

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS URBANA-CHAMPAIGN SENATE
COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET
(Final; Information)

BG.24.03 Report on RS.24.01 “Resolution on the Allocation of Resources to Address Impacts of Collective Bargaining Agreements”

DECISION

On April 15, 2025, the Senate Committee on the Budget (BG) voted on the substance of RS.24.01 as stated in its last two paragraphs:

“THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that it is the sense of Urbana-Champaign Senate that it is the joint responsibility of university administration and the Senate, primarily through its Committee on the Budget, to consider shifting demands on the allocation of university resources;”

“BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Senate direct its Committee on the Budget to assist the university administration (namely the Office of the Provost) to create and monitor policies that would ensure that funds are allocated to address the impact of signed collective bargaining agreements between labor unions and the University of Illinois Board of Trustees.”

The results of this vote were one in favor, four against and no abstentions (1-4-0).

BACKGROUND

On March 27, 2024, during the meeting of the Senate Committee on the Budget (BG), Shawn Gilmore, a faculty senator from the College of Arts and Sciences, introduced a proposed draft of RS.24.01 ([“Resolution on the Allocation of Resources to Address Impacts of Collective Bargaining Agreements”](#)) that was going to be presented to the Senate by a group of senators on April 22, 2024.

On April 22, 2024, during the meeting of the Senate, Nicholas Burbules, a faculty senator from the College of Education, moved to refer RS.24.01 to BG so that it could “review the willingness and ability of BG to take on this responsibility and report back to the Senate prior to a Senate vote on the substance of the resolution”.

On October 15, 2024, during the BG meeting, Shawn Gilmore, a co-sponsor of the proposed resolution, attended to discuss this issue and provide more background on the resolution. The minutes of that meeting provide a summary of the discussion as follows:

“Shawn Gilmore, College of Liberal Arts and Sciences faculty senator and Resolution Sponsor, attended to discuss the proposed resolution on the allocation of funds to address the costs of collective bargaining agreements. Gilmore shared that while this resolution is still an ongoing item, there is no rush or deadline with the resolution. Gilmore shared that the units don’t have any input when contract negotiations are happening or when the negotiations have been settled. Bernhard shared that Deans are made aware of when contract negotiations are taking place and the Office of the Provost has historically helped out for the first year of the contract to assist some of the colleges who may need help. The units are then aware of the increases for the remaining years of the contract and must plan accordingly. For self-supporting units, the process is a bit different in the sense that they are not able to increase student enrollment to cover the additional costs.

Chair Silhan shared that there may not be standing for the Senate to get involved in these types of matters.”

While discussing RS.24.01 at this initial meeting, BG addressed a wide variety of issues related to RS.24.01. Such issues included:

funding faculty payroll, covering student demand, predicting demand for resources, timing the inflow and outflow of funds, overlapping contract agreements, distributing IUs for Gen Ed courses, complexity associated with having a diverse set of departments, systemic imbalances, communication issues at different levels within university, budgeting cycle. task of monitoring allocations and potential path to funding resolution (e-mail dated 1-16-24 from P.A. Silhan to S.P. Gilmore).

BG discussions, such as this, helped analyze the issues involved.

On April 15, 2025, during the meeting of the BG, various issues related to RS.24.01 were reviewed and discussed. In addition, each paragraph of RS.24.01 was reviewed. Next, with a quorum, there was a vote on RS.24.01. The results of this vote were one in favor, four against and no abstentions (1-4-0).

FINDINGS

As noted in paragraph 10 of RS.24.01, the Senate has directed BG (a) to “consult and advise the campus administration and members of the campus community on formulation of policies affecting the budget and on allocation of funds requested by and appropriated to the University of Illinois System and the University of Illinois Urbana-Champaign” and (b) to “[m]onitor the allocation of campus resources among different units of the campus, the processes and criteria followed in determining budgetary needs and in allocating existing and requested new resources, and the implications of budget decisions for educational policy and quality of academic and related programs in the University” ([Senate Bylaws](#) D.4.a.1 and D.4.a.4).

Thus, BG can (a) advise on the formulation of budgeting policies and (b) monitor their implementation. However, each collective bargaining agreement (CBA) would be unique with its own set of issues.

While each CBA would *directly* generate a set of legally binding financial obligations, each CBA also might *indirectly* generate non-CBA effects as well. Such indirect CBA effects might include *second-order effects* (indirect consequences of the primary obligation within a campus unit, such as supervisory costs, benefit costs, and travel approvals) and *spillover effects* (ripple effects across campus units, such as non-union salary adjustments and program initiatives). However, as an eight-member committee with limited time and resources, BG would have limited ability to comprehensively discover and address such effects on a continuing basis. Also, in an advisory capacity, BG would not be able to *ensure* that funds would be allocated to address such effects.

Moreover, it appears that the use of standardized allocation policies would not be effective in a dynamic environment with shifting priorities, since a more timely and flexible approach would be needed. Complex matters, such as those described here, would be addressed better in real time on a case-by-case basis through the resources and decision-making capabilities of the UIUC Integrated Value-Centered Budgeting (IVCB) system. Currently, without RS.24.01, BG is available to *assist* on such matters as requested by the parties involved.

REASONING

While BG plays an important role in shaping and monitoring the budgeting process, ultimate responsibility for budgeting policies rests with various decision makers within the IVCB system. With respect to various CBA effects, BG determined that RS.24.01 was (a) *unnecessary* given the collaborative nature of the IVCB model and (b) *unworkable* given the scope and idiosyncratic nature of CBA effects. Thus, without a feasibility study, our committee expressed these implementation concerns and voted against RS.24.01 by a four-to-one margin.

BUDGET
Peter Silhan, Chair
Neil Baer
Trinity Choi
Eun Yi Chung
Melony Esquivel
Becky Smith
Lindsey Stirek
Marci Uihlein
Aimee Heeter, *ex officio*