions. Since 1989, those deanships have stabilized, with eleven of seventeen having been with the university for five or more years. Furthermore, the group, as a whole, is indeed more diverse than it was ten years ago, as it is composed of six women, including one African American woman. Thus, this concern has been addressed.

On a related note, the team recommended that the university pay special attention to increasing and retaining minority faculty members in most disciplines across the University. The university has responded to this concern at several levels, having established structures through the Office of Affirmative Action (OAA) to promote “diversity, inclusion, collegiality, access to education and resources” as well as to comply with federal and state laws and regulations. The OAA has issued a “Faculty Status Report,” a department by department comparison of UIUC faculty hiring to national data since 1993. This report places the university’s hiring initiatives into context: data since 1989 are provided with estimates of the pool from which hires have been made (and within which other institutions are competing).

Since 1990, the number of female faculty FTE has increased by 20 per cent. In the same period, the percentage of African American tenure track faculty doubled to 2.8 per cent (55 FTE). The number of Hispanic faculty has doubled to 61 FTE. The number of Asian and Pacific
Island faculty increased by 17 per cent. Only the number of American Indian faculty has
decreased, from 7 in 1990 to 5 in 1999. Overall, the number of minority faculty increased by 35
per cent in the period 1990 to 1999. UIUC ranks second in the Big 10 in the percentage of
minority faculty.

We note, however, that a number of the university’s materials underscore its assertion
that structures to support increased minority representation are in place: It is a key point within
the Framework for the Future, and the subject of inclusiveness in general has received the
attention of a series of Task Forces that produced a report on the “Participation and Success of
Underrepresented Students and Staff” (http://www.oc.uiuc.edu/oaa/IBHE_98.pdf). The search
handbook (http://www.oc.uiuc.edu/oaa/search_manual.pdf) includes a section on the importance
of a diverse search committee, and the OAA has reviewed itself and has taken a critical look at
its mission (and the shift from “compliance” to “resource”). Its 1998 Annual Report
(http://www.oc.uiuc.edu/oaa/annual_report.pdf) evaluates the progress of the office in light of the
strategic Framework, indicating that the campus is committed to a coordinated approach to
improving diversity. The current team feels that the university has worked to address the concern
expressed by the 1989 team. As will be seen in the discussion of the third-party comments,
however, other issues have arisen that indicate an ongoing need for attention in this area.

As final concern in this category, the team recommended that, while the university
“maintains an adequate array of programs and services for minority students,” these might be
coordinated, evaluated and supported better. Further, the team suggested the university consider
adopting strategies specific to different ethnic groups, including paying attention to a specifically "American ethnic experience." The university’s response notes that the academic services area of the Office of Minority Student Affairs now reports to the Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs and has a “stable and adequate” budget. They have adopted the suggestion to pursue different strategies for various area studies on campus, and the General Education Requirements include a two-part “cultural studies” component that allows students to satisfy the requirements by (1) studying either U.S. or comparable Western Culture and (2) studying a U.S. Minority Culture or a Non-Western Culture. Thus, this concern seems to have been satisfied.

Financial Resources: The fourth concern expressed by the 1989 site team was that the University libraries were “struggling” with rising costs that outpaced their budgets, and recommended that “serious attention” be given to the university’s research libraries to help them keep pace. Since that time, financial pressures led to the formation of the Task Force on the Future of the Library. As it will be noted in the discussion of Criterion Two, the 1989 team’s concerns on behalf of the University libraries met with little response until necessity forced a response. At this time, the concern expressed in 1989 seems to have been addressed.

The final two concerns expressed by the 1989 team depend to a great extent on forces outside the university. The 1989 team observed “alarm” among faculty and students regarding “the prospect that the institution may be losing the means to compete for and retain top faculty in many fields.” The 1999 Self Study states that the university is “determined to preserve quality by competing for the best faculty” in the face of revenue pressures that have forced the university to
reduce its faculty from 2048 in 1987-88 to 1799 in 1998-99, a loss of 249 faculty FTE. The *Self Study* notes that this has occurred at high cost. The University administration has made a focused effort to improve faculty compensation since 1994-95, and has launched a multi-year, $10 million “Faculty Hiring Initiative” to restore lost faculty positions.

Ten years ago, the team noted that the awareness of “long term resource constraints” was pervasive, affecting myriad management decisions and forcing faculty and administrators to make difficult choices with long-term consequences. The team, in noting the importance of the university in serving the State of Illinois, recommended that the state legislature honestly assess the resources required to assure continued quality of this treasure. In its response to the team’s concerns, the University agreed that the identified needs were, indeed, many, but counters that they cannot be met merely through additional state funding. The report praises the support it has received from the Governor of Illinois and the state’s General Assembly. The *Self-Study* also observes that the state’s economy has reached an “all-time high,” and it suggests that the level of support for The University be extended “modestly.” The current team offers strong encouragement for the university to continue to work with its partners in the Legislature so that these concerns are addressed in a productive and ongoing way.

III. GENERAL INSTITUTIONAL REQUIREMENTS

The team carefully evaluated the responses to the General Institutional Requirements in the institutional self-study, as well as corroborating documents provided in the self-study library.
The team finds that all General Institutional Requirements are satisfied (an exception related to Requirement 6 will be discussed in Section V), but takes particular note of the following:

1. **Mission statement.** The traditional mission since the inception of the university in 1867 has been to provide programs of the highest quality in teaching, research, and service. This is the mission of a distinguished public research university with a commitment to undergraduate education and outreach, as well as research.

6. **The Board of Trustees.** The Board for the University of Illinois system consists of eleven voting members, including one student, appointed by the governor. The non-student members serve six-year, staggered terms. The governor serves *ex officio*. There are three student members, one each from the Urbana-Champaign, Chicago, and Springfield campuses, who serve one-year terms. The governor selects one of these to have a vote, and the other two have advisory roles.

7. **Executive officer.** The chief executive and academic officer is the Chancellor. The chief executive officer of the University of Illinois is the President.

10. **Full-time faculty.** The University reports that 98 percent of its 1,917 faculty members are full-time. Thus, the University has a sufficient core of full-time faculty with a primary commitment to the educational programs of the institution.
16. General education. In 1989, the UIUC Senate adopted a common, campus-wide commitment to General Education, including a statement of philosophy and a set of requirements. The requirements, which have been implemented under the purview of the faculty General Education Board, include: composition; quantitative reasoning; foreign language; natural sciences and technology; humanities and the arts; social and behavioral sciences; and cultural studies. Information is found on the website http://www.provost.uiuc.edu/gened.

III. CRITERIA FOR ACCREDITATION

1. CRITERION ONE: The institution has clear and publically stated purposes consistent with its mission and appropriate to an institution of higher education.

The mission statement was addressed above in the section of General Institutional Requirements. Going beyond the mission statement, the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign has an extensive and evolving articulation of its institutional and educational goals. These are contained in the planning document A Framework for the Future. This document is available at http://www.oc.uiuc.edu/oc/framework/intro.html, and provides direct evidence that the University meets Criterion One. The document is extensively discussed in the companion consultative report.
The organization, financial resources, and physical resources of the university are adequate to accomplish its purposes. The University follows a traditional model of governance for public, state assisted universities with chancellors responsible to a president who is in turn responsible to a Board of Trustees (see figures 1 and 2 of the self study).

While adequate in a narrow sense, the financial resources provided by the state have not increased sufficiently to pay nationally competitive salaries to faculty and staff; to maintain faculty capacity in terms of the number of faculty in comparison to 1988; and to provide adequate resources for the many program initiatives and needs such as undergraduate education, graduate programs, technology, the library, public service programs, and the repair, renovation, and maintenance of buildings and grounds. The university completed a budget study (Framework for Budget Reform) in 1996 to cope with this fiscal situation, and seems to be implementing the new plan effectively. Nevertheless, a institution of the quality of UIUC should not have to live in the financial environment in which it finds itself.

The institution is well-organized to attend to safety and to accommodation of persons with disabilities. There is a good working relationship between campus and community law enforcement agencies. The State of Illinois appropriated $5 million to allow the campus to modify its facilities in accord with ADA requirements, and this work has largely been completed.
During the course of the work, additional problems were identified, and the institution is awaiting funds to correct them.

A major concern, however, is the library. This was also expressed as a concern in the 1989 North Central Association review. It is not at all clear that this concern provoked any action on the part of The University until August 21, 1997, when the University Librarian sent a letter to all University faculty announcing that the Library had incurred a deficit of $800,000 at the end of Fiscal Year 1997. The University Librarian announced also that in order to avoid a deficit of similar size in FY98, several budgetary actions, including a $480,000 reduction to the subject materials fund, would be necessary. The Librarian concluded his letter by assuring the faculty:

"Our situation is serious, but it is neither dire nor unique. The University Library has a record of leadership in its field that we are committed to maintain. It will continue to be an acknowledged attraction that brings students and faculty to our campus. However, it will require some behavioral changes on the part of our users. Opportunities to browse copies of many journals to which we no longer subscribe or, whose price is out of proportion to the number of users, will be reduced in favor of browsing online abstracts and indexes to the contents of journals with expedited delivery of copies of journal articles needed. Our unique collections will be protected. Our commitment to service will guarantee access to a wide range of materials on campus and off."

In October, 1997, the Provost and the Chair of the Senate Council appointed a Task Force on the Future of the University Library to consider, among other matters, the policy issues raised in the University Librarian's letter. The task force's conclusions did not agree with the University Librarian's assessment of the situation. Its executive summary states:

"All academic libraries have confronted these pressures [growth in quantity of material, costs, technology], some more wisely than others. The Task Force
believes, unfortunately, that the University Library has not responded well to these challenges. Indeed, over a twenty-year or more period, the Library has slipped in its ability to facilitate the University's teaching, research, and service missions. We believe that to some extent, the cause of this slippage is budgetary in nature. To a large extent, however, the Library has fallen in recent years because of a lack of communication, a weakness in internal governance mechanisms, and failure on the Library's part to undertake comprehensive strategic planning and to engage the campus community as a full partner."

The University has recently recruited a new University Librarian, who promises to provide vigorous leadership in transforming the library into a technology-based service organization as well as a world-renown collection of books, journals, and other materials. The large number of specialized libraries makes the job especially difficult – libraries range from state-of-the-art to antiquated. A worthwhile goal is to bring all library facilities up to the standard already set by some of the newer libraries. The Librarian will confront the challenges of limited budgets and resistance to change, but there is every reason for optimism.

3. CRITERION THREE: The institution is accomplishing its educational and other purposes.

As a Research I institution, UIUC is actively responding to its many challenges and it appears to be succeeding. The recent U.S. News and World Report on-line (http://www.usnews.com/usnews/edu/college/natua_nf.htm ) ranks the University of Illinois-Urbana-Champaign as tied for 34th in the “top 50 Best National Universities.” The publication credits the University with a graduation rank of 38, and a freshman retention rate of 92%. In 1998, the six-year graduation rate of UIUC freshman was 77%.
The university offers undergraduate degrees in 185 majors in 8 colleges and one institute. Evidence is available on UIUC web pages (http://www.oc.uiuc.edu/pubaff/ssr/programs/accreditation.html) of on-going programmatic accreditation by 26 agencies. Clearly defined course content is provided in the UIUC General Catalog, while a separate publication provides program of study requirements for its undergraduate and graduate degree offerings.

Information on the general education web page (http://www.provost.uiuc.edu/gened/) shows that the University's requirements have increased substantially since 1991. Then only first year composition was required, but from 1993 to 1995 general education requirements blossomed. Now 33-36 hours of course work in a variety of typical subject areas are required of UIUC graduates. Fall 2000 will bring the addition of a "three-semester foreign language requirement" (Self-Study, p.21).

One of the special focus areas of the 1989 NCA visit was minority recruitment and retention. At that time, a reported 95% of undergraduates came from Illinois. In 1998 that number has been reduced to 91%, as reported in the Self-Study. The Self-Study also reports increases in the enrollment of a more ethnically diverse freshman class and one that is approaching gender equity (49.2%).

The 1999 ethnic composition of the undergraduate student body was 71.3% White, 5.4%
Hispanic/Latino, 7.3% African-American, 12.9% Asian-American, 0.2% Native American, 1.3% International, and 1.5% Other/unknown. The state-wide racial and ethnic distributions in the general population of Illinois are: 81.3% White, 9.9% Hispanic (of any race), 15.3% African American, 3.2% Asian, and 0.2% Native American. The enrollment percentages appear to be indicative of a more diverse group than the 1989 report of 16.8% minority undergraduate population, and is similar to the state-wide average of 26.2% minority students in 4-year institutions.

Limited faculty diversity was also discussed in the 1989 NCA report. Today, women make up nearly 21% of the faculty, and minority faculty members constitute nearly 15%.

The University appears to take the assessment process seriously. All departments have had their "student outcomes assessment" plans reviewed by the assessment Task Force committee and published on the UIUC assessment web pages. The plans include comprehensive measures of performance, processes for using assessment results, along with timetables for each plan's implementation. Among the measures of performance is a full complement of professional licensing and graduate placement examinations.

The UIUC graduate college maintains a web address (http://www.grad.uiuc.edu/), which provides a complete set of investigatory tools for the enrolled graduate student and the graduate applicant. UIUC began to review graduate education most recently in 1995. The Task Force on Graduate Education (TFGE) issued an interim report in 1996, and a full report in 1997. These
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reports contained recommendations regarding the quality and operation of graduate programs; the stipends, duties, and benefits provided for graduate students; and the interaction between students and faculty. "A Reality of Achievement: Building on A Framework for the Future" found in the Self-Study provides evidence of the implementation of many of the TFGE recommendations as well as more general graduate education issues.

The 1999 Chancellor's Senior Survey on the Undergraduate Experience revealed that respondents rated the quality of teaching by faculty in their major as 3.9 on a 1 to 5 scale. This was one of the highest reported satisfaction ratings, although not as high as "Your total experience at UIUC" which scored 4.3. In contrast, poor advising, difficulty in getting desired courses, and class size were the top three responses to a question about obstacles in the pursuit of an education at UIUC. Other questions dealt with topics such as: time to the degree, employment, student perceptions of campus climate, and self-assessment of abilities. It is clear that the administration takes the survey results very seriously in planning for improvements.

Several web resources discuss the educational programs available to the University community and the campus activities that provide cultural experiences for students and the neighboring community. Educational outreach through the Office of Continuing Education "provides undergraduate, graduate, and professional development programs that link more than 75,000 citizens of Illinois and beyond to the University."

The university appears to be accomplishing its educational and other purposes. It
continues to employ well-qualified faculty and educate well-prepared students. UIUC is to be applauded for the strides it has made in increased student and faculty diversity, while maintaining student quality.

4. CRITERION FOUR: *The institution can continue to accomplish its purposes and strengthen its educational effectiveness.*

Concerns for the financial resources needed to maintain UIUC were expressed in the 1989 NCA report. The most recent five-year period has been marked by budget stability and has shown modest revenue increases in the last three years. Yet, continuing unmet needs have encouraged campus-wide planning and innovation.

The University’s efforts to reduce somewhat the percentage of in-state students have improved tuition revenues, which currently account for 10-12% of the university’s annual income. In UIUC’s own peer group, only one university, UCLA, had a smaller percentage of out-of-state students (*Self-Study*, p.32). Therefore, UIUC is encouraged to continue to pursue initiatives for broader ethnic and regional diversity of its student body.

The Planning Guidelines require not only a continued growth in research funding, but also a continued ability to outperform in other areas of income. Without such progress, recent improvements of faculty salaries will erode relative to peer institution levels. The result could be that noncompetitive salaries will limit the institution’s ability to attract the best and brightest new
faculty and retain excellent senior faculty. In addition to generally restricted budgets that have restricted new faculty hiring, it is likely that noncompetitive salaries between UIUC and its peer institutions have hurt retention of top salary and further contributed to the 12% reduction (Self-Study, p. 6) in the number of tenure/tenure-track faculty since 1988.

A portion of UIUC’s current state budget request includes, among other items, $1.3 million to support faculty salary increases, $5 million for faculty excellence, $1 million for Library Electronic Information Resources, and $9.6 million for facilities and technological infrastructure. While historically the University has received one-half of the budget amount requested the team was struck by the relative modest nature of these requests. Investment by the legislature in fully funding these requests will more than pay off in terms of faculty quality and improved competitiveness for extramural grants.

The financial data suggest that much of the planning for the future of the institution is dependent on continued budget stability, improved revenue streams, and innovative exploration of additional financial support. The University of Illinois system and the UIUC campus have taken proactive steps to promote the institution’s continued success. One of the most ambitious measures is Campaign Illinois. Its public phase, which began in 1993, has met its $1 billion goal and been extended until the end of 2000. Although this initiative has brought additional revenues to all University of Illinois campuses, UIUC has benefitted by gains in endowed chairs and named professorships from 34 in 1993-94 to 175 (active and deferred) now.
The 1989 NCA accreditation report expressed concern for the renovation and maintenance of the campus' physical plant. In 1994, the Chancellor created the Classroom Remodeling Initiative. This 5-year plan has invested $2 million per year and has been extended to 2002. At that time the commitment will be reduced to $1 million annually to maintain the classrooms and support classroom multimedia technology. Significant challenges remain, however: renovation and remodeling of teaching laboratories are expected to cost $60 million and there remains $187 million in deferred campus maintenance. A reduction in custodial services has also occurred. The state provided $4.5 million in FY 2000 of recurring funding for deferred maintenance. In addition, the campus has another $1 million of recurring funds in reserves for deferred maintenance. Thus, significant progress has been made over the past decade; even more progress must be made to protect the estate's investment in the physical infrastructure of the University.

Progress will require not only additional funds, but careful balancing among competing demands: undergraduate education, research space, public space, athletic space, etc. Admittedly, it is easier to raise money for these special purpose activities that have a strong revenue stream than get funding for the general use instructional areas from the state. Undergraduate education still is focused primarily in the classroom and lab; the University will be challenged to stay the course and commit revenue to these needs.

Two of the most interesting and potentially powerful data collection tools employed at the University are the Senior Survey and the Graduate Survey. The first elicits general impressions
of campus life and the UIUC educational experience from those about to graduate, while the other surveys past graduates and obtains information about career achievements and their relation to education. These tools, as well as the academic unit plans, should help the university improve teaching and learning, while satisfying its customers (students, graduates, industry, and the public) and providing a measurable value added. The use of survey results for improvement is mixed across schools and colleges and departments.

The University seems to do a comprehensive job of planning. There appear to be plans and sub-plans for every important aspect of institutional management. In some cases the documents provided or obtainable describe the results of planning (see Graduate Planning in conjunction with Self-Study). However, it was difficult for the evaluation team to find consistent evidence of plan results in a web-based search. This is the major focus of the consultative report.

The institution continues to plan for the future. Although budgets have increased at a rate of 4 to 5 per cent for the past five years, financial concerns continue. Required funding for capital improvements, salaries, library resources, deferred maintenance, and infrastructure is not being fully realized. Resources for each of these elements are essential for the institution to continue at its present level and to improve. The institution has plans to obtain additional financial resources beyond Campaign Illinois.
5. CRITERION FIVE. The Institution demonstrates integrity in its practices and relationships.

The University conducts its affairs based on high ideals and ethical standards in a legal, academic, and humanistic sense. In addition, diversity goals are part of UIUC’s strategic plan, and the self study contains a good progress report on implementation. For example, the Code of Policies and Regulations Applying to All Students states:

The commitment of the University to the most fundamental principles of academic freedom, equality of opportunity, and human dignity requires that decisions involving students and employees be based on individual merit and be free from invidious discrimination in all its forms.

The Third-Party comments do raise questions regarding the adherence of the University to its own high ideals, however. This is discussed in the following section.

The Athletic Program. The University graduation rate for all students who entered in 1990-91 is 78%, which is third in the Big 10 football conference. The graduation rate for all athletes is 76%, which is also third.

In addition to Division I intercollegiate athletics, the University has an outstanding program of intramural athletics, including athletic opportunities for persons with disabilities.

The Federal Compliance Program. Team members requested information on the federal
financial aid default rates; they were informed that the rate was 4.4\% in 1997, which is below the national average.
V. THIRD-PARTY COMMENTS

A. Context for Third-Party Contents

The North Central Association received over 100 letters, petitions, press releases, and newspaper articles protesting the continued use of the school symbol and mascot, Chief Illiniwek. The Commission also received a copy of Jay Rosenstein’s 1997 public television documentary “In Whose Honor? American Indian Mascots in Sports,” which focused extensively on the ten-year controversy surrounding The Chief. Team members subsequently received several email messages and letters from UIUC faculty, students, and others opposing The Chief. No letters in support of The Chief were received, and no letters on any other topic were received.

The team was told during its campus visit that the institution’s position is that use of The Chief is not an accreditation issue, and so it omitted a discussion of the issue from its self-study. The institution informed those who requested its inclusion that the third-party process could be used instead. The team agrees that a school mascot per se is not an accreditation issue, but it does feel that educational consequences of the policy, tied to NCA criteria, are within the purview of an accreditation review.

During the site visit, team members met with opponents to the school symbol, those in favor of its continued use, the Board of Trustees, the President of the University of Illinois, and the Chancellor of UIUC. The first two groups included faculty, students, alumni, and community
The Facts. The facts as the team understands them are as follows:

1. The Chief has been the athletic and school symbol for seventy years. The graphic symbol is a stylized Chief's face with eagle feather headdress. The Chief is also a student dressed in the buckskin outfit of a Plains Indian with a floor length "eagle" feather headdress and face paint. The student appears at athletic events and performs an improvised "Indian-style" dance. The Chief is extremely popular among some student and alumni groups, for whom he is a symbol of school loyalty and pride. See, for example, http://www.savethechief.com/, http://www.chief.uiuc.edu/ and http://www.chiefilliniwek.org/education.htm.

2. About ten years ago, an American Indian student protested the use of The Chief. Her basic argument was that the Illini tribe, which was largely destroyed by other tribes in the 18th century, were hunter-gathers and not Plains Indians; that the dance was not authentic; and, most important, that the headdress and face paint have religious and spiritual significance to Indian people. Thus, appropriating them for athletic purposes is deeply offensive to American Indians.

3. In 1990, following the protest over the continued use of The Chief as a university symbol, the Board adopted the following motion:

"The tradition of Chief Illiniwek is a rich one and has meaning for the students, alumni, and friends of the University of Illinois. For more than sixty years, the Chief has been the symbol of the spirit of a great university and of our intercollegiate athletic teams, and as such is loved by the people of Illinois. The
University considers the symbol to be dignified and has treated it with respect. His ceremonial dance is done with grace and dignity. The Chief keeps the memory of the people of a great North American tribe alive for thousands of Illinoisans who otherwise would know little or nothing of them. I feel that those who view The Chief as “mascot” or a “caricature” just don’t understand the Chief’s true meaning to thousands of U of I students and alumni – he is the spirit of the Fighting Illini. The tradition of Chief Illiniwek is a positive one and I move that he be retained.”

The vote for adoption was 6 yes; 1 no. Two student members, who had advisory votes on the Board, both voted no.

4. Within the constraints of this Board policy, the administration of UIUC has sought to restrict the use of symbol of The Chief for advertising. In addition, The Chief appears only at football, men’s and women’s basketball, and women’s volleyball games, and restricts his activities to the dance.

5. As the controversy continued, a legislator introduced legislation that would require the University to maintain The Chief as the official symbol. The legislation passed, but received an amendatory veto from the governor, who expressed his opinion that such matters should be settled within the University.

6. The following is found on a web site favoring The Chief (http://www.chief.uiuc.edu/): on September 25, 1982, Sioux Chief Frank Fools Crow traveled to the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign with Sioux elders Anthony Whirlwind Horse and Joe American Horse. During a halftime ceremony at Memorial Stadium, Fools Crow presented the University with the
regalia currently worn by Chief Illiniwek. The nephew of Black Elk, Fools Crow is considered by many to be the greatest Native American spiritual leader of the past century. The regalia that Fools Crow presented was his own personal regalia, hand-crafted by his wife Katie. It is said that Fools Crow was very proud to make this presentation to the University as his work would be seen by so many people. He said:

"These (sacred) ceremonies do not belong to Indians alone. They can be done by all who have the right attitude...and who are honest and sincere about their beliefs in Wakan Tanka (Great Spirit) and follow the rules." - Fools Crow

This account is used to justify the continued use of The Chief.

7. A letter from a distinguished member of the history department argues, as other writers do, that: 1) The Chief undermines the educational program of the university by distorting American Indian history; 2) The Chief seriously undermines the university’s ability to recruit American Indian students; 3) The Chief undermines the learning environment of all students by humiliating American Indian students. Another letter was from the former president of another Big 10 institution, who wrote:

“I know how crucial it is for academic institutions to provide leadership in encouraging and affirming diversity. As a result, I am writing to urge the North Central Accreditation Association to review carefully the negative impact which the current Illinois mascot has on building a diverse educational community. I am a lifelong supporter of Big 10 athletics. Nevertheless, Chief Illiniwek and similar racial caricatures are symbols of discrimination and ridicule. They are an anathema to good sportsmanship and to building cultural understanding and mutual respect.”

Many other letters and petitions present similar arguments about why it is time to retire The Chief.
8. Statements made by individual Trustees on the 1997 videotape followed the 1990 resolution:

1) The Chief's dance and demeanor are dignified and inoffensive; 2) The Chief is not meant to be offensive and so therefore should not offend.

9. On March 9, 1998, the Faculty-Student Senate of UIUC passed a resolution to end the tradition of the Chief.

10. In March, 1998, the Anthropology Department wrote to the Board with these concerns:

"These effects [due to the ongoing presence of the Chief Illiniwek symbol] extend to all aspects of our scholarly lives: teaching, service, and research. Several critical areas deserve attention. The Chief: (i) Promotes inaccurate conceptions of the Native peoples of Illinois, past and present; (ii) undermines the effectiveness of our teaching and is deeply problematic for the academic environment both in and outside of the classroom; (iii) creates a negative climate in our professional relationships with North American communities that directly affects our ability to conduct research with and among Native American people; and, (iv) adversely affects the recruitment of Native American students and faculty into our university and department."

B. Evaluation of the Third-Party Comments

The team followed the Commission's directive on Third-Party Comments: *Avoid trying to resolve the validity of individual comments; instead determine whether the comments raise substantive issues relevant to the institution's ability to meet the GIRs and Criteria.* The team wishes to emphasize at the outset, however, that it does not believe that the choice of a school symbol is an issue for accreditation. Nor is the existence of campus controversy necessarily an accreditation issue. Rather the team sought to analyze all of the issues surrounding the
Accreditation. The team has found that the comments do raise substantive issues relative to communication and governance which are explicated below.

Regarding policy, in 1978 the University of Illinois Board issued the following statement:

“Resolved by the Board of Trustees of the University of Illinois that it reaffirms its commitment and policy (a) to eradicate prohibited and invidious discrimination in all its forms; (b) to foster programs within the law which will ameliorate or eliminate, where possible, the effects of historical discrimination...”

This statement is found in various University publications.

Another statement is found in the Commission’s 1991 Statement on Access, Equity, and Diversity:

“...regardless of specific institutional practices, the Commission expects an institution to create and maintain a teaching and learning environment that supports sensitivity to diverse individuals and groups. Further, the Commission expects an affiliated institution to ... [teach] students and faculty alike to see in proper perspective the differences that separate and the commonalities that bind all people and cultures.”

Another principle is found in UIUC’s strategic plan, A Framework for the Future:

“First, we invest in people: the people who constitute our campus community, at all levels, represent an increasingly diverse population, ...Diversity may challenge accepted wisdom, and may lead to the re-examination of long-held values. Such debates are welcome on this campus, for they are valuable features of intellectual life. We are committed to conducting them in ways that promote and preserve freedom and civility of action and speech...”
Certainly, the institution has the right and the responsibility to establish policy, including policies about The Chief. The team notes, however, that it also has adopted a policy against invidious discrimination. “Invidious” means “tending to arouse ill will, animosity, or resentment.” This has been the hallmark of the controversy over The Chief. In re-considering its policy on The Chief, the institution should take into account the fact that to be accredited means to be a member of the North Central Association, i.e. the policies of the Board should be generally consistent with the policies of the Association, including the Statement on Access, Equity, and Diversity.

Moreover, there is no doubt in the team’s mind that the continued controversy is having a negative effect on the educational effectiveness of UIUC. Ample testimony was received from individual faculty and relevant academic departments about how their missions and programs were negatively affected by The Chief. The team did not find the evidence it hoped to see that the institution has plans to deal with the negative effects of The Chief on educational effectiveness.

Under its Criterion Five, the Commission speaks to institutional integrity. By “integrity”, the Commission means that the institution adheres to its own ethical values as adopted through institutional policies and procedures. The Commission does not seek to prescribe any single set of principles for all institutions. As was noted above, the institution has adopted a statement of ethical principles with respect to discrimination, and to the team’s knowledge, has not articulated
In summary, the considerable evidence on this subject leads the team to these conclusions:

1. The use of The Chief is an educational issue.

2. The controversy surrounding The Chief will not go away.

3. The institution appears not to be addressing the issue in a manner consistent with the some of the policies and principles of its Board, its own strategic plan, the Commission.

4. It is the responsibility of the leadership of the institution to create the environment that will allow for resolution of the controversy in a manner consistent with the principles of the North Central Association and the goals of the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign.

The team wishes to emphasize, however, that it is not advocating a particular outcome, nor does it believe that “resolution” means that all interested parties are satisfied with the outcome. The role of the team is to point out to the institution and to the North Central Association any discrepancies it has found between the way in which the institution is handling the controversy and the principles of accreditation. The team returns to this subject in Section VIII.
VI. STRENGTHS AND CHALLENGES

Strengths

The team has identified a number of exemplary characteristics of the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign. They fall in three categories: human resources, programs, and facilities. This list is illustrative and not exhaustive of the many accomplishments of the University.

Additional strength and challenges will be identified in the companion consultative report.

Human resources. The University has:

- a world-class faculty who direct outstanding research and graduate programs;
- an outstanding record in recruiting, retaining and graduating outstanding undergraduate students;
- an institutional reputation that draws good undergraduate and graduate students who are satisfied with their education;
- a dedicated faculty and staff that, despite concerns about pay relative to peer institutions, provide a learning environment consistent with positive comments in Senior Surveys and the demands of a Research I institution;
- successfully enhanced faculty salary to more competitive levels;
- an excellent program for prevention and resolution of personnel disputes.

Programs. The University has:

- a focus on first year undergraduate experience through programs such as FYI, Discovery, Learning Living Communities, and Unit 1;
- implemented a wide range of programs to recruit, retain and graduate African
Facilities. The University has:

- world-class library collections;
- an outstanding performing and visual arts facilities;
- premier academic resources and support for research computing, extending to all departments;
- an excellent campus recreational system, including adaptive recreation.

Challenges

The team identified a number of challenges, largely recognized by the University administration, facing UIUC as it seeks to achieve the goals that it has set for itself. These challenges fall into four categories: resources, management, diversity, and governance.

Resources. Through its strategic planning process, the University has identified a number of ambitious goals, many of which require significant new investments by the state in this outstanding institution. The University administration also recognizes the necessity to broaden its financial base through fund raising and entrepreneurial enterprises. In this regard, the team identified the challenges listed below. In identifying these challenges, the team does not want to in any way diminish the ambitions of the University to pursue its strategic directions.

- Maintaining the quality of the faculty and, ultimately the students, requires
continued growth in income and endowment. If this does not materialize, faculty and prospective faculty may seek more lucrative opportunities elsewhere. The team is particularly concerned about the decline in number of tenure-track faculty engaged in instruction, and in the increased reliance on non-tenure-track faculty for instruction.

- Significant growth of income and continued commitment is required to maintain momentum in renovation and maintenance in classrooms and teaching laboratories. Shortfalls will lead to an atmosphere less conducive to academic excellence.

- It will be a significant challenge to obtain the fiscal resources required to maintain current levels of quality and to pursue ambitious new initiatives.

Management. The challenges regarding management that the team has identified are all closely related to resource issues. For example, apparent lapses in planning listed below are related to the fact that resource streams to support the results of planning have not been identified. The first challenge is largely independent of resources, however.

- There is a significant challenge in the management of the Library involving its organizational structure, facilities, internal and external communication, and
inconsistent service orientation.

- It will be a challenge to create realistic plans for enhancement of networking on campus, including instructional and library computing, and the new administrative structure for research and graduate education.

- It will be a challenge to facilitate interdisciplinary research and teaching within the framework of the existing budget system.

Diversity. All major institutions of higher education face the challenge of creating and maintaining a diverse and inclusive university community. UIUC clearly recognizes this challenge and has put in place a number of programs, many of them exemplary, to address this issue. The team, however, calls attention to following major challenges in this area:

- The controversy over Chief Illiniwek is divisive, pitting many faculty members and students against University administrators and the Board of Trustees. It has the potential to worsen over time to the detriment of a great university.

- A related challenge is the need to continue emphasis on recruiting, and retaining African American, Latino/a, Native American, Asian American and senior women faculty and administration.
Governance. The governance of a great university such as UIUC is shared among the 
Trustees, the administration, the faculty, the students, and the staff. The team notes with 
alarm the fact while many are talking, few are listening. In the team’s judgment:

- The controversy over The Chief has divided the University community. It 
interferes with the educational climate and with the institution's stated goal of 
creating an inclusive community.

- A process is not in place to engage the appropriate constituencies to bring about a 
resolution of the Chief controversy.

VII. SUGGESTIONS AND ADVICE

The team’s further suggestions are contained in the consultative portion of this report, 
where they are given proper context.
Recognizing the exemplary quality of the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign and its many achievements, the recommendation of the team is to continue UIUC on a regular decennial review cycle (with two stipulations justified below), because it easily meets or surpasses the General Institutional Requirements and the Criteria for Accreditation.

The team considered whether the issue discussed in Section V are of sufficient magnitude to overshadow the otherwise outstanding record of UIUC. As was stated earlier in this report, the team does not consider the use of The Chief, nor the concomitant controversy, to be accreditation issues by themselves. The team is concerned, however, about the governance of the institution in this respect and about the methods the institution has used to address the controversy. While these difficult issues ultimately must be solved internally, the team’s role is to call attention to the need for urgency in changing the institution’s methods of addressing the issues now. Without greater focused efforts to resolve the issue, the team is convinced that the University’s laudable goals to create and maintain a diverse educational community will be difficult to achieve. Thus, the team recommends that a progress report be filed with the Commission by January 1, 2001, delineating the processes that the institution has initiated to prepare for a focused visit on the issues surrounding The Chief. The team recommends that the focused visit be conducted in 2002-03.

During the focused visit, the team recommends that the institution present convincing
Intra-institutional communication and shared governance: The institution should show that all relevant constituencies have been allowed to engage fully in discussion, and that the reasons for decisions reached have been fully articulated to all interested parties. In particular, the institution should address the educational impact of the continued use of The Chief.

Consistent policies. The institution should resolve what appears to many, both within and outside of the University, to be inconsistencies between its exemplary diversity policies and practices, and its policies regarding The Chief. The team emphasizes again that it does not believe that The Chief per se is an accreditation issue. It is incumbent upon any public institution, however, to articulate the rationale for its policies, especially when they are in apparent contradiction with each other.

In the progress report, the institution should show that it has defined and begun executing a process for addressing the issues surrounding The Chief.
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I. INTRODUCTION TO SPECIAL EMPHASIS

The University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign (UIUC) has chosen a Special Emphasis for its 1999 comprehensive evaluation visit from North Central Association (NCA), viz., to focus on its progress in accomplishing the principles and goals outlined in the May 1995 campus strategic plan, *A Framework for the Future* (henceforth called *Framework*). The resulting September 1999 self-study report consists of two main sections: Part I gives documentation of UIUC’s evaluation of its continued ability to meet the General Institutional Requirements (GIRs) and the five Criteria for Accreditation. Part II provides the Special Emphasis documentation of the campus’s progress in accomplishing the seven Key Principles and 134 goals pertaining to the *Framework* strategic plan.

The NCA Team selected to conduct the comprehensive evaluation of UIUC reflects this two-part structure of the self-study report. A small evaluation subteam of 3-4 persons was selected to focus on the evaluation of the campus’s compliance with NCA’s GIRs and Criteria for Accreditation, while a larger consultative subteam of 9-10 persons was identified to assess the campus’s progress made towards following the principles and accomplishing the goals outlined in Part II of the self-study report. In the course of the visit, however, all members of the Team were involved in the compliance discussion and recommendation.

Likewise, the Team Report on UIUC to the NCA Commission on Institutions of Higher Education (CIHE) is in two parts: an evalulative Team Report on the GIRs and Criteria of Accreditation and a consultative Special Emphasis Team Report on the progress made towards accomplishing the *Framework* strategic plan. The two-part Team Report will make its way together through the NCA CIHE process for accreditation.

Thanks to the invaluable and very timely assistance from the UIUC Assistant Provost and her staff, NCA Team members were able to schedule and meet with three or more levels of individuals (including the highest executive level) involved in each of the seven Key Principles
of the *Framework* strategic plan. In addition, the Team met with the self-study committee and the *Framework* strategic plan committee. From these and many other meetings, careful reading of numerous documents, and direct observations, the Team has attempted to glean UIUC’s progress towards accomplishing the *Framework* strategic plan, the results of which are contained in this consultative Special Emphasis Team Report.

The Special Emphasis Team Report is organized in accordance with the seven Key Principles found in *Framework*:

- Invest in People
- Promote Scholarship and Research
- Accord Full Value to Our Teaching Mission
- Invest in Our Facilities and Organizational Environment
- Explore the Use of New Teaching and Information Technologies
- Strengthen Our Strategic Engagement in International Studies
- Reinvigorate Our Commitment to Outreach and Partnerships.

The final section closes with a listing of only the advice and suggestions that are highlighted in the body of this Report. For reference, Appendix A contains a compact listing, useful to the Team, of the *Framework* Key Principles, the priority questions raised by the deans and Provost in 1999, and shortened, single-line versions of the 134 goals covered in the 1999 self-study report.
II. INVEST IN PEOPLE

The first Key Principle of *A Framework for the Future* (May 1995) states that "We shall invest in people". Realizing that people are its greatest asset, the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign (UIUC) has rightly chosen, as its first goal for its future, the one thing that actually makes the accomplishment of all its other goals possible. If there were little investment in people, the chance of success would be low and the future of the greatness of this university would be in doubt. By recognizing the importance of and, in fact, investing in its people, the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign has ensured its reputation as a first-tier university and started its journey with a truly solid foundation.

UIUC realizes that investing in people means investing in all of its people. It means providing the best possible working environment for its faculty and staff, as well as providing the best possible student experiences for its graduate, professional and undergraduate students.

For years, UIUC has had a reputation for having some of the best faculty in higher education. While this continues to be so, UIUC has instituted a number of initiatives to make sure that this will remain the case. Starting with a commitment to recruit only the finest faculty at both the senior and the junior level, UIUC is also committed to making sure that faculty once recruited have a truly positive experience. To do this, UIUC has paid close attention to the salaries of peer institutions and has made difficult allocation decisions to bring up the salaries of the UIUC faculty to equal par with their counterparts. To assist in the recruitment of truly great senior faculty, as well as maintaining some of their own outstanding faculty members, UIUC has moved to increase the number of endowed chairs and named professorships. While much of this has been done by future bequests, the University has made excellent progress in this area.

Realizing that junior faculty are the seeds of its future, UIUC has invested heavily in their success. The Office of the Provost has placed into operation new educational efforts to assist unit heads, deans and faculty members. These include such items as:
- Monthly seminars for administrative officers
- Renewed emphasis upon orientation programs for new faculty and new administrators
- Widespread distribution of revised policies
- Better information on questions involving promotion and tenure processes

The Task Force on Improved Practice has collected and disseminated "best practices" in the hiring and development of faculty and staff and has made a number of recommendations to the Provost. One of these recommendations that have become policy is a new mandatory third-year review of all junior faculty. This more formal, written review, which becomes a part of the faculty member's personnel file, is to provide an assessment of the faculty member's professional development and their prospects for being recommended for indefinite tenure at the end of the probationary period. Junior faculty also has a great resource in the Division of Instructional Development, which helps with instructional, course and curricular issues, and sponsors a well-regarded retreat on teaching.

To support an outstanding faculty there must be an equally outstanding staff. At UIUC, investments have been made in maintaining the outstanding staff and academic professionals. In 1995, the Committee of Academic Professional Personnel was formed. While its primary goal was to examine steps that could be taken to strengthen the academic professional system, its recommendations also covered steps to improve the life of other staff. By the end of 1995, implementation had begun on some of the committee's recommendations, which include the following:
- Monitoring staff and academic professional salaries to make sure they stay competitive with academic counterparts, as well as with local and state opportunities.
In response to the rising numbers of academic professionals and staff, UIUC has taken steps to reduce institutional barriers to advancement and improve the workplace environment. UIUC has worked to improve policies related to performance review, salary, promotion, mobility and benefits.

Through the Office of Human Resources, UIUC has developed an extensive offering of courses, seminars and conferences that staff and academic professionals can take as professional development. The University on behalf of their employees pays many of these.

To help staff and academic professionals keep up with the changing technology, the faculty and staff technology training team offers over 75 courses per year of various computer training and educational topics.

In addition, the Staff Advisory Council and the Professional Advisory Committee afford, respectively, staff and academic professionals the opportunity to participate in policy making and planning at UIUC. In the Team’s judgment, the efforts that UIUC has made in resolving issues and disputes, both from a prevention and solution standpoint, are excellent. The resources allocated in this area help ensure that issues either are caught before they become problems or once becoming problems are handled swiftly and effectively.

As with any major research institution, graduate students at UIUC play an important part in the successful operation of the University. UIUC has made a commitment to only recruit the best graduate students for its outstanding graduate programs and to provide these students with an outstanding educational experience once they are on the UIUC campus. Central to this effort has been UIUC efforts to strengthen the financial and benefit package for graduate students. By the use of programs such as the McNair Scholars, the Illinois Distinguished Fellows and the Enhancement Grants, UIUC has been able to remain competitive in attracting graduate and professional students. This has also assisted UIUC in its goal to increase diversity in all aspects of the University. While recognizing this goal as a benchmark for ensuring its future, UIUC
realizes that this is an area that it must continue to improve if it is to remain successful. Those graduate students who are employed in teaching, research and as graduate assistants also have a new tuition and fee policy. In addition, all graduate students benefit from an improved health benefit package.

The lifeblood of a great university like UIUC is its undergraduate student body. UIUC can take pride not only in the composition of its undergraduate population, but also in its efforts to address the total undergraduate educational experience with emphasis on the first year experience, living learning communities, and planned programming through its Office of Student Affairs. UIUC has become a leader in addressing the student quality of life. The Team commends UIUC for its exceptional six-year graduation rate and its attention to student concerns, as evidenced by its annual senior survey. Its efforts on inclusiveness and minority recruitment and retention are also noteworthy. While UIUC has made great progress in this area, it recognizes that much work is yet to be done. However, UIUC is certainly positioned to become a leader in its efforts to recruit minority students by providing them with adequate financial packages and tackling the problems that impede their academic progress.

Advice: Continue efforts to improve the campus climate for all people.

While it is clear that the University has and will continue to invest in its people, there are two areas of concern. First, discussions with faculty, staff and students suggest that UIUC is woefully inadequate in providing childcare. This was an issue that was mentioned several times. The University needs to explore various options to see that the childcare needs of its people are more effectively met.

Finally, we need to emphasize a serious concern that has the potential to undermine all the great things the University is doing with its people - its unwillingness to openly discuss and
confront its continued use of a Native American, "The Chief", as its symbol or mascot. This is a serious issue that cuts across faculty, staff and student lines. This issue is discussed fully in Part I of the Report, but its connection with the Framework’s first Key Principle, Invest in People, needs to be spotlighted.
III. PROMOTE SCHOLARSHIP AND RESEARCH

The second Key Principle of Framework is "We shall build upon our traditional preeminence and advantages as a center for a broad range of scholarship and research."

The UIUC is a world-renowned institution for research and graduate education. The faculty, students, academic programs, and many research facilities are among the best in the United States and, indeed, in the world. For example, in the Survey of Research Doctorate Programs published by the National Research Council in 1995, 30 of the 37 UIUC programs ranked among the top 30 programs in the U.S., and 10 among the top 10 programs. This is a public, land grant university of considerable distinction, which is home to numerous unparalleled research activities including the National Center for Supercomputing Applications (NCSA).

UIUC has identified several focus areas for emphasis during the next decade or so. These include ambitious initiatives in Biotechnology and Information Technology and a move to establish two research parks and incubator facilities. The Biotechnology initiative will build on strong existing programs in agricultural sciences and engineering, along with substantial programs in biological sciences. The Information Technology initiative will be a logical extension of the national and international leadership of UIUC through the NCSA. On the other hand, the Team was not aware of funding plans sufficient for these and other ambitious initiatives and for maintaining levels of excellence at UIUC.

Advice: Continue working to link resources to ambitious new plans.

Research parks and small business incubators have been part of many extended university campuses; these organizations and facilities have been affiliated with research universities for several decades. In fact, the earliest generation of university research parks is now over three decades old and some would argue that we are now seeing the third generation of research parks
evolve. Virtually none of these activities near campuses has recovered their original investment in less than ten years, and many have required twenty years or more; some have never recovered their original investment.

At this time, UIUC does not have a research park affiliated with it. While the University has apparently done some background investigation and preliminary analysis on the financial and programmatic values of this proposed enterprise, the Team advises UIUC to further study this research park opportunity. The University should view this research park initiative as a long-term investment with no early payback, limited long-term direct financial return on investment, and, as in many cases, less-than-envisioned University/research-park-tenant direct linkages. Distributing the risk across a third-party developer, as the UIUC has planned, may reduce the University’s financial exposure. There are, however, some excellent examples of research parks affiliated with land grant universities located in rather remote or rural regions, and the UIUC would be well advised to visit several more of these as they gather more background information on the ultimate decision and planning. This expanded knowledge base will increase the likelihood of making sound decisions in this new venture at the UIUC.

Advice: Gather more background information for planning and decision-making before launching research parks.

The Team wishes to single out the Critical Research Initiatives program for its exemplary successes. Through this annual $2 million program, small seed grants up to approximately $50,000 for new research initiatives and larger multi-year interdisciplinary research grants of $250,000 or so are used to initiate new areas of inquiry where the likelihood of much larger extramural funding is high. Several examples of success can be cited, and the UIUC believes that the program has already received a positive return on this investment.

Several recent activities in the thrusts in outreach through Partnership Illinois and some in international programs are broadening the initiatives for research, scholarship, and graduate
education to the wider university community. Just one example of this is the East St. Louis project that is being coordinated by the College of Fine and Applied Arts through Partnership Illinois; other examples could be cited. (See discussion on page 36.)

Through the Graduate College, there have been enhancements to services provided to graduate students and to the programs. Particularly notable are the on-line program of study (Graduate Record Audit and Display System) and the web-based admissions process. Efforts such as these will maintain a high quality of graduate student entering the UIUC and effective progress toward degree. The highly competent and dedicated staff in both the Graduate College and the research arm will be important factors in supporting the faculty, department, college, and university goals in research, scholarship, and graduate education during the next decade.

With the return to the faculty of the previous Vice Chancellor for Research and Dean of the Graduate College, the UIUC has decided to split the two University-level administrative functions of research and graduate education into two separate and distinct positions. Such an arrangement is not unusual at large research universities where, very approximately, equal numbers of universities are organized each way. The decision to separate the two functions appears to have been based on several factors:

- The demands on a single individual to serve both functions at the UIUC have become excessive.
- This revised organization would clarify the reporting relationships since the Dean of the Graduate College reports to the Provost and the Vice Chancellor for Research reports to the Chancellor.
- This revised arrangement provides an opportunity to involve broader segments of this large University in administration of research and graduate education at the University level.
All three reasons seem apparent and justified. However, at least one concern was expressed during the visit; i.e., there may be a loss of influence by the Dean of the Graduate College since s/he will no longer have direct input to the Chancellor organizationally, and graduate studies separate from research may be compromised.

The UIUC is in the early stages of this transition to two distinct offices, and many reorganization details remain unclear. For example, some necessary functions such as fiscal management for the separate offices and responsibility for all committees and their functions were unclear at the time of the Team’s visit. While the rationale for the reorganization certainly seems reasonable, there will be a period of some time (perhaps 6-12 months) during which all of the necessary functions should be identified and reassigned as appropriate. This would require close cooperation between the new offices of the Vice Chancellor for Research and the Dean of the Graduate College, which could benefit from input from a small group of knowledgeable UIUC faculty and administrators external to both of these new organizational units.

Advice: Complete implementation of new office structure in research and graduate education.

The UIUC campus is justly proud of its traditional world-class library collections built over many years. They constitute a magnet that has attracted topnotch faculty and graduate students. In recent years, however, faculty, deans, and other campus administrators have become increasingly concerned about the Library’s ability to adapt to a rapidly changing scholarly communication and information technology environment. These concerns and "recommendations designed to improve the Library’s service to the University" were clearly described in the Final Report of the Task Force on the Future of the University Library (March 31, 1998).

Members of the Team were able to explore with various deans and faculty members the several recommendations contained in the 1998 report and to visit a few of the campus’s many
libraries. Based on the aforementioned report, discussion with key players, and direct observations, the Team recommends that the 1998 report should in general be implemented and offers the following specific suggestions:

- Early in her tenure, the new University Librarian should concentrate on the development of a set of shared values among the library staff that emphasizes the Library as an essential service organization in support of the campus’s instructional, research, and public service mission. The extent to which this service orientation may require changes in emphasis in the criteria governing the faculty status of librarians will need to be determined.

- Fostering change and a collaborative service-oriented philosophy should be facilitated by the organizational structure of the Library, clear delineation of authority and responsibility at both administrative and middle management levels, and the development of internal communication mechanisms that are widely understood and actively used.

- An active program of communication with faculty and other users should also help to revitalize the library’s image among campus constituencies. Planning for the future of large research libraries in a rapidly changing technological environment requires educating the faculty about issues such as the changes in scholarly communication, on the one hand, and seeking their advice to inform planning and priority setting, on the other.

- A conceptual master plan for Library space on campus, updating a space needs study prepared in 1995 is needed to guide future renovations and planning.

The Team was taken aback by the backward conditions pertaining to the Main Library: no air conditioning nor humidity control in the stacks for collection preservation, to say nothing of human comfort (see discussion on page 23); 18 separate, small departmental libraries within the building, which is very costly in terms of operating expenses; and the
like. At the other end of the spectrum, the handsome and modern Grainger Engineering Library epitomizes what many experts believe the library of the future should be.

The Team did not visit all of the libraries but wish to note that UIUC has about 42 campus libraries. This traditional pattern of many decentralized libraries, common on large campuses established in the nineteenth century, has given way in recent years to fewer, larger, multi- or inter-disciplinary libraries. The latter can offer more sophisticated services with a core mass of librarians and staff in what many refer to as a high tech/high touch environment. UIUC may wish to consider options in this area, including whenever new academic or research buildings are being planned.

- Consider a campus strategic to gain appropriate control of the Library's own database. Although the Team did not explore in any depth the current arrangement by which the UIUC Library is dependent on a statewide consortium of 42 academic libraries for its online catalog, the Team was concerned to learn that the flagship library in Illinois has no seat on the Policy Council of Illinois Library Computer Systems Organization (ILCSO) and no control of its own database. Large consortia of this type tend to accommodate needs at the level of lowest common denominator, whereas the needs of the UIUC Library are higher.

Advice: Complete the implementation of the 1998 faculty report on the Library.
The third Key Principle of Framework is: "We shall accord full value to our teaching mission, preparing our students for professional life, leadership and citizenship in a changing world."

The UIUC based this Key Principle on the belief that investments in undergraduate education begin with the first year and continue within the majors. The undergraduate experience starts with the convocation program to assist students in their academic transition and culminates with a capstone experience for upper division students in various colleges.

The successful implementation of the First Year Discovery Program, The Women in Math, Science, and Engineering (WIMSE), First Year Impact and the continuance of the Unit One program illustrates the University’s commitment to establish a foundation for academic excellence at the onset.

The creation of the Teaching Advancement Board to enhance the teaching-learning process and the quality of teaching, to recognize teaching excellence, to facilitate the development of Teaching Assistants and non-tenure track faculty has served to raise the awareness of teaching importance on the campus. In that context, the Team suggests that the University might appropriately give attention to designing a system of unit awards for outstanding teaching, whether undergraduate or graduate. Such an approach would have the benefit of enhancing peer awareness of teaching and connecting the structure of rewards directly to the overall performance of the faculty in a unit. When coupled with the strong outcomes based approach to assessing teaching that each unit has adopted, such an approach will reinforce the strong commitment by the institution to not just teaching but also learning. Indeed, in the Team’s judgment, the development of these unit assessment plans is a remarkable advance and
one of the clearest signs of the commitment of the University to building a culture of teaching that supports a culture of learning.

Advice: Move toward more unit-based (as opposed to individual-based) rewards and recognition for undergraduate education.

The Council of Undergraduate Education has improved communication of the undergraduate research opportunities and has developed incentives to encourage faculty inclusion of undergraduates in their research. These opportunities foster communication of academic excellence and achievement for the undergraduate while providing a glimpse of what is and can be in the graduate and professional worlds. As well, these experiences stimulate and challenge faculty perception of the new undergraduates and can provide a different perspective of the future and the community. The University should continue to look for ways to expand undergraduate research opportunities.

Advice: Continue to look for ways to expand undergraduate research opportunities.

The commitment to undergraduate research and teaching gives credence to the University's statement that "one of the most important ways to ensure that our undergraduates receive a superior education is to develop and sustain excellence in our graduate and professional programs". These programs are best sustained by solid research that extend into and enhance undergraduate education, which thus becomes the foundation for continued excellence in graduate and professional programs. The Team notes that this emphasis on excellence in undergraduate teaching promotes strong retention and four-year graduation rates and commends UIUC for them. Most recently, the University recorded a first-to-second-year retention rate of 92% and a four-year graduation rate of 77%.

At the same time, the University's teaching mission is under increasing strain because of a significant decline in the number of regular full-time faculty (about 250) over the past decade and by an almost ten percent increase in the percentage of non-tenure track faculty (to about
20%) delivering undergraduate instruction. In 1989-90, for example, 62.8% of all instructional units were delivered by tenured or tenure-track faculty; in 1997-98 that percentage had declined to 53.9%. Based on discussions with the Provost, that figure today is at about the same level. Expansion of the regular faculty base is essential if the UIUC is to maintain its strong record in attracting, retaining, and graduating the best undergraduates.

The percentage of TA's involved in the delivery of instruction has remained steady over the last decade at about 26%, despite a steep decline in the overall numbers of graduate students at Illinois. This suggests that the University has had to dig deeper into the pool of graduate students who can teach in the undergraduate teaching program.

The University continues to make efforts in academic advising. This includes training for new advisors; in-service training and support for current advisors; successful models of faculty serving as chief advisors in the College of Agriculture, Consumer and Environmental Sciences and the College of Engineering and a planned investment of $750,000 in undergraduate advising enhancements.

Students have reflected a concern about advising in the Chancellor's Senior Survey. Senior students interviewed expressed concern for the lack of advising students about ethnic group course offerings as well as the current structure of registering for discovery courses. Students indicate that athletes, honors students and students with AP credits are afforded the first opportunities to register for discovery courses. Thus the remaining first-year students who need the information offered by the discovery courses are the last ones to register for the courses.

Undergraduate students of color interviewed were aware and appreciative of the combined efforts of the Office of Student Affairs and the service learning components as facilitated through the Associate Provost's office. These efforts have assisted in students's
academic achievement; in their belief that the university "cares about (their) welfare"; and in encouraging their "feeling of being a part of the university".

Students also indicated that there were many issues facing African American students, including academic achievement and retention; feeling secure in the environment; the constant insinuation of preferential treatment in their acceptance at UIUC rather than merit-based; and few faculty role models. Other minority students indicated the lack of role models for Native Americans, Latinos/as, and Asian-Pacific American students. These students also discussed the issue of lack of cultural centers for groups of students and the possibility that those which currently exist will be taken away.

As the University reviews and strengthens its undergraduate programs, it must also seek to realize its framework for the future by understanding the culture of all its students and to educate the whole person for the benefit of the community.

Advice: Develop a more comprehensive vision to synthesize the various initiatives in undergraduate education.
V. INVEST IN OUR FACILITIES AND ORGANIZATIONAL ENVIRONMENT

*A Framework for the Future* sets as its fourth Key Principle: "We shall invest strategically in the facilities and environment our faculty and students need to do their work."

Since the last evaluation visit, the University clearly has worked to improve its physical facilities and campus environment. A number of new buildings have been completed and a number more are in planning, to be funded in whole or in part with private contributions. The Beckman Institute for Advanced Science and Technology, a striking example of the newer campus facilities and occupied in 1989, was the result of a major contribution from alumnus Arnold O. Beckman.

The campus delineates an open, well-articulated presence, a pleasing blend of old and new facilities within well maintained grounds. The blend of facilities and historical campus features produces a generally inviting classic academic environment. The Team commends UIUC for the emphasis placed on master planning, which is evident in the general development of the newer campus quads and the transition of spaces as one moves through the campus. The new arboretum and Japanese gardens are exceptional additions to the campus educational environment.

The addition of all the new space to the campus inventory and the resultant program growth must be impacting the need for more operating and maintenance support from the central University budgets as referenced in several of the goals, primarily goal 77. Further, the issue of funding for deferred maintenance (outlined in goal 78) was referenced by several of those interviewed. Some facility experts recommend a 2.5% reserve for deferred maintenance activity, which would translate into an annual commitment of about $20 million for the UIUC campus. The institution is receiving only approximately $3.5 to $5.0 million annually.
Advice: Pay attention to infrastructure (personnel and operating expenses) to support program growth.

The Team observed the real and continuing need to address the condition and educational utility of many of the older buildings that are contained within the core campus. (The previous NCA visiting team also referenced the accumulated need for repair and renovation of the older buildings.) The quality of this core building space—much of it instructional— is significantly dated, in need of major building systems and envelope upgrades, including central air conditioning, as well as further attention to ADA accessibility. The casual and prevalent use of window A/C units, to name one item alone, is a visual distraction to the appearance of these older core buildings and would surely compromise the quality of the interior environments.

Advice: Mount a more sustained effort to rehabilitate the older core buildings.

The goal to renew, rehabilitate and equip classrooms campus-wide for the 21st century is one initiative that evidently has been well planned and effectively implemented with promising initial results. This Chancellor’s initiative to remodel and retool with state-of-the-art instructional technology 39 classrooms within the central campus was initiated in 1995 at a cost of over $2.0M. The Team commends UIUC that this initiative has been continued and is funded for 2000-2002 to rehabilitate an additional 46 classrooms, 16 in South campus and 30 in the Engineering campus (North of Green Street). However, as plans are developed to continue funding classroom improvements, the Team suggests that efforts be expanded to develop more flexible classroom spaces that are more adaptable to a variety of instructional formats and class sizes (goal 82). These older academic buildings with larger classroom areas and higher ceilings lend themselves well to adaptations incorporating flexible furnishings and room configurations.

Advice: Sustain the initiative to renovate classrooms and labs; focus on older buildings.

During its visit, the Team encountered almost continually the successful result of actions taken to increase the number and quality of study spaces available to students in the Illini Union
(goal 86). The Team commends the availability of support and hospitality services together with the mixture and quality of study environments. The observed heavy student use of these spaces suggests that these initiatives are well received by the students.

The Team notes as exceptional the actions implemented to provide an updated and expanded student recreational system with distributed facilities and programming and commends the University for the particularly impressive presence of adaptive recreational facilities.

The Team also commends UIUC for the continued support and improvements being made in the Krannert Center, a truly remarkable resource to the campus and the surrounding community. These formal performance halls and the high quality arts, music and theater performances are a true educational asset for the institution.

In contrast, the visiting Team was most surprised by the inferior appearance, working condition and general physical context of many of the library units; especially those housed in the Main Library. (See discussion on page 16.) The University is held in high esteem for the size and diversity of its collections, but is conversely challenged by the physical condition of the library spaces—lack of air conditioning and humidity control—as well as the appearance and general context of the collections. The utility of these collections is significantly compromised for campus scholars as well as international scholars seeking to use the collections.

Advice: Improve the physical environment for the University's significant library collection and its many users.
VI. EXPLORE THE USE OF NEW TEACHING AND INFORMATION TECHNOLOGIES

The fifth Key Principle of Framework is to "explore the use of new teaching and information technologies." The priority questions identified by the deans were the right ones: Does the University of Illinois have the kind of organizational structure and infrastructure (both technology and people) to reach its goals? Does it have the kind of resources in place to make significant, rapid changes to meet new needs? The Team commends UIUC for framing the right questions and for making progress toward addressing the issues.

The UIUC has a well-deserved reputation for excellence in research computing. Its historic strengths help to give a positive identity for the University internally and externally. NCSA and the Beckman Institute have opened new possibilities for research agendas and for collaborative research projects of significant scale and impact. UIUC's campus IT provider, Computing and Communications Services Office (CCSO), has actively offered research support for faculty who do not need the resources of NCSA. There appears to be a high degree of cooperation between CCSO and NCSA, which is important if faculty and student interests are to be well coordinated. The Team commends CCSO for providing high-quality base-line services to nearly every member of the University community.

Likewise, the University's efforts to support asynchronous learning (e.g., U of I On-Line) or web-based learning (e.g., work in chemistry and Spanish) have garnered high visibility for the University and for the faculty who have developed these approaches. The Team notes with approval the creation of a CIO position that will report to the provost. Such an organizational structure should help to position computing at the academic center of the institution.

Meetings with a large number of faculty and administrators indicate that the new CIO will face a daunting series of challenges, not all of which fall within his/her job description. The Library automation efforts (e.g., its on-line catalogue) and the administrative systems (AITS) do
not seem coordinated with any other institutional needs or opportunities. Indeed, it is not clear how much input the faculty and staff will have. Goal 103 identified the need to "develop ways to bridge the gap between faculty and large-scale computing organizations." The Team suggests that staff should also be included in this dialogue and that the University aggressively seek to gather input from all of its IT constituencies.

Several goals (97, 98, 99, 100, and 101) explicitly addressed the need to improve opportunities for faculty to become skillful at using technology in teaching either by removing impediments (e.g., lack of training) or by providing incentives. While some faculty have done exemplary work with instructional technologies, we were struck by the lack of coordination of efforts to motivate and support new faculty efforts. There is a new Ed Tech board, but there are many other committees and funding sources that offer different kinds of support. A new group, Center for Educational Technologies (CET), has only 8 FTE but is strategically positioned to help integrate technology into learning. It appears that the central training unit charges fairly steep fees for computer workshops. This fact alone would be seen by many faculty, staff, and teaching assistants as a significant obstacle.

Advice: Devise major training programs to bring people up to speed with respect to new technology.

The Team was struck by the absence of a clearly articulated institutional vision about the role of technology in learning. On the enterprise level, where does the UIUC wish to be within five years? Indeed, given students’ dissatisfaction with large classes, it is curious that technology has not been deployed to help make large classes seem smaller. In other words, lots of committees are doing some positive things, but there is not a clear oversight of all the committees. A close look at the organizational structure is in order and should lead to better
coordination and planning and should help to promote synergy between the faculty who are teaching in resident education and distance education.

The University has been very successful at introducing technology into such high-enrollment courses as Spanish and chemistry because small groups of faculty have sought to solve curricular problems. The success of these faculty would suggest that technology could play an important role in other high-enrollment classes. The current model usually involves large lecturer sections and "recitation sessions" conducted by TA's, a large percentage of whom are not native speakers of English. Since a large percentage of students reported dissatisfaction with these large classes in the Chancellor's Senior Survey (12%), the University might well consider how technology could promote active and collaborative learning and more personalized learning environments. Both of these approaches would help to make large classes seem smaller; they would enable faculty to provide more customized feedback and would make students feel "less like a number" (another point the Chancellor's survey). Certainly, the technology infrastructure is present. What is needed is a specific set of curricular targets.

Advice: Develop a specific plan to consolidate gains made in reducing large class sizes; expand related technology.

Goal 96 called for improved "budgeting and financing practices for IT support." The Team did not have enough information to know how much improvement has been made, but did find that several important areas have no secure funding model. First, the Team is concerned about the funding model for the campus network, for which there is no charge – and thus no income-stream – for network connections. There are sharp differences in connectivity between the North Campus and the South Campus, and these differences will only be aggravated unless there is a predictable income stream to support campus upgrades. It is doubtful that the state appropriation will meet the significant challenge to upgrade the network, and unless the network
is uniformly robust, many opportunities in teaching and research cannot be easily pursued. What other funding models can be considered?

Second, the Team would ask the same questions about funding for faculty development. In a highly decentralized University, it is easy for needs to be overlooked. The Team would encourage the University to develop metrics on users' needs and satisfaction with IT services and to identify quantifiable goals for its faculty development programs. Such metrics would make it easier to document progress achieved and challenges unmet. The Team would also encourage the University to examine whether faculty, staff, and training are satisfied with the training available to them. If their jobs are to be changed – to be made more efficient and more productive – a solid training program is essential. How will such a training program be organized and funded? The Team did not see any data on current success in this area.

Similarly, goal 95 called for the development of "new models to provide off-campus network access." Since the University provides a relatively small number of dial-in modems (~800) and has only recently offered a "premier" service at a low monthly fee, it is not clear that students and faculty have sufficient access to the network from off-campus. Without adequate access, the University's other investments in technology will not be realized. While the private sector may be helpful, the Team believes it is important for the University to monitor whether the off-campus connectivity is adequate for its goals.

The Team commends UIUC for the effort underway to extend Ethernet access to students living in the "certified" private campus housing. As University resources are increasingly being made accessible to those with campus data backbone access, not to mention the rapid expansion of resources available on the Internet, this expanded access will be an asset to the educational opportunities present in the campus environment.
Finally, because technology has changed so rapidly since the last accreditation review, the Team recommends that UIUC look carefully at the IT organizational structures below the level of the CIO. The Team was struck by the high caliber of the IT staff interviewed, but it is unclear whether they are organized in the most effective way to meet the challenges of the next decade. Goal 102 calls for a new committee to oversee "IT standards, security, network, and resource allocation." Such a committee will need to attend to both strategic and tactical issues. But the committee cannot function without a clear statement about the academic IT priorities of the University in the next few years. From that vision of the University, priorities will emerge and the organizational environment should follow.

Advice: Look carefully at the IT organizational structures below the level of the CIO.
VII. STRENGTHEN OUR STRATEGIC ENGAGEMENT IN INTERNATIONAL STUDIES

The sixth Key Principle of Framework is to "strengthen the strategic engagement in International Studies."

The UIUC took a major step to strengthen the strategic engagement in International Studies throughout the institution by making it one of only seven Key Principles of the University’s Strategic Plan A Framework for the Future (May 1995). Based on the Framework and recommendations made by a faculty committee, The Schowalter Report (May 1996), the UIUC has made several important commitments to internationalization, including:

- Ten faculty lines dedicated to promoting international interdisciplinary research and instruction;
- The creation of a position designated as the Associate Provost and Director of International Programs and Studies;
- The creation of a campus-wide International Council;
- Strengthening the international dimensions in students' educational experience;
- Promoting increased study abroad opportunities;
- Strengthening the international dimension of UIUC’s outreach programs.

The provision of ten new faculty lines in 1997 has proven to be very successful. These lines have been used very effectively by the Associate Provost to collaborate with Deans and Departmental Executive Officers in the creation of a total of 17 new positions, using matching funds provided by the participating units. The commitment of these faculty lines was perhaps the single most important element of the plan and demonstrated the University’s strong commitment to internationalization by building its faculty strength.
The International Programs faculty lines not only increased the number of faculty engaged in international research and instruction but also led to the establishment of new relationships among individual units and fostered close intercollegiate and interdepartmental collaboration toward achieving a central University goal. Additional international faculty lines are anticipated and the University administration intends to provide those lines, as resources become available.

Now that the international faculty lines have been allocated and faculty members appointed, or soon to be appointed, the challenge will be to use these faculty as key players in developing a campus-wide sense of common purpose in internationalization. If these new faculty members simply begin to work within their own individual departments and collegiate units, most of the potential synergy may be lost. Some concern was expressed as to whether resources are sufficient for program and faculty development initiatives to provide incentives for continued interdisciplinary collaboration.

A second major initiative involves the desire to increase the number of students participating in international experiences, including study abroad, field-based research, internships, and guided short-term studies. The Office of Study Abroad has made good progress in increasing the number of students participating. The University has also adopted a strategy of developing more short-term experiences to involve those students who may be unwilling or unable to spend a full semester or year abroad in more traditional study abroad programs. The University has a goal of 20% of all undergraduate students having a study abroad or other significant international experience during their careers at the University of Illinois. Involving more students, and especially those non-traditional students who are in professional schools or in other areas which traditionally have been underrepresented, may require additional staff as well as student fellowship, scholarship and other incentive programs.
Advice: Identify staffing and fiscal resources to support international experiences for students.

The UIUC International Council is to serve as the primary governance structure for the efforts aimed at internationalization of the University. Representation on this council is drawn from constituencies across the campus and represents most areas of international activities. This council is relatively new and the challenge will be to make it an effective deliberative and advisory body. One challenge will be to integrate the traditional international and area studies programs, represented by the National Resource Center Title VI Centers, with other existing or emerging areas of cross-area and topical international interests. The creation of the International Council and the International Programs and Studies organization and activities may be viewed as competing with traditional area studies or other established units with international interests. The UIUC might consider ways of creating closer collaboration between area studies-focused activities and more cross-area studies activities through promotion of cross-cutting programs such as that represented in the new Ford Foundation Crossing Borders: Revitalizing Area Studies grants which the UIUC has received.

The recent reorganization of the Office of International Programs and Studies is intended to clarify the roles and responsibilities of the units and staff involved. The development of close collaboration and communication among faculty and staff of the various International Programs and Studies units is essential to success of the internationalization goal of UIUC. As the reorganization takes effect the relationship between the International Council and the Office of International Programs and Studies also must be clearly defined and articulated. Developing effective communications and promoting coordination and cooperation between the Office of International Programs and Studies and the International Council will be especially important.
The UIUC has also made a major commitment to strengthening international dimensions of undergraduate education through the adoption of a three-semester foreign language requirement and encouraging the development of a number of fourth year content-based foreign language courses. The innovative use of instructional technology and asynchronous learning environments in the teaching of large enrollment foreign language classes is very impressive and this effort may serve as a useful model for other technology-enhanced course development for UIUC as well as other institutions. The UIUC has also made a commitment to encourage and support the development of international content in the undergraduate curriculum through new course development and creation of special modules in existing courses.

The Framework document and the self-study express an interest in expanding opportunities for co-curricular and extra-curricular learning including greater interaction between domestic students and their fellow students from around the world. Plans for encouraging this interaction, including the idea of developing a living/learning community focused on this interaction, were not clearly articulated. Some thought might be given to defining the role of the Office of the Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs in the internationalization efforts of the UIUC and clarifying the relationship of that office to the International Council and the Office of International Programs and Studies.

Several faculty and staff commented favorably on the fact that the "climate" for international and interdisciplinary activities on campus has much improved in recent years. It is noteworthy that faculty do see the administration as dedicated to supporting internationalization. Concern was expressed as to whether the resources available to the UIUC would be sufficient in the future to successfully pursue the several new campus-wide initiatives that have been launched.

The general impression is that the internationalization efforts of the UIUC are well underway, generally understood and accepted, and based on a shared understanding that ultimate
success depends on grounding activities in the departmental and collegiate units. One faculty member noted, "It is at the collegiate and departmental level that we are pushing the boundaries."

The use of central University resources to offer incentives and encourage departments and colleges to pursue international and interdisciplinary opportunities has been crucial to the UIUC success to date, and will be essential in future. The commitment to the creation of the International Council and the Office of International Programs and Studies has been a sound investment. The considerable success to date needs to be built upon and extended.

*Advice: Develop specific mechanisms to join budget allocations and interdisciplinary programs.*
VIII. REINIGORATE OUR COMMITMENT TO OUTREACH AND PARTNERSHIPS

The UIUC's strategic plan, *A Framework for the Future* (May 1995) states:

"The knowledge explosion, economic globalization, need for an ever-more educated citizenry, shifting demographics, new information technologies, and a world of cultural and political differences far more complex than had been supposed almost certainly will require us to change, if we are to serve future needs and generations as well as we have in the past."

The University recognized the need to more effectively serve the people of the State of Illinois with coordinated efforts of outreach and partnerships.

Because UIUC is a large, nationally and internationally recognized land grant research institution that operates in a very decentralized environment, it has adopted a unique approach to "re-energizing" and "reinventing" its historic public service mission.

Through the *Framework's* seventh Key Principle, "We shall reinvigorate our commitment to outreach and partnership", the University is emphasizing the (pre-existing) activity of the academic department-based faculty and building on their experience with grantsmanship and project-focused activity.

UIUC supports these decentralized outreach activities with a set of central support operations and services including the office of continuing education, academic outreach, and the executive development center. Many academic units on the campus have independently managed non-credit and certificate programs.

The University is de-emphasizing a formal "outreach" administrative structure, using instead councils and committees to set priorities and allocate resources. Administratively, an Associate Chancellor "without portfolio" oversees the mission.
The organization of outreach activities seems very compatible with other University objectives and aspirations, building from the external interests of the deans, public affairs interests of the administration, and relationships built by the Illinois Extension Service.

The Chancellor chairs the "non-formal" structure with the deans forming the nucleus of the Partnership Illinois Council, which sets policy for the institution's outreach programs and activities. This structure offers leadership at the highest level.

The new initiative at the UIUC, Partnership Illinois (PI), was designed to coordinate public service and outreach efforts, increase their impact, and create new opportunities to serve all the peoples of the State of Illinois. This initiative is an avenue of response for the University. It offers the possibility of redefining in part the mission of UIUC's professional schools.

The PI initiative emphasizes collegiality of faculty across disciplines, requires formulation and formalization of external partnerships, often engages students, and seems to be positioning the University well with communities and organizations across the state of Illinois. Partnership Illinois sponsored the state's first Critical Issues Facing Illinois Conference which included strategy sessions on agriculture, economic development, education, government, health care, technology and transportation.

The Partnership Illinois initiatives recently have been focused upon five strategic areas, each coordinated by a sub-council, and stresses development of active "partnerships" between faculty/departments and external groups. These include

- Enhancing the capacity and performance of state, local, and municipal governments;
- Building the capacity of schools as well as social and health agencies and organizations to serve children, youth and families;
- Expanding ways by which Illinois communities can explore cultural and artistic opportunities;
- Extending the education and knowledge base required to produce and consume safe and healthy food and to be assured a safe water supply and clean air; and,
- Increase community vitality and promote economic development.

Two examples of faculty and students partnering with community groups are found in:
1. the East St. Louis Action Research Project coordinated by the College of Fine and Applied Arts and
2. the Safe Food, Air and Water program coordinated by the College of Veterinary Medicine. Both of these programs extend the benefits of academic research, educational expertise and leadership development to the community. Both students (graduate and undergraduate) and faculty communicate and interact through participatory planning in various, diverse settings and communities. Partnership Illinois is a positive and reciprocal initiative for the University and the State of Illinois.

The accomplishments of Partnership Illinois are significant with over $700,000 in new state funding, the creation of a PI index, and more than 450 active programs involved in outreach and public service. In spite of this significant funding, the Team encourages UIUC to continue to focus the outreach efforts so that expectations do not exceed available resources.

Advice: Carefully focus outreach efforts so that expectations do not outstrip resources.
IX. HIGHLIGHTS OF ADVICE AND SUGGESTIONS

For ease of reference, this final section contains a listing of only the advice and suggestions highlighted in the body of this Report.

Section II
1. Continue efforts to improve the campus climate for all people.

Section III
2. Continue working to link resources to ambitious new plans.
3. Gather more background information for planning and decision-making before launching research parks.
4. Complete implementation of new office structure in research and graduate education.
5. Complete the implementation of the 1998 faculty report on the Library.

Section IV
6. Move toward more unit-based (as opposed to individual-based) rewards and recognition for undergraduate education.
7. Continue to look for ways to expand undergraduate research opportunities.
8. Develop a more comprehensive vision to synthesize the various initiatives in undergraduate education.

Section V
9. Pay attention to infrastructure (personnel and operating expenses) to support program growth.
10. Mount a more sustained effort to rehabilitate the older core buildings.
11. Sustain the initiative to renovate classrooms and labs; focus on older buildings.
12. Improve the physical environment for the University's significant library collection and its many users.

Section VI

13. Devise major training programs to bring people up to speed with respect to new technology.

14. Develop a specific plan to consolidate gains made in reducing large class sizes; expand related technology.

15. Look carefully at the IT organizational structures below the level of the CIO.

Section VII

16. Identify staffing and fiscal resources to support international experiences for students.

17. Develop specific mechanisms to join budget allocations and interdisciplinary programs.

Section VIII

18. Carefully focus outreach efforts so that expectations do not outstrip resources.
APPENDIX: 1999 UIUC Framework Key Principles, Priorities and Goals

FIRST: Invest in People

What are good practices in attracting and retaining the finest faculty, staff, and students? How well do we meet the needs of our employees with respect to inclusivity, compensation, and opportunities for professional development and advancement? How well does an Illinois education prepare graduates to assume positions of leadership in a society that is culturally complex? Our goal here is twofold: to identify and focus on areas of existing strengths so that we can leverage them for expanded excellence, as well as to find those areas where we have not fully met our aspirations.

1. Recruit the very finest faculty, primarily junior level
2. Urge units to use best practices for recruitment, tenure, and promotion
3. Ensure availability of senior faculty mentors for junior faculty
4. Provide development programs for junior faculty
5. Improve mechanisms for departmental assessments of all nontenured faculty
6. Recommend faculty hiring and tenure only in the best interest of the University
7. Achieve 100% faculty salary parity with peers by 2000
8. Increase by 100 the number of endowed chairs and named professorships
9. Recruit best graduate students in all degree programs
10. Achieve competitive graduate assistantship and fellowship packages
11. Create expanded graduate fellowships based on merit
12. Structure graduate support and duties to aid in recruiting and retaining students
13. Provide competitive and flexible benefits packages to graduate students
14. Monitor progress towards competitive staff salaries
15. Eliminate institutional barriers to professional advancement of staff
16. Provide financial and logistical support for professional development of staff
17. Provide opportunities for learning new technologies in the work place
18. Encourage units to involve staff in developing operational policies and procedures
19. Balance size of faculty, graduate students, and undergraduate students
20. Enhance unit autonomy in budget decision making
21. Evaluate proportion of out-of-state students relative to comparable universities
22. Address inclusiveness in development programs for faculty, TAs, and staff
23. Encourage units to use best practices to recruit and retain minority students
24. Provide academic counseling and support for minority students
25. Use merit-based scholarships to attract talented underrepresented minority students
26. Study and address factors that impede academic progress of minority students
27. Provide colleges with annual progress reports on graduation rates
28. Use merit scholarships to attract talented underrepresented minority graduate students
29. Encourage most-talented minority undergraduates to consider graduate school
30. Encourage units to use best practices to recruit/retain women and minority faculty
31. Assess and assist departmental efforts to recruit women and minority faculty
32. Increase advancement opportunities for women and minority staff
33. Explore options for providing convenient child care
34. Collaborate with local community and other institutions for dual-career opportunities
35. Recruit from the broadest possible base, including government and industry
SECOND: Promote Scholarship and Research

Have we provided the right support for research facilities of a collective nature—in particular, in the areas of biotechnology, information technology, and the Library?

How can we continue to improve in these areas? What have we accomplished—and what remains for us to do—in supporting scholarship and research in the arts and humanities?

36. Emphasize/reinforce ties between teaching & research
37. Promote transfer of knowledge to/from society
38. Dedicate some Instructional Development Awards to active learning.
39. Encourage faculty to build undergrad discovery courses based on own research
40. Capitalize on research involvement as teaching tool
41. Provide central support for collective research facilities
42. Assure faculty is supported with adequate office/lab/studio space, etc.
43. Develop Critical Research Initiatives Fund to provide seed money
44. Develop open process for program proposal evaluation
45. Provide better assessment of grants/contracts for compatibility with UIUC interests
46. Develop review mechanisms to maximize central facility effectiveness
47. Preserve, make accessible and provide support for existing Library collections
48. Develop UIUC policy on intellectual property in electronic environment
49. Working with others, develop quality control for low-cost publication
50. Increase access to foreign-language electronic materials
51. Fund strategic acquisition of new library materials
52. Encourage collaboration to explore meaning of IT changes on society

THIRD: Accord Full Value to Our Teaching Mission

How can we continue to improve the quality of undergraduate and graduate education at Illinois? What remains to be done with respect to general education (now that we are nearing the 10th anniversary of the mandate that expanded and increased our general education requirements), living/learning communities, the first-year experience, and academic advising for all undergraduates? A series of committees have made recommendations on a number of graduate issues, and we now find ourselves in a period of transition and imminent change. What should we be doing to improve the quality of education for our graduate students?

53. Develop convocation program for new first-year students
54. Expand First-Year Discovery Program
55. Encourage units to engage undergraduates early in research
56. Enhance quality of opportunities in majors, general ed, and electives
57. Develop capstone experiences for undergrad majors
58. Limit the number of very large classes
59. Support large lectures with active learning, discussions, tech aids, faculty development
60. Explore new living-learning opportunities for undergraduates
61. Explore expansion of First-Year Impact orientation program
62. Create Teaching Advancement Board
63. Undertake detailed exam of advising to develop consistent standards campus-wide
64. Create systems to ensure accurate/timely info for planning undergraduate progress
65. Provide professional advising and develop peer student advising for courses
66. Ensure all students have access to faculty advice throughout undergrad years
67. Move toward model of universal and special training of TAs
68. Increase frequency/availability of TA testing/evaluation & monitor effectiveness
69. Ensure ongoing monitoring of TA performance by faculty
70. Reaffirm teaching as major factor in salary, promotion & tenure decisions
71. Increase awards honoring exceptional teaching by TAs and faculty.
72. Seek private support of teaching recognition and endowed chairs
73. Undertake review of appropriate roles for Graduate College, Provost, & deans
74. Subject policies affecting graduate program quality to second-level review
75. Develop info to help monitor/maintain quality of graduate programs
76. Develop mechanisms to monitor departmental graduate programs

FOURTH: Invest in Our Facilities and Organizational Environment

Do our facilities and organizational structure support the delivery of high-quality education? In what ways could they be improved? Are we approaching facilities issues optimally, given the realities of the constraints under which we operate? The development and implementation of the Support Services Strategy (S3) promise to have far-reaching effects on the way we do business at Illinois; what recommendations would you have for us as we begin to implement this approach? Do our organizational and administrative structures permit us to change while protecting those aspects of our university that are of lasting value?

77. For new facilities, estimate operational costs and identify funding sources
78. For existing facilities, initiate program to cover operational/maintenance costs
79. Renew, rehabilitate and equip classrooms campus-wide for the 21st century
80. Improve and expand teaching labs and computer labs
81. Develop more flexible classroom space
82. Upgrade/maintain selected classrooms for multimedia capability
83. Improve student residential living space
84. Provide improved space for international student services
85. Provide improved space for career services
86. Increase the number and quality of student study spaces
87. Plan and budget for upkeep/renewal of recreational/entertainment facilities
88. Engage in joint review of business procedures with Central Administration
89. Reduce flow of paper throughout UIUC - promote paperless transactions
90. Support streamlining efforts of Urbana-Champaign Senate
91. Encourage academic and administrative units to reduce bureaucracy
92. Support enhancements to U of I Direct on-line registration system
93. Support development of online graduate applications, admissions, & financial aid
94. Encourage use of interactive video and WWW to disseminate information

FIFTH: Explore the Use of New Teaching and Information Technologies

Does our organization and structure support our aspirations in this area? Does our approach to our information technology seem congruent with this goal? Are we suitably using our resident expertise/sophistication in infrastructure/support functions? Are there areas in which we should improve our approaches to support better our aspirations and standards?

95. Explore/develop modes to provide off-campus network access
96. Improve budgeting and financing practices for IT support
97. Offer opportunities for faculty to improve technological skills
98. Recognize technological innovations via campus award programs
99. Encourage faculty to become adept with new technologies
100. Build faculty support services use of new technologies in classroom
101. Expand existing educational programs for new users of IT and electronic resources
102. Establish Committee over IT standards, security, network, & resource allocation
103. Develop ways to bridge gap between faculty and large-scale computing orgs
104. Facilitate student ownership of computers; provide campus-wide hookups

SIXTH: Strengthen our Strategic Engagement in International Studies

Does the organization and implementation of international studies at this institution support our engagement in projects of an international scope? Are there areas in which our practices or organization might be improved and yield a significant gain?

105. Create Council to foster and coordinate international initiatives
106. Identify and develop areas of international scholarship strengths
107. Involve community members in improvement of international studies
108. Create international scholar-in-residence program; facilitate faculty exchanges
109. Expand opportunities for undergrads to interact with international students
110. Expand study-abroad programs; seek private support
111. Develop short-term international exchange programs
112. Encourage language learning
113. Internationalize study and scholarship

SEVENTH: Reinvigorate Our Commitment to Outreach and Partnerships

Are we approaching outreach in a way that benefits our core constituencies while at the same time leveraging and bolstering the strengths of the institution? Similarly, are we able to realize benefits from our corporate partnerships while safeguarding ourselves from possible risk?

114. Establish Partnership Illinois (PI) to extend faculty expertise to larger society
115. Establish PI Council to coordinate/oversee outreach activities
116. Work cooperatively with other public Illinois higher ed institutions
117. Work with public schools (K-12) in local, state and national activities
118. Strengthen mechanisms for technology transfer.
119. Sustain strong relationship with food and fiber industries
120. Coordinate outreach efforts to enhance IL manufacturing & service industries
121. Provide access to current ideas/technology to those in government service at all levels
122. Help Illinois agencies and citizens gain access to information superhighway
123. Extend cultural and artistic resources of UIUC to people of Illinois
124. Use multiple distance ed strategies to extend UIUC resources around the world
125. Establish Chancellor's Advisory Council to provide outside input
126. Achieve greater presence of UIUC satellite in Chicago and suburbs
127. Create forum of corporate leaders to exchange info and advice with UIUC
128. Establish clearinghouse to field inquiries from the public
129. Participate actively in AAU
130. Provide leadership within CIC
131. Work with NASULGC to address issues confronting public education
132. Provide leadership within MUCIA
133. Capitalize on WWW to disseminate info about UIUC
134. Improve satellite uplink capability at UIUC.
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