

ED 022 414

24

HE 000 002

By-Paltridge, James Gilbert

CONFLICT AND COORDINATION IN HIGHER EDUCATION.

California Univ., Berkeley. Center for Research and Development in Higher Education.

Spons Agency-Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C. Bureau of Research.

Bureau No-BR-6-8394

Pub Date 68

Contract-OEC-4-7-068394-0222

Note-136p.

EDRS Price MF-\$0.75 HC-\$5.52

Descriptors-*COORDINATION, *EDUCATIONAL COORDINATION, *HIGHER EDUCATION, *PUBLIC EDUCATION, *STATE AGENCIES

A case study of the Wisconsin Coordinating Committee for Higher Education was the basis for an examination of the factors contributing to effective coordinating mechanisms between public institutions of higher education and their external supportive world (the public and the state legislative and executive branches). Using questionnaires and in-depth interviews with state officials and educational leaders in addition to documented information, the following assumptions were tentatively supported: (1) A coordinating agency in higher education can deal more effectively with conflict between the institutions and the government if representatives of the general public have a voting majority on the board. (2) The coordinating mechanism will function more effectively if its professional staff is both independent of the staffs of the institutions and of the state administrative agencies. (3) The authority structure inherent in a scheme of statutory coordination can serve as a protector, rather than an adversary, of the substantive autonomy of institutions. (4) Coordination can function more effectively if the particular roles and functions of the participating groups are clearly defined, if adherence to these definitions is enforceable, and if provision is made for change and modification of the definitions. (AM)

BR 6-8394

PA-24

Conflict and Coordination in Higher Education

JAMES GILBERT PALTRIDGE

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE
PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS
STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION
POSITION OR POLICY.



**CENTER FOR RESEARCH AND
DEVELOPMENT IN HIGHER EDUCATION
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, BERKELEY**

ED022414

HE 000 001

CENTER FOR RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT IN HIGHER EDUCATION
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, BERKELEY

The Center for Research and Development in Higher Education is engaged in research designed to assist individuals and organizations responsible for American higher education to improve the quality, efficiency, and availability of education beyond the high school. In the pursuit of these objectives, the Center conducts studies which: 1) use the theories and methodologies of the behavioral sciences; 2) seek to discover and to disseminate new perspectives on educational issues and new solutions to educational problems; 3) seek to add substantially to the descriptive and analytical literature on colleges and universities; 4) contribute to the systematic knowledge of several of the behavioral sciences, notably psychology, sociology, economics, and political science; and 5) provide models of research and development activities for colleges and universities planning and pursuing their own programs in institutional research.

The research reported herein was performed pursuant to a contract with the U. S. Office of Education, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. The study was conducted under contract No. 47 OEC-994-0222 (technical title: Changing Organizational Forms for Statewide Coordination of Higher Education). Contractors undertaking such projects under government sponsorship are encouraged to express freely their professional judgments in the conduct of the project. Points of view or opinions stated do not, therefore, necessarily represent official Office of Education position or policy.

Report Series

CONFLICT AND COORDINATION IN HIGHER EDUCATION

The Wisconsin Experience

By
James Gilbert Paltridge

1968

Center for Research and Development
in Higher Education
University of California
Berkeley, California

Preface

A number of systematic studies of coordinating agencies, as supra-institutional or quasigovernmental administrative organizations for ordering a state's higher educational effort, have evaluated the various forms of these agencies in an effort to arrive at some generic principles which might predict their effectiveness, stability, and eventual success. Such principles may be discovered when sufficient empirical evidence has been collected into a body of knowledge from which general observations may be drawn. The purpose of this study was to add to the data on the characteristics and dynamics of state coordinating agencies for higher education in the form of a case study of the Wisconsin Coordinating Committee for Higher Education.¹

The author recently completed a study of the organizational experiences of the California Coordinating Council for Higher Education and its antecedent, the Liaison Committee (Paltridge, 1966). He was asked to supplement this study by replicating it in Wisconsin and he was asked to "compare the results of the two studies with a view towards any generalizations which might validly be made."

There were several reasons for the choice of Wisconsin as the locale of the second study. The Wisconsin Coordinating Committee for Higher Education formed in 1955 was one of the pioneer statutory coordinating boards. It followed by 10 years the formation of California's Joint Liaison Committee, but preceded by 5 years the formation of California's Coordinating Council, the statutory agency. Many of the circumstances which occasioned the formation of Wisconsin's Coordinating Committee were similar to those which brought about the change from the voluntary Liaison Committee to the statutory Coordinating Council in California. The

¹The name of the Committee was changed to Wisconsin State Coordinating Council for Higher Education after passage of an omnibus state administrative organization bill in December 1967 after the time of this writing.

membership composition of the two original statutory agencies was very similar.

During the 1960's, both agencies experienced severe criticism for alleged reluctance or inability to deal adequately and speedily with issues involving expansion of educational facilities and development of new programs. In 1965, the Legislatures of Wisconsin and California, after considerable debate, changed the statutes relating to their coordinating agencies in the hope of giving these bodies new strength and stability. In both cases, debate centered around the matter of public representation on the coordinating board, however the controversy was resolved somewhat differently in the two states.

The report proposes a set of tentative assumptions about factors contributing to effective coordinating agencies, which are based on information presently known. The Wisconsin Committee will be examined in terms of whether these assumptions were borne out in practice as observed by the author and perceived by the parties to coordination. These findings, if supported by further evidence, may form the basis for derivation of generic principles predictive of organizational success. This investigation followed a set of guidelines drawn up in the form of the following questions:

- . What substantive organizational changes have been made in the coordinating mechanism of Wisconsin since its founding in 1955?
- . What were the pressures, internal and external to the higher education community, which brought about these changes?
- . What are the reasons, as they are perceived today, which made these changes desirable?
- . What effects have these changes had on the workability of the coordinating mechanism?
- . Are the new organizational forms viable? Is there evidence that they have stability and the strength necessary to solve the problems which confounded their predecessors?
- . Do the experiences which motivated these changes bear a relationship to experiences in other states? Can they be

explained in terms of tentative theory relating to organizations of this type?

What do the experiences of these changes offer in the way of practical advice and guidelines to other state coordinating agencies?

The project research staff compiled available factual material related to each of the points of interest of this study and codified it according to the preceding basic guidelines. The investigation then sought opinions from a rather large number of persons who participated in or were directly affected by the organizational changes. A questionnaire soliciting information on approximately 130 points of inquiry was developed, pretested, and mailed to approximately 400 persons who might be regarded as members of the higher educational community of Wisconsin.² In the report which follows they are assigned this term. While responses to the questionnaires were anonymous, respondents were asked to identify themselves as: members of the Coordinating Committee for Higher Education both past and present; members of the governing boards of the institutional systems; administrators of institutional systems; members of the faculties of the University of Wisconsin, the Wisconsin State Universities, or the vocational-technical-adult schools; legislators on committees dealing with higher education matters; or another group, composed primarily of persons who have served on advisory committees or commissions related to higher education. Thus, the facts of change are analyzed from the viewpoints of participants in the changes.

The 276 responses to this questionnaire cannot be regarded as a statistical sample of the educational community of Wisconsin nor of the Wisconsin Legislature and, hence, no statistical inferences are made on this assumption. Furthermore, the size of the respondent groups and subgroups in most cases would not permit drawing statistically valid inferences. Therefore, responses to questionnaire items presented in the text or tables are stated in terms of raw figures and commented upon only in the light of apparent differences.

Following the questionnaire returns, in-depth interviews were conducted with a number of state officials and educational leaders to interpret findings and augment information previously gathered and documented.

²Copies of the questionnaire are available from the Center for Research and Development in Higher Education.

The staff for this research project, in addition to the project director, consisted of two research assistants, one in Madison, Wisconsin, who assisted in the documentary research and interviewing and a Berkeley resident, who assisted in matters related to the questionnaire and tabulation and codification of the information gathered from all sources. The project director attended all meetings of the Coordinating Committee between December 1966 and May 1967, spending several days during most of the intervening months in Madison conducting interviews and gathering other material used in this investigation.

The author gratefully acknowledges the valued contributions made by the members of the higher education community, legislators, and executives of the state of Wisconsin who gave generously of their time to provide thoughtful responses to lengthy questionnaires and interviews. Special mention must be made of the cooperation and substantial assistance of Angus B. Rothwell, executive director of the Coordinating Committee, as well as that of former Governor Walter J. Kohler, Jr., chairman of the Committee.

Governor Warren P. Knowles assisted the study by graciously submitting to a detailed interview and assuring the cooperation of his administrative staff. Miss Bonnie Reese, research associate to the Wisconsin Legislative Council, facilitated the compilation of official documents and other archive material.

A panel of five persons read the completed manuscript and offered valuable advice, criticism, and corrections. Their contributions are appreciated but in no way relieve the author of final responsibility for the content of this report.

The author expresses his appreciation to the Center for Research and Development in Higher Education at Berkeley, which sponsored the study and this publication; to Leland L. Medsker, director of the Center, who advised the project; to Lucy Sells of Berkeley and Francis O'Connor of Madison, who served as research assistants; and to Evelyn Schuert and Mildred Bowman, who supervised and prepared the manuscript.

Table of Contents

Chapter	Page
List of Tables	ix
1. The Case for Coordination	1
2. The Wisconsin Experience	15
3. The Change to Citizen Control	26
4. Reorganized Professional Staff	40
5. Committee Authority and Institutional Autonomy	45
6. Definition of Authority and Functional Roles	63
7. Coordinating Committee Leadership	83
8. Conclusions	98
References	109
Appendices	
A. Excerpts from Wisconsin Statutes	
B. Distribution and Availability of Post High School Education Institutions in Wisconsin	

List of Tables

	Page
Table 1. Primary Reason for Change of CCHE Membership as Perceived by Persons in the Higher Education Community.	29
Table 2. Members of the Higher Education Community Who Supported or Opposed the CCHE Membership Change.	34
Table 3. Principal Effect of the CCHE Membership Change Assessed by the Higher Education Community.	36
Table 4. Opinions of the Higher Education Community on Participation of Private Colleges and Universities in the Activities of CCHE.	38
Table 5. Reasons for CCHE Staff Reorganization as Perceived by Higher Education Community.	43
Table 6. Effect of the 1965 CCHE Staff Reorganization as Perceived by Higher Education Community.	44
Table 7. Opinions on the Reasons Why the Legislature Added the Term Direction to Its Charge to the CCHE.	52
Table 8. Opinions on Effects of CCHE on the Autonomy of Institutional Systems.	55
Table 9. Opinions on Beneficial Effects of Increased CCHE Authority on Particular Institutions.	56

	Page
Table 10. Degree of Coordinating Committee Influence over Institutional Decisions—Operating Budgets, Construction Funds.	58
Table 11. Degree of Coordinating Committee Influence over Institutional Decisions—Educational Programs, Degrees Offered.	59
Table 12. Degree of Coordinating Committee Influence over Institutional Decisions—Long-Range Planning.	60
Table 13. Opinions of Public and Private Institutional Administrators on Assigning the Functions of the Higher Education Aids Board to the CCHE.	61
Table 14. Extent of Agreement with Statement on Educational Soundness of the Emerging Role of WSU.	67
Table 15. Extent of Agreement with Statement on Wasteful Duplication of Programs.	68
Table 16. Extent of Agreement with Statement on the Value of a Ph. D.	69
Table 17. Extent of Agreement with Statement on Political Jockeying and Intervention.	70
Table 18. Opinions on Whether the Consolidation of Governance of UW and WSU Would Serve the Best Interests of the State of Wisconsin.	71
Table 19. Extent of Agreement with Statement on Responsiveness of UW and WSU Centers to Local Needs.	76
Table 20. Extent of Agreement with Statement on Lower Admission Standards for UW and WSU 2-Year Centers.	77
Table 21. Extent of Agreement with Proposal for Open Door Admission Policy for UW and WSU Centers.	77
Table 22. Extent of Agreement with Statement on Appropriateness of Dual-Track Programs to VTA Mission.	78

	Page
Table 23. Extent of Agreement with Statement on VTA Dual-Track Programs Duplicating Center Programs.	79
Table 24. Extent of Agreement with Statement on Continued Local Financing of UW and WSU Centers and Branches.	80
Table 25. Extent of Agreement with Statement on Reorganization of 2-Year Institutions into a Single System of Junior Colleges.	81
Table 26. Extent of Agreement with Statement that Present Committee Organization Is More Conducive to Firm, Objective Decision Making.	93
Table 27. Extent of Agreement with Statement on Continued Domination of Committee by University of Wisconsin.	94
Table 28. Extent of Agreement with Statement that the Coordinating Committee Adequately Represents the Interests of Institutional Boards, the Legislature, and State Administration.	95
Table 29. Extent of Agreement that the Committee Has Been Able, Since the 1965 Reorganization, To Hold to a Firm Position on the Nature of 2-Year Institutions.	96

The Case for Coordination

Coordination is a twentieth century organizational form becoming more widely applied to educational decision making and long-term planning at the statewide, supra-institutional level. This organizational dynamic offers accommodation for conflict through respect for the differentiated goals of the participants.

The newness of the organizational form and the fact that coordination in higher education deals with conflict among powerful forces account for the dynamic and changing nature of the organizations for higher education coordination. Because coordinating agencies in state systems of higher education are themselves new, and most are impelled to show visible achievements, they are constantly searching for generic principles which hopefully will predict organizational outcomes.

The unprecedented expansion of postsecondary education in America is presenting a whole new set of problems to the higher education community and to the public which must support the major share of this education enterprise. New colleges and universities are springing up at the astonishing rate of one a week. Established universities have spawned new branch campuses, more than 300 since 1945, and many have created whole new affiliated universities. Four-year colleges have enlarged their student bodies and curriculum, and many have stepped boldly into graduate education. Local communities are determined to have their own community colleges, and 230 have been built since 1960 (*Newsweek*, February 20, 1967). Currently, 6 million young men and women are in colleges and universities, and the United States Office of Education estimates that 9 million students will be seeking higher education by 1975.

Those who financially support this prodigious effort—primarily the taxpayers to state treasuries—have a right to expect that their funds will be expended wisely and efficiently. Furthermore, those who govern public

institutions should have the right to bring about this expansion with a minimum of loss of educational quality, academic freedom, and institutional autonomy. Certainly the needs and goals of the instruments of government and higher education require resolute coordination to reach solutions to these problems in education. Such coordination should be effected in a manner conducive to innovation and enterprise rather than to bureaucratic conformity. The dilemma of planning and coordinating on a system-wide level is how to reconcile the political pressure for control of higher education with the desire of educators to preserve a certain freedom in education and research. Coordinating agencies for higher education at the state level must face all these problems because in most states they are the only organizational entity charged with the overall responsibility of ordering the state's higher education effort.

ORGANIZATIONAL MODELS

In considering organizational models most appropriate to statewide coordination of higher education, it must be realized that the need for coordination will not be satisfied with simple interinstitutional cooperation. Indeed, if this were the case, the voluntary associations which sought to coordinate higher education during the past decade might well have succeeded.

The primary need that coordinating mechanisms must fill today is for an intelligent and fruitful dialogue between educational institutions and their external supportive world—the public who are both clientele and sponsor and that public's instrumentalities of government, the state legislatures and the state executives.¹ Contact between politicians and educators is unavoidable. The function of the coordinating agency is to effect this meeting in an atmosphere of mutual understanding of needs and problems and with mutual tolerance for varying professional perspectives. It is likely that educators will question whether politicians are capable of making decisions concerning higher education practice, and that politicians

¹This study has been concerned primarily with coordination of public higher education. Private higher education, in most states, is free of statutory mandate to enter into coordination with public institutions, except for distribution of certain federal funds. The role of these institutions under coordination and their relationships with the public institutions is more complex than the roles and interrelationships among the public institutions. Therefore the set of assumptions which follow in this chapter relate to organizations concerned with coordination of public higher education. They may also be valid where private institutions are full members of the coordinating organization.

will question whether educators have a realistic grasp of what the political world is like.

Glenny has observed that public educators, while resigned to the fact that only the lawmakers can furnish the funds with which their institutions are built and operated, are nevertheless determined that the responsibilities of lawmakers should be confined to such fiscal matters. Politicians, on the other hand, feel that educators are unrealistic to seek unfettered control of public education. They are inclined to believe that they know better what the people actually want from their educational institutions and how much they are willing and capable of paying to satisfy their education needs as they perceive them (Glenny, 1960). This view suggests an organizational model wherein broad decisions of public policy remain with the elected representatives of the people, but the detailed implementation of decisions, and decisions relating to educational policy, are placed in the hands of professional educators.

The design of the organization must also take into consideration mechanisms for dealing with internal and external conflict, for conflict is inevitable and the reason for the coordinating organization's existence. The organization must permit conflict without allowing it to destroy the equilibrium or the working relationships among its constituent organizations. Pondy (1967) discusses three models frequently employed in dealing with conflict. The *bargaining* or *brokerage model* usually deals with conflict among interest groups in competition for scarce resources. This pattern of behavior is often seen in the interaction of institutions and coordinating agencies, as institutional budgets are prepared for submission to state authorities and as they move through the legislative process. The *bureaucratic model* is primarily concerned with problems caused by attempts of one organization to control the activities of another and organizational reaction to such attempts. This pattern governs interaction that goes to the heart of the authority-versus-autonomy conflict with which every coordinating agency for higher education must deal. The *systems model* is set up to deal with lateral conflict, or conflict among parties to a functional relationship. This model is most often employed to order relationships among higher educational institutions within a state system. It deals with their proclivity for power and suggests the response of the coordinating mechanism which attempts to create boundaries to the power of participants through explicitly stated, distinctively different functions. It seeks to encompass them in a single unified system.

Many students of coordination feel that the bargaining or brokerage model usually results in *ad hoc* rather than permanent solutions to

problems of conflict. The bureaucratic model suggests hierarchical control and the employment of sanctions which are anathema to a desirable degree of institutional autonomy. The systems model seems to offer the best opportunity for meaningful participation by all parties at each appropriate level in the decision-making process for statewide organization of public higher education.

ASSUMPTIONS

Case studies of the Wisconsin Coordinating Committee and the California Coordinating Council (Paltridge, 1966), plus studies of Glenny, Millett, McConnell, Wilson, and the yet to be published investigations of Berdahl and Palola (see reference notes) have concerned various organizational forms and practices employed in coordination. These experiences suggest certain assumptions about the factors which may predict effective organizational models and the consequences of organizational change.² Hopefully, the recorded and analyzed experiences of similar organizations in other states will contribute to the development of workable guidelines for the organization and conduct of a state coordinating agency.

The reorganized Wisconsin Coordinating Committee's composition, staff organization, and scope of authority apparently embody certain assumptions widely discussed in the literature on organizational structures and the functions for coordinating agencies. Thus, Wisconsin's coordinating experience particularly lends itself to examination to see whether these assumptions were borne out in practice as observed by the author and perceived by the parties to coordination.

The assumptions are as follows:

- 1. A coordinating agency in higher education can deal more effectively with conflict between the institutions of education and the instrumentalities of state government if members representing the general public have a voting majority on the board.**

The tradition of lay governance of colleges and universities has long dominated public as well as private education in this country. By and large, this governance has been confined to the development of capital policy for the institution and the selection of the institutional officers who

²Fiegl (1951) defines theory as "a set of assumptions from which can be derived ... a larger set of empirical laws."

will administer that policy. Millett (1962) characterizes these lay boards as "the keepers of the social conscience, the protectors of the public interest in higher education." The academic community has accepted the notion of lay governance with administrative implementation left in the hands of the educators and educator-administrators.

Glenny, a pioneer researcher in coordination of higher education, points out (1965) that the greater effectiveness of a coordinating agency with a majority of public members compared to one with a majority of members representing institutions is revealed primarily in its execution of coordination policy. The public-majority agency usually has outright authority in certain areas, although usually rigidly prescribed, unlike the institutionally dominated agencies, which often are unable to develop and implement statewide plans because they lack authority and lack ability to deal speedily with issues of expansion. Legislators are wary of granting outright powers, however closely prescribed, to the latter type of agency where, Glenny points out, satisfaction with the *status quo*, self-interests of institutions, and domination by the largest and oldest universities seem to prevail.

Millett (1965) sees the lay coordinating board also as a form of political insulation against the pressures of interest groups and partisan groups. McConnell (1965) makes the point that if either the government departments or the institutions lose confidence in the recommendations of a coordinating board, its position becomes untenable. A board with a majority of institutional representatives will find it difficult to hold the continuing confidence of a legislature who regards it as the "fox guarding the chicken coop." It also is likely that such a board will have difficulty holding the confidence of the less powerful members of the combine, if major decisions are apt to be dictated in the interest of the largest and most prestigious university.

On the other hand, the propositions advanced by Festinger and Aronson (1960) related to dissonance in social contexts and those of Barnlund (1958), Kelly and Thibaut (1954), Thorndike (1938), and others in studies of groups versus individuals in the decision-making process might be considered applicable particularly to decision making in coordination and the efficacy of citizen member majorities in the group decision-making process. A proposition might be developed as follows: A coordinating organization is a combine of mutually autonomous cooperating agencies formed to make decisions as a group, serving a particular function and responsible to multiple entities (the educational institutions and the instrumentalities of state government), as contrasted to a single bureau or a single qualified individual empowered to make or recommend the same decisions (a

statewide superintendent of education or a director of administration). The desirability of a group for decision making over the individual decision maker has been traditional, in fact usually politically necessary, in a democratic society.

However, the effectiveness of the group decision-making mechanism must take into account two factors: lingering dissonance, which may succeed the actual decisions ("second-guessing"), and personal biases of the participants. The quality of the decisions and, hence, the long-term stability of the decision-making mechanism will depend upon the extent to which it is able to control these two variables. If most of the participants, however expert, have known biases, the amount of dissonance surrounding their decisions is certain to be high. On the other hand, if biases of most of the group are minimal, provided the individuals are qualified and properly motivated, destructive dissonance is less likely. It might be assumed from this proposition that it is more desirable to entrust coordination of higher education to a group than to an administrative official, and to a board entirely or mostly composed of public representatives.

2. The coordinating mechanism will function more effectively if its professional staff is independent of the staffs of the educational institutions as well as of the staffs of state administrative agencies.

Most of the early coordinating agencies, and particularly those originating from voluntary cooperative associations, depended upon the administrative staffs and fact-gathering offices of the member institutions to supply staff for the coordinating board. These arrangements inherited two fundamental weaknesses. The divided loyalties and shared time usually did not permit sufficient time or continuity of personnel to allow preparation of studies and policy statements based on intensive research and long-term planning. However, the more persuasive argument against such early arrangements was the danger to decisive, objective staff proposals resulting from staff bias in favor of the parent institution or favoritism to the academic community vis-a-vis the legitimate fiscal or other concerns of the state administration or legislators.

These same weaknesses argue that coordinating agency staffs be independent of the staffs of state agencies such as analysts in a department of finance, building commissions, and other administrative bureaus. While most state coordinating agencies are breaking away from this practice, it is still by no means universal that the coordinating boards have professional staffs sufficiently large and qualified to be truly independent of the large and expert staffs of the large universities and key governmental agencies.

It is difficult to exaggerate the importance of this staff function to the coordinating mechanism. Serving a board of part-time and often part-professional members, the coordinating staff members carry a great responsibility for the research necessary for long-term planning and preparation of position papers for wise decision making by the board. As contrasted to staffs serving full-time administrators or full-time departments, bureaus, or commissions, coordinating committee staff members carry a wider responsibility for the accuracy and wisdom of their reports, for in most cases they must be accepted at face value by busy and part-time board members. Because the boards of coordinating agencies usually meet as a group only for 1- or 2-day meetings from four to six or eight times a year, while the political activity of the state and the administrative activity of the educational institutions is more continuous, some coordinating committee staff members must maintain contacts and even carry out delegated duties on a day-to-day and year-round basis.

The importance, and potentially influential nature, of the staff's function in the coordinating committee requires that the professional staff be only the instrument of the board which appoints it and not a force or center of power in itself. There has been evidence in some state coordinating agencies that the professional staffs tend to acquire influence and exercise powers independent of the coordinating boards. More common, however, is the influence the staff itself can have over the decisions of the coordinating agency through the persuasiveness of its recommendations and the continuity of its activity.

3. The authority structure inherent in a scheme of statutory coordination can serve as a protector rather than an adversary of the substantive autonomy of institutions.

This proposition rests upon the distinction drawn by Glenny (1966) between substantive and procedural autonomy. Glenny regards as substantive that institutional freedom which is "essential to the advancement of knowledge, the exploration of ideas, and the critical assessment of society itself [pages 37-38]." Procedural autonomy is independence from rules and laws which supercede the authority of the institutional board and are imposed for the welfare of all institutions in a system. Procedural rules necessarily limit certain freedoms, but it can be argued that this freedom is not (or need not be) substantive to the central purpose of the institution.

The construct, authority, has escaped clear definition in most of classical organization theory. It has been generally thought of only as a

formally granted means of control, rather than a positive source of influence. Yet considering authority in this manner ignores the significance of the political, social, and economic milieu which is influenced by positive innovative practices. Furthermore, authority is but one source of influence or control. McGregor (1960) points out, for example, that physical coercion, persuasion, and the authority of expertise (such as that of a doctor or lawyer) are all sources of influence—although authority which is acquired informally is usually termed influence.

Problems stem from the use of formally granted authority as the sole means of control. Authority implies the availability of sanctions which may be imposed by “one in authority” upon one presumed to be subservient. However, the outstanding fact about relationships in modern organizations is that they involve a high degree of interdependence, and this modifies or minimizes the need for sanctions. In the case of coordinating agencies the welfare of the state depends upon the existence of a good system of public higher education, and public educational institutions depend, in turn, upon an enlightened administration of state government. Interdependence is a control on the exercise of authority in a modern complex society. McGregor states:

Classical organization theory overlooks interdependence [as it relates to authority]. Authority is still useful, but only under certain conditions [page 275].

The authority of a coordinating agency deeply affects institutional autonomy, the historic freedom of universities to teach and discover unfettered by external pressures. Educational institutions, and the dominant state university in particular, often see the authority of the coordinating agency as a threat to their autonomy. State administrators and legislators, on the other hand, might regard the grant of autonomy to the public university or college as a threat to their role as arbiter of public policy. That is not to say that the parties lack respect for academic autonomy or for legally constituted authority. To the contrary, both have shown that they recognize a certain interdependency.

The proposition that coordination can protect institutional autonomy restates the doctrine of freedom within societal law. By recognizing certain controls and rules in the interests of orderly, rational, and equitable development, all colleges and universities stand to benefit. The concept of decision making under conflict is given primary attention in modern organizational theory. It characterizes much of the dynamics of coordinating

organizations, for their procedural decision making is most often done under conditions of conflicting interests. Pondy (1967) points out that just as some decisions may become programmed or routinized, conflict management in an organization also may become programmed or institutionalized.

An organization's success hinges to a great extent on its ability to set up and operate appropriate mechanisms for dealing with a variety of conflict phenomena [page 296].

By bringing order to competition, coordination can free institutions for productive innovation and the achievement of institutional distinctiveness. Bringing order to interinstitutional cooperation and establishing distinctive institutional functions are primary purposes of coordination. Achieving these goals will also serve to institutionalize the interdependence among educational institutions and interdependence between the educational institutions and the instruments of government.

Glenny (1966) finds that throughout the states there has been an increase in power, within circumscribed areas, granted to coordinating agencies. However, he concludes that:

. . . the procedural rules established and the practices engaged in by coordinating agencies seldom touch upon the day to day decisions or affect adversely the substantive educational and research functions of an institution [page 38].

Thus, formalizing and institutionalizing conflict management and interdependence among participants enables the coordinating organization to act to protect substantive institutional autonomy.

4. A coordinating agency will function more effectively if the particular roles and distinguishing functions of the various institutions or institutional systems are clearly defined, if adherence to these definitions is enforceable, and if provision is made for innovative change and modification of the definitions.

This proposition assumes the need for explicit definition of functions and authority of coordinating committees and the member institutions and the provision of means for enforcement. It also assumes a degree of flexibility in the definitions and a willingness to modify or change to encourage innovation and strengthen distinctiveness, and discourage the drift toward emulation or conformity.

Thus, the proposition presupposes a comprehensive design for the state's total public higher educational effort. The plan would remove institutions from competition with each other in areas of inordinate high unit costs or of essential need but limited demand. Medical education and sophisticated research with nuclear accelerators are examples of the first, and examples of the second may be schools of architecture or veterinary medicine, or curricula in significant but specialized pursuits of esoteric knowledge. Prerequisite to such a plan is the sometimes long and tedious effort on the part of the coordinating agency to reach interinstitutional agreement on statements which will satisfy the legitimate goals and ambitions of these institutions.

McConnell (1965) has spoken of the "obsolete nature of intuitive improvisation" in planning for higher education, and Wilson (1965) made what is essentially the same observation in addressing the Association for Higher Education:

Our past assumption has been that the separate aims and activities of existing colleges and universities would somehow add up to the best educational interests of the nation. In my judgment, this is no longer a valid assumption. Higher education has become too complicated, too costly, and too important in the national welfare for its basic decisions to be made haphazardly [unpublished speech].

Any lasting interinstitutional agreement must satisfy legitimate institutional goals and ambitions. Agreement upon statements of differentiated institutional goals which broadly define the essential roles of institutions and systematic assignment of distinctive functions to individual institutions are essential to a coordinated statewide plan. A plan lacking such statements or agreements is likely to be ineffective and short lived. Such a plan does not preclude "healthy competition" between institutions which strive to present more challenging instructional programs. It assumes that interinstitutional competition will continue to encourage educators to devise better programs in general education, the humanities, and liberal arts, as well as stronger and continually modernized programs in the applied fields such as business administration and teacher preparation.

Effective statewide planning, however, does require the imposition of certain restraints to curb excessive proliferation and duplication of specialized programs and facilities. It can be argued that such regulation can help to develop distinctive institutional character by conserving resources for new and innovative programs within the capability and the agreed-

upon functions of each institution. McConnell (1965) has repeatedly pointed out that:

... the great need in public higher education is for constructive, collaborative, and comprehensive planning for purposeful sharing as well as purposeful division of responsibilities [page 136].

He goes on to say that one of the most important purposes of a coordinating agency is to:

... define new educational needs and stimulate present institutions—or, if necessary, new institutions—to meet them [page 136].

It naturally follows that plans cannot be set in concrete for all time. Just as it is necessary that these plans be enforceable, it is also necessary that they be subject to amendment so that institutions may initiate new programs to meet the new needs of society.

One of the most common charges given to coordinating agencies by their state legislatures is to eliminate unnecessary and costly duplicative institutional functions. Most are given the authority to approve or disapprove each new educational program proposed by one of the public higher education institutions, but very few are given authority to order or recommend discontinuance of existing programs which they find to be unnecessarily duplicative. Some state comprehensive plans define differentiated functions of the institutions under coordination. However, too many avoid the task of seeking agreement necessary for such definitions; they resort to *ad hoc* consideration of new programs as they are presented from time to time. *Ad hoc* bargaining defeats constructive, collaborative planning and forces the coordinating agency into exerting "control through negation." Over the long term, such negative control in the absence of a purposeful plan fully accommodates neither the interests of the educational institutions nor the interests of the public, and only plants the seeds for future, possibly disruptive and costly, change. Herein lies one of the greatest opportunities for constructive leadership on the part of coordinating agencies, for such leadership can minimize destructive and costly competition and encourage innovation and the creation of distinctive colleges and universities.

5. A coordinating organization can exercise progressive leadership of its state's higher educational affairs, if it can create a viable equilibrium

among the divisive forces generated out of the opposing goals, conflicting functions, or the competitive aspirations of the various parties to coordination.

Viable equilibrium means a stable and reasonably equitable balance among the powers of the participants and among the internal and external pressures which would obstruct the coordinating agency's work. Specifically this means that the agency's authority necessary to protect the public interest is balanced by the members' autonomy necessary to safeguard the quality and productiveness of the institutions of higher education. It also presupposes that no participant or coalition of participants in the coordinating organization is able to consistently dominate the agency's decision-making processes and that balance will be brought about by the counteracting influences of institutional and governmental or public segments of the coordinating organization.

The surplus of satisfactions a coordinating agency can secure for its membership segments through its responsible leadership, over the burdens of restrained autonomy, will determine the success or failure of the coordinating organization. Barnard (1938) advanced the theory that the efficiency of a cooperative organization depends on its capacity to maintain itself by the satisfactions it affords individual members. He states:

This may be called its capacity of equilibrium, the balancing of burdens [of membership] by satisfactions which result in continuance [page 56].

Barnard further points out that a cooperative system must create a surplus of satisfactions to the cooperating members in order to be efficient and to acquire stability. Pondy (1967) accepts the Barnard model and adds the following:

If conflicts [among participants in the organization] are relatively small, and the inducements and contributions remain in equilibrium, then the participants are likely to try to resolve the conflict within the context of the existing relationship. On the other hand, when contributions exceed inducements, or when conflict is intense enough to destroy the . . . balance, then conflict can . . . dissolve the relationship [page 311].

On the other hand, some conflict may actually be a source of equilibrium and stability. Coser (1956) points out:

A multiplicity of conflicts internal to a group may breed solidarity, provided that the conflicts do not divide the group along the same axis, because the multiplicity of coalitions and associations provide a web of affiliation for the exchange of dissenting viewpoints [page 159].

He feels that some conflict is inevitable and that it is better for participants to engage in frequent minor conflicts of interest and thereby gradually adjust the system. In so doing, they may forestall the accumulation of latent antagonisms which eventually could disrupt the organization. Frequent minor conflicts also serve to keep the antagonists accurately informed of each other's relative strength.

Glenny (1966) makes the point that governors and legislatures increasingly seek to lead in planning major aspects of higher education development. Yet collegiate administrators and state government policy makers do not have a clear conception of the leadership role of the coordinating agency in the political milieu. He sees the statutory charge for planning as the principal legal power allowing the coordinating agency some political leverage under a "scheme of balanced tensions." He says:

The coordinating process is a political one, involving powerful social agencies such as colleges and universities with their historic intellectual independence and autonomy on the one side and the central public policy-formulating authorities of the governor and the legislature on the other.

The coordinating agency, situated between these two powerful political forces, seeks to identify with both in order to achieve satisfactory solutions [The exercise of its legal duty of long-range planning] . . . necessarily takes from both the universities and state authorities a valued traditional function; this, in turn, provides the coordinating agency the means to political leadership.

. . . In a sense, recommendations of the coordinating board, in the public interest, bar legislators from achieving parochial interests Collegiate administrators sometimes resent long-range plans recommended to the governor and legislature by the coordinating agency.

. . . The coordinating agency must face tensions generated by universities and colleges through extensive arousal means,

such as alumni associations On the other side, too, tensions arise from the legislative and executive branches whose local and statewide political constituencies are organized for support

Thus tension is the key to the new leadership. Tensions among elements in the coordination scheme do not entirely dissipate even in smoothly operating systems and, fortunately, cannot. Indeed, the process is similar to the workings of the democratic society and may be described as a 'system of balanced tensions' among diverse elements [pages 29-32].

The equilibrium of forces hypothesized in the foregoing does not assume that conflict will be eliminated; indeed, conflict may thrive. However, holding the various powers in approximate balance will allow the coordinating agency, as the combined instrument of the educational institutions, the public, and the officials of state government, to assume progressive and creative leadership which can promote diversity of educational opportunity while safeguarding the public against costly and wasteful competition.

The Wisconsin Experience

Throughout its history, Wisconsin has displayed a willingness to meet the challenge of an expanding and ever more complex society. The state's provision of public higher education finds its roots in the ordinance of 1787 which stated the principles for relations between the Northwest Territory and the original Federation of States and decreed: "Religion, morality, and knowledge being necessary to good government and the happiness of mankind, schools and the means of education shall forever be encouraged." From these roots has grown a generous and widely available system of higher education of eminent quality. Sixty-three cities and towns throughout Wisconsin contain 2-year or 4-year institutions offering programs of post high school education (see Appendix B). The state's present per capita expenditure of \$31.40 from its general tax fund for public higher education (as reported in the October 12, 1967, issue of *The Chronicle of Higher Education*) is seventh highest in the nation.

HIGHER EDUCATION IN WISCONSIN

University of Wisconsin

Since its founding in the state constitution in 1848, the University of Wisconsin has developed into one of the most prestigious state universities in the nation. Berelsen (1960), enlarging upon an earlier survey of Keniston (1959), ranked the universities with the largest number of outstanding academic departments and placed Wisconsin among the top 10 of all universities and third among public state universities. The recent study of graduate education in 29 fields by the American Council on Education (Cartter, 1966) cited the University of Wisconsin as having seven "distinguished" departments, 19 "strong" departments, and three "good" departments.

University of Wisconsin President Charles R. Van Hise (1903-1918) first articulated the "Wisconsin Idea," which has set the style of the university to this day. Edward Doan (1947), biographer of Robert M. LaFollette, an alumnus of the University of Wisconsin, stated:

The Wisconsin Idea was that continual sifting and winnowing carried on not only in the classroom and laboratory but jointly in the classroom and government administrative office. It was the joint effort of the politician and the professor to serve the common interest of all the people rather than the special interest of particular groups [page 64].

Incorporated in the Wisconsin Idea has been this saying popular in the state: The boundaries of the campus are the boundaries of the state.

During the years of the Progressives under "Fighting Bob LaFollette," the cooperation of legislators and university professors in framing and administering the laws for regulation of corporate wealth won glowing praise in liberal circles throughout the country. The university, not without doubts on the part of some of its faculty, began in the first decade of the twentieth century a long history of close relationships with state administrations and their legislatures. Members of the university staff and faculty helped draft reform legislation and served on regulatory commissions. The extension work of the university was expanded greatly and through it, research was sponsored of obvious benefit to the state. The feeling that the university was, in fact, an arm of the state, turned Wisconsin's citizens toward it and set a precedent of bountiful public support of the institution.

It might be speculated that the Wisconsin Idea has been a beneficence not without its price. The doctrine has brought the university and its chief administrators into close alliance with the political world. In so doing, it has given currency to the notion, held by some state administrators and legislators, that the university, as an arm of state administration, should be a respectful and in many respects a subservient arm. With the swing of Wisconsin politics to conservatism in recent years, this side effect may account for some of the outrage expressed in the legislature when the "university arm" is critical of the Establishment, when its students "misbehave," when the university community is not "properly appreciative" of the state government's sponsorship, or even when its football team suffers defeat. Such problems, however, are not exclusive to Wisconsin.

At present, the university system enrolls about 52,000 students at the main campus at Madison, the University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee, and

eleven 2-year (freshman-sophomore) university centers located at Green Bay, Janesville, Kenosha, Manitowac, Marienette, Marshfield, Menasha, Racine, Sheboygan, Waukesha, and Wausau. New 2-year centers are currently under construction at Baraboo and West Bend, and the 2-year centers at Green Bay and Kenosha are being changed to full 4-year institutions.

Wisconsin State Universities

The system now known as the Wisconsin State Universities has a 100-year record of service to Wisconsin. Originating as a state normal school system, with its first institution founded at Platteville in 1866, these institutions followed the usual pattern of state college development. They were first renamed "state teachers colleges" in 1927 and granted authority to award baccalaureate degrees in the field of education, then were designated as "state colleges" in 1951 and authorized to depart from their limited teacher education programs and to offer degrees in the liberal arts and sciences. Thirteen years later, in 1964, the board of regents, by its own action, designated the colleges as "state universities."

Its board of regents presides over nine institutions located at Eau Claire, La Crosse, Menomonie (Stout State University, which also operates a branch campus at Rice Lake), Oshkosh, Platteville, River Falls, Stevens Point, Superior, and Whitewater. New 2-year branch campuses have been opened at Richland Center and Rice Lake, and others are scheduled at Fond du Lac and Medford. The system enrolls more than 44,000 students on all campuses. There have been a few changes in the group of institutions comprising this system: In 1955, Stout Institute at Menomonie, previously under a separate board of trustees, was added; at the same time, the Institute of Technology at Platteville was transferred to the state colleges and subsequently merged with the existing state college at Platteville in 1959; and the state college at Milwaukee was merged with the university center system in 1955 and later was renamed the University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee.

County Teachers Colleges

A third system of post high school education consists of 15 county 2-year colleges. Established by the legislature in 1899 as county teacher-training schools, they are scheduled for phasing out by 1971 because of the recent change of state laws requiring 4 years of training and a

baccalaureate degree for teacher certification. The schools are governed locally by three-member boards consisting of the county superintendent of schools and two other members elected by the county school board.

Vocational-Technical-Adult Schools

Wisconsin has an extensive vocational-technical and adult education program carried on in 63 institutions throughout the state. The system is under the general supervision of the Wisconsin Board of Vocational, Technical, and Adult Education. Vocational schools are governed by local area boards and have been supported largely by local revenues. However, this has been augmented in recent years by increased state aid and federal assistance programs. Fifteen of these schools offer the Associate of Arts degree in terminal vocational-technical programs, including some general education courses. Two of these schools, at Milwaukee and Madison, offer dual-track programs with 2-year (freshman-sophomore) liberal arts programs accredited by the North Central Association. A pilot dual-track program has now been authorized for the community of Rhinelander, and other units of this system have indicated interest in offering courses which will constitute the first 2 years of collegiate transfer work. Under legislation passed in 1965, the entire state is to be organized under vocational-technical-adult education area districts by 1970 so that these institutions will then operate on district rather than municipal funding. By mid-1967, thirteen out of a proposed 18 districts had been so organized.

Private Colleges and Universities

The private sector of higher education in Wisconsin consists of two universities, 19 four-year liberal arts colleges, and a number of special institutions offering less than a 4-year program. They enroll about 30,000 students. The largest of these, Marquette University in Milwaukee, a Jesuit institution, includes 10 degree-granting colleges and professional schools. Its graduate school offers master's degrees in 31 fields and doctorates in 11 fields. In 1967, its medical school was separated from the university and is now operated by an independent lay board known as the Marquette School of Medicine. Lawrence University in Appleton has three units—Downer College (for women), which in 1963 merged with Lawrence College, the Conservatory of Music, and the Institute of Paper Chemistry.

Most of these institutions are members of the Wisconsin Association of Independent Colleges and Universities, which maintains a full-time staff

and executive director to encourage cooperation among its members and assist them in attaining educational goals and utilizing their total resources more effectively. There is an increasingly close relationship between the private and public institutions in Wisconsin—but at present the private institutions play no formal part in the coordination of higher education in the state other than through their representatives on the higher education aids board.

HISTORY OF COORDINATION

Even before Wisconsin became a state there was public debate over how best to organize the public educational systems—whether the higher educational institutions should be governed by one board, whether they and the elementary and secondary schools should be integrated under a single board, or whether there should be separate boards for each institutional system under some form of supra-institutional coordinating agency.

The question of integration was discussed in 1841 when Wisconsin was still a territory and a bill was introduced into the territorial legislature to establish a single state board of education. This bill was defeated. Similar attempts were made in 1897, 1909, and 1913. In 1915, a state board of education was actually created which included representatives of the university board of regents, the normal school board of regents, the state superintendent of public instruction, the secretary of state, and the governor. The Wisconsin statutes (1915, Chapter 497) show that this board did not replace the existing institutional governing boards and that it was established originally to consider fiscal problems only. In 1917, this board was enlarged from five to nine members; the four new members were private citizens appointed by the governor for terms of 5 years. The 1917 legislature, however, sharply curtailed the fiscal review authority of the board, and this loss of power contributed significantly to its demise in 1923.

Between 1925 and 1937, at least five bills were introduced into the legislature to integrate the system of higher education by substituting a single overall governing board of education for the separate governing boards. None passed.

Efforts to integrate or coordinate the institutions under one board of education continued through 1953, but with no success. In 1949, a bill was introduced to extend the university system to include all state colleges. This, and a similar bill introduced in 1953, failed to pass.

Coordinating Committee of 1955

Governor Walter J. Kohler supported legislation for consolidation both in 1953 and 1955 (*Wisconsin Blue Book*, 1966). In his 1955 message to the legislature he called for consolidation of the higher educational institutions under a single board. The original bill drafted on the Governor's recommendations created a great deal of controversy. In general, the state colleges favored merger of the boards, but the university backed a substitute proposal which only would have merged the university extension center at Milwaukee with the state college in that city and placed the new institution under university control. After a summer of debate, the university recommended that the two boards (those of the university and of the state colleges) develop a "cooperative plan" and this swung the support from consolidation to the idea of coordination. The bill finally enacted by the 1955 legislature provided for continuation of the separate institutional governing boards and created the Coordinating Committee for Higher Education. The Laws of 1955 stated:

The purpose of this section is to provide for the coordination of the activities of the University and the state colleges . . . by providing a permanent joint committee to make a continuing study of the state-supported institutions of higher education . . . the relation thereto of the needs of the people of Wisconsin, to recommend necessary changes in programs and facilities, to provide for a single consolidated biennial budget request . . . and to report the results of its studies to the governor and the legislature [Chapter 619].

The Committee was composed of five regents of the university, five regents of the state colleges, four citizens appointed by the governor, and the state superintendent of public instruction. No provision was made in the legislation for a professional staff, other than that the Committee was authorized to:

. . . use the services of the administrative and technical staffs of the institutions of higher learning and to aid in the studies and activities of this committee . . . and the compensations for such services shall be paid by the respective board or institution regularly employing such personnel [Chapter 619].

In its first year, 1956, the Coordinating Committee approved the merger of the university extension center and state college at Milwaukee, thus creating the University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee.

The Committee was expanded in 1961 to include a representative of the county teachers colleges and again in 1963 to include four members of the board of vocational, technical, and adult education.

Seeds of Change

In the decade between 1955 and 1965 occurred the largest sustained expansion of higher education enrollments in the history of the nation. The number of youths attending postsecondary educational institutions increased from 2,660,000 to 4,119,000. This pressure of new enrollments was due to the sharp rise in the birth rate immediately following World War II, but the increase in percentages of the high school graduates seeking higher education was, and continues to be, the chief source of enrollment expansions. Every state legislature was confronted with the sharply increasing cost of higher education as it struggled to meet the demand for more faculty members, increased operating expenses of all kinds, new building facilities, new campus developments, and whole new higher education institutions.

Coordinating organizations came into existence by voluntary association or by legislative enactment to help state legislators analyze the real and pressing needs of the institutions for more funds. Many of these early organizations came under attack for alleged inability to cope with the whole set of new problems brought on by expansion. During this decade, 25 states created new organizations or reorganized the existing coordinating bodies. In many of these states, two or more basic organizational changes were made during this decade (Paltridge, 1965).

In Wisconsin during this decade, the enrollments at public institutions of higher education increased from 40,439 to 71,097. Serious questions arose concerning the effectiveness of the organization of the Coordinating Committee and its role in the changing structure of the state's higher education system.

During this decade, seeds of change were sown and nurtured by partisan politics, unbridled institutional competition, and confusion over how Wisconsin higher education could continue to expand to meet the new challenges facing the higher education community. The seeds of change might be categorized as follows.

- (1) Competition intensified between the University of Wisconsin and the former state colleges, now the Wisconsin State University system.

(2) The University of Wisconsin began an active expansion program of a network of 2-year undergraduate colleges and of several new extension centers for community programs and adult education in cities and towns throughout the state.

(3) Conflicts increased over educational programs to be offered by the state universities and over the newly articulated aspirations of these institutions.

(4) Long-term planning for the state's higher educational system as a whole was absent. Institutional representatives on the Coordinating Committee apparently assumed that plans of the individual institutions or systems constituted such planning.

(5) Pressures were growing for fiscal economy in the face of the increasing tax burden necessary for operation of state services, of which higher education was one.

(6) A different political party gained control of the state administration in 1964 and of the administration and legislature in 1966.

The Committee of 25

In 1963, the legislature established a citizen-majority committee of 25, charging it "to survey appropriate measures by which the people of Wisconsin can be assured that expenditures for state and local government will remain within the capacity of the taxpayer and will be used most efficiently." One of its three subcommittees was asked to devote its attention to the state's system of public higher education.

The following excerpts reflect the stern nature of this subcommittee's report. The proposals were prophetic of the changes to come:

The present administrative structure of higher education in Wisconsin has evidenced serious weaknesses—weaknesses that can be corrected only by positive legislative action to provide a structure capable of independent decision-making and to establish appropriate machinery to make the administrative agency in higher education an effective body [page 12].

Referring to the membership and organizational structure of the Coordinating Committee, the report stated.

The present CCHE is seriously handicapped because the majority of its members [legitimately] have a special and strong loyalty to the institutions they represent There is evidence that the CCHE . . . has not been able to act objectively and effectively, particularly in considering the merits of establishing new types of institutions combining the functions of existing institutions [page 18].

Regarding the supporting staff of the Coordinating Committee, the report said:

It is believed that at best the present staffing plan is organizationally and administratively awkward . . . it is natural that the various co-directors employed by the separate systems feel obligated, in varying degrees, to espouse the point of view of the respective institutional systems, rather than feeling entirely free to consider the interest of the state as a whole in higher education. This situation is especially undesirable in carrying out the directive to review the budget requests of the separate institutions . . . [page 17].

The report charged the Coordinating Committee with inability to act firmly on the major policy questions in higher education, citing in particular its "apparent failure to establish and hold firm to a definite and specific policy on the nature and locations of new 2-year institutions and of additional 4-year institutions [page 18]."

The subcommittee made three key recommendations designed to meet this criticism:

. . . that the Coordinating Committee be reorganized and renamed the Wisconsin Board of Higher Education; that the board be directed to appoint its own executive director and staff, and a separate legislative appropriation be provided for the operation of the board; and that the number of citizen members on the board be increased to a majority, and the institutional representation be reduced [page 17].

The Coordinating Committee strenuously challenged the findings and recommendations of the committee of 25 and formed a subcommittee to prepare a rebuttal. This five-page statement, designated as *CCHE Working Paper No. 83, October, 1964*, explained the philosophy and the role of the Coordinating Committee as perceived by its members:

The Committee was not conceived to be an independent arm of the state government exercising administrative control over the educational institutions, but rather the Committee is an integral part of the Wisconsin higher education system acting in its behalf in a positive and prudent manner [page 2].

It described the recommendations of the committee of 25 as a "radical departure from the educational and administrative philosophy inherent in the present organization" and opposed any organizational change.

The 1964 political campaigns brought into public debate a number of issues concerning higher education. The desires of a number of Wisconsin communities to have new 2-year and 4-year universities located within them resulted in offers of political support for such proposals by some candidates for elective office. Opposing candidates demanded greater fiscal responsibility on the part of the institutions, a comprehensive long-range plan for higher education, and community-administered higher education institutions offering 2-year terminal general education and more vocational-technical courses. The political party of the opposition candidates gained control of the administration in 1964 and, thus, pressures for reform and reorganization could not be denied.

Reorganized Coordinating Committee of 1965

In a special message to the 1965 legislature, newly elected Governor Warren P. Knowles called for reorganization of the Coordinating Committee. He recommended that a majority of citizen members be placed on the Committee and a separate staff formed under the direction of a qualified executive director responsible only to the Committee. Several measures were placed before the legislature, and the one that finally passed (Bill 797-A, Assemblymen Obey and Nikolay) did so only after several months of debate and after a number of amendments designed to strengthen the authority of the Coordinating Committee.

As revised in 1965, the Coordinating Committee now consists of 17 members: one each from the Board of Regents of the University of Wisconsin, the board of regents of state colleges and the board of vocational, technical, and adult education selected annually by their respective boards; the president of each of the three boards; the state superintendent of public instruction; one member of a county teachers college appointed annually by the governor; and nine citizen members appointed by the governor with the advice and consent of the senate for 8-year terms.

This legislation provides for the appointment of a full-time executive director, who may employ necessary professional and clerical staff, and provides a separate budget allocation for this purpose.

The new law, as noted in the *Wisconsin Blue Book* (1966), also changed the Committee from an agency with the responsibility to *coordinate* existing activities to one which has the power to *direct* all planning for public higher education in Wisconsin. The *Blue Book* further notes:

Through the CCHE, the public has a direct voice in what programs will be offered, what buildings will be constructed or remodeled and what state funds will be required to meet these needs [page 162].

Three of the initial assumptions about the factors that contribute to effective coordination are embodied in these organizational changes. The fourth and fifth assumptions are that, before it can exercise leadership in planning and coordinating in higher education, 1) institutional functions should be defined in a comprehensive statewide plan and adherence to these functions enforceable by the coordinating body and 2) the coordinating agency must achieve a semblance of equilibrium between the satisfactions and the burdens of membership and between the sometimes conflicting goals of the institutions, the public, and the legislature. Each change will be examined in light of the stated assumptions. However, it should be noted that we are viewing the Wisconsin experience *before* the creation of a statewide plan, for evidence of leadership and indications that it has achieved the degree of equilibrium that provides organizational stability.

The Change to Citizen Control

The decision to place voting control of the Wisconsin Coordinating Committee for Higher Education with a group of lay citizens not affiliated with the public higher education system was, in many respects, momentous. It was strongly resisted in many quarters, despite the weight of tradition in Wisconsin for broadly based democratic procedures. It altered an arrangement of 10 years during which the Coordinating Committee regarded itself, and came to be regarded by state officials, primarily as a joint committee of the governing boards brought together to advise state officials of the needs of public higher education. Furthermore, the change was made in the face of opposition from politically strong forces within the Committee's members.

The Wisconsin statutes of 1955 definitely implied that the Committee was vested with certain powers over the conduct and long-term planning of the individual institutions, but critics of the body asserted that the Committee had chosen not to assert this authority. Member institutions usually intervened directly in the political arena to effect their goals rather than through their membership on the Committee.

The shift to citizen control was opposed by the administrative power structure of the University of Wisconsin and by a majority of the members of the 1963-65 Coordinating Committee. This was evident in their public statements and in the resolutions made public by the Coordinating Committee during this period. This opposition was also apparent in the detailed interviews conducted during the course of this investigation in 1966. The survey of members of the Wisconsin higher educational community, however, disclosed that this opposition, although vociferous, was not unanimous.

One feature of the reorganized Wisconsin Committee which makes it uncommon, although not unique among coordinating agencies, is the fact

that no academic executive is a member of the Committee. The higher education institutions are represented only by members of their lay governing boards—the president of the board and one other member chosen by the board membership. Thus, with the exception of the ex-officio superintendent of public instruction, this is a public board of lay citizens serving by gubernatorial appointment and state senate confirmation. The institutions, however, rightfully expect the lay members of their governing boards to serve on the Coordinating Committee primarily as representatives of the institutions and not necessarily as representatives of the public. Exclusion of the chief executive or academic executives of the institutions from membership on the Coordinating Committee eliminates from the decision making, and to a large extent from deliberations, the special expertise of the administrators. They attend regularly, but they must sit on the sidelines during debates on matters which vitally affect their administrative procedures. They frequently speak to issues of debate, but from the sidelines rather than from a chair of responsibility. This may be one of the reasons for the qualified confidence many administrators seem to have in the coordinating mechanism.

REASONS FOR CHANGE TO CITIZEN CONTROL

Important clues to the reasons for the change in membership composition of the Coordinating Committee may be found in the historical description of the climate of change which permeated Wisconsin between 1963 and 1965 and which was described in the preceding chapter. However, it was expected that many of the specific causes of discontent would not surface in detailed documentary form. The research therefore sought additional evidence in personal comments and perceptions of variously informed and personally concerned individuals associated in some manner with higher education and the coordination of higher education. Individual perceptions of the reasons for change were elicited in the questionnaire and in the detailed personal interviews with key officials.

The *Committee of 25 Final Report, Volume 2* (1965) strongly emphasized the "inability of independent decision-making" as a reason for their recommendation that citizen members of the Committee be increased to a majority. It stated:

The present CCHE is seriously handicapped because the majority of its members have a special and strong loyalty to the institutions they represent. It is believed that this legitimate (and, in fact, necessary) commitment prevents them

from unreservedly representing the public interest as CCHE members.

. . .

There is evidence that the CCHE, having a majority of members representing the interests of the institutions affected by these decisions, has not been able to act objectively and effectively, particularly in considering combining the functions of existing institutions [page 18].

In the opinion survey, 276 persons responded to the invitation to describe in their own words "the primary reason for this change." The content of the responses were analyzed and grouped into major categories.

Table 1 shows these categories of responses tabulated by major membership groups and by the institutional affiliation (if any) of the respondent. The following statements represent a consensus of the replies in each of these categories:

- (1) To make higher education more responsive to public opinion by giving control to public representatives.
- (2) To reduce the individual influence of the University of Wisconsin and/or the Wisconsin State University System or the "personal influences" of the representatives of these institutions over the major decisions related to higher education, thereby providing greater *objectivity* to decision making.
- (3) To reduce the rivalries and power struggles among various educational institutions or systems.
- (4) To give *political* officials and appointees greater power and control over higher education policies.
- (5) To reduce the amount of money spent for higher education by reducing the influences of the institutions over budget and fiscal policy decisions.

The largest number of persons responded with answers that could be subsumed under the statement, "To make higher education more responsive to public opinion . . ." This appears to support the reasoning articulated by the committee of 25, which sought to shift membership loyalties

Table 1. Primary Reason for 1965 Change of CCHE Membership as Perceived by Persons in the Higher Education Community, by Response Group and Institutional Affiliation.

By response group	Reasons for change						
	1) Responsive to public	2) Institutional influence	3) Power struggle	4) Political power	5) Cut costs	6) Other	7) No answer; don't know
CCHE members	9	12	3	0	2	2	0
Institutional board members*	6(3)	5(5)	2	0	1(1)	2(1)	0
Administrator group	39	29	8	5	4	21	14
Faculty group	19	7	3	9	1	5	38
Legislative group	8	6	2	0	0	5	2
Other respondents	0	2	1	0	1	0	3
Totals	81	61	19	14	9	35	57
By institutional affiliation							
UW	17	22	7	5	5	11	24
WSU	22	11	4	5	2	6	14
VTA	19	9	2	4	0	9	7
County teachers colleges	1	3	0	0	0	1	0
Private colleges	8	2	0	0	0	2	7

*Numbers in parentheses indicate responses of additional institutional board members who responded in their capacity as CCHE members and are thus included in CCHE totals.

from institutions to serving the public interest. More specific reasons underlying this reason for change are found in other responses. These were taken as guidelines for the direction of questions used in the detailed interviews conducted during and following receipt of the returns from the questionnaire.

The following may be listed as the more specific (and antecedent) reasons for the organizational change to citizen control as perceived by the respondents: 1) institutional domination of decision-making and the divisiveness of institutional rivalries and "power struggles," 2) the political change of the state's administrative and legislative power structure which resulted in the change of political control of educational policies, and 3) the new emphasis placed on fiscal economies.

Institutional Domination and Power Struggles

The issues related to this reason for the membership change were strongly argued and infiltrated with contradictory judgments. In one form or another, however, it was undeniably one of the key contributors to the pressure for change. The charges were stated variously (and, in the last case, with a somewhat different meaning): "The University of Wisconsin dominated the coordinating mechanism," "the University and the state colleges dominated it," and "the institutional representatives dominate it." The latter, of course, was a fact of record, for the institutional representatives on the pre-1965 Coordinating Committee held 14 of the 19 votes, the citizen members only four. The remaining vote was held by the ex-officio superintendent of public instruction.

The county teachers colleges and the vocational-technical-adult schools' representatives were latecomers to the Committee, having been given their seats in 1961 and 1963, respectively. The teachers colleges had little power and were slated for extinction within a few years after acquiring membership. The vocational-technical-adult school representatives had strong grassroots political support, but not until after they were reorganized in 1965 and gained support through the present state administration did they acquire real power on the Committee. Consequently, if there was institutional dominance of the coordinating mechanism, it was exerted by the two university systems.

There can be no doubt of the stronger political position of the University of Wisconsin. In 1955, when the first Coordinating Committee was founded, the university held the dominant position in higher education

as it had for the past century. The state colleges were then just expanding their previously sole function of teacher training and were beginning to enter the fields of liberal arts, general education, the humanities, and various applied educational fields. After 1955, they changed their name to universities, expanded their campuses, enrolled thousands of new students, and expanded their curriculum offerings. In 1955 and 1956, the university responded to this competition by consolidating its position in Milwaukee, Wisconsin's largest city in the state and the hub of industry and commerce. Understandably, the university would want strong representation in this part of the state. It worked to secure representation through the consolidation of the 2-year university extension center and the existing state college in Milwaukee. The combined institutions became a branch of the University at Madison, and is now known as University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee. Later, the university made an unsuccessful attempt to merge the 4-year state college at Eau Claire, then the largest state college, into the university system. This would have given the university representation in this agriculture center on the extreme western side of the state.

The latter part of this decade was marked by the expansion of the university center system, a network of 2-year collegiate institutions offering the approximate equivalent of the freshman and sophomore years at the university. Also during this period two new 4-year universities were authorized.

The university and the state university system, which also started building a system of 2-year freshman-sophomore branch campuses, were rivals for control of new institutions, and the legislature in 1967 considered AB-752 (subsequently tabled) which would have reversed its earlier decision and given control of the two new 4-year institutions to the state university system rather than to the university. Between 1960 and 1965, only two requests for authorization of new 2-year institutions were turned down by the Committee, and five new university centers and four new state university branches were authorized. It was not until after the 1965 reorganization that the Coordinating Committee passed a resolution declaring a moratorium on further expansion of these 2-year centers and branches.

The charges of university domination of the Coordinating Committee, and/or domination of the Committee by the university in *ad hoc* coalitions with the state university system, appear to be substantiated on the basis of the record. This charge is strongly denied by university officials who point to occasional "defeats" of university proposals presented to the Coordinating Committee, but it was given credence in most of the personal interviews conducted during the course of this investigation.

Political Change and the Charge of Political Control

In informal conversations, as well as in some of the formally conducted interviews, the statement often was made that the Coordinating Committee membership was changed primarily because of the change of political party in control of the Wisconsin statehouse in 1965. The inference was that the new political administration of the state wished to have greater control over educational affairs and educational decisions in order to effect the "reforms" which had been issues in the campaign. The new incumbent governor did campaign strongly for educational and fiscal reform of the state's higher education system, calling for more and better planning, tighter control of fiscal policies, particularly those related to new construction, and for more community-based, comprehensive 2-year institutions for terminal vocational and general education. His opponent championed more 4-year universities and more 2-year university centers.

The fact that many of the persons associated with the Coordinating Committee organization were known to have political affiliations contrary to that of the newly elected administration undoubtedly gave added currency to the charge that political motives were a primary reason for the change. It is interesting to note, however, that in the responses to the questionnaire the only persons who volunteered this charge as their perception of the *primary* reasons for the 1965 change were some administrators and faculty members who did not sit on the Committee (table 1). (Nevertheless, the new appointees to the Committee were all of the same political party as the newly elected governor and the majority of members of the legislature.)

Of those who cited political motives, most also cited other reasons for the change. It is probable that politics played some part in this change, but the evidence does not point to political partisanship unmixed with other specific and substantial reasons as a primary motive.

Fiscal Economies

A frequently cited reason for the 1965 membership change was that it made possible an economy move by a new, more conservative state administration by placing this decision making in the hands of persons sympathetic to the idea. Several outspoken opponents of the change charged that it was motivated by a desire to "save money" regardless of educational needs and that the change of membership was the only way this could be brought about. This opinion was stressed strongly in a few of the

conversations and formal interviews, but by a minority of the persons responding to the questionnaire.

Undoubtedly, the pressures for greater fiscal efficiency in the operation of all branches of state government have been a strong factor in legislative deliberations in Wisconsin as they have been in a number of other states in recent years. Taxpayers, in their concern about mounting federal, state, and local tax burdens, have felt the pinch of increasing costs of state services. It is also understandable that higher education administrators and faculty, faced with the increasing demand for higher education, would charge that such economy moves disregard society's needs for higher education, and even charge their opponents with fiscal irresponsibility. The rising costs of higher education in Wisconsin, regardless of whether charges of fiscal inefficiency are founded, would understandably give rise to these charges as reasons for reform.

EXTENT OF SUPPORT FOR CHANGE

The research attempted to assess the support and opposition to the 1965 change of membership composition by asking, "Did you favor (or vote for) this change [of member composition of CCHE]? This inquiry was made nearly 2 years after the legislative enactment, thus some statements may reflect a present rather than an original opinion.

The only group of respondents who actually voted on the change, the legislators, were overwhelmingly in favor of the change (see table 2). Among all respondents, the number of proponents of the change were more than double the number of opponents. The rather large number of "no opinion" responses (about 20 percent) is probably attributable to the fact that many faculty members and faculty administrators indicated throughout the questionnaire that they had very limited knowledge of the affairs of the Coordinating Committee. The only group which registered a negative vote on this question were members of the faculty group. Apparently, more of those faculty members who were informed about the problems of coordination tended to favor the institutional rather than the public control of the coordinating mechanism.

Further analysis of the responses by institutional system affiliation indicates that persons affiliated with the University of Wisconsin and who expressed an opinion tended to oppose the change in membership. Persons affiliated with the other institutional systems tended to favor it—particularly the VTA system, with its strong grassroots base in the

Table 2. Members of the Higher Education Community Who Supported or Opposed the CCHE Membership Change, by Response Group, Institutional Affiliation, and Political Party.

	Supported	Opposed	No opinion
By response group			
CCHE members	18	7	3
Institutional board members*	14(3)	1(4)	1(3)
Administrator group	62	25	33
Faculty group	17	20	45
Legislative group	19	2	2
Other respondents	4	0	3
Totals	134	55	87
By institutional affiliation			
UW	24	30	37
WSU	26	15	23
VTA	32	4	14
County teachers colleges	4	1	0
Private colleges	11	0	8
By political party			
Republicans	47	8	19
Democrats	28	15	20
Independents	20	12	16
None	18	12	16

*Numbers in parentheses indicate answers of additional institutional board members who responded in their capacity as CCHE members and are thus included in CCHE totals.

communities throughout the state, which strongly favored citizen control. Private colleges' and universities' representatives who held an opinion favored the change. From the standpoint of their competitive relations with the public institutions, it is understandable that the private institutions would favor a move which would place the coordinating mechanism in the hands of a group of citizens rather than in the hands of the public institutions.

Finally, it was disclosed that among the persons who stated their political party affiliation, about 60 percent of the Republicans favored the reorganization as opposed to 44 percent Democrats. This is not surprising, for it was a Republican administration which initiated the change.

PERCEIVED EFFECTS OF THE CHANGE

It was fully realized that substantial and lasting effects of the membership change could not be measured only a year or so after the new Committee was constituted. However, members of the higher education community were asked to indicate their present perceptions of the effects of this change in an effort to assess the extent of satisfaction with the change. They were asked to respond to a series of statements encompassing a broad range of opinion, from seeing benefits to institutions to impairments of the stability of the coordinating organization. The statements were:

- (1) It has increasingly benefited the institutions by giving them an unbiased, consultative body to present their needs more effectively to the legislature and state administration.
- (2) It gave control of higher education to representatives of the people of the state.
- (3) It really didn't make much difference.
- (4) It took control of Wisconsin's higher educational systems away from educational experts and turned it over to amateurs.
- (5) It gave control of Wisconsin's higher educational system to political appointees who may be more interested in prevailing problems of the moment than in the long-term goals of the institutions.
- (6) (Principal added comment) It is too early to judge the effects of change.

The idea in the first statement (an objective of those who proposed the change) is directly opposed to the idea in the fifth (a result feared by those who opposed the change). The same opposing viewpoints are presented in the second and fourth statements. The third statement represents a feeling that in spite of the change the Committee is functioning no more effectively or ineffectively than it did prior to 1965. Approximately 20 percent of the persons who responded to this question added the comment that it was really too early to judge the effects of the change.

There was a remarkably even spread of the responses across this broad range of opinion and within each surveyed group, indicating little

Table 3. Principal Effect of the CCHE Membership Change Assessed by the Higher Education Community, by Response Group, Institutional Affiliation, and Political Party.

	Principal effect of change					
	1) Benefits to institutions	2) Control to public	3) Not much difference	4) Experts to amateurs	5) Political control	6) Too early to tell
By response group						
CCHE members	4	4	2	1	4	4
Institutional board members*	3(1)	7(1)	1(2)	0	1(3)	2(2)
Administrator group	30	24	19	3	15	14
Faculty group	14	11	6	8	18	20
Legislative group	7	4	4	0	1	5
Others	2	0	2	0	0	3
Totals	60	50	34	12	39	48
By institutional affiliation						
UW	11	9	13	7	22	17
WSU	13	13	11	2	12	9
VTA	19	18	1	2	2	6
County teachers colleges	0	2	0	0	1	1
Private colleges	5	1	3	0	0	5
By political party						
Republicans	23	12	10	1	4	7
Democrats	10	8	6	6	12	5
Independents	11	8	3	1	8	4
None	9	0	7	4	6	0

*Numbers in parentheses indicate answers of additional institutional board members who responded in their other capacity as CCHE members and are thus included in CCHE totals.

agreement concerning precise effects of the change (see table 3). While most persons felt that the change has benefited the institutions (statement 1), nearly as many felt that the change has been to the detriment of the institutions (statements 4 and 5) because it encouraged short-sighted political control of higher education affairs or because it shifted control of these affairs from experts to "amateurs." Some institutional administrators and faculty members, particularly from the University of Wisconsin, and some of the members of institutional governing boards serving on the Committee saw the change as detrimental to the institutions because it has resulted in unsympathetic political control of their affairs (statement 5).

Viewing the responses according to stated political party affiliation, Republicans, who largely promulgated the change, appear to see benefits to the institutions. Democrats tend to look upon the change as a political move more than anything else.

FURTHER MEMBERSHIP CHANGE?

The research attempted to assess the sentiment for still further change in the membership composition of the Coordinating Committee by probing in the questionnaire two areas in which future changes might occur. These also were discussed in the personal interviews.

Respondents were asked whether they favored still stronger citizen control of coordination. Apparently there is practically no interest in an all-citizen coordinating committee. The questionnaire vote was 244 no and 11 yes, although four of the yes votes were from the group of 23 legislators who responded. A proposal to increase the citizen majority appointed by the governor met a similar fate: 207 no and 18 yes. (A few more persons indicated no opinion on the second question.) Neither idea drew favorable response in the interviews.

A series of questions was designed to measure sentiment for bringing the private colleges and universities into some form of membership or other representation in the conduct of coordination. The possibilities, in a descending order of involvement, are as follows: 1) full voting membership on the Coordinating Committee, 2) representation on the Coordinating Committee, but with voting privileges restricted to matters directly affecting their interests, 3) formation of a committee of private institutions which would be only consultative and advisory to the Coordinating Committee, and 4) strict separation of private institutions from the

public institutions' affairs which are the concern of the Coordinating Committee.

The public higher educational community and legislators strongly rejected any form of voting representation for private institutions on the Coordinating Committee, favored the formation of a private institution advisory committee to the Coordinating Committee, and expressed sharply divided opinion on the strict separation of affairs of the public and private institutions (see table 4). The 19 private institution administrators who responded to the questionnaire favored membership with full voting privileges. They seemed to reject the idea of sending an advisory committee to consult with the Coordinating Committee.

Table 4. Opinions of the Higher Education Community on Participation of Private Colleges and Universities in the Activities of CCHE.

<u>Extent of participation</u>	<u>All respondents</u>		<u>Public institution administrators</u>		<u>Private institution administrators</u>	
	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>
1. Voting membership	42	159	7	72	13	2
2. Representation with limited voting privileges	45	123	11	52	3	6
3. Advisory committee to CCHE	124	60	52	21	1	7
4. Strict separation	73	69	32	23	2	6

Note: This table records only the "yes" and "no" votes; all others voted "No opinion" or did not respond.

The personal interviews disclosed a significant number of responses from education and state officials in favor of involving private institutions more closely in higher education planning and decision making in the state. Several officials prophesied that the private institutions would eventually gain voting representation on the Coordinating Committee, as is the case in a number of other states with statutory coordinating organizations.

Private institution officials, however, seem to want to approach this matter with caution. They want their voices to be heard in state higher

education planning, but they do not want to become embroiled in the political struggle and bargaining which surrounds many public higher education issues. While some private institutions favor cooperative arrangements with public institutions and sharing facilities as well as responsibility for certain areas of instruction, they generally do not favor direct state aid except through the individual state scholarship program. They want to have political influence, but they seem to prefer that this influence come through their own association, recently strengthened by the appointment of an executive director and central staff and the establishment of a permanent office in the state capitol, Madison.

Reorganized Professional Staff

The 1955 legislation which created the Committee had made no provision for staff other than to authorize the Committee to "use the services of the administrative and technical staffs of the institutions of higher learning to aid in the studies and activities of this committee [Statutes of Wisconsin, Section 39.024, 1963]." Members of the small staff which served the Committee, thus, were "on loan" and in the pay of their parent institutions. Under this arrangement, analytic studies and statewide planning papers were more likely to be collations or syntheses of individual institutional data and plans than original research and development.

For a number of years, the staff was under the tripartite direction of the senior staff members drawn from the administrative staffs of the university, the state university system, and later from the vocational-technical-adult schools. During these years, the chairmanship of the Committee rotated annually among the presidents of the institutional governing boards.

The 1965 legislation created a professional staff completely independent of the administration of the member institutions and empowered the Committee to appoint and fix the salary of a full-time executive director "who shall have a recognized and demonstrated interest in and knowledge of public higher education [Chapter 619]." It empowered the executive director to employ, with Committee approval, such professional and clerical staff as necessary, and it provided a legislative appropriation of supporting funds.

The charges of institutional domination of the Coordinating Committee which resulted in the shift in voting majority from institutional to citizen members appointed by the governor also underlay the reorganization of the Committee staff. While there were mixed feelings regarding the effects

of this change, there was general consensus that the change was necessary and that it had increased the professional quality and objectivity of the staff as well as the volume of staff work.

The heated political debate surrounding the reorganization of the coordinating organization probably tended to distort the retrospective view of the circumstances which prompted the creation of the new, independent professional staff. Members of the Coordinating Committee and staff whose political opinions differed from those of the new state administration charged that political motives were behind the change in directorship and the method of recruiting staff. These opposing political viewpoints are publicly known. The charge of political motivation can only be speculative. The new Coordinating Committee appointed after the 1965 legislative session selected as director a nonpartisan elected official, the state superintendent of public instruction under both Democratic and Republican administrations. In many respects, this was a natural decision because the former superintendent had served as an ex-officio member of the governing boards of the three principal systems of public higher education in the state and, hence, was well versed in the governmental and administrative history and problems of these institutions.

REASONS FOR CHANGE

The impression can be drawn from the content of the detailed interviews with key education and government officials that, while the staff reorganization was simultaneous with the reorganized membership of the Coordinating Committee itself, discontent over the staff arrangement may have triggered the main force of criticism of the Coordinating Committee organization as a whole. The charges of institutional domination within the coordinating organization were frequently leveled at the staff work upon which Committee decisions were based.

All but the most ardent advocates of retention of the *status quo* agreed that an independent professional staff was necessary; 195 out of 213 affirmed the need for change in the questionnaire. The survey data also showed that the Wisconsin education community felt that staff reorganization was effected to overcome what they regarded as biased consideration of higher education affairs or ineffectiveness of the Committee's work because of an alleged inability to propose bold measures and act decisively. More than 200 persons responded to the questionnaire by expressing their opinions on the reasons for change to a professional staff.

After content analysis, these responses were grouped under four major categories characterized by the following statements, in the order of the frequency with which they were mentioned (table 5). The largest number of persons in each of the response groups surveyed indicated that 1) "it was necessary to obtain greater objectivity with less chance for biased judgment in the professional work" upon which the Coordinating Committee would make its decisions. The second largest number of persons in each group felt that the change was necessary in order to 2) "create a more effective, efficient, and decisive quality of staff work." The term decisive was probably the key word in this response, for criticism was leveled at the inability of the staff, as well as of the Committee itself, to take a strong position which might be contrary to the interests of one or more of the institutional systems. A minor number of responses (although usually quite emphatic) indicated that this change 3) "was only thought to be desirable, but was actually unnecessary," or that 4) "the previous staff was too subservient to political control." A variety of miscellaneous responses could not be subsumed accurately under the foregoing, but none was mentioned as frequently.

PERCEIVED EFFECTS OF THE CHANGE

Members of the higher education community were asked whether the "professional quality," "objectivity," "wisdom," and "quantity" of the work of the new professional staff had improved, declined in quality, or remained the same (table 6). The responses indicated general opinion that the new staff work had improved in each of these areas. The rather large number of persons responding "no change" or who simply said it was too early to tell reveals the newness of the Coordinating Committee. It is noteworthy that the largest number of negative responses to the qualitative characteristics—professional quality, objectivity, and wisdom—came from institutional administrators. Like most others, however, they saw an increase in the quantity of the new staff's work. This, of course, was the general group from which the former staff members had been drawn. Persons associated with the university were more critical of the quality of the new staff work than were other institutional groups.

Table 5. Reasons for CCHE Staff Reorganization as Perceived by Higher Education Community,
by Response Group and Institutional Affiliation

	Reasons for change					
	1) Greater objectivity	2) More efficient, decisive	3) Really unnecessary	4) Less subservient to political control	5) Other responses	6) No opinion
By response group						
CCHE members	13	6	2	1	2	4
Institutional board members*	11(4)	3(1)	0	0(1)	1	1(4)
Administrative group	63	24	2	1	10	20
Faculty group	13	16	1	3	14	35
Legislator group	10	6	0	0	5	2
Others	4	0	0	0	0	3
Totals	114	55	5	5	32	65
By institutional affiliation						
UW	37	10	2	5	12	25
WSU	27	16	1	0	5	15
VTA	17	14	0	0	6	13

*Numbers in parentheses indicate answers of additional institutional board members who responded in their capacity as CCHE members and thus are included in CCHE totals.

Effects [statements paraphrased; see page 42]														
	Professional quality			Objectivity		Wisdom		Quantity			Too early to tell		Other	
	+	-	0	+	-	0	+	-	0	+	-	0		
<u>By response group</u>														
CCHE members	12	1	9	17	1	4	11	1	8	14	1	5	2	9
Institutional board members**	12(5)	1(1)	2(3)	12(5)	0(1)	1(2)	11(2)	1(1)	1(4)	9(4)	0(1)	4(2)	0(1)	4(0)
Administrative group	51	3	34	48	8	32	38	8	30	50	4	22	9	13
Faculty group	19	1	14	19	2	13	11	4	17	19	2	10	3	6
Legislator group	13	0	5	15	0	1	13	1	1	8	0	6	4	3
Others	0	0	3	3	0	0	2	0	1	3	0	0	1	0
<u>By institutional affiliation</u>														
UW	24	3	21	22	7	24	15	9	24	32	5	9	4	11
WSU	25	1	18	29	3	13	22	3	16	19	2	18	7	8
VTA	29	0	8	26	1	6	20	2	7	24	0	16	2	2

Committee Authority and Institutional Autonomy

Coordinating organizations may serve in one of at least three roles: 1) as an advocate of the interests of the higher education institutions, presenting their ideas and needs to the legislature, or 2) as a state administrative agency, expert in higher education affairs, recommending decisions to the administration or legislature, or 3) as a mechanism for ordering interaction between the institutions and the state agencies, interpreting the interests, needs, and goals of one side to the other.

The language of Section 39.01 to 39.05 of the 1955 Statutes of Wisconsin must be examined for implied as well as explicit meanings. One might assume from the text that the early Coordinating Committee was designed to fill the second role and possessed considerable authority in the governance of Wisconsin's public higher education—more, in fact, than is the case in many similar state organizations. This, however, would not be an accurate appraisal of the administrative practice or decision-making characteristics of the Committee. Its powers are subject to conflicting interpretation in relation to the powers of institutional governing boards on one hand and state administrative agencies and legislature on the other. The Coordinating Committee, for these reasons and others, chose not to make extensive use of the stated or implied powers. Furthermore, the political involvement of the legislature and state agencies in so many details of higher education made extensive use of these powers pragmatically unwise if not impossible. It can be said that the Committee acted in the first role, although it was intended to act in the third.

LEGISLATIVE INTENT TO STRENGTHEN AUTHORITY

The revised statutes of 1965 do not make entirely clear which of the three roles the Coordinating Committee was intended to assume. When

these revisions were under consideration, some state officials and members of the legislature apparently desired to articulate the role of the Coordinating Committee more clearly and to strengthen its authority. Several pieces of legislation were proposed to effect this, but most failed to pass. AB-797 (1965) finally passed, but with some of its more explicit passages concerning authority deleted. Nevertheless, in debate and in the few references to authority which remained in the bill, the implication was clearly conveyed that the new Coordinating Committee was expected to use its existing authority more positively than in the past. Chapter 619 of the Laws of 1955 seemingly granted explicit authority as follows:

The Committee shall *determine* what overall educational programs shall be offered in several units of the university and the state colleges . . .

The committee shall *adopt* a coordinated plan for the integration and most efficient use of existing facilities and personnel, and an order of priority for construction of new facilities and all institutions under its *jurisdiction*.

The coordinating committee shall have *final authority* in determining the single, consolidated, biennial budget requests to be presented to the governor and shall have *full responsibility* for such presentation.

The boards of regents in the discharge of their duties shall *observe all decisions* of the coordinating committee made pursuant to this section. (Author's italics.)

Other passages in this statute, however, cast some shadow on the degree of authority of the Committee. They raised questions which plagued the Coordinating Committee over the next 10 years: Was this organization intended to be an advocate for higher education institutions? Was it supposed to be a governing agency (within specified and limited areas of concern) with decision-making authority? Or, was it intended to be an advisory organization, with power only to recommend action and policy to other organizations or agencies? The 1955 statement of purpose reads:

Section 39.024

(1) Purpose. The purpose of this section is to provide for *the coordination of the activities* of the University of Wisconsin and the state colleges and institutes by providing a permanent

joint committee to make a continuing study of state-supported institutions of higher education under *their jurisdiction*, the relation thereto of the needs of the people of Wisconsin, to *recommend* necessary changes in programs and facilities, to provide for a single, consolidated, biennial budget request for all such institutions, and to report the results of its studies and recommendations to the governor and the legislature.

(3) Powers. Without limitation because of enumeration the committee is authorized and directed to *make studies and recommendations* in the following fields: educational planning . . . physical plant . . . budget requests . . . etc.

(i) Duties and Functions of existing boards. . . . Except as expressly provided in this section, nothing herein shall be construed to deprive the Board of Regents of the university and the Board of Regents of the state colleges of any of the duties and the powers conferred upon them by law in the government of the institutions under their control. (Author's italics.)

Assembly bill 797 (1965), after a number of amendments, contained in its finally approved form all of the above passages and added only two passages which might be construed as enlargements of the authority of the Coordinating Committee. The statement of purpose was changed to read as follows (changes italicized):

(1) . . . The purpose of this section is to provide for the *direction and* coordination of the activities of the University of Wisconsin and the state colleges

Under the statement of the Committee's powers in relation to educational planning, the following statement was added:

No new educational program shall be developed or instituted at any institution of higher education except with the committee's approval [03a].

A statement from the original statute followed this:

No educational program for which the legislature has made an appropriation existing at any institution of higher education shall be abandoned except with legislative approval.

How the Wisconsin educational community regarded the implications of the word *direction* (added to the statement of purpose) will be examined in detail later in this chapter. Requiring prior Committee approval of new educational programs prohibits institutions from unilaterally launching new educational programs and implies that the legislature will not authorize a new educational program proposed by an institution if the Coordinating Committee has not approved it. This is a significant grant of authority, but it is meaningful only if it is firmly and decisively exercised.

Some students of coordinating organizations would argue that the positive authority in the new statement in the Wisconsin statute is weakened by retention of the requirement of legislative approval of abandonment of educational programs unless the statute also requires that the Coordinating Committee review periodically all programs and discontinue or recommend discontinuance of outmoded or duplicative programs. Without this added authority, institutions can employ camel's-nose-under-the-tent expansion starting with only a "preparatory" or "survey" course and slowly augmenting it until a full major program is difficult to dislodge. McConnell (1964) commented on this problem:

A coordinating board should also have the authority to discontinue educational programs. Such power may save the board from being confronted, as is now often the case, with what amounts to a *jait accompli*, that is, with a request to give approval to a *program or curriculum* on the ground that the institution already offers all or nearly all the necessary *courses*. If the authority to discontinue programs does not control this sort of academic one-upsmanship, some continuing review of course offerings may become essential [page 139].

With today's changing and expanding body of knowledge, courses become obsolete, and societal changes also render instructional programs obsolete. However, old programs always have their protagonists, often with political influence. Therefore, an attempt to require specific legislative approval for discontinuance of programs may encounter political hurdles.

The final report of the committee of 25 (1965), which sharply criticized the Coordinating Committee for its "inability to act," proposed no changes which would define more clearly the powers and authority of the Committee and thus facilitate its ability to act. Its only recommendation relative to the Committee's authority and statutory power was that the

name of the organization be changed to the Wisconsin Board of Higher Education. In this connection the report stated:

The proposed name change will enhance the prestige of the administrative agency for higher education and will more clearly describe the nature of its duties. The present statutory responsibilities of the CCHE for post-secondary education in Wisconsin will continue to be vested in the reorganized body *Hopefully, these statutory powers will be adequate, if effectively utilized.* (Author's italics.)

Early in the 1965 legislative session, the assembly committee on rules introduced AB-547, embodying the recommendations in the final report of the committee of 25. This bill carried the endorsement of the newly elected governor. Some legislators, however, attempted to go beyond these recommendations to create a stronger organization to coordinate the state's higher education systems; AB-786 would have abolished the regents of the state colleges and combined the newly named state university system with the University of Wisconsin. It also proposed a general reorganization of the administration of the vocational-technical schools, renaming them technical and community schools, and combining the 2-year university centers with the technical schools into a system of district-based community colleges. The latter measure aimed to allow more students to obtain a vocational education or their first 2 years of college in their own communities and then transfer to one of the several branches of the university if they wished and could meet entrance requirements. It also provided for a strengthened coordinating organization to be called the Wisconsin Commission on Higher Education. Public hearings were held on this proposed legislation, but both bills failed to pass.

However, much of the strengthened language pertaining to the coordinating organization in AB-786 was subsequently reintroduced by amendments to a new bill (AB-797, 1965). This bill followed more closely the recommendations of the committee of 25. It retained the old name of Coordinating Committee, increased the number of public members to a majority, reduced the number of institutional board representatives, and provided an independent professional staff. In its amended version, the purpose of the Committee was reworded to state that it was "to provide for the *direction* and coordination of the *programs, services and* activities of the University of Wisconsin and the state colleges, etc. . . ." (Author's italics.) In later amendments, the words programs and services were dropped, but the term direction remained in the bill in its final form.

Clearly, the bill's authors intended the word direction to imply that the Committee would have additional authority to coordinate the state's higher education efforts.

In December 1967, just prior to publication of this report, the name of the Committee was changed to Wisconsin Coordinating Council for Higher Education. Since the study was made during the time the organization was known as Coordinating Committee, and all respondents and documents refer to it as the Committee, this name is retained throughout the report.

PERCEPTION OF INTENDED COMMITTEE ROLE

Coupling the word direction with coordination in the wording of the purpose of the Coordinating Committee engendered considerable controversy over the degree of additional authority implied. The authors of the amendment which added this word very clearly stated, during the course of the interviews, that the word "meant just what it said"—that the Coordinating Committee "should do more than just coordinate, that it should have greater authority and be able to direct the institutions to act in accordance with its decisions." "In other words," one legislator stated, "they should be able to say that a certain institution should stay out of a certain area of the state and direct them to stay out of it. Or they should direct another campus or institution to establish certain programs and direct other institutions to stay out of these program areas." He went on to add, "I doubt whether this authority is being used yet to any significant degree, but the capacity [for authority] is there and I certainly think the legislative intent is clear."

An account of the controversy over legislative intent of the newly amended statute appeared in the *Capitol Times* on November 15, 1965:

Last week's Coordinating Committee for Higher Education meetings showed that Republican plans to establish the CCHE as a 'super-board' of higher education are going to face rough sledding.

_____ fought strongly to limit the Coordinating Committee's role . . . by adding a carefully worded list of criteria to be used in selecting the new executive director The new Republican appointees [of Governor Knowles] defeated [the] motion on an 8 to 7 count.

_____ said that it was the 'Legislature's intent' to give the CCHE the powers of a super-board. Later, he denied that the CCHE had these powers . . . [but] suggested that the powers of the CCHE had been significantly strengthened by the recently passed law.

One of the regents of the university publicly argued that the term direction referred only to "direction of the planning activities" (which was but one of the responsibilities delegated to the Coordinating Committee). An official of one of the other education systems stated:

There is no question as to the intent of the Wisconsin Legislature in setting up the CCHE. The intent unquestionably was to have the CCHE as the top governing body of all higher education in Wisconsin.

Several state officials, legislators, and a former director of the Coordinating Committee all stated that at one time they had favored combining governance of the university and the state university systems. However, each denied that this was the intent of the present legislation or that there was an implied charge to the Coordinating Committee to legislate itself out of business by integrating its functions into a single-board plan.

More than 200 members of the Wisconsin higher education community responded to the questionnaire's invitation to state their opinions as to the reasons why the legislature added the word direction, and to state their interpretation of its meaning. All but 27 responses could be subsumed under the following statements of reasons:

- (1) To increase the power, control, and/or authority of the CCHE
- (2) To give CCHE the responsibility for leadership in higher education policy formulation
- (3) To increase the ability of CCHE to plan and coordinate the whole of higher education
- (4) To give independence to the CCHE and thereby overrule the dominant influence of the two university regental boards
- (5) To increase the legislature's fiscal control and, hence, administrative control over higher education.

Table 7. Opinions of the Higher Education Community on the Reasons Why the Legislature Added the Term Direction to Its Charge to the CCHE, by Response Group.

By response group	Reasons (full statements on page 51)					
	1) More power	2) Leadership	3) More planning	4) Independence	5) More fiscal control	6) No opinion
CCHE members	14	3	3	0	0	4
Institutional board members*	6(5)	3	2(1)	0	2	2(3)
Administrator group	40	9	23	2	6	30
Faculty group	23	7	7	2	3	29
Legislator group	13	1	4	1	2	1
Others	4	0	0	0	0	3
Totals	100	23	39	5	13	69

*Numbers in parentheses indicate answers of institutional board members who responded in their capacity as CCHE members and thus are included in CCHE totals.

Approximately one-half of all respondents indicated clearly that the legislature intended to give the Coordinating Committee more power, control, and authority (table 7), although not vis-a-vis the authority of the legislature. The ever-present suspicion that the legislature intended to increase its fiscal and administrative control over the higher education institutions is reflected in the fact that more administrators than members of any other group saw this as the purpose for adding the word direction. Although the number is small, the personal interviews conducted after the questionnaire response was tabulated disclosed that some of the principal administrators were firmly of this opinion.

At the outset of this chapter, reference was made to three roles in which coordinating organizations may serve—as the advocate of the educational institutions, as an agency of state government, or as the mediator between the two. In the personal interviews, an attempt was made to determine which of the three largely mutually exclusive roles was considered desirable

by educational leaders in Wisconsin. It is not surprising that key governmental and educational administrators were divided in their viewpoints. Generally, institutional leaders felt that the Coordinating Committee should "promote the cause of higher education." State officials, mindful of the need for expert advice as well as for "someone who will take the heat out of our decisions," favored the second alternative. The 1965 citizen committee of 25 also seemed to favor this role in its introductory statement:

The legislature is highly dependent upon the administrative agencies it establishes for information upon which to base rational decisions, for recommendations of solutions to public problems and even for identification and description of the problems themselves [page 12].

The third role of mediator between the legislature and the institutions implies an independent or unaligned position. Many Committee members and staff as well as the governor favored this position. To be successful, however, the agency which fills this role must be more than simply a buffer. It must be given—and must be strong enough to accept—a positive and dynamic leadership role. Whether the statutory charge to the Wisconsin Committee is sufficiently well defined and whether the Committee can gather enough strength and support to assume leadership will be the deciding factors in determining the Committee's organizational stability and effectiveness in coordination.

EFFECT OF COMMITTEE AUTHORITY ON INSTITUTIONAL AUTONOMY

A majority of the members of the Wisconsin higher education community surveyed indicated by a vote of 142 to 38 that the Coordinating Committee does in fact now exercise more authority over the affairs of the institutions. However, significantly, 96 persons out of 276 (nearly one-third of each group surveyed) declined to state an opinion on this matter.

The authority of the Coordinating Committee impinges upon the authority and hence autonomy of the institutions primarily in designating the distinctive and differentiating functions of the individual institutions, and in designating locations of new campuses. These functions are central to long-term statewide planning for higher education. The other primary function of the Coordinating Committee, reviewing budget requests and

presenting a consolidated budget, is not a final decision-making function of the institutions or of the Coordinating Committee. Final decisions in this area are made by the legislature; the institutions can only propose, and the Committee can only recommend.

Complementing the perception of a more authoritative Coordinating Committee since 1965 is a perception by many respondents of a corresponding decrease in the autonomy of the institutions. While it is probably true that members of a coordinating organization must surrender some of their autonomy in order to provide the coordinating organization with enough authority to effectively perform its designated functions, a case can be built for the assumption that increased coordinating authority within defined boundaries can promote autonomy of individual members by bringing order to competition and relieving members of possibly stricter governmental authority. The success and the stability of the coordinating organization depends on balancing the satisfactions of member institutions and the public with coordination against the loss of institutional autonomy.

Persons associated with each of the three principal institutional systems replied to an inquiry regarding the degree of autonomy they felt their institutions had gained or lost as a result of the increased authority of the Coordinating Committee (table 8).

While the exercise of greater authority by the Coordinating Committee was apparent to most in the higher education community, opinions about the beneficial effects of this exercise of power upon the autonomy of individual institutions varied according to institutional affiliation of the respondents. Only one person associated with the University of Wisconsin felt that the university's autonomy had been increased. More felt that its autonomy had been decreased, and that this had been to the detriment of the institution. About one-quarter of the UW respondents saw no particular change in the university's autonomy, but 46 percent felt that its autonomy had been decreased and to the detriment of the institution.

Persons associated with the state university system were more tolerant. While a few saw an increase of autonomy, the largest number felt that autonomy had decreased but that it was in the public interest and not to the detriment of the institution.

The VTA school people seemed to feel that the Coordinating Committee, by playing a major role in the recent reorganization of their schools, had either increased their autonomy, or if it had diminished autonomy, it

Table 8. Opinions of Persons Affiliated with Institutions Regarding the Effect of CCHE on the Autonomy of their Institutional Systems.

	UW group			WSU group			VTA group		
	Inst. bd.	Admin.	Faculty	Total	Inst. bd.	Admin.	Faculty	Total	Total
Increased autonomy	-	1	-	1	-	1	2	3	12
Decreased autonomy, but in the public interest	4	11	3	18	6	13	5	24	20
Decreased autonomy, to the detriment of the institution	3	14	14	31		4	6	12	3
Has not changed autonomy	-	10	11	21	2	5	8	15	6

had been for the public's (and, presumably, their) best interest. The fact that the strengthened Coordinating Committee has already put into effect the 1965 legislative mandate to establish VTA area districts throughout the state for administration and funding might account for this endorsement.

Persons not identified with the university perceived the effects of coordinating authority differently from persons identified with the university (table 9). Those affiliated with the university indicated strongly that the Coordinating Committee's authority had not been beneficial to their best interests, while persons in the groups not directly associated with the university responded to the contrary concerning its effect on the university. There seemed to be general agreement among all groups, whether or not they were affiliated with the particular system, that the Coordinating Committee's authority has been exercised in the best interests of the state universities and of the vocational-technical schools.

Table 9. Opinions of the Higher Education Community on Beneficial Effects of Increased CCHE Authority on Particular Institutions, by Institutional Affiliation.

	Yes	No	No opinion
<u>Has CCHE authority been beneficial to UW?</u>			
UW respondents	8	30	11
Others	37	14	42
<u>Has CCHE authority been beneficial to WSU?</u>			
WSU respondents	16	7	11
Others	52	12	44
<u>Has CCHE authority been beneficial to VTA?</u>			
VTA respondents	21	1	5
Others	59	5	51

PERCEIVED INFLUENCE IN RELATION TO AUTHORITY

It is evident from other findings of this study that there is no clear agreement, even among persons most directly concerned, over the type of authority the Coordinating Committee may exercise or the influence it is able to exert. The question is whether the Committee's power is definite and authoritative, whether it is limited to review and advice or recommendations, or whether it is minimal and indefinite.

The research attempted to determine the degree and type of influence accruing to the specific functions of the Coordinating Committee, whether this influence corresponds to the statutory definitions of its authority, and what type of role this influence indicates for the Committee—that of a governing agency or of bringing order to complex governmental and institutional relationships. Members of the higher education community were asked what kind of influence they believe the Coordinating Committee, in discharging its various functions, actually exerts over the institutional decisions. Since this question requires that the respondents know in some detail the internal operating functions of coordination, it is not surprising that approximately one-fourth of all respondents were unable to answer the question.

On the basis of the replies, it appears that on institutional decisions relating to operating budgets and construction funds, the Coordinating Committee's influence is regarded by most persons as actually "review and advisory (table 10)." In this case, the perceptions of the Committee's influence correspond with the statute's legal grant of authority stated as "to review the separate budget requests . . . and to recommend a single, consolidated biennial budget request to the governor [Section 39.03b]." Because the Committee (presumably) has the sole power to perform the consolidation of both operating and construction budgets, it may seem to some persons that this power is considerable and may amount to being definite and authoritative. The majority of Coordinating Committee members so regard their influence, and the institutional board members (half of whom are also on the Committee) are about equally divided on this issue.

On decisions related to educational programs and degrees offered, apparently most respondents perceived the Coordinating Committee's influence as "definite and authoritative (table 11)." The statutes provide that "the Committee shall determine what overall educational programs shall be offered . . .," but they also require that all new major programs in higher

Table 10. Degree of Coordinating Committee Influence over Institutional Decisions, Perceived by Higher Education Community, by Response Group.

Type of decision and response group	Degree of influence			
	Definite and authoritative	Review and advisory	Very little or indefinite	Don't know; no answer
Operating budgets				
CCHE members	17	9	2	0
Institutional board members*	8(5)	8(4)	0(1)	0
Administrator group	30	57	15	18
Faculty group	10	27	11	34
Legislator group	3	15	1	4
Others	2	2	0	3
Totals	70	118	29	59
Construction funds				
CCHE members	20	8	0	0
Institutional board members*	6(5)	8(5)	1	1
Administrator group	36	50	16	18
Faculty group	14	29	5	34
Legislator group	4	12	4	3
Others	2	2	0	3
Totals	82	109	26	59

*Numbers in parentheses indicate answers of institutional board members who responded in their capacity as CCHE members and thus are included in CCHE totals.

education and all degrees offered must be approved finally by the legislature. The Coordinating Committee's legal authority in these areas can only be to review and advise, even though its recommendations may carry considerable influence in the legislature. It would appear, however, that even the legislators surveyed had mixed feelings about the Coordinating Committee's authority in these areas. The largest number of legislators choosing an individual category described the Committee's power as "review and advisory." However, more than half their replies were spread among the following choices—"authoritative," "indefinite," or "don't know or no answer." Respondents in survey groups identified with the institutions seemed to regard the Committee's influence in these areas as "definite and

authoritative.” However, division of opinion among and within all groups probably can be attributed to the indefiniteness of the statutory charge.

Table 11. Degree of Coordinating Committee Influence over Institutional Decisions, Perceived by Higher Education Community, by Response Group.

Type of decision and response group	Degree of influence			
	Definite and authoritative	Review and advisory	Very little or indefinite	Don't know; no answer
Educational programs				
CCHE members	15	8	4	1
Institutional board members*	12(4)	4(3)	0(2)	0(1)
Administrator group	52	39	13	16
Faculty group	27	17	5	33
Legislator group	5	10	2	6
Others	2	2	0	3
Totals	113	80	24	59
Degrees offered				
CCHE members	15	8	5	0
Institutional board members*	11(4)	4(4)	0(2)	1
Administrator group	56	29	18	17
Faculty group	25	18	4	35
Legislator group	4	7	4	8
Others	2	2	0	3
Totals	113	68	31	64

*Numbers in parentheses indicate answers of institutional board members who responded in their capacity as CCHE members and thus are included in CCHE totals.

Responsibility for long-range planning for the state's higher education system has always been regarded as a responsibility of the Coordinating Committee. The statutes, however, make no specific reference to the Committee's exact function in long-range planning other than in the statement of purpose which provides that the Committee "shall make a continuing study of the state-supported institutions . . . and the relation thereto of the needs of the people [Section 39.024]" Governor Knowles,

however, in his inaugural address specifically fixed responsibility for planning on the Coordinating Committee and asked it to prepare a long-range plan to submit to the 1967 legislature. However, generally persons closely associated with the educational institutions do not feel this responsibility is properly the Committee's. Many in this group consider that long-range planning by and for institutional systems should be the keystone of state-wide planning. This probably accounts for the more divided opinions of groups other than Coordinating Committee members about the kind of influence the Coordinating Committee actually has over decision making related to this function (table 12). Opinion was divided particularly among members of the administrator group, but also among faculty members and institutional board members and legislators. Committee members tended to think their influence in this area is or should be authoritative.

Table 12. Degree of Coordinating Committee Influence over Institutional Decisions, Perceived by Higher Education Community, by Response Group.

Type of decision and response group	Degree of influence			
	Definite and authoritative	Review and advisory	Very little or indefinite	Don't know; no answer
<u>Long-range planning</u>				
CCHE members	22	5	1	0
Institutional board members*	9(8)	6(1)	1(1)	0
Administrator group	49	45	12	14
Faculty group	33	14	1	34
Legislator group	11	7	2	3
Others	2	1	1	3
Totals	126	78	18	54

*Numbers in parentheses indicate answers of institutional board members who responded in their capacity as CCHE members and thus are included in CCHE totals.

Long-term statewide planning is a required prerequisite to federal funding. In Wisconsin—unlike most other states—the intrastate coordination of federal funds available under certain titles of the higher education acts of 1963 and 1965 is not under the direction of the Coordinating Committee, but under a separate organization—the Wisconsin Higher Education Aids

Board. Because the Coordinating Committee does not contain representation of the private colleges and universities, it does not qualify to fulfill this function under the terms of the federal acts. A portion of the board's planning funds are allocated to the Coordinating Committee, but the separate planning by the public and private sectors complicates the Committee's task of coordinating and consolidating these plans.

The authority which goes with the responsibility for state administration of federal funding would greatly increase the influence of the Coordinating Committee with both its member institutions and with state agencies. The fact that this authority, and hence the influence, is divided has undoubtedly hindered comprehensive planning of the state's higher education effort. Combining these functions under a single agency could be accomplished only by another statutory change of the Coordinating Committee membership, adding representatives of the private institutions. Presently, apparently neither the public institutions nor the private universities and colleges want this amalgamation (table 13). The interviews disclosed that neither is ready to relinquish any autonomy to an organization in which the other holds voting privileges.

It is not surprising, in light of the difficulties the Committee encountered in fulfilling the function of statewide planning, that key government and education leaders could not agree on the actual or desirable role of the Committee.

Table 13. Opinions of Public and Private Institutional Administrators on Assigning the Functions of the Higher Education Aids Board to the CCHE.

Response group	Yes	No	No opinion
Public institution administrators	16	51	34
Private institution administrators	1	13	3

Acknowledging the interdependency of the state's welfare and the provision of quality education, the amount and type of authority or influence a coordinating organization may exert, whether as an advisory board, a

governing agency or a mediating mechanism, depends to a large extent upon its maintaining a complex balance between the autonomy of the institutions and the fiscal and administrative requirements of the state. This semblance of balance must be obtained in order to secure agreement from institutional representatives and legislators on the meaning and execution of the statutory authority.

Definition of Authority and Functional Roles

The designated roles and prescribed authority of a coordinating agency and of the parties to coordination beg for precise definition, if coordination is to be effective. Furthermore, the charge to the coordinating organization should ideally grant authority to the agency to enforce adherence to specified institutional roles, yet build in the possibility for innovation and modification of the definitions. A comprehensive statewide plan for higher education would properly encompass such definition of powers and functions of the institutions.

The Wisconsin experience with coordination has been burdened by ambiguity in the statutory charge to the Coordinating Committee and some confusion as to the role this committee was created to fulfill. The absence of clear definition of authority and role of the coordinating agency is likely to result in the blurring of outlines of institutional role and authority. This chapter will examine the effects of this ambiguity as it is reflected in the opinions of members of the educational institutions and the authority of their governing boards.

The research found that there is little question of the intended primacy of the University of Wisconsin as the center for higher learning and research, and graduate and professional preparation. Furthermore, university administrators held strong opinions concerning the importance of the university in providing community-based, 2-year collegiate education. However, this opinion is not shared by all members of the higher education community.

Many respondents tended to equate the function of the Wisconsin State University System with that of the University of Wisconsin. In this respect, the Wisconsin experience is not unlike those of a number of other states in which large multicampus public state college systems have developed. Confusion over the role of these institutions centers largely

around the nature and extent of graduate degree programs to be offered, and the amount and type of research appropriate to these institutions. The state universities offer such a complexity of programs that precise definition of their mission is difficult, and this probably contributes to the confusion. Concern over "status" also impedes resolution of the problems of role definition.

The historic and primary role of the vocational-technical-adult schools is implied in the name. However, a secondary role of some of these institutions, providing 2-year terminal general education and the first 2 years of collegiate preparation for transfer to 4-year institutions, is gaining favor in some communities throughout the state. Opinion is divided concerning the proper institutional setting for the 2-year collegiate program—whether it should be an exclusive function of the university or the state universities, or of both, whether it should be a function of the technical schools as well, or whether a distinctively separate system should be established to assume this function.

Deciding which system should provide this service is probably the most difficult problem today in the organization of Wisconsin's higher educational affairs. This decision involves the articulation of programs between the 2-year and the 4-year institutions. It also must take into account complex fiscal considerations pertaining to basic institutional costs and possible economies inherent in consolidation of facilities and elimination of competition for location of new facilities. It also challenges established practice and the pressures of political power.

The fate of the county teachers college system, namely, discontinuance after 1971, probably has settled any question about the role of these institutions. In some cases, however, disposition of the abandoned facilities may open problems over location and institutional administration of other 2-year institutions.

The private colleges and universities of Wisconsin enroll nearly one-third of the full-time college students in the state. This sector of higher education strongly competes with the public institutions, not only for students, but for new programs and a greater share of federal funds. These individually autonomous institutions are not subject to the authority of the Coordinating Committee, for they are not members nor parties in any way to the activities of the Committee. Many feel public institutions' officials and Coordinating Committee members are reluctant to consider the particular strengths and program offerings of the private institutions in long-range planning for higher education.

CONFLICT OVER INSTITUTIONAL ROLES

Two major controversies have arisen over the jurisdictions and appropriate functions of the various institutions and institutional systems, generated partly by an accumulation of *ad hoc* legislation passed in the absence of long-term educational program planning. These, however, are symptoms as much as they are causes of the controversies, for the basic problems arose out of the new demands which society placed upon higher education—demands for expansion in availability and quality of education. The rush to fulfill these demands has stimulated competition and sometimes has resulted in duplicate facilities and programs. Such competition and duplication have placed demands on the state treasury which can be met now only by the most efficient planning of available resources. Controversy centers around these questions: 1) Can and should the traditional university function be performed by the University of Wisconsin and the Wisconsin State University System? 2) Should the institutions which offer 2-year higher education programs at the community level be administered separately by each institutional system or under a coordinated or combined system?

The underlying causes of these two problems have been largely responsible also for the pressures to change the coordinating organization. Unless the Coordinating Committee can successfully cope with the many problems surrounding these two issues, further changes and successive reorganization may result.

It is not a purpose of this study to suggest solutions to these problems, nor do the research findings lead to any clear-cut solutions. The imminent need for a viable organizational scheme, however, may be seen in the organizational change and the fact that pressures still exist for conditional or temporary remedies.

COMPETITION TO ASSUME THE UNIVERSITY FUNCTION

With the almost overnight expansion of college enrollments immediately following World War II, when returning veterans took advantage of federal assistance to complete their interrupted education, public state colleges throughout the nation began a transition from teacher training institutions to liberal arts colleges to comprehensive colleges, and often to university or university-type institutions. In Wisconsin, as in other states, these public colleges expanded their baccalaureate offerings into the liberal arts and humanities, programs of general education, and programs in a

variety of applied or subprofessional fields. In 1964, these state colleges, by unilateral action of their board of regents, adopted the name Wisconsin State Universities, but it was not until late 1967 that this name was formally approved by the legislature. Graduate degree programs, formerly confined to teacher education, are being planned in new fields. The faculties are seeking additional funds for research, and pressures mount for authorization to grant doctoral degrees.

A Provisional Long-Range Plan for Higher Education in Wisconsin (1967) was drafted by the Coordinating Committee staff, recommending that state laws be amended to authorize a limited number of doctoral programs at the state university campuses. The staff report has been a significant gain for those seeking "full university status" for these institutions. This movement also has lent weight to state university faculty demands for academic freedom comparable to that accorded the university faculty, for greater freedom for student expression and activism, for a greater share of the state money for research, for greater freedom to solicit federal support of research, and for equipment and facilities to carry on such research. However, the politically conservative legislature has balked at appropriating funds for expanding budgets. Legislators also tend to be critical of faculty and student behavior which deviates from traditional collegiate pattern of emphasis on sports and social life to embrace university mores and concerns with academic freedom. These disquieting developments in the state universities have given rise once more in the legislature to the notion that if all of the public university institutions were governed by the Regents of the University of Wisconsin, somehow the problems would be solved by that body and would not plague the decision-making machinery of the legislature and state administrative offices.

This research focused on the development of state colleges into state universities because this movement discloses many reasons for the past organizational changes in the coordinating mechanism and the apparent effects of these changes. It has been noted already that the increasing competition between the two university systems was one of the seeds of change which, as it grew to major proportions, stifled the ability of the former coordinating organization to make prompt decisions free of divisive political maneuvering.

In an effort to assess the ability of the new coordinating organization to cope with these problems, opinions were sought about the new name, the new role, and the expanding activity of the new state university system. Responses to a set of proffered statements related to various controversial issues on this subject were analyzed in several ways. The responses of lay

persons serving as members of the Coordinating Committee, institutional governing boards, and other educational committees were distinguished from responses from educational "professionals" (members of the administration or the faculties of the several institutions) and from the responses of legislators. Also, the responses of persons identified with the university and those identified with the state university system were retabulated separately.

Respondents were first asked to indicate agreement or disagreement with the statement:

The emerging role of the Wisconsin state universities is a progressive and educationally sound move which will enhance Wisconsin's provision of needed higher education programs.

Generally more agreed than disagreed with this statement (table 14), although persons identified with the University of Wisconsin tended to disagree with the statement.

Table 14. Extent of Agreement with Statement on Educational Soundness of the Emerging Role of WSU, by Response Group and Institutional Affiliation.

	Agree	Disagree	No opinion
<u>By response group</u>			
Lay members of CCHE, governing boards, and other (lay) groups	32	12	7
Institutional administrators and faculty	99	65	38
Legislative group	10	7	6
Totals	141	84	51
<u>By institutional affiliation</u>			
UW	29	41	21
WSU	41	15	8

The issue of financial considerations related to possible duplication of educational programs was raised in the following statement:

The emerging role of the state universities is a move which is likely to result in wasteful duplication of educational programs and course offerings.

Opinion on this point among institutional administrators and faculty seems to be almost evenly divided (table 15). The lay members of the Coordinating Committee, governing boards, and other committees seemed more inclined to disregard the possibility of this threat, although legislators, perhaps more fiscally minded than members of the other groups, were a little more inclined to agree than disagree with the statement. Persons associated with the two institutional systems divided according to the dominant interests of their institutions; the university group tended to agree that wastefulness would result; the state university people tended to discount possible wasteful duplication.

Table 15. Extent of Agreement with Statement on Wasteful Duplication of Programs, by Response Group and Institutional Affiliation.

	Agree	Disagree	No opinion
<u>By response group</u>			
Lay members of CCHE, governing boards, and other (lay) groups	14	28	8
Institutional administrators and faculty	87	85	28
Legislative group	11	8	4
Totals	112	121	40
<u>By institutional affiliation</u>			
UW	45	28	18
WSU	20	38	6

Respondents also were asked to react to the statement concerning the proposal to authorize the state universities to grant the Ph. D. degree. The proffered statement was:

The emerging role of the state universities is a move which will dilute the value of the Ph. D. degree.

Opinion on this issue was very sharply divided according to institutional affiliation (table 16). Persons identified with the university tended to agree with the statement in about a 2-to-1 ratio, and persons identified with the state universities disagreed with the statement in about the same ratio. Among lay members of the Coordinating Committee, governing boards, and other committee groups, more disagreed with the statement than agreed. Opinions of legislators were quite evenly divided.

Table 16. Extent of Agreement with Statement on the Value of the Ph. D., by Response Group and Institutional Affiliation.

	Agree	Disagree	No opinion
By response group			
Lay members of CCHE, governing boards, and other (lay) groups	9	33	9
Institutional administrators and faculty	83	94	25
Legislative group	8	10	5
Totals	100	137	39
By institutional affiliation			
UW	51	27	13
WSU	18	42	4

Throughout the interviews, and particularly in the narrative statements which were invited throughout the questionnaire, respondents often referred to alleged political involvement of the institutions in their competition for new programs and new funds. Direct political pressure or lobbying by powerful educational systems, particularly concerning budget appropriations, continually threaten the proper functioning of a coordinating committee. There is evidence to support the prediction that this political maneuvering will increase as the role of the state university system expands. The statement proffered to respondents to the questionnaire was:

The emerging role of the state universities represents a move which encourages political jockeying for particular institutional advantages such as new programs and increased budgets.

On a more than 2-to-1 ratio, across categories, respondents agreed with this statement (table 17). Of the response groups, institutional administrators and faculty members endorsed it most strongly. Viewing the responses according to institutional affiliation, the university group was nearly unanimous in their agreement, but the opinions of the state university group divided almost equally.

Table 17. Extent of Agreement with Statement on Political Jockeying and Intervention, by Response Group and Institutional Affiliation.

	Agree	Disagree	No opinion
By response group			
Lay members of CCHE, governing boards, and other (lay) groups	21	19	10
Institutional administrators and faculty	120	42	38
Legislative groups	12	5	6
Totals	153	66	54
By institutional affiliation			
UW	67	7	17
WSU	29	26	9

Pressures for change. In Wisconsin, feeling seems to be growing that if the state universities and the University of Wisconsin are going to perform essentially the same functions, they might as well be combined into the same organizational system. Again in 1967, the legislature considered a proposal (AB-718) to consolidate these systems. Although the bill was defeated, the issue is still alive.

The pros and cons on this issue are strongly debated. The interviews disclosed that legislators and state administrators feel that consolidation would somehow end the competitive struggles between the two university systems which take place in their halls. The top administrators in both systems resist, however, the idea of consolidation as a practical administrative matter.

Persons who responded to the questionnaire were asked their opinions on this issue, and their replies probably were the most evenly divided of any of the responses (table 18). Legislators, the only group which strongly

favored consolidation, endorsed it in a ratio of 2 to 1. While chief administrators of the institutions have gone on record against consolidation, the larger administrative group shown in the table, which includes administrative staffs and academic administrators, split almost evenly on this point, with a rather large number in that group expressing no opinion.

Table 18. Opinions on Whether the Consolidation of Governance of UW and WSU Would Serve the Best Interests of the State of Wisconsin, by Response Group and Institutional Affiliation.

	Yes	No	No opinion
By response group			
CCHE members	13	13	2
Institutional board members*	4(6)	9(4)	3(1)
Administrator group	49	47	22
Faculty group	33	35	14
Legislative group	11	5	7
Others	1	5	0
Totals	111	114	48
By institutional affiliation			
UW	39	36	16
WSU	27	29	8

*Numbers in parentheses indicate answers of institutional board members who responded in their capacity as CCHE mem'ers and, thus, are included in CCHE totals.

CONFLICT OVER THE ROLE OF 2-YEAR INSTITUTIONS

Two-year, post high school education is now being offered in Wisconsin by all four of its public higher education systems as well as by several private institutions. Historically, each system developed its 2-year campuses with different purposes, goals, and programs. There has been a noticeable

trend, particularly in recent years, toward offering more similar programs. There is an increasing demand for general education programs at locations close to students' homes and part-time jobs, as well as for local 2-year terminal and transfer programs. These institutions have competed intensely to augment enrollments and broaden course offerings to make the institution more attractive to graduates from local high schools. The 2-year institutions are proliferating at such a rate that 1969 will see 105 institutions located in 63 cities and towns throughout the state (see Appendix B). This takes account of the fact that five 2-year county teachers colleges were closed in 1967, two more are expected to close in 1968, and the remaining 13 are scheduled to be phased out by 1971. Some schools will vacate usable physical facilities (probably fewer than half of those remaining), and these may be used for other 2-year institutions.

The incentive for founding 2-year public higher education institutions in Wisconsin—whether technical school, university center, or branch campus—comes from local community leaders, not necessarily, and perhaps only incidentally, from educational planners. Political persuasion and other inducements usually offered to desirable smokeless industries (to use the words of one state official) are employed to influence institutions to locate branches or centers in local communities—favorable land locations, attractive buildings, and a promise to share maintenance or operating expenses. Land, buildings, and maintenance by law must be provided by the local taxpayers. The local community initiates the petition guaranteeing funding support to the university regents, the regents of the state university system, or to the state board of VTA schools. In some cases, petitions have been forwarded simultaneously to two or more boards, setting off competitive bids for the favorable decision of the Coordinating Committee and the legislature. In this manner, the three systems of local 2-year institutions in Wisconsin have evolved.

The vocational-technical-adult system consists of 63 schools, of which 22 are evening schools exclusively and 41 are full-time schools offering 2-year programs (15 of these presently may award the Associate of Arts degree). The full-time schools may offer one or more of three types of programs of general education: 1) courses in support of vocational and technical programs, 2) a terminal sequence of self-enrichment programs, or 3) a liberal arts collegiate transfer curriculum. The third type is presently available only at the Milwaukee and Madison VTA schools. However, a pilot project offering dual-track programs of technical courses and liberal arts transfer courses, which will constitute the first 2 years of a collegiate program, has been approved for the northern Wisconsin community of Rhinelander.

Other communities presently supporting VTA schools have expressed interest in dual-track programs. This program is being watched closely by the university center system. This system to date has supported the extension of dual-track programs in only two types of localities—the major metropolitan centers, such as Milwaukee and Madison, and the sparsely populated rural areas, such as Rhineland, where the community could not support a needed vocational school plus a regular 2-year center of the university. The VTA schools also are watching closely the intrusion of university centers and branches into their domain of vocationally oriented courses. In its October 1966 publication *Opportunities through Education*, the Wisconsin State Board of Vocational, Technical, and Adult Education states:

These schools attempt to meet the varied needs of people through the following types of programs: (1) the junior college, (2) the technical institute, (3) one- and two-year vocational programs, (4) special vocational programs, and (5) a variety of special educational services [page 2].

The University of Wisconsin system of 2-year university centers has 11 institutions. Three opened since 1964, and two more will open in fall 1968. Two 2-year branch campuses are operated by units of the state university system, both opened since 1966. One more will open in 1968 and another in 1969. Consideration is being given to converting one of these branches (Rice Lake) into a dual-track vocational and collegiate institution. Several other communities have been designated by the Coordinating Committee as priority sites for university centers or branch campuses, but opening dates have not been set. By mid-1967, the Coordinating Committee passed a resolution recommending a moratorium on the approval of any more 2-year campuses, but this moratorium does not apply to the campuses already in the planning stages.

The 2-year university centers and branch campuses offer the first 2 years of collegiate studies in preparation for transfer to the "parent" 4-year university. Each 2-year institution has become a center for community development, cultural programs, and adult education. While focused on 2-year collegiate transfer programs, the curriculum offerings have broadened to include general education courses and clearly occupationally oriented courses. The catalogs now list courses in home economics, nursing, occupational therapy, pharmacy, accounting, business administration, and applied engineering. While these courses are acceptable for transfer of credit to the parent university, they also can serve as a 2-year terminal general education program.

These centers and branches reveal the grassroots political influence of the University of Wisconsin and, lately, of the Wisconsin State University System. The communities petitioned for the institution because they wanted the prestige of a university located within the community. However, the university and the state university systems also encouraged, and often helped initiate, the community's petition.

The proliferation of these 2-year institutions has resulted in duplication of physical facilities in many cities, towns, and villages. Throughout the state are 28 communities which have two or more institutions; 21 of these have two or more 2-year institutions (see Appendix B). The Coordinating Committee staff has urged that such institutions in the same or nearby town make common use of dormitories, food services, student unions, gymnasiums, auditoriums, and guidance counseling and placement services. The actual number of courses duplicated in institutions located in the same or neighboring communities is probably still minimal. However, trends in the VTA schools to broaden general education programs and develop dual-track curricula, combined with the trend in the university centers and branches to install vocationally oriented curricula most certainly will increase the duplication.

The *Provisional Long-Range Plan for Higher Education in Wisconsin* (1967) contained a recommendation from the Coordinating Committee's staff that the Committee and the institutional systems

. . . cooperatively study ways to extend higher educational opportunities by the revision of admissions standards to attract more students, particularly those third and fourth quartile high school graduates who might profit from a collegiate experience [page 28].

The provisional plan described this as a desirable open door policy which would make the Associate of Arts degree program attractive to more students as a 2-year general education or, if the student is successful, as a transfer program. The VTA system officials are concerned that the result of such a policy would be to lure students from VTA schools by the prestige of a university name. They fear also that the open door policy will force the centers and branches into including more vocational program offerings.

Pressures for change. In its report to the 1965 Wisconsin Legislature, the committee of 25 (1965, Vol. 2) pointed directly to the former Coordinating Committee's inability to resolve the problems associated with 2-

year post high school education as one of the reasons necessitating an organizational change in the state's coordinating mechanism. It stated that the Coordinating Committee "has not been able to act objectively and effectively, particularly in considering the merits of establishing new types of institutions combining the functions of existing institutions [page 18]." It stated that one of the reasons for its proposed organizational change was the fact that the institutional boards

... have taken different positions on the question of how to meet the need to greatly expand the post-high school opportunity in the state ... and whether a new type of two-year system should be created which is oriented to the needs of the fifty percent of the freshman-age group who do not choose to seek a traditional four-year liberal arts degree [page 18].

If the issues involved in this controversy reflect the causes of previous organizational change, possibly they predict further change, for there is evidence that the 1965 reorganization has not yet remedied the situation and the new coordinating organization has not yet reconciled the sharply divergent views on this matter. This research, therefore, sought to assess the opinions of members of the higher educational community and leaders in both education and state government on a variety of issues bearing on this controversy and some proposed solutions.

One central issue is whether the 2-year university centers and branch campuses have been sufficiently responsive to local educational needs. There is little question that the VTA schools respond to these needs; the university and the state university systems are broadening community development and cultural programs and the vocational program offerings at their 2-year centers apparently to meet this challenge.

Questionnaire comments on this point (table 19) generally affirmed that the centers and branches were responsive to local needs. However, dissenting opinions in each respondent group bear some significance. Predictably, when responses were categorized according to the institutional affiliation, more persons associated with the University of Wisconsin (which operates most of the 2-year centers) affirmed responsiveness of the centers than did persons associated with the Wisconsin State University System (which has only recently come forth with 2-year branch campuses). The majority of persons associated with the VTA schools, whose grassroots political support is in local communities, felt that the university centers and branches were not sufficiently locally responsive.

**Table 19. Extent of Agreement with Statement on Responsiveness
of UW and WSU Centers to Local Needs, by Response
Group and Institutional Affiliation.**

	Yes	No	No opinion
<u>By response group</u>			
Lay members of CCHE, governing boards, and other (lay) groups	27	14	9
Institutional administrators and faculty	92	59	49
Legislative group	12	6	5
Totals	131	79	63
<u>By institutional affiliation</u>			
UW	56	13	22
WSU	32	19	13
VTA	11	29	10

Respondents also were asked whether admission standards of the centers should be lowered (as recommended by the Coordinating Committee staff) to admit more students from the lower quartiles of high school graduates (without specifying how much the standards would be lowered). Then they were asked to affirm or reject an open door college plan which would admit any high school graduate. The response to the first question (table 20) indicates that nearly half of the respondents expressing an opinion were willing to lower admission standards of the university centers and branches. Opinions among the lay members of the Coordinating Committee, institutional boards, and advisory commissions as well as the opinions of legislators were apparently evenly divided. This is quite significant, for these persons can strongly affect the ultimate decision on this matter. A few more administrators and faculty members oppose the lowering of admission standards. Categorizing responses according to institutional affiliation shows that this opposition comes mainly from the persons associated with the university. The state university people slightly favored lowered admission standards. This probably is related to a stronger vocational orientation and a desire to attract more students into their newly initiated branch system. People affiliated with VTA schools voted against the proposal, probably because admitting more lower quartile students would make university centers and branches more competitive with the VTA schools.

Table 19. Extent of Agreement with Statement on Responsiveness of UW and WSU Centers to Local Needs, by Response Group and Institutional Affiliation.

	Yes	No	No opinion
By response group			
Lay members of CCHE, governing boards, and other (lay) groups	27	14	9
Institutional administrators and faculty	92	59	49
Legislative group	12	6	5
Totals	131	79	63
By institutional affiliation			
UW	56	13	22
WSU	32	19	13
VTA	11	29	10

Respondents also were asked whether admission standards of the centers should be lowered (as recommended by the Coordinating Committee staff) to admit more students from the lower quartiles of high school graduates (without specifying how much the standards would be lowered). Then they were asked to affirm or reject an open door college plan which would admit any high school graduate. The response to the first question (table 20) indicates that nearly half of the respondents expressing an opinion were willing to lower admission standards of the university centers and branches. Opinions among the lay members of the Coordinating Committee, institutional boards, and advisory commissions as well as the opinions of legislators were apparently evenly divided. This is quite significant, for these persons can strongly affect the ultimate decision on this matter. A few more administrators and faculty members oppose the lowering of admission standards. Categorizing responses according to institutional affiliation shows that this opposition comes mainly from the persons associated with the university. The state university people slightly favored lowered admission standards. This probably is related to a stronger vocational orientation and a desire to attract more students into their newly initiated branch system. People affiliated with VTA schools voted against the proposal, probably because admitting more lower quartile students would make university centers and branches more competitive with the VTA schools.

Table 20. Extent of Agreement with Statement on Lower Admission Standards for UW and WSU 2-Year Centers, by Response Group and Institutional Affiliation.

<u>By response group</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>No opinion</u>
Lay members of CCHE, governing boards, and other (lay) groups	22	22	6
Institutional administrators and faculty	80	98	22
Legislative group	10	10	3
Totals	112	130	31
<u>By institutional affiliation</u>			
UW	26	58	7
WSU	32	23	9
VTA	19	26	5

The majority in all groups rejected the open door policy at the centers and branches (table 21). Nevertheless, it is significant that one out of three persons favored the idea. The ratio is closer among lay members of the Coordinating Committee and the governing boards, legislators, and persons identified with the state universities and the VTA schools.

Table 21. Extent of Agreement with Proposal for Open Door Admission Policy for UW and WSU Centers, by Response Group and Institutional Affiliation.

<u>By response group</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>No opinion</u>
Lay members of CCHE, governing boards, and other (lay) groups	17	29	4
Institutional administrators and faculty	64	119	17
Legislative group	7	14	2
Totals	88	162	23
<u>By institutional affiliation</u>			
UW	20	66	5
WSU	25	34	5
VTA	21	24	5

Offering dual-track general education and collegiate transfer programs in VTA schools and, possibly, state university branches is one of the solutions Wisconsin currently is considering to fulfill the need for locally available collegiate programs. Questionnaire respondents were asked, first, whether dual-track programs were appropriate to VTA schools and, second, whether such programs in VTA schools duplicate the programs at nearby university centers or branch campuses.

The majority expressing an opinion across all categories considered the dual-track program appropriate to the VTA function (table 22) but not by a very wide margin. Most of the university people did not feel the dual-track programs inappropriate; the state university people were divided almost down the middle, although a few more felt such offerings were appropriate. Persons associated with the VTA schools also felt that these programs were appropriate; the amount of dissenting opinion probably reflects the long tradition of orientation strictly to vocational programs and the fact that most of the 63 VTA schools (in fact, all but two, at present) are not now offering dual-track programs.

Table 22. Extent of Agreement with Statement on Appropriateness of Dual-Track Programs to VTA Mission, by Response Group and Institutional Affiliation.

<u>By response group</u>	Yes	No	No opinion
Lay members of CCHE, governing boards, and other (lay) groups	25	11	14
Institutional administrators and faculty	90	66	44
Legislative group	10	7	6
Totals	125	84	64
<u>By institutional affiliation</u>			
UW	40	29	22
WSU	29	24	11
VTA	26	13	11

The question of whether or not VTA dual-track programs duplicate offerings at nearby university centers or branches was not addressed to the present situation, for the duplication could only exist now in the cities of

Milwaukee and Madison where the university maintains full 4-year universities. The question really bears more on the potential threat of duplication. Most persons felt that dual-track VTA schools duplicate the centers' offerings (table 23) but not by a particularly strong majority. Lay members of governing boards and committees were almost evenly divided on this issue (20 saw duplication, while 21 saw no threat of duplication), while clearly more institutional administrators, faculty, and legislators saw a threat of duplication. Apparently, more persons associated with all three institutional systems saw a threat of duplicated offerings than did not.

Table 23. Extent of Agreement with Statement on VTA Dual-Track Programs Duplicating Center Programs, by Response Group and Institutional Affiliation.

<u>By response group</u>	Yes	No	No opinion
Lay members of CCHE, governing boards, and other (lay) groups	20	21	9
Institutional administrators and faculty	95	53	52
Legislative group	14	6	3
Totals	129	80	64
<u>By institutional affiliation</u>			
UW	39	23	29
WSU	35	18	11
VTA	22	18	10

The broadly expanding systems of 2-year university centers and branches have presented a heavy tax burden to the communities who must buy land, construct buildings (and new ones as they are needed for expansion), and pay a share of the maintenance costs for each new 2-year institution. Many communities, particularly in the poorer and more sparsely populated sections of the state, have found these costs burdensome. Furthermore, the law has been interpreted unevenly in that when new 2-year institutions (but for third- and fourth-year students) were approved in Green Bay and Parkside (Kenosha), the state paid these costs because the institutions were slated to eventually become 4-year universities. Legislation was introduced into the 1967 state assembly to reverse this law and reimburse counties which had already paid the costs of these

university centers and branches. These bills, however, were indefinitely postponed by a fiscally conservative legislature.

The research solicited opinions from the respondent group on the question of whether this community obligation (and law) should be continued. More of the total number of opinion responses indicated that local communities should not continue to be required to finance the construction of these institutions (table 24). However, this opinion was to the reverse in the Coordinating Committee group, which tended to favor the present system.

Table 24. Extent of Agreement with Statement on Continued Local Financing of UW and WSU Centers and Branches, by Response Group and Institutional Affiliation.

	Yes	No	No opinion
<u>By response group</u>			
CCHE members	17	11	0
Institutional board members*	8(8)	4(3)	4
Institutional administrators	42	59	17
Faculty members	23	45	14
Legislators	11	11	1
Others	1	5	0
Totals	102	135	36
<u>By institutional affiliation</u>			
UW	36	42	13
WSU	25	32	7
VTA	13	31	6

*Numbers in parentheses indicate answers of institutional board members who responded in their other capacity as CCHE members and are thus included in CCHE totals.

Respondents were then asked if they would favor a complete reorganization of the 2-year institutions and adoption of a statewide comprehensive community (junior) college system, with local control and support, liberal state aid, and coordinated through its own state agency. Some members of the state administration have favored this idea, and from time

to time it has been considered seriously by some of the education leaders. Several education leaders said that Wisconsin has gone too far in the development of its 2-year institutions to consider changing to a system of community (junior) colleges along the lines developed in other states.

Table 25. Extent of Agreement with Statement on Reorganization of 2-Year Institutions into a Single System of Junior Colleges, by Response Group and Institutional Affiliation.

	Yes	No	No opinion
By response group			
CCHE members	14	12	2
Institutional board members*	3(4)	11(5)	2(1)
Institutional administrators	37	56	25
Faculty group	28	35	19
Legislators	2	5	6
Others	0	5	1
Totals	84	134	55
By institutional affiliation			
UW	25	57	14
WSU	29	24	13
VTA	12	26	12

*Numbers in parentheses indicate answers of institutional board members who responded in their capacity as CCHE members and thus are included in the CCHE totals.

It seems clear that such a reorganization now represents a radical proposal, particularly to the University of Wisconsin which has now developed a strong system of 2-year centers. Judgment on the advisability of such reorganization, although divided, is clearly on the negative side (table 25). However, certain response groups show some interesting differentiation of opinion. A small majority of the present and past members of the Coordinating Committee who responded to the question apparently would favor such a reorganization today. Most members of the three institutional governing boards (10 of whom are serving or who have served as Coordinating Committee members) rejected the idea. Faculty members were sharply divided, although the majority of the respondents rejected the idea.

Members of the legislature also seemed to reject the idea quite strongly. Among the three institutional systems, University of Wisconsin people rejected the idea, as might be suspected from previous data. The state university group was almost evenly divided but with a few more favoring reorganization. The VTA group clearly rejected reorganization. In personal interviews, VTA system officials expressed the fear—probably broadly shared by other VTA administrators—that if the system were converted to the community (junior) college idea, the vocational and technical programs eventually would be neglected in favor of the liberal arts collegiate transfer programs.

Coordinating Committee Leadership

Leadership may be seen as a power usually acquired other than by formal delegation. Most organizations exert leadership more as a result of the constituents' confidence in the organization and their willingness to accept its leadership. The 1955 Wisconsin Coordinating Committee was delegated more powers than are most other state coordinating agencies composed principally of constituent institutional members. However, they were ill-defined and most sparingly employed. When the Committee was reorganized in 1965, these powers were continued and presumably strengthened, but they were still not defined specifically. In order to assert leadership, the new Committee must rely upon the degree of confidence and informal influence it can gain for itself through persuasion.

Leadership also may be seen as an organizational function which can be performed only when an internal balance of forces is present within the coordinating mechanism. Leadership involves advancing new ideas and taking progressive actions within a framework of its own authority and that of its members. This may meet with conflicts and temporarily upset the internal balance. The coordinating agency must be able to restore balance quickly so that it can continue to exert leadership. If these assumptions are correct, it may be predicted that the Wisconsin Committee can exert leadership only when it has established viable balance through measures which define the boundaries of institutional authority as well as define the perimeter of its own authority.

This study elected to examine the Coordinating Committee's leadership in three areas: long-term planning, interinstitutional cooperation, and cooperation and coordination of interests between state government and the institutions of higher education. It must be recognized that the Coordinating Committee at the outset of this study had been holding quarterly regular meetings for only a little over a year since its major reorganization.

Therefore, the Committee had not had much time to build and exercise leadership. In fact, at the point at which the study was conducted, lack of leadership seemed more in evidence because it was so early in the Committee's experience and because of the difficulty of dividing history into discrete eras, with the line of demarcation being the 1965 statutory reorganization of the Committee.

LEADERSHIP THROUGH PLANNING

The fundamental function of any coordinating organization in higher education is to design a comprehensive plan for higher education that will bring order to relationships between the state and higher education institutions, fulfill the state's higher educational goals, assure fiscal efficiency and necessary economic prudence, and still maintain an appropriate atmosphere for scholarly inquiry and for diverse and innovative teaching methods. All other functions specifically within the province of the coordinating organization are subordinate to this key responsibility.

The public utterances of Governor Warren Knowles from the early days of his candidacy for the governorship to the present have stressed his interest in the formulation of a "master plan for all post-high school education in Wisconsin which will be of guidance to the legislative and executive branches." In the 1965 reorganization legislation he sponsored, the principal charge was to "formulate a comprehensive statewide plan for fulfillment of the state's historic goals of provision of educational opportunity for all."

An official statewide plan for higher education in Wisconsin has not yet been produced. A number of planning documents have been written; among them, the January 1967 semiannual report prepared by the Coordinating Committee staff and titled *A Provisional Long-Range Plan for Higher Education in Wisconsin* holds the greatest promise for eventual articulation of long-range policy.

Chapter 619, Section 39.024 of the Statutes of Wisconsin, which in 1955 created the Coordinating Committee, charged that organization "to make a continuing study of the state-supported institutions of higher education under its jurisdiction. . . ." It did not specifically request the development of a single planning document, and, while the Committee produced numerous studies of Wisconsin's higher educational efforts and needs, it was not until June 1964 that the Committee undertook to produce one. This document was presented by the Coordinating Committee

in the form of its January 1965 semiannual report as a "restatement of the plans and the policies of the Coordinating Committee for Higher Education" and titled *A Comprehensive Plan for Higher Education in Wisconsin*.

By this time, the Coordinating Committee was already under heavy attack by the legislatively created committee of 25 as well as by numerous candidates for office in the November 1964 election. The plan was labeled as "too little and too late" and it was severely attacked as a planning statement after the fact of a series of independently conceived policies and actions from 1955 through 1964. In many respects, it presented a visible target for the specific charges discussed in previous chapters as reasons for the 1965 reorganization of the Committee.

The 1967 Provisional Long-Range Plan was produced during the first year of the reorganized Coordinating Committee and its newly created staff. It was done at the insistence of the governor and legislature that the Committee present such a document to the 1967 biennial legislature. It does not purport to be a finished planning document; in fact it clearly states:

It should be noted at the outset that the recommendations contained in this report are recommendations of the CCHE staff and not necessarily recommendations of the Coordinating Committee. It is anticipated that these staff recommendations will be acted upon in the near future by the Coordinating Committee and its subcommittees *before the preparation of a long-range master plan for higher education in the state* [page 1]. (Author's italics.)

This staff report, upon transmission to the governor, was given widespread attention in the press, and this unfortunately led many persons to believe that the document was a pronouncement of the Coordinating Committee itself—a finished document, an agreed-upon statement of policy. Angus B. Rothwell, executive director of the Coordinating Committee, presented this document to the Committee on March 9, 1967, and stated that it was "intended to serve both as a report on recent actions of the CCHE and as a framework within which educational decisions will be made in the future."

Largely on the basis of incorrect assumptions, the Provisional Plan was criticized by some legislators who felt it had not dealt realistically with the fiscal requirements of legislative proposals and by others for its inconclusive proposals related to the major higher education problems as perceived by the public, the legislators, and the press. Governor Knowles,

however, staunchly supported and praised the Provisional Plan and a number of its specific recommendations. He correctly described it as a "step towards providing guidelines for our future development of the higher educational system. . . ."

The 132-page document should be regarded more as a report on Coordinating Committee activities and accomplishments, presented in conjunction with a list of 65 recommendations for specific actions or for future studies. Many recommendations deal with minor procedural matters, and others deal with matters which might be considered more properly by institutional governing boards. Many simply ratify previously stated goals or policies of the institutional boards. However, this first step toward developing a comprehensive plan is an impressive compilation of data on the present status of higher education in Wisconsin and on the issues which must be decided.

Shaping these data into a viable plan will require difficult decisions on the key issues which are presently designated only for "future study." The Committee will have to hammer out policy related to institutional roles. It will have to decide upon long-term plans for physical expansion of several public higher education institutions, and these plans must take into account the facilities and services of the private institutions in meeting the state's higher education needs. This undoubtedly will require closer liaison than presently exists between the public and private sectors of Wisconsin higher education. The Committee also must decide upon a meaningful procedure for review of budget requests to win the confidence of the institutions, state agencies, and the legislature and so that individual institutions will find no advantage in direct political negotiations.

The Committee has made most of the easy decisions, but it has left many difficult basic decisions for later. The staff report perhaps has been too concerned with details and not enough with broad policy. Such policy could offer guidelines for deciding details by the Committee, when appropriate, or by the institutional systems.

The Committee's greatest opportunity for leadership is in long-term fiscal planning based on astute calculations of long-range educational needs. *Ad hoc* planning and calculations of needs have proved costly and wasteful in the past. Too often demands by towns and villages for university centers or branch campuses have mustered strong political support. Too often the pleas for funds to meet institutional crises have dictated *ad hoc* fiscal decisions.

The research disclosed several illustrations of fortuitous actions on the part of the early Committee during the past decade. Matters related to the designation and location of new campus facilities offer an apt example. Before the paint was hardly dry on the new buildings for the 2-year university centers in Green Bay, Racine, and Kenosha, plans were already afoot to establish 4-year university campuses in these areas. The 1965 legislature, after some debate, decided that the new institutions should be operated by the University of Wisconsin. When state officials (the building commission) balked at the cost of developing these 4-year campuses, the proposal was shifted to designate them as 2-year campuses, offering the third and fourth years of college to complement the freshman- and sophomore-year institutions already established. But since these new institutions required more land for expansion than was available at the metropolitan sites of the first 2-year institutions, new larger parcels of land had to be acquired. By the time these decisions had been made, the original pressures for 4-year institutions were renewed, and the Coordinating Committee approved a proposal to open the new campuses as third- and fourth-year institutions in 1969, and to expand them into full 4-year campuses in 1970.

As late as fall 1967, however, plans for these two institutions were still in turmoil. A measure was introduced into the 1967 legislative assembly (AB-752) to transfer control of the institutions from the University of Wisconsin to the Wisconsin State University System. The measure was tabled, but its existence indicated the Committee's lack of decisiveness and purposeful long-term planning. The State University at Whitewater with 7,000 students and unused dormitory space does not relish the competition of the proposed 4-year University of Wisconsin campus only 50 miles distant at Kenosha-Parkside. In the Green Bay area, powerful political forces in Outagamie County on the western shore of the Fox River sought in late 1967 to move the newly designated Green Bay campus to their side of the river from the original Brown County site chosen by the legislature's selection committee. To back up the legislative measure to this effect (AB-72), they introduced AB-288 to postpone the enabling legislation for purchase of sites in Green Bay and Kenosha-Parkside. Both measures failed. These controversies cannot be blamed on the Coordinating Committee, for the issues were not placed before it for opinion or approval. However, the controversies present no picture of past Coordinating Committee leadership in educational planning.

Other matters properly the concern of the reorganized Coordinating Committee and part of its responsibility for long-term planning have been settled through interinstitutional bargaining or by the governor's office.

In one instance, the Stevens Point and Platteville state universities and the University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee each submitted proposals for starting the first architectural school in the state. The Coordinating Committee originally favored the Milwaukee proposal. The *Milwaukee Journal* (February 5, 1967) reported that the state university representative on the Committee, who wanted to break the monopoly of the University of Wisconsin in professional education, vigorously opposed a recommendation favoring the university at Milwaukee. He was later joined by a University of Wisconsin representative (who feared defeat of the whole idea) in a motion to approve all three programs. This plan won subcommittee approval, but after a week's delay of the final vote by the full Committee, the matter was withdrawn for further study.

In a compromise of sorts, the Coordinating Committee approved the proposed 5-year School of Architecture for the University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee, but additionally approved a 3-year program for WSU-Platteville, and 2-year programs for WSU-Stevens Point and three other state universities. The 3- and 2-year programs were labeled "preprofessional," which they are. Nevertheless, the Committee's action raises the questions: Has it allowed "the camel's nose under the tent"—an action which will only result in future pressures for schools of architecture at one or more state universities, which might prove both duplicative and costly? Will the Coordinating Committee achieve rational preplanning as a basis for decisions on future needs and future resources?

In another instance in 1966, the University of Wisconsin sought major funding to rebuild and enlarge its medical school at Madison. This proposal became sidetracked in a controversy over whether the university should abandon the old medical center in Madison and build a new medical school on available property on the Madison campus; whether the medical school would be located more appropriately in Milwaukee, the most heavily populated area of the state; whether both facilities should be built; or whether a cooperative arrangement should be made between the University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee and the private medical school operated by Marquette University (which involves public financial aid for a private school). The matter was not referred to the Coordinating Committee for recommendation, but was assigned to a special committee of educators, legislators, state officials, and private citizens appointed by the governor, on the grounds that the Coordinating Committee had no jurisdiction in matters related to private schools and had at that time insufficient staff to undertake a study of this magnitude. The Coordinating Committee then and currently has a staff representative on the governor's committee. However, the Coordinating Committee (which has official responsibility

for higher education coordination) has not significantly contributed leadership to resolving this policy question. Nor will a decision by the governor's committee be based on a preconceived long-range plan for higher education in the state.

The challenge to assume a positive role of leadership in long-range planning has been put squarely to the new Coordinating Committee. Members of the higher education community, including the education leaders in state government, agree that the Coordinating Committee until recently has been short of high-caliber professional staff, and that this factor has been largely responsible for the Committee's lack of leadership. Early in the 1967 fiscal year, the Coordinating Committee appointed two additional staff members, both highly qualified professional researchers and analysts. These appointments undoubtedly will strengthen the Coordinating Committee, particularly in its review of budget requests and preparation of a consolidated budget. No other area of Committee activity requires so much technical expertise as this. If the new budget work, starting with the 1969-71 biennial budget, can win the confidence (if not the admiration) of the institutions and the state administrators and legislators, the Committee will have taken a long step toward assuming leadership in higher education affairs.

PROMOTING INTERINSTITUTIONAL COOPERATION

The Coordinating Committee has another opportunity to assume leadership in promoting cooperation among the three higher education systems. Competition among these systems and conflicts over division or duplication of programs, budget requests, branch campus locations, and matters which affect institutional prestige are, perhaps, inevitable, but they are costly. The Coordinating Committee can achieve leadership if it is able to establish equilibrium among these competing pressures. The Committee will achieve this only by securing the cooperation of each institution on the development of a long-range plan which fulfills the appropriate goals of each system and which is specific enough to preclude conflicting interpretation.

The present director of the Coordinating Committee is almost unanimously considered a fortunate choice for the job of effecting interinstitutional cooperation. For 8 years, he was a member of the Coordinating Committee in his capacity as superintendent of public instruction. As superintendent, he also served as ex-officio member of the governing boards of the three institutional systems. In this capacity, he secured

firsthand knowledge of all phases of higher education in Wisconsin and the trust of competing institutions. Thus, he occupies an admirable position to promote and, hopefully, sustain cooperation. He was perhaps the only person who in 1965 would have been acceptable to the educational establishment and the new state administration, and who could have been given a reasonable chance to reestablish a fruitful dialogue between alienated members of the Coordinating Committee.

In the first one and one-half years after reorganization, the new Coordinating Committee adopted a number of administrative procedures and other resolutions which, when they become established and sustained, can form a foundation for effective leadership. Chief among these actions was a moratorium the Coordinating Committee placed on authorizing 2-year university centers or branches beyond those which are already specifically scheduled and funded. It also adopted procedures for evaluating new building proposals and academic programs. It adopted a whole new system of area organization of the vocational-technical-adult schools and helped reorganize the administration of this system. The Committee has secured legislative approval for closing the weakest of the county teachers colleges (those with fewer than 50 enrolled) and has proposed elimination of the remaining schools in this system. These actions, and a number of other proposals in the Provisional Long-Range Plan, could not have been taken unless the Coordinating Committee had been able to secure some measure of agreement and cooperation among the institutional systems.

Some persons associated with the former Committee have charged that these measures do not constitute leadership but "simply confirm what was going to happen anyway." However, in the opinion of the author, these committee actions are important first steps toward institutional cooperation on vital issues.

It is certainly too early to assess whether institutional governing boards and administrative groups have whole-heartedly accepted either the leadership of the Coordinating Committee or the limits upon institutional autonomy which such leadership implies. Some interviewees stated that the state universities and the vocational-technical-adult systems have gone a long way toward accepting the authority and the leadership of the Committee, but that the University of Wisconsin (which has the most autonomy to lose) is still reluctant to relinquish its position of direct influence in the statehouse. One state official observed that, while university representatives—like those of other public institutions—still go directly to state officials and legislative leaders with special pleadings, they are now "far more careful about what they do and how they do it."

It is unrealistic to suppose that the University of Wisconsin or other institutional systems will give up their lobbying activity in the Wisconsin Legislature as long as it is to their advantage. If the Coordinating Committee is able to bring about a greater degree of institutional cooperation, it must effect a balance among the competing forces so that it will be to the disadvantage of any one system to disturb that balance.

EFFECTING GOVERNMENTAL COOPERATION

There is ample evidence to support the assertion that the reorganized Coordinating Committee has considerable political advantage. The new Committee is a creature of the present administration. It was sponsored and strongly endorsed by the new Republican governor. Both houses of the legislature for the first time in several years are controlled by the political party of the governor. This administration is generally disposed to fiscal conservatism, and the Coordinating Committee has committed itself to establishing fiscal responsibility.

Politics extend deeply into education affairs generally. In 1965, the incoming governor named nearly a majority of the members of the new Coordinating Committee, and these, along with other members of the governor's political party on the institutional boards, have given Republican members control of the Committee. The governor's mid-1967 appointments gave Republicans a majority of the seats on the Wisconsin State Board of Vocational, Technical, and Adult Education. The *Capitol Times* (June 19, 1967) pointed out that senate Republicans for several years have controlled appointments to the board of regents of the state university system by refusing to confirm appointments of Democratic governors from their political party. As a result, that 13-member board is entirely Republican. Republicans do not control the 10-member University of Wisconsin Board of Regents, but they are represented by four conservative appointees of the incumbent governor.

While political unanimity on the new Coordinating Committee has facilitated cooperation with the legislature and agencies of state government, it has not made the Committee's relations with university administrators any easier. The administrators feel the pinch of a fiscally conservative, mutually reinforcing power structure within their own governing boards and in the statehouse. This conservative philosophy of legislators and governing boards has made its mark on relations with the administrators and faculty members in areas other than fiscal policy. Institutions have come under fire for their own and their students' political activism.

Because faculty and institutional officials are not represented directly on the Coordinating Committee, this group has tended to be more critical of the Committee and more apt to attribute its reorganization to political motives. It appears that if the Committee would capitalize on its new position of political favor, its members must learn to play the role of "educational statesmen," persuading the education community that Committee leadership can stave off extreme institutional or political pressures.

Effective long-range planning for higher education is becoming increasingly dependent upon the legislature's political stability and its understanding of, and sympathy with, educational goals. A recent constitutional reform in Wisconsin may prove beneficial to long-range planning by lengthening the term of the governor's incumbency.

The Wisconsin constitution formerly specified a 2-year term for its governors. Thus, when a governor was inaugurated, he proposed a state budget concurrent with his incumbency. This has often resulted in short-term rather than long-term decisions. In 1966, the governor's term was extended to 4 years, starting with the election of 1970. The constitution also specifies biennial meetings of its legislature and, consequently, biennial budgeting for all state functions and services. A proposed constitutional reform establishing annual meetings of the legislature and annual budgeting will be placed before the voters in 1968. These two reforms should prove more conducive to long-term planning and to more precise budgeting for the implementation of long-term educational goals.

PERCEPTIONS OF COORDINATING COMMITTEE STRENGTH THROUGH LEADERSHIP

Criticism of the pre-1965 Coordinating Committee, by the committee of 25, centered around charges that: 1) the Coordinating Committee, composed of a majority of representatives of the various institutions, was not able to act "objectively"; 2) the University of Wisconsin "dominated" the actions of the Committee; 3) the Committee was unable to "act firmly" on the major policy questions affecting higher education; and 4) the Committee had not been able to "hold firm to a definite and specific policy" on the nature and location of new 2-year institutions and additional 4-year institutions.

The research attempted to assess the apparent strengths and potential for leadership of the new Committee by asking members of the higher education community whether they felt the present Committee had met

these pre-1965 criticisms. Responses were generally favorable to the new organization, but a large number of persons did not feel sufficiently well informed to express an opinion. This was particularly true of faculty and administrators below statewide institution levels. It is significant that these groups apparently are not informed of, or involved in, institutional discussions and other decision making in statewide planning.

A majority in all response groups stating opinions concluded that the present organizational pattern of the Coordinating Committee is more conducive to firm, objective decision making (table 26). Administrators and faculty members seemed less sure of this point than legislators and the lay members of the Coordinating Committee and the institutional governing boards. Among persons associated with the three institutional systems, those associated with the University of Wisconsin were less enthusiastic in their opinions in favor of the new Committee than were persons associated with the state university system and the vocational-technical-adult schools.

Table 26. Extent of Agreement with Statement that Present Committee Organization Is More Conducive to Firm, Objective Decision Making, by Response Group and Institutional Affiliation.

	Yes	No	No opinion
By response group			
CCHE members	22	6	0
Institutional board members*	12(6)	0(4)	4
Administrator group	59	20	39
Faculty group	22	16	44
Legislator group	17	1	5
Others	2	1	3
Totals	134	44	85
By institutional affiliation			
UW	32	22	37
WSU	32	11	21
VTA	30	4	16

*Numbers in parentheses indicate answers of institutional board members who responded in their capacity as CCHE members and thus are included in CCHE totals.

Asked whether or not the present Coordinating Committee continues to be dominated by the University of Wisconsin (see table 27), most respondents in all groups felt that such domination does not now exist, whether or not it existed before 1965. Interestingly, however, four present Coordinating Committee members (three of them citizen members) dissented from the majority of their colleagues. Persons associated with the state university system were somewhat less sure than those affiliated with the other two systems that the university no longer dominates the Coordinating Committee.

An effort was then made to determine whether or not the Coordinating Committee, as it operates today, adequately represents the interests of the educational institutions, the legislature, and the state government (table 28). Most of those who had formed an opinion on this matter (many had not) indicated that the Committee does represent the interests of all three groups who are parties to it or who have strong interest in its work. All groups, including legislators, seemed to feel that the Committee represents

Table 27. Extent of Agreement with Statement on Continued Domination of Committee by University of Wisconsin, by Response Group and Institutional Affiliation.

	Yes	No	No opinion
By response group			
CCHE members	4	20	4
Institutional board members*	0(1)	12(8)	4(1)
Administrator group	16	61	41
Faculty group	11	21	50
Legislature group	6	12	5
Others	2	2	2
Totals	39	128	106
By institutional affiliation			
UW	5	53	33
WSU	11	25	28
VTA	7	22	21

*Numbers in parentheses indicate answers of institutional board members who responded in their capacity as CCHE members and thus are included in CCHE totals.

Table 28. Extent of Agreement with the Statement that the Coordinating Committee Adequately Represents the Interests of Institutional Boards, the Legislature, and the State Administration, by Response Group and Institutional Affiliation.

	(1) Institutional boards			(2) Legislature			(3) State administration		
	Yes	No	No opinion	Yes	No	No opinion	Yes	No	No opinion
	Yes	No	No opinion	Yes	No	No opinion	Yes	No	No opinion
<u>By response group</u>									
CCHE members	15	7	6	13	6	9	14	6	8
Institutional board members*	10(6)	2(2)	4(2)	7(2)	3(3)	6(5)	13(3)	0(2)	3(5)
Administrator group	50	26	44	41	19	60	53	12	55
Faculty group	22	15	45	24	7	51	30	5	47
Legislator group	16	3	4	5	11	7	12	6	5
Others	3	1	3	1	2	4	2	1	4
Totals	116	54	106	91	48	137	124	30	122
<u>By institutional affiliation</u>									
UW	25	30	36	27	19	45	38	12	41
WSU	29	9	26	19	6	39	25	2	37
VTA	29	3	18	22	5	23	28	4	18

*Numbers in parentheses indicate answers of institutional board members who responded in their capacity as CCHE members and thus are included in CCHE totals.

the interests of the institutional governing boards. However, they were less sure that the Committee represents the interests of the legislature, and members of the legislature itself were more inclined to feel that their interests were not adequately represented. The governor's strong stand in favor of coordination and the reorganized Coordinating Committee probably accounts for the strong feeling that the interests of the state executive and his administration are served by the Committee. Tabulating the responses by institutional affiliation reveals some skepticism among university people as to whether their interests are adequately represented by the Committee. In fact, more felt they were not adequately represented than thought they were.

Opinion was much more sharply divided within all groups on the matter of whether or not the new Committee has been able to hold to a firm position on the nature of new 2-year institutions (table 29). Fewer of the total number of respondents felt the Committee had held firm than otherwise. Most Committee members and members of the governing boards felt that the Committee is now taking a firmer stand on this issue.

Table 29. Extent of Agreement that the Committee Has Been Able, Since the 1965 Reorganization, To Hold to a Firm Position on the Nature of 2-Year Institutions, by Response Group and Institutional Affiliation.

	Yes	No	No opinion
By response group			
CCHE members	14	10	4
Institutional board members*	10(2)	3(7)	3(1)
Administrator group	38	48	32
Faculty group	13	25	44
Legislature group	8	9	6
Others	2	0	4
Totals	85	95	93
By institutional affiliation			
UW	14	37	40
WSU	17	29	18
VTA	26	13	11

*Numbers in parentheses indicate answers of institutional board members who responded in their capacity as CCHE members and thus are included in CCHE totals.

However, administrators, faculty members, and legislators were more inclined to doubt the firmness of the Committee's position. Persons identified with the VTA schools, reflecting satisfaction with the Committee's role in reorganizing this system, felt that the Committee was now firmly dealing with problems related to 2-year institutions, but those affiliated with the University of Wisconsin and the state universities tended to disagree.

Organizational leadership is a specific requirement of a coordinating agency which would serve the best interests of all persons and organizations in the state concerned with higher education affairs. In spite of the handicap of statutes which do not spell out specific authorities concomitant with its responsibilities, there is evidence that the reorganized Committee is an improvement over the old form with respect to its ability to assert leadership.

However, the Committee's future success will depend upon its performance in two areas. First, it must formulate a specific and viable plan for the long-range development of higher education in Wisconsin. Without such a plan, leadership falls to the winner of an interinstitutional power struggle or reverts to regulatory agencies of state government. Secondly, the Committee must consolidate its influence with the institutional administrators and governing boards to avoid having its authority undermined by direct negotiations between the institutions and political forces in the legislature and state offices.

Conclusions

Politics and conflict are two facts of life facing all higher education coordinating organizations. Providing public higher education is a matter of public policy and, hence, a matter of politics. Furthermore, the link between education and politics is strengthened as mass education becomes more prevalent. The public expects politicians and political parties to deal with questions of what government is and should be doing in education (Clark, 1966). Politics is a game of accommodating conflicting interests, and dealing with conflict is an organizational function of coordinating agencies. If politics and conflict disappeared from public higher educational affairs, coordinating organizations would hardly be necessary.

Coordination is an organizational dynamic employed to bring order to conflict. As the causes of conflict change or shift from one pressure point to another, organizational activity sometimes changes to accommodate new conditions. The history of nearly all coordinating organizations is marked by repeated organizational change affecting both the form and the function of these agencies. But organizational change sometimes undermines confidence in the agency, which jeopardizes its stability and longevity. It is disruptive and it is costly.

This report proposed a set of tentative assumptions about factors contributing to effective coordinating agencies. The Wisconsin Committee was examined in terms of whether these assumptions were borne out in practice as observed by the author and perceived by the parties to coordination. It was hoped that these findings might form the basis for derivation of generic principles predictive of organizational success, minimizing the need for disruptive change in the coordinating agency. There has been little opportunity in Wisconsin to put these assumptions to conclusive test over an appropriate period of time and there was not sufficient evidence discovered in this case study, nor for that matter in the contemporary

literature of such studies, to prove these assumptions correct. Nevertheless, it is appropriate to review the assumptions on the basis of the Wisconsin experience and the experiences of a few other states which have faced similar problems.

1. A coordinating agency in higher education can deal more effectively with conflict between institutions of education and the instrumentalities of government if members representing the general public have a voting majority on the board.

The 1965 statutory change of composition of the membership of the Wisconsin Committee, which placed voting control with lay citizens not otherwise associated with one of the higher education institutions, was shown to be favored now by a majority of the educators, legislators, and state officials concerned with education administration. It was, however, strongly opposed in 1965 by a majority of the members of the pre-1965 Coordinating Committee and by many persons in the statewide administration and faculty of the University of Wisconsin.

The change was recommended by the *Committee of 25 Report* to the 1965 legislature and by the newly elected governor who sought to achieve a more stable organization and bring greater fiscal responsibility to higher education decisions. Charges were made that the reform was not necessary, that it was politically rather than educationally motivated, and that it was designed to limit the influence, if not the prestige of the University of Wisconsin. The research indicates that there was genuine need for reorganization and strengthening of the coordinating organization and that, while the charges of political motivation may have had some substance, politics was not the chief reason for the organizational change. Most members of the higher education community agreed that the pre-1965 Committee was dominated by the institutions, particularly the University of Wisconsin. So long as this was true, governmental agencies and their public constituents did not have confidence in decisions of the Coordinating Committee. The change in the Committee membership in 1965 gave the Committee a majority of citizen members who have no obligations to the institutional boards. In the eyes of the higher education community, this improved the Committee's potential for decision making independent of institutional influence, and eliminated the major cause of conflict between the education community and the political leaders in that state.

In California, the distribution of power among the educational institutions resulted in deadlocks in the decision-making process, which the

public member minority was not able to break. This continuing conflict almost resulted in the demise of the Coordinating Council in 1964 and it was not until after its 1965 reorganization, in which the number of citizen members was doubled (but remained short of a voting majority), that confidence was restored (Paltridge, 1966). The fact that 2 years later a state administration chose to ignore the coordinating mechanism on certain key educational decisions has raised new interest for change to a nonpartisan public member majority, hopefully to restore public and legislative confidence in the Council.

Maryland's experience was essentially the same as those of Wisconsin and California. This state's first coordinating organization, the Advisory Council for Higher Education, was formed in 1962. It was composed of nine representatives of the state's public and private education institutions. This council was unable to resolve the conflicts between the institutions, and the state legislature changed the membership to an all-citizen board in 1964. Institutional representatives now form several advisory committees which assist the council in its deliberations but do not participate in the decision making.

Pliner (1966) points out in her 1965 survey of coordinating boards that all but two of the states with statutory coordinating agencies have citizen majorities. California and Minnesota are the two exceptions. Glenny (1966) finds that public-member agencies appear to have greater longevity and enjoy greater legislative support in comparison to boards of institutional members. He points out that the older statutory coordinating agencies consisting entirely of public members have never been threatened with extinction, while on the other hand, those agencies with the majority of institutional representatives have had more uncertain existence. The trend, he points out, is clearly toward coordinating boards with citizen majorities.

While there has been insufficient time to accurately judge the effects of the new public member majority on the long-term effectiveness and stability of the Wisconsin coordinating mechanism, a significant body of opinion in the education community holds that it should be beneficial to the long-term interests of the institutions by giving them an unbiased body which can present their needs more effectively to the legislature and state administration. However, suspicion lingers of too much political involvement in higher educational affairs, and the new Coordinating Committee with its majority of citizen members appointed by the governor has gained only a precarious hold on the necessary confidence of the university and the rest

of the educational community. This it must secure, as well as that of the state officials and legislators, if it is to remain stable.

The research found no strong sentiment for further increasing the citizen majority on the Committee nor for changing it to an all-public board with no direct institutional representation. Greater participation of the private colleges and universities in statewide higher education planning may come with time, but presently the public institutions favor only increased communication with the private sector and do not support placing private institutions' representatives on the Coordinating Committee with voting privileges.

2. The coordinating mechanism will function more effectively if its professional staff is independent of the staffs of the educational institutions as well as the staffs of state administrative agencies.

When the California Coordinating Council was formed in 1960, the idea of an independent professional staff for the organization was accepted with little if any debate and regarded as a necessary improvement over the previous shared-staff arrangement under the Joint Liaison (coordinating) Committee. In Wisconsin, the statutes creating the Coordinating Committee in 1955 provided only that the staff be drawn from the administrative staffs of the member institutions. Creation of a separate and independent professional staff for the new Coordinating Committee at the time of its 1965 reorganization was strongly debated. The institutions felt that only persons already employed by the institutions could supply the necessary professional competence and intimate knowledge of higher education administration. Also it was evident that the institutions were hesitant to trust their affairs and intimate plans to an "outside" agency. In spite of these misgivings, however, the Wisconsin higher education community appears to be satisfied with the independent posture of the new Committee's professional staff and satisfied with the work of its new director.

Detailed interviews with key education and governmental officials revealed that, while the staff reorganization was simultaneous with the more extensive reorganization of the Coordinating Committee itself, discontent over the staff arrangement may have triggered the main force of criticism of the Coordinating Committee organization as a whole. The charges of institutional domination within the coordinating organization were frequently leveled at the staff work upon which Committee decisions were based. Whether or not there was any bias in the staff studies, the staff, after all, was in the employ of the institutions and was serving a committee,

the majority of whose members were representatives of these same institutions.

Apparently, preference for an independent professional staff is shared by other states with coordinating agencies. Pliner (1966) points out that all but two statewide coordinating organizations now employ their own professional staffs. There is, however, a wide range of sizes of staffs employed by these agencies, ranging from as few as two persons to as many as 20, and with annual budgets ranging from \$75,000 to \$450,000. Several states reported in Pliner's survey that their biggest problem was recruiting and retaining qualified professional staff. Generally, the states who reported this also reported less ample budgets and more restrictive civil service regulations on employment.

Highly qualified professional staff members are necessary, and there is ample evidence that the staff function will be most effective if staff members are responsible only to the coordinating agency.

3. The authority structure inherent in a scheme of statutory coordination can serve as a protector, rather than an adversary, of the substantive autonomy of institutions.

Substantive autonomy is essential to the advancement of knowledge and exploration of ideas. However, certain procedural rules and laws must be established for the good of all institutions within a system. Some fear that procedural regulation will restrict substantive autonomy. Conflicts ensue when framers of the rules allow their enthusiasm for order to restrict institutional functions that are properly and necessarily autonomous. They also ensue when institutional administrators or governing boards seek to extend the scope of their autonomy to the point where even the slightest restriction impinges on their notion of institutional autonomy.

There is, for example, a frequently expressed concern that coordination may function in such a way that the autonomy of one institution can be strengthened only at a cost to the autonomy of another. This particularly concerns persons associated with a dominant state university as they view with some alarm the demands for increased autonomy by state colleges and community colleges. Such a loss of autonomy by the university can happen if the coordinating agency is not strong enough to prevent usurpation or unnecessary duplication of university functions. A loss of autonomy by the state colleges can happen when the coordinating agency has not been given the authority to delineate a respected, needed, and

prestigious collegiate (not necessarily university) function for the vigorous systems of comprehensive state colleges. In these cases, the authority of the Coordinating Committee could reinforce the autonomy of all institutions.

Officials of both the University of Wisconsin and the University of California have expressed public and private concern over loss of autonomy by the "imposition" of an authoritative coordinating board into the hierarchy between the regents and the legislature. Yet the experience of Wisconsin indicates that the absence of coordinating authority does not insure institutional autonomy. Before the Wisconsin Coordinating Committee was reorganized and strengthened, the state college system assumed the name of universities and considerably broadened the range of its instructional programs. It has now challenged the right of the university to be the sole grantor of doctoral degrees, and has attempted to extend pre-professional programs into professional training schools. If the Coordinating Committee does not exercise its authority to define institutional functions, this move may do more to vitiate the university's autonomy than does the Committee's right to circumscribe authority.

Most members of the Wisconsin higher education community are of the opinion that the Committee is now asserting more authority, and they generally feel that this has been to the benefit of the institutions. There is, however, skepticism on the part of some people associated with the institutions over the political nature of this authority, and they express the fear that its main purpose is to effect fiscal economies not necessarily in keeping with the needs of the institutions. The solution to this controversy lies in the professional quality and independence of the coordinating authority and in the statesmanlike manner in which this authority is used. It also depends upon the commitment of the coordinating agency to creative administration under a systematic long-term plan rather than reliance upon *ad hoc* negative control—usually through its ability to disapprove individual budgetary items.

4. Coordination can function more effectively if the particular roles and distinguishing functions of the various institutions and institutional systems are clearly defined, if adherence to these definitions is enforceable, and if provision is made for innovative change and modification of the definitions.

The designation of appropriate institutional functions within a state system of public higher education is usually one of the key elements in a

comprehensive statewide plan for public higher education. There are, however, more states with established coordinating agencies than have developed a comprehensive plan for higher education. Many state coordinating agencies, for various reasons, have not developed specific statements of institutional missions or distinguishing educational functions. Several agencies feel that there is wisdom in not formally codifying specific statements of functions, either because they foresee no problems in this area or because their present authority provides for approval or disapproval of educational programs and they would prefer to regulate program duplication under this authority. They may prefer not to open the subject to debate for fear of commitments that would be difficult to change.

Wisconsin has not yet developed a basic, comprehensive plan incorporating explicit statements of institutional functions which can guide long-term planning. Approval of new programs in the past was on an *ad hoc* basis and in the absence of a specific statewide plan. The result has been recurring interinstitutional conflict, which brought on the reform movement in 1965.

The new Committee appears to be working diligently on these problems. However, the exact role of the two university systems continues to be a subject of controversy. Unless the roles and functions of the university and the state university system are more clearly defined, conflict and competitive struggles between the two systems will continue. Unless the Committee can curb proliferation of 2-year institutions on other than an *ad hoc* moratorium basis, and curtail the tendency to duplicate functions across the various systems which operate 2-year institutions, conflict will continue among educational institutions and between the institutions and the legislature. The funds required to meet the rapidly expanding demand for a variety of education beyond high school can be provided only if there is assurance that they are being used to the best advantage. The "quick and easy" way to fiscal efficiency that may be imposed eventually—that of consolidation of governance of the system—is not likely to calm the competitive conflicts. In fact, it might increase them, for the faculties in the present state university system might then have an even stronger claim to higher salaries, research facilities, lighter teaching loads, and other benefits on a par with those of their colleagues in the present university system.

One feature of the California Master Plan of 1960 which has attracted praise for this pioneering planning document is the fact that it spells out in considerable detail the differentiated and distinguishing functions of the University of California, the state college system, and the system of

community (junior) colleges. This document further provides that the Coordinating Council is to review the Master Plan every 5 years and submit a detailed report to the legislature on recommendations, if any, of changes to be made. While it cannot be said that the Master Plan has eliminated rivalries and interinstitutional competition in California, it probably has served to give the state system a degree of stability.

The Coordinating Board of the Texas College and University System was given a legislative mandate to order the initiation, consolidation, or elimination of degree or certificate programs, to develop and promulgate a basic core of general academic courses which would be freely transferable among all public institutions of higher education in Texas, and to order deletion or consolidation of any courses. The board also has published a statement of general role and scope for each 4-year institution in the state.

If defining institutional functions is desirable, it makes sense to grant authority to coordinating agencies to secure adherence to these functions. The statutes which established coordinating agencies in most states charged those agencies with the responsibility for avoiding costly duplication in programs. Most of these statutes, including those of Wisconsin, give the coordinating agency authority to approve, or recommend approval, of all new educational programs, but only in a few cases do the statutes give the coordinating agency authority to discontinue or recommend discontinuance of unneeded educational programs. The Pliner survey (1966) shows that all but three or four of the states with statutory coordinating agencies have given their coordinating organizations the right to approve new degree programs, but fewer than half of these have the authority to discontinue such programs once they are established. Furthermore, half the states whose coordinating agencies have the authority to discontinue programs have only partially implemented this authority or have not implemented it at all.

In the case of Wisconsin, the first significant attempt to regulate potential duplicative functions was the 1967 decision on establishing a 4-year school of architecture at the University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee. However, the difficulty of the decision and what it portends for future Committee deliberations point out that the lack of a comprehensive plan defining institutional roles is a serious obstacle to exercise of this authority. Agreement in principle on a master design which will designate the functions and authority of the three higher educational systems will lessen disruptive conflicts and perhaps head off legislative solutions which could be more strictly regulatory than commonly-arrived-at agreements. This sets the

stage for a show of leadership by the Coordinating Committee which would benefit all parties concerned and enhance the Committee's prestige and influence as well.

The Wisconsin Committee has not had time to prove or disprove this assumption, for the authority has not been in use long enough to prove its benefits.

5. A coordinating organization can exercise progressive leadership of its state's higher educational affairs if it can create a viable equilibrium among divisive forces generated out of opposing goals, conflicting functions, or competitive aspirations of the various parties to coordination.

There are various types of balance implied in this proposition—balance between the autonomy of the participants and the authority of the regulator (the coordinating agency), balance between the burdens of membership in a coordinating agency and the satisfactions derived from such membership, balance of powers between the conflicting interests represented in or related to the coordinating mechanism, balance of tensions between opposing forces in educational institutions and agencies of state government.

Only a few statutory coordinating agencies are given as much implied authority in the statutes as that vested in the Wisconsin Coordinating Committee. But the Committee has not made full use of its power—to effect the balance between authority and autonomy and between burdens and satisfactions, which is a prerequisite to leadership. Prior to 1965, the powerful institutions would not submit to such authority. Since 1965, perhaps, the Committee has used more authority, but it is still not fully utilized.

This study elected to examine the Wisconsin Coordinating Committee's leadership role in three areas: long-term planning, interinstitutional cooperation, and cooperation and coordination of interests between state governments and the institutions of higher education. It must be noted that when this study began, the Coordinating Committee had been meeting regularly for only a little more than a year since its major reorganization. Thus, the Committee has had little time to build and exercise leadership.

Comprehensive planning is necessary if a coordinating organization is to bring order to relationships between the state and higher education institutions, fulfill the state's higher education goals, assure fiscal efficiency

and necessary economic prudence, and still maintain an appropriate atmosphere for scholarly inquiry and for diverse and innovative teaching methods. While a comprehensive plan for higher education in Wisconsin has not yet been produced, a number of planning documents have been written. Among them, the January 1967 semiannual report, prepared by the Coordinating Committee staff and titled *A Provisional Long-Range Plan for Higher Education in Wisconsin*, holds the greatest promise for eventual articulation of long-range policy.

The Coordinating Committee has another opportunity to assume leadership in promoting cooperation among the three higher education systems. In the first one and one-half years after reorganization, the Committee has developed a number of administrative procedures which, when they become established and sustained, could be a basis for Committee leadership. The Coordinating Committee obtained agreement for a moratorium on authorizing new 2-year university centers or branches. It has set up procedures for evaluating new building proposals and new academic programs. It adopted a new system of area organization of the vocational-technical-adult schools. It secured approval for closing the county teachers colleges. These actions attest to the Committee's ability to secure some measure of agreement and cooperation among the institutional systems.

Political compatibility of the majority of the Coordinating Committee members with the legislature and the administration has facilitated the Committee's ability to cooperate with the legislature and state agencies. However, this has not eased Committee relations with university administrators. The administrators feel the pinch of a conservative power structure on their own governing boards and in the statehouse in areas of fiscal policy as well as in other areas. Institutions have been criticized for their own and their students' political activism. Perhaps because faculty members and administrators are not represented directly on the Coordinating Committee, this group has tended to be more critical of the Committee and more apt to attribute its reorganization to political motives. It appears that if the Committee would capitalize on its new position of political favor, its members must fill the role of educational statesmen, persuading the education community that the Committee's leadership is an antidote to the negative effects of extreme institutional or political pressures.

Despite statutes which do not spell out specific authorities concomitant with the Committee's responsibilities, there is evidence that the reorganized Committee has improved its ability to assert leadership, partly because it has acquired a greater degree of influence—or informal authority—

among members of the legislature, administration, and the public. It has derived this influence from the fact that it is now a public body, not subject to criticism for institutional bias, and from the fact that it is the creation of the now incumbent state administration. Furthermore, the new Committee has derived influence from its willingness to assume increased responsibility for leadership.

References

- Barnard, C. I. *The functions of the executive*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1938.
- Barnlund, D. C. A comparative study of individual, majority, and group judgment. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 1958, 58, 55-60.
- Berdahl, R. O. *Study of statewide systems of higher education* (working title). Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education. In press.
- Berelson, B. *Graduate education in the United States*. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1960.
- Carter, A. M. *An assessment of quality in graduate education*. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1966.
- Clark, B. R. The study of educational systems. *International Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences*, 1966.
- Coser, L. *The functions of social conflict*. Glencoe, Illinois: Free Press, 1966.
- Doan, E. N. *The La Follettes and the Wisconsin idea*. New York: Rinehart, Holt & Winston, 1947.
- Feigl, H. Principles and problems of theory construction in psychology. In W. Dennis (Ed.), *Current trends in psychological theory*. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1951. Pp. 174-213.
- Festinger, L., & Aronson, E. The arousal and reduction of dissonance in social contexts. In D. Cartwright & A. Zander (Eds.), *Group dynamics*. Evanston, Illinois: Row, Peterson & Co., 1960. Pp. 214-231.
- Glenny, L. A. Politics and current patterns in coordinating higher education. In W. J. Minter (Ed.), *Campus and capitol: Higher education and the state*. Boulder, Colorado: Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education, November 1966. Pp. 27-46.

- Glenny, L. A. State systems and plans for higher education. In L. Wilson (Ed.), *Emerging patterns in American higher education*. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1965. Pp. 86-103.
- Glenny, L. A. *Autonomy of public colleges: The challenge of coordination*. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1959.
- Kelley, H. H., & Thibaut, J. W. Experimental studies of group problem solving and process. In G. Lindzey (Ed.), *Handbook of Social Psychology*. Cambridge: Addison-Wesley, 1954. Pp. 735-85.
- Keniston, K. *Graduate study in the arts and sciences at the University of Pennsylvania*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1959.
- McConnell, T. R. The coordination of state systems of higher education. In L. Wilson (Ed.), *Emerging patterns in American higher education*. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1965. Pp. 129-140.
- McConnell, T. R. Foreword. In L. Glenny, *Autonomy of public colleges: The challenge of coordination*. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1959.
- McConnell, T. R. *A general pattern for American public higher education*. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1962.
- McGregor, D. *The human side of enterprise*. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1960.
- Millett, J. D. *The academic community: An essay on organization*. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1962.
- Millett, J. D. State planning for higher education. *Educational Record*, summer 1965, 46(3), 223-30.
- Newsweek*. February 20, 1967, 65.
- Palola, E. G. *Statewide planning in higher education: Its implications at the institutional level* (working title). Berkeley: Center for Research and Development in Higher Education. To be published.
- Paltridge, J. G. *Organizational forms which characterize statewide coordination of public higher education*. Unpublished manuscript, University of California, Berkeley, 1965.
- Paltridge, J. G. *California's Coordinating Council for Higher Education*. Berkeley: Center for Research and Development in Higher Education, University of California, 1966.
- Pliner, E. (Ed.) *Coordination and planning*. Baton Rouge, Louisiana: Public Affairs Research Council, 1966.

Pondy, L. R. Organizational conflict: Concepts and models. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, September 1967, Ithaca, New York: Cornell University, 296-320.

Thorndike, R. L. The effect of discussion upon the correctness of group decisions, when the factor of majority influence is allowed for. *Journal of Social Psychology*, 1938, 9, 343-362.

University of Wisconsin--History digest. Madison, Wisconsin: University of Wisconsin Publications Service, 1962.

Wilson, L. (Ed.) *Emerging patterns in American higher education*. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1965.

Wisconsin Committee of 25, final report. Madison, Wisconsin: Legislative Council, State Capitol, August 1965, Vols. I, II, & III.

Wisconsin Legislative Reference Bureau. *The Wisconsin blue book*. Madison, Wisconsin: Document Sales, 1966.

Appendices

APPENDIX A

EXCERPTS FROM WISCONSIN STATUTES

20.415 HIGHER EDUCATION, COORDINATING COMMITTEE FOR.

(1) Administration. There is appropriated on July 1, 1965, \$145,000 and on July 1, 1966, \$154,000 from the general fund to the coordinating committee for higher education to carry out its functions under s. 39.024.

39.024 Coordinating Committee (1) Purpose. The purpose of this section is to provide for the direction and coordination of the activities of the University of Wisconsin and the state colleges, schools of vocational, technical and adult education and county teachers colleges by providing a permanent joint committee to make a continuing study of the state-supported institutions of higher education under their jurisdiction, and the relation thereto of the needs of the people of Wisconsin, to recommend necessary changes in programs and facilities, to provide for a single, consolidated, biennial budget request for the University of Wisconsin and the state colleges, and that portion of the budget request of the state board of vocational, technical and adult education described in sub. (3) (c), and to report the results of its studies and recommendations to the governor and the legislature.

(2) Committee (a) Composition. To carry out the purposes of this section, there is created a coordinating committee of 17 members, one from the regents of the University of Wisconsin, one from the board of regents of state colleges, one from the state board of vocational, technical and adult education, 9 citizens, the president of the board of regents of the University of Wisconsin, the president of the board of regents of state colleges, the president of the state board of vocational, technical and adult education, the state superintendent of public instruction and one member of a county teachers college board, appointed annually by the governor from recommendations made by the association of county teachers college boards. The appointive regent members and the appointive members from the state board of vocational, technical and adult education of the committee shall be sel-

ected by a majority vote of the board of which they are members and shall be selected each year at the annual meeting of their board. The citizen members shall be appointed by the governor with the advice and consent of the senate. Terms of citizen members shall be for eight years. Citizen members serving on the effective date of this amendment (1965) shall serve out their full terms. The governor shall first appoint 2 of the citizen members added by this amendment (1965) for 2 years and one each for 4, 6 and 8 years, and thereafter for 8 years. The necessary reductions in membership of the present committee provided by this amendment (1965) shall be accomplished when appointments are to be made next.

(b) Chairman. The chairman of the committee shall be elected by a majority vote of the committee at the first meeting held after the effective date of this act (1963). The chairmanship of the committee shall be determined annually by its members.

(c) Secretary; meetings of committee. The committee shall select a secretary from its membership. The committee shall hold regular meetings at least once every 3 months at such time and place as may be determined by the chairman. Special meetings may be called at the request of a majority of the committee or on the chairman's own initiative upon 5 days' notice. Members of the committee shall be compensated for their services on the committee in the manner provided for their services under chs. 36, 37, and 41.

(d) Executive director. The committee shall appoint and fix the salary of a full-time executive director who shall have a recognized and demonstrated interest in and knowledge of public higher education. The executive director shall employ, with the approval of the committee, such professional and clerical staff as is necessary, outside the classified service.

(3) Powers. Without limitation because of enumeration the committee is authorized and directed to make studies and recommendations in the following fields:

(a) Educational planning. The committee shall determine what over-all educational programs shall be offered in the several units of the university, the state colleges, the collegiate transfer and technical education programs of the schools of vocational, technical and adult education and county teachers colleges to avoid unnecessary duplication and to utilize to the best advantage the facilities and personnel available for instruction in the fields of higher education. No new educational program shall be developed or instituted at any institution of higher education except with the committee's approval. No educational program for which the legislature has made an appropriation existing at any institution of higher education shall be abandoned except with legislative approval.

(b) Physical plant. The committee shall adopt a coordinated plan for the integration and most efficient use of existing facilities and personnel, and an order of

priority for the construction of new facilities at the University of Wisconsin and the state colleges.

(c) Budget requests. The committee shall review the separate budget requests of the university and the state colleges, the budget requests of the state board of vocational and adult education for state aid to vocational, technical and adult schools in support of post high school collegiate transfer and technical education programs and shall recommend a single, consolidated, biennial budget request to the governor for the support of all institutions under its jurisdiction, retaining the identity of the appropriation sections contained in ch. 20 relating to said institutions. It shall also review and make appropriate recommendations to the department concerning the biennial budget requests of the department of public instruction for state aids for county teachers colleges.

(d) Grants to institutions. The committee shall establish a plan which will encourage and promote grants by private individuals and agencies to all such institutions.

(e) Legislative recommendations. The committee shall continuously study the needs of the people of Wisconsin for state-supported higher education and recommend any legislative proposals needed to carry out its decisions resulting from such study.

(g) Report. Semiannually the committee shall issue reports of its findings and recommendations, which reports shall be delivered to the board of regents of the University of Wisconsin, the board of regents of the state colleges, the state board of vocational and adult education, the boards of the several county teachers colleges, the governor, to both houses of the legislature when in session, and to the executive secretary of the legislative council when the legislature is not in session. The first such report of findings and recommendations shall be made 6 months from the date of first convening of the committee.

(i) Duties and functions of existing boards. The coordinating committee has final authority in determining the single, consolidated, biennial budget requests of the University of Wisconsin and the state colleges and that portion of the budget request of the state board of vocational and adult education described in para. (e) to be presented to the governor and has full responsibility for such presentation. The over-all educational programs offered in the state-supported institutions of higher education shall be those determined by the coordinating committee and facilities and personnel shall be utilized in accordance with the coordinated plan adopted by the committee. The boards of regents and the state board of vocational and adult education in the discharge of their duties shall observe all decisions of the coordinating committee made pursuant to this section. Except as expressly

provided in this section, nothing herein shall be construed to deprive the board of regents of the university, the board of regents of the state colleges, the state board of vocational and adult education and boards of county teachers colleges of any of the duties and powers conferred upon them by law in the government of the institutions under their control.

Within 30 days after the enactment of this act, the regents of the University of Wisconsin, the board of regents of state colleges and the state board of vocational and adult education shall each meet to select their respective member on the coordinating committee for higher education. Upon the selection by each group of its member, the terms of such group's former appointed members shall terminate. Thereafter, appointments shall be made at the time prescribed under section 39.024 (2) (a) of the statutes.

If the executive director or any professional staff of the coordinating committee for higher education are appointed from the faculty or staff of any of the higher education institutions participating in the coordinating committee, such institution shall grant the appointee a leave of absence for the duration of his service with the coordinating committee, and his tenure at the institution shall in no way be affected by the granting of such leave of absence.

This bill is declared to be an emergency appropriation bill, recommended by the joint committee on finance, in accordance with the requirements of section 16.47 (2) of the statutes.

(3) (j) Interstate agreements. The coordinating committee with the approval of the joint committee on finance if the legislature is in session or the board on government operations if the legislature is recessed or adjourned or the governing boards of the systems under its jurisdiction, with the approval of the coordinating committee; and the joint committee on finance if the legislature is in session or the board on government operations if the legislature is recessed or adjourned, may enter into agreements or understandings which include remission of nonresident tuition for designated categories of students at state institutions of higher education with appropriate state agencies and institutions of higher education in other states to facilitate utilization of public higher educational institutions of this state and other states. Such agreements and understandings shall have as their purpose the mutual improvement of educational advantages for residents of this state and such other states or institutions of other states with whom agreements are made.

Statute governing Coordinating Committee scholarship committee as amended by Chapter 257, Laws of 1965.

20.776 (1) Nonresident tuition payments. There is appropriated from the general fund to the state scholarship committee, on July 1, 1966, and annually thereafter, \$170,000 as a nonlapsing appropriation to reimburse state residents for tuition paid as approved in s. 36.165 (4). The administrative detail of disbursing such funds shall be handled by existing personnel of the University of Wisconsin specifically designated to draw on this account by the scholarship committee.

36.165 (1) State scholarship committee. The coordinating committee for higher education shall establish a state scholarship committee to provide scholarships on a statewide basis and seek out talented students who can best benefit from such scholarships.

(2) The scholarship committee shall select a chairman and secretary. The secretary shall keep a record of the proceedings and determinations of the committee. The committee shall establish rules and standards governing a scholarship program which it shall administer. Such rules and standards shall be consistent with law. Eligibility for scholarships shall be based on scholarship ranking. The committee shall encourage the creation of local scholarship committees in the counties and municipalities of the state and the raising of private funds for scholarships and for use by the state and local scholarship committees in carrying out their functions. Out of funds appropriated to or otherwise received by them for such purposes the state scholarship committee may establish and grant scholarships to persons eligible for scholarships, subject to such rules and standards and the requirements of sub. (4) and ss. 36.161 and 37.11 (12) and (13).

(4) Any person entitled to exemption from nonresident tuition as enumerated in s. 36.16 (1) (a) who has completed at least one year of collegiate work and who is attending or has been admitted to a public institution of higher education in another state or an institution of higher education in this state to engage in a first professional degree course of study in veterinary medicine, architecture, forestry or dentistry which is not offered in a Wisconsin public institution of higher education may apply to the scholarship committee for the difference between the tuition he is required to pay and the resident fees he would have paid as a resident student at the University of Wisconsin. If the committee determines that the applicant is eligible under this subsection and that his academic record indicates that he is capable of benefiting from the instruction, the committee may grant the application. Payments shall be made to applicants on the certification of the chairman and secretary of the scholarship committee. No payment for any one individual shall exceed \$500 per academic year consisting of 2 academic semesters or 3 academic quarters.

APPENDIX B

DISTRIBUTION AND AVAILABILITY OF POST HIGH SCHOOL EDUCATION INSTITUTIONS IN WISCONSIN

Listed are cities and towns in which there is located one or more higher educational institutions. The institutions listed include the 4 present and authorized University of Wisconsin campuses and 13 UW centers; the 9 Wisconsin State University campuses and their 4 branches; the 41 full-time, 2-year Vocational, Technical and Adult Education Schools; the 15 County Teachers Colleges presently operating; and the 21 private universities and colleges.

City (County)	Population	Institutions	Total institutions in approx. same area
Algoma (Kewaunee)	3,855 (18,282)	Co. teachers col.	1 Univ. of Wisconsin 2 UW centers 3 VTA schools 2 county teachers col. 2 private colleges
Antigo (Langlade)	9,691 (19,916)	VTA school Co. teachers col.	1 UW center 4 VTA schools 1 county teachers col.
Appleton (Outagamie)	48,411 (101,794)	VTA school Lawrence Univ.	1 Univ. of Wisconsin 2 UW centers 1 WS University 6 VTA schools 1 county teachers col. 2 private colleges
Ashland (Ashland)	10,132 (17,375)	VTA school Co. teachers col. Northland Col.	1 VTA school 1 county teachers col. 1 private college
Baraboo (Sauk)	7,660 (36,887)	UW center (1968)	1 Univ. of Wisconsin 1 UW center 1 WSU branch 2 VTA schools 3 county teachers col. 1 private college

City (County)	Population	Institutions	Total institutions in approx. same area
Beaver Dam (Dodge)	13,113 (63,170)	VTA school	1 Univ. of Wisconsin 2 UW centers 1 WSU branch 8 VTA schools 2 county teachers col. 5 private colleges
Beloit (Rock)	32,846 (113,913)	VTA school Beloit College	1 Univ. of Wisconsin 1 UW center 1 WS University 6 VTA schools 4 private colleges
Burlington (Racine)	5,856 (141,781)	St. Francis College	2 Univ. of Wisconsin 3 UW centers 1 WS University 7 VTA schools 1 county teachers col. 8 private colleges
Chippewa Falls (Chippewa)	11,708 (45,096)	VTA school	2 WS Universities 2 WSU branches 3 VTA schools 1 private college 1 county teachers col.
Columbus (Columbia)	3,467 (36,708)	County teachers col.	1 Univ. of Wisconsin 1 UW center 3 VTA schools 3 county teachers col. 1 private college
Cudahy (Milwaukee)	17,975 (1,036,047)	VTA school	1 Univ. of Wisconsin 3 UW centers 8 VTA schools 1 county teachers col. 7 private colleges
De Pere (Brown)	10,045 (125,082)	St. Norbert College	1 Univ. of Wisconsin 2 UW centers 4 VTA schools 2 county teachers col. 2 private colleges

City (County)	Population	Institutions	Total Institutions in approx. same area
Eau Claire (Eau Claire)	37,987 (58,300)	WS University VTA school	2 WS Universities 2 VTA schools
Fond du Lac (Fond du Lac)	32,719 (75,085)	WSU branch (1968) VTA school Marian College	3 UW centers 1 WS University 1 WSU branch 7 VTA schools 2 county teachers col. 3 private colleges
Fort Atkinson (Jefferson)	7,908 (50,094)	VTA school	1 Univ. of Wisconsin 2 UW centers 1 WS University 8 VTA schools 2 county teachers col. 5 private colleges
Frederic (Polk)	857 (2,268)	County teachers col. (to close in 1968)	1 WS University 1 WSU branch 1 VTA school 1 county teachers col.
Green Bay (Brown)	62,888 (125,082)	Univ. of Wis. (1969) UW center VTA school	1 Univ. of Wisconsin 2 UW centers 4 VTA schools 2 county teachers col. 2 private colleges
Janesville (Rock)	35,164 (113,913)	UW center VTA school	1 Univ. of Wisconsin 1 UW center 1 WS University 6 VTA schools 4 private colleges
Kaukauna (Outagamie)	10,096 (101,794)	VTA school County teachers col.	1 Univ. of Wisconsin 2 UW centers 1 WS University 6 VTA schools 1 county teachers col. 2 private colleges

City (County)	Population	Institutions	Total Institutions in approx. same areas
Kenosha (Kenosha)	67,899 (100,615)	Univ. of Wis. (1969) UW center VTA school Carthage College	1 Univ. of Wisconsin 2 UW centers 1 WS University 2 VTA schools 1 county teachers col. 3 private colleges
La Crosse (La Crosse)	47,575 (72,465)	WS University VTA school Viterbo College	1 WS University 1 VTA school 1 county teachers col. 1 private college
Ladysmith (Rusk)	3,584 (14,794)	Mt. Senario College	2 WSU branches 2 VTA schools 1 private college
Madison (Dane)	157,844 (222,095)	Univ. of Wisconsin VTA school Edgewood College	1 Univ. of Wisconsin 2 UW centers 7 VTA schools 3 county teachers col. 4 private colleges
Manitowoc (Manitowoc)	32,275 (75,215)	UW center VTA school County teachers col. Holy Family College	1 Univ. of Wisconsin 3 UW centers 4 VTA schools 2 county teachers col. 3 private colleges
Marinette (Marinette)	13,329 (34,660)	UW center VTA school	1 UW center 1 VTA school
Marr' field (Wood)	14,153 (59,105)	UW center VTA school	2 UW centers 1 WS University 4 VTA schools
Mayville (Dodge)	3,607 (63,170)	County teachers col.	1 Univ. of Wisconsin 2 UW centers 1 WSU branch 8 VTA schools 2 county teachers col. 5 private colleges

City (County)	Population	Institutions	Total institutions in approx. same area
Medford (Taylor)	3,260 (17,843)	WSU branch (1969) County teachers col.	1 UW center 1 WSU branch 3 VTA schools 1 county teachers col. 1 private college
Menasha (Winnebago)	14,647 (107,928)	UW center VTA school	1 UW center 1 WS University 1 WSU branch 6 VTA schools 2 county teachers col. 3 private colleges
Menomonie (Dunn)	8,624 (26,156)	WS University	2 WS Universities 1 WSU branch 3 VTA schools 1 county teachers col.
Merrill (Lincoln)	9,541 (22,338)	VTA school	1 UW center 1 WSU branch 3 VTA schools 3 county teachers col.
Milton (Rock)	1,671 (113,913)	Milton College	1 Univ. of Wisconsin 1 UW center 1 WS University 6 VTA schools 4 private colleges
Milwaukee (Milwaukee)	741,324 (1,036,047)	Univ. of Wisconsin VTA school Marquette Univ. Alverno College Cardinal Stritch Col. Mt. Mary College	1 Univ. of Wisconsin 3 UW centers 8 VTA schools 1 county teachers col. 7 private colleges
Neenah (Winnebago)	18,057 (107,928)	VTA school	1 UW center 1 WS University 1 WSU branch 6 VTA schools 2 county teachers col. 3 private colleges

City (County)	Population	Institutions	Total Institutions in approx. same area
New Lisbon (Juneau)	1,337 (17,490)	County teachers col.	2 UW centers 2 VTA schools 2 county teachers col.
Oshkosh (Winnebago)	45,110 (107,928)	WS University VTA school	1 UW center 1 WS University 1 WSU branch 6 VTA schools 2 county teachers col. 3 private colleges
Platteville (Grant)	6,957 (44,419)	WS University	1 WS University 1 WSU branch
Port Washington (Ozaukee)	5,984 (38,441)	VTA school	1 Univ. of Wisconsin 3 UW centers 7 VTA schools 1 county teachers col. 6 private colleges
Racine (Racine)	89,144 (141,781)	UW center VTA school Dominican College	2 Univ. of Wisconsin 3 UW centers 1 WS University 7 VTA schools 1 county teachers col. 8 private colleges
Fredsborg (Sauk)	4,371 (36,887)	County teachers col.	1 Univ. of Wisconsin 1 UW center 1 WSU branch 2 VTA schools 3 county teachers col. 1 private college
Rhineland (Oneida)	8,790 (22,112)	VTA school	3 VTA schools 1 county teachers col.
Rice Lake (Barron)	7,303 (34,270)	WSU branch VTA school	1 Univ. of Wisconsin 1 WS University 1 WSU branch 2 VTA schools 1 county teachers col.

City (County)	Population	Institutions	Total Institutions in approx. same area
Richland Center (Richland)	4,746 (17,684)	WSU branch (1967)	1 UW center 1 WSU branch 2 county teachers col.
Ripon (Fond du Lac)	6,163 (75,085)	Ripon College	3 UW centers 1 WS University 1 WSU branch 7 VTA schools 2 county teachers col. 3 private colleges
River Falls (Pierce)	4,857 (22,503)	WS University	2 WS Universities
Sheboygan (Sheboygan)	45,747 (86,484)	UW center VTA school Lakeland College	3 UW centers 1 WSU branch 6 VTA schools 2 county teachers col. 4 private colleges
Sheboygan Falls (Sheboygan)	4,061 (86,484)	County teachers col.	3 UW centers 1 WSU branch 6 VTA schools 2 county teachers col. 4 private colleges
So. Milwaukee (Milwaukee)	20,307 (1,036,047)	VTA school	1 Univ. of Wisconsin 2 UW centers 8 VTA schools 1 county teachers col. 7 private colleges
Stevens Point (Portage)	17,837 (36,964)	WS University VTA school	2 UW centers 1 WS University 3 VTA schools 1 county teachers col.
Stoughton (Dane)	5,555 (222,095)	VTA school	1 Univ. of Wisconsin 2 UW centers 7 VTA schools 3 county teachers col. 4 private colleges

City (County)	Population	Institutions	Total Institutions in approx. same area
Sturgeon Bay (Door)	7,353 (20,685)	VTA school	1 county teachers col.
Superior (Douglas)	33,563 (45,008)	WS University VTA school	1 WS University 1 VTA school
Two Rivers (Manitowoc)	12,393 (75,215)	VTA school	1 Univ. of Wisconsin 3 UW centers 4 VTA schools 2 county teachers col. 3 private colleges
Union Grove (Racine)	1,970 (141,781)	County teachers col.	2 Univ. of Wisconsin 3 UW centers 1 WS University 7 VTA schools 1 county teachers col. 8 private colleges
Viroqua (Vernon)	3,926 (25,663)	County teachers col. (to close 1968)	1 WSU branch 1 county teachers col.
Watertown (Jefferson)	13,943 (50,094)	VTA school Northwestern College	1 Univ. of Wisconsin 2 UW centers 1 WS University 8 VTA schools 2 county teachers col. 5 private colleges
Waukesha (Waukesha)	30,004 (158,249)	UW center VTA schools Carroll College	1 Univ. of Wisconsin 3 UW centers 1 WS University 11 VTA schools 2 county teachers col. 8 private colleges
Wausau (Marathon)	31,943 (88,874)	UW center VTA school	2 UW centers 1 WS University 1 WSU branch 6 VTA schools 2 county teachers col.

City (County)	Population	Institutions	Total Institutions in approx. same area
Wautoma (Waushara)	1,466 (153,249)	County teachers col.	1 UW center 2 WS Universities 4 VTA schools 1 county teachers col.
West Allis (Milwaukee)	68,157 (1,036,047)	VTA school	1 Univ. of Wisconsin 3 UW centers 8 VTA schools 1 county teachers col. 7 private colleges
West Bend (Washington)	9,969 (46,119)	UW center (1968) VTA school	1 Univ. of Wisconsin 3 UW centers 1 WSU branch 10 VTA schools 2 county teachers col. 8 private colleges
Whitewater (Walworth)	6,380 (52,368)	WS University	1 Univ. of Wisconsin 4 UW centers 1 WS University 7 VTA schools 1 county teachers col. 7 private colleges
Wisconsin Rapids (Wood)	15,042 (59,105)	VTA school	2 UW centers 1 WS University 4 VTA schools