DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 174 182 HE 011 709

AUTHOR Floyd, Carol Everly
TITLE Conflict Between the State Coordinating Board and the Principal State University: Illinois During Rapid Higher Education Growth. ASHE Annual Meeting 1979 Paper.
PUB DATE Apr 79
NOTE 22p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Association for the Study of Higher Education (Washington, D.C., April 1979)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Advisory Committees; College Administration; *Facility Expansion; Governing Boards; *Government School Relationship; Higher Education; *Institutional Autonomy; Interviews; Mass Media; Multicampus Colleges; Political Influences; *Political Issues; Power Structure; Publicize; State Agencies; *State Boards of Education; *State Universities
IDENTIFIERS *ASHE Annual Meeting 1979; Branch Campuses; Public Higher Education; *University of Illinois

ABSTRACT

The political factors underlying the ability of the Illinois Board of Higher Education to prevent the development of additional new campuses as part of the University of Illinois are analyzed. The primary factors underlying the board's success are: (1) its investment in winning the issue because of the threat to its goals and survival; (2) the use of language and political symbolism; and (3) disinterest of significant political actors. Information is drawn from the printed public record (board and university reports, board and university trustee board minutes, and advisory committee reports), news articles and editorials, and individual interviews. Background information is provided on the organizational history of Illinois public higher education and growth in the 1960's. (Author/MSE)

# CONFLICT BETWEEN THE STATE COORDINATING BOARD AND THE PRINCIPAL STATE UNIVERSITY: ILLINOIS DURING RAPID HIGHER EDUCATION GROWTH

Carol Everly Floyd

Illinois Board of Regents





Prepared for delivery at the 1979 Annual Meeting of the Association for the Study of Higher Education, Washington, D.C., April 18-19, 1979.

Association for the Study of Higher Education
The George Washington University
One Dupont Circle, Suite 630
Washington, D.C. 20036
(202) 296-2597

This paper was presented at the Annual Meeting of the Association for the Study of Higher Education held at the Washington Hilton in Washington, D.C. April 18-19, 1979. This paper was reviewed by ASHE and was judged to be of high quality and of interest to others concerned with the research of higher education. It has therefore been selected to be included in the ERIC collection of ASHE conference papers.

CONFLICT BETWEEN THE STATE COORDINATING BOARD AND THE PRINCIPAL STATE UNIVERSITY: ILLINOIS DURING RAPID HIGHER EDUCATION GROWTH

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

During the 1960's, the Illinois Board of Higher Education, a regulatory coordinating board, sought to provide strong leadership in master planning for meeting rapidly rising enrollment demands. The University of Illinois, the principal state university, hoped to add new campuses in urban areas and develop partially on the model of the University of California system. In spite of a number of strong assertions by the University of Illinois of its case for the new campuses, the Illinois Board of Higher Education was not inclined toward the further expansion of the University of Illinois. In the end, the two new university campuses established in the 1960's were placed under governing boards other than the University of Illinois Board of Trustees.

The author will analyze the political factors underlying the ability of the Illinois Board of Higher Education to prevent the development of additional new

---

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

campuses as a part of the University of Illinois. The primary factors underlying the Board of Higher Education's success are:

1. the total investment of the Board in winning the issue because of the level of threat to its institutional goals and survival;

2. the skillful use by Board leadership of language, some of which involved political symbolism;

3. disinterest of significant political actors with regard to the issue.

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

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

## I. ORGANIZATIONAL HISTORY OF ILLINOIS PUBLIC HIGHER EDUCATION[1]

### A. Prior to Establishment of Board of Higher Education

In 1960 there were three governing boards for all state public four-year higher education institutions: the University of Illinois Board of Trustees, the Southern Illinois University Board of Trustees, and the Teachers College Board. In 1960 the University of Illinois was the only comprehensive public university in Illinois. Southern Illinois University's teaching, research, and

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

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

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

The genesis of the Illinois Board of Higher Education can be seen as arising from a coincidence of legislative desires to avoid mediating disputes between competing universities and expert opinions on the need for the coordinated development of higher education. The competition, which had been confined in the 1940's and 1950's to the University of Illinois and Southern Illinois University, was broadening with the transformation of the former teachers colleges into developing universities. The advisory Commission on Higher Education (established by the legislature in 1954) was frequently ignored by the universities who took their requests directly to the legislature.

The legislature passed and the Governor signed the bill creating the Illinois Board of Higher Education in 1961. The basic powers of the Board are in three

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

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

## II. ILLINOIS HIGHER EDUCATION GROWTH IN THE 1960'S

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

Beginning in the early 1960's, the University of Illinois expressed interest in adding new campuses and thus developing on the model of the University of California. As a culmination of its long-range planning efforts, the University of Illinois presented a proposal entitled "The University of Illinois and Plans for the Future" to the Illinois Board of Higher Education late in 1964. The University of Illinois proposed to continue its long-term planning for four-year campuses in the heavily populated areas of Illinois (Chicago, Peoria, Springfield, Decatur, Rockford, and Rock Island). It also sought immediate approval to operate a higher education program at Navy Pier in Chicago, the site which was being abandoned as the University of Illinois at Chicago Circle was being completed. The Navy Pier campus, it was suggested, was to serve to meet the immediate needs for college spaces and would exist on a temporary basis. The university proposal was labeled "empire-building" in a number of quarters and particularly so by the private universities who were concerned about the effect of any further expansion of the University of Illinois upon their own enrollment prospects. Questions were raised as to why the proposal had not been made earlier while the Illinois Board of Higher Education was formulating Master Plan I and how the plan coordinated with junior college development.

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

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

In Fall 1967 the Illinois Board of Higher Education established a subcommittee to consider the questions of general location, function, and governance of the two new campuses. The determination that any new campus be for junior, senior and graduate students only grew out of discussions regarding Master Plan II and was not particularly controversial. All four university governing boards presented papers to the Special Committee with regard to the governance question. Only the University of Illinois seemed to regard its proposal as more than perfunctory. In Spring 1967, at the time the bill establishing the Board of Regents had gone through the legislature, a legislative friend of Southern Illinois

University had introduced a bill providing for the Southern Illinois University Board of Trustees to govern Illinois State University and Northern Illinois University and the new Springfield campus. That bill was quickly killed.

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

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

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

## III. INSTITUTIONAL GOALS AND SURVIVAL

One factor in the Illinois Board of Higher Education's success in denying to the University of Illinois jurisdiction over the two new campuses provided for in Master Plan II was the greater intensity of the Board leadership in winning on the issue. The Illinois Board of Higher Education leadership was convinced it must win because of the very strong threat to goals central to its self-maintenance

posed by actions of the University of Illinois. It does not appear that the University of Illinois felt particularly threatened. This perspective draws upon concepts introduced by organizational theorists including Philip Selznick[2] and Herbert Simon et. al.[3] in the 1950's. According to that perspective, institutions are very likely to resist redefinition of organizational goals. Anything which is likely to effect a redefinition of an organizational goal will be perceived as a threat to the institution's survival. Any organization which presses for redefinition of another organization's goals or prevents another organization's goal attainment will almost certainly be strongly resisted. The degree of threat an institution will feel when attainment of a goal is blocked will depend on the importance of the goal.

The importance of the goal of development of new campuses to the University of Illinois is evidenced by the frequent articulation of the goal during the period 1963-67 and repeated efforts aimed at the attainment of that goal. There is, however, no suggestion in either the written record or in the interviews that the author conducted with those who had held leadership positions at the University during the 1963-69 period that suggests that the University considered new campuses to be of the first order of importance.

The goal of providing strong leadership in statewide planning, grounded in the statutory master planning function, was clearly the most important goal of the Illinois Board of Higher Education. The powers of budget review and program approval were used by the Board to support the master planning function. Palola et. al. in commentary on Illinois planning experiences note the fears of the Board of Higher Education at the time the University made its proposal to reopen Navy Pier. The Board feared that University of Illinois statewide planning initiatives would draw attention away from their own. If the University of Illinois consistently presented plans for its own development prior to the regularized process connected with the stages of Board master planning, attention would be

focused on these University of Illinois plans. Under those circumstances, Palola et. al. conclude that the Board would not be able to set the agenda for the master planning process.[4] Palola et. al. view the Board of Higher Education as having faced major threats to its planning authority in the aggressive planning of the University of Illinois to reopen Navy Pier and to govern the new campuses provided for in Master Plan II.[5]

Board Executive Director Lyman Glenny expressed concerns in explicitly political terms about possible University blocking of Board goal attainment. In the Fall of 1967, Glenny was convinced that the assignment of either of the two planned campuses to the University of Illinois would make it virtually impossible for the Illinois Board of Higher Education to effectively perform any of the functions it had been assigned. If the University of Illinois were assigned any new campuses, it would tend to dominate the whole system of public higher education. The political resources of the University of Illinois, already very substantial, would be augmented, making it almost certain that the University could "capture" the Board and transform it into an appendage. The Board would pass away as a policy-maker, Glenny continued, if it lacked more than one of the following political resources: the backing and confidence of the governor, a balance of power among the public colleges and universities, and the support of a significant portion of the legislature. The support of the governor was the sole political resource of which the Board could feel assured. If the University of Illinois Board of Trustees was assigned governance of any additional campuses, Glenny was convinced, the balance of power among the public colleges and universities, which was already strained because of the University's size, would be completely destroyed. The increased services the University would provide to the legislature from a Springfield campus would further increase its support in the legislature.[6]

In sum, the goal of providing strong leadership in statewide master planning was central to Illinois Board of Higher Education survival as a significant

policy-making entity because master planning was the major function it had been assigned by statute. The Board leadership felt that the attainment of its primary goal was being blocked by University planning and that the addition of new campuses to the University would increase the political resources of the University to such an extent that it would be virtually impossible for the Board to exert any leadership.

## IV. LANGUAGE

The Board of Higher Education developed new terms for discussion within which it was exceedingly difficult for the University to make its case for the new campuses planned to implement Master Plan II. Certain symbols were useful to the Illinois Board of Higher Education in justifying its position because of their roots in American political tradition and because they could be used to reflect negatively upon the University of Illinois.

### A. Terms for Discussion

With the varied evolutions of former teachers colleges toward a more traditional university mold and the establishment of the junior college system, the Board of Higher Education staff started to develop new terms for discussing higher education. The terms of most significance were "system of systems".

The "system of systems" terminology was used to analyze the governance of higher education in the report of the master planning committee on governance which preceded Master Plan II and in the commentary accompanying the recommendations on governance in Master Plan II. The terminology was never formally adopted by the Board. In the thought frame of "system of systems", each of the systems consisted of a governing board and the institutions it governed. It was suggested that each system should have functional unity and cohesion. Differentiations were made between systems in terms of the breadth of the undergraduate curriculum,

diversity of professional schools, development of graduate programs, and involvement in research and public service. Five types of public higher education institutions were identified:

1. the fully developed, complex, multi-purpose university (University of Illinois)

2. the rapidly developing, complex, multi-purpose university (Southern Illinois University)

3. the "liberal arts" university (Northern Illinois University and Illinois State University)

4. State universities and colleges--institutions with more limited scope than the "liberal arts" universities

5. junior and community colleges

The recommendation, in Master Plan II, that the Board of Regents be established to govern the institutions identified as "liberal arts" universities was consistent with that typology.

Given the consensus of the Special Committee that both new campuses planned pursuant to Master Plan II should have a limited curriculum with few graduate or professional programs but with somewhat greater breadth for Springfield, the University of Illinois found it difficult to present its case for the campuses using the "system of systems" perspective. The University argued that a broader function in graduate education and public affairs research was appropriate for the Springfield campus and that the institutional typology was irrelevant and never formally adopted by the Board. These arguments had little effect.

One rationale provided by the Special Committee for the governance assignments was that the function for the Springfield campus, which included some post-masters education, was similar to that of the Board of Regents institutions and that the more limited function for the Chicago area campus was consistent with institutional functions in the Board of Governors system.[7]

B. Political Symbols

A perspective on political symbols is drawn from Murray Edelman's The Symbolic Uses of Politics.[8] Edelman sees political symbols as a major legitimator of political activity and even as the major political resource that can be employed on certain issues. Although symbols would not appear to be as significant in the politics of higher education as they are in some other areas, they were significant in the case being examined. The symbols employed fit into the category that Edelman terms "hortatory." In hortatory language, there is a particular attempt by one group to persuade others that the policies they support should be accepted generally. The denotations of the content are quite ambiguous and unstable. Examples of such symbols are the "public interest" and the "national security". Such words mean different things to different people and are therefore generally efficacious.[9] The "balance of power" symbol was frequently employed by Illinois Board of Higher Education Executive Director Lyman Glenny during deliberations on the governing board assignment for the two new campuses.

At the meetings of the Special Committee, Glenny suggested that the power of any of the systems of higher education in Illinois was shown in numbers of students (undergraduate, graduate, and professional), number of faculty and staff, operating and capital budget, and plant investment. Charts were displayed at the meetings of the Special Committee which compared the four university systems. Comparisons were made of full-time equivalent undergraduate, graduate and professional enrollments; full-time equivalent faculty and staff; operating budgets; capital budgets; and plant investment. These charts were prominently included in the report of the Special Committee. At the same time that the charts were displayed at the meetings of the Special Committee, it was pointed out that a great deal of political power would accrue to the governing board to which the Springfield campus was assigned.

The report of the Special Committee highlighted the "balance of power" symbol at some length including the following:

> The people of the United States have developed certain concepts over a long period of time, for dealing with problems of power. Basic to these concepts is the idea of balance between and among various groups as a means of providing fair treatment of those with little power and preventing large interests or combinations from promoting their own goals at the expense of broader public needs. The concepts of divisions of powers and of checks and balances are indeed the central framework of the United States Constitution, and have since been extended to other areas of life and living, including higher education.[10]

Although it was relatively easy to demonstrate the massive resources and potential political power of the University of Illinois, it was difficult to lend credibility to the suggestion that there was a major danger to higher education as a whole of possible University exercise of that power. The most direct explanation of that danger that was made by Illinois Board of Higher Education leadership as a part of the public record came from the chairman of the Special Committee on the completion of its report:

> It is simply human nature, if too great an amount of power be allowed to accumulate in any segment of higher education, there is a tendency for that segment to drain off resources which would otherwise be needed for the sustenance and maintenance of other education programs and the meeting of other educational needs.[11]

It appears that perceptions of University of Illinois efforts to promote the 1964-65 proposal to continue to operate on Navy Pier and to plan for other campuses throughout the state also lent at least some degree of credibility to that suggestion. It was agreed by nearly all individuals interviewed by the author as a part of this study that the University of Illinois was stuck after its promotion of the Navy Pier proposal with a bad image. There were, of course, major differences among interviewees as to the degree to which the bad image was justified. Interviews sources and editorials suggest that the University of Illinois was thought at the time of the Navy Pier controversy to be improperly throwing its weight around by most individuals not associated with the University of Illinois.[12] The "balance of power" symbol was useful to the Board of Higher

Education leadership in gaining acceptance of its position by the press. The two Chicago major daily newspapers owned by Field Enterprises accepted the position that the two new campuses must not be connected with the University of Illinois in editorials which relied strongly on "balance of power" symbolism.[13] The Chicago Tribune which might have been expected to be sympathetic to the University opposed new campuses for the University on the grounds that the state could not afford additional campuses which would take parity with Urbana-Champaign as their goal.[14]

V. DISINTEREST OF SIGNIFICANT POLITICAL ACTORS

Undoubtedly the University of Illinois as the principal state university has significant political resources which help in gaining legitimation and financial support for its activities. Allan Rosenbaum finds these resources to include: a governing board elected by the voters; service to multiple constituencies, particularly highly organized interests such as labor and agriculture; a tradition of non-involvement of political leaders in academic affairs; and the functioning of a client-patron relationship between some key legislators and the university.[15]

Such political resources do not assure that the university is in a strong position on every issue. There was in fact no major source of political support for the University on the new campus governance assignment issue.

The lack of legislative interest deserves some exploration in order to identify the factors which prevented the University from getting the legislature to make the decision itself on the governance assignments instead of delegating it to the Board or overturning the Board's decision.

One observer finds that leaving the decision to the Board was consistent with legislative attitudes observed in previous years. The legislature was interested in decisions concerning the number of new campuses, their locations, and the size of their budget. Issues beyond these were considered to be "detail" and therefore not of major concern to the legislature. The decision was considered "detail"

because no major material benefits would be distributed on the basis of the governance decision. The disinterest was reinforced in a number of instances, including that of the new campuses governance assignments, because there was a chance that these issues would be controversial.[16]

The client-patron relationship which existed between the University of Illinois and Illinois Senator Everett Peters (who represented the district in which the University's Urbana-Champaign campus is located during the period 1940-70) has been described as the University's most important political resource insofar as immediate political problems such as avoiding a budget cut or getting legislative approval for a particular new building were concerned.[17] That relationship was not, however, a major political resource for the University with regard to winning the governance of the two new campuses planned pursuant to Master Plan II. During Spring 1967, Senator Peters was very cool to University hopes to be assigned the Springfield and Chicago campuses. He had reservations about a new Chicago area campus while the University's Chicago Circle campus was not yet fully developed. He disliked becoming involved in the battle over Senate Bill 955 because of the strong legislative lobbying effort carried on by the supporters of the private schools who were attempting to block new public campuses. Peters made it clear to the University that he would not be the principal supporter of Senate Bill 955 or become involved in an effort to amend the bill to include assignment of the two new campuses to the University.[18]

The University of Illinois' strong dependence in its general legislative strategy on one senator as power-broker for its interests put the University in a very weak position when that senator would not become involved in an issue. The University's general political circumstances were less strong than those of the principal state university in some other Midwestern states where public higher education depended less on the brokerage of interests and more on status as a universal good. The lower priority attached to higher education than in other

Midwestern states was related to the larger role of the private sector which enrolled approximately forty percent of all students and greater exporting of students to other states. The University drew few benefits from ties to University graduates in the legislature because the great majority of legislators had attended private institutions in Illinois or elsewhere.

After the Illinois Board of Higher Education made its decision to assign the Springfield campus to the Board of Regents and the Chicago campus to the Board of Governors, it would have been virtually impossible for the University of Illinois to convince the legislature not to routinely pass bills creating the new universities and assigning them for governance as the Illinois Board of Higher Education had recommended. Once a legislature delegates a decision to another body, it is unlikely to question the decision that the delegatee has made unless new material benefits are for the first time perceived to be connected with the question or unless the delegatee's decision is extremely unpopular. From the time that Senate Bill 955 was passed until Spring 1969 when the bills formally creating the new universities were before the legislature, there is no indication that any new material benefits were perceived to be connected with the governance questions. Also, the Illinois Board of Higher Education had been quite successful in developing symbols, particularly those relating to "balance of power," justifying its position to the general public, which were well received by a number of newspapers.

It should also be noted that the governor stayed out of the new campus governance controversy entirely. Governor Otto Kerner's (1961-68) policy was essentially to approve the decisions of the Illinois Board of Higher Education on all higher education matters. He had chosen both the Board Chairman and Executive Director carefully and was very confident of their decision-making abilities. Kerner was also particularly concerned that the strength of the Board be maintained so that university competition be kept in check and not become an issue for the governor. The only higher education issue on which Kerner was heavily

involved was the decision on the number of new campuses to be built pursuant to Master Plan II. Kerner insisted that the number must be limited to two because that was the maximum number which could be "gotten through" the legislature. In 1969 when the bills creating the two new universities and assigning them to governing boards were in the legislature, the newly elected governor. Richard Ogilvie avoided involvement in a matter dealt with primarily during his predecessor's term. The issue involved would not be recurrent and the Board's decision was not unpopular. Neither Governor Kerner nor Governor Ogilvie was an alumnus of the University of Illinois nor had any other particular tie to it.

CONCLUDING ANALYSIS

The analysis has provided an understanding of the political factors underlying the settlement of issues between a regulatory coordinating board and a principal state university during the period of rapid higher education growth in the 1960's. Events in Illinois during the 1960's illustrate the considerable political success of the regulatory coordinating board on an issue it identifies as crucial, on which it can effectively employ political symbols, and which seems to interest no significant external university constituency. Inasmuch as the Illinois Board of Higher Education was regarded during the 1960's as about the strongest of the regulatory coordinating boards, the considerable strength shown in this case is probably not entirely typical.

During the mid-1970's in Illinois, as in a number of other states, conflict between the coordinating board and principal state university has been less pronounced than during the 1960's. Major political issues focus no longer on master planning for growth but rather on accommodating to circumstances where higher education is a somewhat lower priority and overall state revenue is tight. The most prominent conflict is that between the governor (along with his budget office) and the coalition of public universities led by the University of Illinois. Under those circumstances, the Illinois Board of Higher Education's primary political

problem is maintaining a delicate balance of its position between the executive branch and higher education.[19]

FOOTNOTES

[1]Samuel K. Gove and Carol Everly Floyd, "The Politics of Public Higher Education: Illinois," AAUP Bulletin, LIX (September, 1973), pp. 287-93.

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

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

[4]Ernest Palola, Timothy W. Lehnmann, and William R. Blishchke, Higher Education by Design: The Sociology of Planning (Berkeley: University of California, Center for Research and Development in Higher Education, 1970), pp. 345-46.

[5]Ibid., p. 347.

[6]Interview with Glenny in early 1968 cited in Carl Grafton, "Coordination of State Universities in Illinois and Indiana," unpublished doctoral dissertation, Purdue University, 1970, pp. 103-13.

[7]Questions of consistency about the rationale are raised in Palola et. al., op. cit., p. 320.

[8]Murray Edelman, The Symbolic Uses of Politics (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1964).

[9]Ibid., pp. 114, 116, 134, 135.

[10]Special Committee on New Senior Institutions, Report of the Special Committee on New Senior Institutions to the Board, December 1967, pp. 38-39.

[11]Chicago Daily News, December 21, 1967.

[12]Confidential Interviews. Editorial, Bloomington Daily Pantagraph, January 4, 1965. Editorial, Chicago Tribune, February 3, 1965.

[13]Editorials, Chicago Sun-Times, November 13 and 24, 1967. Editorials, Chicago Daily News, November 11 and December 28, 1967.

[14]Editorial, Chicago Tribune, December 28, 1967.

[15]Allan Rosenbaum, "Public Higher Education and State Politics: Political Resources, Institutional Cooperation and Public Policy in Illinois," prepared for delivery at the 1974 Annual Meeting of the American Political Science Association at Chicago, Illinois.

[16]Grafton, op. cit., p. 136.

[17]Rosenbaum, op. cit., p. 29.

[18]Champaign-Urbana News Gazette, April 23, 1967.

[19]Carol Everly Floyd "The Illinois Board of Higher Education and Conflict over the Public Higher Education Budget, FY 1971 to FY 1977," in The Changing Face of State Finance, edited by Jay H. Abrams and Robert J. Dworak (Springfield: American Society for Public Administration, Central Illinois Chapter, 1977), pp. 21-26.