

To: President Raj Echambadi
Provost Elizabeth Hudson

Cc: Board of Trustees

Re: Resolution approved 37-1-0 by faculty members at Chicago-Kent

Date: July 21, 2026

The following resolution was approved by a vote 37 yes, 1 no, 0 abstentions, at an informal meeting today attended by 32 active Chicago-Kent faculty (including active emeritus faculty). Proxy votes were solicited ahead of the meeting and 6 timely received proxy votes were counted.

* * *

WHEREAS, the faculty of the rebranded Chicago-Kent School of Law within the announced College of Professional Futures ("Chicago-Kent" or the "law school"), are committed to the institution, to its students, and to the sound stewardship of Illinois Institute of Technology, and take the step contemplated by this motion only after other avenues have been exhausted;

WHEREAS, the University confronts a financial crisis, including a projected deficit in the range of \$100 million and a projected decline in annual revenue from approximately \$300 million to approximately \$200 million in FY2027, and the University has announced its intention to enact reductions in force for faculty and staff, and to ask the Board of Trustees to declare a state of extraordinary financial exigency for the purpose of terminating the appointments of faculty;

WHEREAS, a condition of this magnitude does not arise in a single budget cycle, but is the product of years of institutional decisions concerning enrollment, capital commitments, borrowing, expenditure, and revenue projection made under the direction of the President and the Provost and their predecessors, and the faculty have at no point been afforded a candid account of how the University arrived at this position;

WHEREAS, the financial model, assumptions, and projections on which the contemplated declaration of exigency rests have not been shared with the faculty, with the University Faculty Council, or with the Dean and faculty of the School of Law, such that the faculty are asked to accept the necessity of extraordinary measures without the information required to evaluate that necessity;

WHEREAS, a declaration of extraordinary financial exigency is the most severe action an institution can take against its own faculty, extinguishing the tenure protections on which academic freedom depends and terminating the employment of staff and of faculty without tenure protections who bear no responsibility whatever for the University's financial condition;

WHEREAS, the administration has proposed to resolve by termination of faculty and staff a crisis that it has not demonstrated cannot be addressed by other means, and has not first exhausted or seriously presented alternative measures including administrative reductions, deferred capital expenditure, restructuring of debt, revenue initiatives, or shared and proportionate sacrifice beginning at the senior administrative level;

WHEREAS, rather than enlisting the faculty as partners in addressing the crisis, as the Faculty Constitution requires, the administration has centralized decision-making and has prevented the Dean and faculty of the School of Law from overseeing the law school's curriculum, budget, staffing, admissions, and the use of funds it raises or has raised;

WHEREAS, the University has prohibited the School of Law from using funds it raises to supplement its own budget, with the result that millions in gifts, pledges, and anticipated gifts secured within the previous Dean's first five months was followed by a sharp contraction in giving once donors learned the funds would not augment law school operations — a self-inflicted loss of revenue at the precise moment the University asserts its financial distress;

WHEREAS, the faculty is concerned that the University has used and is using funds donated for the benefit of the law school for other, non-law-school purposes;

WHEREAS, the previous Dean and current Interim Dean have repeatedly approached University leadership about how to reduce a budget gap, yet the University has not provided the law school with a full accounting of the amount required to be reduced;

WHEREAS, the University has charged or contemplates charging the School of Law proportional overhead for University-wide costs, including undergraduate residence halls, bearing no relationship to the operation of a law school, while simultaneously restricting the law school's capacity to raise offsetting funds;

WHEREAS, contemplated reductions to clinical faculty, to legal research and writing faculty, and to other full-time faculty, together with contemplated increases in teaching loads and student-faculty ratios, individually and cumulatively place at risk the School of Law's compliance with ABA Standards 201, 202, 203, 301, 303, 304, 309, 312, 316, 403, 501, and 601–605;

WHEREAS, contemplated reductions to staff—especially pertaining to the library, career services, and other mission-critical areas like student affairs and bar preparation—and faculty will place at risk the School of Law's ability to carry out its program of legal education in accordance with its accreditation obligations and consistent with representations made to and relied on by students;

WHEREAS, on May 7, 2026, thirty members of this faculty transmitted a signed letter to the President and the Provost setting out then-known concerns in detail;

WHEREAS, on May 11, the President responded to the May 7 letter with an email promising to "work closely with the leadership of the law school to evaluate these points and determine the best path forward," but those discussions never occurred;

WHEREAS, following the May 7 letter, both the President and Provost indicated that it contained inaccurate statements, but they never identified or communicated what they believed those inaccurate statements to be;

WHEREAS, on May 15, following Dean Czarnezki's announcement of his resignation, three faculty members with accreditation responsibilities transmitted a detailed memorandum to the Vice Provost for Accreditation and Assessment recommending specific corrective steps, and the Provost's office confirmed that University counsel had advised that the accreditation problems identified in the memo required no response;

WHEREAS, on May 20, before the appointment of Interim Dean Krent, the Provost acknowledged a lack of communication between her office and the Law School, stating that she was "concerned by the various communications that have flown around for issues that can pretty simply be resolved by communication and collaboration";

WHEREAS, following that acknowledgment, the Provost appointed six Law School faculty members to an ad hoc liaison committee charged with meeting with three vice provosts to facilitate communication and collaboration between the Provost's Office and the Law School;

WHEREAS, although the ad hoc liaison committee met twice, the representatives of the Provost's Office were repeatedly unable to answer basic and time-sensitive questions, including whether the Board of Trustees had voted on a colleague's tenure case and when he would receive formal notice of his tenure decision;

WHEREAS, these meetings demonstrated that the Provost, through her own errors and omissions, bears personal responsibility for these oversight and communication failures, as necessary decisions either had not been made or had not been communicated even to the vice provosts whom the Provost had designated to communicate and collaborate with the Law School;

WHEREAS, in each instance and as a consistent pattern the President and Provost have individually and collectively failed to provide timely and substantive responses to concerns raised by the Law School regarding whether it will remain in compliance with ABA accreditation standards and whether the University will thereby risk its own Higher Learning Commission accreditation;

WHEREAS, the Law School is already experiencing difficulty securing sufficient faculty coverage for its courses and cannot be assured that it will be able to cover all necessary classes;

WHEREAS, a one-year grace period would provide the Law School additional time to develop and implement a sustainable plan for meeting its instructional and staffing needs;

WHEREAS, these contemplated reductions and their impact on our compliance with ABA standards is doubly problematic given that, less than a month before students arrive, up to one third of our faculty may be laid off, and that the law school cannot plan for this contingency without information about who will be leaving and who will remain able to teach classes;

WHEREAS, the University has announced a restructuring that would eliminate the College of Law's status as an independent college and place the Law School within a newly created school in the College of Professional Futures alongside the Business School;

WHEREAS, the administration has asserted that this restructuring will produce staffing-cost savings without presenting any non-speculative evidence, analysis, implementation plan, or explanation demonstrating how such savings would be achieved;

WHEREAS, the University has not identified the staffing model, administrative responsibilities, reporting relationships, budget allocations, or operational changes necessary to implement the restructuring;

WHEREAS, the absence of such planning and guidance has left basic operational and public-facing questions unresolved, including whether and how the Law School's website, email signatures, branding, communications, and other institutional materials should be revised;

WHEREAS, announcing a fundamental restructuring of the Law School without substantiating its purported financial benefits or providing the resources, direction, and planning necessary for implementation has created uncertainty and impaired the Law School's ability to plan, communicate, and operate effectively;

WHEREAS, the President announced at a university-wide meeting on July 17, 2026 that the university's financial crisis is driven by a dramatic enrollment decline and intends to impose university-wide faculty and staff cuts, even though the law school's enrollment is increasing; and

WHEREAS, the faculty's confidence in the leadership of this University rests on competent financial stewardship, candor with the faculty, respect for the shared governance obligations of the institution, and fidelity to the accreditation obligations of its professional schools, and in each of these respects that confidence has been forfeited;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that we have **no confidence in the President of Illinois Institute of Technology** and **no confidence in the Provost of Illinois Institute of Technology**; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Board of Trustees should decline to declare extraordinary financial exigency unless and until the administration first (i) discloses to the faculty the complete financial model, assumptions, and projections on which the request rests; (ii) demonstrates that no alternative short of the termination of tenured appointments is available; (iii) provides a full accounting for the decisions that produced the University's financial condition; and (iv) meaningfully includes faculty, or a representative body designated by the faculty, in identifying individuals whose appointments are to be terminated; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Board of Trustees should restore to the Dean and faculty of the School of Law the authority over curriculum, budget, staffing, admissions, and the use of funds raised by the law school that the ABA Standards require, and to permit the law school to raise and retain funds on its own behalf subject to a defined contribution to the University; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that this resolution shall be transmitted to the President, the Provost, the Chair and members of the Board of Trustees, and the University Faculty Council.