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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Orientation to the Study

It was not until the last day of the regular session of the Illinois Seventy-fourth General Assembly that the senate and house were able to reach agreement on the amendments to House Bill 1710, legislation designed to provide new impetus for the junior college movement in Illinois. On July 15, 1965, Governor Otto Kerner affixed his signature to the bill and the Public Junior College Act assumed its place among the statutes of the State of Illinois. This legislation would encourage the development of new junior colleges as a part of public higher education and would offer strong inducements to existing junior colleges to sever their legal ties with common school districts.

In 1964 the Illinois Board of Higher Education reported, "All but one junior college are operated by local boards of education also operating a common school." The board perceived this situation as detrimental to junior colleges.

The chief handicap which junior colleges have not been able to overcome is their identification with the common school system. It also accounts for the low prestige of the junior colleges. In general, under this system, the

---


two-year colleges in Illinois or elsewhere, have been poorly financed, badly housed, and inadequately supervised.\(^3\)

The board's charges would indicate that the junior colleges were neglected step-children of the common school system. The colleges were the victims of administrative neglect, occupying a secondary position when facilities and funds were limited. Junior college students often found it necessary to share classrooms, libraries, and lunchrooms with high school students and in some cases with elementary school children. Not infrequently junior college students found themselves studying a subject under the same teacher they had in high school and using the same reference works. Technical programs were judged inadequate and, in some cases, the junior colleges failed to provide a quality transfer program.\(^4\)

The change is now complete. Each public junior college in Illinois is now part of a district organized as a legal entity separate from the school district(s) which it may encompass or with which its boundaries are coterminus.\(^5\) No longer controlled by a board of education also responsible for other schools, each junior college district now has a board of trustees responsible for no other level of educational enterprise. But the local district is not completely autonomous. Many local decisions are dependent upon the approval of the Illinois Junior College Board. And often the approval of the Illinois Junior College Board is subject to the sanction of the Board of Higher Education.

\(^{3}\text{Ibid.}, \text{p. 52.}\)

\(^{4}\text{Ibid.}, \text{pp. 51-52.}\)

\(^{5}\)The State Community College of East St. Louis is an exception. Created by special legislation, this district is supported by the state and governed by the Illinois Junior College Board.
In effect, each local board reports directly to the Illinois Junior College Board and to the Board of Higher Education through the Illinois Junior College Board.

Plans and activities of the local college districts are often subject to the approval of other state agencies. Notably, the Board of Vocational Education and Rehabilitation and the Illinois Building Authority are two additional agencies which hold approval authority in selected areas of junior college development.

Liberated from the control of the common school boards, junior colleges now find that the decision-making process is diffused among a number of boards, only one of which is a local board. There is both state and local responsibility and authority for each junior college district.

At the time it developed the master plan, which included the legal structure for the control and supervision of junior colleges subsequently adopted by the legislature, the Board of Higher Education said, "Illinois will be served best by a partnership of local initiative and state supervision and aid." It based this conclusion on "a conviction that a degree of local responsibility is desirable so that the programs can best meet the local needs." The Board maintained, "The demonstrated experience in other states, as well as in Illinois, reveals that local control can be both effective and economical." In assessing its plan, the Board said, "It preserves the advantages of local initiative and control, and it assures adequate state participation to maintain high standards."
The partnership between the state and the individual institution, however, is not always without its difficulties. Rauh states, "One of the thorniest issues in public higher education today is the conflict--actual or potential--between statewide coordination and the autonomy of local institutions."10

Gleazer warns, "In a few states policy determination is largely at the state level, and the drift if not purposive movement is in that direction."11 He questions whether "community involvement and college responsibility to community needs," which are inherent in the concept of the community college, can be maintained "under direction from the state."12

Faced with the problem of developing a master plan which, when implemented, would provide "education of increasing quality for substantially larger numbers of students" the Board of Higher Education established three guidelines for the plan.13 The first of these was the "preservation of diversity."14

Diversity is evidenced in three ways: diversity of choice, diversity of educational patterns, and diversity of purpose. A student should have a wide range of choices. Each institution should have the opportunity to experiment with a variety of educational patterns. While liberal arts colleges may have a single purpose, universities may have many purposes. And junior colleges


12 Ibid.


14 Ibid.
which are "created to serve the needs of a particular community" are not single purpose institutions. 15

The Board felt that colleges must be protected from themselves if they were to escape the malady of conformity. "Without planning, colleges and universities face the danger of losing this diversity by seeking conformity." 16

The Board was equally emphatic in its desire to prevent the growth of carbon copy institutions and to promote the growth of colleges and universities with individual marks of excellence.

Each institution should consciously attempt to be different from any other and to excel in a limited number of programs. Only through this concept can high quality be achieved. The Master Plan ought to develop procedures which will foster the continuance of diversity and discourage uniformity. 17

The second guideline was the "promotion of flexibility and adaptability." 18 Educational programs cannot be cast in concrete standing as monuments to ideas long after those ideas have ceased to be useful. Programs must be flexible enough to adapt to the knowledge explosion, changing social needs, and changing enrollments. Existing programs should be carefully evaluated. Specific programs may need to be expanded within certain colleges and initiated in others. "The plan must, therefore, provide for the rational expansion of programs where the greatest need and the highest potential for quality exists, as well as for the accommodation of additional students." 19

The third guideline called for "prudent financial determination of priorities." 20 The Illinois citizen was to be assured of the maximum return for

---

15 Ibid. 18 Ibid.
16 Ibid. 19 Ibid.
17 Ibid., p. 15. 20 Ibid.
each dollar spent on public higher education. "There must be provision for continuous scrutiny of expenditures as related to approved functions" said the Board.\(^\text{21}\) This statement has two implications which find their implementation in legislation: (1) monies may be spent only on functions which have received approval and (2) even though an expenditure for a particular function has been approved, that expenditure and the function for which it was expended should be examined to determine if the monies were used prudently.

The Board also suggested that colleges might be more prone to spend money for program proliferation than for educational quality. The Board took the position that, "when necessary, the influence of the Board of Higher Education should be exerted to insure quality in selected programs in preference to dissipating financial resources among many programs."\(^\text{22}\) This statement clearly indicates that the Board believed that the governing boards of the various institutions were quite capable of dissipating funds through program proliferation. If this assumption is correct, it raises several questions regarding the competency of the governing boards to develop valid educational policy. If the governing board willfully dissipates funds, one would question the integrity of the board. If it unwittingly dissipates funds, one would question its competence. In either case, one would question the value of having a board either unwilling or incapable of acting in the public interest.

Illinois junior colleges, then, operate under the aegis of legislation based on a master plan which stresses diversity of purpose, flexibility and

\(^{21}\text{Ibid.}\)

\(^{22}\text{Ibid.}\)
adaptability, and prudent financial policies. The authority and responsibility for achieving these criteria are shared by the local district and by statewide boards.

Purpose of the Study

This study will attempt to determine whether junior colleges have sufficient autonomy to make their maximum contribution to the advancement of public higher education. Are they involved in Rauh's "thorny" issue of statewide coordination vs. local control? Would Illinois fit within Gleazer's classification of states where policy determination is at the state level or moving thereto? Do the administrative and legal frameworks within which junior colleges operate permit or encourage them to be flexible, adaptable, diverse and to make efficient and proper use of their financial resources?

Specifically the study advances the following hypotheses:

1. Each Illinois public junior college is free to develop as a distinct institution with a unique character.

2. Each Illinois public junior college has the authority to exercise the necessary discretion for the most effective use of its local revenue and funds disbursed through state agencies.

3. Each Illinois public junior college enjoys academic freedom without legislative or administrative restrictions from the state.

4. Each Illinois public junior college has effective control of its curriculum, public services, and research activities.

5. There is a trend toward increased local autonomy for Illinois public junior colleges.
Plan of the Study

The study will include a brief chronicle of the development of public junior colleges in Illinois. The general issue of state control vs. local autonomy will be examined through a review of the literature on this subject. Four legislative acts directly affecting junior colleges will be examined. Particular emphasis will be placed upon the Public Junior College Act and An Act Creating a Board of Higher Education. . . . . The acts creating the Board of Vocational Education and Rehabilitation and the Illinois Building Authority will be examined to a lesser degree.

A questionnaire based upon the stated hypotheses will be submitted to the chief executive officers of the Illinois public junior colleges. Interviews with a selected group of college presidents will then be conducted. Factors determining the selection of the presidents to be interviewed include: location and geographic size of the college district, enrollment, equalized assessed valuation, equalized assessed valuation per capita, authorized tax rates, tuition charges, and per capita cost per full-time equivalent student.

The questionnaire will attempt to determine: (1) whether limitations beyond those necessary for statewide coordination are imposed upon public junior colleges, (2) the source of any limitations that may exist, and (3) whether there is a trend toward increasing or decreasing local control. The interviews will be based upon information yielded by the questionnaires.

The conclusions and recommendations of the study will be derived from the results of the questionnaires and the interviews which will be interpreted in terms of the literature germane to the subject, the applicable statutes, and the policies and procedures of the state agencies as they affect junior colleges.
Limitations of the Study

The study recognizes that no institution in an interdependent society can be completely autonomous. Even in the most primitive of societies distinctive rights and responsibilities of primary and secondary groups limit the freedom of activity of each. In a complex society, the array of political, social, economic, and technological forces acting upon any one institution would be difficult to enumerate and even more difficult to analyze. The autonomy of a college is subject to all of the forces of the environment in which it exists. In addition to external forces it is subject to internal constraints. Aldrich says, "It [institutional autonomy] is affected not only by external constraints but also by the attitudes and experience of those within the institution who are concerned about the state of its autonomy, be they students, faculty, staff, administrators, regents, alumni, etc."23

This study will not seek to analyze institutional autonomy as it may be affected by internal constraints. Neither will it seek to determine what constraints might be imposed by the broad spectrum of societal forces such as the mores of the community, the political climate, or the economic welfare of the nation. Nor will it seek to determine whether the junior colleges are subject to constraints by organizations that are tangential to it such as the North Central Association, the Illinois Conference on Higher Education, and the various certifying and licensing agencies, some of which operate under the State Superintendent of Public Instruction and the Department of Registration and Education.

Four agencies, the Illinois Junior College Board, the Board of Higher Education, the Board of Vocational Education and Rehabilitation, the Illinois Building Authority, the legislation creating these agencies, and the administrative and policy decisions of these agencies will be treated in this paper.
CHAPTER II

THE JUNIOR COLLEGE IN ILLINOIS

Early Development

Illinois is often credited with being the birthplace of the junior college. There is some evidence to support this claim. William Rainey Harper, while president of the University of Chicago, first advanced the idea of public junior colleges in a speech to the National Education Association in 1900. While Harper coined the term "junior college," his concept of a public junior college evolved from ideas expressed as early as 1861 by President Henry Tappan of the University of Michigan and in 1869 by President William Folwell in his inaugural address at the University of Minnesota.

Goshen, Indiana can claim the distinction of having the first public junior college, but to Joliet, Illinois must go the honor of having the oldest extant junior college. Harper, after whom a junior college in Illinois has been named, is credited with providing the impetus for the initiation of the junior college program in Joliet in 1901.

---

3 Ibid., p. 49.
4 Ibid., p. 47.
While Illinois may have provided the birthplace for junior colleges, seemingly it did not provide the climate for growth. In the 1950's it ranked third among the states in junior college enrollments. However, the ranking is somewhat misleading for in reality it reflects more nearly a ranking of Chicago's achievement than it does the achievement of the entire state. For as Medsker points out, nearly 80 percent of the students were enrolled in branches of the Chicago City Junior College.\textsuperscript{5}

In 1956 twelve communities in Illinois maintained seventeen junior college centers. Chicago had six branches enrolling 13,659 students, and the remaining eleven colleges had enrollments ranking from 100 to approximately 560.\textsuperscript{6}

While Illinois may have ranked third, it was a poor third when compared to first place California which in 1959 had 63 junior colleges in 56 districts with a total enrollment exceeding 300,000.\textsuperscript{7} In that same year Illinois junior colleges enrolled 27,856 students.\textsuperscript{8}

Although the growth of junior colleges in Illinois from 1901 until the passage of the Public Junior College Act in 1965 was not dramatic, local districts must receive credit for most of the growth that did take place. The early junior colleges were established without official legal sanction from the state. It was not until 1931 that the legislature gave Chicago permission


\textsuperscript{6}Ibid., p. 224.

\textsuperscript{7}Ibid., pp. 208-210.

for a junior college program. Six years later existing downstate colleges were validated by the legislature and legislation was passed permitting the establishment of new colleges. 9

Definite regulations regarding local support for junior colleges were established in 1943. In 1955 the state finally recognized that it had some responsibility for the support of junior colleges and provided aid of $100 per student per year. This amount was increased to $200 in 1957. 10

The 1959 session of the legislature legalized the establishment of junior college districts. Prior to this time, all junior colleges were a part of either a unit district or a high school district. After receiving approval of its plan by the state superintendent of public instruction, a community or a group of communities could submit a referendum to the voters calling for the establishment of a district and the adoption of a tax rate within the limitations provided by the legislature. The legislature also granted junior colleges the right to charge tuition and changed the state support formula to $7.60 per credit hour for each hour of work carried by each student through mid-semester. 11

Moline Community College, now known as Black Hawk College, was the only college to reorganize under the provision of this act. 12 However, four new

---


college districts, Rock Valley, Sauk Valley, Triton, and William Rainey Harper, came into existence under the provisions of the 1959 legislation.\textsuperscript{13}

By the time the Public Junior College Act was passed in 1965, twenty-two public junior colleges existed. Of this number, seventeen were organized and operated as parts of unit or high school districts. One was organized and operated as an area college. The four remaining were organized as area colleges but had not yet opened their doors to students.\textsuperscript{14} Triton and Rock Valley opened in the fall of 1965. Sauk Valley and Harper opened in 1966 and 1967 respectively after having reorganized under the provisions of the 1965 legislation. By this time Chicago City College had eight campuses. There were, therefore, twenty-seven college centers operated by twenty organizational units offering programs in the fall of 1965 only several months after the enactment of the Public Junior College Act.

The head count enrollment of these colleges in 1965 was 62,253 equating to a full time equivalency of 39,846. The total enrollment in all public institutions in 1965 was 168,657 with a full time equivalency of 135,612.\textsuperscript{15} Thus the junior colleges accounted for 36.9 percent of the total head count and 29 percent of the total full time equivalency of all public colleges and universities. These statistics assume an added dimension with the realization that junior colleges offer no upper division work on the undergraduate level and have no graduate or professional schools.


\textsuperscript{14}\textit{Ibid.}

\textsuperscript{15}Froehlich and Lewandowski, \textit{Enrollments}, p. 79.
With the inclusion of private colleges and universities, Illinois institutions of higher learning had a head count of 294,802 and a full time equivalency of 234,266 in 1965.\textsuperscript{16} Applied to these figures, junior college enrollments accounted for 21 percent of the head count and 18 percent of the full time equivalency of all college and university students in the state.

One other development should be noted. The late 1950's and early 1960's witnessed a growing balance between Chicago and the remainder of the state. By 1965 Chicago no longer had 80 percent of the junior college enrollment. Other areas of the state had demonstrated progress and Chicago's junior college enrollment dipped to 56 percent of the head count and 51 percent of the full time equivalency enrollment of public junior colleges.\textsuperscript{17}

\textbf{Progress Since 1965}

The passage of House Bill 1710 was not without its immediate results, the most obvious being the designation of all existing junior colleges and/or districts as Class II colleges and/or districts. The law stated:

\begin{quote}
Any junior college district existing on August 1, 1965 shall after such date become a Class II junior college district and the junior college board of such district shall become a Class II junior college board.\textsuperscript{18}
\end{quote}

In addition the law specified that the territory of a common school district which maintained a junior college and had a separate tax rate for its

\begin{footnotes}
\item \textsuperscript{16}\textit{Ibid.}
\item \textsuperscript{17}Percentages based on statistics in Froehlich and Lewandowski, \textit{Enrollments}, pp. 82 and 90.
\end{footnotes}
support was also to become a Class II junior college district and that the
school board of that district would become a Class II junior college board.
School districts which offered junior college programs but which did not have
a separate tax for their support were granted the option of continuing to
operate grades 13 and 14 under the provisions of the school code.19

The Class II label was not meant to imply that a value judgment had been
made relative to the quality of a college. It was merely meant to distinguish
it from Class I colleges which were those which had met the criteria of the
Public Junior College Act and were, therefore, eligible to receive benefits
not available to Class II districts.

A district can receive Class I status only upon proper application and
subsequent acceptance by the Illinois Junior College Board and the Board of
Higher Education. To be considered for this status, the proposed district
must have a population of 30,000 or must consist of at least three counties or
those portions of three counties not included in a Class I junior college dis-

A district can receive Class I status only upon proper application and

...
a. Application of eleven Class II colleges for organization as Class I colleges.

b. Petitions for the establishment of nineteen new Class I districts to or through the referendum stage.

c. Petitions for the establishment of three additional Class I districts to the public hearing stage.

2. Received, and has under study for future action, seven petitions for new Class I districts.

3. Received, considered and granted 15 petitions for annexation and one petition for disconnection.20

Twenty-three Class I districts had been established by the time the Board prepared its report, and the Board predicted that six additional districts would be ready for establishment by July 1, 1967. Other areas were preparing feasibility studies, and it appeared to the Board that "Class I districts will encompass almost all of the land area of Illinois within the next two years."21

At this time only one proposed district had failed to receive approval at the referendum stage. Even in this case the majority of those voting favored the creation of the district, but the distribution of the population was such that the issue needed to carry in both incorporated and unincorporated areas and the rural voters did not grant approval.22

Ten of the existing districts were able to convert from Class I to Class II without holding a referendum. The remaining thirteen districts were


21Ibid., p. 21.

22Ibid., pp. 22-23.
either entirely new districts or included in pre-existing districts. In the referenda conducted by these districts, 74 percent of the voters favored the establishment of the district. Those already living in a community served by a junior college which was to be incorporated into a new district were even more positive in their response, casting 89 percent of the votes in favor of the new larger district. Nearly 6,500,000 people were included in Class I junior college districts within eighteen months after the passage of the law.

In its second biennial report, the Board noted that there were now thirty-four Class I districts and forty-one junior college campuses. Only one college was operating without Class I status. Eight million six hundred eighty-five thousand people lived within the boundaries of junior college districts which encompassed 65 percent of the total area of the state.

By January of 1970 there were thirty-six Class I districts, thirty-four of which were in operation, and one experimental junior college district which was under the direct supervision of the Illinois Junior College Board. The number of campuses had increased to forty-four. The total population of the junior college districts was 9,115,000 and 67 percent of the area of the state was within a junior college district.

23 Ibid., pp. 22-23.
24 Ibid., p. 21.
25 Ibid., p. 22.
27 Gerald W. Smith, "Selected Subjects and Data--January, 1970." (Mimeographed memorandum distributed by the Executive Secretary of the Illinois Junior College Board.)
In the fall of 1969 there were 151,717 students classified as freshmen and 73,338 classified as sophomores enrolled in both public and private colleges and universities in Illinois. Public junior colleges accounted for 83,351 of the 123,997 freshmen and 22,499 of the 51,235 sophomores enrolled in public institutions. In addition, the junior colleges had 14,063 unclassified students bringing their total enrollment to 119,913.²⁸

The public junior college enrollment responsibility in 1969-70 is perhaps better illustrated by the following:

1. 54.9% of all freshmen in Illinois were enrolled in public junior colleges.
2. 67.2% of all freshmen in Illinois enrolled in public institutions were enrolled in public junior colleges.
3. 30.7% of all sophomores in Illinois were enrolled in public junior colleges.
4. 43.9% of all sophomores in Illinois enrolled in public institutions were enrolled in public junior colleges.
5. 47.0% of all freshmen and sophomores in Illinois were enrolled in public junior colleges.
6. 60.4% of all freshmen and sophomores in Illinois enrolled in public institutions were enrolled in public junior colleges.
7. Public junior colleges accounted for 46.1% of the full time equivalency of all freshmen in Illinois.
8. Public junior colleges accounted for 58.7% of the full time equivalency of all freshmen enrolled in public institutions in Illinois.

²⁸Froehlich and Lewandowski, *Enrollments*, pp. 79 and 82. Martin and Thornblad (Albert H. Martin and Carl E. Thornblad, *Report on Selected Data and Characteristics of Illinois Public Junior Colleges 1969-70* [Springfield, Illinois: Illinois Junior College Board, 1970]) report the junior colleges had 79,186 freshmen, 21,094 sophomores and 47,603 unclassified students for a total enrollment of 147,882 students. These represent mid-term enrollments. Froehlich and Lewandowski's statistics were gathered prior to the beginning of many of the continuing education programs which do not always run concurrently with the regular degree credit programs.
9. Public junior colleges accounted for 25.3% of the full time equivalency of all sophomores in Illinois.

10. Public junior colleges accounted for 37.2% of the full time equivalency of all sophomores enrolled in public institutions in Illinois.

11. Public junior colleges accounted for 38.8% of the full time equivalency of all freshmen and sophomores in Illinois.

12. Public junior colleges accounted for 51.8% of the full time equivalency of all freshmen and sophomores enrolled in public institutions in Illinois.29

The renewed vigor of the junior college movement in Illinois has been described by Edwards as an "exuberant rebirth." He maintains, "The junior or community college has now become the foundation of higher education in Illinois."30 According to Erickson, "The Public Junior College Act of 1965 gave rebirth to a dynamic movement in Illinois."31

The provisions of the Public Junior College Act will be detailed in the following chapter. It is significant, however, to note at this point at least three provisions of the act which were significant in the creation of new junior college districts and the resultant increase in junior college enrollments:

1. The act increased state support to $11.50 per credit hour for each hour of work carried by each student through mid-semester. However, this amount applied only to those colleges meeting the criteria for a Class I district. Support for other students was limited to $9.50 per credit hour. Support for Class I districts has now been increased to $15.50 per credit hour.

29 Percentages based on raw data in Froehlich and Lewandowski, Enrollments, pp. 79 and 82.


2. The act provided for state participation in capital outlay. Class I districts were made eligible to receive up to 75 percent of the amount expended on land, buildings, and fixed equipment on approved projects.

3. The act contained a provision which granted financial assistance to any junior college student who lived in an area which did not maintain a junior college. The act made the student's local board of education responsible for paying that portion of the student's tuition which exceeded the amount charged local residents by the college which the student attended.

There are, no doubt, other factors which have influenced this growth. Local initiative, the increasing number of college age youth, the interest of the Junior College Board in establishing new districts, and the activities of the colleges themselves certainly cannot be discounted. However, the economic imperatives cited previously were certainly strong inducements for the development of new junior college districts and the reorganization of those in existence.
CHAPTER III

LEGISLATION

The Public Junior College Act -- Composition, Powers and Duties of the Illinois Junior College Board

The Public Junior College Act is of prime importance in an examination of the legal framework within which the public junior colleges must operate. The act provides for the creation of the Illinois Junior College Board and sets forth the qualifications, tenure and method of selecting the members. Composed of nine people, the Board consists of the Superintendent of Public Instruction and eight members appointed by the Governor with the advice and consent of the Senate. The Governor is empowered with the authority to select the chairman but the board elects the vice-chairman. While the act specifies that the Board's principal office must be in Springfield and that the Board shall meet at regular intervals, the Board determines how often, when, and where it shall meet. The method of calling special meetings is specified and a quorum is defined as a majority of the membership. Members are not compensated for their services, but "they shall be reimbursed for their actual and necessary expenses while engaged in the performance of their duties."

---

2 Ibid., Section 102-1.
3 Ibid., Section 102-3.
4 Ibid.
5 Ibid.
6 Ibid., Section 102-5.
The Board is directed to "employ and fix the compensation of an executive officer and such employees as it deems necessary for the purpose of this Act." The act further specifies that there shall be an Executive Secretary of the State Board who "shall have charge of all the records of the State Board and keep the same secure at all times. He shall keep a full and complete record of the attendance of members of the State Board and full and complete minutes thereof."8

Thus does the Public Junior College Act provide for the creation and operation of the Illinois Junior College Board. It is significant to note that in creating the Board, the legislature either deliberately or unwittingly failed to delineate the specific purpose for the Board's existence. It did not define to what end the Board's activities should be directed. Nowhere in the act is the Board designated as either a governing or a coordinating body. Nor is it stated explicitly that the central purpose of the Board shall encompass both of these functions. The board's purposes can be determined only by studying the act in its entirety. But even then the board's functions and the degree to which they might be exercised are subject to interpretation.

According to a graphic presentation entitled, "Organization of Higher Education Systems in Illinois," the Board of Higher Education ascribes only coordinating functions to the Illinois Junior College Board. However, an examination of the Public Junior College Act reveals that the Board not only has the

7Ibid., Section 102-6.
8Ibid., Section 102-9.
duty to coordinate but the power to exercise some controls. The Board, therefore, can govern to the extent that it can control. Whether it is primarily a governing board or a coordinating board is contingent upon two factors: (1) the roles of the Board and its staff as perceived by the Board and its staff and (2) the priorities which the Board and its staff establish.

In Section 102-12 the State Board is given specific duties and is endowed with the power to perform them. However, this list of duties and their attendant power do not constitute the entire substance of the duties and powers granted the Board. Indeed, the power of the State Board as it relates to the development and operation of the colleges is amplified throughout the entire act. The duties and powers of the State Board as enumerated in Section 102-12 constitute but a small portion of the State Board's sphere of authority. The section reads:

The State Board shall have the power and it shall be its duty:

(a) To provide statewide planning for junior colleges as institutions of higher education and coordinate the programs, services and activities of all junior colleges in the State so as to encourage and establish a system of locally initiated and administered comprehensive junior colleges.

(b) To organize and conduct feasibility surveys for new junior colleges or for the inclusion of existing institutions as Class I junior colleges and the locating of new institutions.

(c) To cooperate with the junior colleges in continuing studies of student characteristics, admission standards, grading policies, performance of transfer students, qualification and certification of facilities and any other problem of junior college education.

(d) To enter into contracts with other governmental agencies; to accept federal funds and to plan with other state agencies when appropriate for the allocation
of such federal funds for instructional programs and student services including such funds for vocational and technical education and retraining as may be allocated by state and federal agencies for the aid of junior colleges.

(e) To determine efficient and adequate standards for junior colleges and physical plant, heating, lighting, ventilation, sanitation, safety, equipment and supplies, instruction and teaching, curriculum, library, operation, maintenance, administration and supervision, and to grant recognition certificates to junior colleges meeting such standards.

(f) To determine the standards for establishment of junior colleges and the proper location of the site in relation to existing institutions of higher education offering academic, occupational and technical training curricula, possible enrollment, assessed valuation, industrial, business, agricultural, and other conditions, reflecting educational needs in the area to be served; however, no junior college may be considered as being recognized nor may the establishment of any junior college be authorized in any district which shall be deemed inadequate for the maintenance, in accordance with the desirable standards thus determined, if a junior college offering the basic subjects general education and suitable vocational, and semiprofessional and technical curricula. [sic] 10

An examination of these powers and duties indicate that (a), (b) and (f) define the Board's role as it relates to the founding and development of a statewide system of junior colleges. Clearly the Public Junior College Act was enacted to encourage the development of junior colleges; the State Board was designated as the agency to promote that development.

Paragraphs (c) and (d) stress the Board's function as a coordinating agency, instructing it to cooperate with junior colleges in conducting various

studies, granting the Board the right to make agreements with other agencies, to accept federal funds and to cooperate with other agencies in determining the allocation of federal and state funds particularly as they relate to vocational education.

Paragraph (e) deals more directly with the relationship of the State Board to the college than do any of the other provisions of Section 102-12. In effect, it makes the State Board an accrediting agency of the state by charging it with the responsibilities of developing standards and granting recognition to those junior colleges meeting the standards. It appears that great care was exercised in developing a comprehensive list of items for which standards are to be developed. Hardly any phase of a college program or its implementation thereof is omitted. Buildings, administration, instruction, equipment, curriculum—all are included. Indeed, should anything of import be neglected, the general term "operation" could be construed to cover it.

Paragraph (e) also provides the foundation for Section 102-15 which deals with the recognition of junior colleges and makes more explicit the Board's responsibility in this regard:

The State Board shall grant recognition to junior colleges which maintain equipment, courses of study, standards of scholarship and other requirements set by the State Board. Application for recognition shall be made to the State Board. The State Board shall set the criteria by which the junior colleges shall be judged and through the executive officer of the State Board shall arrange for an official evaluation of the junior college and shall grant recognition of such junior colleges as may meet the required standards.\(^{11}\)

\(^{11}\)Ibid., Section 102-15.
The significance of this recognition is revealed elsewhere in the act. "Any Class I junior college district which maintains a junior college recognized by the State Board is entitled to claim an apportionment of $15.50 for each semester hour or equivalent in a course carried by a student through each mid-term by each student in attendance who is a resident of Illinois." Only after it has been determined by the State Board that a junior college has met the standards established by that board does the college become eligible for financial support from the state for its instructional program.

Furthermore the State Board has a direct influence upon the structure and direction of the instructional program of the college. Ironically, the power to exercise this influence is nestled away in that provision of the act which issues procedural directives for meetings of the State Board and establishes the requirements for a quorum at those meetings:

A majority of the members of the State Board shall constitute a quorum at all meetings, but the approval of a new unit of instruction, research, or a public service for a junior college shall require the concurrence of a majority of all members of the State Board.

The term 'new unit of instruction, research or public service' includes the establishment of a college, school, division, institute, department or other unit including majors and curricula in any field of instruction, research or public service not theretofore included in the program of the junior college, and includes the establishment of any new branch or campus of the institution. The term shall not include reasonable and moderate extensions of existing curricula, research or public service programs which have a direct relationship to existing programs; and the State Board may, under its rule making power, define the character of such reasonable and moderate extensions.13

12Ibid., Section 102-16.
13Ibid., Section 102-3.
This, no doubt, constitutes one of the most forceful lines of influence of the State Board upon the local college—the virtual authority to control the growth of the curriculum and the research and public service functions of each junior college within the state. While it does not grant the State Board the power to dictate the direction of these functions, the Board does have the power to reject college proposals in these areas. The local college is not free to build its total program without the sanction of the State Board.

It is interesting to note that with but two minor exceptions—the substitution of "junior college" for "institution" and the substitution of "State Board" for "Board"—the language in the second paragraph of the provision quoted on page 27 is identical to the language found in the act which creates the Board of Higher Education. The junior colleges, then, must contend with a program approval process involving two boards at the state level. First its programs must be approved by the Illinois Junior College Board which then presents them to the Board of Higher Education for final approval.

The State Board is also empowered with the authority to prevent the local board from purchasing land even when the capital to be expended is derived entirely from local effort. In granting the local board the right to purchase land, the act specified, "No such purchase may be made without the prior approval of the State Board." If a local board wishes to build, buy or lease buildings, it can do so only if those buildings are located upon a site meeting

---


the approval of the State Board.\textsuperscript{16} Nor may a local board contract for the lease of land, buildings, or rooms for a period in excess of five years without approval of the State Board.\textsuperscript{17}

The act entitles Class I junior colleges to receive state funds for building purposes.\textsuperscript{18} The State Board is designated as the administrative agency for receiving and evaluating applications from the junior colleges for the receipt of state funds for erecting a physical plant.\textsuperscript{19} The project plan of each college must be approved by the State Board.\textsuperscript{20} The State Board must study each project submitted to determine the need for the project, and ability of the local district to finance a part of the project, and "any other matters which the State Board deems necessary."\textsuperscript{21}

Although it is not incumbent upon the State Board to do so, the Board may require from each college desiring to participate in shared funding the following information:

(a) Description of present facilities and those planned for construction.

(b) Present junior college enrollment.

(c) The projected enrollment over the next five years. However, no application shall be accepted unless such district contains 3 counties, or that portion of 3 counties not included in an existing junior college district, or the projected enrollment shows 1,000 full-time students within five years in districts outside the Chicago standard metropolitan area and 2,000 full-time students in the Chicago standard metropolitan area, such areas as defined by the U. S. Bureau of Census.

\textsuperscript{16}\textit{Ibid.}, Section 103-37. \hfill \textsuperscript{19}\textit{Ibid.}, Section 105-3.
\textsuperscript{17}\textit{Ibid.}, Section 103-38. \hfill \textsuperscript{20}\textit{Ibid.}, Section 105-8.
\textsuperscript{18}\textit{Ibid.}, Section 105-1. \hfill \textsuperscript{21}\textit{Ibid.}, Section 105-5.
(d) Outline of junior college curricula, including vocational and technical education, present and proposed.

(e) District financial report including financing plan for district's share of costs.

(f) Facts showing adequate standards for the physical plant, heating, lighting, ventilation, safety, equipment and supplies, instruction and teaching, curricula, library, operation, maintenance, administration and supervision.

(g) Survey of the existing junior college or proposed junior college service area and the proper location of the site in relation to the existing institutions of higher education offering pre-professional, occupational and technical training curricula. The factual survey must show the possible enrollment, assessed valuation, industrial, business, agricultural and other conditions reflecting educational needs in the area to be served; however, no junior college will be authorized in any location which, on the basis of the evidence supplied by the factual survey, shall be deemed inadequate for the maintenance of desirable standards for the offering of basic subjects of general education, semi-professional and technical curricula.

(h) Such other information as the State Board may require.\(^2\)

The relationship between this portion of the act and Section 102-12 which enumerates certain duties of the State Board should not be overlooked. This section of the act gives the State Board the authority to require the individual college to present evidence that it has met the standards which the State Board has been charged with developing.

\(^2\)Ibid., Section 105-3.
The academic term of each junior college is also subject to state jurisdiction. Although the local board is charged with establishing the academic term, its decision is subject to the consent of the State Board.23

The development of articulation procedures "to the end that maximum freedom of transfer among junior colleges and between junior colleges and degree-granting institutions be available and consistent with minimum admission policies established by the Board of Higher Education" is also a delegated responsibility of the State Board.24 The board is directed to cooperate with the four-year colleges in discharging this responsibility with no mention whatsoever of the role of the junior college for easing the problems confronting the junior college transfer student.

Perhaps with the realization that the tasks of the State Board were many and diverse, the legislature gave the Board the right to appoint advisory committees, the members of which are to serve without payment for services but to be reimbursed for necessary expenditures.25

While the actions and recommendations of the Junior College Board are in some instances subject to the approval of the Illinois Board of Higher Education, the legislature did provide for direct avenues of communication between itself and the Junior College Board. The Board is to make a biennial report directly to the legislature on "the status of junior college education, its problems, needs for improvement and projected developments"26 and to "submit recommendations for such legislation as it deems necessary."27

23Ibid., Section 103-16.
24Ibid., Section 102-11.
25Ibid., Section 102-7.
26Ibid., Section 102-10.
27Ibid.
The multiplicity of the powers and duties of the Board is evident. Yet these powers are not confined to those enumerated as exclusive prerogatives of the Board and those shared with local boards and other agencies. Specific and detailed as the powers of the State Board might be, they are further expanded by the authority granted to "make and provide rules and regulations not inconsistent with the provisions of this Act for the proper administration of this Act." 28

Powers and Duties of Local Boards

Just as the powers and duties of the State Board are dispersed throughout the entire act, so are the functions of the local board similarly scattered. However, most of the duties of the local board are listed consecutively and are specified as "duties." The same format is followed for most of the "powers" of the local board. The "duties" and "powers" are differentiated as such and a distinction is made between them.

As the following list indicates, most of the duties of the local board are procedural matters with but little implication for policy development. Duties of the local board so listed and described as such are: to keep records for the purpose of substantiating claims for state support in accordance with rules adopted by the State Board; to cause an annual audit to be made by a licensed public accountant; to publish a financial statement each year according to the regulations of the State Board; to provide for funds sufficient to maintain the college; to designate a treasurer; to conduct all necessary elections including those for board members excepting those districts in cities of 500,000 or more.

28Ibid., Section 102-4.
where the right to conduct elections is limited; to adopt and enforce all necessary rules for the management and government of the colleges of its district; to appoint the chief administrative officer, all other administrative personnel and all teachers and to fix their salaries; to pay orders and bills in accordance with the specified procedures of the act; to establish rules not inconsistent with any regulations prescribed by the State Board by which any organization or association may acquire funds in the name of the college; to establish admission regulations not inconsistent with other provisions of the act; and to purchase indemnity insurance for the protection of board members, employees and student teachers.  

The board's duty in regard to the admission of students is expanded elsewhere in the act where it is stated: "The Class I junior college districts shall admit all students qualified to complete any one of their programs including general education, transfer, occupational, technical, and terminal, as long as space for effective instruction is available."

This provision of the act is quite prescriptive, directing the junior colleges to: (1) counsel and enroll the students in programs according to their abilities and interests; (2) allow no student to enter a college transfer program unless he has competence and ability similar to that of students admitted to the state universities for similar programs; and (3) give admission preference to the best qualified students residing in the district using class rank and ability and achievement tests to determine those best qualified.
The local board, with the exception of the board for a district consisting of a city of 500,000 or more population (Chicago), has the duty of preparing and adopting a budget and filing a certificate of levy in the manner prescribed in the School Code.\textsuperscript{32} And as indicated previously, the local board establishes the academic term with the consent of the State Board.

Before listing the powers of the local board the act states: "This enumeration of powers is not exclusive but the board may exercise all other powers, not inconsistent with this Act, that may be requisite or proper for the maintenance, operation and development of any college or colleges under the jurisdiction of the board."\textsuperscript{33}

With the State Board having been empowered with the authority to make rules and regulations not inconsistent with the act and the local board having been empowered to exercise powers not inconsistent with the act, it is not unreasonable to ask, "What agency is granted the authority to determine consistency?" and "Whose decision shall prevail when the local board and the State Board disagree as to what is or is not consistent with the act?"

The act fails to deal directly with these questions. The context of the act, however, indicates that the final authority rests with the State Board. The act has no provision enabling a junior college to reverse a decision of the State Board. On the other hand, the State Board has the power to grant or withhold recognition and since reimbursement is contingent upon recognition it would be impolitic for a local board to ignore any directive from the State Board.

\textsuperscript{32}Ibid., Section 103-20.

\textsuperscript{33}Ibid., Section 103-30.
The enumerated powers of the local board are: to provide or to participate in providing insurance protection and benefits including medical, surgical and hospital benefits as well as retirement annuities; to provide auxiliary services for its employees and students; to establish tenure policy; to borrow money and issue bonds in the manner prescribed by the School Code; to establish a working cash fund; to sell bonds for its creation, maintenance, or increase; to make provision for the levying of taxes to pay the interest and principal on the bonds; to authorize the treasurer to make interfund loans; to cooperate with civil defense agencies and to make its buildings available as civil defense shelters; to purchase a site or sites for college purposes with the approval of the State Board and to engage in condemnation proceedings when necessary; to build, buy or lease suitable buildings upon a site approved by the State Board and to issue bonds in the manner prescribed for buying, building, equipping and improving the buildings; to lease equipment and machinery; to procure insurance for college property; to accept federal funds and gifts, grants, devises or bequests; to enter into contracts for educational services; to accept high school students for advanced vocational training; to sell real or personal property not needed for junior college purposes; to employ needed personnel; to establish a Security Department; and to grant use of its buildings for meetings of non-college groups.34

The local board also has the power to require tuition of each student in an amount not to exceed one third of the per capita cost, such tuition to be in proportion to the number of semester hours in which the student is enrolled.35

34 Ibid., Section 103-31 -- 103-43.

35 Ibid., Section 106-4.
The Board may through a referendum increase its tax rates; but at any single election, the rates may not be increased by more than .125 percent for educational purposes nor more than .05 percent for building purposes.36 Never may the rates be in excess of .75 percent for educational purposes nor more than .1 percent for building purposes.37

Tax rates for districts located in cities of 500,000 or more (Chicago), however, are fixed by the legislature. The act states that taxes for such districts may not exceed more than .05 percent for building purposes and beginning in 1970 nor more than .175 percent for educational purposes.38

Finally, junior college boards have the power to issue tax anticipation warrants within the limits prescribed by the legislature.39 Although the specific procedures for issuing warrants are not the same for districts in cities having a population of 500,000 or more as they are for other districts, neither district may issue warrants in excess of 75 percent of the total amount of taxes levied.

Authority Retained by the Legislature

In addition to the prescriptive provisions of the act cited previously, the legislature reserved for itself some prerogatives relating to both procedural matters and the character and development of public junior colleges. The act is designed to stimulate the growth of Class I junior college districts.40

36Ibid., Section 103-14.  
37Ibid., Section 103-1.  
38Ibid., Section 107-18.  
39Ibid., Section 103-20.  
40Since Class II junior college districts as defined by the act no longer exist, those portions of the act relating to these districts are omitted from this study.
A Class I district must have its own governing board; it cannot be a part of a common school system. As indicated earlier, no district can receive Class I recognition unless it: (1) has a population of at least 30,000 inhabitants or covers at least three counties or that portion of three counties not included in a Class I district; (2) has an assessed valuation of at least $75,000,000; and (3) levies a tax for junior college purposes.41

Not only did the legislature insist that a Class I junior college offer a comprehensive junior college program, it also defined such a program as:

. . . a program offered by a junior college which includes (1) courses in liberal arts and sciences and general education; (2) adult education courses; and (3) courses in occupational, semi-technical or technical fields leading directly to employment. At least 15% of all courses taught must be in fields leading directly to employment, one-half of which courses to be in fields other than business education.42

While establishing the criteria by which junior colleges will be judged is a function of the Junior College Board,43 the legislature's definition of a comprehensive program establishes standards for the State Board to follow in terms of the breadth of its criteria for program development.

The legislature also determined the procedures for establishing junior college districts, granting no state agency the right to establish a district; local districts are created only as a result of local initiative. A petition must be filed by 500 or more voters within the proposed district44 and a

---

41 Ibid., Section 101-2.
42 Ibid.
43 Ibid., Section 102-15.
44 Ibid., Section 103-1.
feasibility study prepared on the local level. 45 If the State Board reacts negatively to the proposal, it must state its reasons for doing so and publish them in a newspaper having circulation within the proposed district. The matter is then ended. If the State Board approves the creation of the district, it so recommends to the Board of Higher Education. If the Board of Higher Education rejects the recommendation, all action on the petition ceases. If the recommendation is accepted, the matter is referred once again to the Illinois Junior College Board which must then call a public hearing at which any resident of the proposed district in favor of or in opposition to the proposal may be heard. After the hearing the State Board decides whether an election should be called for the purpose of creating the district. 46

Not only did the legislature reserve for itself the right to establish the form of the ballot for the election, it also specified the manner in which the results of the election are to be determined. 47 A majority of affirmative votes does not always assure the success of the issue. Whenever more than 30 percent of the equalized assessed valuation of the territory to be included in a junior college district is unincorporated territory, then a majority of the votes cast in the unincorporated territory and a majority of votes case in the incorporated territory must be in favor of establishing a district. It is evident, therefore, that while a large majority of the voters could cast their ballots in favor of the proposition, the proper geographical distribution of a small number of negative votes could result in defeat of the issue.

45 Ibid., Section 103-2.
46 Ibid., Sections 103-2 -- 103-4.
47 Ibid., Section 103-5.
The form for the official ballot used in the election of local board members is also prescribed as are the qualifications, tenure, and manner of election of the board members. The district board consists of seven members, each of whom must be 21 years of age, citizen of the United States, and a resident of the junior college district at least one year prior to the election. If the unincorporated areas within a district include at least 15 percent but not more than 30 percent of the taxable property, then at least one board member must be chosen from the unincorporated territory. But if the assessed valuation of the unincorporated territory exceeds 30 percent of the total, then at least two members of the board must reside in unincorporated areas.

Board members serve terms of three years. The legislature also determined for each board the methods for calling special meetings, determining a quorum, and the selection of officers.

Board of Higher Education

As the "official state coordinating and planning agency" for public higher education in Illinois, the Board of Higher Education might well be called

48 Ibid., Sections 103-7.
49 Many students meet these qualifications and in several instances students are now serving as members of the Board of Trustees of the college which they attended.
50 Ibid., Section 103-6.
51 Ibid., Section 103-8. The length of the term of each member elected to the initial board is determined by lot--2 to serve for 1 year, 2 for 2 years and 3 for 3 years.
52 Ibid., Sections 103-8 -- 103-10.
53 Illinois Board of Higher Education. Growth, p. 3.
a "super board." No institution of public higher education in Illinois is free from its influence. The Board of Regents, the Board of Trustees of Southern Illinois University, the Illinois Junior College Board, the Board of Governors of State Colleges and Universities, and the Board of Trustees of the University of Illinois are limited in their scope of authority by the powers granted the Board of Higher Education. The act creating this board stipulates:

The Board shall exercise the following powers and duties in addition to those otherwise specified in the Act:

(a) To cause to be made such surveys and evaluations of higher education as it believes necessary for the purpose of providing the appropriate information to carry out its powers and duties.

(b) To recommend to the General Assembly the enactment of such legislation as it deems necessary or desirable to insure the high quality of higher education in this State.

(c) To advise and counsel the Governor, at his request, regarding any area of, or matter pertaining to, higher education.

(d) To submit to the Governor and the General Assembly on or before the first Monday in February of each odd numbered year a written report covering the activities engaged in and recommendations during the two calendar years which ended on December 31 of the last preceding even numbered year.

(e) To make rules and regulations for its meetings, procedures and the execution of the powers and duties delegated to it by the Act.

(f) To establish general policies with respect to the amount of charges for extension and adult education courses and for public services.

(g) To establish minimum admission standards for public junior colleges, colleges and state universities. Admission standards for out-of-state students may be higher than for Illinois residents.
(h) To design, establish, and supervise the operation of an information system for all State universities and colleges, to provide the Board with timely, comprehensive, and meaningful information pertinent to exercise of its duties. The information system shall be designed to provide comparable data on each State institution of higher education.

(i) To receive, receipt for, hold in trust, expend and administer for all purposes of this Act, funds and other aid made available by the Federal Government or by other agencies public or private.54

Should there be any doubt concerning the ability of this board to influence the course of higher education in Illinois, it should be noted that of the nine powers and duties listed, one-third of them establish this board as an advising and/or recommending body to the Governor and/or the General Assembly. Two of the powers, to cause surveys to be made and to design, establish and supervise an information system, grant the Board of Higher Education the power to demand information from the colleges.

The power to demand specific information may not be as innocuous as it first seems. Should demands be both frequent and extensive, requiring colleges to cast information with a precise format, the demands on the time of the college staff could be excessive and the cost could be significant.

Two of the powers, the establishment of policies concerning changes for public services, adult and extension courses, and the power to establish minimum admission standards, relate directly to specific college operations.

The remaining two powers, the right to administer and expend a broad category of funds and to make rules and regulations including those necessary for the implementation of the powers granted, could be quite broad in application.

54 Illinois Board of Higher Education, Revised Statutes (1969), Chapter 144 Section 189.
In any case where the powers and duties of the Board of Higher Education conflict with those granted to any one of the five systems of higher education in Illinois, the authority of the Board of Higher Education will prevail. Its powers supersede those granted any other board. The powers and duties conferred upon other boards by statutes are retained by those boards "except insofar as they are limited by the powers and duties delegated to the Board of Higher Education by this Act."\(^{55}\)

Each of the five systems of higher education, however, is represented on the sixteen member board, which is composed of the Superintendent of Public Instruction, ten members appointed by the Governor, and the chairmen of the boards of the five systems. No segment of public higher education in Illinois is without representation on the Board. However, since the University of Illinois comprises one system and Southern Illinois University comprises one system, each of these institutions has a direct voice on the Board. The Board of Governors has jurisdiction over five colleges and universities and the Board of Regents governs three universities. Each of these institutions has a shared voice but still a direct voice. The thirty-six junior college districts comprising forty-four colleges have one representative and this representative is already once removed from the local level. For the Illinois Junior College Board stands between the junior college boards and the Board of Higher Education while no such agency stands between the boards governing the other state colleges and universities. Thus while all segments of public higher education are represented on the Board, it cannot be claimed that each segment is represented equally or that the lines of communication for each college are direct.

\(^{55}\textit{Ibid.}, \text{ Section } 190.\)
The act leaves no doubt that the major responsibility for the development of public policy for higher education rests with the Board of Higher Education. Undergirding the structure of public higher education in Illinois is a master plan developed by the Board in 1964 as a result of a legislative directive. The legislature stipulated that the Board should:

... analyze the present and future aims, needs, and requirements of higher education in the State of Illinois and prepare 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 areas of teaching, research and public service.56

It is also obvious that the legislature did not view the master plan as just another document for the archives for it also directed the Board "to submit to the General Assembly and the Governor drafts of proposed legislation to effectuate the plan."57

Recognizing the necessity of planning and realizing that long range plans must be tentative because of changing conditions, the legislature directed the Board to continue to study, analyze, and evaluate the master plan and to recommend amendments and modifications.58 In 1965 the Board was directed to expand the master plan with a comprehensive analysis of the need and requirements for additional programs in the health professions and with recommendations for the proper location, cost and necessary ancillary facilities required for expanding the health programs.59

56Ibid., Section 186.

57Ibid.

58Ibid.

59Ibid., Section 186-1.
The Board's ability to influence public policy is enhanced by its role in the formation of budget requests for public higher education forwarded to the Governor and the General Assembly. Each of the five systems of higher education must submit to the Board its budget proposals for both the operation and capital needs of its institutions. In its analysis of these proposals, the Board must consider the tuition and fees charged as well as the current and projected utilization of the total physical plant. The Board then submits to the Governor, the General Assembly, and the budget agencies of both the Governor and the General Assembly its recommendations for appropriations for each of the four colleges, each university, and the total appropriation for the junior colleges. 60

The Board is also given broad powers over colleges and universities in the areas of instruction, research and public service. No new units in any of these areas may be established without the consent of the Board. Reasonable and moderate extensions of existing programs are permissible, but the Board has the right to determine what is reasonable and moderate. 61 The Board may not only veto programs but can give new form to proposed programs for "the Board may approve or disapprove the proposal in whole or in part or approve modifications thereof." 62 Furthermore, the Board has the authority "to periodically review all existing programs of instruction, research and public service at

---

60Ibid., Section 188.
61Ibid., Section 187.
62Ibid.
the state universities and colleges and to advise the appropriate board of control if the contribution of each program is not educationally and economically justified."63

The Board was not left without the tools to perform this task. "The Board may examine the books, records and files of any public institution of higher education and of any office of state government, as to matters germane to its responsibilities hereunder, subject only to laws or regulations pertaining to the confidential nature of information or date."64

Marsh, a former research associate on the staff of the Board of Higher Education, maintains that the legislature has also granted the Board the power "to adopt a code of conduct for officers and employees of state institutions of higher learning."65 An examination of the act, however, reveals no such power granted to the Board.

The legislature appropriates funds for the operation of statewide boards. Operating expenditures of the Board of Trustees of the University of Illinois and the Board of Trustees of Southern Illinois University are included in the budgets of these institutions. The legislative appropriation of $772,000 for the 1969-70 fiscal year provides a sound basis of support for the activities of the Board of Higher Education. The amount compares very favorably with the $263,000 and the $334,000 granted respectively to the Board of Regents and the

---

63Ibid.

64Ibid., Section 192.

Board of Governors as well as with the $281,000 granted to the Junior College Board.66

Vocational Education Act

The Board of Vocational Education and Rehabilitation does not occupy a place in the structure of the systems of higher education in Illinois. It does, however, have a direct and important relationship with the junior colleges for the approval of the disbursement of federal and state funds for the support of technical and vocational education must come from this Board.

It will be recalled that at least 15 percent of all courses taught in the public junior colleges must be in occupational, semi-technical or technical fields. In the fall of 1969, 3,836 classes constituting 23.8 percent of the total offerings of the public junior colleges were in career-oriented fields. These classes accounted for 21.3 percent of the total semester hours generated.67 In the 1969-70 school year the public junior colleges offered a total of 752 career programs, an increase of 142 over 1968 and of 422 over 1967.68 Obviously junior colleges are interested in the financial support of these programs. The need for special equipment and facilities for many career programs and the relatively small class sizes underscore this interest.

The Board of Vocational Education is designated as the official state agency for the administration of the Federal Vocational Education Law and is charged:


68Ibid., p. 15.
To promote and aid in the establishment of schools and classes of the types and standards provided for in the plans of the Board, as approved by the federal government, and to cooperate with State agencies maintaining such schools or classes and with State and local school authorities in the maintenance of such schools and classes.\footnote{69}

The Board also has the duties and powers to: employ needed personnel; investigate and study vocational education; report to the Governor on the status of vocational education and its recommendations regarding the development of vocational education; submit to the Governor an itemized statement of monies received from federal and state sources and of expenditures; make necessary reports to the federal government; and to furnish financial assistance to deserving blind and deaf students. Its most direct influence upon junior colleges, however, is derived from its power: "to promulgate reasonable rules and regulations relating to the enforcement of the provisions of this Act."\footnote{70}

With this authority the Board on November 15, 1967 adopted the following regulations directed to public junior colleges:

1. The Vocational and Technical Education Division, Board of Vocational Education and Rehabilitation, shall make its professional staff available for organization and development of occupational education in public junior colleges. Subsequent to approval of a curriculum by the Illinois Junior College Board, and Board of Higher Education if applicable, the Board of Vocational Education and Rehabilitation shall consider that curriculum for approval of financial support.

2. The Board of Vocational Education and Rehabilitation through its staff shall administer, supervise and evaluate approved vocational and technical education programs, services and activities under terms of the

\footnote{69}{\textit{Illinois, An Act in Relation to Vocational Education and Vocational Rehabilitation of Disabled Persons, Illinois Revised Statutes, (1969), Chapter 122, Section 197.}}

\footnote{70}{\textit{Ibid.}}}
Illinois State Plan to the extent necessary to assume quality in all occupational education which is realistic in terms of actual or anticipated employment opportunities and suited to the needs, interests and abilities of those being trained.

3. Occupational curricula will be evaluated periodically by the Board of Vocational Education and Rehabilitation. Reports of achievements in occupational programs shall be filed as requested by the Board of Vocational Education and Rehabilitation.71

These regulations made it quite clear that the Board would be directly involved in shaping junior college career programs. Not only did the Board assume its position in the approval process but it promised to "administer, supervise and evaluate" to the extent necessary all programs which it has approved. While both the Board of Higher Education and the Junior College Board are charged with evaluating the colleges and universities, neither has promised to administer and supervise approved programs. These regulations also imposed upon the junior college the responsibility of reporting to the Board of Vocational Education and Rehabilitation as that Board requests. These regulations were modified in 1970; the changes made will be discussed in a later chapter.

While junior colleges are free to offer a career program once it has been approved by the Junior College Board and the Board of Higher Education, the Board of Vocational Education and Rehabilitation can for all practical purposes veto those approvals by withholding its approval and thereby denying support.

Once a local board has approved a program, that program, as noted previously, is always subject to the approval of two state boards and the operation

of that program is subject to the evaluation of two state boards. However, if it is an occupational program it is subject to the approval of three boards.

**Illinois Building Authority**

"An Act to create the Illinois Building Authority and to define its powers and duties" became law on August 15, 1961. The Illinois Building Authority was created for three purposes:

(a) to build and otherwise provide hospital, housing, penitentiary, administrative, classroom, library, recreational, laboratory, office and other such facilities for use by the State of Illinois;

(b) to conduct continuous studies into the need for such facilities;

(c) to serve the General Assembly by making reports and recommendations concerning the providing of such facilities.\(^2\)

The Illinois Building Authority is important to the public junior colleges because it is through this agency that the State of Illinois participates in helping to finance the construction of physical facilities. The legislature does not make a specific appropriation for capital needs and construction for each junior college district but makes one lump sum appropriation for all junior colleges. The amount allocated to any junior college district is determined by the Illinois Junior College Board.\(^3\) Projects are financed through the sale of bonds by the Illinois Building Authority. Each junior college project and the land on which it is built becomes the property of the Illinois Building Authority.


\(^3\)Ibid., Section 213-3.
Authority which it leases to the institution for which it was built. The General Assembly makes the appropriations to pay the rent. When the bonds have been retired, the property is conveyed to the local junior college district. 74

The junior colleges may prepare their own plans and specifications for their buildings, but these plans must meet with the approval of the Authority. A budget for the project must be submitted to the Authority according to guidelines established by the Authority. When the junior college has been notified that its project has been approved and that the Authority is ready to proceed with construction, the local district must convey to the Authority its share of the financing. This includes a deed for the land, the value of which is determined by the IBA as a result of appraisals made by three appraisers appointed by the IBA but whose fees are paid by the local college, and a conveyance of cash and/or verification of funds already spent by the local district in connection with the project. The verification must consist of documents from those to whom monies were paid attesting to the amount of money they have received and to the fact that this money was paid for work necessary for the proposed project. Land, cash and prior expenditures must account for 25 percent of the approved total for the project. Bidding is conducted by the IBA and the contract awarded by the same agency.

74 Ibid., Section 213-5.
CHAPTER IV
COORDINATION, CONTROL AND AUTONOMY

Patterns of Coordination

Diversity has characterized American education. Few facets of the educational enterprise have been standardized. The quality of diversity is also a distinguishing feature of the governing systems of American higher education. So diverse are the governing patterns that any generalization concerning their growth and structure is bound to have its exceptions.

The evolution of the structure of American higher education over three centuries has not been systematic or uniform. At the moment, State structure for public higher education presents a confusing picture. Several states have inaugurated an overall coordinating board for their institutions; others maintain a strict individual autonomy for their institutions and their controlling boards; still other States have the State Board of Education, originally designed for State-level direction of public elementary and secondary education, for governing and coordinating some of their colleges, and an additional board or boards responsible for certain institutions not regulated by the State Board of Education.1

Pliner and Lindsay have divided the growth of the organization and administration of higher education into four historical periods.2 From colonial days until the middle of the nineteenth century, the focus was on private


2Emogene Pliner and Hubert C. Lindsay, Coordination and Planning (Baton Rouge, Louisiana: Louisiana Public Affairs Research Council, September, 1966), pp. 12-18.
institutions which enjoyed complete autonomy. The development of public colleges and universities was stimulated by the Morrill Act and from the middle of the 1800's until the 1940's the states created either single state-wide governing-coordinating boards or multiple boards for governing their institutions. The span from 1940 to 1960 witnessed the establishment of voluntary coordinating mechanisms and the birth of state-wide coordinating agencies established by statute. The growth of the latter type of organization continued throughout the 1960's.

Some system of coordinating public higher education exists in almost every state. Glenny places these systems into three categories. The first is the voluntary system, a loosely structured organization initiated and implemented by the cooperating institutions with no statutory powers. The second means of coordination is a single governing-coordinating board which has jurisdiction over all state supported institutions of higher education within a particular state. The third system is characterized by a coordinating board which is super-imposed over the governing boards of individual institutions and/or over the governing boards of systems of colleges and universities. Many variations are found within these three patterns.

**Coordinating Pattern in Illinois**

It is within the third pattern of control and coordination that the public colleges and universities in Illinois operate. There are five systems of public higher education in Illinois. Each of four of the systems has a single governing board. The Board of Regents governs Illinois State University,

---

Northern Illinois University and Sangamon State University. Chicago State College, Eastern Illinois University, Northeastern Illinois State College, Western Illinois University and Governors State University are under the jurisdiction of the Board of Governors of State Colleges and Universities. The Trustees of Southern Illinois University and the Trustees of the University of Illinois are the respective governing agencies for Southern Illinois University and the University of Illinois including all the campuses of these two institutions. The activities of all these boards are coordinated by the Board of Higher Education.

The fifth system of higher education consists of the junior colleges. Thirty-six of the districts have their own governing boards and the Illinois Junior College Board is the coordinating board for these districts. The thirty-seventh district, the State Community College of East St. Louis, has a local advisory board, but its immediate board of control is the Illinois Junior College Board.

Although a coordinating board, the Illinois Junior College Board has coordinate status with the four major governing boards and bears the same relationship to the Board of Higher Education as do these boards. The relationship of the junior colleges to the Board of Higher Education is, therefore, not identical to that of the senior institutions. Junior colleges fall within the coordinating jurisdiction of two state boards. The senior institutions are represented on the Board of Higher Education by the chairmen of their respective governing boards. The junior colleges are not represented by a member of any of their governing boards but by the chairman of their coordinating board.

---

It could be argued, of course, that the State Community College of East St. Louis has direct representation since the Illinois Junior College Board has direct control of that institution. With the exception of this institution, all junior colleges are further removed from this institution than are the senior colleges; yet all powers granted the Board of Higher Education apply equally to all the public colleges and universities.

Concepts of Coordination

The word "govern" denotes more strength than does the word "coordinate." The ability to govern implies the ability to control, direct, enforce, prescribe. Coordination, on the other hand, denotes a harmonizing process, a logical integration of diverse parts. Part of the appeal of coordination lies in the term itself. It would be difficult, indeed, to find advocates for an uncoordinated hospital, an uncoordinated business, an uncoordinated army, an uncoordinated orchestra, or an uncoordinated school.

"Coordination," according to Dimock and Dimock, "is placing the many aspects of an enterprise in proper position relative to each other and to the program of which they are a part; it is harmoniously combining agents and functions toward the achievement of a desired goal." Applying this general definition to public higher education in Illinois, coordination of public higher education could be described as the process of placing the public colleges and universities in the proper position relative to each other and to public higher education; it is harmoniously combining the colleges and their

---

programs toward the goal of providing a better quality of higher education for greater numbers of students.

In contrast, Dimock and Dimock hold, "Control is checking the speed and direction of action, regulating steps in a larger process aimed at a particular objective; it is synchronization, accountability, and the evaluation of accomplishment."\(^6\)

In amplifying their definitions, Dimock and Dimock say, "Coordination is the active means by which a blend is secured; control is the analytical method by which the blend is regularly tested and evaluated."\(^7\)

Theoretically, the applications of these definitions to the mechanisms for coordination and control of public junior colleges would place the responsibility for defining relationships among the colleges and universities and achieving cohesiveness and unity in pursuing state-wide goals for public higher education with the Board of Higher Education and the Illinois Junior College Board. The local governing boards would be responsible and accountable for determining the direction and speed of their activities within the framework of their defined purposes and for evaluating their progress.

However, it is questionable if coordination and control are mutually exclusive functions. Dimock and Dimock concede that "to find a proper line of demarcation between internal operating independence and overhead control, and to apply it faithfully in every case, is one of the hardest problems of administration."\(^8\)

\(^6\) Ibid.
\(^7\) Ibid.
\(^8\) Ibid., p. 376.
Educational governing and coordinating boards have not escaped the weight of this problem. Glenny's study reveals:

Both types of boards have had difficulty in differentiating between the functions of coordinating and that of governing the affairs of each institution. The problem has been more serious for coordinating agencies because governing, at least in theory, is reserved to the separate institutional boards. But governing agencies have also been weakened by the lack of a clear separation in viewing these two functions.9

One of the legitimate functions of a coordinating board is planning. As noted in Chapter III, planning is a statutory obligation of the Illinois Junior College Board and the Board of Higher Education. "Planning is classifying one's objectives and then determining what action shall be taken by whom, when, by what methods, and at what costs in order to achieve the desired goals."10

Planning is obviously a decision making process. If the process of planning involves determining what, whom, when, how, and at what costs, it is apparent that the function of coordination involves controls. If the junior colleges are not directly involved in the planning process or if the decisions of the state coordinating boards are made irrespective of the wishes of the colleges, then coordination becomes control and the title "coordinating board" is misleading, if not a misnomer.


Considerable attention in this study will be directed to Glenny's concepts of coordination and control because of his close identification with developments in Illinois. Glenny was the Associate Director of Planning of the Illinois Board of Higher Education at the time A Master Plan was developed and published. It was during his tenure (1965-1968) as Executive Director of the Illinois Board of Higher Education that A Master Plan - Phase II was developed. The plan contained recommendations regarding the governance of higher education which were adopted by the legislature.

10Dimock and Dimock, Public Administration, p. 131.
The degree to which a coordinating board exercises controls is not depend- 
ent solely upon the statutory powers granted. It depends to no small extent 
upon the board's concept of how coordination can best be achieved. If the 
board, as in Illinois, is accountable to the legislature and the governor for 
achieving coordination, then it must have the authority commensurate with this 
responsibility. The method of achieving coordination may lie anywhere along 
the continuum bounded by dictum on the one end and consensus on the other.

Glenny defines coordination as "the act of regulating and combining so as 
to give harmonious results." He says, "Presumably this definition implies 
some degree of integration, centralization and force." This definition would 
indicate that Glenny believes that force is essential to the achievement of har- 
mony and integration.

There are, according to Glenny, two general modes of coordination and 
most state agencies approach one or the other. "Both modes," he maintains, 
"result less from powers granted or assumed by the agency than from its compo-
sition." Placing Glenny's two modes on a continuum would result in "broker- 
age" on the one end and "leadership" on the other. This continuum would be 
shorter than that suggested earlier and would not accommodate force, an essen-
tial ingredient in Glenny's concept of coordination.

The brokerage method is employed by the coordinating agency "which looks 
upon itself as a mediator or arbitrator among the conflicting forces at work on

12Ibid.
13Glenny, "Politics and Current Patterns in Coordinating Higher Educa-
tion" in Campus and Capitol, p. 33.
higher education and thereby assumes the role of a broker in the political market."\textsuperscript{14} In analyzing this statement one cannot overlook either the definitions of the significant terms or the semantic overtones of the language employed.

An arbitrator actually judges the merits of conflicting cases and renders a decision. A mediator seeks to reconcile differences. The term "broker" cannot be appropriately equated with "arbitrator" or "mediator." Both "arbitrator" and "mediator" are respected terms but are subject to a loss of dignity when equated with "broker in the political market." The connotations of trading and bargaining implicit in the term "broker" and the connotation of "market" which implies buying and selling tend in and of themselves to argue against the mode of coordination being defined.

An advocate of what Glenny calls the brokerage system would probably avoid the term "brokerage" with its negative connotations for education and use the equally emotive word "democratic" with its positive connotations. Such an advocate, then, using Glenny's same technique might say, "The democratic method is employed by the coordinating agency which looks upon itself as the body responsible for reconciling differences among the conflicting forces at work on higher education, and thereby assumes the role of a harmonizing agent in the political laboratory."

Such a definition does not lead us closer to the truth than does Glenny's. Glenny's work cannot be ignored, not only because of his former position in Illinois, but because his \textit{Autonomy of Public Colleges} is one of the most comprehensive and respected studies thus far completed on state-wide coordination and control.

\textsuperscript{14}\textit{Ibid.}
The brokerage method is subject to three weaknesses according to Glenny:

First, the role forsakes initiative in leadership, especially in statewide planning and in meeting changes effectively.

Second, the brokerage approach encourages only the strongest forces to rapprochment while ignoring those too weak politically to be a threat.

Third, since dominant institutions try to maintain their position and their autonomy a safe approach to all major change becomes the prevailing attitude.15

Glenny endorses the view that as a mode of coordination consensus is a measure of desperation and as such it is regressive and self-defeating.16 He concedes, however, that as a result of the brokerage method, "Many group interests may be partially satisfied in order to achieve harmony but no influential group is completely disaffected."17 Whether this is a desirable result is debatable. However, most administrative decisions and legislative actions on matters of public policy are the result of a tempering process. Decisions should not be made without considering reactions to them.

According to Glenny, his preferred leadership method produces a different result. He maintains that the presidents and board members of the largest state universities are likely to be disaffected by this process.18 If disaffection is a natural result of Glenny's chosen mode of coordination, this result is inconsistent with the "harmonious results" derived from coordination as he defines that term.

15Ibid., p. 34.
16Ibid., p. 35.
17Ibid., p. 33.
18Ibid., p. 37.
Agencies which follow Glenny's leadership mode "are not expected to be mere mediators among the universities. They are expected to assert the kind of positive leadership that James A. Perkins recently espoused for university presidents." It is not clear from this statement if Glenny would have the coordinating boards supplant this leadership, exercise it in concert with the presidents or exercise it independently of the president's efforts in leadership.

Perkins examined university leadership within the framework of forces acting upon the university that might tend to limit institutional autonomy. The interplay of these forces upon the university "suggest a re-examination of the idea of university autonomy." He identified these forces as faculty specialization, state, regional, national and international agencies and maintained that they will tend to erode the autonomy of the university in the absence of positive university leadership.

Perkins placed a premium upon the internal integration of the university but noted that the cost factor of specialization has led the specialists to seek to obtain their objectives through organizations other than the university with the resultant achievement of external integration at the expense of internal integrity. The sacrifice of internal integrity has a deleterious effect upon the institution and the president and faculty that fail to protect internal integrity "will see their university become a gigantic intellectual

19Ibid., p. 36.


21Ibid., pp. 10-13.
mobile put in motion only by the chance currents of air generated by the opening and closing of distant doors.\textsuperscript{22} Many national and international foundations, boards and corporations are now encouraging new developments and "it is to these institutions that faculty flock in increasing numbers to negotiate their projects."\textsuperscript{23}

At the federal level, Perkins was concerned with the increasing trend toward the coordination of academic disciplines. If national coordination remains unchecked, Perkins maintained the autonomy of the university in academic matters will not be merely violated but will actually be bypassed.\textsuperscript{24}

Perkins also warned of the dangers of off-campus coordination at the state and regional levels on such matters as budget, personnel and purchases. "Thus at these levels, and particularly at the state level, the problem of autonomy is to maintain freedom from general executive controls."\textsuperscript{25}

The academic community must protect its autonomy if it is to protect academic freedom. It can rely upon no other agency for this protection. "Autonomy for the university surely has its strongest case in its role as the great protector of intellectual freedom. To reduce that autonomy in favor of public authority would represent a danger not to be taken lightly."\textsuperscript{26}

Perkins feared that these forces operating upon higher education at the state, regional, national and international levels would factor the colleges

\textsuperscript{22}Ibid., p. 11.
\textsuperscript{23}Ibid., p. 15.
\textsuperscript{24}Ibid., p. 14.
\textsuperscript{25}Ibid., p. 12.
\textsuperscript{26}Ibid., pp. 14-15.
and universities out of the discourse on academic freedom, innovation, and planning. He said:

We must participate [in the planning process] as institutions that have a sophisticated motion of the future needs of higher education at all levels. We must actually know what these needs are and what must be done to meet them, and we must be ready to explain that plans for our own institutions take this knowledge into account. And finally, we must convince the interested public that, as universities, we are really both sensitive to and operate within the dictates of the larger public interest.

In conclusion, let me assert that the future of university autonomy turns directly on our capacity to persuade others that only through an appropriate measure of autonomy will academic freedom be protected; that the autonomous university can innovate and that the autonomous university can responsibly balance its own interests with those of larger public interests at all levels of society.27

It does not appear that the leadership for which Perkins called is similar to that which Glenny described. Perkins sought leadership that would protect, participate, convince, persuade and explain. Glenny admitted that his mode of leadership for achieving coordination involved integration, centralization and force. Certainly these last two elements are not to be found in Perkins' description of positive leadership. While Perkins did not deny the need for cooperative, coordinated effort, he would view colleges and universities as active participants in the planning process and not as disaffected servants of decisions made by a centralized authority.

There is at least one other significant difference between the views of Glenny and Perkins. Glenny holds that the individual institution and its spokesmen cannot be trusted to align themselves with the best interests of

27Ibid., p. 16.
higher education but will instead pursue selfish interests. Again and again Glenny reflects this distrust. He states: "Proposals from institutions overlook many statewide conditions and generally reflect an egocentric attitude, placing the particular institution at the center of developments." If one is to accept Glenny's judgments, the universities suffer from myopia which in turn leads them to seek for themselves more than what is fair.

The limited outlook of a university, in creating new branch campuses or professional schools or of trying to obtain more than an equitable share of state funds, may be contrary to effective master plan developments of higher education.

Neither large universities nor small colleges escape Glenny's wrath:

Those leaders of universities which are the most powerful financially and politically may resent even procedural impediments in their path to 'manifest destiny.' Leaders of smaller institutions aspiring to create by replication 'The' prestigious state university resent controls which curb that possibility.

Glenny even doubts the sincerity of those who argue for local autonomy.

Too often, however, the self-government advocates have a proclivity to press for freedom only for their own institutions, especially for material goals such as additional funds or additional campuses. . . . As Ivan Henderacher recently stated: 'All men are not inherently evil, but in any competitive situation there are likely to be some who will stoop to whatever will get by.'

Neither do the legislators escape Glenny's criticism. He charges that they "may be resentful of the agency's objective planning proficiency which

28 Glenny, "Politics and Current Patterns," Campus and Capitol, p. 34.
29 Ibid., p. 31.
30 Ibid., p. 38.
31 Ibid., p. 38.
discourages purely political decisions in such matters as location of new campuses and allocation of funds to institutions."32

Glenny's evaluations of college administrators and legislators take many strange twists and turns. He argues that both groups arouse their constituencies to create tensions detrimental to the best interests of higher education.33 The argument implies that effective coordination cannot result from contests among groups. Yet Glenny argues that the coordinating board should seek to establish its own constituency with faculty members an important part of this group. Glenny does not distrust faculty. He says, "Unlike many college administrators, faculty members generally commit their professional expertness without strong bias toward the more parochial aspirations and objectives of their institutions."34

Glenny is a master of the persuasive device which some rhetoricians have labeled "ironic denial." This technique consists of using innuendo, implicative statements, or direct statements singly or in coordination to create a desired impression that will linger despite a contrary statement that will be offered at another time. Despite the allegations by Glenny cited above, he also says, "Legislator and university administrator alike sincerely believe they promote the public welfare in pursuing their particular interests."35 At another point, Glenny writes, "The increase in political influence of the coordinating board results directly from the support of the governor, legislators,

32 Ibid., p. 30.
33 Ibid., pp. 31-32.
34 Ibid., pp. 37-38.
35 Ibid., p. 31.
and college administrators, the great majority of whom work for the broad public interest."36

How can these administrators whose proposals "generally reflect an egocentric attitude" be such strong allies of the broad public interest? How can legislators who are prone to make "purely political decisions" lend their support to increasing the political influence of the coordinating board? Or, could it be that the characteristics which Glenny ascribes to college administrators and state legislators in justifying his case for a statutory coordinating board are not appropriate?

The positions which Glenny takes on the effect of coordinating boards upon institutional autonomy also merit attention. On the one hand Glenny argues that state controls emanating from a coordinating board deal with procedural matters and thus have little effect upon the individual institution. He states:

By asserting certain controls and rules in the interest of orderly, rational, and equitable development, all the colleges and universities in the state system stand to benefit. The procedural rules established and the practices engaged in by coordinating agencies seldom touch upon the day-to-day decisions or affect adversely the substantive educational and research functions of an institution.37

Certainly Glenny must recognize that procedures do not exist in isolation from policy. But Glenny does not mention policy when he seeks to minimize the erosion of institutional autonomy by a coordinating board. Nor should Glenny need to be reminded that day-to-day administrative decisions are made within

36 Ibid.
37 Ibid., p. 38.
the framework of policy. It is clear that Glenny does not expect the individual institutions to make state-wide policy for he is concerned with the development of the "coordinating agency's policy strength." One could not be blamed for concluding that Glenny would have the state coordinating board formulate both policies and procedures. It is confusing to argue that only procedural matters are involved when in fact substantive issues are at stake.

While Glenny minimizes the erosion of institutional autonomy in *Campus and Capitol*, he takes a different position in another tome. He writes:

> But the autonomy left to the individual institution is, in the writer's opinion, more the result of poor exercise of coordinating functions rather than an outcome inherent in a system under a coordinating agency. If a coordinating agency were to plan, program and budget as conscientiously and thoroughly as expected by the legislature in establishing it, then the local institution and its board would have far fewer major policy matters to decide.

He also holds that coordinating policy will inevitably "diminish the importance" and "reduce the responsibilities" of existing boards "despite assurances to the contrary."

One is tempted to ask, "Will the real Lyman Glenny please stand up?"

The case for coordination is not strengthened by efforts to obscure the issues or by attempts to deny their existence. Neither is the process of affirmation with subsequent denial flattering to the logic supporting coordination. And finally, issues are not settled objectively by casting aspersions at the motives of others. In defense of Glenny, it must be stated that he is quite capable of building logical rationale for the development of state-wide

---


systems of coordination as he did in Autonomy of Public Colleges. It is when he becomes defensive of his proposals and departs from his rationale that he and his arguments become vulnerable.

The reasons necessitating state-wide coordination are difficult to dispute. Glenny cites the new functions of higher education, the creation of new colleges, and the increasing size of state government resulting from the necessity of many new services and the expansion of older functions as factors which create financial and programming problems which cannot be solved if individual colleges enjoy unlimited freedom. 41

White cites increasing costs and the complexity of governance as reasons for focusing attention upon the issue of coordination. The greater acceptance of state-wide planning, according to White, is due to three reasons:

1. Public higher education has assumed a more important portion of the enrollment burden.

2. Education is beginning to defend itself more outspokenly as a basic industry.

3. Educational costs are rapidly rising. 42

Edwards lists six causes contributing to the necessity for better planning:

1. Increasing enrollments and further projected increases.

2. New and diverse educational needs.

3. Financial strain resulting from sharply increased costs in all areas of state governmental responsibility, combined with lagging state revenues.

41Ibid., p. 12.

4. Unnecessary duplication of programs and services among state institutions.

5. Proliferation of programs and services within institutions.

6. Rivalry between public institutions.43

It should be noted that all the reasons cited previously are pragmatic considerations. Problems exist; solutions are necessitated. However, justification for a coordinating board need not be limited to the necessity for solving problems, meeting emergencies, or dealing with crises. Many educational questions are questions of public policy and in effect they become political questions. It is often difficult to force a dichotomy between the educational and political aspects of a given problem.

Education and politics are inseparable when politics is considered to be the theory of managing affairs of public policy or the practice thereof. Ultimate decisions about the shape and support of the state-wide system of public higher education are formulations about political policy.44

However, it must not be assumed that all educational policy decisions are political decisions. Henderson says, "The public interest demands that a distinction be made between issues of a political nature and those of an educational cast."45


Public policy issues include determining what percentage of the state income should be devoted to higher education, the distribution of funds, the role of individual institutions within the system, the general geographical location of colleges and universities, and the extent and nature of the state's responsibility for higher education. What is to be studied and researched, how instruction and research are to take place, and the maintenance of an environment conducive to academic freedom are educational issues. This distinction provides a guideline for a state board in relationship with individual institutions. Henderson would have the state board play a dominant role on questions of public policy and would place the educational decisions within the province of the individual institution.

The implementation of Henderson's ideas is not without difficulty for problems and issues have an aversion to being compartmentalized. And judgments as to whether a problem is in the realm of public policy or falls in the category of educational decisions will differ. It is not safe to assume that the individual colleges and the coordinating board will have the same perception of the roles each are to perform. Consequently, friction is produced.

Conflicts ensue when framers of the rules allow their enthusiasm for order to restrict institutional functions that are properly and necessarily autonomous. Conflicts also ensue when institutional administrators or governing boards seek to extend the scope of their autonomy to the point where even the slightest restriction impinges upon their notion of institutional autonomy.

---

46 Ibid.

This problem should not be attributed to nefarious motives on the part of either group but to the difficulty inherent in achieving the proper relationship between the dual necessities of state-wide planning and institutional autonomy.

With the exception of Glenny, those who advocate state-wide coordination of higher education recognize the threat posed by a coordinating board to institutional autonomy and the necessity for protecting that autonomy. Wilson maintains, "Some institutional autonomy is a social necessity rather than an academic luxury." He also states, "Erosions of institutional autonomy may take place so gradually, subtly, or indirectly that awareness of what has happened does not occur until well after the fact."

Brunbaugh, a staunch advocate of state-wide coordinating boards, argues, "Within the general framework of a state system of higher education, each college or university should be granted a maximum degree of autonomy, both in its fiscal operations and in the management of its personnel and its academic program."

Wattenbarger stresses that the state board must recognize its limits of responsibility and that curriculum matters should be within the purview of the

---


49 Ibid., p. 141.

individual college. He also emphasizes that a state Board should concentrate on leading in lieu of controlling. Bogue and Burns argue that excessive prescription produces stagnation.

In 1952 McConnell was not among those who advocated mandatory state-wide coordination. He wrote, "The writer is not yet ready to concede that voluntary coordination cannot meet the need for cooperative planning, definition of institutional roles and relationships, and integrity in carrying out agreements. By 1965 he had changed his mind concerning the feasibility of voluntary coordination, but he did not reject the value of institutional autonomy.

Henderson is emphatic in building a case for coordination. He points out that in the past issues were "resolved through cumulative actions by individual

---


institutions and through decisions by the governor and legislature. In view of
the growing complexity of the problems of the state and also of higher educa-
tion, uncoordinated approaches are no longer sufficient. Comprehensive plan-
ing is essential. Nevertheless, he warns, "These new state boards are
growing rapidly in power and following the Parkinson model will seek accretions
of power. Thus it is urgent in the formative state to determine the true roles
of the state boards of higher education lest we unwittingly establish fifty
ministries of higher education in the U. S."56

Medsker recognizes that junior colleges must sacrifice some autonomy when
operating under a state-wide plan. However, he does say, "Any state plan
for community colleges should be just that—a state plan. Each institution
should have its own individuality and, if under a local board, should be auton-
omous, subject to minimum standards imposed and enforced by the state."58

Johnson conducted a study to determine the advantages and disadvantages
of state-wide coordination of junior colleges. He reached the conclusion that
state-wide coordination was desirable. However, he too wishes to protect the
autonomy of the local college and made the following recommendation:


56Ibid., p. 30.


Assign to each junior college major authority and responsibility for decisions regarding its programs and development. Local autonomy is necessary to the encouragement of the creative initiative which is essential for the optimum development of vital and effective junior colleges.59

Shay agrees that it is difficult to dispute the need for coordination at the state level but fears that attention to economic efficiency will transcend concern for educational effectiveness. "Local autonomy and the spread of leadership are desirable," he says, "because they can lead to maximum effectiveness of the organization, even though a high degree of centralization may seem in the short run, at least, to be more efficient."60

It is evident that even those who advocate state coordination sense the dangers to autonomy which such coordination poses. State coordination is in one sense a calculated risk. Its proponents believe in its necessity and trust that its potential benefits are more to be desired than its disadvantages are to be feared. Nevertheless, they make no effort to belittle the disadvantages that might accrue. They recognize that the strength of an institution is within that institution. A coordinating board cannot supplant a college. Its proponents hold that it is a facilitating agent, helping each college to reach its goals and to contribute to the achievement of the objectives of higher education by working in concert with other institutions.


Despite the growing trend toward the development of state-wide systems of coordination, there are still those who are skeptical of its reputed benefits and others who are openly opposed to its implementation. Hungate is not ready to concede that the advantages claimed for state coordination have been realized. He calls for an appraisal to determine the merits of centralized state agencies.

The practice of the states in seeking to centralize certain responsibilities for higher education in state agencies should be carefully re-examined to see whether money economies that may have resulted are in truth real. It may be found that the exercise of responsibilities by state agencies for higher education have cost, in the form of lessened institutional achievements and restrictions on freedom, much more than the economies achieved.61

Buffington has reached the conclusion that ultimately the student will suffer from state coordination because means will be substituted for ends. He says:

The primary emphasis of our colleges should be on students and the quality of the educational program. However, I do contend that in the long run the emphasis of the coordinating theocracy pushed by the legislature will be on order, efficiency, symmetry, uniformity, and statistics. The two are not necessarily incompatible, but the tendency is for them to become counter forces. The measures used to determine success or give approbation become ends in themselves.62


Chambers' position on state coordination is the antithesis of Glenny's. An advocate of voluntary coordination, Chambers is the most vociferous critic of central agencies. His bitterness for centralized administration rivals Glenny's distrust of the college administrator.

Chambers argues for complete freedom for the institutions from state boards of control and coordinating boards as well:

Not only is the freedom of our state universities menaced by the intrusion in their affairs of detailed controls by various noneducational fiscal and administrative officers of the state; it is also endangered by consolidating the control of several institutions in one governing board; it is threatened by superimposing above several existing boards another layer in the administrative structure in the nature of a mandatory coordinating board armed with coercive power to interfere in their budget making and in the extension and contraction of their academic and professional programs of instruction and research.63

What measure of autonomy should a public college or university enjoy? If its autonomy is limited by a state coordinating board, might it not also be argued that in the absence of such a board that the legislature would exercise the powers normally granted a board? One cannot escape the fact that appropriations for public higher education are the function of the legislature. And that power is certainly one of the determinants of the ability of public institutions to meet the needs of higher education.

The legislature in Illinois has chosen to establish coordinating boards, the Illinois Junior College Board to represent the junior colleges to the Board of Higher Education and the Board of Higher Education to represent all

systems to the legislature and the governor. How much autonomy should junior colleges have? Have the coordinating boards, the Board of Vocational Education and the Illinois Building Authority acted as controlling agents or coordinating bodies?
CHAPTER V

PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS

Development of Hypotheses

Whether there should be statewide coordination of higher education is a moot issue. Coordinating boards are a reality and a return to an informal or voluntary system of coordination appears unlikely. Indeed, the trend toward the establishment of statewide coordinating boards continues to gain strength. There are only five states without some type of statewide governing or coordinating board. Nineteen have a single board with both governing authority over the public institutions of higher education and advisory authority to the state government. Twenty-six states have a board or council with coordinating authority.¹

In Illinois, the Board of Higher Education and the Illinois Junior College Board have coordinating responsibilities which affect the junior colleges. The Board of Vocational Education and Rehabilitation and the Illinois Building Authority also have responsibilities which affect the development and/or operation of these colleges. As was indicated in Chapter IV, it is difficult to draw a line of demarcation between the end of coordination and the beginning of control. To what extent should public junior colleges operating within a coordinated system or system of systems be autonomous? Does the exercise of

control by state agencies in Illinois limit the autonomy of public junior colleges beyond those limitations necessary for coordination and planning? If so, are these limitations statutory or are they the result of the policies and procedures of state agencies?

Five hypotheses were established for this study:

1. Each Illinois public junior college is free to develop as a distinct institution with a unique character.

2. Each Illinois public junior college has the authority to exercise the necessary discretion for the most effective use of its local revenue and funds disbursed through state agencies.

3. Each Illinois public junior college enjoys academic freedom without legislative or administrative restrictions from the state.

4. Each Illinois public junior college has effective control of its curriculum, public services, and research activities.

5. There is a trend toward increased local autonomy for Illinois public junior colleges.

The first four hypotheses were included to determine whether public junior colleges enjoy the essentials of autonomy within a coordinated system. The basis for these hypotheses is presented in the forepart of this chapter. The fifth hypothesis was established to test the statements of Gleazer, Henderson and others which were cited earlier in the study to the effect that coordinating boards seek accretion of power.

It must be granted that there are no absolutes of autonomy to which all will subscribe. However, there is some measure of agreement on the minimum essentials of autonomy. Ashby describes his criteria as "essential ingredients" and emphasizes that they must be widely understood by the public, politicians and civil servants. He says:
To be autonomous a university must be free to select its students and its staff and to determine the conditions under which they remain in the university.... An autonomous university must be free to set its own standards and to decide to whom to award its degrees.... An autonomous university must be free to design its own curriculum although it may in practice have to do so within certain constraints, such as the requirements of professional bodies which recognize the degree as a right to practice, and the financial sanctions imposed from the outside to prevent a university creating (for example) a medical school. Finally ... an autonomous university, having received its income from state or private sources, must be free to decide how to allocate it among the different categories of expenditures. It is this last prerequisite for autonomy which is most in danger of erosion.2

The Commission on Legislation of the American Association of Junior Colleges has acknowledged the necessity of a state agency to exercise some of those rights which Ashby would reserve for the institution. "Minimum standards," the commission stated, "should be set up by the state agency to insure quality of instruction, breadth of educational opportunity, and effectiveness of operation. Approval by the state agency should be the basis for receipt of state funds by the community junior college."3 The commission also endorsed a partnership concept for the administration of fiscal matters. It maintained, "The plan for financing will recognize that responsibility for record keeping, auditing procedures, and fiscal control is a joint responsibility shared by the state coordinating agency and the institution itself."4


4 Ibid., p. 7.
The commission stressed the necessity of local control when it stated "The control of a community college should be vested preferably in a local board whose sole responsibility is the operation and management of the college."\(^5\) The commission stressed that there should be a cooperative relationship between the local board and the state agency with a "maximum degree" of control for the local board especially in the area of curriculum development and services so that it can "respond directly and promptly to community needs."\(^6\)

The commission was also concerned with the individual identity of each junior college. "The organization, operation and control of community junior colleges," it said, "should reflect both a recognition of the institutional integrity of the college and its coordinate relationships with other educational levels within the state."\(^7\) A junior college, then, while part of a state system, must be more than a quantitative portion of an amorphous mass; each college should be a distinct institution.

Medsker developed some general criteria for the control structure of junior colleges. Accepting the definition of control as "the authority to direct, to regulate, to command," Medsker said, "To one in education the term [control] at once suggests both the agency and the process by which an educational institution is given its legal entity and to which it becomes responsible for operating within a framework of policy."\(^8\)

\(^5\)Ibid., p. 5.
\(^6\)Ibid., pp. 5-6.
\(^7\)Ibid., p. 8.
Through what agency and by what process does a junior college become a legal entity? To whom is it responsible once it is created? A public junior college district is created by the voting public within a prescribed geographical area through a referendum held with the consent of the Illinois Junior College Board and the Board of Higher Education. When a referendum is successful a board of trustees is elected, and it is only after the trustees assume office that the district has a legal entity. Two state agencies and the public are involved in the initial process by which a district gains its legal entity, but it is the local board which becomes the "body politic and corporate."9 It is the election of the local board which gives a district a legal entity, but state agencies and the public are involved in the processes by which the entity is created. Medsker's concept of control when applied to Illinois would suggest state agencies, the public and the local board.

Medsker does not deny the need for statewide coordination, but he evidences a strong concern for local control.

1. The control pattern must be such as to recognize an institution as an entity with a character which it must achieve through the pursuit of goals. In other words, each institution is a personality which like a human being has--or should have--hopes and ambitions to be fulfilled and which if not fulfilled will wither and leave the institution sterile.

2. The legal entity which really directs the community college need not necessarily procure all or even most of its tax money from within itself. The planning of community colleges should be done within the framework of all higher education and if major state funds are used in the support of such colleges, the stewardship of these funds, with proper reporting procedures, can be vested in control bodies which may be more effective than the state as a control agency.

---

3. Governing agencies of community colleges must not have so many responsibilities that the time and energy available for the direction of the community college is beyond the realm of probability.

4. The controlling body of a community college should be as close as possible to the people served by the college.

5. The controlling agency of a community college should be one which can have no conflict of interests between the community college and any other institution for which it is responsible. Its dedication to the unique characteristics of the community college must be unquestioned.

6. Any state plan for community colleges should be just that—a state plan. Each institution should have its own individuality and, if under a local board, should be autonomous, subject to minimum standards imposed and enforced by the state.\(^\text{10}\)

It is obvious from Medsker's criteria that he believes that the substantive control of a junior college should rest with a local agency that is concerned and dedicated to serve the best interests of the college.

Wilson also struggled with the concept of institutional autonomy. While he expressed his belief that "The persistent academic concern with autonomy is somewhat curious"\(^\text{11}\) and his concern that "Higher education has become too crucial to the general welfare for its development to be left entirely in local hands,"\(^\text{12}\) he also held that "Some institutional autonomy is a social necessity

\(^\text{10}\text{Medsker, Patterns for the Control, pp. 15-16.}\)


\(^\text{12}\text{Ibid., p. 138.}\)
rather than an academic luxury"¹³ and that there is "... a latent threat to the enduring purposes of institutions and the autonomy they must have to achieve them."¹⁴

Wilson described his criteria for institutional autonomy as "admittedly minimal rather than optimal." They represent a modification of those proposed by Ashby.

1. Every academic community must be able to exercise the functionally necessary control of its membership of faculty, staff and students. Although public policy may legitimately influence this membership, outside agencies should not be permitted to dictate the entry, retention or exit of particular individuals.

2. Consistent with the requirements of accrediting associations and recognized professional groups, each institution should be responsible for maintaining its own academic standards.

3. Conceding the right and power of outside agencies to grant or withhold funds and to influence their allocation, no institution should be deprived of the discretion required for their most effective utilization.

4. A sufficient degree of autonomy must be maintained for the institutions trustees, administrators, and students to exercise distinctive rights and shared responsibilities. Such rights and responsibilities should be respected both internally and externally.

5. In the realm of ideas, colleges and universities must be accorded the functional freedoms necessary for intellectual enterprise.¹⁵

Although there are differences in the criteria, recurrent are the themes that a college should be able to develop its own individuality; that it should

¹³Ibid., p. 135.
¹⁴Ibid., p. 143.
¹⁵Ibid., pp. 143-144.
enjoy academic freedom; that it should be allowed to exercise its judgment in
the expenditure of funds; and it should have control over those functions
through which it achieves its goals. The hypotheses of this study and the
questions designed to test them are based on these themes.

Description of Survey Instrument

The methodology of this study included an examination of literature re-
lated to the subject, a questionnaire (Appendix I) directed to the chief execu-
tive officer of thirty-four of the thirty-five junior college districts in
Illinois which were operative during the 1969-70 academic year and interviews
with nine college presidents. The State Community College of East St. Louis
was excluded from this study because its control system is not analogous to
that of the other junior colleges. It is a state junior college with no local
tax revenue and is governed directly by the Illinois Junior College Board. It
does have a lay advisory board. At the time this study was conducted, its
chief executive officer was the executive secretary of the Illinois Junior
College Board and the administrator in charge of daily operations was an asso-
ciate secretary of that Board.

Thirty-three out of the possible thirty-four responses were received.
The one president who did not respond left his position during the month the
questionnaire was distributed. His successor had responded to the question-
aire while president of another college.

In two of the multi-campus districts, the chief executive officer of the
district carries the title of chancellor and the administrative head of each
campus is known as a president. Only the chief executive officer of each dis-
trict, i.e. the officer who reports directly to the local board, participated
in the response to the questionnaire. In this study the title of president will be used only in reference to the chief executive officer of a district and includes those known as chancellors.

The survey instrument included a series of statements to which each president was asked to respond by indicating his reaction according to a set of value components similar to those of the Likert scale. After expressing his opinion as strongly agree, agree, undecided, disagree or strongly disagree, the president was asked to place a check in a matrix which would indicate the agencies or statutes which he believed placed limitations upon the junior college beyond those limitations necessary for statewide coordination and planning. For the fifth hypothesis, the presidents were asked to indicate their views of trends in state control by indicating whether there is decreasing control, increasing control or no significant difference in control for each agency and statute discussed. A space was also provided for comment.

Following the statement of the proposition the responses to each option will be indicated by percentage with the number of responses to each option enclosed in parentheses. A hypothetical example follows:

**Proposition X** — Financial planning for Illinois public junior colleges should be made by a statewide coordinating board.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Presidents' Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39.4% (13)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To proposition X 39.4% or 13 presidents indicated strong agreement; 45.5% or 15 indicated agreement; no president was undecided; 12.1% or 4 expressed disagreement; and 3% or 1 president expressed strong disagreement.
Each proposition will be discussed with reference to the appropriate policies and procedures of the boards involved and the relevant statutory applications.

Data and Analysis

HYPOTHESIS 1: EACH ILLINOIS PUBLIC JUNIOR COLLEGE IS FREE TO DEVELOP AS A DISTINCT INSTITUTION WITH A UNIQUE CHARACTER.

Proposition 1.1 — Each public junior college district in Illinois has the freedom necessary to be innovative in its instructional methods.

Presidents' Responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>39.4% (13)</td>
<td>54.5% (18)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6.1% (2)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Illinois Junior College Board has taken the official position that it does not wish to discourage the development or implementation of new ideas.

The State Board recognizes that the future promises innovations in education which are now only dimly perceived. These innovations will affect greatly all phases of junior college operation. It follows, therefore, that nothing in this document is intended to discourage creativity, adaptability and change.  

The responses to this proposition indicate that the colleges have the freedom to adopt instructional methodologies which may range from the traditional at one extreme to a systems approach at the other. If there are limitations upon the freedom to adopt or develop an instructional methodology, these limitations must result from procedures related to policies developed for other...

issues. Instructional methodology is not mandated by a policy statement by any of the boards or through the statutes examined in this study. It must be accepted, however, that other policies can influence methodology.

For example, apportionment is based upon total semester hours at mid-term as specified by the Public Junior College Act. The Illinois Junior College Board has decided that semester hours claimed are subject to audit, the basis of the audit being class attendance at mid-term. Conceivably, individualized instruction could require no class attendance. An exception to this procedure would need approval if the college expected apportionment.

The matrix which followed the proposition gave the president the opportunity to check those agencies and/or statues which they thought restricted the freedom of the college beyond those limitations necessary for statewide coordination and planning.

Of the two presidents who disagreed with this proposition, one cited the administrative and policy decisions of the Illinois Junior College Board and the other cited the Department of Education and Registration. Five presidents who marked "agree" were responsible for eleven citations. The administrative and policy decisions of the Illinois Junior College Board were each cited three times; the Public Junior College Act and the act creating the Board of Vocational Education were each cited once as were the administrative and policy decisions of the Board of Higher Education, the Illinois Building Authority and the Department of Registration and Education.

This latter group of presidents, while indicating their agreement with the proposition, still feel that there are some restrictions upon this freedom beyond those absolutely necessary for statewide coordination and planning. Similar responses occur for other propositions; the rationale will not be repeated.

The responses of 31 presidents (93.9%) affirm this proposition.
Proposition 1.2 — Each public junior college district in Illinois has the freedom necessary to be innovative in the design of its facilities.

Presidents' Responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12.1% (4)</td>
<td>66.7% (22)</td>
<td>3% (1)</td>
<td>15.2% (5)</td>
<td>3% (1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Developing a campus master plan and criteria which will determine the specifics of architectural design are two of the most challenging opportunities facing a young junior college district. Each junior college district in Illinois, whether a newly created district or one which reorganized under the 1965 act, is eligible for financial assistance from the state of up to 75 percent of the cost for new facilities. The junior college may transfer real property at its appraised value as part of its contribution to the building program. At present, costs of construction, which include architect's fees, legal and administrative costs, fixed equipment construction to the five foot line and contingencies, cannot exceed $30 per gross square foot.

Master plans for campus development must be approved by the Illinois Junior College Board and the Board of Higher Education. Construction documents must be submitted to the Illinois Junior College Board and the Illinois Building Authority for approval. A specific application which includes a detailed construction budget must also meet the approval of the Illinois Junior College Board and the Board of Higher Education. A second construction budget must be submitted to the Illinois Building Authority. Unfortunately, the two budget documents are not consistent in format or in specifications. For example, contingency allowances differ; nevertheless, the total amount in each budget must equal that of the other.
There are, of course, policies which establish parameters for planning. The ratio between net assignable space and gross square footage must not be less than .65. The amount of space for which a college may plan is determined by the projected enrollment of full-time equivalent on-campus day students. The enrollment projection must be approved by the Illinois Junior College Board and the Board of Higher Education. A differentiation has been made between the amount of allowable space per student for those enrolled in specified occupational programs and all other students. A college is allowed a maximum of 140 gross square feet per full-time-equivalent day student enrolled in a course using one of the enumerated shops. Other than for these students a college is allowed a maximum of 110 gross square feet for its first 1,500 full-time equivalent day students; 100 gross square feet for the next 1,500 students; and 90 gross square feet for each student above 3,000.  

Gymnasiums designed to include space for spectator seating and seats in excess of those normally allocated for student use are specifically excluded from state participatory financing. The general design and size of the gymnasium must evidence a plan for a high level of utilization for instructional purposes. The state reserves the right to deny authorization for state financing for a gymnasium or swimming pool when its specifications, size, fixed equipment or facilities exceed that which is required for the curricular requirements of physical education.

While physical education facilities designed for spectator sports are the only facilities specified as not eligible for state participation in financing,

\[^17\text{Ibid.}, \text{p. 50.}\]
as a very practical matter the $30 per square foot limitation excludes the construction of other types of facilities. Since fixed equipment is included in the cost per square foot, observatories and highly sophisticated laboratories would raise the cost per square foot beyond the limitations of the construction budget.

Policies have also been developed by the Illinois Junior College Board outlining the extent of the state's participation in site development. The state will participate in the costs for site clearance, the construction of needed utility service lines, required streets and walkways, installation of lighting for the grounds, seeding, landscaping, and parking facilities.

The Board of Higher Education, however, has established a policy in state participation for the construction of surface parking facilities. The policy calls for a continuation of the 25 percent local and 75 per cent state participation for those parking facilities installed prior to July 1, 1975 with the stipulation that the junior colleges initiate parking fees or establish other means of local funding which will enable them to offset state participation after July 1, 1975. After this date there will be no state participation for junior college parking facilities other than that for land cost with the exception of newly created junior college districts which may be eligible to receive state funds for three consecutive biennia.

When public transportation is generally available, parking facilities may be provided for 20 percent of the full-time equivalent students. In those cases where there is limited public transportation, parking facilities may be provided for 50 percent of the full-time equivalent day students. Parking
facilities may be provided for 65 percent of the full-time equivalent day students when there is no public transportation.

It was with the knowledge of these policies, which are largely the result of financial considerations, that agreement and strong agreement with the proposition were expressed by 26 presidents (78.8%) while 6 presidents (18.2%) expressed disagreement and strong disagreement, with one president (3%) remaining undecided.

Ten of the presidents (30.3%) cited one agency and/or statute as exercising control beyond that necessary for statewide coordination and planning. The president who expressed strong disagreement named the administrative and policy decisions of the Illinois Junior College Board as being responsible for excessive limitations as did three of the presidents who disagreed and two who agreed. The law creating the Illinois Building Authority was also cited by the president who strongly disagreed, but the administrative and policy decisions of that agency were also cited by six of the presidents including three who agreed to the proposition. Two of the presidents, one expressing agreement and one disagreement, cited the administrative and policy decisions of the Board of Higher Education and one cited a source not listed in the matrix but did not specify it.

The support of nearly four-fifths of the presidents affirms this proposition. If the future proves them correct, the junior colleges will not have the contemporary equivalent of the "Altgeld Castles" which are found on the campuses of six of the state universities.
Proposition 1.3 -- Each public junior college district in Illinois has the freedom necessary to be innovative in its internal management and organization.

**Presidents' Responses**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>27.3% (9)</td>
<td>63.6% (21)</td>
<td>3% (1)</td>
<td>6.1% (2)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Traditional organizational concepts and managerial procedures are now being subjected to careful scrutiny. The private and public sectors of the economy are looking to one another for new ideas and for procedures to implement them. Program budgeting, developed by the Department of Defense, is gaining increased acceptance by the business and education communities. Participatory management is no longer merely a textbook term but is now being implemented in a variety of ways in government, business and education.

While we must beware of the specious logic which says

\[
\text{It is old; therefore it is bad} \\
\text{It is new; therefore it is good},
\]

we can no longer hallow the traditional on the grounds that it is traditional.

Whether a college condones, condemning, or withholds judgment on the dominant societal forces or the effects of these forces, it should recognize that these forces do affect education. To deny the existence of the effects is to place education outside the fabric of society. A college should have the freedom to organize and to manage its internal affairs in a manner consistent with its approach to those forces which affect it.

The internal management and organization of a college affects both the students and the college employees. Student revolts are no longer isolated
phenomena and even those students who are not connected with a cause are less reluctant to criticize than were their counterparts in those halcyon days when the word "college" connoted the tranquility of the halls of ivy coupled with the fierce loyalty of a football oriented student body who sought release from the pressures of academia through Greek letter hi-jinks or by swallowing goldfish.

Colleges employ the unskilled, the skilled, the para-professional, and the professional. None of these groups is unaware of the ever increasing benefits accruing to labor nor are they oblivious to the methods by which these benefits are attained. Teachers organizations often display an ambivalence, sometimes claiming the just rights of labor and sometimes calling for the due rewards of a professional.

Staff and student problems often become public issues and the answers to the problems are sometimes delivered from the governmental domain. Unfortunately, answers are not always solutions. Too often they attack effects with little influence upon causes.

If handbook solutions could meet the expectations of the management and organizational needs of the colleges, educational consultants, arbitrators and mediators would soon increase their courtship of other markets and governors, legislators, and mayors would find fewer reasons for direct involvement in college management problems or for public proclamations which often offer all the hope and results consistent in scope with the rationale of a simplistic approach.

Organizational changes and management procedures are difficult if not impossible to effect without the support of the power structures within a college.
Change is often perceived by those affected as threatening and often this perception is justified. Rare is the line administrator who will preside over the disintegration of his own enterprise without the promise of an equal or more satisfying enterprise.

One of the two presidents who disagreed with the proposition cited the Public Junior College Act and administrative and policy decisions of the Illinois Junior College Board; the other cited the North Central Association. Administrative and policy decisions of the Board of Vocational Education received mention from two presidents; the Department of Registration and Education and administrative and policy decisions of the Illinois Junior College Board were cited once, but not by the same respondent.

With 30 (90.9%) of the respondents expressing agreement or strong agreement with Proposition 3, it is evident that few of the colleges have experienced interference from state agencies in developing their management and organizational policies and procedures. These colleges then have had an opportunity which is much more difficult for older colleges to capture—the opportunity to implement a management system whether traditional or innovative that will best meet the needs of the college. It is too early to tell whether the colleges have succeeded, but the opportunity was not denied.

The responses affirm the proposition.
Proposition 1.4 — Each public junior college district in Illinois has the freedom necessary to make maximum use of its ability to meet local problems.

Presidents' Responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>24.2% (8)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>63.6% (21)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>3% (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>6.1% (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3% (1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although junior colleges were originally established to offer the first two years of the standard college curriculum, this is no longer a realistic or acceptable approach for a junior college. In the first place a standard college curriculum no longer exists; secondly, this approach would not satisfy the requirements of the Public Junior College Act which stipulates that junior colleges must be comprehensive institutions.

A public junior college will more nearly approach its potential as the dimension of its role as a community college increases. Today the public junior college is being more closely identified with public higher education and is losing its image as a high school addendum. In Illinois it has an identity with the system of junior colleges of which it is a part. The well-organized and effective American Association of Junior Colleges has given the junior college a national identity. However, its strongest, most meaningful, and most important identification must be with the community it was designed to serve.

If it is to serve its community adequately, its concern for local needs must be no less than its concern for broad educational issues. And it must have the ability to marshall its resources so that it may cope with those problems which rank high on its priority scale.
Colleges are encouraged to make use of community resources. Internships for students in occupational programs are recognized and encouraged. Lay advisory committees for the development of occupational programs are recommended by the Illinois Junior College Board and are required by the Board of Vocational Education and Rehabilitation.

Limitations placed on maximum use of staff ability are probably no more rigid than most colleges would voluntarily adopt and are less rigid than some have adopted. The normal teaching load in non-laboratory classes may not exceed more than sixteen semester or quarter hours. Overload assignments are permitted if the overload is one course with credit hour value of five or less; or, if the overload consists of several courses, their combined credit hour value may not exceed three semester or four quarter hours.

Being in and of the community, junior colleges are expected to offer "educational service which may help in the solution of community problems." Despite their short existence, some of the junior colleges have already responded impressively to this challenge. Their students and staffs have conducted surveys for quasi-municipalities; they have worked closely with civic groups such as the League of Women Voters in designing survey instruments and in evaluating results; they have served in advisory capacities to park districts, assisting in the development of recreational programs; one college designed and conducted a drug study at the request of one of the high schools in its district and many of the colleges have offered drug education seminars for their communities. One college was able to secure private funding to sponsor a

---

18 Ibid., p. 28.
19 Ibid., p. 25.
two-week camping trip to the interior of Canada for ten underprivileged elementary school boys, and this same college was able to secure private funding to conduct an eight-week music program for sixty-four economically deprived youngsters, each of whom received a new instrument at the end of the session.

This enumeration is not meant to be comprehensive nor does it imply that all colleges are similarly involved. The extent of involvement in community problems varies greatly from district to district. But it is indicative of a variety of ways in which colleges have responded to local needs.

The president who strongly disagreed with this proposition cited the Public Junior College Act, Administrative and Policy decisions of the Illinois Junior College Board and the North Central Association as interfering with the freedom of the college to meet local problems. One president who expressed disagreement also cited the North Central Association while the other cited administrative and policy decisions of the Board of Vocational Education. Administrative and policy decisions of the four subject agencies were cited by two presidents who registered agreement, the second of whom also cited the statutes creating the Board of Vocational Education and the Illinois Building Authority.

A substantial majority of the presidents supported this proposition. Twenty-nine (87.8%) subscribed to the opinion that each college has the freedom necessary to make maximum use of its ability to meet local problems. The proposition was affirmed.

Summary: Each of the four propositions supporting the first hypothesis was verified by the presidents' responses, the support level ranking from a 78.8% of the responses to a high of 93.9%. The responses substantiate the first hypothesis.
HYPOTHESIS 2: EACH ILLINOIS PUBLIC JUNIOR COLLEGE HAS THE AUTHORITY TO EXERCISE THE NECESSARY DISCRETION FOR THE MOST EFFECTIVE USE OF ITS LOCAL REVENUE AND FUNDS DISBURSED THROUGH STATE AGENCIES.

Proposition 2.1 — Each Illinois public junior college district has the authority to exercise the necessary discretion for the most effective utilization of funds raised at the local level.

Presidents' Responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12.1% (4)</td>
<td>66.7% (22)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>21.2% (7)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tuition and taxes are the two principal sources of funds raised at the local level. It should be noted, however, that several junior colleges charge no tuition and in a few instances not-for-profit foundations have been established to assist the local college. While the Public Junior College Act limits tuition to one-third of the per capita cost and specifies the formula by which per capita costs must be determined, it does not specify for what purposes tuition must be spent. The law prohibits tax rates for educational purposes in excess of .75 percent of the equalized assessed valuation and limits taxes for building purposes to a maximum of .1 percent; it does not specify how the monies must be expended within these categories. Determining specific allocations within budget accounts is a prerogative of the local board. But the exercise of this prerogative is not without some limitations.

The law prohibits the local board from leasing buildings, rooms, or land for a period exceeding five years without the specific approval of the Illinois Junior College Board. Although the cost of the leasing agreement would be underwritten by local revenue, the ultimate decision would rest with the state.
One point currently at issue is the authority of the two coordinating boards to substitute their discretion for that of the local board in the expenditure of funds for sites and construction. May a local district purchase land with local funds without permission of the Illinois Junior College Board and the Board of Higher Education even though the local district does not intend to use the land or any portion thereof as its contribution to the building program? The Illinois Junior College Board holds that the local district may not make such a purchase and there is statutory evidence to support this position.

The Public Junior College Act includes this statement: "No such purchase [of one or more sites for college purchases] may be made without the prior approval of the State Board." The statement is unequivocal and stands in support of the Illinois Junior College Board directive to one junior college district to divest itself of approximately 100 acres of land which the district had to buy in order to negotiate the purchase of the site on which the college buildings were to be erected. The district was unable to secure an option on the land which it deemed most desirable to own without taking an option on the adjacent land. In exercising the option for the land which was approved for purchase, the local district also had to exercise the option for that land which was not approved.

The local board felt that it had the right to hold this land inasmuch as it was not requesting the state to share in its cost. The Illinois Junior College Board ruled otherwise, citing its right of prior approval.

20 Public Junior College Act, Chapter 122, Section 103-36.
However, there are those who take issue with this ruling holding that the power of approval granted by the state which is contained in a section of the law dealing with the powers of the local board should be interpreted in context with those sections of the law enumerating the powers of the Illinois Junior College Board. In reference to site acquisition, the Illinois Junior College Board has the power and duty to establish standards for the proper location of the site.\textsuperscript{21} It also has the right to request site information from a junior college in its application for state funding.\textsuperscript{22} However, an application for state funding for a building project cannot include a request for acreage in excess of 200 for those schools with 3,000 or more projected full-time equivalent on campus day students. The law does not specify that the junior college district submit any kind of information about land which it may desire to purchase without state participation. Admittedly, this is a gray area; clarification must await amendments or a court decision. In the meantime, the Illinois Junior College Board has established a precedent demonstrating that it can veto the decision of a local board in expending local funds for site acquisition.

The current limitation of $30 per square foot for construction purposes is also indicative of the state's ability to control the expenditures of local resources. Recently the bids on a college project came in at approximately $32 a square foot. The college did not have the authority to pay the extra $2 per square foot without the permission of the Illinois Junior College Board and the Board of Higher Education even though no state funding in addition to that already approved for the project was involved.

\textsuperscript{21}\textit{Ibid.}, Section 102-12.

\textsuperscript{22}\textit{Ibid.}, Section 105-3.
A report from one junior college indicates that the Illinois Junior College Board exercised some control over private monies by refusing to allow a district to accept grants-in-aid for athletics. In referring to this incident on the questionnaire, the president of the college involved writes, "The point is not whether the policy of athletic grants-in-aid is desirable--rather if a state agency can prohibit one from receiving gifts for one purpose, might it not also prohibit the receipt of gifts for any purpose?"

The Public Junior College Act provides a legal basis for appealing this decision of the Illinois Junior College Board for it grants the local board the right "to accept gifts, grants, devises or bequests from any source when made for junior college purposes."23

Other situations could arise which might merit a change in the statutes or in their interpretation. Presently every curricular program offered by a college requires state approval. Suppose, for example, a proposed program was denied by one of the state coordinating boards. If the college was committed to the program to the extent that it was willing to defray all costs from local revenue, the college would not have the prerogative to fulfill its commitment.

The utilization of local revenue is not entirely at the discretion of local authorities. Nevertheless twenty-six of the presidents (78.8%) indicated that controls exercised in this area are not in excess of those necessary for statewide planning and coordination.

Seven presidents dissented. Five of them cited administrative and policy decisions of the Illinois Junior College Board and three cited administrative

23Ibid., Section 103-39.1.
and policy decisions of the Board of Higher Education. The Public Junior College Act was cited twice and the statutes creating the Board of Higher Education, the Board of Vocational Education, and the Illinois Building Authority were each cited once as were the administrative and policy decisions of the latter two boards and the Department of Registration and Education.

The twenty-six supporting responses are sufficient to affirm this proposition.

**Proposition 2.2** — Each Illinois public junior college district has the authority to exercise the necessary discretion for the most effective utilization of state apportionment funds based on semester hours or semester hour equivalency.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Presidents' Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The state's contribution to the operating expense of a public junior college is based on the total semester hours or semester hour equivalency being generated at mid-term. A full-time equivalent student is one who carries 15 semester hours or the equivalent thereof. At the present rate of support, the junior college receives $465 per academic year for a full-time equivalent student. This applies to all students in approved courses except those enrolled in courses for which the district receives 50 percent or more of federal financing.

There are no statutory provisions regulating the fund application or the disbursement of this operational aid. Since the apportionment is based on credit hours generated, there is an inclination to conclude that this aid was
intended to help the college defray those expenses which are budgeted from the educational fund. Although it escapes positive proof, it appears from an examination of the tax rates which the voters approved in establishing the junior college districts that the citizens' committees which proposed these rates viewed the state credit hour apportionment as a support function for the educational fund.

The legislature, however, did not wrap itself in a cloak of omniscience which would enable it to foresee the financial circumstances peculiar to the needs of each yet uncreated junior college district. Imperatives for the fund allocation or disbursement of state apportionment is absent from the law. Nor do such imperatives appear in the official document published by the Illinois Junior College Board which contains the guidelines, policies and procedures approved by that board. Both the Junior College Act and the Illinois Junior College Board respect the necessity for the local district to allocate these funds according to its best judgment.

But attempts have been made to force an allocation pattern upon the junior colleges. A letter from one of the associate secretaries of the Illinois Junior College Board in August of 1969 stipulated that revenues from state apportionment should be distributed to the Education Fund and the Building Fund in the same proportion that the local tax revenue is distributed for operating purposes. Since the distribution of revenue from these funds is determined by the tax rates levied for these funds which in turn were established at the time the districts were created which was prior to the time local boards were elected, this administrative order would cancel the right of the junior colleges to allocate their funds according to their best judgment.
Eleven months after this directive was issued, an official accounting manual was published which nullified this directive by stating, "The local Board of Trustees should make a determination within the budget for distribution of revenues from state apportionment and tuition among the education fund and the building fund." This statement establishes no ratio and the local board remains free to allocate these monies entirely to one fund or to establish any other satisfactory disbursement proportion.

It would appear that the problem has been resolved. And perhaps it has been. But this associate secretary, who was a strong advocate of tighter state controls, is now employed by the Bureau of the Budget. It is certainly within the realm of possibility that in his new position he may have greater influence upon the development of policies affecting the junior colleges than he had as an employee of the Illinois Junior College Board.

Of the four presidents expressing disagreement with this proposition, three cited administrative and policy decisions of the Illinois Junior College Board and two cited administrative and policy decisions of the Board of Vocational Education. The one president who expressed strong disagreement placed the responsibility for excessive control upon the Public Junior College Act. One president expressing agreement cited the Board of Vocational Education and Rehabilitation.

The support of 28 (84.9%) presidents affirms this proposition.

---

Proposition 2.3 -- Each Illinois public junior college district has the authority to exercise the necessary discretion for the most effective utilization of funds disbursed through the Board of Vocational Education.

Presidents' Responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>51.5% (17)</td>
<td>3% (1)</td>
<td>45.5% (15)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This proposition received a higher level of disagreement than did any other proposition in the study. It is probable if this same proposition were offered three years hence, there would be a higher percentage of supportive responses. Most of the experiences which the colleges have had with the Board of Vocational Education and Rehabilitation were based on policies and procedures which were supplanted by a new approach which is outlined in *Criteria for Program Approval and Financial Support* published in November of 1970.25 Although experience with the new policies is too limited to merit firm conclusions, they are apparently more liberal and the procedures to be followed do not force the junior college into a secondary school mold.

Funds are disbursed through the Board of Vocational Education and Rehabilitation for program operation and for the purchase and rental of equipment. Funding for program operation is based on a flat grant per contact hour enrollment and on an equalization formula. Support for approved equipment is based upon an equalization formula with no district receiving less than 40 percent nor more than 60 percent of equipment costs.

Program approval, which will be discussed in relation to the fourth hypothesis, is a prerequisite for financial support. Support follows approval and when the priorities of the college and those of the Board of Vocational Education and Rehabilitation are not in harmony, then the will of the state agency prevails. If a college wishes to initiate programs x, y, and z, with program x receiving top priority, it is possible for the Board of Vocational Education to grant approval to programs y and z and to deny approval to program x. Therefore while the college will be receiving funds, it cannot use them to support the program which it deems most needed.

A similar rationale applies to the purchase of equipment. A college must submit an itemized list of all the equipment it wishes to purchase for an occupational program. It is quite possible that the items that will be approved for partial state support are not the items which the college deems most necessary for conducting the program.

These are the examples of the type of policies which are responsible for the sharp division of opinion on this proposition. All of the fifteen presidents who disagreed with this proposition cited the administrative and policy decisions of the Board of Vocational Education and Rehabilitation as being responsible for the limitations placed upon the colleges in the use of funds disbursed through that board. In addition two of them cited the statute creating that board and one cited the administrative and policy decisions of the Illinois Junior College Board. One president who agreed with the proposition also checked the administrative and policy decisions of the Board of Vocational Education as excessive.
The support for this proposition is not sufficiently strong to merit unqualified affirmation. Neither is it sufficiently negative to assume the contrary.

Proposition 2.4 — Each Illinois public junior college district has the authority to exercise the necessary discretion for the most effective utilization of funds allocated to it by the state for building purposes.

Presidents' Responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>48.5% (16)</td>
<td>12.1% (4)</td>
<td>36.4% (12)</td>
<td>3% (1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The first step that a junior college must take in its quest for state participation in its building program is the development of a master plan for its campus development which must be approved by the Illinois Junior College Board and the Board of Higher Education. The Illinois Junior College Board exercises final authority for site approval and executes a staff study based on the following criteria:

1. Location of the proposed site in relation to the geography and population of the entire district and surrounding environment;

2. Accessibility of the proposed site by existing and currently planned highways and/or streets;

3. Cost of the proposed site in relation to the land values of the district and availability of site to be backed up by at least two appraisals, one of which must be a member of the American Institute of Real Estate Appraisers;

4. Cost of development of the proposed site in relation to topography, soil conditions and utilities;

5. Size of the proposed site in relation to projected student population and land cost; and
6. The number and location of alternate sites considered.\(^{26}\)

The Public Junior College Act excludes state participation in financing for "land or buildings intended primarily for staff housing, dormitories, or for athletic exhibitions, contests or games for which admission charges are to be made to the general public" but includes "classroom buildings and equipment, related structures and utilities necessary or appropriate for the uses of a Class I junior college."\(^{27}\) That which is "necessary or appropriate" is determined by the Illinois Junior College Board.

Each specific building project is studied by that board to determine the relationship of the project to the master plan. Any significant changes in campus planning must be approved by the Illinois Junior College Board and the Board of Higher Education.

The two boards have adopted a joint statement of policies and procedures for review of capital funds requests. Once the legislature has established a biennial appropriation for junior college construction and has authorized the sale of bonds to raise the necessary capital, the Illinois Junior College Board determines the capital quotas for the individual colleges. A number of factors are involved to determine whether a junior college is eligible for funds during a particular biennium and, if eligible, the amount of its allocation. The three most important factors are: (1) the number and amount of previous allocations made to a college; (2) the ability of the college to finance its share of a project and (3) the projected full-time equivalent on-campus day student.

\(^{26}\) Illinois Junior College Board, *Standards and Criteria*, p. 45.

\(^{27}\) *Public Junior College Act*, Chapter 122, Section 105-2.
Enrollment projections are developed according to procedures established by the Illinois Junior College Board with the advice of the institutions.

Each college is free to select its architect. The working drawings for construction are subject to the approval of the Illinois Junior College Board and the Illinois Building Authority.

It is not surprising that the policies regarding building projects are among the most precise policies articulated by the Board of Higher Education and the Illinois Junior College Board. Nor is it amazing that the procedures to be followed are carefully monitored. Spending money for building attracts attention. It is not unreasonable to assume that the indignation expressed publicly by the Board of Higher Education and the furor created as a result of the disclosure that one of the state universities was building what the newspapers termed a "presidential mansion" hastened the retirement of the president involved.

While some presidents may disagree with some of the policies regulating construction, the statutory base for these policies, or the procedures by which they are implemented, care has been exercised by the Illinois Junior College Board to make them available to all the institutions involved. The institutions are fully aware of the stated criteria to be used by the coordinating boards in evaluating their applications for support.

The Illinois Building Authority is in reality a mortgage house. Its primary responsibility is to market bonds to finance construction projects underwritten entirely or in part by the State of Illinois. Authorization for projects comes directly from the state government or from the state government
through another agency to the Illinois Building Authority. The Illinois Building Authority does not determine allocation of funds.

Title for any project financed through the Illinois Building Authority becomes the property of that body until the time when the bonds sold to finance the project are redeemed by appropriations made by the General Assembly. As a mortgage house, the Illinois Building Authority must have certain basic information about the project it is mortgaging.

After it has received permission from the Illinois Junior College Board and the Board of Higher Education, a junior college may submit its application to the Illinois Building Authority. Even though the project has the approval of the two state coordinating boards, it does not follow that the project as submitted will be approved by the Illinois Building Authority. Although this agency has identified very carefully all of the procedures that must be followed from the time an application is submitted until the day the last workman leaves the scene of the completed project, it has failed to identify the policies which govern its evaluation of a project.

From time to time it distributes a policy memo but no comprehensive guide has been developed which would assist junior colleges in determining whether their projects will meet the standards required by the Illinois Building Authority. As a result, when funding is not granted to the extent authorized by the Illinois Junior College Board and the Board of Higher Education, whose authorization cannot exceed that amount approved by the legislature, it is not unusual for a college to feel that it is the victim of an arbitrary judgment.

Nine of the twelve presidents who disagreed with this proposition cited administrative and policy decisions of the Illinois Building Authority as did
the president who strongly disagreed. Two of the presidents who disagreed felt that the statute creating this body was not in the best interests of the junior colleges; this belief was also shared by the president who expressed strong disagreement.

One president cited the law creating the Board of Higher Education, and administrative and policy decisions of that board were cited by three. The president who strongly disagreed cited the Public Junior College Act and the administrative and policy decisions of the Illinois Junior College Board; he was joined by one other president in the first instance and by four in the second.

Because four presidents expressed uncertainty, neither those in agreement nor those in disagreement represent a majority. The positive responses are not sufficient to verify the proposition nor are the negative responses great enough to deny it.

**Conclusion:** The presidents gave substantial support to the first two propositions indicating their belief that the local district has the authority to exercise the necessary discretion for the most effective use of funds raised at the local level and the state apportionment funds based on semester hours or semester hour equivalency.

Only 51.5 percent (17) of the presidents believed that the local district has the authority to exercise the necessary discretion for the most effective utilization of funds disbursed through the Board of Vocational Education. One president was undecided. This proposition registered a higher level of disagreement than any other in the study. Each of the fifteen (45.5 percent) who disagreed checked the administrative and policy decisions of the Board of
Vocational Education as being responsible for unnecessary limitations being
placed upon the expenditure of these funds. Two of the fifteen also cited the
law creating the Board of Vocational Education and one of these cited the ad­
ministrative and policy decisions of the Illinois Junior College Board.

The fourth proposition is the only proposition in the study which did not
receive the support of a majority of the presidents. Only 48.5 percent (16)
of the presidents endorsed this proposition which held that the local district
has the authority to exercise the necessary discretion for the most effective
use of funds allocated to it for building purposes.

Although this proposition received the lowest level of support given any
proposition, it did not register the highest level of disagreement because
12.1 percent (4) of the presidents were undecided. The thirteen presidents
(39.4 percent) who expressed disagreement and strong disagreement cited the
administrative and policy decisions of the Illinois Building Authority ten
times and the statute creating that agency four times. The fourteen criticisms
so directed exceed the total of all other criticisms. Six were directed to ad­
ministrative and policy decisions of the Illinois Junior College Board and two
to the statute creating that agency. One criticism was directed to the statute
creating the Board of Higher Education and three to the administrative and pol­
cy decisions of that board.

In terms of the number of objections to the last two propositions, more
criticism was directed to the Board of Vocational Education and the Illinois
Building Authority than to the coordinating board for junior colleges or the
coordinating board for public higher education. The two boards directly con­
cerned with junior colleges received the least amount of criticism. The Board
of Vocational Education which is also concerned with elementary and secondary schools and the Illinois Building Authority whose responsibilities relate to many state agencies received the greatest amount of criticism.

This would lead to the conclusion that those agencies which are least related to the junior colleges are most likely to impose unnecessary and/or unreasonable limitations upon the right of the local district to utilize effectively the funds allotted to it.

The responses to these four propositions do not lend categorical support to the hypothesis. The responses support the idea that local districts have the authority to exercise the necessary discretion for the most effective use of local revenue and for the state apportionment funds based on semester hours or semester hour equivalency. The support for the premise that the local districts can exercise the necessary discretion for the effective utilization of funds disbursed through the Board of Vocational Education is not sufficiently strong to merit its acceptance. Neither is the support for the premise that junior colleges can exercise the necessary discretion for the most effective utilization of funds allocated to it for building purposes strong enough to merit its acceptance. But the negative responses to these propositions are not sufficient to prove otherwise. The conclusions to these two propositions are in doubt. Therefore, the second hypothesis can be neither accepted or rejected.
HYPOTHESIS 3: EACH ILLINOIS PUBLIC JUNIOR COLLEGE ENJOYS ACADEMIC FREEDOM WITHOUT LEGISLATIVE OR ADMINISTRATIVE RESTRICTIONS FROM THE STATE.

Proposition 3.1 — Each Illinois public junior college is free to maintain an environment conducive to freedom of thought and discussion.

Presidents' Responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24.2% (8)</td>
<td>75.8% (25)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The presidents evidenced a high level of agreement with this proposition. No contrary evidence was discovered. The agencies with which this study is concerned have not attempted to render value judgments which would impair the freedom of the campus community to examine any issue be it popular or unpopular. Certainly freedom of expression is the foundation upon which academic freedom stands. A higher level of support was accorded this proposition than any other in the study. There was not a single check in the matrix to indicate any of the designated state agencies had sought to exercise control in this area.

There are some isolated instances of attempts to limit freedom of discussion, but these attempts stem from sources other than the coordinating agencies. One junior college has been subjected to much pressure from its community because of the speakers included in its lecture series. In one instance a state legislator wrote a letter expressing his disappointment in the selection of speakers for a lecture series. He subsequently wrote another letter to the college demanding an itemization of all expenditures, which included postage, stationery and staff time involved in publicizing a speaker to whom he had objections.
The president of the college involved noted that the legislator was so impressed with the courtesy, promptness, and thoroughness which characterized the college response that he has since frequently contacted the college for its advice on educational matters before legislative committees.

Historically the Illinois legislature has not hesitated to intrude upon the affairs of the campus. Banfield has documented the powerful influence of individual legislators upon the University of Illinois. In May of 1970 the president of Illinois State University was summoned by a group of legislators to explain why he allowed the flag to be flown at half-mast. He emerged from the conference "shaken and with tears in his eyes." One legislator described the incident as "an affront to the university, to academic freedom and to the democratic form of government." If freedom of thought and discussion in Illinois public junior colleges are to be subjected to restraints, there is no evidence to indicate the likelihood of such restraints finding their source in the state boards. It is more likely that these restraints, if they develop, will come as a result of political pressures from the community or from elected state officials who have a power base in state government.

The strong agreement and agreement of 33 presidents (100%) lend unqualified support to this proposition.

30 Ibid.
Proposition 3.2 — Each Illinois public junior college is free to develop and maintain its academic standards without limits other than those imposed by accrediting agencies and recognized professional groups.

Presidents' Responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21.2% (7)</td>
<td>75.8% (25)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3% (1)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The response to this proposition indicates that the responsibility of the Illinois Junior College Board to determine efficient and adequate standards for instruction and teaching have not been implemented in a fashion detrimental to the determination of academic standards by the individual college. One president who registered agreement with the proposition did indicate his belief that the Illinois Junior College Board and the Board of Vocational Education do exercise controls beyond those necessary for coordination. The one president who registered disagreement cited the Illinois Junior College Board for excessive control.

The Illinois Junior College Board has taken the position that it will not place a value judgment upon the standards of an individual college other than determining whether those standards are consistent with the law. Standards among the individual colleges may vary but must remain consistent with the philosophy upon which the Illinois Junior College Act is based. Instead of pre-determining absolute standards which would blanket each college, the board has taken the position that the evaluative criteria should be realistic in terms of the objectives of the college. The board states its position as follows:
In the evaluative process, the basic questions shall always be: (1) Is the philosophy of the college consistent with that stipulated in the Public Junior College Act? (2) Are the objectives of the college consistent with its stated philosophy? (3) Are the stated objectives of the college being realized?31

No evidence was discovered that would indicate that the right of the individual college to establish and maintain its academic standards is jeopardized by state agencies. The positive responses of 32 (97%) of the presidents affirm this proposition.

Proposition 3.3 — Each Illinois Public Junior College is free to develop policies for the exercise of distinctive rights and shared responsibilities for trustees, administrators, faculty and students.

Presidents' Responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

The board of trustees of a community college cannot escape legal responsibility for the duties assigned to it nor for those powers it may choose to exercise, but the degree to which it becomes involved in initiating or implementing policy decisions is determined at the local level. As part of an information exchange program, the presidents recently sent to one another one month's board packet. These packets included the agenda for one meeting, the minutes of the previous month's meeting, documents relating directly to items on the agenda on which action was sought, and administrative reports. An examination of this material reveals that the rights and responsibilities shared

31Illinois Junior College Board, Standards and Criteria, p. 15.
by boards and administrators vary greatly in kind and proportion from one district to another. In some cases the board is called upon to make broad policy decisions; in others the board is directly involved in designing procedures for policy implementation. The discretion which the administration is allowed to exercise in purchasing escapes the label of uniformity.

Printed board policies also reveal the wide differences among the colleges in delineating distinctive rights and mutual responsibilities of those in the campus community. Several hundred pages are required for the policies of some boards while others may extend no more than fifty pages.

Employment of personnel is a prerogative of the local board granted by statute. This is a responsibility which is shared in a variety of ways. In some instances the board does little more than ratify the recommendations of the president. And the president may base his recommendations entirely upon the advice of a person with designated responsibility for a particular area. Some junior colleges follow the practice not uncommon in senior institutions of involving faculty members in the selection of new staff members. One junior college which mandates student interviews for all potential employees of its student personnel division illustrates the extent to which the responsibility of staff selection is sometimes shared.

The junior colleges not only have the right to determine the reservation of rights for particular groups and to designate those responsibilities which shall be shared but they are encouraged to do so by the Illinois Junior College Board. "The delineation of roles of the board and of the administrative staff
should be stated in a document or documents containing board policies and pro-
cedures" is a criterion established for local boards.32

In its statement on standards for policy development for junior colleges, 
the Illinois Junior College Board directs the development of the following doc-
uments: district junior college board policies and procedures, faculty and/or 
administrative handbook, organizational chart, college catalog, and student 
handbook. It further maintains that the development of these documents shall 
be "characterized by the cooperative effort, understanding and acceptance of 
all concerned and shall clearly identify and delineate the authority and re-
sponsibility of all concerned in the total operation of the junior college."33 
This standard is re-emphasized by one of the criteria to be applied: "The 
various segments of the junior college community should be involved in policy 
development."

Whether the junior colleges have implemented the development of policy in 
a manner which recognizes the interests and the abilities of the various groups 
to contribute cannot be determined by any investigation of this study. How-
ever, the prevailing question is not whether it has been done but if it can be 
done. Thirty-one (93.9%) of the presidents expressed agreement or strong 
agreement with this proposition; the remaining two (6.1%) were undecided. Not 
one president cited a state agency or a law as an example of a limiting factor. 
The evidence supports the affirmation of this proposition.

32Ibid., p. 19.
33Ibid.
Proposition 3.4 — Each Illinois public junior college is free to exercise the necessary control of its membership of faculty, staff, and students without any outside agency dictating the acceptance, retention, or dismissal of any particular individual.

Presidents' Responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12.1% (4)</td>
<td>72.7% (24)</td>
<td>3% (1)</td>
<td>9.1% (3)</td>
<td>3% (1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As indicated previously, it is the duty of the local board to appoint and fix the salaries of administrators and teachers. The only statutory limitation on appointments and salaries is that there can be no discrimination on account of sex, race, creed, color, or national origin. The appointments are not subject to approval by any agency other than the local board. It is a power of the local board but not a duty to establish tenure policies and policies governing the discharge of teachers and administrative personnel.

The local boards' statutory powers also include the right to employ other personnel as may be needed, to fix their compensation, and to establish policies governing their employment and dismissal subject only to the stipulation that the same discriminatory prohibitions applicable to teachers and administrators must also apply to other personnel. Neither are these appointments subject to approval by any agency other than the local board.

The Illinois Junior College Board, however, has established some criteria to be used in the evaluation of administrative and instructional staffs. The president should have had graduate work at the doctoral level, previous experience in higher education or in educational administration and should have a record of demonstrated competence in educational leadership. Experience and graduate work are easy to document, but a conclusion regarding demonstrated competence rests to no small degree upon value judgments.
Other members of the administrative staff are expected to have had previous administrative experience in education, successful classroom teaching experience and a minimum of a master's degree with emphasis in the area appropriate to the duties assigned. Members of the administrative staff need "a thorough understanding and mastery of administrative leadership." This understanding and mastery "may be obtained through study which includes courses in: (a) administration and supervision, including course work in administrative leadership, finance, and educational program; (b) behavioral sciences; (c) history and philosophy of education, including theories of social change; and (d) the public junior college."

Accountants and counselors, according to the Illinois Junior College Board, "may be employed upon the basis of demonstrated competence in their field of specialization with an appropriate background of education and experience."

The Illinois Junior College Board holds that members of the teaching staff should be prepared in accordance with generally accepted standards for teaching, supervision and administration in the disciplines and subject fields to which they are assigned. These generally accepted standards include "collegiate study and/or professional experience" and a master's degree or beyond "except for such subjects and fields in which graduate programs are not normally available or in which work experience is the principal teaching medium."

34 Ibid., p. 20.
35 Ibid.
36 Ibid.
37 Ibid., p. 28.
38 Ibid.
The Public Junior College Act severed junior colleges attaining Class I status from the jurisdiction of the Office of Public Instruction and consequently the certification requirements for junior college personnel as required by that office are no longer applicable. A teacher or administrator no longer needs to present credentials to a state office to prove that he has the requirements necessary for employment in a junior college. The college itself may decide if an employee has the experience, education, and personal qualities it finds desirable.

In one sense the burden of proof has shifted from the individual to the college. The college may be held responsible for employing a staff that meets the criteria of the Illinois Junior College Board. The list of courses specified as desirable for members of the administrative staff reads not unlike the courses required for an all-grade supervisory certificate for the common schools. If the Illinois Junior College Board should choose to apply its criteria for personnel quite rigidly, the net effect would be a re-birth of certification.

A comparison of the 1967 edition of *Standards and Criteria for the Evaluation and Recognition of Illinois Public Junior Colleges and Other Guidelines, Policies and Procedures Approved by The Illinois Junior College Board* with the 1970 edition of the same publication provides some evidence to indicate that the Illinois Junior College Board is showing greater interest in involving itself in establishing standards for professional personnel. The statements in the 1967 edition with respect to the teaching staff are referred to as "minimum requirements," "a general guide" and "are recommended." The statements in the 1970 edition are labeled "standard" and "criteria." The 1967 edition specifies
no degree requirement for instructors in adult and continuing education but requires "demonstrated competence in the field of specialization based upon education or experience which is acceptable in lieu of a degree requirement."39

In the 1967 edition the master's degree was a recommended minimum requirement for those teaching courses in the transfer curricula; the 1970 edition cites the master's degree as a criterion for all teachers except in those instances where graduate work is not normally available or for those programs "in which work experience is the principal teaching medium."40

The Board of Vocational Education and Rehabilitation has established minimum requirements for personnel involved in vocational programs which are funded in part through this board. The requirements are categorized according to competencies, professional experience, employment experience, and in-service education and are set forth for the local director, assistant director, local supervisor, vocational guidance coordinator and the instructors.

The minimum requirements for each position are very similar. Basically, they call for the general competencies related to the particular position, professional experience of two years in vocational technical education programs, although this requirement is omitted for the guidance coordinator, employment experience in an occupational field of one year or 2,000 hours, and attendance at workshops and seminars sponsored by the Board of Vocational Education. In

---


the case of directors or assistant directors, however, attendance at seminars and workshops may not be limited to those sponsored by the Board of Vocational Education but may include those recognized by this board.\textsuperscript{41}

Although these requirements are worded very specifically, there is an option provided which is termed "alternate qualification." Any person who does not meet the requirements may be granted annual approval upon recommendation and justification by the chief administrator of the college.

While the staff criteria established by the Illinois Junior College Board and the minimum requirements established by the Board of Vocational Education and Rehabilitation determine standards for staff selection, they in no way dictate the hiring or firing of a particular individual. But these same guidelines could supercede the judgment of the college in hiring a person for a particular position if that person in the opinion of the college authorities was qualified but failed to meet the stated standards of these two state agencies.

There are but few regulations regarding the acceptance and retention of students. As "open-door" colleges, junior colleges are expected to admit all students of post high school age. The law recognized inadequacy of space as being the only reason for excluding a student and states that when space is inadequate those students residing in the district who are best qualified shall be admitted and that class rank and the results of ability and achievement tests shall be used as guides to identify those best qualified. A literal interpretation of the act could conceivably run counter to the criterion established by the Illinois Junior College Board which states that when space is inadequate those students residing in the district who are best qualified shall be admitted and that class rank and the results of ability and achievement tests shall be used as guides to identify those best qualified.

\textsuperscript{41}Board of Vocational Education and Rehabilitation. \textit{Criteria for Approval}, pp. 6-8.
limited that the best qualified students should be admitted in such manner as to provide a balance of students in transfer, occupational and adult education curricula.

Although no student is to be denied admission barring space limitations, the college is charged with the responsibility "to distribute the students according to their interests and abilities." 42 A student, therefore, could be denied admission to a particular program on the basis of a statutory provision. Neither the law nor policy statements from the state level establish requirements for the retention or dismissal of students.

Of the presidents who agreed with this proposition, only one cited the Illinois Junior College Board as exercising excessive control and only two cited the Board of Vocational Education and Rehabilitation. One of these two was the same president who cited the Illinois Junior College Board. None of the presidents who disagreed or strongly disagreed cited any of the laws or agencies listed in the matrix. One cited "the union" and the other three cited the Department of Registration and Education which exercises considerable influence in staff selection of those personnel directly involved in staffing the associate degree program in nursing education.

Twenty-eight of the presidents (84.8%) affirmed this proposition. The four who disagreed did so on the grounds of organizations other than those with which this study is concerned. The presidents do not believe that either the statutes or the boards which are the subject of this study inhibit the local district in exercising the necessary control of its membership of staff,

42Public Junior College Act, Section 103-17.
faculty and students. Those requirements set forth by the statutes and the boards do not transcend the need for statewide coordination and planning.

Conclusion: No other hypothesis was endorsed as strongly as this one. Agreement ranged from a low of 84.8 percent to 100 percent. On the first and third propositions not a single president indicated any external controls. Only two presidents indicated objections to regulations regarding academic standards. Of the six presidents who objected to controls exercised with respect to the acceptance, retention or dismissal of faculty and/or students, four of them limited their objections to agencies not included in the study, unions and the Department of Registration and Education. There were only six objections directed to the listed agencies, three to administrative and policy decisions of the Illinois Junior College Board and three to the administrative and policy decisions of the Board of Vocational Education and Rehabilitation. These six objections were made by three presidents.

HYPOTHESIS 4: EACH ILLINOIS PUBLIC JUNIOR COLLEGE HAS EFFECTIVE CONTROL OF ITS CURRICULUM, RESEARCH, AND PUBLIC SERVICE ACTIVITIES.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Presidents' Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There are two imperatives in the Public Junior College Act which affect curriculum development. The first of these seeks to assure comprehensiveness by mandating courses in liberal arts and sciences, adult education courses, and courses in occupational, semi-technical and technical fields which lead directly to employment and which must constitute at least 15 percent of all courses taught and of which one-half must be in fields other than business education.
The second is that provision of the law referred to in Chapter III which was lifted practically verbatim from the act creating the Board of Higher Education. While it grants broad powers to the Illinois Junior College Board, it is not found in that section which enumerates the powers and duties of that board but is squeezed into the section setting forth the requirements for meetings of the board.

Since this portion of the law is germane to all the propositions for this hypothesis, it is appropriate to re-examine and restate it at this point. It says:

A majority of the members of the State Board shall constitute a quorum at all meetings, but the approval of a new unit of instruction, research, or a public service for a junior college shall require the concurrence of a majority of all members of the State Board.

The term 'new unit of instruction, research or public service' includes the establishment of a college, school, division, institute, department or other unit including majors and curricula in any field of instruction, research, or public service not theretofore included in the program of the junior college, and includes the establishment of any new branch or campus of the institution. The term shall not include reasonable and moderate extensions of existing curricula, research, or public service programs which have a direct relationship to existing programs; and the State Board may, under its rule making power define the character of such reasonable and moderate extensions. 43

Several observations are pertinent:

1. The state legislature evidently placed high priority upon this approval function for it is the only function performed by the Illinois Junior College Board which requires more than a majority vote of a quorum.

2. The language is conducive to different interpretations.

43 Ibid., Section 102-3.
A new college, an organizational unit of the college, a field of study and a new branch or campus of the college are all defined as a new unit of instruction. Excluded from the definition is that which is in existence and reasonable and moderate extensions of that which is in existence.

It is quite clear that a new branch or campus of the college requires approval as a new unit of instruction. But does it therefore follow that the approval of a new branch or campus also requires approval of the instructional program to be offered at that branch or campus if these programs are already in existence by virtue of their approval for the home campus? Does the law actually specify that a previously approved curriculum loses exclusion and becomes a new unit of instruction when it is offered in a newly approved branch? Or is it the intent of the law that the establishment of a new campus or branch and the establishment of new programs require approval? If a curriculum which is already in existence loses its approval exclusion when taught in a branch or campus, then it lies within the authority of the state not only to veto a curriculum but to determine for a multi-campus district the locations at which an approved curriculum might be taught.

The Illinois Junior College Board has taken the position that each campus or branch of a college must be treated as a separate college for purposes of program approval. But then it has complicated the problem by stating that the junior colleges are encouraged to operate extension centers and avowing, "The decision to offer instruction at extension centers within a junior college district rests solely with the local junior college board." Presumably a branch

could be called an extension center and pre-existing programs implemented. But if a branch is called a branch, then programs could not be transferred.

The position taken by the Illinois Junior College Board on program approval for new branches or campuses of a college might well reflect the intent of the law but it is not difficult to construct a contrary case. The basic issue is whether program approval should be granted to a Class I junior college district or to a Class I junior college. If the district is to be considered the entity, then it is for district level that program approval should be determined. If the college, branch or campus is the entity, then program approval should be determined for that level. If the latter is the case, then at which level should the criterion of program comprehensiveness be applied? If it is applied at the district level, then program approval by branches is superfluous. If the criterion of comprehensiveness is applied at the branch level, the result would be an unnecessary duplication of facilities and programs.

It is questionable if the legislature was aware of all the ramifications involved in duplicating in the Public Junior College Act wording from an act which was originally designed to coordinate the activities of the state colleges and universities which have no chartered boundary lines, are not funded locally, are governed by an appointed body rather than a locally elected board, and draw students from a much larger population base than does any junior college.

Certainly the legal validity of curriculum approval by branch is open to question, but the Illinois Junior College has the responsibility of playing the March Hare in interpreting the Alice language of the legislature and cannot be faulted for the position taken. Significant to its position are the facts that
Illinois Junior College Board policy on this matter is consistent with the position taken by the Board of Higher Education and that the adoption of the policy was subsequent to action taken by the higher board.

As directed by the statute, the Illinois Junior College Board has defined "reasonable and moderate extensions" of existing programs. Three criteria are applied: (1) the extension must be directly related to an existing program; (2) it must be housed within an existing organizational unit of the college; and (3) it must not result in a new degree, certificate or major, a major being a concentration of study which consists of three or more courses yielding nine or more semester hours or the equivalent of nine or more semester hours. It is within these parameters that a junior college may expand its curricular offerings without approval from the coordinating boards.

All curricular offerings submitted to the Illinois Junior College Board for approval must also be submitted to the Board of Higher Education for its sanction. The application must be accompanied by the recommendation of the Illinois Junior College Board. Both boards use the same criteria to determine reasonable and moderate extensions.

Despite the broad powers granted these agencies for the approval of curricular programs, it is the local district that initiates a program for approval. While a local district cannot offer a program without state sanction, neither can the state impose a program upon the local district. The state actually responds to a request, either negatively or affirmatively; curriculum requests are not created at the state level.

There is a question concerning the necessity for dual program approval by the coordinating boards. If the judgment of the Illinois Junior College Board can be trusted, there appears to be no need for its sanction by another board. If it cannot be trusted, then its recommendations for program approval to the higher board are unnecessary and its effectiveness as a screening agent questionable. Requests for program approvals from the senior institutions flow directly from their governing boards to the Board of Higher Education, their coordinating agency. It does not appear logical to hold the Illinois Junior College Board responsible for coordinating junior college programs if it is to be denied the power of final program approval.

Occupational programs which are to be funded in part by the Federal Vocational Education Act also need the approval of the Board of Vocational Education and Rehabilitation. Since many colleges wish to exceed the statutory requirement that at least 15 percent of all courses must be in the vocational area, the policies of this board have a great influence upon program development.

It appears that program approval by this board will be less difficult to achieve than in the past. Policies which were effective until February of 1970 stipulated that after approval of a curriculum by the Illinois Junior College Board and the Board of Higher Education, "the Board of Vocational Education and Rehabilitation shall consider that curriculum for approval of financial support."\textsuperscript{46} The new policy states that subsequent to approval of a curriculum by

\textsuperscript{46}Board of Vocational Education and Rehabilitation. Policy adopted November 15, 1967.
the two coordinating boards that the Board of Vocational Education and Rehabilitation "shall approve" the program.47

The new language appears to make approval by this board contingent only upon approval by the other two boards. However, there are other considerations which lessen the impact of the new language. For example, new programs must be justified in part on the basis of local employment opportunities. It is questionable if this is sound practice for a population that is highly mobile. But disregarding the factor of mobility, there still remains another important consideration. While depressed urban areas grab the headlines, genuine poverty is not unknown in other portions of the state; notably the rural southern tip. The greatest occupational opportunity in that area is the opportunity for unemployment, hardly the aim of a vocational program.

Working at odds with the criterion of employment opportunities is the necessity to offer occupational programs in five categories, one of which is agriculture. Several junior colleges in the Chicago area have not received full approval of their annual plans because they failed to offer agricultural programs. It is difficult to prove a need for agricultural programs in one of the world's largest industrial centers.

The use of advisory committees to assist in the development and evaluation of occupational programs is a commonly accepted practice throughout the country. The experience and knowledge of advisory committee members add a useful dimension to planning occupational programs. Occasionally, however, the requirement that advisory committees be used tends to become a handicap. For example, in

47Board of Vocational Education and Rehabilitation. Revised Policies Adopted February 19, 1970.
depressed rural areas employers who may serve on these advisory committees do not always look with favor upon a well-trained person whose skills may require higher wages than are common. And people serving on the committees who may represent the occupations as practitioners sometimes fear the coming competition. The attitudes of these people are not encouraging to the development of occupational programs. When this happens, the college involved finds that anticipated assistance becomes a realized handicap.

The one president who expressed strong disagreement with this proposition cited the acts creating the Board of Higher Education, the Illinois Junior College Board, the Board of Vocational Education and Rehabilitation and the administrative and policy decisions of these agencies as responsible for unnecessary control. He also cited the Department of Registration and Education as did one of the presidents who disagreed. Of the ten expressing disagreement, seven cited administrative and policy decisions of the Board of Vocational Education and six cited the administrative and policy decisions of the Illinois Junior College Board. There was one citation for the act creating the Board of Vocational Education and one for the act creating the Board of Higher Education. Two of the ten cited the Public Junior College Act.

Four of the nineteen who expressed agreement with the proposition held that the administrative and policy decisions of the Illinois Junior College Board present restrictions beyond those necessary for statewide coordination and one of these four held the same belief for the Board of Vocational Education and Rehabilitation.

While disagreement and strong disagreement accounted for 33.3 percent of the responses, the support given is sufficient to affirm the proposition.
Proposition 4.2 — Each Illinois public junior college has authority commensurate with its responsibility to determine the courses that may be required or recommended for each curricular program offered.

Presidents' Responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3% (1)</td>
<td>60.6% (20)</td>
<td>3% (1)</td>
<td>30.3% (10)</td>
<td>3% (1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While there may be agreement between the state agencies and College A that the college should offer a program in data processing, it does not necessarily follow that the college and the state agencies will agree on what courses should constitute the program. Should English be included? If so, should it be the English composition course offered to transfer students or should the students in data processing take Business English?

A program application to the Illinois Junior College Board must include the courses to be offered in the program. If approval of the courses is not granted, the program cannot be offered. If a college should offer courses beyond the "reasonable and moderate extension," this will be reflected in the unit cost study.

Unnecessary program duplication among neighboring colleges could result in dissipating financial resources. But course approval becomes a matter of educational judgment when the desirability of the program is not in question.

The components of a curriculum should be selected in terms of the objectives of the curriculum. The authority to determine the components carries with it a measure of ability to select the objectives.

Comments on the questionnaires claimed that there was excessive interference on the part of state staffs in determining program content. The Illinois
Junior College Board has expressed a strong interest in articulation between the junior colleges and the state supported universities and colleges. It is legitimately concerned with the transfer opportunities of junior college students and continues to sponsor articulation conferences which may enhance these opportunities.

The junior colleges have been resentful of the implied necessity to structure their courses as carbon copies of courses in the senior institutions. Recently the Board of Higher Education passed a resolution calling upon the senior colleges to accept all credits earned by graduating transfer students and to recognize any student with an associate degree as having completed his general education requirements. This new resolution may lessen the concern of the state staff with course selection.

The Board of Vocational Education has decreased the influence of its staff in course selection. Recently nullified policies stated that its staff would be "available for organization and development of occupational education." The new policies specify that its staff shall be "available for consultative services in organizing and developing occupational education."

In fact, the newly developed approval criteria of the Board of Vocational Education and Rehabilitation does not even mention courses. Instead it places an emphasis upon the achievement of objectives. The criteria do not require a program consisting of a planned sequence of courses but ask for "a planned

48 Board of Vocational Education and Rehabilitation Policy Adopted November 15, 1967.

49 Board of Vocational Education Revised Policies Adopted February 19, 1970.
sequence of those essentials of education or experience (or both) deemed necessary for the individual to achieve such objective [the objective of instruction].

The Board of Vocational Education and Rehabilitation recently approved a program in Industrial Technology which has no courses but is structured to enable the student to reach specified behavioral objectives. A student in this program will not complete his work by passing a required number of courses but will be successful when he demonstrates a satisfactory level of competency for each of the specified objectives.

The president who expressed strong disagreement with this proposition had also expressed strong disagreement with the previous proposition. He included the Department of Registration and Education in his citation as well as the laws creating the Board of Higher Education, the Illinois Junior College Board, and the Board of Vocational Education and the administrative and policy decisions of these agencies.

Of the ten who expressed disagreement with this proposition, five had expressed disagreement with the previous one. Eight cited administrative and policy decisions of the Board of Vocational Education while seven checked the administrative and policy decisions of the Illinois Junior College Board. The administrative and policy decisions of the Board of Higher Education was cited once as were the laws creating the Board of Higher Education, the Illinois Junior College Board and the Board of Vocational Education.

One president who agreed cited the Board of Vocational Education.

---

50 Board of Vocational Education and Rehabilitation. *Criteria*, p. 2.
The measure of agreement and disagreement accorded this proposition is the same as that accorded proposition 4.1, and while the agreement is not overwhelming it is sufficient to affirm the proposition.

Proposition 4.3 -- Each Illinois public junior college district has authority commensurate with its responsibility to determine the public services it may offer.

Presidents' Responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9.1% (3)</td>
<td>78.8% (26)</td>
<td>3% (1)</td>
<td>9.1% (3)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The discussion of the proposition related to the development of curricular programs questioned the wisdom of transferring a provision of one act to another law. The same provision of the Illinois Junior College Act which prohibits curriculum expansion beyond a "reasonable and moderate extension" also places the same limitation upon the expansion of public services. The anomaly of this prohibition for junior colleges is heightened by the realization that at no other place in the act is public service cited. No procedure for funding public services is provided by the act.

An examination of the budgets of the state senior institutions reveals that public service is a budget category for which state funds are appropriated. The official budget form which junior colleges must use provides no income category for public services. Presumably the receipt of funds for public services could be considered out of the ordinary.

Nevertheless, both the Illinois Junior College Board and the Board of Higher Education have developed policies defining the extension of public services in junior colleges. According to the Illinois Junior College Board,
reasonable and moderate extension of public service activities consist of "new public activities which are (1) designed to serve the needs peculiar to the college district; (2) which are to be concluded in one year or less; and (3) for which no state funds are requested."\textsuperscript{51}

According to the Board of Higher Education a "reasonable and moderate extension of public service is any new public service if (i) its total annual operating expenditure from whatever source obtained does not exceed $250,000; or (ii) its annual operating expenditures from state appropriation does not exceed $50,000."\textsuperscript{52} The higher board has reserved the right to regulate public service activities which exceed the financial limits established even if the money comes from private sources.

Only three presidents expressed disagreement with this proposition. Two cited the Board of Vocational Education and its statutory base; two cited the Department of Registration and Education; the Illinois Junior College Board and the Board of Higher Education and the act creating it were cited once.

One of the twenty-six presidents who agreed did cite the administrative policies and procedures of the Illinois Junior College Board.

The positive responses of 87.9\% of the presidents affirm this proposition.


\textsuperscript{52} \textit{Ibid.}, p. 37.
Proposition 4.4 — Each Illinois public junior college district has authority commensurate with its responsibility to determine the extent and purposes of its research activities.

Presidents' Responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12.1% (4)</td>
<td>75.8% (25)</td>
<td>9.1% (3)</td>
<td>3% (1)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The statutory requirements and the boards' policies that pertain to the "reasonable and moderate extension" of research are identical to those applicable to public service. There is no provision in the Public Junior College Act to fund research.

Organized research for program improvement and expansion is deemed a legitimate budget item for the public senior universities and is funded by the state.

Although junior colleges are teaching institutions, they are requested to conduct institutional research. The Illinois Junior College Board has declared, "Each public junior college shall have a formalized procedure for collecting, analyzing and reporting data which can be used as a basis for the improvement of administrative procedures, institutional practices and student personnel services."53

The one president who disagreed with this proposition cited the Board of Higher Education and the Illinois Junior College Board and the statutes which created them. The affirmative responses of 87.9 percent of the presidents support this proposition.

53Ibid., p. 22.
Conclusion: Each of the first two propositions was supported by 21 (63.6%) presidents. The third and fourth propositions were supported by 29 (87.9%) presidents. Eighteen of the presidents who supported the first also supported the second. Two of the remaining three registered disagreement with the second and the third was undecided. Of the three presidents who supported the second but not the first, two registered disagreement with both the first and second propositions. Generally, then, those who agreed that the colleges had the necessary authority to determine the curricular programs also agreed that the colleges had the necessary authority to select the courses that may be required or recommended for each curricular program offered.

Five presidents who registered agreement with the first proposition indicated, however, that there were controls beyond those necessary for statewide planning and coordination. Their objections combined with those who disagreed totalled thirty-two, the largest number given to any proposition. The second proposition received twenty-seven objections and ranked second highest in the number of objections cited.

Of the three presidents who disagreed with the third proposition, two had registered disagreement with the first and second propositions. The third president was also the only president who disagreed with the fourth proposition.

The responses support the acceptance of this proposition.
HYPOTHESIS 5: THERE IS A TREND TOWARD INCREASED LOCAL AUTONOMY FOR ILLINOIS PUBLIC JUNIOR COLLEGES.

To test this hypothesis the presidents were asked to indicate their views of the trends in state control by placing checks in a matrix which would indicate either decreasing control, no significant change in control, or increasing control as resulting from the statutes creating the agencies which are the subject of this study or as reflected by the administrative and policy decisions of these agencies.

Their responses follow:

1. Twenty-seven presidents (81.8%) indicated the administrative and policy decisions of the Board of Higher Education are indicative of increasing control; the remaining six (18.2%) saw no significant change in control as a result of action by this board.

2. Eight presidents (24.2%) believed increased control has been granted to the Board of Higher Education as a result of statutory changes; the remaining twenty-five (75.8%) saw no significant changes in the statutes affecting state control.

3. Twelve presidents (36.4%) believed the administrative and policy decisions of the Illinois Junior College Board demonstrate increased control; two (6.1%) believe these policies indicate less control and nineteen (57.6%) saw no significant changes.

4. Four presidents (12.1%) saw increased control resulting from the Public Junior College Act; four (12.1%) believe changes in the act have resulted in decreased control and twenty-five (75.8%) perceived no significant changes.

5. Thirteen presidents (39.4%) believed that the administrative and policy decisions of the Board of Vocational Education are indicative of increased control; ten (30.3%) believed these policies are resulting in decreased control and ten (30.3%) perceived no significant changes.
6. Four presidents (12.1%) believed increased power has been granted the Board of Vocational Education by virtue of the statutes; four (12.1%) saw the statutory powers of this board decreasing, and twenty-five (75.8%) indicated no significant changes.

7. Twelve presidents (36.4%) believed the administrative and policy decisions of the Illinois Building Authority portend increased control by this agency; one (3%) believed that control would decrease and twenty (60.6%) perceived no significant changes.

8. Three presidents (9.1%) believed trends indicate increased statutory powers for the Illinois Building Authority; one president (3%) saw decreasing control and twenty-nine (87.9%) perceived no significant changes.

The data do not support the hypothesis. Only twelve presidents indicated decreased control for one or more of the eight areas and their responses of decreased control totaled twenty. However, the responses of increased control by this same group totaled thirty.

Only two presidents did not cite increasing control for one or more of the eight areas but neither did these two presidents cite decreasing control, but instead indicated no significant change for each of the eight areas.

Also pertinent is the fact that each of the six presidents whose responses to the propositions included no disagreements or strong disagreements indicated increasing control for one or more areas.

Of the 83 responses indicating increased control, 64 were addressed to administrative and policy decisions and 27 of these specified the Board of Higher Education. Sixty-one percent of the total number of responses indicated no significant change but 93.9 percent (31) of the presidents indicated increased control in one or more areas.
Conclusion: The responses to the questionnaire support the conclusion that the administrative and policy decisions of the Board of Higher Education are exercising increasing control of Illinois public junior colleges.

Summary

The presidents' responses to the questionnaire supported the following hypotheses:

(1) Each Illinois public junior college is free to develop as a distinct institution with a unique character.

(3) Each Illinois public junior college enjoys academic freedom without legislative or administrative restrictions from the state.

(4) Each Illinois public junior college has effective control of its curriculum, public services, and research activities.

The responses to the second hypothesis did not warrant its acceptance or rejection.

(2) Each Illinois public junior college has the authority to exercise the necessary discretion for the most effective use of its local revenue and funds disbursed through state agencies.

The fifth hypothesis was rejected.

(5) There is a trend toward local autonomy for Illinois public junior colleges.

The presidents' responses indicated that there is a trend toward decreased local autonomy for Illinois public junior colleges.

All but six of the presidents disagreed with one or more of the propositions supporting the first four hypotheses. Of the remaining six, one expressed uncertainty on two propositions and the other expressed uncertainty on one.
The responses to the propositions supporting the first four hypotheses revealed concerns regarding the ability of the college to determine: (1) curricular programs, (2) the courses which constitute those programs, and (3) the most effective utilization of its funds. Although the administrative and policy decisions of the Board of Higher Education were cited nineteen times by only ten presidents, twenty-seven presidents believed that there was a trend toward more control by this agency.

These results plus the necessity to secure information and insights relevant to the opinions of the presidents as reflected in the questionnaire prompted the interviews and the subsequent investigation reported in the following chapter.
CHAPTER VI

INTERVIEWS WITH COLLEGE PRESIDENTS

Nine presidents were interviewed; no interview was shorter than one hour. Each was recorded so that quotations used would be direct quotations and would not represent an interpretation of what had been said and would not contain semantic nuances other than those recorded. Each president was guaranteed anonymity as well as the promise that any remarks which he did not want quoted would be held in confidence. Every geographic area of the state was represented. The districts ranged from among the smallest to among the largest in geographic size and enrollment. They ranged from among the lowest to among the highest in equalized assessed valuation, equalized assessed valuation per capita, authorized tax rates, tuition charges, and per capita cost per full-time equivalent student.

It was planned to ask a group of pre-determined questions, but often the answer to one question would open a new area of inquiry. Consequently, in most cases the interview was not structured. The personal experiences of the presidents differ; therefore an area of great concern to one president was often of little import to another.

A number of factors operate to influence their individual perceptions. Basic, of course, is the belief the president holds concerning the respective roles of the state agencies and the local district and his interpretation of the statutory provisions affecting and/or delineating these roles. Although
the local districts share some problems, each has its unique difficulties. It is not unlikely, therefore, that a president would be influenced by a decision on a problem which he felt was peculiar to his district. A president who agrees with the educational philosophy as expressed by staff members of the state agencies or as implemented by the state boards is likely to perceive problems in a much different light than one who disagrees with these positions. Personality differences between a president and an agency staff member could also influence a president's analysis of the problems. If a president felt that policies were not applied consistently, his views would also differ from one who believed that all districts were treated in the same manner.

The first portion of this chapter will present the concerns expressed by the college presidents relative to the relationships between the local districts and the state agencies. The concluding section will include a discussion of the causative factors which have produced the effects and symptoms indicative of weaknesses in state-local relationships.

Areas of Concern Regarding the Illinois Junior College Board

The presidents interviewed were unanimous in declaring the necessity of a coordinating board for junior colleges. A well coordinated system of junior colleges is in the best interests of both the individual institutions and the junior college movement. The presidents, however, were far from unanimous in their appraisal of the system in Illinois.

The reactions ranged from the very positive, "I am surprised and pleased that we have not had any outright governance" to the very negative, "We don't have coordinating boards; we have governing boards." Yet those with the most
positive reactions held some reservations while those with the most negative reactions were not without praise for the system. Most would defend the Illinois program as one of the best in the country but would also regard it as a system that is becoming increasingly vulnerable to forces that would diminish its strengths and increase its weaknesses.

Some presidents give the impression that they feel as though they are walking through an unfamiliar building in the dark, unsure of their footing, not knowing when there might be a drop in the floor level. The respective areas of authority of the Illinois Junior College Board and the local district are not defined clearly to the satisfaction of all. As one of the presidents said, "The very questions that are asked at the Presidents' Council meetings reflect confusion. What may have been the case in the past is suddenly changed. We have difficulty understanding the reason for the change. It may be a very slight change but have a very direct effect on the college." His position was supported by another president who chose more graphic language in describing the state guidelines: "It's just as though there was a short order cook who had some meals to prepare and he prepared them. He made hash."

Two of the presidents held the position that the guidelines and policies of the Illinois Junior College Board were not comprehensive and they preferred them not to be. "They're adequate," said one, "and it is not wise to develop too many policies until we have more experience—until we know what areas need policy development." The president who expressed the greatest degree of satisfaction with the Illinois Junior College system and was far from unstinting in his praise of it said, "I would be fearful that if we delved too deeply in this business—if we are too concerned about developing policies at the state level—
we might be carrying things too far and we would be taking away from local in-
itiative and local authority."

Another held that the areas of responsibility and authority are clearly
delineated but are not followed. "The Illinois Junior College Board," he
said, "fails to exercise some authority where it should and gets extremely in-
volved in some situations where it should not." Other presidents evidenced
support for this position.

Most of the presidents agreed that the Illinois Junior College Board exer-
cises its authority for program approval with a vigor and enthusiasm for con-
trol beyond what is necessary or desirable and that it is remiss in its obliga-
tion to coordinate programs. The presidents accept and recognize the statutory
authority of the Illinois Junior College Board to exercise the power of program
approval. Their claims for autonomy in program development are moderate, cer-
tainly less extensive than those recommended by Henderson.¹ The presidents do
not support the view that the constituents of a program should be influenced
by or determined by a state agency. Program approval should be based upon cri-
teria relating to priorities and needs and should not be contingent upon the
selection of the courses that constitute the program. The presidents feel that
the Illinois Junior College Board renders value judgments on the structures of
programs that exceed the responsibility and authority of that board.

"The authority to determine what courses constitute a program," one presi-
dent stated, "should rest with the college officials, the professional people
in the field and their lay advisory committees." Another said, "When we start

¹See page 69.
talking about a no course institution we upset a lot of people. If the premise is that the staff at this college does not have the ability to decide what learning experiences should constitute a program, then we should not be here."

Another president maintained in reference to program approval, "They [the Illinois Junior College Board] render value judgments which are really not recommendations but are actually orders."

The president who was least critical of interference by the Illinois Junior College Board stated, "We enjoy a reasonable amount of freedom in developing programs, especially vocational programs. So far we have never been turned down, so maybe this colors our thinking. We have experienced some difficulties in getting approval for our transfer programs." Several presidents shared the feeling that there was a tendency on the part of the Illinois Junior College Board to force the local district to place its transfer programs within the molds developed by the state universities and colleges.

The coordinating responsibility for program development has been neglected according to some presidents. Long range planning for program development is apparently lacking. The presidents' views of the coordination of program development belie allegations of kingdom building as expressed by Glenny.\(^2\) One president expressed his position in this manner: "Our neighboring district has an excellent Dental Assistants Program. We shouldn't be allowed to offer that program until the neighboring district can no longer meet the demands."

"We can't afford to offer all the programs that are needed, particularly those vocational and technical programs which are very expensive," said another president. "Furthermore, we shouldn't be allowed to offer all of them. I'd

\(^2\)See page 63.
like to work with our two neighboring districts. We ought to decide what each is best able to do so that among the three districts we would have a program of vocational-technical education that would be far better than anything any one of us could support. That is a coordinating responsibility. The Illinois Junior College Board should help us in this type of activity." These comments illustrate the desire of the presidents for the Illinois Junior College Board to immerse itself in its coordinating responsibilities in program development in lieu of involving itself in rendering value judgments on the determinants of a particular program.

One president lamented, "We can't get definitions when we need them. What is a program? What is an out-of-district resident?" These questions may appear to be of little consequence. But they are very important to some districts. References to programs appear throughout the Public Junior College Act as they do in the document specifying the criteria, standards, and guidelines of the Illinois Junior College Board and in this study. The significance of a definition for this term is illustrated by the following example given by one of the presidents:

We have a young man enrolled in our college who is from another junior college district. He is here because he wants to be in one of our transfer programs. His home district won't honor the charge back because the college says it has the same program. We don't happen to believe that it does. But that college has every right to define a program the way it wants to define it. Our definition and theirs differ. The result is that we have to charge this young man out-of-district tuition, and he has to pay all the freight. We have asked the Illinois Junior College Board to define program. We've been told it's too difficult to do. Consequently, people all over the state who are attending colleges outside of their own districts are receiving charge-back support from their home districts or are paying out-of-district tuition depending upon how liberal or how restrictive 'program' is defined by their home district.
The term "resident" or its antonym "out-of-district resident" also needs clarification. Is residency established merely by moving into a district even if for the express purpose of attending the college in that district? Are age and source of financial support to be considered in determining residency? The courts have been called upon for decisions concerning residency of public school students. Do these same decisions apply to junior colleges? The answers are yet to be discovered. Until there is a policy developed, the junior colleges can be expected to continue to exercise individual judgments on these matters. These are problems which are germane to all the colleges and which call for the exercise of a coordinating responsibility.

The Uniform Accounting Manual and the unit cost study were the objects of extended discussion in the interviews. However, the presidents did not react unanimously in appraising these instruments. One president characterized them as "devious ways to get information to be used for devious purposes" while another said, "The data gained through these instruments will be the best friends we have in the long run." Another called the unit cost study "a useless exercise in time" and maintained, "The new cost accounting manual and the unit cost study may force some of us to become organized in more traditional ways unless we can discover ways to provide like data."

The objections to the Uniform Accounting Manual and the unit cost study were not in reality objections to having a manual or requiring the study; they were objections to the form which the instruments take and the directions furnished with them. But even on these factors the views were disparate:
Many of the questions are asked in such a way that they determine a response that does not actually indicate what you are doing in the local district. And when you know what you're doing, it's not half as bad as what the form makes it appear to be.

The state has every right to request information. They have every right to determine the choice of the form.

You can call a horse a cow if you make the right definitions. Unfortunately the unit cost study does not provide clear definitions. The result is that horses are becoming cows and cows are becoming horses.

Because of the form in which the data are cast, raw data is becoming an excellent source of material to be misinterpreted; it's a base for obviously misleading comparisons.

The disagreements between those responding positively and those responding negatively to these accounting tools did not focus upon the necessity for the instruments but rather upon the validity of the data and the way the data might be applied. If the president thought the directions were clear, the data collected from the various colleges were comparable, and that it would be used by those who understood it, he tended to react favorably. If he had doubts about the clarity of the directions, the comparability of the data, or its eventual uses, he reacted negatively. It is likely all would agree with the president who said, "I'm not ashamed to report anything they want to know. I just want to know what it is that I'm reporting and that others are responding in the same way even though our data differ. And finally I want to know that the person who is reading it knows what he's reading."

The interviews revealed that the Illinois Junior College Board and the presidents have attempted to keep the avenues of communication free from detours and barricades. The presidents know that telephone inquiries are welcome. They need feel no reluctance in stating their views by phone or mail or at the
regularly scheduled meeting of the Executive Secretary of the Illinois Junior College Board with the Council of Presidents. The agenda and minutes of each meeting of the Illinois Junior College Board are mailed to the presidents. A president who has submitted a master plan or a particular building project for approval is always invited to appear before the board when the presentation is made. Nothing precludes a president from asking for a place on the agenda at any meeting. Sometimes presidents who are in attendance at a meeting of the Illinois Junior College Board are asked for their reactions to an agenda item by the chairman of the board. Presidents have been recognized to participate in a discussion even when a general invitation had not been extended.

What has been the result of all of these attempts to facilitate communication? Again the answer depends upon which president's opinion one accepts. "We get to talk; they hear us; but they never listen" was the opinion expressed by one president. Another president cited the recently revised document on standards, criteria and guidelines as an example to demonstrate that the Illinois Junior College Board does listen. All institutions were invited to react to the material to be included in that document before it was submitted to the Illinois Junior College Board for final approval. "We are pleased," said this president, "to find many of the suggestions made by this district included in the approved document. The Illinois Junior College Board was less receptive to ideas on the uniform accounting manual than on other things."

There is no dearth of exchange of ideas. Sincere attempts have been made to solicit opinions and ideas from the districts. But the communication often lacks focus. As one president said, "Communication is more than verbiage. You can sit and talk about 40 or 50 items and not come to grips with the basic
problem. You must identify the basic issues and communicate on these and this is where the breakdown comes."

One president suggested that excessive communication has worked to the detriment of the Illinois Junior College Board. He said, "The Illinois Junior College Board is listening too much. It is torn by many conflicting views and consequently it cannot stake out a leadership role for itself."

Many of the opinions quoted previously are highly critical. But they are not to be interpreted as criticisms directed at people. The presidents were fulsome in their praise of the present executive secretary of the board and his predecessor. They are familiar with junior college systems in other states and prefer the situation in Illinois to what they have observed and experienced in other areas.

It must be remembered that the Illinois program is new and that it is a bold program which was called upon at the time of its creation to meet pressing educational needs. It had no time to be a boy; manhood was demanded immediately. The criticisms made should be interpreted in the light of this statement made by one of the presidents:

The system was put together with such speed that there was not really time for mature planning before the system went into operation. The Illinois Junior College Board and the local boards have been running to keep up. In the press of developing new institutions, trying to take care of expanding enrollments, building programs, day to day details, there hasn't been the time to do the required long range planning.
Areas of Concern Regarding the Board of Vocational Education and Rehabilitation

Vocational education in the public schools was the focal point of the educational activities of the Board of Vocational Education and Rehabilitation for many years. The explosive growth of the junior colleges presented the board with a new segment of the educational community demanding increased attention. Suddenly the board was faced with a group of pragmatic institutions carving out new roles and new methods for vocational education.

It is not surprising that tensions were created as a result of honest differences of opinion. As indicated previously, some of the procedures and policies of this board have been completely changed and others adapted in response to the needs of the junior colleges. But the changes do not receive unqualified approval from the presidents interviewed. Reactions once again were diverse:

I'm very pleased with the progress.

We're happy; they have freed themselves from the secondary pattern.

They are trying to recognize our problems. There has been some progress.

The basic problems regarding the Board of Vocational Education simply have not changed.

The process of program approval by the Board of Vocational Education is one source of confusion. The descriptions of the approval process offered by the presidents are not consistent with each other. Some presidents hold that the approval process as officially described (see Chapter V) is the process that is followed. Others hold that the Illinois Junior College Board does not approve a program until it gets an unofficial nod from the Board of Vocational
Education. Still others hold that once approval has been granted for the yearly plan that the rest of the process as far as these two boards are concerned is mere paper work. One's perception of the approval process influences one's conclusions regarding the state-local relationship.

The same concerns expressed about the Illinois Junior College Board regarding course versus program approval were applied to the Board of Vocational Education by some presidents. But again there was an absence of unanimity. Some hold that course approval is no longer a matter of real concern to the Board of Vocational Education while others take the position that the necessity to include courses in the yearly vocational plan does in effect grant course approval to the Board of Vocational Education.

Although the criteria for program approval are available in printed form, the manner in which the criteria are applied is a subject of doubt among the presidents. To say that the examples cited are perplexing is an understatement.

One president related his difficulties in securing approval for a two-year program in one of the vocational areas. The college had a one-year certificate program and wished to expand it. The request was denied on the basis that the staff was not qualified to teach a two-year program. The request was submitted again the following year, and it was approved. "I don't know that our arguments were any different the second time around," he said.

Another president cited the difficulties he had in getting approval for an associate degree program in data processing. "We had a one-year certificate program. We were able to demonstrate that there were over 100 data processing installations in our area. We had evidence demonstrating that there was
sufficient interest to guarantee enrollments. But we kept getting turned down on the basis of no need. It took us months and months before we finally got an approval. It's now one of our most successful programs."

Concern was also expressed regarding the coordinating activities of this board, particularly in reference to the establishment of area secondary vocational schools and area post secondary vocational schools. Some of the presidents have questioned the advisability of duplicating programs, equipment and facilities and in cooperation with the superintendents of the public schools in their districts have suggested that the junior colleges and the high schools pool their resources and combine their energies to establish one or more centers for all seeking vocational education. Opposition from the board has prevented them from proceeding.

One president views the necessity for coordinating vocational education as having more implications for the future of vocational education than any other problem. He said:

The absence of a delineation between the role and function of the area secondary vocational schools and the junior colleges or the post secondary vocational schools presents major difficulties. Since the board has not attempted to make this delineation or attempted to do anything about coordination, I think there are going to be some serious problems concerning articulation, duplication and competition for programs in the future.

While the Board of Vocational Education is the agency designated by the state to disburse federal funds for vocational education, the presidents question the advisability of administrative machinery that places such an important function of the junior colleges in the Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction. Would the logic supporting the idea that junior colleges must
conform to the rules of both the Illinois Junior College Board and the Board of Vocational Education, a sub-division of the Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction, also support the idea that secondary schools should conform to the rules of the Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction and the Illinois Junior College Board?

The fact that the federal government requires the states to designate a disbursement agency is without question. But it does not necessarily follow that each junior college should report to the Board of Vocational Education for decisions regarding vocational programs. This is burdensome not only for the individual colleges but for the board as well.

It would be more logical for the Illinois Junior College Board, functioning as a coordinating agency and representing all of the junior colleges, to work directly with the Board of Vocational Education in all those areas which now require contacts between the junior colleges and the vocational board. This would require both the junior colleges and the Illinois Junior College Board to develop long range plans for vocational education. With those plans formulated, the Illinois Junior College Board could guide all program approvals through the vocational board.

Preferable, but less probable, is the development of a plan that would enable the Illinois Junior College Board to disburse vocational funds to the junior colleges. This could be done in either of two ways: (1) the Illinois Junior College Board could receive funds from the Board of Vocational Education for disbursement to the junior colleges or (2) appropriate legislative changes could be made designating the Illinois Junior College Board as a direct recipient of federal funds. The state should recognize that there have been
significant changes in educational patterns since 1919 when the Board of Voca-
tional Education and Rehabilitation was designated as the recipient of federal funds for vocational education. At that time junior colleges were but isolated phenomena. The methods for the disbursement of vocational education funds is compatible with neither the governing nor the coordinating systems for junior colleges.

Areas of Concern Regarding the Illinois Building Authority

Although the Public Junior College Act permits construction to be financed through either the Illinois Junior College Board or the Illinois Building Authority, 3 projects to date have been financed through the latter organization. Current political and economic factors indicate that it is highly improbable that the legislature will appropriate money for financing junior college construction through the Illinois Junior College Board. There are those who predict that soon junior college projects will be handled by the Illinois School Buildings Commission, but the chances of the Illinois Junior College Board to assume this function are indeed slight. But until changes are made, the services of the Illinois Building Authority will remain indispensable to each junior college district.

Does the agency have a significant effect upon building programs? Some presidents are highly disturbed with its procedures and decisions while others agree with the president who described his experiences with this agency as "nothing more than the normal bureaucratic struggles." One president did say, "We have had no trouble with the IBA because we have done what they wanted us to do."

3Public Junior College Act, Chapter 122, Section 105-6.
On the other hand, the complaint was often expressed that it is difficult to discover what the Illinois Building Authority really does want. One president said, "It is very difficult to get anything in writing" and another related that after every visit to the office of this agency either he or the college architect summarizes the agreements reached and the directions given and mails a copy to the agency offices. He said, "Not once have we received a reply. And so we never know if we have interpreted them correctly."

The aversion of the Illinois Building Authority to "put things in writing" led to serious consequences for one college. College officials and the college architect had met frequently with the authority's staff members. The project had been explained and the problems solved, but before the project was submitted to the board of the Illinois Building Authority there was a turnover in personnel on the agency's staff. There was no documentation of staff recommendations for this project. "Consequently," the president said, "we had to start all over from scratch."

Most of the presidents did not believe that the decisions of the Illinois Building Authority affected instruction. However, one was vehement in expressing a contrary opinion. He said, "When you grant a unit the power to approve a building, you influence instruction. Modes of instruction should dictate building design. A building should be designed in accordance with educational specifications. If changes are made in it, those changes can affect the ability of the college to implement its instructional system."

The Illinois Building Authority will not approve as part of a construction project any equipment which cannot be classified as "fixed equipment." A definition of fixed equipment, therefore, assumes importance, so a rationale has
been developed to determine when equipment is fixed. Here is how it works:
The bond holders must be protected. They cannot be expected to hold bonds on
equipment that can be moved out of the building or stolen. So fixed equipment
is an essential part of a building.

This means, for example, that a cabinet with utilities, plumbing or elec-
trical, is fixed equipment. A cabinet identical in all respects with the ex-
ception of the utilities is not fixed equipment. One cabinet is difficult to
remove, so it becomes fixed equipment. A door, very easily removed, is also
fixed equipment. A rule of thumb is not an adequate substitution for a defi-
nition.

To sit in the carpeted offices of the Illinois Building Authority and to
be told that carpeting is not an approved item for junior colleges constitutes
an ironical situation. Carpeting is difficult to remove, and it is doubtful
if anyone is going to steal it. The Illinois Building Authority will agree
that carpeting is fixed; it finds its objections elsewhere. Carpeting wears
out. The carpeting will not last as long as the number of years for which the
bonds were issued. Therefore, the bond holders are not protected in case the
state defaults on its payments. The state will participate in floor covering
as long as it is not carpeting; presumably asphalt tiles have an unlimited life
expectancy. The state does participate in the cost of paint which could hardly
be classified as a durable substance.

The argument of the expense of carpeting is not germane to the problem.
Currently, $30 per square foot is the maximum allowed for a building with or
without carpeting. Some colleges have proposed that they be allotted an amount of money equal to what the state would supply for approved floor covering and the individual colleges would assume the cost difference between that amount and the cost for carpeting. The reply was an unqualified negative.

One college argued that carpeting was necessary because the design of its building necessitated the acoustical qualities that carpeting would offer. This particular building has few interior walls or doors and consists primarily of free space which lends itself to daily change and to adaptability for educational innovations yet unseen. After explaining his case, the college president was told that his case would be reconsidered if he would prepare a document to substantiate his claims. This he did.

Several months later he returned with a document which included:

1. A statement of the educational philosophy of the college.

2. A description of the educational methods to be employed to implement this philosophy.

3. A statement detailing the relationship between the design of the building and the educational methods and the relationship between the design of the building and the educational philosophy.

4. Statements from acoustical engineers indicating the necessity of carpeting for this type of design.

5. Statements to the same effect from architects.

6. Abstracts from publications of the Educational Facilities Laboratory relative to open space planning and the use of carpeting.

4Previous guidelines specified $30 per square foot as the maximum allowed. Present guidelines do not specify an amount but promise that bid experiences and cost indices will be used to adjust cost allowances. However, the maximum has not been changed to date.
7. A letter from the Educational Facilities laboratory in reference to this project.

The document was presented; the reaction was immediate and final. "This is very interesting, but you cannot have carpeting; it is against the rule." The brief was useless; it was never examined. The president picked up the material and returned to his campus. When the bids for this project were opened, the low bid averaged about $28 per square foot. The other $2 per square foot allotted to the college cannot be used. Carpeting is against the rules.

As indicated earlier, a junior college may transfer money and/or land as its portion of the total amount of a building project. Quite naturally junior colleges have chosen to transfer land. One college was told it could not transfer land beyond that extending five feet from the perimeter of the building. The president objected, citing the Public Junior College Act. The reported response was, "We don't need your land; we need the money." Several months later the staff member rescinded his previous decision.

The Illinois Junior College Board has on its staff an associate secretary, one of whose major responsibilities is building projects. He examines each project to determine whether it conforms to the specifications of the Illinois Junior College Board. If this board is to have the responsibility for coordinating the Illinois Junior College System and if, as the statutes specify, the coordinating responsibility includes the duty to determine efficient and adequate standards for the physical plant, why should its decisions be subject to review by an agency whose primary responsibility is that of a mortgage house?
Areas of Concern Regarding the Board of Higher Education

The opinions of the presidents interviewed regarding the Board of Higher Education were harmonious one with another but dissonant with the activities of that board. The board has its own orchestra, its own director. It selects its own music and writes its own program notes. Everybody is free to listen, but it does not want too many flute players waiting in the wings. The orchestra does not mind if there are a few combos around the state as long as they pass an audition before playing, play approved music, and do not play it so loudly or so well that they attract too much attention. A wide subscription list of lay people helps this orchestra in its activities, but not too many other musicians are included. Sometimes the lay people are invited to form a chorus but often after they have rehearsed and are ready to sing, they are told that there is not room for them on the program.

The orchestra has grown tremendously. At first it was not an orchestra at all; it was only a duet. By 1966 it had become a trio, and only five years later it had grown to thirty-five full time members with a supporting staff of clerical and secretarial personnel.

Occasionally other musicians from around the state are invited to play with the orchestra. They are always happy to get the chance but about the only openings ever available are those for second fiddle. They claim that the regular members of the orchestra always get to play the lead parts and that no matter how the music is written, the director always wants to transpose it into another key. They criticize the orchestra claiming that the percussion section is so loud that it drowns out the richness of the melodic line and the
subtleness of the harmony. They only hope the big orchestra will not make their combos play the same kind of music.

But the orchestra should not be blamed. It has to please the orchestral board and the orchestral board has to please the orchestra's patron. The patron listens to the orchestra carefully. Then he listens to the orchestral board. Are they booing the orchestra or are they applauding? Then he consults his financial managers. If the orchestral board is booing when he thinks it ought to be applauding or if it is applauding when he thinks it ought to be booing, he threatens to take his support away from the orchestra. Then the orchestra gets frightened, and the little combos get frightened too because if he takes the money away from the big orchestra then the combos will not have any money either.

It is tough to play to a patron who is tone deaf.

The allegory is descriptive of the comments made by the presidents and can be substantiated by the minutes of the meetings of the Board of Higher Education and public statements of the governor and officials in the Bureau of the Budget. The presidents view the Board of Higher Education as an instrument posing the greatest of threats to the autonomy of public colleges and universities in this state. Their opinions concerning the activities of this board can be summarized by the following statements: (1) The Board of Higher Education has infringed upon the responsibilities of the Illinois Junior College Board and has circumvented that board. (2) The Board of Higher Education is showing little respect for the decision of the Illinois Junior College Board. (3) The Board of Higher Education is exercising authority above and beyond that granted it by law and is reaching for a governing position in lieu of its legitimate coordinating
function. (4) The Board of Higher Education is building a bureaucratic structure which if unchecked will render the individual junior college districts, their coordinating board, and the governing systems of the state colleges and universities defenseless against its will.

The evolving pattern of relationships between the Illinois Junior College Board and the Board of Higher Education is creating confusion at the district level. One president expressed it this way:

How are we on the local level going to understand the relationship between the Illinois Junior College Board and the Board of Higher Education? This is where we have more of a problem in the state than we do right now between the local district and the Illinois Junior College Board.

Another president believes the higher board is assuming the position of a super board with the Illinois Junior College Board assuming a subservient position. He stated:

Again and again I have listened as the Board of Higher Education ignored the recommendations of the Illinois Junior College Board. The higher board staff makes its own study and its own analysis of junior college affairs and its own recommendations, and it could care less about the Illinois Junior College Board. The role of this board has been substantially altered in the last year, and the higher board is calling the shots.

The dominant role which the Board of Higher Education has assumed at the expense of the Illinois Junior College Board is illustrated by the disposition of the apportionment formula recommended by the Illinois Junior College Board. A formula was adopted by the Board of Higher Education at its meeting on December 1, 1970. But the story starts long before this date. The junior college presidents were consulted by and worked with the executive secretary of their coordinating board in developing a funding formula. The proposal made by the executive secretary to the Illinois Junior College Board was not supported with
enthusiasm by every president but most thought it a reasonable proposal which represented progress. However, the Illinois Junior College Board did not accept its executive’s recommendation but substituted a proposal of its own which it forwarded to the Board of Higher Education. The staff of the Board of Higher Education did not agree with the proposal and presented a counter proposal.5

In the course of the discussion on the proposal, Mr. Fowle, who as Chairman of the Illinois Junior College Board is automatically a member of the Board of Higher Education, spoke to the issue. The minutes say he spoke "at length" and the summary of his comments, which are included in the minutes, detail the position of the Illinois Junior College Board and support its proposal.

Subsequently, a representative of the Association of Community College Boards of Trustees urged rejection of the new staff plan and recommended the adoption of the plan proposed by Mr. Fowle.

Then Dr. William Staerkel, Chairman of the Council of Junior College Presidents, spoke. The following excerpt is from the minutes:

Dr. Staerkel said that the Council wished the Board to know how it stands on this important matter. He recounted the establishing in the fall of 1969 of an Advisory Committee on Financing Junior Colleges and noted they had a wide variety of lay persons on this committee who had worked for many months and when the report was completed the presidents had studied it and approved the work of the Committee. However, he stated that what had been presented today departed significantly from the report of the committee and two major objections were: (1) it offers only minor relief to the majority of the districts and (2) it toys with the delicate matter of equalization.6

---

6Ibid., pp. 24-25.
After Dr. Staerkel completed his remarks, one president appeared in support of the staff's new proposal. The board's executive director was asked his opinion, and he urged support of his staff's proposal; it was adopted.

This example of how an apportionment proposal was developed illustrates not only the manner in which proposals of the Illinois Junior College Board are treated but also reveals a decision-making process which is questionable in many of its aspects. A simple listing of events makes this point obvious:

1. The Illinois Junior College Board ignored the proposal of its executive and substituted its own proposal.

2. The staff of the Board of Higher Education did not accept the recommendations of one of its own committees, the Advisory Committee on Financing Junior Colleges.

3. As employees of a coordinating board, the staff of the Board of Higher Education substituted their own recommendations for those of the board which has the statutory responsibility for providing statewide planning for junior colleges.

4. The Board of Higher Education chose to ignore the recommendations of the Illinois Junior College Board, the Council of Community College Presidents, a committee of its own creation, and the Association of Community College Boards of Trustees.

Is it any wonder that the junior college presidents question the relationship between their coordinating board and the Board of Higher Education?

At the meeting of the Board of Higher Education on January 5, 1971 the capital budget requests for the junior colleges were considered. The minutes of that meeting demonstrate that the Board of Higher Education has something less than awesome confidence in the ability of the Illinois Junior College Board to predict building needs. The Illinois Junior College Board had requested $110 million for capital construction. The Board of Higher Education
had previously approved $74 million. It was learned that the higher board
staff planned to reduce the recommendation to $58,600,000. Capital construc-
tion for junior colleges is lagging because $94 million which was authorized
by the legislature has been frozen by the governor.

The Illinois Junior College Board evidently decided that its request for
$110 million would not be honored. Therefore, its executive officer, Dr. Fred
Wellman, appeared at the meeting of January 5 and requested reinstatement of
the $74 million. Also appearing in opposition to the reduction was a student
from a state university, a representative of the Association of Community Col-
lege Boards of Trustees, and Dr. William Staerkel, representing the Council of
Junior College Presidents.

The minutes contain the following summary of Dr. Staerkel's remarks:

Dr. Staerkel representing The Association of Illinois Junior
College Presidents said he was speaking for all of the presi-
dents and thousands of students going to school in make-shift
buildings. He said that they are trying to give them an edu-
cation in these types of facilities, but they are being de-
prived of many advantages. He continued by saying the Board
has an excellent staff, doing a good job, but they sometimes
err; so a plea is being made today on behalf of all presidents
of junior colleges to at least restore the $74 million which
the Board approved previously.7

It should be noted that Dr. Staerkel's remarks were made on behalf of and
at the request of the Council of Presidents. But when he had concluded his re-
marks, a member of that group sought recognition and endorsed the reduction.
The minutes read, "He concluded by noting the reduction to $58 million was
agreeable to him and all they [the colleges in his district] want is their
share of the available funds."

The board approved its staff recommendation.

7Minutes of the Board of Higher Education, January 5, 1971, p. 25.
In the long range development of the junior colleges, the results of this reduction will be not nearly so important as the reasons for it. These reasons are to be found in a staff document dated January 5, 1971 and titled "Staff Recommendations for FY 72 Illinois Junior College Capital Construction."

The reasons advanced in this document reflect a distrust of the planning ability of the Illinois Junior College Board and a desire to increase the decision making responsibilities of the Board of Higher Education. The document disputes the enrollment projections of the Illinois Junior College Board and substitutes the projections of the Board of Higher Education. Secondly, the document recommends two new methods for the construction of junior college campuses, systems building and the flexi-campus model. Thirdly, it expresses a concern that junior colleges pose a threat to the private sector of higher education. Fourthly, it advances the idea that the mission and scope of junior colleges is not adequately defined, and finally it deplores the location of new colleges in rural settings.

The first of these statements is particularly disturbing because: (1) it is contradictory to the rationale for junior college planning as expressed in the Master Plan and (2) it undercuts the statutory obligation of the Illinois Junior College Board. The second objection evidences the higher board's desire to involve itself in campus master planning and to remove this prerogative from the local district and the Illinois Junior College Board. On June 2, 1970 the Board of Higher Education passed a resolution which required: (1) the Illinois Junior College Board to supply a copy of each master plan which had been approved and (2) that all future master plans be submitted to the Board of Higher Education for approval. To impose the systems building concept and flexi-campus
model concepts upon the junior colleges will remove the opportunity of the local district to be innovative in its building design.

In essence, the systems building concept calls for the erection of pre-engineered permanent buildings and the flexi-campus concept involves the erection of pre-engineered temporary structures. Many colleges have started construction on the first phase of their master plans; a few are occupying their initial buildings and are in the second phase of construction. To retroactively impose a new master plan is economically unsound, educationally unwise, and architecturally abhorrent.

To argue that junior colleges are posing a threat to private higher education is to argue that the Board of Higher Education could not plan adequately when it developed the Master Plan for Higher Education in Illinois and A Master Plan—Phase II. These documents dealt specifically with enrollment projections for higher education and considered the impact expanded public enrollments would have upon private institutions. Does the Board of Higher Education endorse these master plans or does it deny the validity of their recommendations? If it agrees, there should be no argument about the impact of junior colleges upon private education. If it disagrees, then by disagreeing it contests its own ability as a planning agency.

In reference to the third objection, it is disconcerting that an agency which holds that the mission and scope of Illinois public junior colleges are not clearly defined would presume to want to exercise control over junior college development and would deny the validity of the opinions of those who do not have difficulty understanding the junior college concept. If the Board of Higher Education does not understand the place of junior colleges in higher
education, let it examine its own master plans, the Public Junior College Act, and the abundant literature in the field. Another study is not needed. Let us not plough ground which has already been turned, enriched and seeded. Let the crops which are thriving yield their fruit.

By denying an adequate knowledge of the mission and scope of Public Junior Colleges in Illinois and by simultaneously seeking to extend its control over those colleges, the Board of Higher Education is in effect saying to these colleges and their coordinating board:

We do not know what you are supposed to do or how much of it you are supposed to do, but we know how much money you need to do it. We do not know what you are supposed to do or how much of it you are supposed to do, but we know what kind of facilities you need to do it. We do not know what you are supposed to do, but when you present a new unit of instruction, we will evaluate it and tell you whether or not it is appropriate for your institution.

When the Board of Higher Education deplores the location of new junior colleges in rural settings, it is obvious that that board does not understand the mission and scope of junior colleges. Junior colleges are commuter colleges. Let the board look again to A Master Plan for Higher Education in Illinois. The rationale for the development of commuter colleges is explained in the board's own document. But the staff study says, "The tendency to locate new colleges in rural settings away from centers of population is contrary to the needs of an urban society." 8

Chicago has a junior college district which operates eight junior colleges and a TV college. The Chicago suburban area has twelve junior college districts --Bloom, DuPage, Harper, Joliet, Lake, McHenry, Moraine Valley, Morton, Oakton,  

8Staff Recommendations for FY 72 Illinois Junior College Board Capital Construction, p. 6.
Triton, Thornton and Waubonsee. These thirteen districts constitute 34 percent of the total districts in the state, excluding the state supported district in East St. Louis. These colleges have a total of 21 campuses or 47 percent of the total junior college campuses in the state.

Rockford, Peoria, and the Moline-Rock Island area are also included in junior college districts. These three districts have a total of four campuses. Therefore, the only areas in the state which could be classified as urban, excluding East St. Louis, constitute 46 percent of the junior college districts and 55 percent of the total campuses. There is not an urban area in the State of Illinois which is not within a junior college district unless one wishes to classify such cities as Bloomington as urban areas. But even if such a classification is made, the logic does not hold; for colleges are not placed in rural or urban areas at will. They can be created only with the approval of the local electorate. Are the people in 'Centerville' to be blamed because the residents of the Bloomington area have chosen not to have a junior college? Are the construction projects of all the areas in the state to be delayed because some areas have chosen not to have junior colleges?

One might question whether Illinois is an urban society. And if junior colleges must be placed only in urban areas, who will speak to the needs of the people in Troy Grove, Ridott Corners, Pearl City, Lanark and the hundreds of other rural communities. There is only a limited number of urban centers.

The facts substantiate a claim counter to the staff's position. The urban areas have their junior colleges. The staff's argument is really a lament that there are not more urban areas.
The staff position on capital construction for junior colleges cannot be substantiated. Yet it was accepted as the basis for cutting $52 million from the request of the Illinois Junior College Board or $26 million from the amount which the Board of Higher Education had previously approved. The capital requests of the senior colleges and universities were also reduced.

The Illinois Junior College Board fared no better when it sought a $3 million grant for disadvantaged students throughout the state. Instead of honoring this request, the Board of Higher Education approved a $2 million grant and directed the entire amount be funneled to the Chicago City Colleges. Dr. Wellman requested $500,000 for distribution throughout the state. Request denied.9

Apportionment, capital construction, grants for disadvantaged students—the Illinois Junior College Board lost on every issue. But one issue still remained—the funds for the central office of the Illinois Junior College Board. The staff of the higher board recommended that the request be reduced and that two proposed position be eliminated. Following is the official explanation:

The Illinois Junior College Board has requested the addition of two new professional positions, an Associate Secretary for Finance and a Construction Projects Assistant, and three new nonprofessional positions, two secretary-stenographers and one receptionist.

Staff recommends the Associate Secretary for Finance position and two secretary-stenographer positions.10

This item was considered by the Board of Higher Education at its January 5 meeting. Following is the discussion of the budget as taken from the minutes of that meeting.

Mr. Clements called upon the Illinois Junior College Board for their presentation.

Mr. Fowle called attention to the request for additional staff.

Dr. Holderman said that the staff concurred and agreed to add this and the budget will be adjusted accordingly.11

One might ask -- If the "staff concurred," what happened between the time it made the cut and then decided to restore it? Was the Illinois Junior College Board consulted before the cut was made, or did the Illinois Junior College Board approach the Board of Higher Education after it learned of the recommended reduction? Answers to these questions would provide interesting insights into the operation of the Board of Higher Education.

The minutes do not reveal how much was restored to this budget. The operating budget requests for all the senior colleges and universities, the systems' governing boards, and the Illinois Junior College Board are contained in a document titled "Executive Director's Report #93." This document also contains the staff's recommended line item reductions for each budget. In each case the staff recommendation reflected a reduction in the request. The staff recommendation for the central office administration of the Board of Higher Education does not appear in this document nor is the amount stated in the minutes. It was approved as recommended.12 But when the recommended budgets for the senior colleges and universities, the systems' governing boards, and the Illinois Junior College Board were passed, they were approved as provided by the "Executive Director's Report #93" "with amendments approved by the Board,


including agreed upon technical adjustments to the staff recommendations.\textsuperscript{13} By telephoning an associate secretary of the Illinois Junior College Board, it was learned that the "technical adjustments" included the reinstatement of the position of Construction Projects Assistant but did not include the addition of the receptionist.

The tasks of the Illinois Junior College Board need not be repeated at this point. Suffice it to say that it is an agency responsible for coordinating an increasing number of junior college districts (thirty-four operative districts in 1969-70 and thirty-six in 1970-71) and directly responsible for governing one district. The colleges in these districts enrolled approximately 150,000 students in the 1969-70 academic year. This board has been delegated direct responsibility for the growth and development of a major segment of the public higher education enterprise. It is required to make decisions which will affect hundreds of thousands of people in the years to come. Yet its decision to hire a receptionist was vetoed by the Board of Higher Education as it made a line item deduction in the proposed budget. The Board of Higher Education has reserved for itself the right to determine whether the Illinois Junior College Board needs a receptionist. If the Board of Higher Education does not trust the Illinois Junior College Board's ability to make so simple a decision, it no doubt distrusts more difficult decisions.

A summary of appropriations for the central offices of the Illinois Junior College Board and the Board of Higher Education is in order:

\textsuperscript{13}\textit{Ibid.}, p. 25.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Biennium</th>
<th>Board of Higher Education</th>
<th>Illinois Junior College Board</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1961-63 Biennium</td>
<td>150,000</td>
<td>300,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1963-65 Biennium</td>
<td>150,000</td>
<td>472,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1965-67 Biennium</td>
<td>300,000</td>
<td>281,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1967-69 Biennium</td>
<td>647,000</td>
<td>328,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1969-70 Biennium</td>
<td>772,000</td>
<td>461,013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970-71</td>
<td>1,435,300</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971-72 (Recommended)</td>
<td>1,800,200</td>
<td>461,013</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


15This item not included in above reference. Secured by phone call to Illinois Junior College Board offices.

16Year Illinois changed from biennial to annual appropriations.


(The 1970-71 figures represent the obligational authority for that year. The 1971-72 figures were recommended by the Board of Higher Education but were not endorsed by the governor. In each case, totals were obtained by adding amounts for administration and financial planning and fiscal management although the Board of Higher Education chooses to list these separately, together they constitute the budget for the central office.

19Ibid., p. 594.

(The 1970-71 figures represent the obligational authority for that year. The 1971-72 figures were recommended by the Board of Higher Education but were not endorsed by the governor.)
Much of what has happened to the two boards is clarified by comparing the 1965-67 biennium appropriations with the 1970-71 annual appropriations. The point need not be labored. A simple comparison of staffing as of November, 1970 will tell the story both accurately and dramatically:

**Illinois Junior College Board - Authorized Staff Positions**

- Executive Secretary
- Associate Secretary for Research and Finance
- Associate Secretary for Building Projects and Grants
- Office Manager
- Associate Secretary for Student Services
- Associate Secretary for Baccalaureate and General Studies Programs
- Associate Secretary for Occupational Programs
- Associate Secretary for Recognition and Adult Education Programs

In addition the board had the consultative services of a legal counsel and of the former executive secretary. The president of the East St. Louis Junior College is also attached to the board, but his duties are related specifically to that institution.

**Board of Higher Education - Authorized Staff Positions**

**EXECUTIVE STAFF**

- Executive Director
- Administrative Assistant to The Executive Director
- Special Assistant, Legal Affairs
- Special Assistant, Governmental Affairs
- Executive Assistant to the Executive Director

---


Board of Higher Education - Authorized Staff Positions, Continued

PROGRAM PLANNING AREA

Deputy Director for Program Planning
Administrative Assistant - Law Enforcement
Assistant Director for Master Planning
Staff Associate - Institutional Cooperation
Coordinator Community College Capability Project
Assistant Director for Program Planning
Assistant Director for Public Service
    and Community Programs
Coordinator, Title I Project
Research Assistant
Research Associate

FINANCIAL PLANNING AND ANALYSIS

Deputy Director Financial Planning and Analysis
Executive Assistant to the Deputy Director
Administrative Assistant
Associate Director - Operating Budgets
Budget Analyst - Operating Budgets
Assistant Director - Capital Budgets
Budget Analyst - Capital Budgets
Assistant Director - Budget Research
Research Associate - Budget Research

RESEARCH, EVALUATION, DATA PROCESSING AND FISCAL MANAGEMENT

Deputy Director for Research, Evaluation and Data Processing
Research Associate
Research Assistant
Assistant Director for Research
Assistant Director for Research
Associate Director - Data Systems
Assistant Director - Data Systems
Associate Director - Fiscal Management
Research Associate
Assistant Director - Fiscal Management

The Assistant Director for Program Planning and the Research Associate in the Program Planning Area were part-time positions at the time of this report but were scheduled as of January 1, 1971 and February 1, 1971, respectively, for full-time positions. In addition to the Special Assistant for Legal
Affairs the Board also retains a legal counsel as a consultant on a per diem basis and two consultants on program planning on a per diem arrangement.

The current full-time professional and auxiliary staffs of the Illinois Junior College Board numbers seventeen; a planned increase of three people will bring the total to twenty in the 1971-72 fiscal year. The current full-time professional and auxiliary staff of the Board of Higher Education numbers fifty-five; a planned increase of fifteen people will bring the total to seventy in the 1971-72 fiscal year.

It is David vs. Goliath. But this time Goliath has the sling-shot.

There is evidence to support the premise that the Board of Higher Education intends to become increasingly involved in approval of junior college instructional programs. In its budget narrative it requests more money for "additional program review expertise, particularly the addition of staff with knowledge of community colleges." On October 7, 1969, in a report to the Board of Higher Education, the executive director made it clear that in the future new instructional programs must reflect the colleges' position as agencies for social change.

We are moving ahead to develop criteria and a system of priorities for measuring the potential for success of instructional programs in helping solve the problems of society.

We believe it is possible to mount programs aimed directly at meeting human needs or at improving the quality of life and eliminating injustice, whether it emanates from discrimination or from more subtle forms of mismanagement of our environment.

---


23 Ibid., p. 590.

24 Ibid., p. 583.
This does not mean, of course, that only public service efforts, relevant instructional programs, and applied research endeavors will be approved. It does mean that new programs other than these types must be of such superb character that they justify the risk to be taken in allocating dollars to them rather than to programs aimed at considering human needs or improving the quality of life.²⁵

The argument is not with the executive director's goals although they are subject to query. The real question is: At what level are instructional goals to be determined? Is this really the function of an absentee coordinating board?

Not one of the junior college presidents interviewed knew of a single junior college instructional program that had been vetoed by the Board of Higher Education. The minutes of the regular meetings of this board covering the period from April 2, 1968 through January 5, 1971 reveal no evidence of any junior college program being disapproved. On numerous occasions program proposals by the state universities and colleges were vetoed by the Board of Higher Education on the basis that they were not needed or because they represented needless duplication.

But what does the future hold? At a recent meeting of the board the executive director said that the review of junior college proposals would be intensified.²⁶ What are the results of an intensive review by the Board of Higher Education? Item #7 of the January 5, 1971 meeting provides the answer. At that meeting the instructional programs for the Governor's State University, which will open in the fall of 1971, was introduced. The staff reported that


they had conferred with personnel at Governor's State University and had reached the conclusion that

... the program statements offered by Governor's State University do not fully communicate the sense of urgency and commitment on the part of Governor's State University staff to provide Illinois with a new kind of institution of higher learning, one which does not initiate or duplicate existing institutions and programs, and to achieve the mission of a community oriented institution which was charged to Governor's State University by the Board of Higher Education in the Report of New Senior Institutions.27

This is diplomatic language for saying, "The poor fellows mean well; they just do not know how to do it."

Approximately one third of the programs submitted by Governor's State were for its first year of operation. Of this group, the staff recommended tentative approval of all but one, the Bachelor of Arts in Social Welfare. The staff recommendations adopted by the Board read as follows:

The staff further recommends that approval of the above new units be conditioned on a progress report to be made to the Board of Higher Education before Fall, 1971. The report should cover the following items with respect to the programs recommended for approval:

1. Refinement of Program Statements
2. Completed Learning Modules
3. Defined Performance Objectives and Methods for Measuring the Achievement of Objectives (with respect to both learning modules and degree program completion)
4. Cooperative Education (utilization of community resources)
5. Community Service
6. Inter-College Programs
7. Community Professors
8. Faculty Evaluation and Reward System
9. Determination of Areas of Emphasis
10. Admission Policies
11. Impost - Outpost Concepts28


28Ibid., p. 22.
This was a proposal adopted by a coordinating board. Most of the items listed are not even the legitimate concern of a governing board. These are the concerns of administration and instruction. The Board has often refused to approve program proposals from the state colleges and universities and has demonstrated a particular reluctance to approve graduate programs. Previous proposals, however, have not been refused on the basis of program content but on needs and priorities as the board staff has interpreted them. This is the first recorded instance of the board's involvement in program content and organization. This intrusion represents a serious threat not only to Governor's State University but to all the public colleges and universities in the state as they submit program proposals to this board.

The examples cited are not isolated instances but typify the kinds of decisions, the rationale for these decisions, and the methods employed to reach them. "Decisions in education," said Henderson, "are best made where the professional effort must be made." The minutes of the meetings of the Board of Higher Education evidence where the decisions are being made. It is obvious that the public colleges and universities in Illinois are being factored out of the discourse on decisions affecting their future.

The circumvention of the Illinois Junior College Board is evidenced not only by the committees on junior college affairs which are appointed directly by the board, and the assignment of staff members to make studies of the various aspects of junior college planning and operations, but in the in-boxes on the college presidents' desks.

One president said:

We get requests for information from the Board of Higher Education without our knowing whether the Illinois Junior College Board is involved. It seems to me that if the Board of Higher Education is consistent in coordinating with the Illinois Junior College Board, it would be better for us to supply the data there and let them in turn pass it on to the Board of Higher Education.

Another president commented about a questionnaire on adult and continuing education which he had received recently from the Board of Higher Education.

To my knowledge—and I have looked into this very carefully—no community college representative nor any member of the state junior college staff was contacted concerning this. This is a document that is obviously designed for the senior institutions, but we are required to complete it. It is virtually impossible for an institution like ours to answer.

While the Board of Higher Education has questions for the junior colleges, some of the presidents also have questions they would like to ask that board. One such question is, "Why was our building project referred to the Health Education Commission?" And an interesting question it is.

This college had leased a building adjacent to a hospital. The building was to be used primarily for para-professional programs in health. The lease contained an option to purchase. After finding the arrangement most satisfying, the college decided to seek permission to exercise its option. After considerable study of the building, its location in relation to other hospitals in the district, its appraised value, purchase price, costs of remodeling, and the programs to be offered there, the Illinois Junior College Board approved the project and notified the Board of Higher Education.

The president of the college became concerned when the proposal did not appear on the higher board's agenda. He called the board offices and was told
that the project was referred for study to the Health Education Commission, an advisory group.

Specifically what is the Health Education Commission supposed to do? A description of its activities is provided by the executive director of the Board of Higher Education.

The charge from the State Board of Higher Education requires a comprehensive review of the various health sciences in the State of Illinois. Such a review must, of necessity, include not only a careful examination of educational programs currently in operation, but also of health care in the State, and how the health care of the State relates to the current educational programs.30

The charge to this committee is devoid of any reference to building programs. Furthermore, it is a statutory responsibility of the Illinois Junior College Board to prepare the studies in reference to junior college building projects. The proposal for the approval of the building is not a proposal for approval of educational programs; the para-professional medical programs are already in operation and have received the approval of the Illinois Junior College Board and the Board of Higher Education.

The maze becomes more complex. Procedures change; policies are altered. Responsibility is difficult to place. Relationships among the state boards approach the incomprehensible. The functions of coordination, governance, and administration lose their focus and the resultant blur works to the advantage of none.

Factors Contributing to the Problems Discussed

No one factor produces the variety of effects enumerated in the preceding pages. There is, instead, a variety of causative factors linked in many combinations which often produce a chain of reactions that end in conflict. The causes discussed in the following paragraphs cannot be isolated one from another for there is no simple cause to effect relationship. One cause or a combination of causes produce an effect or effects which singularly or in combination with each other become a cause or causes to produce a new effect or effects. Therefore, although listed separately, the causes are actually a family of factors bearing close relationships with each other.

1. The presidents have failed to remain united on crucial issues and to effectively espouse the mission and accomplishments of the junior colleges. The presidents interviewed placed much of the blame for the undesirable aspects of present state and local relationships upon themselves.

   We haven't put our proposals into the proper framework. We've been derelict. We're viewed as pirates, potentates and entrepreneurs. We're being asked to do more and more. We need to present our case in terms of student needs. We should ask the state if it wants us to turn the students down—if it really wants us to close the door of the open door college.

   Another president said:

   It is sad that we have so much difficulty agreeing on a position. We came as close to agreeing on the fiscal formula as proposed by the advisory committee as anything we've done. Until the presidents accept the majority vote as the official opinion of the junior colleges, we're going to be in trouble.

   His opinion was echoed by another who states:

   The problem is that community college presidents are almost like human beings—at times. Unfortunately under our present structure, we are not presenting a united front. One
spokesman needs to be the spokesman for the group. The Council of Presidents is not ready for that kind of action.

As noted previously, when the apportionment formula was before the Board of Higher Education, the Chairman of the Council of Presidents spoke on behalf of the Council in favor of the proposal presented by the Illinois Junior College Board. One president appeared to oppose the proposal. When the capital construction budget was considered, another president appeared in opposition to the position expressed by the Chairman of the Council of Presidents and supported the reduction.

Minorities should have the right to be heard. Certainly principles should not be compromised. But if the presidents are not able to stand in unity, those who conquer need not waste time dividing.

2. DURING THE FORMATIVE GROWTH PERIOD OF THE JUNIOR COLLEGES, THE STATE EXPERIENCED A CHANGE IN ITS EXECUTIVE LEADERSHIP AND THERE HAVE BEEN MANY CHANGES IN PERSONNEL IN THE STATE AGENCIES. THESE CHANGES NECESSITATE ADJUSTMENTS.

The present executive secretary of the Illinois Junior College Board assumed his position July 1, 1970. Of the six associate secretaries, only two held their positions in January of 1967; and one of these left his position in 1968 and only recently returned to his previous assignment.

The present executive director of the Board of Higher Education assumed his position on July 1, 1970. More than two-thirds of the staff positions of that board have been created since his arrival. In addition to the personnel in the newly created positions, resignations of some of the previous staff members also brought new faces to this board.
The director of the Division of Vocational and Technical Education of the Board of Vocational Education and Rehabilitation came to his position in 1968. Since that time the division has been reorganized and job functions re-defined. Some of those who were on the staff previously have remained but find themselves with different responsibilities.

The administrator in charge of the Illinois Building Authority is not new to his position. However, most of the staff members who work with junior colleges have changed since 1969, and at least one who came since that date and was closely identified with junior college projects has left. Exercising the license of hyperbole, one president said, "Every time I go down there I meet a new set of strangers."

The fact that changes have taken place cannot be criticized. The point is simply that the changes took place at a critical point in the development of the junior colleges.

The Board of Vocational Education and Rehabilitation was suddenly called upon to deal with junior colleges on a large scale. The Illinois Building Authority had worked with state funded projects but not with projects which were funded in part by local sources. The Illinois Junior College Board found itself heavily involved in lending assistance to the creation of junior college districts and at the same time had to handle all the aspects of planning for a statewide system. The Board of Higher Education served as the coordinating agency of the governing boards of the state supported colleges and universities and had difficulty defining its coordinating role in respect to a group of colleges which had another coordinating board.
The situations were new. Many people in the state agencies were new. With the exception of those colleges which converted to Class I status, most of the personnel in the junior colleges were new. It was inevitable that detour signs would appear on the road to success.

In 1969 a new governor was inaugurated. His predecessor was not disposed to assuming the role of an official critic of higher education. The new governor evidenced strong concern over the financial problems of the state. He created a Bureau of the Budget and it soon became evident that the bureau was to become more than an accounting agency. It was to do more than to keep the governor and the legislature apprised of the state's financial condition. It was also to render value judgments upon all agencies, departments, and services supported by the state and to advise the governor accordingly.

Less than a month after the governor was inaugurated, he made known his priorities for junior college capital construction by freezing all building projects. The plea was that the state treasury was in peril. Several college districts, having passed bond issues adequate to support several phases of construction, sought permission to finance their initial projects entirely with local funds with the understanding that the state's share could be paid at a later date. The requests were denied. As a result, colleges which expected to break ground in April or May of 1969 did not start their projects until May or June of 1970. In the meantime construction costs had risen from 10 to 12 percent. Consequently the dollars bought less.

The Board of Higher Education learned that it was expected to work closely with the Bureau of the Budget. It also learned that the governor was inclined to support the bureau's recommendations.
The presidents evidenced general agreement that the Board of Higher Education is under direct pressure from the governor and the Bureau of the Budget. One said, "The governor is just going to have to let up his pressure on the executive director."

The presidents feel the pressure is piped right down to the junior colleges. It proceeds from the Bureau of the Budget and/or the governor's office to the Board of Higher Education. From there it is piped either directly to the junior colleges or to the Illinois Junior College Board, which in turn sends it to its ultimate destination, the local district. One president summarized it in this manner:

Many of the basic decisions about higher education are being made by the governor and are made in terms of budgetary implications and are handed down to the staff of the Board of Higher Education with the instructions to find some way of implementing them.

3. THERE IS AN INTERNAL INCONSISTENCY IN THE SYSTEM OF SYSTEMS FOR COORDINATING AND GOVERNING BOARDS.

The presidents would not necessarily endorse this view. Most believed the system of systems was fine but said it just was not working the way it should. The concept is good, but the results do not equal expectations.

Their view is best phrased by the president who said:

The concept of the system of systems is good. There are a number of plans that are good plans in and of themselves. The problem is making them work and this involves the people in them. If the right people are in the right places, the system will work.

The logic is strong. The right people working within a poor framework are to be preferred to their opposites working within a good framework. Moving
boxes on an organizational chart does not solve problems. But sometimes mov-
ing a box can make it easier to solve a problem.

The Board of Higher Education is a coordinating board which is supposed to deal directly with the Board of Governors, the Board of Regents, the Board of Trustees of the University of Illinois, the Board of Trustees of Southern Illinois University and the Illinois Junior College Board. However, these boards do not occupy coordinate positions in the structure of higher education. Four are governing boards and one is a coordinating board. The relationship which the Illinois Junior College Board bears with the junior colleges is not analogous to the relationship of the governing boards with the colleges they represent.

The Illinois Junior College Board is a "higher board" in the same sense that the Board of Higher Education is. It is the coordinating board for one segment of the higher education community. It does not have the responsibility for making governing decisions; however, as a coordinating board, it finds its activities and decisions subjected to judicial review and reversal by another coordinating board which duplicates the work which it has already performed. This weakens its relationship with the local districts because they are fully aware that the important and final decisions will be made by another board.

4. THE STATUTES INVITE MISINTERPRETATION.

The presidents interviewed were unanimous in their endorsement of the concepts supporting the Public Junior College Act as they perceived those concepts. Some found but little fault with the law claiming interpretation causes the problems. Other, while supporting its basic principles, would make changes.
There is a danger in prescriptive legislation for education. Yet clarity should be an objective. The fact that there are so many different interpretations of the responsibilities of local and state boards would indicate a lack of clarity. Omissions in the Public Junior College Act also lead to confusion. Often the act refers to the School Code and directs junior colleges to follow the law as prescribed in that document. What happens when a situation arises for which there is neither a provision in the law nor a reference to the School Code? Does one assume the School Code prevails?

Do the junior colleges have the right to purchase land, build buildings, initiate instructional programs without approval from state agencies when the support for such programs comes entirely from local funds? Opinions differ.

Certainly the law would be easier to interpret if the duties and powers of the Illinois Junior College Board were placed in one section of the act. The nature of the relationship between the local board and the Illinois Junior College Board would also be clarified.

Is the Illinois Junior College Board a coordinating board or a governing board? The law does not stipulate. The conclusion that it is a coordinating board is reached inductively by examining its powers and duties. But as long as its powers and duties are subject to variant interpretations and the distinction between governing and coordinating is not clearly identified, how valid is the conclusion? The same questions may be applied to the Board of Higher Education.

Neither are the levels of responsibility among the various boards clearly defined. This was illustrated with abundant clarity at a recent meeting of
the Board of Higher Education when a petition for the establishment of a new junior college district was before the board.

Dr. Holderman presented the petition saying that in order to explore more fully some possible new modes of inter-institutional cooperation and/or to design alternative patterns for private and public inter-institutional relationships, more time is needed prior to recommending the approval of the Maconland Petition to organize a Class I Junior College District and the staff recommends that the Board of Higher Education defer decision on the petition until June, 1971.

Mr. Fowle said that he objected to the staff recommendation inasmuch as he felt the Board was exceeding its powers.

Dr. Holderman pointed out that the statute creating the Board of Higher Education directs the Board to concern itself with both private and public interests in Illinois higher education and the staff recommendation is merely addressing that particular charge.31

If the law is clear, it should not be unreasonable to expect the chairman of the Illinois Junior College Board who is also a member of the Board of Higher Education and who is also a practicing attorney to distinguish between the functions of the two boards on which he holds membership. Either the chairman of the Illinois Junior College Board or the executive director of the Board of Higher Education is interpreting the law incorrectly.

What does program approval mean? Does the law really intend it to mean approval of courses that constitute a program, the interpretation given by the Illinois Junior College Board? Does the authority for program approval given the Board of Higher Education grant it the prescriptive authority which it exercised in reviewing the proposals of Governor's State University?

Whether the statutes have established levels of overlapping authority or whether the interpretations of the statutes have established overlapping levels

31 Minutes of the Board of Higher Education, December 7, 1970, p. 27.
of authority is debatable. But if not established by law, overlapping authority is certainly permitted.

The statutes have contributed to the difficulties.

5. **BUREAUCRACY SEeks TO FILL VACuUMs.**

This principle can find support in the corporate structure, government, and in all levels and areas of education. When territory is not staked out, it will soon have a claimant. Indeed, the principle operates in the simplest of social organizations. It does not take long for the leadership role to be captured in a first grade playground group.

When policies have not been developed, when designated responsibilities have not been met by the responsible group, another group with tangential obligations will usurp these responsibilities and the attendant authority. The usurpation may be either lateral or vertical. Quite naturally, however, those with a power base are better able to respond to the invitation to make the move. And when responsibilities and areas of authority are not clearly defined, the invitation becomes less easy to resist. Letter press can be discarded; engraving is enticing.

Since the Board of Higher Education existed before the Illinois Junior College Board and the emergence of the Class I districts, the direction of the power is not surprising. Both the Illinois Junior College Board and the colleges have had little time to mature. Problems of immediacy have continued to command their attention. A retirement plan is secondary to tomorrow's meal for a man who is scratching out a living. Operational problems and just getting the system started have taken priority over long range planning and coordination.
Both the Illinois Junior College Board and the colleges were vulnerable. If the presidents are unable to stand unified, the vulnerability of the colleges will increase.

6. THE BOARD OF HIGHER EDUCATION'S PERCEPTION OF ITS ROLE IS INCONSISTENT WITH THE LEGITIMATE FUNCTIONS OF A COORDINATING BODY.

Perhaps the strongest evidence for the support of this statement is found in the numerous excerpts from minutes of the board which have been cited previously. The board does not deny its responsibilities for planning and coordination but seeks to magnify these roles to include governing and administering. It establishes rules, implements them, and evaluates how well others follow them. It is executive, legislative and judicial.

Henderson warned against accepting "the notion that higher education is a department of government, just as highways and state police are. Thus it is urgent in the formative state to determine the true roles of the state boards of higher education."\(^{26}\)

The notion which Henderson warns against is the position assumed by the present executive director. He says, "This 'fourth branch of government' concept is valuable chiefly because it emphasizes the desired independence of higher education."\(^{27}\)

But then he finds a position for planning boards in the 'new federalism' and argues for the autonomy of coordinating boards.\(^{28}\) His concerns in reality

\(^{26}\)Henderson, *Control in Higher Education*, p. 29.


\(^{28}\)Ibid., pp. 1181-1182, 1185.
are addressed to the independence of coordinating boards and not to the inde-
pendence of higher education. How independent is a college which has its pri-
orities established for it through line-item budget deletions and reductions?
Fortunately, the junior colleges have not yet faced this ordeal. But the pos-
sibility becomes greater as the Board begins to increase its attention to
junior colleges.

He takes the position that there is no threat to the autonomy of public
colleges and universities in Illinois,29 yet the minutes of the meetings of
the Board of Higher Education reveal that every time a representative from one
of the colleges or universities or a member of the board questioned him con-
cerning the possible impact of one of his proposals on institutional autonomy,
he would reply that the proposal was merely an implementation of a board re-
sponsibility.

The executive director is most articulate in voicing the difficult posi-
tion of a coordinating board:

State Boards of higher education delicately straddle various
sectors of state government. From the standpoint of the
governor and legislature, the state board is an administra-
tive agency of state government created to review the needs
of state-assisted colleges and universities and to supervise
the planning and development of the whole of higher educa-
tion. From the point of view of the individual colleges and
universities, the state board has a major role to perform:
to present and defend the needs of the state institutions
as these are perceived by the institutions themselves.30

29Ibid., p. 1184.
30Ibid., p. 1185.
He holds, and rightly so, that the state board can be the captive of neither the government nor the institutions. The position is legitimate and well stated. There is only one ingredient missing, the parameters within which the board will operate. At present there appear to be none.

Conclusions

The interviews with the presidents and the documentation presented identify problems which exist between the state agencies and the junior colleges. Areas of authority are difficult to define; levels of authority are difficult to distinguish. Coordinating is sometimes neglected in favor of governing.

One of the functions of a coordinating board is to guard against the wasteful duplication of effort by the colleges. Yet the approval hierarchy for programs and construction dictate a wasteful duplication of effort not only by the colleges but also by the state agencies. The activities of the coordinating agencies need to be coordinated.

Policies need to be clarified and in the case of the Illinois Building Authority the policies followed for approval of junior college construction must be developed and made available to the junior colleges.

The relationships among the state boards must be clarified and perhaps redefined. The responsibilities of the Illinois Junior College Board have been fractured. Its decisions on buildings are subject to change by the Illinois Building Authority. Its decisions on master plans for junior college campuses are subject to the veto of the Board of Higher Education. The Board of Higher Education can nullify any or all of its program approvals and the Board of Vocational Education and Rehabilitation retains approval authority for vocational programs. The Board of Higher Education has demonstrated little faith in the
recommendations of the Illinois Junior College Board and has demonstrated its desire to become the major planning and coordinating unit for the public junior colleges. Indeed, its activities in recent months have made the Illinois Junior College Board impotent.

While the junior colleges have communication links with the Illinois Junior College Board, more and more decisions affecting junior college development are being made by the Board of Higher Education which is twice removed from the local district. Input from the junior college districts and from the Illinois Junior College Board is ignored by the Board of Higher Education in favor of the recommendations of its own staff. The greatest threat to the autonomy of Illinois public junior colleges is posed by the policies and procedures of the Board of Higher Education.

Several presidents suggested that this board may be the unwilling tool of the executive branch of the state government. That this is a distinct possibility cannot be denied. On the other hand, the proclivity of this board to create a bureaucratic structure which through sheer force of financing and staffing can overwhelm the efforts of the Illinois Junior College Board, whose budget it controls, indicates its desire to strengthen its power base.

The failure of the junior college presidents to remain united on crucial issues, the turnover of personnel in the state agencies, an internal inconsistency in the system of systems for coordinating and governing boards, the ambiguities and omissions of the statutes which invite misinterpretation, the natural tendency of bureaucracy to fill authority gaps, and the inclination of the Board of Higher Education to expand its coordinating functions to governing powers have contributed to the existing problems.
The need for junior colleges was carefully analyzed before the Public Junior College Act was written. Legislation was shaped to promote their growth and development. But the legislation is not reflective of careful attention to the position which these colleges and the Illinois Junior College Board occupy in relation to each other and in relation to other state boards which have a critical influence upon junior college development.

If the statutory duties of the Illinois Junior College Board are fractured by the statutory duties of other boards, confusion and duplication result and coordination becomes difficult to achieve. If the statutory duties of the Illinois Junior College Board are in conflict with the duties of one or more other boards and are either ignored or usurped by these boards, then the Illinois Junior College Board will become a coordinating figurehead. Consequently, junior colleges will be factored out of the discourse on their future.

The junior college movement in Illinois has grown rapidly since 1965. The Board of Higher Education now gives evidence of its lack of confidence in the Illinois Junior College Board and the institutions it represents. It poses a threat to the autonomy of the individual colleges by its assumption of the responsibilities of the Illinois Junior College Board. While the Illinois Junior College Board retains the right to say "No" to junior colleges within the limits of its authority, its ability to grant an assuring "Yes" no longer exists.

The Board of Higher Education has become a governing board despite protestations to the contrary. Unless the authority which it exercises is curbed, the staff of this board will guide the future of public higher education in Illinois. The senior colleges and universities and the junior colleges will be subservient to a central staff removed from the center of the educational process. The Ministry of Higher Education will have been created.
C H A P T E R V I I

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

This study examined the autonomy of Illinois Public Junior Colleges. The system within which they operate is complex. In some states junior colleges exist only as a result of local effort; in some states junior colleges are state colleges existing within a financial and organizational framework similar to the Illinois state colleges and universities. But in Illinois the junior colleges are neither totally local nor wholly state. They exist as part of a supportive partnership of the state and local areas.

Each college district has a Board of Trustees as its governing body. However there is a state coordinating board for junior colleges with designated powers and duties with respect to those colleges. There is another state board which is responsible for the coordination of all of the institutions of public higher education including the junior colleges.

Financial support for operational and capital expenditures is derived from both state and local sources. Local tax rates are established by the electorate subject to maximums established by law. No district can be created if in the opinion of the Illinois Junior College Board there is not an adequate base for local support or if the proposed tax rates, despite the size of the base, will yield insufficient revenue.

In the pursuit of their mission, the junior colleges must work with a variety of state agencies, chief among which are the Illinois Junior College
Board, Board of Higher Education, Board of Vocational Education and Rehabilitation and the Illinois Building Authority. All of these agencies have statutory authority with respect to one or more phases of junior college activities.

There is a complex array of relationships existing among these agencies and between the junior colleges and these agencies. Recognizing the imperatives that are concomitant with state aid, the study was addressed to determining whether the junior colleges enjoyed the autonomy necessary for the pursuit of their goals and, if not, whether the limitations upon autonomy resulted from the administrative and policy decisions of the state agencies. The study recognized that no college could be completely autonomous and granted that some limitations upon freedom of action were necessitated by statewide planning and coordination.

Criteria reflecting the minimum essentials of autonomy were developed. These criteria were based upon the literature in the field and served as the foundation for a questionnaire which was sent to the chief executive officer, chancellor or president, of each district. The responses were analyzed in reference to legislation and the procedures and policies of the subject agencies. Subsequently, nine college presidents were interviewed; their reactions and supportive evidence were presented.

Conclusions

The study sought to test the following hypotheses:

1. Each Illinois public junior college is free to develop as a distinct institution with a unique character.

2. Each Illinois public junior college has the authority to exercise the necessary discretion for the most effective use of its local revenue and funds disbursed through state agencies.
3. Each Illinois public junior college enjoys academic freedom without legislative or administrative restrictions from the state.

4. Each Illinois public junior college has effective control of its curriculum, public services, and research activities.

5. There is a trend toward increased local autonomy for Illinois public junior colleges.

The responses to the questionnaire supported the first, third and fourth hypotheses. Strongest support was evidenced for the third hypothesis with the first and fourth following in that order. Responses to the second hypothesis were too sharply divided to draw a conclusion. The fifth hypothesis was rejected. The responses indicated that there was a trend toward decreased local autonomy, the chief reason being the direction and scope of the activities of the Board of Higher Education. Twenty-seven of the thirty-three presidents cited this board; twelve cited the Illinois Junior College Board; thirteen, the Board of Vocational Education and Rehabilitation; and twelve, the Illinois Building Authority.

The weight of the evidence gathered in the interviews tends to discredit the second hypothesis.

Six operative conditions were identified as responsible for weakening local-state relationships and producing a variety of effects which in turn threaten or erode local autonomy:

1. The presidents have failed to remain united on crucial issues and to effectively espouse the mission and accomplishments of the junior colleges.

2. Changes in the executive leadership of the state have resulted in new policy directions and changes of personnel in the state agencies have necessitated adjustments by those agencies and by the colleges.
3. There is an internal inconsistency in the system of systems for coordinating and governing boards.

4. The statutes invite misinterpretation.

5. Bureaucracy seeks to fill vacuums.

6. The Board of Higher Education's perception of its role is inconsistent with the legitimate functions of a coordinating body.

There are also a number of specific problems which deserve attention. The areas of responsibility of the Illinois Junior College Board and the Board of Higher Education are not clearly delineated by the statutes or by practice. While the Public Junior College Act presumably grants coordinating authority and responsibility to the Illinois Junior College Board, the act creating the Board of Higher Education places the Illinois Junior College Board on a coordinate level with the governing boards of the state colleges and universities. The evidence demonstrates that the two coordinating boards have been unable to reach agreement upon their respective areas of responsibility.

Recent events show an increasing tendency by the Board of Higher Education to ignore the recommendations of the Illinois Junior College Board and to assume for itself the responsibility for the coordination and long range planning for junior colleges.

The Illinois Junior College Board and the junior colleges must be supportive of one another. Each must respect the right of the other. The Illinois Junior College Board must take the initiative at the state level as a positive and effective exponent of the junior college movement. It must concentrate upon the coordinating and planning functions delegated to it; the temptation to become involved in decisions which are the responsibility of the local district must be resisted.
The necessity of approvals from several agencies for campus master plans, building programs, instructional programs, public services, and research results in a needless duplication of effort and obscures accountability. Coordination of the activities of the colleges has received abundant attention to the end that needless costs might be eliminated. Coordination at the state level deserves equal attention. The needless duplication of approvals incurs additional expense at both the state and local levels. When authority is divided among several groups, accountability remains afloat. If the Illinois Junior College Board is to be responsible for coordination and planning its necessary authority to perform these tasks must not be fragmented among other agencies.

The Public Junior College Act needs clarification. The term "program" for example is not adequately defined. Consequently, program approval is interpreted by some to include approval of the courses in a program while others hold that the local district should be able to decide what courses or learning experiences should constitute a program. Neither is it clear if a junior college is free to pursue an activity which normally requires state approval if the college intends to finance the activity entirely from local funds. References in the law to the School Code have also created confusion. Does the School Code become operative for those situations which are not covered in the act? The act is so structured that the powers and duties of the Illinois Junior College Board appear throughout the act although one section of the act purports to list the powers and duties of the board. The rapid growth of the junior college has made it difficult to achieve the mature planning necessary
for orderly growth and development. At this juncture it is important to examine the policies and laws within which the junior colleges must operate.

**Recommendations**

The Public Junior College Act should be codified. The Council of Presidents and the Illinois Junior College Board should share in the task of studying this law. The law should be examined in terms of its structure, content, and language. The results of the study should be presented to the legislature for appropriate action.

The coordinating and planning responsibilities of the Illinois Junior College Board which have been eroded must be restored to that board. The relationships between the Board of Higher Education and the Illinois Junior College Board must be clarified. There is an overlapping of authority. It can be argued that the confusion regarding the authority levels is directly attributable to the statutes. It can also be argued that policy decisions are the source of confusion or that the statutes and policy decisions combine to create difficulties. Either the two boards must adopt a mutually satisfactory policy statement defining their respective areas of authority or appropriate legislative changes must be made. If there is no action on this matter and the Board of Higher Education continues to usurp the authority and responsibility of the Illinois Junior College Board, the latter board will no longer be a force in higher education and its usefulness will be questionable.

Those responsibilities which have not been delegated to the Illinois Junior College Board but which have remained within the authority of the Board of Vocational Education and Rehabilitation and the Illinois Building Authority
should be delegated to the Illinois Junior College Board. If it is legally impossible to transfer these functions, then procedures should be developed which will eliminate the necessity of the college to work directly with these agencies and which will place the responsibility for this work with the Illinois Junior College Board.

The Illinois Junior College Board and the local districts must recognize their mutual dependence. The board must recognize its obligation to assume the role of effective leadership for the junior colleges. The Council of Presidents must remain united on crucial issues. The presidents must not give the appearance of disunity to either the Illinois Junior College Board or the Board of Higher Education. If the presidents are unable to reach consensus on crucial issues, then a method must be devised to present both majority and minority opinions. The opinions must be clearly stated so there is no question as to which opinion is endorsed by the majority of the presidents.

The governing boards of the state colleges and universities and the Illinois Junior College Board must work together to protect the autonomy of their respective institutions from infringements by the Board of Higher Education. These boards are in an advantageous position to cooperate effectively inasmuch as each is represented on the Board of Higher Education. If the other members of the Board of Higher Education and the staff are not amenable to reason, then these boards must take recourse by appealing to the legislature.

Several subjects related to the Board of Higher Education deserve additional study.

In *Shaping Educational Policy*, Conant charged that the Illinois legislature and specifically several powerful members of the Illinois legislature exercised
undue influence upon the course of higher education in Illinois. Personal relationships and power politics influenced educational decisions. Conant urged the implementation of a unit for statewide planning and coordination. Illinois now has this type of unit. It is now appropriate to determine whether those same factors which operated in the legislative branch of the government are now operating within the executive branch and within the Board of Higher Education.

It is appropriate to evaluate the Board of Higher Education after a decade of its operation. Several questions appear to be pertinent. Has the board met its designated responsibilities? Have the purported advantages of statewide planning been realized? Can any disadvantages be identified? If so, are the advantages greater than the disadvantages? What will be the effect of the board's decision and policies upon private colleges and universities? Should the Board of Higher Education enjoy complete autonomy? The board has numerous study committees. How are these committees chosen? Are their recommendations generally accepted? The influence which the Board of Higher Education has exerted merits a careful study of its operation and achievement.

Illinois colleges and universities have enjoyed excellent reputations. The state has committed itself to the development of a system of public junior colleges which finds its base in responsibilities shared by the local district and the state. The Illinois junior college system has gained national recognition during its short history. It is often identified as a model for other states to replicate. The Public Junior College Act encourages local initiative and local responsibility. Decisions in education are best made by those who
have the greatest investment and who must ultimately bear the responsibility. If the direction of higher education finds its source at levels far removed from where education takes place, local initiative will be destroyed. If authority is to be housed in the Board of Higher Education, responsibility cannot be housed on the campus. It would be well for the Board of Higher Education to recognize its own limitations, to restrict its activities to planning and coordinating, and to recognize the competency of campus authorities, the Illinois Junior College Board, and the governing boards.

There is a need for educational statesmanship throughout the community of higher education. There is ample room for all educational statesmen; there is no room for empire builders. All of higher education will suffer if the education community loses its identity to an education kingdom.
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APPENDIX A

QUESTIONNAIRE

THE PURPOSE OF THIS QUESTIONNAIRE is to ascertain how the chief executive officers of Illinois Public Junior College Districts perceive the extent of the authority of the local district to pursue its own goals.

You are asked to respond to four series of statements by indicating after each statement whether you strongly agree, agree, disagree, strongly disagree or are uncertain.

Following each series of statements is a matrix. In each case where you believe there are limitations beyond those necessary for statewide planning and coordination, place a check in the appropriate cell(s).

The following abbreviations are used in the matrices:

- **BHE** Board of Higher Education
- **IJCB** Illinois Junior College Board
- **BVE** Board of Vocational Education
- **IBA** Illinois Building Authority
- **L** Legislation creating the agency
- **A&P** Administrative and/or Policy decisions of the agency
SECTION I

Please circle one response for each of the following items:

1. Each public junior college district in Illinois has the freedom necessary
   1.1 to be innovative in its instructional methods
       *Strongly Agree  Agree  Uncertain  Disagree  Strongly Disagree*
   1.2 to be innovative in the design of its facilities
       *Strongly Agree  Agree  Uncertain  Disagree  Strongly Disagree*
   1.3 to be innovative in its internal management and organization
       *Strongly Agree  Agree  Uncertain  Disagree  Strongly Disagree*
   1.4 to make maximum use of its own ability to meet local problems
       *Strongly Agree  Agree  Uncertain  Disagree  Strongly Disagree*

If you believe the local college district is limited in any of the above beyond those limitations necessary for statewide planning and coordination, indicate the source or sources of each limitation by checking the appropriate cell(s):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>BHE</th>
<th>IJCB</th>
<th>BVE</th>
<th>IBA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>A&amp;P</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>A&amp;P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>:</td>
<td>:</td>
<td>:</td>
<td>:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>:</td>
<td>:</td>
<td>:</td>
<td>:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>:</td>
<td>:</td>
<td>:</td>
<td>:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

OTHER :
SECTION II

Please circle one response for each of the following items:

2. Each Illinois public junior college district has the authority to exercise the necessary discretion for the most effective utilization of

2.1 funds raised at the local level
   Strongly Agree Agree Uncertain Disagree Strongly Disagree

2.2 state apportionment funds based on semester hours or semester hour equivalency
   Strongly Agree Agree Uncertain Disagree Strongly Disagree

2.3 funds disbursed through the Board of Vocational Education
   Strongly Agree Agree Uncertain Disagree Strongly Disagree

2.4 funds allocated to it by the state for building purposes
   Strongly Agree Agree Uncertain Disagree Strongly Disagree

If you believe the local college district is limited in any of the above beyond those limitations necessary for statewide planning and coordination, indicate the source or sources of each limitation by checking the appropriate cell(s):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>BHE</th>
<th>IJCB</th>
<th>BVE</th>
<th>IBA</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>:</td>
<td>:</td>
<td>:</td>
<td>:</td>
<td>:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>:</td>
<td>:</td>
<td>:</td>
<td>:</td>
<td>:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>:</td>
<td>:</td>
<td>:</td>
<td>:</td>
<td>:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>:</td>
<td>:</td>
<td>:</td>
<td>:</td>
<td>:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Please circle one response for each of the following items:

3. Each Illinois public junior college is free

3.1 to maintain an environment conducive to freedom of thought and discussion

Strongly Agree Agree Uncertain Disagree Strongly Disagree

3.2 to develop and maintain its academic standards without limits other than those imposed by accrediting agencies and recognized professional groups

Strongly Agree Agree Uncertain Disagree Strongly Disagree

3.3 to develop policies for the exercise of distinctive rights and shared responsibilities for trustees, administrators, faculty and students

Strongly Agree Agree Uncertain Disagree Strongly Disagree

3.4 to exercise the necessary control of its membership of faculty, staff, and students without any outside agency dictating the acceptance, retention, or dismissal of any particular individual

Strongly Agree Agree Uncertain Disagree Strongly Disagree

If you believe the local college district is limited in any of the above beyond those limitations necessary for statewide planning and coordination, indicate the source or sources of each limitation by checking the appropriate cell(s):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>BHE</th>
<th>IJCB</th>
<th>BVE</th>
<th>IBA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SECTION IV

Please circle one response for each of the following items:

4. Each Illinois public junior college district has authority commensurate with its responsibility to determine

4.1 the curricular program it will offer

   Strongly Agree  Agree  Uncertain  Disagree  Strongly Disagree

4.2 the courses that may be required or recommended for each curricular program offered

   Strongly Agree  Agree  Uncertain  Disagree  Strongly Disagree

4.3 the public services it may offer

   Strongly Agree  Agree  Uncertain  Disagree  Strongly Disagree

4.4 the extent and purposes of its research activities

   Strongly Agree  Agree  Uncertain  Disagree  Strongly Disagree

If you believe the local college district is limited in any of the above beyond those limitations necessary for statewide planning and coordination, indicate the source or sources of each limitation by checking the appropriate cell(s):

| : BHE : IJCB : BVE : IBA : |
SECTION V

Please check the cells which reflect your view of trends in state control of Illinois public junior colleges:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>BHE</th>
<th>IJCB</th>
<th>BVE</th>
<th>IBA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>L : A&amp;P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decreasing Control</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increasing Control</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Significant Change</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please use the space below for any comments you may wish to make regarding the structure for coordination and control of Illinois public junior colleges:

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
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APPENDIX B

PROPOSITIONS RANKED ACCORDING TO DEGREE OF SUPPORT

1. (3.1) Each Illinois public junior college is free to maintain an environment conducive to freedom of thought and discussion.

2. (3.2) Each Illinois public junior college is free to develop and maintain its academic standards without limits other than those imposed by accrediting agencies and recognized professional groups.

3. (3.3) Each Illinois public junior college is free to develop policies for the exercise of distinctive rights and shared responsibilities for trustees, administrators, faculty and students.

4. (1.1) Each public junior college district in Illinois has the freedom necessary to be innovative in its instructional methods.

5. (1.3) Each public junior college district in Illinois has the freedom necessary to be innovative in its internal management and organization.

6. (4.3) Each Illinois public junior college district has authority commensurate with its responsibility to determine the public services it may offer.

7. (4.4) Each Illinois public junior college district has authority commensurate with its responsibility to determine the extent and purpose of its research activities.

8. (1.4) Each public junior college district in Illinois has the freedom necessary to make maximum use of its ability to meet local problems.

9. (2.2) Each Illinois public junior college district has the authority to exercise the necessary discretion for the most effective utilization of state apportionment funds based on semester hours or semester hour equivalency.

10. (3.4) Each Illinois public junior college is free to exercise the necessary control of its membership of faculty, staff, and students without any outside agency dictating the acceptance, retention, or dismissal of any particular individual.
11. (1.2) Each public junior college district in Illinois has the freedom necessary to be innovative in the design of its facilities.

12. (2.1) Each Illinois public junior college district has the authority to exercise the necessary discretion for the most effective utilization of funds raised at the local level.

13. (4.1) Each Illinois public junior college district has authority commensurate with its responsibility to determine the curricular program it will offer.

14. (4.2) Each Illinois public junior college district has authority commensurate with its responsibility to determine the courses that may be required or recommended for each curricular program offered.

15. (2.3) Each Illinois public junior college district has the authority to exercise the necessary discretion for the most effective utilization of funds disbursed through the Board of Vocational Education.

16. (2.4) Each Illinois public junior college district has the authority to exercise the necessary discretion for the most effective utilization of funds allotted to it by the state for building purposes.
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