

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 209 983

HE 014 502

AUTHOR Floyd, Carol Everly
TITLE Organizational Goals and Self-Maintenance in Public Higher Education Coordination: The University of Illinois and the Illinois Board of Higher Education During the 1960's.

PUB DATE Nov 79
NOTE 20p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Southern Political Science Association (Gatlinberg, TN, November 1-3, 1979).

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.

DESCRIPTORS Agency Role; *Board of Education Role; *College Planning; Conflict Resolution; Educational History; Governance; *Government School Relationship; Higher Education; Leadership Responsibility; *Master Plans; Multicampus, Colleges; Organizational Climate; Organizational Objectives; School Location; State Boards of Education; State Universities; *Statewide Planning; Success; Urban Universities

IDENTIFIERS *Illinois State Board of Higher Education; *University of Illinois.

ABSTRACT

The institutional goals of the University of Illinois and the Illinois Board of Higher Education during the 1960s and conflict between the two entities are examined. One goal of the University of Illinois was to develop new general purpose campuses in the urban areas of the state in order to increase its educational services to the state. One goal of the Illinois Board of Higher Education was to provide effective leadership for statewide master plans for public higher education. Attention is directed to the importance of the goals, actions blocking goal attainment, and degree of goal attainment. Differences in organizational circumstances of the two groups are examined to help determine whether the goals are central to institutional self-maintenance. The university's goal of adding new general purpose campuses was directly frustrated by the board's rejection of the plans of "The University of Illinois and Plans for the Future," and by denial of governance of the Chicago and Springfield campuses provided for in Master Plan II. The board's goal of providing strong leadership in statewide master planning was partially blocked by the mere existence of University of Illinois statewide planning initiatives. The board was able to protect its goal by denying the fruit of the University's planning initiatives. For the university, the goal of adding new general purpose campuses was important but only one among a broad set of goals typical of the comprehensive university. It is suggested that the goal of providing strong leadership in statewide master planning was central to the board's self-maintenance. (SW)

* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *

ED209983

ORGANIZATIONAL GOALS AND SELF-MAINTENANCE IN PUBLIC HIGHER EDUCATION
COORDINATION: THE UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS AND THE ILLINOIS
BOARD OF HIGHER EDUCATION DURING THE 1960'S

Carol Everly Floyd

Assistant Deputy Director for Academic Affairs
Illinois Board of Regents

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as
received from the person or organization
originating it.

Minor changes have been made to improve
reproduction quality.

Points of view or opinions stated in this docu-
ment do not necessarily represent official NIE
position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS
MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Carol Everly Floyd

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

FILE 014 502

Prepared for delivery at the 1979 Annual Meeting of the Southern Political
Science Association; Gatlinberg, Tennessee; November 1-3, 1979.

ORGANIZATIONAL GOALS AND SELF-MAINTENANCE IN PUBLIC HIGHER EDUCATION
COORDINATION, THE UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS AND THE ILLINOIS BOARD OF
HIGHER EDUCATION DURING THE 1960'S

Statewide higher education coordinating boards were established in a number of states during the 1950's, 1960's, and early 1970's. They arose from the coincidence of legislative desires to avoid mediating disputes between competing universities and expert opinions on the need for coordinated development of higher education. Coordinating board statutory authority typically includes approval of new degree programs, master planning for future development of higher education, and formulation of budgetary recommendations to the legislature and/or governor.

During the major period of higher education growth in the 1960's, a particularly high degree of political conflict between the statewide coordinating board and the principal state university was observed in a number of states. The most comprehensive and prestigious public university has usually been the major opponent of the establishment of coordinating boards which have more than advisory powers and are composed of a majority of public as opposed to institutional members. It has usually also been the major opponent of the policy positions such regulatory coordinating boards have taken.

There has not been much examination of statewide higher education coordination from the perspective of political science and even less organizational analysis. The author seeks to contribute to an understanding of the process of higher education coordination by an examination of the institutional goals and self-maintenance which underlies it. The analysis will account for the high degree of conflict between the principal state university and the statewide coordinating board in terms of institutional goals and self-maintenance.

The case to be examined in some detail is that of Illinois during the period of rapid higher education growth in the 1960's. Conflict between the University of Illinois and the Illinois Board of Higher Education was particularly marked. Illinois is likely to be a particularly useful case study because the Illinois Board of Higher Education was regarded during the 1960's as the politically most powerful of the regulatory coordinating boards.

I. ORGANIZATIONAL GOALS AND SELF-MAINTENANCE

Self-maintenance needs are inherent in the nature of modern organizations. As Philip Selznick suggests in Leadership in Administration, organizations are inevitably marked by strong concerns for self-maintenance.

The views and opinions in this paper are those of the author and do not necessarily represent the opinion of the Board of Regents.

A living association blends technical aims and procedures with personal desires and group interests. As a result, various elements in the association have a stake in its continued existence. Moreover, the aims of the organization may require a certain permanence and stability.¹

Substantially the same idea, in somewhat different terminology, is offered by Simon, Smithberg, and Thompson in Public Administration. Institutions, they suggest, have a strong will to survive.² Simon, Smithberg, and Thompson also provide a more explicit link between institutional survival and institutional goals than that stated less concretely by Selznick. They indicate that institutional self-maintenance takes the form of attempts to protect institutional goals.³ Although it is not directly stated, it can be inferred from Simon, Smithberg, and Thompson that an organization will not be equally protective of all its goals because all are not equally important to its survival.

An important part, therefore, of the examination of organizational goals is distinguishing between those which are central to organizational survival, at least in the views of the leaders of the organization, and those which bear a lesser significance. Survival interests will condition the priorities among these goals and the tactics used to achieve them.

The only use of the concept of institutional self-maintenance which the author finds in the literature on higher education politics is that by Allan Rosenbaum. In concluding comments on the various relationships between state universities and state politics, Rosenbaum describes the motivations of the University of Illinois and the other Illinois state universities for their involvement in the political process as "the maintenance and enhancement needs of large formal organizations"⁴ Rosenbaum does not examine the organizational goals of state universities or state governmental units.

The case to be examined within the framework of institutional goals and self-maintenance is that in Illinois relating to new campus development and master planning. One goal of the University of Illinois was to develop new general purpose campuses in the urban areas of the state in order to increase its educational services to the state. One goal of the Illinois Board of Higher Education was to provide effective leadership for statewide master plans for public higher education.

The focus of this examination will be these institutional goals. More specifically, it will be the importance of the goals, actions blocking goal attainment, and degree of goal attainment. Determinations of whether a goal is central to institutional self-maintenance are necessarily inexact and must be made on the basis of the environmental circumstances of the institution. Attention will be given to differences in organizational circumstances of the two entities. The recency of the establishment of the Illinois Board of Higher Education and the limited number of its goals will be related to the importance of the statewide master planning goal. The breadth of University of Illinois' goals will be related to the importance of the new campus development goal.

Written sources of information on the case were drawn from the printed public record which includes official Illinois Board of Higher Education and University of Illinois reports, minutes of the Board and of the University of Illinois Board of Trustees, and reports of committees advisory to the Board. Statements and correspondence in the files of the Board and the University were consulted. News articles and editorials relating to the controversy were examined. A number of individuals knowledgeable about the case were interviewed in depth during 1972 with the understanding that they would not be quoted and that no specific pieces of information would be attributed to them unless specific permission was granted. Whenever it was possible, information received from anonymous sources has been supported by public information.

Prior to developing the analysis, certain background information needs to be provided about the organizational history of Illinois public higher education and Illinois higher education growth in the 1960's.

II. ORGANIZATIONAL HISTORY OF ILLINOIS PUBLIC HIGHER EDUCATION⁵

A. Prior to Establishment of Board of Higher Education

In 1960 there were three governing boards for all state public four-year higher education institutions: the University of Illinois Board of Trustees, the Southern Illinois University Board of Trustees, and the Teachers College Board. In 1960 the University of Illinois was the only comprehensive public university in Illinois. Southern Illinois University's teaching, research, and public service functions were significantly less comprehensive and well developed. It had won legislative approval to offer liberal arts programs only in 1943; gained a separate governing board in 1949, and was still prohibited from developing programs in a number of professional areas. In the late 1950's, the other four-year state institutions governed by the Teachers College Board were emerging from the status of teachers colleges under which their programs had been limited by law to teacher education. They were developing full undergraduate liberal arts curricula and desired graduate and professional programs.

In 1960 only the University of Illinois and Southern Illinois University operated campuses in addition to the main campus. The University of Illinois had long had a Medical Center campus in Chicago and had also operated since 1946 a two-year branch campus on Navy Pier. In 1960 the University was still involved in finding a site for a Chicago campus which would have full four-year and graduate programs and would replace the Navy Pier campus. Southern Illinois University was already operating small temporary branch campuses in the St. Louis area while in the process of developing a permanent branch campus in Edwardsville.

B. Establishment, Powers, and Structure of the Illinois Board of Higher Education

As previously noted, the genesis of the Illinois Board of Higher Education can be seen as arising from a coincidence of legislative desires to avoid mediating disputes between competing universities and expert opinions on the need for the coordinated development of higher education.

The competition, which had been confined in the 1940's and 1950's to the University of Illinois and Southern Illinois University, was broadening with the transformation of the former teachers college into developing universities. The advisory Commission on Higher Education (established by the legislature in 1954) was frequently ignored by the universities who took their requests directly to the legislature.

The legislature passed and the Governor signed the bill creating the Illinois Board of Higher Education in 1961. The basic powers of the Board are in three areas: budget review, program approval, and master planning. The Board makes budget recommendations to the Governor and to the General Assembly. Approval of the Board is necessary before an institution can establish a new branch or campus or offer any new unit of instruction, research, or public service. The Board is charged with preparing a master plan for the "development, expansion, integration, coordination and efficient utilization of the facilities, curricula and standards of higher education for the public institutions of higher education in the area of teaching, research, and public service." The Board formulates the master plan and prepares for the legislature and Governor drafts of proposed legislation to effect the plan. Although a statewide planning function was assigned to the Illinois Board of Higher Education in the form of its master planning function, no mention was made in the statutes regarding which planning activities were still the prerogative of the universities. This ambiguity of planning prerogative greatly contributed to conflict between the Board and the University of Illinois over planning for new campuses.

The Executive Director who heads the Board professional staff has always had, due to his control over the information supplied to the members of the Board, a large influence on Board policies. In practice, Board policy has been developed by the executive director who then seeks the consent of the chairman. The Board has sources of advice in both technical committees and advisory committees.

III. CASE BACKGROUND

Master Plan I, the first master plan of the Board of Higher Education, involved a number of provisions including those for the establishment of a partially state-supported system of junior colleges and enlargement of the state college system through acquisition of the Chicago Teachers College. The latter institution was to be placed under the governance of the Teachers College Board whose name was to be changed to the Board of Governors of State Colleges and Universities. Also projected was a future emphasis on commuter rather than residential institutions for junior, senior, and graduate-level work. There was no strong opposition to Master Plan I proposals either in Board formulation or state governmental consideration.

Beginning in the early 1960's, the University of Illinois expressed interest in developing new general purpose campuses. As a culmination of its long-range planning efforts, the University of Illinois presented a proposal entitled "The University of Illinois and Plans for the Future" to the Illinois Board of Higher Education late in 1964. The University of Illinois sought special funding to intensify its long-term planning for four-year campuses in the heavily populated areas of Illinois (Chicago, Peoria,

Springfield, Decatur, Rockford, and Rock Island). It also sought immediate approval to operate a higher education program at Navy Pier in Chicago, the site which was being abandoned as the University of Illinois at Chicago Circle was being completed. The Navy Pier campus, it was suggested, was to serve to meet the immediate needs for college spaces and would exist on a temporary basis. The university proposal was labeled "empire-building" in a number of quarters and particularly so by the private universities who were concerned about the effect of any further expansion of the University of Illinois upon their own enrollment prospects. Questions were also raised as to why the proposal had not been made earlier while the Illinois Board of Higher Education was formulating Master Plan I and how the plan coordinated with junior college development.

The Illinois Board of Higher Education staff report prepared in response to the University of Illinois proposal stressed the impropriety of the University of Illinois proposal for statewide planning; the Illinois Board of Higher Education was to do all statewide planning. In April 1965, the Board declined to grant the University of Illinois the permission it sought. University of Illinois President David Dodds Henry said the University would abide by the Illinois Board of Higher Education decision but added that the University would press its case for new campuses in the planning for Master Plan II which was then in its beginning stages.

Among the provisions of Master Plan II completed in 1966 were those recommending the creation of an additional university governing board and the establishment of an unspecified number of upper-division commuter institutions in the Chicago Metropolitan area and in Springfield, the state capital. The Board of Regents was to be created to govern Northern Illinois University and Illinois State University then under the jurisdiction of the Board of Governors. The rationale provided was that these two universities which were expected to develop a relatively full range of doctoral programs in the arts and sciences ought to be governed separately from those universities encouraged to develop a much narrower range of functions. The bill establishing the Board of Regents passed easily in the 1967 legislative session. Heated controversy surrounded the legislative consideration, however, of Senate Bill 955, the bill providing funds for the advanced planning for a campus in the Chicago area and one in Springfield because of the opposition of the private colleges and universities to the establishment of new public university campuses. The private college and university forces although strong were ultimately not able to prevail. As had been recommended in Master Plan II, S.B. 955 also provided that the Illinois Board of Higher Education decide which governing board would be responsible for the new campuses. During the 1967 legislative session, the University of Illinois supported S.B. 955 and had the impression that the Board would assign it the Springfield campus.

In Fall 1967 the Illinois Board of Higher Education established a subcommittee to consider the questions of general location, function, and governance of the two new campuses. The determination that any new campus be for junior, senior and graduate students only grew out of concerns for junior college development and was not particularly controversial. All four university governing boards presented papers to the Special Committee with regard to the governance question. Only the University of Illinois seemed

to regard its proposal as more than perfunctory. In Spring 1967, at the time the Bill establishing the Board of Regents had gone through the legislature, a legislative friend of Southern Illinois University had introduced a bill providing for the Southern Illinois University Board of Trustees to govern Illinois State University and Northern Illinois University and the new Springfield campus. That bill was quickly killed.

At the meetings of the Special Committee, Illinois Board of Higher Education Executive Director Lyman Glenny highlighted a number of drawbacks to developing the new campuses within the University of Illinois emphasizing concerns about protecting the functional identity of the new campuses and maintaining a "balance of power" within public higher education. University of Illinois President Henry continued to emphasize the many strengths of the University and maintained that irrelevant non-educational criteria were being injected into an educational debate.

In December 1967, the Special Committee recommended that the Springfield campus be assigned to the Board of Regents and the Chicago area campus to the Board of Governors. Once the Special Committee made its report, the University of Illinois ceased to advance its case for the campuses while disputing certain recommendations and commentary in the report which it considered offensive. The final Board of Higher Education report removed most of that contested language.

After the Illinois Board of Higher Education accepted in January 1968 the recommendations on governing boards for the two new campuses, there was no apparent University opposition to legislative establishment and funding of the two new campuses. In the 1969 biennial legislative session, bills were passed and signed by the Governor establishing Sangamon State University under the Board of Regents and Governors State University under the Board of Governors.

IV. CASE ANALYSIS

A. University of Illinois Aspirations for Development of New Campuses

Dating back to no later than 1963, it was a significant goal of the University of Illinois to meet the needs of Illinois for more student spaces in higher education by establishing an unspecified number of University of Illinois campuses throughout the State. During the 1950's the University of Illinois was still unsure whether it wished to operate any new campuses because of reservations on whether such efforts would tend to drain resources from its principal campus in Urbana. By the early 1960's, demand for new campuses in the urban areas was strong. It appeared that if the University of Illinois was not interested in new campuses other state universities, particularly Southern Illinois University, would be.⁶ A major planning effort was the 1962-63 study by a staff member, Robert Crane, of the need for a four-year university in Springfield, the state capital. That study was undertaken at the urging of a citizens group in Springfield.

The planning model which the University of Illinois was examining from the early 1960's through the 1967 proposal to govern the new Springfield campus, was that of the University of California system. The University of California

system was regarded by many scholars of higher education as the most successful system in providing high quality teaching, research, and public service throughout a large area; that high regard was not, however, universal. As a result of its planning activities during the early 1960's, the University of Illinois determined that the University of California system could serve, to a large degree, as its planning model. On a number of occasions at staff meetings with the Illinois Board of Higher Education, the University of Illinois made reference to the University of California model and suggested that the Board staff might well profit from talking to the staff of the California system.⁷

As the provisional Master Plan I was being developed, the University of Illinois indicated its willingness and desire to develop and govern new campuses. The position of the University of Illinois was communicated in "Goals and Functions of the University of Illinois," a report submitted to the Illinois Board of Higher Education in December 1963, in response to a request from the Board about the goals and functions of the University. The report identified a need for more four-year state-supported universities. It pointed out the Crane study of the higher education market in and around Springfield as the only extended study of any urban area that had been done to that date. It suggested the necessity of such studies for other population centers. It recognized the desirability of a stress on commuter institutions in planning for the future. It identified as an open question whether these campuses should be associated with existing universities. Finally, it pointed out advantages of such association, and indicated its willingness to undertake responsibility for new campuses.⁸ A subsequent speech by University of Illinois President Henry clarified the University's goal:

We believe that the University's recent experience in commuter design constitutes an obligation for timely initiative and careful analysis. We are now preparing a comprehensive study of the broad question of how additional service by the University of Illinois should be planned, and within the coming months will make recommendations to the Board of Trustees and to the Board of Higher Education as a result of this inquiry.⁹

The University of Illinois was clearly interested in establishing new campuses and apparently saw extensive long-range planning as a major initiative it could take to help call attention to the need for and win support for new campuses. At the same time, the University was aware of the ambiguity created when the Illinois Board of Higher Education was assigned by statute the master planning function with no mention of the extent to which the long-range planning which the University had historically done was to be restricted. In the speech previously quoted, the University of Illinois shows apprehension that the Illinois Board of Higher Education might attempt to curtail University statewide planning efforts.¹⁰ It is also implied in the speech that continued long-range planning by the University of Illinois relating to the whole state is appropriate and actions of the Illinois Board of Higher Education aimed at restriction are inappropriate.

B. Illinois Board of Higher Education Statewide Master Planning Function

The principal duty assigned to the Illinois Board of Higher Education was the master planning function. Lyman Glenny, who was Associate Director (1962-65) and Executive Director (1965-68) of the Board, has written of the Board's functions:

State-wide, long-range planning is the principal legal power which allows the coordinating agency to gain a degree of political leadership in the "scheme of balanced tensions." Priorities and determination of need...logically follow from a grand design which is subject to continuous reassessment and revision in order to reflect the dynamics of societal change. As master planning becomes a continuous process, the agency gains insight and sophistication in higher education policy-making and its consequences. 11

Because statewide master planning was the primary function with which the Illinois Board of Higher Education was charged, it inevitably had to be the principal goal of the Board to provide strong leadership in statewide master planning. Any University of Illinois action perceived by the Illinois Board of Higher Education to threaten its statewide master planning function, as the Board itself defined that function, would be a significant threat to the Board.

During the first three years of the Illinois Board of Higher Education operations, staffing and budget were extremely minimal. Most of the planning activity connected with the development of Master Plan I was carried on in conjunction with University of Illinois staff. Given the dependency of the Board staff upon the University staff in these early planning activities, it was impossible to fully assert any exclusivity for its statewide master planning function. These circumstances contributed to the previously noted ambiguity about whether statewide planning is reserved to the Illinois Board of Higher Education and whether any statewide planning is permitted to the universities. A recommendation to amend the statute to remove the ambiguities will be described later in the paper.

Illinois Board of Higher Education interpretation of the exclusivity and extent of its statewide master planning function will be examined in the next section of this paper.

C. "The University of Illinois and Plans for the Future,"--Navy Pier and Planning in Downstate Cities

As noted in Section III, the University of Illinois presented to the Illinois Board of Higher Education during December 1964 a proposal entitled "The University of Illinois and Plans for the Future," which included the University's intention for long-range planning for campuses in a number of Downstate cities and immediate approval to temporarily operate on Navy Pier.

The reassertion by the University of Illinois that it intended to carry on extensive statewide planning was perceived by Browne and Glenny to be a continuing threat to the Illinois Board of Higher Education mandate for statewide planning activities as they interpreted that mandate. Executive Director Browne realized that the planning efforts of the University of

Illinois had been essential to the Illinois Board of Higher Education developing Master Plan I. By late 1964, however, the Board had been able to recruit a more extensive professional staff. In Browne's opinion, the Board was in a position to provide statewide planning leadership although it still depended on some efforts of the University of Illinois staff.¹² In conversations with University of Illinois staff soon after the proposals were received, both Browne and Glenny expressed the inconsistency they perceived between University of Illinois planning efforts and Illinois Board of Higher Education responsibility for statewide planning.¹³

The Illinois Board of Higher Education staff report prepared in response to the University of Illinois proposal stressed the impropriety of the University of Illinois proposal for statewide planning. Such planning should not be conducted the staff report stressed, even in part, by a single state university. The planning should be conducted by experts from a number of institutions under circumstances similar to those under which master plans are prepared. The legal mandate of the Board for statewide planning was stressed:

It is the Board of Higher Education which has the clear legal mandate to 'analyze the present and future aims, needs and requirements of higher education in the State of Illinois' and in doing so to recommend 'from time to time as it determines, amendments and modifications' to its Master Plan.¹⁴

A recommendation of the staff report which was stressed was that new senior college campuses be established only where a comprehensive junior college existed. That recommendation aimed at preventing planning for spaces for juniors and seniors from having a negative effect on junior college development which was crucial to the implementation of Master Plan I.¹⁵

After the announcement of the Illinois Board of Higher Education decision against the continued operation of a University of Illinois Navy Pier campus, University President Henry announced the University would abide by the Board decision but would press its case for new University campuses in the planning for Master Plan II.

1. Effect--University of Illinois

The University of Illinois had frequently articulated the goal of adding new campuses to the University of Illinois in order to meet the need for more student spaces in higher education. The denial by the Illinois Board of Higher Education of approval to reopen Navy Pier and for funding to carry on intensive planning in four other urban areas was a threat to the attainment of that goal. Rejection of the Navy Pier proposal was a direct threat to the goal. Refusal to directly fund planning for the four urban areas was a somewhat less direct threat because of opportunities to plan in a less intensive fashion with other funds.

2. Effect--Illinois Board of Higher Education

The controversy over the proposal "The University of Illinois and Plans for the Future," is assessed by Ernest Palola and others to be the "... first major test of the Board of Higher Education's planning authority."¹⁶

What was at stake, Palola and others find, was whether the Illinois Board of Higher Education could resist being hurried into making a major policy decision by the planning proposals of the principal state university before the Board could explore a variety of considerations relating to Master Plan I and Master Plan II. Had the Illinois Board of Higher Education gone along with the University of Illinois plans, ambiguities would have been created for the development of the junior college system under Master Plan I and planning for new senior campuses under Master Plan II.

A number of questions such as the following would have been raised with regard to the statewide master plan: Was the development of University of Illinois campuses in certain cities to be a substitute for junior colleges? If the University of Illinois was allowed to develop campuses in these urban areas would this be the extent of university development which was necessary, would much of the planning to be undertaken for Master Plan II be unnecessary? The fear of the Illinois Board of Higher Education was not that Board decisions would be appealed by the University of Illinois to state political figures but rather that University of Illinois statewide planning initiatives would draw attention away from those of the Board. If the University of Illinois consistently presented plans for its own development prior to the regularized process connected with the stages of Board master planning, attention would be focused on these University of Illinois plans. Under those circumstances, the Illinois Board of Higher Education would not be able to set the agenda for the master planning process.

Palola and others view the case of "The University of Illinois and Plans for the Future," as a major success for Illinois Board of Higher Education planning authority.¹⁷ In other words, the Board protected well its statewide master planning goal as it defined that goal.

It appears that Illinois Board of Higher Education denial to the University of Illinois of approval to continue operations on Navy Pier was a necessary step to translate its statewide planning authority, as it interpreted it, into reality. To allow the University of Illinois to gain a new campus, even temporarily, mainly as a result of aggressive planning initiatives could only be considered acceptance of continued statewide University planning activities.

D. Controversy Over Statewide Planning After the Navy Pier Controversy and Before Senate Bill 955'

Potential for continuing threat to the Illinois Board of Higher Education leadership in statewide master planning goal remained after the end of the controversy over Navy Pier. The Illinois Board of Higher Education had in that controversy clearly indicated that it would oppose, through the denial of budget requests for such purposes, efforts of the University of Illinois to plan in a relatively independent manner for meeting a large proportion of the enrollment needs of the state as a whole. The University of Illinois, however, was still able to plan for new campuses on a limited basis without the additional resources for statewide planning that it had sought in "The University of Illinois and Plans for the Future." The continued determination of the University of Illinois to plan on a statewide basis and its concern that its statewide planning activities would be hampered by the Illinois Board of Higher Education was reflected in an internal University staff memo:

...in the Board of Higher Education staff reaction to University of Illinois proposals for additional campuses, you will note the tone of concern as to why the University has chosen to assume a state-wide planning interest. This posture of the staff illuminates another aspect, the hazard that the institutions will not plan aggressively, will be inhibited by the presence of a state agency.¹⁸

The nature of the friction between the Illinois Board of Higher Education and the University of Illinois with regard to definition of the Board's state-wide planning function was delineated further by Royd Keenan in a study done for the Commission on State Government--Illinois of the Illinois public higher education system. The law creating the Board while granting state-wide planning authority to the Board did not deny it to the University of Illinois or any other of the higher education institutions. In the existing gray area, both the Board and the University undertook extensive investigations. The undertaking by the University of statewide planning raises serious political questions. The investment of resources by the University in these studies helps the University gain expertise which gives it a very strong advantage in getting approval of its plans by the Board. Once the University of Illinois has made a sizable investment in planning and gained substantial expertise, it then becomes only fair that the University be given responsibility for the unit it has planned.¹⁹ Keenan concludes that the only manner in which the Illinois Board of Higher Education will in fact have ultimate statewide planning authority is if the act creating the Board is changed to require the reporting to the Board of any study commissioned by a governing board or its administrative officers involving the investigations of desirability of establishing new campuses and to require the Board's approval before any funds are expended for such studies.²⁰

President Henry responded very strongly to the suggestion that the University of Illinois be required to have prior Illinois Board of Higher Education approval for its statewide planning efforts. Such a suggestion was perceived to be a threat to the long accepted institutional prerogatives of the University, "...to deny that an institution cannot, on its own initiative, undertake planning studies--cannot indeed search out ideas, explore alternatives, make known its views--is a violation of institutional integrity."²¹

Due to strong University of Illinois opposition to Keenan's recommendations, no changes in the Illinois Board of Higher Education statute were made. Also, a recommendation in the provisional draft of Master Plan II that Board approval of planning aimed at the establishment of a new campus had to precede university expenditure of such funds was omitted from the final draft. The gray area in which the University of Illinois had the flexibility to carry on statewide planning activities therefore remained.

During revision of the provisional draft of Master Plan II, the University of Illinois had again underlined its desire to govern new campuses. It asserted that "functional" criteria did not provide a basis for refusal to grant the University of Illinois Board of Trustees governance of new campuses.

A statement on the provisional draft of Master Plan II, which the University of Illinois submitted to the Illinois Board of Higher Education includes the following:

The University of Illinois holds to its previous position that it will seek to serve as an administrative agent for the development of one or more new campuses--a position based upon its experience and professional resources.²²

E. New Campus Governance Assignments Controversy

1. Continued Efforts of the University of Illinois to Develop New Campuses

While Phase II of the Master Plan was being developed and sold to the legislature, the University of Illinois continued statewide planning efforts in close cooperation with the Illinois Board of Higher Education and also independently. A major planning effort was a second study (Ferber) of the Springfield area undertaken at the urging of and financed by the Springfield citizens group. The report reaffirmed the need for senior college spaces in the Springfield area. As described in Section III, the University of Illinois was intensively planning for and expected to be assigned the governance of the Springfield campus for which the Illinois General Assembly in Spring 1967 had appropriated money for the later stages of planning.

The University of Illinois presented a statement making suggestions for the general nature of and governance of the Springfield campus before the Special Committee at an October 1967 meeting. In it the University stressed (1) two major planning efforts in Springfield (the Crane and Ferber reports) which members of its staff had completed; (2) its involvement in educational affairs in Springfield; (3) its ability to develop high quality graduate programs; (4) its qualifications to provide research and technical services to state government; and (5) its administrative structure.²³ The University indicated its concern with the new campus development goal by its vigorous activity during the deliberations of the Special Committee and advisory committees in September-December 1967.

At a November 1967 meeting of the University of Illinois Board of Trustees, a resolution was approved indicating that the University of Illinois would continue to seek governance of the Springfield campus but would no longer seek governance of the Chicago campus.²⁴ The University ceased to advance its case for assignment of the Springfield campus only after the Special Committee had reached its decision and presented it to the Illinois Board of Higher Education in January 1968.

2. Illinois Board of Higher Education, Continued Concern for Leadership in Statewide Master Planning

In the Fall of 1967, Lyman Glenny as Executive Director of the Illinois Board of Higher Education, was convinced that if the University of Illinois were to gain any more general-purpose campuses, the Illinois Board of Higher Education would become totally ineffective. Concern was expressed as in the controversy over "The University of Illinois and Plans for the Future," that statewide planning initiative would be lost to the University of Illinois.

Another concern, not previously expressed, was that if the University gained a campus in the state capital, it would gain major political resources. These political resources could be used by the University to prevent the Board from taking any action distasteful to the University.²⁵

Glenny was convinced that the assignment of either of the two planned campuses to the University of Illinois would make it virtually impossible for the Illinois Board of Higher Education to effectively perform any of the functions it had been assigned. If the University of Illinois were assigned any new campuses, it would tend to dominate the whole system of public higher education. The political resources of the University of Illinois, already very substantial, would be augmented, making it almost certain that the University could "capture" the Board and transform it into an appendage. The Board would pass away as a policy-maker, Glenny continues, if it lacked more than one of the following political resources: the backing and confidence of the governor, a balance of power among the public colleges and universities, and the support of a significant portion of the legislature. The support of the governor was the sole political resource of which the Board at that time could feel assured. If the University of Illinois Board of Trustees gained any additional general-purpose campuses, the balance of power among the public colleges and universities, which was already strained because of the University's size, would be completely destroyed. The increased services the University would provide to the legislature from a Springfield campus would further increase its support in the legislature. Thus, assignment of a Springfield campus to the University of Illinois would cause further imbalance of power among the public colleges and universities and would increase the support within the legislature for the University of Illinois. The Illinois Board of Higher Education would lack two of the three political resources important to the maintenance of its influence in statewide master planning as well as in its other assigned functions.²⁶

In sum, the potential assignment of either of the two campuses to the University of Illinois was perceived by the executive director of the Illinois Board of Higher Education as having the effect of increasing the political resources of the University to such an extent that it would be virtually impossible to attain the Board's goal of leadership in statewide master planning.

F. Effect of the New Campus Governance Assignments Controversy

1. University of Illinois--Goal Frustration

The failure of the University of Illinois to gain either of the two new general-purpose campuses must be judged a major frustration of its goal of developing new campuses. In both the Navy Pier reopening case and the new campus governance assignment case, campuses had been denied to the University.

In December 1967, there was mention by the Illinois Board of Higher Education of the development of two campuses in addition to the two whose later stages were being planned pursuant to Senate Bill 955. One of these campuses would concentrate on the pure and applied sciences and would be located near the Atomic Energy Commission nuclear reactor in Weston, Illinois.²⁷ References were made to the likelihood that the campus would be a part of the University of Illinois. By the time this suggestion was made, however,

there was already the beginnings of a consensus that the state would not need additional campuses beyond the new Chicago and Springfield campuses. The report of the Committee on New Institutions to the Illinois Board of Higher Education in December 1971 later confirmed this consensus. It recommended that no new senior college campuses be planned. Subsequent to the new campus governance assignments controversy, there have been no opportunities for the University of Illinois to develop new general-purpose campuses.

That the university attached some importance to the goal of development of new general-purpose campuses was evidenced by the frequent articulation of the goal during the period 1963-67 and repeated efforts aimed at attainment of that goal. The author finds no evidence that the University considered the attainment of the goal to be central to its survival.

2. Illinois Board of Higher Education--Goal Protection

The success of the Illinois Board of Higher Education in denying governance of the new campuses planned pursuant to Senate Bill 955 to the University of Illinois is judged by Palola and others to be a major validation of the Illinois Board of Higher Education planning authority. The Board had been successful in two confrontations (both the Navy Pier reopening case and the new campus governance assignment case) with the University in which the University had aggressively planned for new campuses.²⁸ The Board also perceived the denial of the Springfield campus to the University of Illinois as preventing any increase in the University's political resources which would have resulted from the operation of a campus in the state capital. An increase in University political resources would have threatened not only the principal Board goal, that of leadership in statewide master planning, but also all other goals.

In the opinion of this author, Palola and others overstate the degree of validation of the Illinois Board of Higher Education master planning authority which the Board's success in the new campus governance case implied. The University of Illinois would pose a significantly reduced threat to the Board's master planning authority, only if the University ceased to plan on a statewide basis. The University of Illinois has not stopped such planning. Recent examples include continued University statewide planning relative to its role in medicine, nursing, and allied health fields.

The goal of providing strong leadership in statewide master planning does appear to be central to the self-maintenance of the Illinois Board of Higher Education. The main function assigned by statute to the Board was statewide master planning; the other functions undergird the performance of the master planning function. No organization can feel secure when the exclusivity of the principal function it has been assigned by statute is disputed.

V. CASE SUMMARY

The University of Illinois goal of adding new general-purpose campuses was directly frustrated by Illinois Board of Higher Education rejection of the plans of "The University of Illinois and Plans for the Future," and by denial of governance of the Chicago and Springfield campuses provided for in Master Plan II. The Illinois Board of Higher Education goal of providing

strong leadership in statewide master planning was partially blocked by the mere existence of University of Illinois statewide planning initiatives. The Board was able to protect its goal by denying the University of Illinois the fruit of its planning initiatives: reopening Navy Pier, funding for planning for new campuses in several Downstate cities, and governance of the Springfield and Chicago campuses provided for in Master Plan II.

For the University of Illinois, the goal of adding new general-purpose campuses was important but yet only one among a broad set of goals typical of the fully comprehensive university. The author has found no indication that University leadership considered the goal to be of the first order of importance or central to its self-maintenance.

As a new executive agency, the Illinois Board of Higher Education had a relatively narrowly limited function and was very concerned about fully implementing that function. Because statewide master planning was the major function assigned by statute to the Illinois Board of Higher Education, the goal of providing strong leadership in statewide master planning was central to Board self-maintenance.

VI. DIRECTIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

This paper has applied some organizational theory concepts to provide an additional perspective on statewide higher education coordination. The case examination provides an understanding of the institutional goals and self-maintenance which underlies the process during one historical period in one state. Further research is needed to provide a fuller perspective over time in one state as environmental changes occur. The clarification of concepts from this additional research should probably precede any comparative analysis between states.

Significant changes in the general state political environment have occurred in Illinois during the 1970's and would appear to have had a major impact on institutional goals and self-maintenance in higher education coordination. During the mid and late 1970's, conflict between the University of Illinois and Illinois Board of Higher Education has been a less prominent aspect of Illinois higher education coordination than was the case in the 1960's. Major political issues focus no longer on master planning for growth but rather on accommodating to a situation where higher education is a somewhat lower priority and overall state revenue is tight. Now the primary Illinois Board of Higher Education role relates to the budgetary process and legislative and gubernatorial expectations are more specific. The most prominent conflict is that between the governor (along with his budget office) and the coalition of public universities led by the University of Illinois.²⁹

FOOTNOTES

This paper is a reformulation and expansion of a portion (especially Chapters I and III) of "Politics of Public Higher Education Coordination: Illinois Cases," unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Illinois (Urbana-Champaign), 1976. Political factors underlying the settlement of disputes between a regulatory coordinating board and the principal state university are explored in "Conflict between the State Coordinating Board and the Principal State University: Illinois during Rapid Higher Education Growth," 1979 Annual Meeting of the Association for the Study of Higher Education.

¹Philip Selznick, Leadership in Administration (Evanston, Illinois: Row, Peterson, and Company, 1957), pp. 20-21.

²Herbert Simon, Donald W. Smithberg, and Victor A. Thompson, Public Administration (New York: Alfred A. Knopf and Company, 1950), pp. 381-401.

³Ibid., p. 394.

⁴Allan Rosenbaum, "Public Higher Education and State Politics: Political Resources, Institutional Cooperation and Public Policy in Illinois," delivered at the 1974 meeting of the American Political Science Association, p. 51. Rosenbaum indicates that he borrows the term "maintenance and enhancement needs of large formal organizations" from the writing of Edward Banfield on the motivations for the participation of large formal organizations in the political process. Edward C. Banfield, Political Influence (New York: Free Press, 1961), pp. 263-65.

⁵A more detailed account is found in Samuel K. Gove and Carol Everly Floyd, "The Politics of Public Higher Education: Illinois," AAUP Bulletin, LIX (September, 1973), pp. 287-93. See also Floyd, op. cit., pp. 4-6, 14-18, 43-87, and 150-66.

⁶Carl Grafton, "Coordination of State Universities in Illinois and Indiana," unpublished doctoral dissertation, Purdue University, 1970, p. 127.

⁷Champaign-Urbana News Gazette, February 3, 1965.

⁸David D. Henry, "Goals and Functions of the University of Illinois," December 5, 1963. (Mimeographed)

⁹David D. Henry, "Master Plan for Higher Education in Illinois," May 21, 1964, p. 10. (Mimeographed)

¹⁰Ibid., p. 9.

¹¹Lyman A. Glenny, "Politics and Current Patterns in Coordinating Higher Education," in Campus and Capitol, edited by W. John Minter (Boulder: Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education, 1966), p. 32.

¹²Interview with Richard Browne, June 14, 1972.

¹³Earl Porter, "Conversation with Richard Browne and Lyman Glenny, December 17, 1964," December 21, 1964. (Typewritten)

¹⁴Staff, Illinois Board of Higher Education, "Staff Analyses and Recommendations on the Proposal 'The University of Illinois and Plans for the Future,'" December 21, 1964, p. 7. (Mimeographed)

¹⁵Ibid., pp. 7-8.

¹⁶Ernest Palola, Timothy W. Lehmann, and William R. Blischke, Higher Education by Design: The Sociology of Planning (Berkeley: University of California Center for Research and Development in Higher Education, 1970), p. 346.

¹⁷Ibid., p. 312.

¹⁸Staff, University of Illinois, "Memo," March 10, 1966, p. 2. (Type-written)

¹⁹Staff Memorandum, Commission on State Government--Illinois, The Illinois System of Public Higher Education, by Boyd Keenan, September, 1966, p. 47. (Mimeographed)

²⁰Ibid., pp. 45-46.

²¹David D. Henry, "Notes on Agenda Paper G," September 30, 1966 (Mimeographed)

²²University of Illinois, "Comments on Provisional Draft of Document Entitled 'A Master Plan for Higher Education in Illinois--Phase II--Extending Educational Opportunity,'" November 1, 1966, p. 5. (Mimeographed)

²³University of Illinois, "Proposal for the Establishment by the University of Illinois of a New Institution of Higher Education in Springfield," October 16, 1967. (Mimeographed)

²⁴Champaign-Urbana Courier, November 10, 1967.

²⁵Interview with Glenny cited in Grafton, op. cit., pp. 114-15.

²⁶Ibid.

²⁷Champaign-Urbana Courier, December 5, 1967.

²⁸Palola and others, op. cit., p. 347. Palola and others also identify the case of planning for new campuses in Springfield and Chicago as a test of Illinois Board of Higher Education planning authority on two fronts. Success in winning approval for Senate Bill 955 tested Board planning authority when opposed by the private colleges. Board success in denying governance of the new campuses to the University of Illinois tested its planning authority under conditions of University opposition.

²⁹Some exploration of this period is found in the author's "The Illinois Board of Higher Education and Conflict over the Public Higher Education Budget, FY 1971 to FY 1977," in The Changing Face of State Finance, edited by Jay H. Abrams and Robert J. Dvorak (Springfield: American Society for Public Administration, Central Illinois Chapter, 1977), pp. 21-26. The conceptualization of institutional goals and self-maintenance is implicit rather than explicit.