

C
JL6uCl
1958/59
cop. 2

THE STATE OF THE UNIVERSITY

Some Points of Interest, 1958-59

David D. Henry
President
University of Illinois

THE LIBRARY OF THE
JAN 8 1959
UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS

Presented

URBANA, December 9, 1958, 4:00 p.m., University Auditorium—Faculty Assembly sponsored by the Champaign-Urbana Chapter of the American Association of University Professors

CHICAGO, December 10, 1958, 1:10 p.m., Room 221, Dentistry-Medicine-Pharmacy Building — All-Faculty Convocation for the Chicago Professional Colleges

CHICAGO, December 11, 1958, 1:00 p.m., Chicago Undergraduate Division — Faculty Assembly sponsored by the Chicago Undergraduate Division Chapter, American Association of University Professors

C
IL6uCP1
1958/59
exp. 2

Introduction

Each year it becomes more difficult for me to compress within the limits of a single address a discussion of all the topics which call for attention under the title "The State of the University." The difficulty arises partly from the temptation to make this statement a kind of annual report, but it also comes from the expanded activity of the University, the enlarged significance of its work, and the increase in the number of problems with which it must deal in order to chart a sound course.

The choice of subjects is also difficult, for in retrospect, the issues, decisions, events, changing circumstances all seem to run together in the continuing stream of University affairs.

John P. Marquand in his latest novel has his playwright protagonist observe that in any drama there is always a "well-constructed turning point, but in life you were always too involved in living to make a successful analysis."

We must not be too involved in our institutional living to make a successful analysis — for our future will be influenced by our present objectivity. I therefore welcome this occasion which provides one of our few opportunities for useful introspection.

I. Some Current Indices

As we look at the agenda of current business, we may infer that the University faces the future from a position of strength.

ENROLMENTS AND ADMISSIONS

While I do not wish to emphasize a quantitative measurement of the University's work, we should take note that the University of Illinois increased in a year of relatively stable enrolments among the large universities in the Middle West.

The regular fall enrolment of the University this year reached the figure of 25,325, an increase of 1,082 with a significant increase on each campus.

This enrolment places the University of Illinois second to the University of Minnesota among Council of Ten Universities (Minnesota has 26,568). The increase is second to the University of Wisconsin in this group (Wisconsin's increase was 1,623). It registers the largest number of new freshmen (5,589).

The University's total increase took place despite a decline of 900 in veteran enrolment. The extramural enrolment is 3,678, compared with 3,074 last year. Thus the grand total including residents and extramural enrolments for the year is 29,003, contrasted with 27,317 last year.

Provost Gordon Ray has identified the following as contributing factors to the increase:

1. Improved economic conditions in the state and nation: more money available to students and their families, better opportunities for jobs the previous summer, etc.
2. The state scholarship program: 28 per cent of the 2,160 students receiving state scholarships elected to attend the University of Illinois.

3. More efficient counseling and admissions arrangements: the University's relations with the high schools are more extensive, efficient, and cordial than they have been in the past, and admission, registration, and freshman week procedures have improved. The steps taken in the administration of testing, job placement, counseling, registration, student aids, housing contracts, etc., have all made their contribution to improved relationships.
4. Availability of approved housing for nearly all students, both women and men.

It should be pointed out, moreover, that the increase of 1,082 students was realized without any relaxation of standards. Denials totaled about 2,500 this year, as opposed to about 1,700 in 1957-58, when statistics on this matter were kept for the first time.

Indeed, the complexion of the student body has changed as a result of the new admissions practices, according to Dean C. W. Sanford. Nearly 50 per cent of the freshmen who enrolled last September on the Urbana-Champaign campus came from the top quarter of their high school classes, and nearly 80 per cent were from the top half — a significant increase in each category over the previous year. Comparable improvement was noticed at the Chicago Undergraduate Division.

The 14.68 per cent from the third quarter of the graduating class and the 5.81 per cent from the lowest quarter are the smallest percentages in these categories in the University's record.

This improvement in the quality of the student body has been achieved without arbitrary admissions regulations and with proper consideration of the capacities of the individual student.

SOME ACADEMIC NOTES

Recruitment

The past year has been a notable one in faculty recruitment. While we have regretted the departure of several honored and respected colleagues to posts of greater responsibility, we have been gratified to announce an impressive list of distinguished appointments. In general the University has been able to meet the intense academic competition among the first-rate institutions of the country. As will be noted later, to hold our own in this kind of competition will require prompt improvement in facilities and salaries, but at this moment we are pleased with the personnel record.

Recognitions

The list of faculty honors and posts of professional responsibility is impressive.

The bibliography of the University faculty has been the most extensive on record.

The grants and contracts that have come to faculty members for research and experimental work from the national foundations, from the state, from individual and corporate donors, as well as from the federal government, have been reassuring. We are pleased, both for the confidence they reflect and the opportunities for extended service they provide.

Alumni gifts to the University of Illinois Foundation have also come to an all-time high.

New Programs

While budget and space limitations have restricted expansion of the educational program during the past year, a number of curricular innovations should be mentioned.

A five-year program leading to simultaneous degrees in engineering and liberal arts went into effect this fall. It was established to meet the growing need for graduates with backgrounds in both areas.

A new curriculum in forest production and in wood technology and utilization has been established.

An honors program in mathematics was inaugurated this fall, designed to give a select group of freshmen and sophomores opportunity for a deeper and more thorough study of mathematics than is generally possible in the standard courses.

Advanced work is being offered leading to new degrees of Doctor of Philosophy in Anthropology, Master of Science in Nuclear Engineering, and Master of Accounting Science.

Additional courses are being offered to meet increased interest in Russian language and civilization.

A new engineering mechanics curriculum opened this fall as a new field of technical preparation.

New Buildings

The buildings now under construction will add important research and teaching quarters. The biology building, fine and applied arts building, art gallery, the physics building, the computer laboratory, the library addition will be important new academic assets for the University.

50th Anniversary of the Graduate College

A highlight of the academic year was the observance of the fiftieth anniversary of the founding of the Graduate College.

A study of leading American graduate schools published in December, 1957, listed the University of Illinois in the top group in the number of degrees conferred and in the number of fields where the University gradu-

ated large numbers. The study pointed out that among the institutions which gave the largest number of degrees in at least 10 out of the 48 identified fields, Illinois ranked sixth. By a similar study in 1925-35, Illinois ranked eleventh. Assuming that the number of degrees awarded is indirectly a reflection of quality as measured by superior students, particularly where high standards of admission and graduation obtain, the increasing stature of the University of Illinois Graduate College is a point of pride. The increasing enrolment in the Graduate College is another satisfying index.

These scattered observations on enrolment, on the faculty, on educational progress, on new facilities define a year of sound growth and increased strength.

If the measurement of our work were in a setting of static demand and unchanging circumstance, we would have reason to be assured, if not complacent, about our ability to meet tasks ahead.

Because the University is confronted with new demands, because the context for its work has changed, and because resources are below those required for a continuation of the high level performance of the past, it is important that we take stock and share our concern with the people of the state.

I shall present a view of the tasks ahead under the headings: Internal Planning; External Planning; the Budget Year; the Faculty Emphasis; and University Relations.

II. Internal Planning

Two reports were issued during the past year which I believe will come to be regarded as milestones in the history of the University.

I refer to the preliminary report of the University Study Committee on Future Programs and to the report of the University Building Program Committee on Requirements for the Decade, 1959-69.

THE COMMITTEE ON FUTURE PROGRAMS

The Study Committee on Future Programs was appointed in June, 1957. It was asked to be a medium for institutional self-examination and to make suggestions for next steps in over-all educational planning. I expressed the hope that the Committee would emphasize outstanding guidelines for future development, some points of emphasis, some restated objectives, some new objectives, and programs to implement these suggestions. In short, I asked the Committee to provide the groundwork for future educational planning for the University.

Recognizing that the future of the University of Illinois will be affected by state-wide planning and the development of other institutions, the University Study Committee accepted its charge within these broad limitations.

Since its continuing work would necessarily rest upon its assumptions about the chief responsibilities and aims of the University in the next decade, the Committee last June issued a preliminary report on this subject, together with some observations on the growth and size of the campus at Urbana-Champaign and on general education in the University.

The President's Faculty Conference

To assist the Committee in measuring the acceptance of its general premises and to stimulate and collect suggestions which might be useful in future deliberations, a conference of approximately 100 faculty members was called in an all-day session on June 9, 1958.¹

Because I believe the conclusions of the Committee and the conference will be influential in the future administration and planning of the University, I give them stress today. The statement of future aims and responsibilities of the University, the heart of the report, follows.

Future Aims and Responsibilities of the University

We will assume that state-wide educational developments look toward wider sharing of undergraduate education among public and private institutions, especially at the freshman and sophomore level. On the other hand it may be assumed that for the next decade at least the University will continue to be the principal public institution with comprehensive programs at advanced levels in the fundamental fields of learning and in the professions. The spectrum of the University's activities will continue to be broad but the chief functions on which its efforts should be focused as the State's educational system develops are the following:

- a. Teaching, research, and scholarly and creative activity in the fundamental fields of learning.
- b. Teaching and research in professional and occupational areas closely dependent on the fundamental fields of learning.
- c. Liberal education of able young men and women who do not intend to become highly trained specialists and, to the extent possible, of students aiming toward specialized or professional training.
- d. Vocational training in fields which are clearly of substantial and wide importance to the State and Nation, especially those which require four-year programs including sound preparation in the fundamental fields of learning and which the University is uniquely or best fitted to provide.
- e. Extension education and essential public services which require the kinds and level of expertness represented in the faculty of the University.

The characteristic feature in all of these functions is the emphasis and dependence on the fundamental branches of learning. It is this feature which will give the University unity and coherent purpose in the midst of diversity of function and of large numbers of students and faculty. All of these objectives are important. The order in which they are listed expresses the completeness with which the University must attempt to fulfil them. Thus teaching and the advancement of knowledge in the basic fields must underlie all of the University's essential work. For the next decade at least the University will have nearly unique responsibilities among the state-supported institutions in graduate teaching and research in the basic fields and in a number of professional and occupational fields. Liberal education, however, will be shared among many colleges, as will vocational and some professional

¹ The abstract of proceedings of the conference together with the preliminary report will be printed within the next few weeks and made available to the members of the faculty and others who are especially interested. At the close of the conference, a consensus was stated, although, of course, not every participant necessarily subscribed to every part of every statement.

training among a different group of colleges. The opportunities and needs for extension education and public service will be so numerous that the University will have to select those in which it can be most useful and effective and which are consistent with the major educational responsibilities of the University.

Fundamental Fields of Learning: The fundamental fields are mathematics, the biological and physical sciences, the humanities, the fine arts and the social sciences. They are fundamental not only because they have long been studied for their own sake but also because they underlie most fields of applied knowledge. In science, for example, basic research is the source for every advance in applied science.

Premises in Educational Planning

As I see it, three fundamental theses emerge from the report and the discussion conference.

1. Choices must be made.
2. Institutional balance is essential to continuing effectiveness.
3. Relationships with the people of the state must remain direct and personal.

The necessity for making choices arises from the pressure of additional numbers and the many other new demands while resources remain relatively limited within any one period. The University cannot be all things to all people and maintain quality and over-all effectiveness.

The state university historically has followed the assumption that it would not only be a comprehensive instructional institution for college age youth, but a service institution willing to do anything of educational good for the general public.

This objective may have been acceptable at the time when there was a limited number of agencies for education and related services and a much smaller constituency; but today in the interest of efficiency and quality and the best utilization of future resources, the comprehensive state university must make some choices.

The Committee warns us that the kinds of choices that the University can make will be affected by the availability of educational opportunity elsewhere in the state. Will community colleges be established at the needed rate? Will they have the resources to develop good programs? Will the other state colleges and universities be strengthened? How rapidly may the four-year program in Chicago be developed?

The second major thesis of this report is that balance is essential to quality and to over-all effectiveness. The report points out the importance of balance between numbers of students in the lower division and in the upper division, among professional offerings, among activities in instruction, research, and service. It should be added that there must also be balance between facilities and enrolments, between campus size and the services of the local communities, between resources and demands.

It would be a mistake to interpret the report or the conference statement as an endorsement of arbitrary restriction of the University's growth. Growth is a normal function of a living institution. To stimulate growth artificially is unwise. To limit growth arbitrarily is likewise unwise — it is as unwise now as it would have been when the University first reached an enrolment of one thousand or ten thousand. However, to plan for the University's growth to be in balance with respect to its several responsibilities and in relationship to its resources is a primary obligation of all concerned with its administration.

There, indeed, may be an optimum size for any one institution at any one place but that size should be determined by the formula of balance, not by a prejudgment in arithmetic. As long as the University has resources to do its work and keeps a proper balance within the objectives which it accepts, with quality of performance controlling, it will continue to increase in strength, stature, and effectiveness.

There are those who advocate altering the nature of the comprehensive state university to make it an institution with research as its main objective, with instructional service only for the intellectual elite. Following this course would invite a diminution of strength.

The University of Illinois is strong because it is multi-faceted. It reaches into the life of the state on a broad front and in many ways. An arbitrary restriction on its size or its scope would cut its roots in popular support. Other institutions would be called upon to perform its discarded functions. It is not necessary, while encouraging research, graduate work, and achievement from gifted students, to shut off the University's many other services as long as they are related to the over-all objectives as phrased in the preliminary report of the Committee on University Programs.

The third thesis of the report, implied if not stated, is that the vitality of the University is affected by its relationships to the people of the state. Here, as in other aspects of the University's work, the services undertaken should be closely related to teaching and research. Yet the philosophy of grass roots service, affecting in some way every home, business, every citizen's welfare, must remain a guide. Thus, we are faced with the question of how to change our methods, practices, and program pattern in order to achieve balance, with the highest quality of performance, without changing the philosophy of broad and meaningful service to the people of the state. The method, obviously, now must be the discovery and dissemination of new knowledge, the provision of leadership and consultation in new forms, as well as in conventional instruction.

In summary, the Committee's report represents an emphasis on the importance of careful planning within a coherent framework. In the past, the consideration of new developments has been sporadic and disjointed, unrelated to an over-all plan.

I believe the report of the Committee and the conference should be noted as a significant step in educational planning, consonant with the physical planning which has been so well carried forward over the years by the Building Program Committee of the University.

In sending the preliminary report of the Committee on Future Programs to the members of the Board of Trustees, I indicated that action is not necessary at this time. I stated that I was impressed with the validity of the recommendations, however, and that the outline of direction given by the Committee is one in which I concur.

BUILDING PLANNING, 1959-69

A second milestone of the year was the report of the Building Program Committee, outlining the requirements for buildings and land between 1959 and 1969.

Confronted by the necessity of projecting building completions beyond two years, by the need to make clear the over-all requirements upon which the bond issue allocations were based, and by the need to relate building requirements to educational developments as well as to the enrolments of the future, the Building Program Committee in 1957 set out to define a ten-year program.

The recommendations for the capital budget as approved by the Board of Trustees for 1959-61 are related to the tentative recommendation for 1961-63 and these in turn are related to the ten-year outline.

The report has taken into account minimum uniform standards for the campus, the sources of financing, priorities of space needs, and the maximum capacity for construction.

The recommendations are of two kinds — those which would help the University catch up with past needs, and those which would prepare for the future.

It should be emphasized that the recommended building program takes into account improvement of present performance as well as new enrolments. One-half of the space recommended is designed to help the University fulfil present obligations, including the requirements of the present program at the Chicago Undergraduate Division. Providing the faculty with research equipment and space and with facilities adequate for efficient instruction has come to be a primary element in faculty morale and in recruitment of staff.

The planning upon which the Building Program Committee has made its recommendations is flexible and susceptible to continuing refinement and revision. The Committee has utilized the ideas of faculty and staff from throughout the University as well as those of special consultants. The plan

is one in which we can all have the greatest of confidence as to objectivity, integrity, and professional quality.

Planning Assumptions for the Development of the Chicago Undergraduate Division

A major portion of the physical planning is devoted to the Chicago Undergraduate Division. Approximately \$50,000,000 of the ten-year estimate of \$198,534,000 is allocated to proposed permanent facilities for the present two-year program. This figure will have to be increased by any site cost above \$3,000,000 and by facilities required by expansion to degree programs.

At the October 23 meeting of the Policy Committee of the University of Illinois Board of Trustees, the preliminary report on site studies prepared by the Real Estate Research Corporation was presented. Four sites were identified as being superior to all others proposed, considered in the light of the criteria, other than cost and availability, established by the Real Estate Research Corporation in consultation with the Board of Trustees and University of Illinois officials. When information regarding cost and availability is at hand, a ranking of the four sites will be made.

The Chicago Undergraduate Division is being planned so that it can develop into a general campus of the University of Illinois, serving commuting students living in the Chicago area. Authoritative estimates indicate that 15,000 to 20,000 students may be expected at the Chicago campus by 1970.

Staff plans call for the development of the campus in several stages. The first stage will be the establishment, by 1963, at the permanent campus of programs currently being offered at Navy Pier — the first two years of college work, including the following areas of instruction: liberal arts and sciences, engineering (including architecture), commerce and business administration, and physical education.

The second stage will be the establishment of four-year degree programs in a limited number of fields of instruction. It is anticipated that courses for upperclassmen will be added as soon after 1963 as physical facilities and operational funds can be made available.

As the need for new programs arises, and as soon thereafter as the proper physical facilities and staff can be provided, additional curricula will be offered at the Chicago Undergraduate Division.

Each major step in the development of the Chicago campus will be taken after full consultation with the Illinois Commission of Higher Education, with due consideration of the services of other institutions in the area.

The Real Estate Research Corporation has advised the Board of Trustees that any one of the four sites described in its preliminary report would be superior in meeting the criteria of *accessibility*, *expansibility*, and *general character*. As already noted, a choice from among the four sites must yet be

made in terms of cost and availability. The latter factor is defined in terms of the time table established by the Board of Trustees. This time table provides for the beginning of construction in January, 1960, and the relocation of the Chicago Undergraduate Division on the new campus in the fall of 1963, when facilities must be ready to accommodate 6,000 commuting students, 1,500 more than can be accommodated at Navy Pier.

Chicago Professional Colleges

Another major portion of the building planning has to do with the Chicago Professional Colleges.

When the Research and Educational Hospitals were completed, the general plan called for the remodeling of the older structures for laboratories and non-hospital uses by the Colleges. This program of remodeling has proceeded slowly, partly because funds have not been available in sufficient amount, and partly because each new step is dependent upon the completion of a prior one. The completion of this remodeling program requires approximately \$7,000,000.

New construction at the Chicago Professional Colleges includes completion of the Research Building, the first half of which is now under construction, a laboratory addition to the Hospitals, the Medical Sciences Building, completion of the Dental-Medical-Pharmacy Building, the provision of a gymnasium and an auditorium, and construction of a drug and horticulture building. Service projects include steam plant, laundry, and a student union.

The estimated cost of new construction is \$25,000,000, with a total requirement at the Medical Center campus in the next ten-year period of approximately \$32,000,000.

The ten-year allocation to the Champaign-Urbana campus is \$115,960,000. The details of this program are included in the printed report which has had distribution and which is available upon request. The grand total for the ten years is \$198,534,000.

The physical needs of the University of Illinois are large. They represent a backlog of accumulated building deficits and a conservative estimate of the minimum requirements for future enrolments and for an adequate research program. The estimates are projected on the assumption that student housing will be self-liquidating over the lifetime of the buildings and that many facilities will come to the University through private gifts and matching grants.

I believe the planning estimates are conservative. Both economy and efficiency require that we move forward promptly in their fulfilment. For these reasons the Building Program Committee has suggested that we build as rapidly as construction capacity permits during the next four years. This means a capital budget of \$54,879,000 in 1959-61; \$68,340,000 in 1961-63; and the balance of \$75,315,000 in 1963-69.

In this discussion of internal planning for the University I have stressed the two reports which have had to do with over-all University responsibilities in education and physical plant planning. Note should be taken also of the planning activities going forward on the direction of University committees dealing with instruction by television, alumni affairs, degree programs of the Chicago Undergraduate Division, University extension, general education, programs for gifted students, space science and technology, gerontology, student services, instruction and research in child development, religious education, community problems. These study groups are in addition to the many important standing and *ad hoc* committees assisting in the solution of immediate administrative problems or advising on continuing policy.

III. State Planning

Any discussion of the State of the University in 1958-59 must take into account the University's relationships with other institutions and the activities in state planning for higher education.

There is a great deal of general interest in this subject. In public discussion, there is also a great deal of oversimplification of the issues involved as well as an exaggeration of some of the weaknesses of the present arrangements.

THE COMMISSION ON HIGHER EDUCATION

The current public interest in state planning in higher education came into focus in the creation in 1957 of the Illinois Commission of Higher Education. Organized late in that year, the Commission undertook its assignment with vigor and already has progress to report. It procured a highly competent professional staff, created a number of advisory committees, and initiated a number of important studies. It has met regularly and faithfully in undertaking its heavy responsibilities. It will present its first report to the Governor and the General Assembly early in 1959.

The University of Illinois has cooperated fully with the Commission, has made staff resources available for the Commission's work and has interestedly participated in the discussions at all levels and at all stages.

In my view, the Commission represents a sound, practical middle ground for effective state planning in higher education in Illinois. It is "middle ground" in the sense that it is structured between voluntary and mandatory coordination. As a design for practical progress, the Commission deserves support and understanding as it deals with the complex problems involved.

PUBLIC INTEREST IN STATE PLANNING

The present public interest in state planning is related to the new widespread concern about the welfare of higher education. It has been said that the average citizen is ambivalent in his attitude toward the colleges and universities. He is amazed at the projected cost in dollars and energy to gear up the educational enterprise to the requirements of the space age; yet he realizes that education has become an instrument of national defense and international policy as well as of economic strength and individual fulfillment.

As he studies ways and means to strengthen education, Mr. Average Citizen expects wise planning, prudent management, and efficient utilization of educational resources. He is beginning to ask for state planning as a condition for greater support. Unilateral, institutional expansion without professional study of the needs of the state as a whole or of the potential contribution of all institutions supplying that need, public and private, appear to him unwise. Favoring one geographical area at the expense of another will not make much sense. He will expect new developments to be based on a broad view of higher education in the public service, upon facts rather than bias, upon consultation rather than competition, and upon the ability to evolve adequate machinery for the implementation of interinstitutional action.

THE UNIVERSITY'S RESPONSIBILITY IN STATE PLANNING

What are the responsibilities of the state university in state planning?

Some say, "Why bother about what others do? Why not chart one's own course, go one's own way?" A ready answer, already suggested, is that participation in state planning is a matter of intelligent internal planning. Obviously what happens in any one institution affects in some way every institution. For example, no comprehensive state university can ignore the impact upon its own work from the efforts of regional institutions to undertake state-wide responsibilities. No state university can ignore the development of junior colleges. No state university can ignore the expansion of other institutions within the state and remain efficient or realistic in its own programming.

Equally important is the public view of the comprehensive land-grant state university as having a responsibility to the state as a whole on many fronts. It is a source of ideas on many subjects. The university is expected to exercise leadership in all planning where education and research have a bearing on the state's welfare.

Beyond current necessity and historical expectation, there is the inherent professional obligation to have the university's resources utilized in the improvement of education service in general. Incumbent upon all state uni-

versities is the expectation for educational statesmanship in working for a prudent and wise utilization of a state's resources, for leadership in planning for maximum results from the expenditures of the state's educational dollars and energy.

DEFINING COORDINATION

While we may believe that state planning is inevitable and that sound state planning will encourage a prudent use of the state's resources, and make for an orderly pattern of institutional relationships, we must also take note of the parallel public concern with the question of enforced coordination of the state universities and other institutions. The new interest in this subject arises from different sources, for different reasons: from some who have an interest in making sure that state planning will be quickly effective; from others who have an interest only in limiting expenditures.

A single board of control for the public institutions within a state is not a panacea, however. Experience with this mechanism is uneven among the states where it has been tried and at best it cannot deal adequately with the institutions outside its jurisdiction. Further, merely amalgamating boards of control or creating a "super board" does not automatically achieve the result desired among the institutions directly concerned. In the more complex situations, particularly, there should also be carefully designed plans for integration of administration and of program and agreement on general objectives. Without such integration, a super-board plan may but transfer present confusion from one arena to another.

There are those who say that voluntary planning, without any new machinery, is enough. Unfortunately, the record on voluntary planning is not very good. There are a few examples in the United States where such planning is apparently working. However, one institution moving in a competitive spirit and without regard for the welfare of the state as a whole can destroy cooperative relationships. In such a situation, the main state university cannot adequately make its case or reply to covert criticism, because a public quarrel is an inappropriate posture for a professionally responsible agency.

The machinery for state planning cannot be patterned on example, moreover. Examples are always illustrative, but they do not prove. It is well to remember the limitations on comparisons. No two institutions can be compared, for they are unlike in too many ways. Nor can one state solve its problems by imitating others.

Institutions, like people, resemble one another in many ways, but in personality, nature, temperament, purposes, character, each is an individual and must be understood as an individual. States, too, must work out their

problems in the light of their resources, their history, their standards and aspirations.

Institutional relationships must be hammered out in ways indigenous to a state community. The organization of one state may look effective, but still be ineffective in another. Coordination at the state level must take into account historical relationships and present capacities, as well as the differences in leadership and professional attitudes.

In trying to build a state plan for the future of higher education, there is not one answer but many. Junior colleges must be encouraged. Private institutions must be utilized to the utmost. New institutions may have to be established. Existing institutions must be strengthened and helped to grow.

In facing these new developments, it must be continually emphasized that coordination is a result, not a process. It cannot successfully be imposed. It does not arrive suddenly. It does not come through edict or mandate. Effective state plans grow out of the experience of institutions in working together.

I believe that improved coordination among the institutional programs and services in Illinois will be the outcome of professional studies and discussions, particularly if there is adequate machinery for effective communication and analysis. The Commission of Higher Education can provide that machinery.

Further, I believe that the most useful work of the Commission will be planning for the future. While existing programs and services have to be taken into account in such planning, our joint efforts will be most productive if pointed toward dealing with the problems which can be solved only with the help of the Commission and about which there is considerable urgency.

AN APPROACH TO COOPERATIVE PLANNING

Believing that institutions should not regard what is best for the state as a whole as in any way inimical to their own development, I have stated to the Commission of Higher Education that the University of Illinois would support having all plans, including its own, submitted to impartial scrutiny along the following lines:

1. The specific need for a proposed new program should be defined.
2. Plans to fill the need for a new program should not be adopted until ways and means to fulfil existing needs in the same field for which the state already has an obligation are measured.
3. Further, new major obligations should not be undertaken until existing needs in all fields in all institutions are examined and priorities considered.
4. Then, proposed new programs at all institutions should be considered, to see if any have equal or prior claim upon the state's resources.

5. Finally, consideration should be given to when, where, and how best to fulfil the specific need upon which the proposal is based.

The way is uncharted and intricate. How to get the best in planning without intruding unwisely upon the professional responsibilities of the universities is a central question in the future of institutional relations in many states, particularly in populous states with a variety or large number of colleges and universities.

With restraint in answering unfair criticism, with patience in dealing with unwise demands, with objectivity in viewing the needs of the commonwealth, the University of Illinois must work for improved institutional relationships in general and for state planning in particular; it must continue to press for impartial appraisal, in a state-wide context, of professionally prepared and objectively considered recommendations in planning for the future.

IV. The Budget Year

Since the fulfilment of the needs and opportunities of the University in large measure is related to financial resources, it is obvious that the State of the University in the future will be greatly influenced by the actions of the General Assembly in 1959.

The University has done its planning prudently and carefully, and the officers of the University have every reason to believe that the requests will be received by the Governor and the members of the General Assembly with sympathetic interest and understanding.

Reference has been made to the ten-year building program. We all hoped that accelerated progress in the development of that program would be authorized by the voters of the state in the bond issue proposal which was recently upon the ballot.

A WORD ON THE BOND ISSUE

Now that the bond issue has apparently failed of adoption in the referendum, some other way to finance the capital requirements will have to be found. The needs remain exactly as they were before the election. They are serious, and only prompt and effective action by the legislature can prevent their resulting in a deterioration in quality of service and a failure to meet rising enrolments and other mounting obligations.

It is reassuring to note that among those who voted on the bond issue a

decisive majority was in its favor. Further, despite extended public discussion of the question, the needs for which the bond issue was proposed were at no time seriously questioned. It is to be assumed, I believe, that the people of Illinois wish to have a first-rate system of higher education and that they believe these needs ought to be met, but that they prefer that these needs be financed in ways other than general obligation bonds.

We look forward to working with the Governor and the General Assembly in defining next steps. The capital budget of the University as approved by the Board of Trustees for the next biennium is \$54,879,000.

THE OPERATION BUDGET

The operation budget for 1959-61 has been filed with the Department of Finance. It was submitted by the President, and approved by the Board of Trustees, after the usual careful preparation by the University Budget Committee and in consultation with the University Council.

While substantial reductions were made by the Budget Committee in the original estimates prepared by the colleges, schools, institutes, and other units, the estimates as submitted represent a firm ground for continuing progress.

The requested increase for the biennium is in the amount of \$26,948,000, or approximately 26 per cent of the current appropriation. The total requested budget of \$131,510,000 includes \$118,410,000 from tax resources of the state and \$13,100,000 from University income.

Mandatory Increases

Of the \$26,948,000, \$10,248,000 may be classified as for mandatory increases. This amount is necessary for increased contribution to the University Retirement System, including some improvements, the amount to continue for a full biennium certain expenses of the present budget carried for only one year, the increase necessary for expense and equipment to meet rising costs, and to continue on a permanent basis expenditures financed this year temporarily from savings. There is also the amount required to put new buildings in operation and to staff the expected additional enrolments.

The difference between the amount requested and the mandatory increases noted above is for three items: \$4,100,000 is for improvement in the educational programs, \$600,000 is for health insurance, and \$12,000,000 is for salary adjustments.

Improving the Educational Program

The amounts requested by deans and directors for improving the educational program in the biennium was \$14,334,000. This sum was reduced by

the Budget Committee to \$4,100,000. All the programs requested were desirable and important. It was felt, however, that with the central importance of the salary item, the new budget should be restricted to expansion of areas of teaching, research, and public service, which would maintain the University's academic position, leaving to another time the question of inauguration of new programs.

While the sum proposed for this purpose is less than 30 per cent of the requests from deans and directors, it does cover the minimum amount needed to enable the University to meet current professional expectations. It will thus provide for essential improvements.

Health Insurance

A new item in the budget request, in the amount of \$600,000, is for the University's contribution to the health insurance program.

The University has in the past arranged, on a voluntary basis, hospital, medical, and surgical insurance for members of the staff and their dependents. A staff committee, after a thorough study, recommends a comprehensive plan which would cover the first \$250 of all hospital expenses, and 80 per cent thereafter. It would also cover 80 per cent of medical expenditures in excess of \$100. Each person would be insured for a \$15,000 maximum benefit. The University would pay the full cost of the insurance for staff members and half of the premium for dependents. This proposal is in line with a growing practice in industry and provides an excellent personnel benefit at a relatively low cost to the state.

Salary Adjustment

In the opinion of all concerned with budget preparation, including the Board of Trustees, the salary adjustment for the staff in the amount of \$12,000,000 for the biennium is the key concern.

While the increases provided in the 1957-59 budget have enabled the University to keep pace with increases granted in similar institutions, further adjustments of considerable magnitude will be required during the next four bienniums if faculty salaries are to be brought into line with comparable professions and other universities of great distinction. The President's Committee on Education Beyond the High School has recommended that faculty salaries be increased to twice the 1956 level within five to ten years.

From 1952 until 1956 the cost of living remained fairly constant, rising only 2 per cent during the four-year period. Thus, the increases made during that period represented substantial gains in purchasing power. During the last two years, however, in spite of the business recession, the Bureau of Labor Statistics Index of Consumer Prices has risen steadily so that the price level is now 6.5 per cent greater than it was two years ago. There are good reasons for believing that a similar trend in living costs will continue.

The increases in faculty salaries at a number of other universities in the Middle West since 1951 on the average have exceeded those at the University of Illinois. These schools are planning for increases comparable to those presented here. In 1957 the University ranked fourth among the Council of Ten Universities in average salaries for full professors, fifth for associate professors, third for assistant professors, and second for instructors.

Several leading universities now have minimum salaries of \$12,000 for full professors. The minimum at the University of Illinois is now \$8,400, and it should be raised. Approximately three-quarters of the academic staff are below the rank of professor.

The gap between faculty salaries and commercial and industrial positions requiring comparable training is so great that many of the most promising students go into other lines of work. The situation is particularly acute in engineering, but shortages also exist in architecture, law, commerce, medicine, dentistry, chemistry, and many other fields.

Business Week magazine has reported that the average salary of ten-year college graduates is \$9,200 for industry and \$10,400 for banking. This is from 20 to 30 per cent more than the average University of Illinois faculty member of similar seniority receives. A neighboring engineering school recently made a study of 47 teachers who left its faculty to enter industry. Two-thirds of the former staff members received industrial salaries which exceeded their academic salaries by 50 per cent, and one-sixth of them received more than twice as much.

The University of Illinois has one of the largest and one of the finest colleges of medicine in the country. Yet fewer than 10 per cent of the full-time staff of the College receive salaries above the national *average* for practicing physicians.

The most serious problem facing higher education in the next decade is recruiting enough personnel adequately to staff classes for twice the present enrolment. The University can ill afford to lose staff to other professions, and concerted efforts must be made to attract more people to the teaching profession. Many men and women are temperamentally attracted to the academic life, but to hold even these a generous increase in the salary level is essential.

Adjustments in nonacademic salaries must be made to keep pace with anticipated increases in industry and in private and federal employment. In most nonacademic groups the salaries are now reasonably in line with comparable positions elsewhere, but further adjustments are needed in some areas.

Altogether, \$4,000,000 is needed for salary adjustments in the first year of the biennium and an additional \$4,000,000 the second year, a total of \$12,000,000 for the biennium.

The amount requested is nearly half the new money asked for, and is approximately 10 per cent of the total proposed budget from tax funds. It is not the final answer to the salary problem, but it will permit a continuation of orderly improvement.

From the foregoing it is apparent that grave issues in financing higher education confront the Governor and the 1959 General Assembly.

The University of Illinois has prepared its budget recommendation with an awareness of the fiscal problems of the state but also with a careful measure of its responsibilities.

The increase in population, the demands of the economy, the requirements for progress in a space age create new necessities. There is no inexpensive or easy way in providing quality education and productive research for high level performance in all areas of our economy as we compete internationally for new ideas and new knowledge.

V. The Faculty Emphasis

At the risk of repeating the obvious, I shall make a few comments on the central place of the faculty in the life, government, and planning of the University of Illinois. Our taking this point for granted, our not talking about it very much, may lead some to overlook it. The academic verities should be repeated occasionally.

The panel on education in the recent Rockefeller Brothers Fund Report emphasized the need for continuing concern with individual values in these words:

The danger is that we may forget the individual behind a façade of huge and impersonal institutions. The risk is that we will glorify science and forget the scientists; magnify government and ignore the men and women who discharge its functions; pin our hopes on education, business or cultural institutions, and lose sight of the fact that these institutions are no more creative or purposeful than the individuals who endow them with creativity and purpose.

Beyond the temptation to overlook the individual, there is another danger. This is the difficulty of giving free expression to creativity within an institutional atmosphere. We face the threat that our increasingly organized efforts will become increasingly routine; that the structures of science, government, and enterprise will become hard shells resistant to growth and change, rather than flexible institutions capable of renewing and re-creating themselves.¹

It should be obvious to all who inform themselves about University of Illinois affairs that this institution has built a strong and effective tradition for faculty participation in University planning and policy decisions. Faculty views are influential in all matters affecting the life and welfare of the University. As the University has become large, it has necessarily become dependent upon representative faculty views, but even within this framework the senates, committees, and councils have remained vital and constructive.

¹ *The Pursuit of Excellence — Education and the Future of America* — Special Studies Project, Report V — Rockefeller Brothers Fund, Garden City, Doubleday & Co., Inc., 1958, p. IX.

But I would speak not alone of faculty participation in the organized life of the University — I emphasize the place of the individual teacher and scholar. Our planning for the future is not only for students but to enable the faculty better to do its work with students and to advance research. New buildings are important for new enrolment, but they are also essential to give the scholar the tools for professional achievement. Emphasis on improvement in the salary structure has been a central point in recent budget presentations and it will remain so in the next.

Every effort to strengthen the University in quality and importance in the life of the state and the nation is indirectly a support of the faculty. As the University grows in prestige and is recognized for academic strength, faculty welfare is proportionately advanced.

Some believe that University growth and faculty welfare are in competition. They advocate arbitrary limitations of size and expansion of function. In my opinion, this position does not recognize the dynamics of institutional strength. The welfare of the faculty is related to the normal and wholesome growth of the University. Support will be procured only for that which in the broad sense is regarded as important.

James Conant has reminded us of the continuing interrelationships of public understanding, normal growth, and faculty welfare. "Through the thousand years of university history, one fact has stood out; universities have flourished when their teaching was relevant to the times; universities have withered when they clung to outworn disciplines and traditions. But lest we rashly innovate for innovation's sake, we must remember that universities have also sickened when they entered rashly upon new ventures irrelevant to the problems of their times."²

As we translate our planning for the future into qualitative terms, whether we are discussing salaries or buildings or new programs, let us remember that in so doing we are dealing with the welfare of the faculty.

² Conant, James B. "The University and a Free Society" (History of the Ohio State University; Vol. V, Addresses and Proceedings of the Inauguration of Howard Landis Bevis, October 24 and 25, 1940), Ohio State University Press, Columbus, 1941.

VI. University Relations

In discussing the State of the University and in making plans, we must recognize that the future will be determined in part by attitudes and events beyond our control. What happens to any one institution is influenced by the climate for higher education generally. We are reminded by James Bryant Conant that "Public demand has shaped the evolution of American education, and informed public opinion will largely determine the future pattern."¹

The fact that the comprehensive state university, as typified by the institutions of the Middle West, has grown in scope and strength should not lead to complacency, to thinking that the critics have been dispersed, that debate on fundamental issues can be avoided, or that institutional relations can be ignored.

We may discount the current talk about asking the student to pay the full cost of his education as inconsistent with the tradition of the people's university, one available to all who have the ability to meet its requirements. We may minimize the current talk about limiting enrolments to those who are exceptionally talented as being inconsistent with the American dream of education for all who can profit from educational service. We may believe that the current talk about ceilings on expenditures for education is inconsistent with the studies that show that the state universities have been responsible for improvements in the economy far beyond any expenditures made upon them, improvement arising from new knowledge, from trained personnel, and from implementation of new ideas. But these topics are receiving serious public attention and they are but representative of a number of others to which the state universities must aggressively respond.

¹ *The Citadel of Learning*, Conant, James B., Yale University Press, 1956, p. 51.

A recent issue of *Fortune Magazine* contained a feature article attacking what the author referred to as the "Productivity Record of the Colleges and Universities," emphasizing per pupil costs and faculty-student ratios as the measure of productivity. The author voices the question as to whether the changes in American education over the past two decades have made for an improvement or a deterioration of the educational product.²

This is but one article and one spokesman. But students of public opinion know that the theme is a recurrent one.

The Kiplinger Magazine, *Changing Times*, for November, 1958, featured the headline "Waste in the Colleges," asking questions: Why don't colleges make more efficient use of their space and facilities? Why don't colleges make more efficient use of their teachers? Why don't colleges prune away superfluous courses?

Other questions that are up for public discussion are: Is there strength in the concentration of resources in the comprehensive state university or should new services and resources be further regionalized? Should voluntary giving to public universities be encouraged? Does the state control of universities interfere with institutional efficiency and academic integrity? Are admissions practices and policies changing rapidly enough? What is the moral and spiritual atmosphere in which our students and faculty work? Should the student be expected to pay the full cost of his education or at least as much of it as he can get money for by borrowing?

Then there are the practical considerations which arise from conditions governing the recruitment of college teachers, developments in federal policies, the utilization of university experts in applied fields, the requirements of basic research, the distribution of educational service.

While it is true that the settlement of many of these issues will be beyond the control of any one university, no one institution is absolved from making its contribution to a professional solution of the questions raised. Some one has said that the cynic is the termite of education. This may be true, but I believe institutional lassitude in general professional matters is a far more serious threat to accelerated progress. Edmund Burke said "for the triumph of evil it is only necessary that good men do nothing." Some of the issues confronting higher education will be settled in this pattern unless professionally we all do all that we can, beyond our own individual assignments and responsibilities, to help in the public understanding of the role of higher education in American life.

² Seligman, Daniel, "The Low Productivity of the Education Industry," *Fortune*, October, 1958, p. 135 ff.