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The Commission represents in its membership quite diversified and rich experience, not only in university administration and teaching but in the conduct of educational surveys of various kinds. Speaking for the Council, I wish here to record appreciation of the work and the report of the Commission.

A state university plays an important part in the life of a state. The administration and achievements of the University of Illinois are therefore matters of interest to the people of Illinois. This survey report will, I trust, enable the University to serve its constituency even more effectively than it has done in its fine past.
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George F. Zook  
President
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Dear Dr. Zook:

I have the honor to transmit to you herewith the report on the survey of the University of Illinois.

The Commission members met in Urbana September 1 and 2, 1942, and adopted an outline for the study which was to follow. They subsequently held two other meetings in Urbana, and two in Chicago.

The Commission was fortunate in securing the full-time services of Dr. John W. Taylor to work as its executive secretary. Between August 23 and December 28 he spent thirteen weeks at the University of Illinois collecting and organizing information on items as directed by the Commission.

While the resolution passed by the Board of Trustees authorizing the Commission to set October 20, 1942, as the date by which the report should be completed, appointments by the members of the Commission were accepted with the definite understanding that no date of completion could be set in advance, and that the survey would probably not be finished by October 20th.

The method pursued in preparation of the report has been that of interviewing administrative and teaching officers and alumni and of examining records and printed materials.

Throughout its work the Commission has been extended the fullest cooperation and every courtesy on the part of all individuals from whom it sought information, with the exception of Attorney General Barrett whose statement in full in response to the Commission's invitation is included in the first chapter of the report.

Respectfully submitted,

R. A. Kent
Chairman
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INTRODUCTION

In order to understand the purpose of this report and the factors which determine its scope, it is necessary to know something of the conditions under which the Commission worked.

On July 25, 1942, the Board of Trustees of the University of Illinois by formal vote authorized the survey of the University by the American Council on Education. The Board motion stipulated that this survey:

shall be to investigate the charges made against the Board of Trustees and the administration of the University of Illinois by the Attorney General of Illinois in the following press statements issued by him, and any other charges he may make, to determine their truth or falsity:

“I intend to prove that since 1934 a group of hand-picked political puppets have virtually built a political empire in Champaign and Urbana and have cloaked their operations and defended their illegal activities behind the shield of education.

“The University has been on the downgrade since 1934 when control was taken over by a board of trustees who were not the choice of the people but were hand-picked by the downstate democratic machine and the Kelly-Nash machine in Cook County. . . .”

In order to clarify the situation it should perhaps be stated here that the two charges stated above arose out of the controversy between the Board of Trustees of the University of Illinois and George F. Barrett, Attorney General of Illinois. This controversy revolved around two principal issues. The first of these was concerned with the legal right of the University to pay the salary of Sveinbjorn Johnson as legal counsel of the institution. The second point at issue was concerned with the right of the selection and appointment of the legal counsel of the University. The Board of Trustees of the University and the Attorney General of Illinois each claimed this right. In the letter of July 27, 1942 from President Willard to President Zook of the American Council on Education, requesting the survey, the following statement was made:

The American Council on Education is not expected to include in this survey a study of (a) the right of the Board of Trustees to appoint a University Counsel and an Assistant to the University Counsel, as
that question can now be settled only by the courts; (b) the services of the present University Counsel as State Director for Illinois of the Federal Office of Government Reports; provided, however, that this does not preclude consideration of these or other questions that may be deemed appropriate subjects for inclusion in the survey. The American Council on Education is requested to complete its survey on or before October 20, 1942.

Very early in its deliberations the Commission was officially informed that three other studies of the University were already under way. The Commission immediately interested itself in learning the scope and limitations of these studies in order that there should be no overlapping of its undertaking with what had been otherwise provided for.

The study which most directly bore on the planning and work of the Commission was one undertaken by the Council on Medical Education and Hospitals of the American Medical Association. The Commission was told that this study, requested by the Board of Trustees of the University and made by the American Medical Association, was to do for the Medical Center in Chicago what the study by the American Council on Education was designed to accomplish in the Urbana divisions of the University. The Commission therefore has left the study of the programs of the Chicago colleges to such specialized agencies as the American Medical Association, and itself has studied the Chicago colleges only in their relation to the institution as a whole.

At the beginning of its work, President Willard informed the Commission that at the request of the Board of Trustees the firm of Booz, Fry, Allen, and Hamilton was at work on "a survey of the business operations, business departments, activities and methods of the University." Hence, the Commission purposely avoided examining any of the business methods and practices used at the University except in so far as the organization and administration of business relationships in a university are themselves involved in educational evaluation.

A third study, requested by Governor Green and George B. McKibbin, director of finance, includes a survey of the administrative relationships and financial branches of the various agencies of the state government. This study, under

1See President Willard's letter of December 24, 1941, to Booz, Fry, Allen, and Hamilton.
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the direction of Professor S. E. Leland of the University of Chicago, includes a survey of the field of education and educational administration made by Professor George A. Works, also of the University of Chicago. Assured by Mr. Leland that this study would embrace an evaluation of the administrative and the budgetary relationships of the state institutions of higher education, including the University of Illinois, the Commission has not dealt with this phase of the institution in its report.

Having been informed of the work of these other agencies, the Commission limited its activity to the collection of information bearing on these two questions: (1) Since 1934 has a group of hand-picked political puppets virtually built a political empire at the University of Illinois? (2) Has the University of Illinois been on the downgrade since 1934?

The Commission has understood its duty to be to examine critically and impartially the data it has collected and to give considered answers to these two questions.

Immediately following the first meeting of the Commission on September 1, 1942, the following letter was sent to the Honorable George F. Barrett, Attorney General of the State of Illinois:

Under date of July 25, 1942, the Board of Trustees of the University of Illinois authorized a survey of that institution by the American Council on Education, the general scope of the survey to be the charges made by you against the University.

In this action the Board made clear to the American Council on Education that the survey was not to include the matter under dispute concerning the University's legal counsel, but rather to investigate your charges that the University has been on the downgrade since 1934.

The American Council on Education appointed a Commission of five educators to make the study. This Commission has just had its first meeting, and I have the honor to extend to you an urgent invitation to appear before the Commission so that it may have directly from you such statements as you wish to make which bear upon the investigation it has been asked to make. The Commission will be glad to meet you at such time and place as you will indicate, provided only that the date be not earlier than September 6.

Under date of September 26, 1942, the following reply was received from Attorney General Barrett:

I am in receipt of your letter dated September 2, 1942, advising me that you are Chairman of a Commission named by the University
of Illinois to conduct a survey of that institution and inviting me to appear before such Commission.

This is the second attempt by the Kelly-Nash Democratic Trustees of the University of Illinois and Arthur Cutts Willard, puppet President thereof, to conduct a white-washing investigation by a group appointed and selected by the President of the University and the Kelly-Nash Democratic Trustees.

Under date of July 16, 1942, Arthur Cutts Willard addressed a letter to members of the Board of Trustees of the University of Illinois in which he stated in part, and I quote, "The American Council on Education will select all members of survey commissions and a director for each survey subject to the approval of the body requesting the survey." (emphasis mine)

It is apparent from this provision that any and all members of your so-called survey commission must have first obtained the approval of the Kelly-Nash tools before any of them could undertake their so-called investigation.

It is obvious therefore that the alleged survey commission is in no position to conduct an impartial investigation when membership upon such commission is dependent upon the approval of the Kelly-Nash Democratic Trustees.

At the time that the Board of Trustees of the University authorized the American Council on Education to conduct its alleged survey it also attempted to authorize the expenditure of a sum of $4,000 to pay the salary and expenses of the members of the so-called survey commission.

The appropriation made by the Legislature to the University of Illinois does not contain any appropriation in any amount for such a purpose. Under the Constitution and Statutes of the State of Illinois neither the University of Illinois or any other State officer or agency can expend any sum of money whatsoever except upon the specific appropriation therefor by the Legislature of the State of Illinois.

The Kelly-Nash Democratic Trustees and Arthur Cutts Willard, their puppet President of the University, want nothing but a biased and prejudiced investigation and are even willing to make an illegal expenditure of public funds in order to obtain the whitewash that they desire.

The charges which I have made and which I again make are not against the academic features of the University but against the administration of the University by the Kelly-Nash Trustees and their puppet President, Arthur Cutts Willard.

For the professors and instructors of the University who carry on the actual work of education, I have the highest regard. Their functions have been admirably performed, and to date, in spite of the inefficient and incompetent administration by Arthur Cutts Willard and the Kelly-Nash Democratic Trustees, they have kept the scho-
lastic standing of the University above reproach. They cannot, how-
ever, continue to keep the educational features of the University
intact if they are forced to carry on their shoulders the load of a
boss controlled and mismanaged business administration.

The Kelly-Nash Democratic Trustees of the University of Illinois
and their puppet President, Arthur Cutts Willard, have at all times
attempted, by misleading statements, to give the false impression that
my charges were directed against the educational features of the
University of Illinois.

They know that this is untrue as will be shown by the following
excerpts from the minutes of a meeting of the Board of Trustees of
the University of Illinois, on June 20, 1942, in which Arthur Cutts
Willard stated to the Board of Trustees in part as follows:

I recommend that the Board of Trustees authorize:

1. A survey of the University of Illinois by the American Council on
   Education. The general scope of this survey shall be to investigate the
   charges made against the Board of Trustees and the administration of the
   University of Illinois by the Attorney General of Illinois in the following
   press statements issued by him, and any other charges he may make, to
determine their truth or falsity:

   “I intend to prove that since 1934, a group of hand-picked political
   puppets have virtually built a political empire in Champaign and Urbana
   and have cloaked their operations and defended their illegal activities
   behind the shield of education.

   “The University has been on the downgrade since 1934 when control
   was taken over by a board of trustees who were not the choice of the
   people but were hand-picked by the downstate democratic machine and the
   Kelly-Nash machine in Cook County.

   “Myself and other alumni of the University have watched our school’s
   decline since the political termites crept into the administration.

   “The Johnson exposure in itself is enough to warrant an investigation
   of the entire administrative branch of the University, if such irregularities
   have been committed in one department, they may have been committed
   in others.”

I am compelled to direct your attention to the fact that on Decem-
ber 16, 1941, which was prior to the time I made my charges against
the Kelly-Nash Democratic Trustees and their tool, Arthur Cutts
Willard, the Board of Trustees of the University authorized a survey of
the University by the firm of Booz, Fry, Allen, and Hamilton,
Business Analysts, located at 135 S. LaSalle Street, Chicago, Illinois.
On December 24, 1941, Arthur Cutts Willard directed a letter to that
firm employing it to make a survey. On January 29, 1942, Booz, Fry,
Allen, and Hamilton commenced work on that survey. The survey
was completed and copies of the written report were delivered to
Arthur Cutts Willard at the University Club in Chicago over a month
ago. At the meeting of the Board of Trustees on August 25, 1942, the
Trustees authorized payment to Booz, Fry, Allen, and Hamilton of a
sum of approximately $20,000 for services rendered in conducting
their survey and making their report.
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Great publicity has been given by the Kelly-Nash Trustees and their tool, Arthur Cutts Willard, to their authorization to the American Council on Education to make a survey but no mention whatever has been made of the survey and report of Business Analysts, Booz, Fry, Allen, and Hamilton.

It is obvious that this report, which has been in the hands of Arthur Cutts Willard for over 30 days, confirms and substantiates the charges which I have made against the Kelly-Nash Trustees and their puppet, Arthur Cutts Willard.

I now charge that this report has been suppressed not only from the Public but from the Republican Trustees by the Kelly-Nash Democratic Trustees and their puppet President, Arthur Cutts Willard, and I shall demand that it be released for publication forthwith.

The anxiety with which the Kelly-Nash Trustees and their tool, Arthur Cutts Willard, direct that your Commission shall make its report by October 20, 1942, which is two weeks before an election at which the Bosses, Kelly and Nash, are attempting to foist three more controlled trustees upon the people of Illinois, the method of selection and approval of the investigators by the Kelly-Nash Democratic Trustees, their direction of silence with reference to the matter of Sveinbjorn Johnson's double salary for two full-time jobs, and suppression of the report of Business Analysts, Booz, Fry, Allen, and Hamilton, are proof positive that your Commission is also slated to become a tool of Kelly-Nash and their "Boss" dominated trustees for a whitewash for political purposes.

I will not become a party to such an obvious Kelly-Nash Democratic whitewash and therefore I must decline the invitation contained in your recent letter.

* * * *

In carrying out its study the Commission with the help of its full-time executive secretary secured extensive statistical and other data from numerous offices and administrative officers of the University. It personally interviewed the President of the University and most of the other administrative officers, members of the faculty representing all academic ranks, members of the Board of Trustees, alumni, officials of the Alumni Association and of the University General Advisory Committee.

Finally, the Commission wishes to make it perfectly clear that this study is not in any sense a comprehensive educational survey of the University. As already stated, it concerns two main issues. It is only to be expected that in dealing with these issues, corollary matters would claim attention which might prove worthy of final inclusion in the report.
Indeed this was anticipated in the interview which the Commission had with President Willard when its first meeting was held. At that time he requested that, in addition to carrying out the mandate set forth in the Board's resolution authorizing the appointment of this Commission, the Commission include recommendations on other aspects of the program of the University as these might logically arise in connection with the main issues.
II

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

THE UNIVERSITY A "POLITICAL EMPIRE"

This study began with the main purpose of finding objective, reliable answers to two questions, the first of which was: Since 1934 has a group of hand-picked political puppets virtually built a political empire at the University of Illinois?

The evidence examined which bore upon this included:
1. The composition of the Board of Trustees
2. The manner by which persons become members of the Board of Trustees of the University
3. Powers exercised by the Governor as ex officio member of the Board of Trustees of the University: (a) as head of his party; (b) as chief executive of the state
4. Relations of the Board of Trustees to the internal administration of the University
5. Influence from outside sources on university educational policy and personnel
6. Use of noneducational university personnel for patronage purposes.

Concerning the charge that "since 1934 a group of hand-picked political puppets have virtually built a political empire in Champaign and Urbana and have cloaked their operation and defended their illegal activities behind the shield of education," the Commission unanimously and unequivocally states that it has not been able to find any evidence to substantiate such a charge.

THE UNIVERSITY SINCE 1934

The second question to be answered was: Has the University of Illinois been on the downgrade since 1934?

The evidence pertinent to this question was much more extensive and varied in character than that concerning the first one, and perforce includes several features.

1. The first one of these features examined was the quality of the student body. Was there a drop in the quality of students admitted? What were the comparative records of student scholastic achievement? What was the relative student mortality?

[14—A.C.E. Report]
In each of the foregoing respects present conditions show an improvement over 1934.

2. The second feature examined was the curriculum. What curricular provisions have been made for the expanding educational needs resulting from greatly increased undergraduate enrollment? What provisions have been made toward the individualization of curricula? What is the attitude of the faculty toward these needs, and how does it express its attitude?

There has been a genuine attempt to fructify the undergraduate curricula through an all-University General Division launched by the President and supported, where it has been supported, mainly by younger members of the faculty. This attempt was successfully frustrated by the University Senate, and the Division finally emerged in greatly modified form within the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences. Even this new educational venture is ill-supported by the college faculty as a whole, and therefore is not a success. There are also catalog descriptions of plans for “individual curricula,” and for “independent study” under the tutorial plan for juniors and seniors. The number of students enrolled in both of these programs is, however, an inconsequential part of the total college registration. That part of the faculty which determines policies and programs does not welcome change, and hence proper provisions have not been made for adapting programs to new needs. This is a situation which is apparently no worse now than it was in 1934, except that the needs are greater.

3. The third feature concerns the quality of teaching. Does the University recognize the evaluation and improvement of instruction as functions of major importance? What does it do to find out how good this teaching is? How does it try to make the teaching better? How sensitive is the faculty to the problems of undergraduate instruction, and how fruitful is it in developing satisfactory practices of instruction to solve these problems? Finally how does the University of Illinois compare in these matters with other similar universities?

The University as a whole has not overtly committed itself to evaluating the quality of undergraduate teaching as a major institutional function. It has done almost nothing to find out how good that instruction is, although it has carried on a few
individually isolated activities to try to improve instruction. There is, of course, throughout the faculty the belief that teaching ought to be well done. But with altogether too few exceptions, members of the faculty have, as far as the Commission could find out, either done nothing about it formally or systematically, or have given no constructive encouragement to those who have tried to do something.

Again it should be said that the condition is much the same now as it was in 1934. The slight changes that have been made are in the direction of improvement.

4. The fourth feature has to do with the material conditions in instructional efficiency. In this connection the library facilities rate high and on this point the University has more than held its own since 1934. In building facilities, expenditures have been less for instructional than for other purposes, but probably conditions are at least as good now as in 1934 in this, as well as in laboratories and other material instructional equipment.

5. The fifth feature concerns the nonformal, noncurricular aspects of student welfare. This is an area in which the University has made marked strides since 1934. Witness the Union buildings both at Chicago and at Urbana, the men's dormitories, and the reorganized Union Board of 1942 and its relation to other student activities. The administration has shown a genuine awareness of the responsibility of the University for the welfare of the student outside his curricular activities, and has been intelligently aggressive in striving to meet these needs. Probably outside the building program, the progress made in this area since 1934 is the greatest of any made in the University for that period.

6. The sixth feature examined was the quality of the faculty. Is it as good, not so good, or about the same as it was in 1934? Answers were sought through examining in detail the degrees held by the faculty and where these degrees were obtained, the scholarly productivity of the faculty, the distribution of the faculty by ranks, salaries paid, conditions of tenure, conditions of retirement, ratings of faculty members according to national standards, and reasons why certain individuals left the University of Illinois teaching staff and why others did not accept appointments to it during the period under discussion.
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Comparisons were favorable to the University on the points of degrees, of scholarly productivity, of distribution of faculty ranks, and of conditions of tenure and retirement. On the other hand, there was apparently a slight drop in national ratings and salaries paid, although the last condition is one reflected in other comparable institutions for the same period by reason of the depression. Statements were secured from persons who left the University and from others who were invited to come but did not accept. Although the number of persons so consulted was limited the evidence thus secured apparently reflected a rather critical attitude toward certain aspects of the University.

On the whole it would seem that certain major conditions determining faculty quality have changed somewhat during the period under consideration. In some respects these conditions have definitely improved, in others there has been no perceptible change, and in still others there has been some retrogression. When all these items are considered as a whole, however, it can be said that a general improvement has occurred with regard to the general quality of the faculty.

There are several matters, however, which should be given consideration if the faculty is to be continuously replenished with new members of high quality. Salaries must be maintained at a high level if the University is to meet the competition of other similar institutions for superior personnel. Another fact that must be considered is that faculty members do not find at the University of Illinois the progressive educational point of view and alertness toward problems of curricula and teaching that they can find elsewhere. It should be said that this condition is one that does not seem to be different from what it was in 1934, except that greater progress has been made along these lines during this period at some other institutions than at the University of Illinois.

7. The seventh feature examined to determine whether "the University of Illinois has been on the downgrade since 1934." was the general character and direction of its educational program. During this period a greatly increased burden has been placed on the educational program by reason of the much larger number of students than before. To meet this the University seems, with some exceptions, to have concerned
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itself more with organization forms and administration procedures than with the conduct and character *per se* of the education given the undergraduate. The exceptions have occurred in the main outside of the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences, though it has been in that college that the most pressing educational needs have appeared.

Both the character of the educational program and its direction have markedly felt the effect of the traditional forms of organization within the University, by which the men of longer tenure and higher rank have determined these features to the near exclusion of the influence of the members of lower rank and more recent appointment. This has unquestionably resulted in undue perpetuation of vested educational interests and of traditional educational programs, and in failure of the educational program of the University to take proper direction at some very crucial turns in the road.

But as has been already stated here with reference to more than one point above, although this condition reveals a major weakness in the institution it is consonant with and not different from that of 1934. Again the University has been running true to form.

8. The eighth and last feature examined to determine the relative educational status of the University since 1931 was the character of educational leadership. This was explored particularly by locating the centers of educational initiative and control, and by tracing the relationships between these centers and the President of the University.

It is assumed as a fundamental thesis that the President of the University should be its educational leader. This does not mean that he should attempt to administer directly all educational programs. It does mean, however, that he should never delegate to any person, office, or group of persons those final decisions whose exercise determines the locus of highest educational leadership in the University.

Strongly potential, if not actual, sources of such control have been developed in the office of the Provost, in the Bureau of Institutional Research, and especially in the Advisory Committee of that Bureau. It would seem that the power of these agencies as centers of educational control is not something that has resulted from the agencies' deliberate efforts to ac-
quire power, nor has it probably been the conscious intention of the President. The whole situation is rather the result of a combination of causes, conspicuous among which have been the rapid growth of the University, the desire of the President for statistical information and educational advice from the most reliable sources (aids to which he is certainly entitled), and the excellent work done by each of these agencies. Nevertheless, the outcome has been that these agencies have assumed administrative functions which properly center in the President.

Viewed from one angle this situation represents a distinct advance over 1934. From another point of view, however, it is genuinely potential of dissipating the educational leadership which should be exercised directly by the President, through the establishment of too many centers almost coordinate in rank but uncoordinated in the actual discharge of that leadership.

To summarize the evidence examined under the eight subdivisions explored to determine the educational trend of the University since 1934, the Commission finds no ground for the sweeping assertion that the “University has been on the downgrade” during that period. Not only has no actual deterioration been disclosed but the facts indicate that the University has made in some features noteworthy gains, that it has kept the status quo in many others. This is in general what a similar examination of any comparable university would probably disclose, although it should again be cited that the most significant weakness of the University is not absolute but relative. It has failed to advance during this period at points where other similar institutions have pressed forward significantly toward improvement.

RECOMMENDATIONS

This concluding section gathers together and states briefly the recommendations which have been made directly or by implication in the body of the report:

1. The Commission recommends that the University of Illinois make a careful study to determine whether there is not another method of selecting members for its Board of Trustees which will remove that selection and the operation of the Board, as far as possible, from partisan influences.
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2. The Commission recommends that the selection of graduate students be placed upon a basis which will distribute appointments more equitably among the several departments of the graduate school, and that the means of selection be such as to give more nearly reliable indexes of proper performance of the persons selected as graduate students. An example of such an instrumentality is the recently developed Graduate Record Examinations.

3. The Commission recommends that the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences:
   a. Define clearly what the purposes of its educational program are
   b. Adapt its curricula better to the needs of that group of students who drop out of the college before securing any degree
   c. Strengthen the General Division by removing its present handicaps in requirements
   d. Make the General Division an educational service unit for students in the several professional schools enrolling freshmen
   e. Set up curricula organized on the basis of the needs of the students as individuals and as members of a significantly changing environment.

4. The Commission recommends that the undergraduate schools, other than the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences, review their respective curricula in order to insure for each school:
   a. Those studies most pertinently important in that field at the present time
   b. A broad inclusive base extending beyond the specialized field, on which the curricula of special studies should be built.

5. The Commission recommends that the University as a whole and each of its colleges, especially on the undergraduate level, make quality of teaching a major objective of attention; that faculties become acquainted with the literature now available reporting studies and experiments on teaching in other universities; that they examine with care their own practices in the light of these reports, and institute studies and experiments of their own; and that these and similar measures be taken for the purpose of finding out how effective the teaching is which they are giving in their respective colleges and fields, and how to improve that teaching. The University already has personnel and organization facilities which will make it possible to go far in this matter if these are used properly, as some accomplishments already achieved in this field show that they can be.

6. The Commission recommends that opportunity be given to persons in the lower faculty ranks to participate in formal discus-
sions in the formulation of the educational policies of the several colleges, and of the University as a whole. Genuine opportunity given younger men by older ones through Senate, faculty, department, and committee memberships and a real encouragement by sympathetic cooperation would undoubtedly result in marked progress within the University in a relatively short time.

7. The Commission recommends that the administration of student affairs be further coordinated by placing responsibility therefor in one person directly under the President of the University.

8. The Commission recommends that participation in the provisions for student health be made compulsory on the part of all full-time students.

9. The Commission recommends that the number of graduate assistants doing regular undergraduate teaching be materially reduced.

10. The Commission recommends that by appropriate salary and rank outstanding excellence in teaching be given recognition commensurate with scholarly research and productivity on the part of the faculty members.

11. The Commission recommends that as soon as moneys are available there be established a limited number of professorships paying salaries significantly in excess of the regular maxima, in order that the University may draw to its faculty some men of highest standing in their respective fields.

12. The Commission recommends that the University exercise constant care to see that a proper proportion of the persons appointed to positions on its faculty have training and experience outside of the University of Illinois.

13. The Commission recommends that the Board of Trustees, the President, and representatives of the administration and teaching staff of the University, working together, study the problem of proper organization for the University with particular reference to the delegation and assignment of administrative responsibilities in order to insure the highest and most effective type of educational leadership throughout the University.

14. The Commission recommends that, as one of its major institutional efforts, the University of Illinois devote itself to the extended studying of what should be its long-term educational program, both for the University as a whole and also for its several colleges and schools.

Finally, the Commission wishes to record an observation, the implication of which it believes to be potentially highly significant.
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for the future of the University. The appraisal which the Commission has made of the functioning and the quality of the educational program of the University of Illinois clearly leads to the conclusion that there is no basis for the indictments made by Attorney General Barrett against the University. But because of what the Commission has observed, it is strongly of the opinion that the present situation is fraught with grave dangers for the future of the University. Educational issues may become confused with political or partisan considerations—if indeed this has not already occurred. The repetition and amplification of the charges made, or the statements of other charges for reasons not definitely connected with the general welfare of the University as an educational institution, will tend to intensify the political hue which has already been cast upon the scene.

This report has without fear or favor pointed to some features where the University not only might but assuredly ought to make changes in order to strengthen itself. The Commission would urge that these matters be given prompt and decisive attention not only by the President and his assistants in the general administration but also by the deans of the several colleges. At the same time the Commission expresses the hope that the administrative officers of the University and the Board of Trustees will continue to exercise in the future, as they have exercised in the past, that high-minded, nonpartisan interest in the educational welfare of the University which the citizens of Illinois have placed in their sacred charge.
III
HAS A POLITICAL EMPIRE BEEN VIRTUALLY BUILT AT THE UNIVERSITY?

The question at issue revolves primarily around the administrative organization and control of the University. This is centered in a board of trustees. This Board is composed of two ex officio members, the Governor of the State and the Superintendent of Public Instruction, together with nine other members, three of whom are selected by the state electorate every two years at the time of the general state elections. Candidates for these elections appear on the tickets of the regular political parties of the State. It is thus apparent that all of the members of the Board are elected at large by the voters of the State since the two ex officio members, the Governor and the Superintendent of Public Instruction, are also thus elected. The same political influences and control effective in the election at large may therefore operate in the selection of the members of the Board of Trustees.

METHOD OF SELECTION OF THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES

It is conceivable that political manipulation could be exercised to create a political empire in the University through the manner in which persons whose names appear as candidates on the ballots of political parties are nominated for election. Careful investigation reveals that more than one-third of a century ago it became the custom for a nominating committee of the Alumni Association of the University of Illinois to submit three names to the Republican State Convention and three names to the Democratic State Convention. The state party conventions were under no obligation to accept the nominations of the Illinois alumni committee. What did they actually do? From 1906 to the present, 143 individuals have been either originally nominated or approved by the state party conventions as candidates for members of the Board of Trustees of the University of Illinois. Eighty-two of these individuals were nominated by the Alumni Association whereas the
nomination of the remaining 61 originated in the state conventions themselves. That is to say, in approximately 57 percent of the cases, the state nominating conventions accepted the recommendations of the Alumni Association.

It is the opinion of the Commission that the nomination and election of the members of the Board of Trustees of the University do not result in the setting up of "a group of hand-picked political puppets" who exercise administrative control over the University.

It seems pertinent, however, to raise the question here whether the present method of selecting members of the Board of Trustees is the most desirable one. It makes possible the nomination for political reasons of persons who are to be voted upon and makes Board members when elected potentially amenable to those political influences which may be brought to bear upon any person elected upon a partisan ballot. Also it is to be observed that this method is employed in very few other states.

RELATION OF THE GOVERNOR TO THE UNIVERSITY

Under the American system of political party control it is but natural that the governor of a state should be not only the chief administrator of the state but also the titular head of the party in control. Since in the case of the University of Illinois he is also ex officio a member of the Board of Trustees, it is very pertinent to inquire whether or not political control or at least direct political influence has been employed through the office of the Governor to bear directly upon the administration of the University.

The Commission has diligently searched but has been unable to find any instance during this period in which the Governor has even attempted to take advantage of his dual relation as state party leader and member of the Board of Trustees, to bring any kind of pressure to bear upon the University.

As chief executive of the State, the Governor has another relationship with the University. It is his prerogative to veto specific items in appropriation bills which provide support for the University. There are instances of record when the Gov-
Governor has exercised this right—more often, however, the Governor will request legislators to amend the appropriation bill of the University so as to delete specific items. As further evidence of the inability of the Governor to exercise final control over the University there have been instances during the last decade when, after such amendments have been initiated, the General Assembly has refused to pass them.

In connection with budgetary legislation there exists the Illinois Budgetary Commission which is a joint committee of both houses of the legislature and which acts as an advisory body to the Governor in the preparation of the state biennial budget. The Governor has the right, with the advice of this Commission, to present to the General Assembly a budget for all biennial state expenditures including those for the University. At the same time the University also has the right, which it regularly exercises, to originate through some member of the General Assembly its own appropriation bill regardless of whether the Governor is in agreement with the sums requested in it.

So far, the discussion has concerned itself with two possible types of political control or manipulation of the University. The first had to do with the selection of the members of the Board of Trustees, and the second with the relation of the Board to the Governor as head of the ruling political party.

From the evidence considered, the Commission is of the opinion that in such matters as the determination of the amounts requested for the University, the amounts appropriated to it, and what these amounts should be, there has been no undue exercise of political control.

**THE BOARD, THE PRESIDENT, AND THE FACULTY**

There is a third important potential source of what at least is frequently called political control over an institution of higher education. It has to do with the administrative relationships existing between the Board of Trustees, the President of the University, and the teaching faculty of the institution. The questions of importance are: What are the educational controls that are exercised and how are they carried out?
A brief answer to this is that the present administrative controls represent an historical development and as they now exist are of a character quite consistent with their origins.

To be more explicit, under the law providing for the organization and maintenance of the Illinois Industrial University: The trustees shall have power to provide the requisite buildings, apparatus, and conveniences; to fix the rates for tuition; to appoint such professors and instructors, and establish and provide for the management of such model farms, model art, and other departments and professorships, as may be required to teach, in the most thorough manner, such branches of learning as are related to agriculture and the mechanic arts, and military tactics, without excluding other scientific and classical studies. They may accept the endowments of voluntary professorships or departments in the University, from any person or persons or corporations who may proffer the same, and, at any regular meeting of the board, may prescribe rules and regulations in relation to such endowments and declare on what general principles they may be admitted: Provided, that such special voluntary endowments or professorships shall not be incompatible with the true design and scope of the act of congress, or of this act; and they shall, as far as practicable, arrange all the regular and more important courses of study and lectures in the University, so that the students may pass through and attend upon them during the six autumn and winter months, and be left free to return to their several practical arts and industries at home during the six spring and summer months of the year, or to remain in the University and pursue such optional studies or industrial avocations as they may elect: Provided, that no student shall at any time be allowed to remain in or about the University in idleness, or without full mental or industrial occupation: And provided further, that the trustees, in the exercise of any of the powers conferred by this act, shall not create any liability or indebtedness in excess of the funds in the hands of the treasurer of the University at the time of creating such liability or indebtedness, and which may be specially and properly applied to the payment of the same.¹

Until 1901 the educational administration of the University was centralized chiefly in the hands of the Council of Administration. This Council was composed of the President, the Vice-President, the Dean of the Graduate School, the Dean of Undergraduates, the deans of the separate colleges, and the Dean of Women. The Council held frequent meetings and concerned itself with matters of internal administration as well

¹Laws of the United States and State of Illinois concerning the University of Illinois, Section 7, pp. 31-32, Urbana, 1908.
as educational policy. Some of these matters might now be thought of as more properly falling under the jurisdiction of the faculties of the several colleges or of the University Senate.

In 1901 the University Senate was organized. It was composed of the President, the deans, the High School Visitor, and the full professors of the University. With the organization of the Senate the Statutes of the University were modified so that the Council of Administration was to function as an advisory body and the Senate was to formulate educational policies.

The establishment of the Senate and its wise leadership under President James, a scholar and educational statesman, account in large measure for the educational policies that enabled the institution to acquire the earmarks of a real university with a reputation for scholarship and research. Under President Kinley the institution grew at an ever more rapid pace. Still greater material demands were placed upon the University to meet the physical needs of its increasing student body. Under these conditions, the President seemed to assume more personal responsibility for the leadership of the University through strengthening the position of the Council of Administration, with the result that the Council, meeting weekly, tended to assume powers assigned by university statute to the University Senate, which usually met for a scant hour only five times a year.

With the coming of President Chase there was a distinct effort made to rehabilitate the University Senate. This was done by setting up a Committee of Nine to make a “comprehensive study of the general educational organization and administration of the University.” This act on the part of President Chase began a movement to return to the Senate powers which had been originally granted to it but which in the interim had been exercised by the advisory Council of Administration. This move clearly meant more active participation by the Senate in the formulation of educational policies of the University.

It is entirely possible, in fact it is common knowledge in the world of higher education, that influences emanating from persons or groups outside the President and the members of the University faculty may attempt in some way to determine

---

1See letter of President Chase of November 18, 1930 to the University Senate.
educational policies, curricula, and appointment of the personnel of a university.

For example, some legislatures have passed laws requiring faculty members of state universities to take the oath of allegiance. In some states attempts have been made to secure through legislation the teaching of natural science so as to be acceptable to certain groups professing forms of religious belief. In the cases of some institutions organized groups on the outside have been able to secure the dismissal of faculty members whose beliefs were obnoxious to the group.

Fortunately the University of Illinois has been free from such outside interferences with the administration of the University.

Bearing in mind the nature of the accusation made against the University of Illinois that there has been built in it since 1934 "a political empire," the Commission made an extended and diligent search to discover whether any influence of this kind had successfully registered itself in the University since 1934. As a result of these inquiries the Commission can say without reservation that it has been unable to find a single instance in this period. It is the consistent, independently given testimony, on the part of the President of the University, of members of the Board of Trustees, and of teaching and administrative members of the faculty that the determination of what the educational policies should be and how they should be carried out within the University and the determination of the curricula have all been decided within the University and in accordance with procedures of administrative control as officially set up.

According to the Statutes of the University of Illinois it is the responsibility of the Board of Trustees to pass upon all educational policies, appointment of personnel, and establishment of curricula. The regular procedure is that any policy or curriculum shall be presented by the President to the Board for its approval, after having passed through certain steps which are clearly specified. The Commission has been unable to discover any transgression of this procedure. It is, of course, within the rights and duties of the Board to refuse to approve recommendations, if, in the judgment of the Board, they should not be approved. The Board has exercised this
prerogative at its discretion although very infrequently. But when it has occurred, the Board has not substituted an appointee of its own choice, but has most appropriately merely declined to approve and requested the President to make another recommendation.

It is to be especially noted that there seems to have been a meticulous observance of proper procedure in cases where members of the Board of Trustees and the President of the University have been approached, as it is inevitable that they would be, to use their influence to secure the appointment of persons not already on its staff to positions in the University. In such cases the uniform procedure seems to have been to refer such applications to the same officers who would have originally considered the appointment had the applications been initiated within the University, and to inform the parties presenting the names that such references had been made and that the individuals would be considered solely on their merits, and by the appropriate officials.

The present procedures in the respects above narrated are thoroughly consistent with historical precedent obtaining at the University of Illinois. This summary indicates that the University has gone through a major struggle, resulting in the establishment of the idea that the appropriate officers within the University should determine what its educational policy should be.

It is the opinion of the Commission that if attempts political in character have been made to determine or modify educational policies or staff appointments at the University of Illinois since 1934, such attempts have made no headway whatever and, further, that they have not met with any support from the Board of Trustees or from the university administration.

**RELATIONSHIP OF THE UNIVERSITY TO THE STATE CIVIL SERVICE**

Faculty members are not the only personnel in a university in whom politicians may be interested. The large number of nonacademic employees on the payroll of a university may be a source of political patronage. Under “An Act to regulate the civil service of the State of Illinois” approved May 11,
1905, and put into effect in 1911, the nonacademic employees of the University of Illinois came under the authority of the State Civil Service Commission. Under a working agreement with the Civil Service Commission, the University was allowed approximately 150 positions which were prefixed by the title "University." To illustrate, a University Junior Clerk-Stenographer and a University Senior Accountant existed as special position classifications to fill the needs of the University in recognition of the difference between a secretary in the University and one at a noneducational institution.

In 1940 the State Civil Service Commission announced to the University that these 150 special classifications had been abolished and that henceforth university vacancies would be treated no differently from those in other parts of the state government. Following this change the University had difficulty: (1) in getting applicants certified to positions within a reasonable time, and (2) in obtaining individuals whose qualifications met its needs. This caused the University to sponsor a bill to amend the State Civil Service Act so as to exclude employees of the University of Illinois from the state civil service system and to direct and authorize the Board of Trustees of the University to establish its own classified civil service, covering nonacademic positions. This bill was passed by the General Assembly and signed by the Governor on July 22, 1941. The University then set up its own system of classification, which went into effect in mid-1942. The conclusion seems justified therefore that the University, in setting up its own classified service, took a step which will not only improve the efficiency of its nonacademic staff, but which will also distinctly strengthen the institution against possible political patronage.

In this section the Commission has examined the manner in which members of the Board of Trustees have been selected, the relations which the governors of the State have sustained toward the University, the operation of civil service among the employees of the University, and the exercise of administrative powers by the Board of Trustees and by the President of the University in relation to the University as a whole and to the faculty of the University. In none of these connections has the Commission found evidence to substantiate the accusation that a political empire has virtually been built at the University.
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IV
HAS THE UNIVERSITY "BEEN ON THE DOWNGRADE SINCE 1934"?

The statement of the Attorney General, an alumnus of the University, "that the University has been on the downgrade since 1934" is not explicit.

Since the University was established and is conducted as an educational institution, and since the statement quoted above was made by an alumnus, no other meaning can reasonably be attached to it than that the University, as an educational institution, has been on the downgrade since 1934. It is, therefore, the more distinctly educational aspects of the problem that the Commission has considered.

Education being a matter of general public concern and being an experience in which so many of us have participated, it is an activity about which most people have definite opinions and on which many consider themselves competent judges. This is very natural and on the whole reflects an interest that is commendable and that is wholly necessary to the proper maintenance of a system of free public education.

It should be noted, however, that within the last two or three decades criteria or standards of measurement have been developed in the field of education by means of which the quality as well as the quantity of educational production can be determined. It is no longer necessary as it once was to depend on individual opinion as to whether programs of education and the institutions administering them are producing the results expected of them.

The quality of an institution of higher education depends mainly upon certain characteristics of that institution. Briefly stated and without any reference to relative importance these features are:

1. The quality of the student body
2. The character and quality of the curricula
3. The quality of teaching
4. The quality of instructional materials and facilities
5. The attention given to nonformal, noncurricular aspects of student welfare
6. The quality of the faculty
7. The general character and direction of the educational program
8. The quality of educational leadership

During the period beginning with the year 1934, the enrollment of the University of Illinois increased at a rate that reached totals beyond anything experienced in the entire previous history of the institution. The magnitude of this growth can best be appreciated by citing some enrollment figures. For twenty-nine years (from the founding of the institution to 1895-96) enrollment remained under 1,000 students. The year 1896-97 saw the beginning of a twenty-year period during which the figures mounted steadily, with the exception of the years 1912-13 and 1917-18, to 7,000. In the session 1919-20 a steeper climb began which reached a climax of almost 15,000 in 1930-31, or more than 100 percent increase in thirteen years. In the three succeeding sessions (during the depression) losses of 1,000 students a year occurred. Beginning with 1934-35, however, there was an average yearly gain of 1,000 students; the climax was reached in 1938-39 with almost 18,000 students. A highly significant fact is that of the enormous increase in students on all campuses of the University of Illinois, almost 80 percent was in undergraduate divisions on the Urbana campus.

Increases such as those occurring since 1934 are likely to cause certain problems to arise in educational institutions. The first of these relates to the maintenance of standards of admission under the pressure of great numbers of additional students. The second grows out of the greater diversity of interests and abilities appearing among these new students. These differences in turn require that the institution give consideration to their recognition and classification, and to the modification of the educational program to meet the new educational requirements of students. The third is concerned with the modification and expansion of the physical facilities and the administrative organization of the University to care for the greatly increased enrollment. The necessity for providing for so many more students than during any previous period brings enormous stresses and strains upon the physical facilities of
the institution on the one hand, and on the other upon the mechanism of educational organization and administration.

The strain on facilities demanded a building program and a greatly increased budget. The over-all budget has increased from $11,594,902 in 1933-35 to $19,339,127 in 1941-43. Building and major capital outlays from the first figure were $140,900. The appropriations for 1941-43 included capital items of $1,019,000 not all of which will be expended because it will not be possible to secure materials and federal approval for construction. The total amount spent for new buildings and equipment from July 1, 1933, to June 30, 1942, was $7,958,974.

THE QUALITY OF THE STUDENT BODY

Let us consider first the students, and ask whether the increase in numbers has caused a deterioration in the general quality of the students admitted.

Rank of Freshmen in High-school Graduating Classes

One of the best single measures of academic ability of freshmen is rank in the high-school graduating class. Data are available concerning students admitted to the freshman class of the University of Illinois for each session beginning with 1935-36. A study of these data reveals that since 1935 there has been a slight increase in the percentage of the students admitted from the higher levels of their high-school graduating classes. For example, the increase on the Urbana campus in students ranking in the top tenth of their high-school graduating classes has been from 20 percent in 1935 to 22 percent in 1941-42.

Freshmen are admitted to six schools or colleges1 at the University of Illinois: Liberal Arts and Sciences, Commerce, Engineering, Agriculture, Fine and Applied Arts, and Physical Education. When these data are analyzed for each college it is noted that in the Colleges of Liberal Arts and Sciences, Commerce, and Engineering, the trend is very similar to the institutional trend, whereas in the College of Agriculture

---

1In addition a small group of freshmen are admitted to the Industrial Education curriculum of the College of Education.
there is a noticeable increase in the percentage of students drawn from the upper half of the high-school graduating classes as indicated by 73 percent in 1935 and 80 percent in 1941. In two of the smaller colleges, Fine and Applied Arts and Physical Education, the trend is found to be in the other direction. Here there was a somewhat smaller percentage of students admitted from the upper half of the high-school graduating class in 1941 than in 1935, the figures being 68 percent and 74 percent in Fine Arts, and 34 percent and 41 percent in Physical Education.

Additional information on the quality of students admitted was secured from data which the Commission obtained from four other selected midwestern state universities. This information shows that the experiences of these universities during the same period very closely parallel that of the University of Illinois.

It is the judgment of the Commission that since 1935 at the University of Illinois: (1) the quality of students admitted, based upon the criterion of rank in high-school graduating class, has been similar to freshmen admitted to certain other comparable midwestern state universities, and that (2) the quality on the whole has not deteriorated but actually has shown slight improvement.

Scholastic Records of Freshmen

Another index of the quality of students admitted is the scholastic record which these students made while they remained in the institution. Data are available on the scholastic averages made by freshmen who entered the University of Illinois in the years 1935 to 1940 inclusive. Since the rank in high-school graduating class of students admitted to the University of Illinois from 1935 to 1941 has improved slightly, as might be expected, the grade point average of freshmen in their first year of university work from 1935 to 1940 has also shown a slight improvement. Weights are assigned to grades as follows: A = 5; B = 4; C = 3; D = 2; and E (failure) = 1. The grade point averages of all freshmen for their first year of university work beginning with the class which entered in September 1935 and ending with the September 1940 class were 3.17, 3.18, 3.19, 3.21, 3.19, and 3.20 respectively.
Therefore to the extent to which grade point averages in the first year of work of collegiate level can be considered as an index, the quality of students admitted to the University of Illinois since 1934 has not deteriorated but actually has shown a slight improvement.

Selection of Graduate Scholars and Fellows

Since the selection of students for graduate fellowships and scholarships may be considered as bearing on the quality of the student body, the following discussion is pertinent here. There are two committees of the Executive Faculty of the Graduate School. The work of the Committee on Staff and Courses is discussed below. The Committee on Scholarships and Fellowships receives from the Dean of the Graduate School the application of individuals seeking to be chosen as graduate scholars and fellows, whether they have been recommended by a particular department or not. This Committee of five is charged with the responsibility of studying all the applications and especially those of students recommended by the departments, with the understanding that it will recommend to the Executive Faculty of the Graduate School a list of students with a list of alternates to fill vacancies. The Committee attempts to select students of greatest promise without regard to departmental distribution, except that in cases of doubt concerning relative excellence of candidates some consideration may be given to the question of the most desirable distribution of students by departments. Such policy tends to bear out the old adage, "For unto everyone that hath shall be given, and he shall have abundance; but from him that hath not shall be taken away even that which he hath."

It is obvious that, in general, departments with distinguished and long-recognized reputations in national university circles will receive the greater number of better student applications, and hence usually the greater number of appointees. For example, the Department of Chemistry is much more likely to receive a correspondingly greater percentage of superior applicants than is a department in which the graduate faculty is less well known. It would seem that some more equitable basis for selection of graduate fellows and scholars

See page 77.
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should be used since the one now in use at the University results in the continual building up of graduate work in the already well-known departments, and at the same time makes it difficult for less well-known departments to gain graduate students.

The Graduate School has not participated in any of the cooperative studies carried on nationally for the purpose of improving methods of selection of graduate students and candidates for higher degrees. In the judgment of the Dean of the Graduate School as expressed to the Commission, the only really important factors in the selection of a student to specialize in a given field is the student's ability in that field as indicated by (1) his collegiate record and (2) the judgments of individuals qualified to recommend him.

It is the judgment of the Commission that the present method of selecting graduate students at the University falls short of what it ought to be when one considers present practices among outstanding graduate schools in the United States as well as the distribution of students among departments in the University qualified to do graduate work.

**Student Mortality**

A third though minor index of the quality of a student body is reflected in student mortality or the failure of students to remain in school long enough to complete a course of instruction.

The University of Illinois participated in a study sponsored by the United States Office of Education in which mortality of students entering as freshmen in the fall of 1931 was investigated in 25 institutions. Of the group of institutions studied, 14 were publicly controlled. The percentage of students leaving the University of Illinois during or at the end of a four-year period without obtaining a degree was 63.6 percent, whereas the corresponding figure for the whole group (including the University of Illinois), was 64.3 percent. The percentage of freshmen at the University of Illinois who entered in 1931 and who obtained a degree was 27.1 as compared to 28.3 in the group of 14 publicly controlled institutions. The percentage of students transferring to some other institution upon leaving the University, as well as those re-
turning at a later date to continue work after having left, was practically the same as the average for the 14 publicly controlled institutions.

The most recent mortality figures available at the University of Illinois are on the freshman class of September 1935. The proportion of those failing to graduate within eight semesters was 61.3 percent and the proportion of them obtaining degrees was 38.5 percent.

Although mortality figures are available only for the entering classes in 1931 and 1935 and comparative data are available only on the class of 1931, it is the judgment of the Commission that there has been no significant change as regards student mortality at the University during the past ten years.

Admission Requirements

Obviously a factor which operates conspicuously in determining who is admitted to a university is what the university requires on the part of those who apply.

Previous to 1932-33 the University of Illinois admitted as a freshman any graduate of an accredited high school who could present three units in English, one in algebra, one in plane geometry, and another ten units from lists of general and special electives. In 1932 the requirements were changed so as to demand three units of English, three units as a major and two units as a minor chosen from the fields of foreign language, mathematics, science, or social studies. In addition, the Registrar was empowered to admit a student who ranked in the upper 10 percent of his high-school graduating class without regard to the distribution of his high-school credits.

Effective in the fall of 1934, students who graduated in the upper 25 percent of their high-school classes were admitted without regard to the distribution of their credits. Then in 1939-40 requirements were changed so as to permit students in the upper 50 percent of their high-school graduating classes to enter the University without specific requirements in the distribution of their high-school credits. In this same year, a restrictive provision, placed upon students graduated in the lowest 25 percent of their high-school classes, required that they be admitted to the University on probation and be re-
quired to take whatever tests were prescribed by the Personnel Bureau and, at the same time, be placed under the special charge of the dean of the college concerned.

The changes made in the admission requirements at the University of Illinois during the past ten years have tended to minimize the importance of specific subjects taken in high school and at the same time to emphasize the general ability of a student as measured by his rank in his graduating class without regard to the subjects which he had pursued.

With few and minor exceptions, these trends in general admission requirements at the University of Illinois are similar to those requirements set up by other midwestern state universities and are in conformity with good modern educational practice.

On the basis of facts concerning rank in high-school graduating class, scholastic average of freshmen, student mortality, and general admission requirements, there is no justification to assert that the quality of students admitted as freshmen at the University of Illinois has deteriorated between 1934 and 1942.

THE CHARACTER AND QUALITY OF THE CURRICULA

Once the University has selected the persons to be admitted, the considerations of importance are: What are these persons to be taught? And how are they to be taught? It is not going too far to say that these two features constitute the heart of the undergraduate educational program of any university. This statement assumes still greater importance in the light of the fact that 80 percent of the great increase in the total enrollment of the University of Illinois since 1934 has been in the undergraduate divisions on the Urbana campus. Furthermore, the real importance of this fact can be fully appreciated only when it is recalled that most of the increase has been in the undergraduate body of the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences. Because of this fact, and also because of the fact that so many of the professional schools of the University require preprofessional study in the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences, the curricula and the teaching in liberal arts assume positions of great importance.

*See page 32.

[38—A.C.E. Report]
Turning our attention now to these curricula alone, we find that certain changes have been made in liberal arts during the period under consideration. The general curriculum (as distinguished from the curriculum of the General Division of the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences) has remained practically unchanged since 1913. The premedical curriculum which is administered by a special faculty committee was extensively revised in 1937 and the curriculum in chemical engineering in 1938. There have been three or four revisions in the curriculum in chemistry in the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences over the past fifteen years. In 1939 a social administration curriculum was established and finally in 1940 the General Division with its own special curriculum was opened to students.

One of the fundamental difficulties encountered in American universities today is also found at the University of Illinois. Over 60 percent of the students who enter a large state university fail, for one reason or another, to obtain a bachelor's degree. At the same time it must be remembered that our higher institutions are young, and that many have been and many still are attempting to attain the status of a true university. The University of Illinois has been successful in its evolution from an industrial college to a state agricultural and mechanical college, then to a liberal arts college, and finally to an institution of university character. But the institution has failed to provide for the changing social and educational needs of its undergraduate students, and one of the outstanding reasons is that the University has concentrated on the development of research, scholarly production, and graduate instruction. Had the institution not such a large number of undergraduate students, so large a percentage of whom do not go on to graduate work, it could base its reputation solely on its graduate and professional programs both of which have achieved distinction.

It may be that the trend toward a separation of what is now considered the first two years in college in our higher institutions should be hastened administratively. In planning for a postwar America consideration should be given to the diversion of that group of poor risks (from the point of view of graduation from established courses of study) to schools
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and curricula more nearly suited to the abilities and needs of these students. Doubtless there will be a long transition period. One cannot expect that overnight the freshmen and sophomores from all the universities in the country can be kept in the high schools and provision made for their education there. It can be expected, however, that planning be carried out in this connection, and it can be expected that the universities do something toward the solution of this problem within the present structure of their organizations, such as, for example, providing terminal curricula looking toward the granting of an associate in arts degree.

The most pronounced attempt to make curricular adjustments to meet the newly recognized needs of the increased undergraduate body in the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences was the setting up of the General Division. The present development and status of this curriculum shed significant information on what the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences does for its undergraduate students and how it does it.

The present requirements of the General Division curriculum are based on seven general courses, one in each of the following fields: (1) verbal expression, (2) history of civilization, (3) biological science, (4) physical science, (5) social science, (6) literature and the fine arts, and (7) philosophy and psychology. These courses consist of subject matter from related groups of departments of the University, and are organized according to the nature of each field and the educational needs of students. Each course extends through the two semesters of the school year and gives eight semester hours of credit toward graduation. The student in the freshman year is required to carry twelve hours a week of the courses in verbal expression, history of civilization, and biological science; four hours of a foreign language; one hour of hygiene; plus military science (for men) and physical education. The sophomore is required to carry four hours of physical science, two four-hour courses chosen from among social science, literature and fine arts, and philosophy and psychology together with four hours of foreign language, military science (for men) and physical education. The freshman year of this program exceeded by

*See University of Illinois Annual Register, 1941-42, p. 118.
two hours a week the courses carried by students in the regu-
lar curriculum.

It is important to note, however, that as originally con-
ceived the General Division encompassed more than the cur-
ricular offerings within the College of Liberal Arts and
Sciences. The General Division was, in fact, to have been a
University-wide organization, with an independent administra-
tion, in which all freshmen would have been required to take
certain prescribed courses regardless of the college or school
in which they initially enrolled. Why was the original con-
cept not carried out?

The initiative for the establishment of a General Division
for the University came from President Willard while pre-
siding at a meeting of the University Senate. On February
11, 1935 he appointed a presidential committee and addressed
them as follows:

I have, as you may know, been giving consideration to various ways
and means for improving the effectiveness of the University in ac-
complishing our educational objectives. Several possibilities invite
attention, but none seems more likely to affect all colleges, schools,
and departments than a study of certain problems relating to our
freshmen, including their preparation, orientation, and instruction,
considered as a group coming from the high schools of the State into
the University. Such a study should include (1) methods or devices
for a closer and better correlation between the high schools and the
University designed to attract and guide those students who expect to
pursue their education beyond the high school level, (2) a careful
review and possible subsequent revision of our freshman instruction,
including attention to the orientation and transition of freshmen into
the University environment, as well as teaching methods and subject
matter or courses of instruction, and (3) special consideration of the
desirability of requiring all freshmen to take certain prescribed
courses regardless of the college or school in which they may be
initially enrolled.

It is my idea that such a study should be broad in scope and
include many items, ranging from such matters as advice and infor-
mation which we should furnish to high school teachers and pupils
preferably in group conferences, followed by a thorough study look-
ing toward the best curriculum for a better and broader foundation
for later work either in the University or in private life for those
who may not continue beyond the first or second year in the Univer-
sity. It seems to me that we should frankly recognize the fact that
many of our students, averaging as much as twenty-five percent, or
two thousand to twenty-five hundred, during the past decade, do not
pursue their University education beyond the sophomore year. (These
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figures include, of course, a few who transfer to other institutions.) Such a large number—the equivalent of a fair sized university—demand and deserve special consideration in making up our freshman and sophomore curricula. Undoubtedly, we could and should arrange for certain general courses of great value to all students, whether they continue on to a degree or not, and regardless of the later field of specialization. These courses should serve to develop a better knowledge of the responsibilities of citizenship, as well as of modern life and society. In addition, consideration should be given to prescribed courses in general science (with no or little laboratory work), rhetoric, and other subjects.

I am, therefore, asking you as a group to make a study or investigation of this matter along the lines herein indicated and report your conclusions and recommendations directly to me. I believe you should invite representatives of all colleges and schools to confer with your group before you arrive at any final conclusions, but probably not before you have made a preliminary survey and set up a tentative program. I assure you that I consider this matter a major problem in the future development of the University, and I shall place the greatest confidence in and attach the greatest importance to your advice, whatever it may be.  

This statement from the President was one which showed educational vision and should have received greater consideration from the faculty than it did receive.

Stimulation also came from a group of faculty members, for the most part those low in rank and young in age, through informal discussions. Through the original incentive of the President of the University, the special Senate Committee on Educational Program for Freshman and Sophomore Students organized subcommittees in each of the colleges concerned. The informal group mentioned above was named the Liberal Arts College subcommittee. Subcommittee reports were then made to the special Senate Committee on Educational Program for Freshman and Sophomore Students, which in turn considered the proposals and decided to recommend to the Senate that a two-year General Division with certain requirements be set up on a university-wide basis for all undergraduate schools. On April 4, 1938, the University Senate approved a recommendation from its Committee on Educational Policy, to which the President had referred the report of the Special Committee on Educational Program for

---

*Report of the Committee on Educational Program for Freshman and Sophomore Students, June 1, 1936.*
Freshman and Sophomore Students “that steps be taken toward establishing a General Division within the University or in the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences.” The Senate, influenced by the interest of the various colleges and schools on the campus in the University-wide two-year requirement, refused to adopt the Policy Committee’s recommendation. However, on October 3, 1938, the Senate approved another recommendation “that the further development of plans for a general division or curriculum . . . be attempted by the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences.” The Dean of the College then appointed a committee which drew up a proposal for a completely new unit within the College, having a separate faculty and a separate administrative head. These recommendations were reported to the Executive Committee of the College. The Executive Committee, in turn, modified the proposal and reduced it in scope so as to provide for a General Division corresponding to a department within the structure of the already existing college organization. This is the plan which was finally adopted in the spring of 1940.

How has the General Division fared?

It is to be admitted that a two-year period is not long enough to serve as a basis for drawing final conclusions concerning an experiment of this character. Nevertheless, some very important facts concerning it can already be cited.

First there is the enrollment. Since the establishment of the General Division first semester enrollments have been as follows: 97 in 1940; 109 in 1941; and 92 in 1942. Obviously, the enrollment in the General Division of the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences forms an insignificant part of its almost 4,000 undergraduate students, and it shows no tendency to increase.

Second, according to all the reports which the Commission has received, the plan is popular neither with the students nor with the faculty members. New students coming to the campus are advised by the upperclassmen not to take it, because, so they are told, it is harder than the regular curriculum. This may be true because it requires the study of a foreign language and a total of two hours of work more per week than do the other freshman and sophomore curricula.
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In the third place, as far as the faculty is concerned, though the evidence is not definitive, circumstantial evidence is sufficiently strong to warrant the statement that even the plan that was finally adopted lacks the constructive support of many of those who have formal positions of educational leadership in the University, or who otherwise exercise such leadership. Some of the faculty members expressed the opinion that the General Division, both as originally conceived and as finally adopted, was bound to meet organized and determined opposition because it cuts across departmental lines and thus tends to disrupt a portion of the organization that already exists, and perchance to weaken present and traditional controls over the curriculum. It is of the highest significance that younger members of the faculty of the lower professorial ranks, who were zealous to see the establishment of such a curriculum and who would still be glad to support it on the basis of its educational merits, now state that they have ceased to promote it aggressively lest they jeopardize their own professional advancement within their respective departments.

The Commission is unanimous and unequivocal in its opinion that a program of general education should be provided in the University and that the facilities of the program should be made available to students pursuing any undergraduate curriculum in the University. The problems created by the tremendous increase in the size of the undergraduate body at the University of Illinois and the ever-increasing complexity of educational needs which this student body presents can be met much more effectively for many students by a curriculum of this character even than by modifications of existing traditional curricula.

All undergraduate schools of the University had very conventional programs in 1934. There is no evidence of any unusual development since then unless the General Division be excepted, nor has there been any consistent serious consideration of desirable modifications of these programs.

It may be argued by some that the point of view expressed above does not make proper allowance for two provisions in the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences. The first one is that a limited number of sufficiently gifted and mature students, under the direction of the college committee on individual curricula, may make arrangements for individual curricula, the satisfactory completion of
which will lead to the degree of Bachelor of Arts or Bachelor of Science. The main purpose of such individual curricula is to serve to the best possible advantage the needs of the superior student who can demonstrate his capacity to profit more from individual programs of studies than from any of the conventional programs.¹

It is not necessary to labor the theoretical value of the above provisions. Suffice it to say that the accumulated total number of students actually taking advantage of this provision since it was set up in 1936 has been only 39, inclusive of the session 1941-42. There were 18 students enrolled under this plan in its beginning year. By 1941-42 this number had dwindled to 3.

The second provision concerns the tutorial plan, established in 1935, under which juniors and seniors in the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences with at least a "B" average have opportunities for independent study and investigation. In 1937 there were 18 enrolled under this plan; 4 in 1938; 8 in 1939; 3 in 1940; 2 in 1941; and 4 in 1942.

These provisions fall into insignificance as optional programs when we remember that almost 4,000 undergraduate students are enrolled in the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences.

There have been other modifications made in the curricula of the Colleges of Agriculture, Commerce, Engineering, Fine and Applied Arts, and the Schools of Journalism and Physical Education; also a Social Administration curriculum has been set up in the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences. While these are commendable, none of them has proved to be of major educational significance.

The Commission concludes, therefore, that although there has been no absolute deterioration in the educational program for undergraduate students, there has been neither foresighted planning nor constructive curricular program-making to meet the changing educational needs of the undergraduate student body.

**THE QUALITY OF TEACHING**

As already stated, what the undergraduate students are taught and how they are taught constitute the two crucial considerations in the program of a university for such students. The first of these matters has been discussed under the general

¹See University of Illinois Annual Register, 1941-42, p. 115.
consideration of curricula. Let us now turn to the second, under the discussion of teaching.

What constitutes good teaching? Who are the good teachers? Is it possible to determine with any considerable degree of objectivity whether undergraduate instruction is efficient? These and other kindred questions have been moot points for many years in the realm of undergraduate higher education. Wide differences of opinion still exist concerning them. Nevertheless, in recent years objective methods have been developed to determine whether instruction at this level is effective or not. These devices though not infallible are far more reliable than personal opinion. In spite of the fact, however, that such measures exist and that they have been applied with highly useful results, the idea is still prevalent in many quarters, especially among the members of faculties who themselves do the teaching, that the really important results of teaching cannot be measured.

Evidence in support of the point of view that quality of teaching can be objectively measured is to be found in the growing body of reports of experimentation in fields of instruction. These reports show that the results of learning differ when different teaching procedures are used.

Since what the student learns is the real end measure of the effectiveness of what he is taught, it is only reasonable that faculties both as individual members and as groups should inform themselves as to the best ways of measuring the results of their instruction, and for their own benefit as well as for the benefit of students make the best possible use of such information.

Throughout practically all the Commission's interviews with teaching, as well as with administrative, members of faculties the question was repeatedly asked: What is being done toward the evaluation of instruction? The replies given were almost wholly in the negative. A few exceptions occurred in a limited number of departments where it was reported that the teaching of graduate assistants had received special attention through periodic departmental staff conferences, to which assistants had been invited and where educational policies had been discussed. Furthermore, members of
the administrative staff indicated an awareness of this problem and the desirability of doing something about it.

It should be stated furthermore that the staff in the office of the Provost has in recent years made an approach to this problem by helping individual instructors when requested in the construction of examinations. But only a little of this work has been done thus far. Nothing precise or comprehensive has been achieved in evaluating instruction by the faculty as a whole, or in checking the results of instruction through student achievement tests which might be used as a basis of comparison with similar reports from other institutions of higher education.

This last fact is of peculiar significance since tests of student achievement with nationally established norms have been available and widely used among leading institutions of higher education since about 1925.

It is true that in 1939 the Senate Committee on Educational Policy completed a survey of all courses and curricula given at Urbana for the professed purpose of improving teaching effectiveness. This report resulted in a reduction of the number of courses offered and in the number of overlapping courses, but it did not result to any considerable extent in changing the content of the remaining courses. It is misleading, however, to consider this study and report as contributing directly to problems of teaching effectiveness. Of course, it is true that proper teaching depends upon a selection of proper materials to be taught, but it is a non sequitur to conclude that once the proper materials have been chosen, good teaching is thereby insured.

Finally, some credit must be given to the following activities of limited scope which have been carried on:

1. In the fall of 1938, the Provost's office of the University of Illinois was expanded to provide for consultation and assistance to faculty members in studying educational problems. The added staff included a consultant in higher education and several research assistants. Bibliographical materials as well as lists of syllabi were assembled, printed in mimeographed form, and made available to the staff members charged with developing the new courses in the General Division. They covered the general areas of the biological sciences, the physical sci-
ences, the social sciences, the humanities, general education, English, and philosophy and psychology. Two printed studies in higher education have already been published in the fields of English composition and examinations in law.8

2. The faculty of the University has for some years been interested in the problems of teaching rhetoric at the undergraduate level. One of the printed studies referred to above is a result of the cooperation of the office of the Provost with the English Department. The office of the Provost has been working on the preparation of objective type examinations and has been making studies of the testing of results of the instructional program, particularly in the Department of Chemistry.

3. Recently the staff of the office of the Provost has been working very intensively with the College of Agriculture, particularly in the Departments of Horticulture and Agronomy. Faculty meetings have been held in the College of Agriculture at which teachers have demonstrated or discussed teaching in agricultural engineering, dairy production, home economics, and agronomy. Experiments and studies which have to do with: (1) the mental level of the students, (2) the relation of subject matter to objectives, (3) methods of presentation, (4) methods of measuring results, and (5) physical equipment required for laboratory presentation9 are being carried on by the office of the Provost in cooperation with the College of Agriculture.

4. In the College of Engineering two professors10 have been attempting to devise a method of instruction that would result in a greater degree of creative effort on the part of a selected portion of students in a course than would normally be true, without increasing cost or decreasing effectiveness of instruction given to the general group of students. Normally, lecture groups run to 20 or 25 students. Experimental sections of


10 See Report of the Survey of Courses and Curricula of the University of Illinois by the Senate Committee on Educational Policy, 1939, p. 51.

about 40 students are being operated in Strength of Materials; at the same time there are sections of five or six selected students in this course and in Kinetics. Professors Draffin and Seely reported recently that "these sections have been in operation for three semesters and while the results have been most encouraging we do not feel that sufficient work has been done to warrant other than general conclusions; it is planned to continue these experimental sections."

In the Department of Theoretical and Applied Mechanics so-called discussion-demonstration sections were set up containing about 20 students and running parallel to the regular small-squad laboratory sections. The results of the discussion-demonstration work, when compared with the results of the regular lecture and laboratory sections on the basis of the examination papers of each group, have led Professors Draffin and Seely to conclude that their experiments show "that laboratory instruction can be carried out as effectively in large sections by the discussion-demonstration method as in small-squad sections only one-half as large."11

5. In 1942 the General Division of the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences employed a full-time examining technician. He is engaged in evaluating the work of the students of the General Division and in comparing their work with control groups in the regular curriculum of the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences. He is also engaged in the preparation of objective type examinations to be used in the survey courses of the General Division curriculum. Several preliminary reports have been published in educational journals and several mimeographed reports issued to the faculty.

6. Although it lies outside the scope of this study the Commission feels it pertinent to mention that the Executive Dean of the Chicago colleges reported to the Commission that definite progress is being made in physiology, anatomy, and bacteriology in setting up courses for groups of students from the Colleges of Medicine, Dentistry, and Pharmacy.

It will be said by some that one measure of the quality of teaching is the proportion of students who go on to do graduate work and the quality of their achievement as graduate students. There is some degree of truth in this assertion. The

"/bid."
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fallacies in it, however, lie first in the fact that many students who graduate do not go on to graduate work and should not do so, and second that over 60 percent of the students who are taught in the undergraduate courses do not even receive the baccalaureate degree. The measure of the quality of the instruction given both these groups must therefore be in terms other than their preparation to do graduate work.

It is the judgment of the Commission that the University of Illinois during the last decade has done far less than it should have done to provide means for adequate evaluation of its undergraduate instruction. As far as the Commission is aware, this does not represent a change in policy and from that point of view, therefore, does not constitute a deterioration on the part of the institution. Nevertheless, the means for such evaluation were greater in the last decade than they have ever been before in the history of higher education.

QUALITY OF INSTRUCTIONAL MATERIALS AND FACILITIES

An institution of higher education may have well-organized curricula and may be intelligently sensitive to the proper instructional administration of these curricula, and still not be able to carry on its program as it should. Among the factors which directly bear on this situation are the kind and quality of the materials and facilities provided for instruction.

The University Library

In a modern university there is no instructional facility of any greater importance to the undergraduate as well as to the graduate student than the library. Any discussion of a university library naturally falls into two categories: library facilities and library service. Statistically it is a relatively simple matter to compare a university library with itself or with other libraries in the country provided figures are at hand. In size, as measured by the number of volumes, the library of the University of Illinois in 1930-31 ranked fifth with about 900,000 volumes (after Harvard, Yale, Columbia, and Chicago). In 1940-41, with about 1,265,000 volumes, the Illinois library ranked in the same order as far as size is concerned. The size
of library staff is another index. During this ten-year period the University of Illinois was able exactly to double its staff (from 69 employees to 138). The appropriation for salaries at the University library in ten years has increased from approximately $165,000 to $245,000. Appropriations for books, periodicals, and bindings have remained practically the same, around $125,000 annually throughout the period.

Although the library does not keep its circulation statistics in such a way as to separate faculty use from student use, the average circulation per person has followed the same trends as those in a group of university libraries studied over the ten-year period, 1927 to 1937. There is evidence to indicate that normally freshmen and sophomores use the library less than upperclassmen. With this in mind, the increased circulation per person in the University of Illinois library during the years in which the enrollment was rapidly expanding is a significant fact, since during that period the relative numbers of freshmen and sophomores in the institution were higher than previously. It might have been expected that the library circulation per person would decline. However, such was not the case.

A recent report shows the locations of the leading collections for advanced study and research in American libraries. The American Library Association Board on Resources of American Libraries drew up a list of 75 subjects and asked approximately 500 authorities where, in their opinion, the best library collections are to be found. The following list contains the names of university libraries each of which was judged to have ten or more such collections: Harvard, California, Columbia, Michigan, Pennsylvania, Chicago, Yale, Cornell, Minnesota, Princeton, Illinois, Stanford, Duke, Texas, New York University, Wisconsin, North Carolina, Johns Hopkins, Washington, Iowa State College, Ohio State University, and Massachusetts Institute of Technology. In relation to other libraries in this group, Illinois stands eleventh. It must be noted, however, that this type of ranking on the basis of number of collections tends to give the advantage to large li-
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libraries, simply because they have a better chance to have more mention by virtue of their size.

As far as service to students is concerned, it is of interest to note that the University of Illinois was the first institution in the country to establish a course for undergraduate students in the use of the library. This was done in 1897. It is still a flourishing course and many institutions have followed this lead. During the past ten years the University library has improved its services along lines of library films, service to visually handicapped students, the opening of browsing rooms in the two Union buildings, the compilation of a handbook for the use of undergraduates, and the setting up of traveling collections for the university community in Urbana. It is the judgment of the Commission that during the past decade the University library has held its own in the matter of size of collections and that services to students have increased in quantity and improved in quality.

**The Building Program**

Perhaps the outstanding achievement of the present administration of the University of Illinois has been its building program which from July 1, 1933, to June 30, 1942, involved a total cost for new buildings and equipment of $7,858,974. Of this total amount $2,178,567 was spent for the Union Building at Urbana and men's residence halls. These buildings unquestionably contribute to the morale and general welfare of the student body. A further analysis shows that instructional activities benefited through the following items: first, through the addition to the library and the erection of Gregory Hall in Urbana at a cost of $1,110,929; second, through the erection of the Natural Resources building at a cost of $582,335 which released much valuable space for class and laboratory use at Urbana, which was formerly occupied by the two state surveys; third, through the erection of the Education and Research Laboratory building for the three colleges in Chicago at a cost of $1,818,136; fourth, through the erection of the power, heat, and light plant in Urbana at a cost of $1,685,934 which made possible the expansion of the physical plant for educational purposes to an extent which would have been otherwise impossible.
Although the Commission did not have the time to examine in
detail the innumerable minutiae of material instructional facilities
such as laboratory equipment, maps, and the like, nevertheless, on
the basis of the information which it has, the Commission is of
the opinion that the material instructional facilities are at least as
well provided now as they were a decade ago.

THE ATTENTION GIVEN TO NONFORMAL, NON-
CURRICULAR ASPECTS OF STUDENT WELFARE

Student Housing

Authentic history relates that the original dormitory of the
Illinois Industrial University, the predecessor of the Univer-
sity of Illinois, was made uninhabitable in 1880 as a result of
a storm. Since no money was forthcoming from the State at
that time for its reconstruction, the University was compelled
to open an agency for rooms in the Urbana-Champaign dis-
trict. This, so the narrative states, proved a source of great
concern both to those responsible for the administration of the
University and to the parents of the students. Thus from the
earliest days of the institution, student welfare has been a
matter of administrative concern at the University of Illinois
and student housing has been a major item in this concern.

Since the destruction of this first dormitory, the University
never has been able to house all of its students in its own dor-
mitories. The business brought to the university community
by reason of the fact that so many hundreds of students must
rent rooms in private residences has built up over the years
an income of no mean proportions in the community and one
which in more recent times has seemed to have its repercus-
sions registered in the administrative policies of the institution
itself.

Busey Hall was built in 1917. In the middle twenties Evans
Hall was built and Davenport House acquired to house women
students. With the exceptions of those who lived in these resi-
dences, however, the students of the University resided in
private homes and ate in restaurants distributed over the entire
Urbana-Champaign residence and business districts. The ad-
ministration of the University was conscious of the problem
of improving living conditions of students and in 1937 re-
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quested an item in its legislative budget to enable the University to build men's residence halls on the campus. Suffice it to say that money requested for the dormitories was not appropriated by the General Assembly.

In 1935 the Board of Trustees established the University of Illinois Foundation.

... objectives may be summarized as follows: (1) to assist in developing the facilities of the University by encouraging gifts ... (2) to receive, hold and administer such gifts with the primary object of serving purposes other than those for which the State of Illinois ordinarily makes sufficient appropriations, (3) to act as the business agent of the Board of Trustees of the University in the performing of other services specified by them, and (4) to undertake such other enterprises as tend to promote the interests and welfare of the University."

By using this Foundation as a holding corporation, the University negotiated loans from life insurance companies, secured federal grants-in-aid, and gifts from the alumni and without appropriations from the General Assembly; in spite of opposition, it successfully financed men's residence halls, the student-faculty-alumni Union building at Urbana, and the student-faculty-alumni Union building in Chicago.

The erection of these buildings was far more significant than the mere additional accommodations they provided might imply. Previous to the opening of the men's dormitories, the University found it exceedingly difficult to set up and maintain minimum standards to be met by rooming houses in order for them to be placed on the approved list of the University. The opening of the dormitories provided these standards and gave a leverage for their enforcement. Thus the provision of University residences for men resulted in a general improvement of living conditions in the entire community. The Commission feels that the administration of the University has accomplished much in the direction of solving the student housing problem and recommends that the University work toward the establishment of a dormitory system which will more nearly take care of the housing needs of all its men and women students.

The opening of the Illini Union Building also had a broad

"See University of Illinois Annual Register, 1941-42, p. 425.
influence on student life by providing recreational and dining facilities which were previously available to students only under commercial management and frequently under disreputable conditions. The pleasures of the students were made sources of profit to the community. It is easy to see why the profit-seeking interests so vigorously opposed the erection of this center. It is quite as easy to see also why their chief interest, as long as the center did not exist, lay in the profits they could make rather than in the excellence of the services they could give.

The opportunities provided in this center, with its library browsing room, its center of art, its amusement rooms, its dining rooms, and its cafeteria, are a far cry from the conditions existing previously, and have inevitably led to an improvement in the morals as well as the morale of the student body.

Except for the establishment of rules and regulations governing conduct, institutions of higher education have not until recent years been willing to acknowledge and shoulder responsibility for their students' lives outside the classroom, laboratory, or library. Even today some institutions are unwilling to assume these obligations. But increasingly colleges and universities are recognizing that students are something more than minds to be trained. In making new facilities available to students, the University of Illinois publicly testifies that it recognizes the broad responsibility for the entire life of each student while he is living in the academic community.

Personnel Bureau

In its report of June 1, 1936, the President's special Committee on Educational Program for Freshman and Sophomore Students recommended the establishment of a personnel bureau as part of the General Division of the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences. The Committee reported that it believed such a bureau would make possible:

1. The earlier adaptation of students to the University environment
2. The solution of a great variety of social, economic, and personality problems and maladjustments
3. Proper advice to, and if properly staffed, adequate treatment for, students who are so seriously maladjusted as to require psychiatric service
4. The promotion of more direct and personal contacts between students and the institution
5. An increase in confidence among parents that the University has a vital interest in their children as individual persons
6. A marked contribution to the program of extracurricular activities in so far as these are related to the *in loco parentis* functions of the University."

In the spring of 1937-38, the Personnel Bureau of the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences was established to provide students with educational and vocational guidance. . . . By means of scientific tests, conducted by staff members who are trained in psychological methods, an analysis is made of each student applying to the Bureau for assistance. The results of this analysis are interpreted to the student in private interviews with counselors, who are faculty members selected for service in the Bureau because of their understanding of student life. All students eligible to enter any college or school of the University may avail themselves of the services of this Bureau."

This statement expressed the potential field of activity of the Personnel Bureau. It was not until July 1, 1942, that the Bureau was placed under the general administration of the office of the Provost and became a university-wide agency. During the fall of 1942 the Bureau began officially to extend its services to the other colleges of the Urbana campus and to select members of the teaching staff as part-time counselors. In the autumn of 1942 for the first time the Personnel Bureau's battery of freshman guidance tests was given to all incoming freshmen. Thus the original plan for the scope of the work of the Bureau was realized. In the judgment of the Commission, this was a definitely forward looking step.

**The Reorganization of Student Affairs**

During the last decade the University has shown concern for student welfare in still another direction. In 1936 a recommendation, originating in the student body and coming from
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"See Report of the Committee on Educational Program for Freshman and Sophomore Students, June 1, 1936, pp. 78-79.

"See University of Illinois Annual Register, 1941-42, p. 115.
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the Senate Committee on Student Affairs, was made to the President of the University to set up an associated student body. The recommendation also carried a proposal for the appointment of a vice-president in charge of student affairs. The execution of this plan as recommended could not have been accomplished without considerable additional expense and major reorganization which at the time seemed neither feasible nor advisable to the administration. In spite of this, however, sentiment for an associated student body continued. Efforts on the part of the administration to secure a better organization of student affairs continued. For example, the number of individual student organizations has been reduced from about 300 to approximately 175.

During the summer of 1942 a report of the Senate Committee on Student Affairs for the reorganization of the Illini Union Board and the definition of its relation to other student activities was made. This report included recommendations that: (1) "all activities of the Illini Union Board shall be subject to the approval of the (Senate) Committee on Student Affairs" (upon which sit members of the Student Senate, and, as ex officio members, the Dean of Men and Dean of Women); (2) "all financial and building management and operation policies shall be the responsibility of the Business Office and the Physical Plant Department"; (3) purpose of the Illini Union Board shall include (a) the "responsibility for administering all student activities of an all-University nature, for either men or women or both . . . plus other activities delegated to it by the Student Affairs Committee," (b) the "responsibility for organizing and directing a program of social activities for the faculty and alumni"; and (4) the personnel of the Illini Union Board consist of nine students (three men and two women selected by the Illini Union Board and two each selected by the Dean of Men's Council and the Woman's League respectively), three faculty members selected by the President, one representative of the alumni appointed by the President on nomination of the Association, the manager of the Illini Union, and the Social Director of the Illini Union.

*See Minutes of the Board of Trustees' Meeting, August 29, 1942, pp. 80-82.*
After study by a committee of the Board of Trustees the proposed plan of reorganization was adopted by the entire Board at a meeting held on August 29, 1942. Thus, the Illini Union Board comes into the same relationship with the Committee on Student Affairs that the publication board, the concert and entertainment board, the Theatre Guild and all other major student activities bear to it.

This serves as an illustration of how interested groups have been able to effect a change in university policies and a reorganization in activities connected with the noncurricular aspects of the administration of student affairs.

Why was it possible to bring this to such a successful conclusion when, during at least a part of the period while this was going on, the attempt to set up a General Division in the educational organization of the University did not succeed?

Obviously one reason is that the plan which succeeded emanated in part from the student body and received continuing support from it. Another reason rests upon the following action taken by the University Senate on February 10, 1936:

Subject to such statements of policy as have been or may be adopted by the University Senate, the functions and duties of the Committee on Student Affairs shall be limited to those approved by the President, and in all its administrative actions the Committee shall be responsible to him."

Thus this plan of reorganization was merely received for record by the Senate as a committee report and went directly to the President of the University. Finally, it seems not at all improbable that the real reason why the reorganization of student affairs was consummated with such dispatch was that it was a matter which could be handled administratively by the President of the University without the necessity for Senate action.

The Commission recognizes the difficulty under which the administration of the University has labored in recent years to provide for noncurricular aspects of its students’ welfare. The Commission commends the administration of the University for its efforts in this direction and is of the opinion that substantial progress has been made toward the solution of the important problem of organization and administration of student

"See Minutes of the Senate of the University of Illinois, February 10, 1936.
affairs. As a further step in this program, the Commission recommends that the student administration setup be coordinated further and that the responsibility be centered in one administrator. This action would bring the University in line with a trend in many institutions to unify under a dean or director of student affairs the principal noninstructional activities that affect student welfare, such as those concerned with housing, social life, health, financial aid, and all-university counseling services.

The University of Illinois is in accord with the very widespread practice in institutions of higher education in making proper provision for the health of its students through University hospitalization service. As a matter of fact its service was the first of the kind in the country, having been founded in 1899. This service is available on a volunteer basis to students, nonteaching staff, and faculty members. The Commission commends the University in making these facilities available, but it strongly recommends that participation therein be made compulsory for the entire body of full-time students.

It is apparent to the Commission that important progress has been made at the University of Illinois since 1934 in student housing, the administration of student personnel work, the organization of student affairs, and the administration of general student welfare. The University can make still further progress in handling these matters by further coordination under a more centralized administration.

THE QUALITY OF THE FACULTY

There is nothing more important to any institution of higher education than the persons who constitute its faculty. Their qualifications as scholars, as teachers, as students determine very largely the educational heights which the institution can reach or the depths to which it may sink.

Obviously the size of the teaching staff of a university is no index of the quality of the teaching carried on or of the qualifications of that staff for teaching. In order to compare the quality of the present faculty with that of 1934, it is necessary to choose some measures or indices. Further, these indices must be limited to those items upon which data are available for 1934 and for the present period. With these limiting factors in mind the Commission has chosen as indices of
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faculty quality: (1) the degrees held, (2) the institutions at which the degrees were obtained, (3) the distribution of the faculty among the several possible ranks, (4) the scholarly productivity of the faculty, (5) their ratings on a national basis, (6) their salaries, (7) the relative importance of scholarship and teaching ability, (8) faculty morale, and (9) the ability of the University to hold and attract outstanding talent.

Degrees Held by Faculty Members

In 1934-35 faculty members of all ranks held degrees as follows: doctor's 37.7 percent, professional 9.5 percent, master's 40.5 percent, bachelor's 11.7 percent, and none .6 percent. In 1941-42 the relative number of those holding the doctor's as the highest degree was 41 percent; the professional degree, 4 percent; the master's degree, 35 percent; the bachelor's degree, 19 percent; and those holding no degree, .6 percent. A study of these figures year by year indicates a consistent increase in the percentage of individuals holding doctor's degrees with the exception of the year 1936-37 when the percentage dropped. This drop is probably to be explained by the facts that the staff had increased in absolute numbers from 778 members in 1934-35 to 936 in 1936-37, and that, of the 158 teaching staff members added between 1934-35 and 1936-37, 109 were assistants, 19 were instructors, 3 were associates, 7 were assistant professors, 7 were associate professors, and 13 were professors. Obviously, when the number of graduate assistants is increased by 109, this means a decrease in the percentage of individuals holding doctor's degrees since the assistants do not possess such degrees.

As far as the holding of a doctor's degree or its equivalent is a measure of the quality of a faculty, it may be stated that the quality of the teaching staff of the University of Illinois has not deteriorated since 1934 but, on the contrary, its quality has improved.

Institutions at Which Degrees Held by Faculty Members Were Obtained

The appointment of a high percentage of individuals to permanent positions in the same institution where they have had their higher education does not make for a cosmopolitan
faculty. This inbreeding may easily lead to institutional provincialism. Any institution of higher education needs new blood constantly added to its faculty in order to obtain that stimulation which comes from the thinking of other academic groups.

A study of degrees held by individuals of the rank of associate and above in 1934-35 on the Urbana campus of the University of Illinois reveals that 38.5 percent of them had at least one degree from the mother institution. The corresponding figure for 1941-42 is 39.6 percent. When the particular academic ranks are scrutinized we find that in 1934-35, 26.9 percent of the professors hold some degree from the University of Illinois and in 1941-42 this figure is 36.8 percent. In 1934-35, 51.2 percent of the associate professors held some degree from the University of Illinois while by 1941-42 the figure had decreased to 36.8 percent. In 1934-35, 39.0 percent of the assistant professors held Illinois degrees and by 1941-42 the percentage had increased to 47.3 percent. In 1934-35, 56.4 percent of the associates held degrees from the University but by 1941-42 the figure had decreased to 37.5 percent. When the rank of instructor is examined as a group a very striking contrast between 1934 and 1942 is found. In 1934-35 there were 64.3 percent of the individuals of this rank who held some degree from the University of Illinois while in 1941-42 only 36.2 percent of the instructors were graduates of the mother institution.

An examination of the sources of degrees held by persons on the Urbana campus of the rank of associate and above by colleges reveals that the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences has by far the most cosmopolitan faculty and that the 1941-42 figure in that college on individuals holding all degrees from institutions other than the University of Illinois was 72.9 percent while in 1934-35 it was 72.4 percent. Next in order is the College of Engineering with 52.9 percent in 1934-35 and 60.9 percent in 1941-42. Agriculture has the largest relative number of teachers with degrees from Illinois: 65.8 percent in 1934-35 and 64.9 percent in 1941-42. Trends in the Colleges of Education and Commerce are in opposite directions in the two schools. In Education in 1934-35 there were 53.3 percent of the individuals in the ranks under discussion who
held degrees from Illinois whereas in 1941-42 the figure had decreased to 46.2 percent. In Commerce in 1934-35 the corresponding figure was 50 percent and in 1941-42 it was almost 60 percent.

It is significant that, although the amount of inbreeding for the whole group has changed very little since 1934-35, the relative number of Illinois-trained individuals occupying senior positions in the faculty has greatly increased. In view of the fact that under the present organization at the University of Illinois the senior faculty members have such a large part in the determination of educational policy, it seems to the Commission that in the appointment of individuals to permanent faculty rank there should be a wider selection on the basis of the sources of the degrees obtained.

Distribution of the Faculty Among the Several Possible Ranks

One index of the quality of a faculty is generally acknowledged to be the distribution of its personnel among the several possible ranks within it. That is to say, there should not be too many persons in any one rank.

Save for the inevitable reduction in both student body and teaching staff during the depression years, the staff grew steadily from 1923 up to 1941-42. In comparison with certain selected state universities, the ratio of teaching staff to students is somewhat higher at the University of Illinois. It was reported that an effort is being made at the University to reduce the ratio of students to teaching staff members. This is borne out by the fact that although 1938-39 was the peak enrollment year, 1941-42 was the peak staff year. Obviously significant changes in the size of the student body have resulted in correspondingly significant changes in the size of the teaching staff, a fact which is to be interpreted as good university management.

To avoid the cost of adding full-time instructors, and at the same time to provide enrollment for the Graduate School, the University has engaged graduate assistants to whom were assigned many of the duties normally performed only by full-time members of the teaching staff. In some departments these assistants have responsibility for a large percentage of ele-
mentary instruction. In others they act as quiz masters and laboratory assistants. During the decade from 1923 to 1933 the percentage of assistants in relation to full-time members of the instructional staff varied from 28.5 percent in 1923 up to 34.5 percent in 1929. During the depression years this figure dropped to 24.3 percent. During the peak enrollment years of the past decade this figure reached a high of 29 percent but since that time has steadily decreased to 24.5 percent in 1941-42. The relative number of assistants on the teaching staff in 1941-42 was lower than at any time since 1923-24 with the single exception of 1933-34, at which time the figure was only .1 percent lower than the 1941-42 figure. The University administration is fully conscious of the dangers of assigning teaching responsibility to inexperienced personnel whose primary interests, for the time being at least, are directed toward the securing of advanced degrees. The figures make it fully evident that there is a studied administrative policy at the University of Illinois directed toward the reduction of the number of graduate assistants used in teaching. The Commission commends the administration on this policy.

Scholarly Productivity of the Faculty

Another index of the quality of a faculty is its scholarly productivity. With the exception of a single year, there has been a steady increase in the volume of books, articles, and reviews published. This exception was the year 1938-39, which may be explained by the fact that the rapidly accelerating university enrollment reached its peak that year.

The total volume of these publications increased from 991 in 1933-34 to 1,584 in 1940-41. Since the staff also has increased during this period a better measure is the ratio of publications to staff. The number of articles, books, and reviews published by members of the faculty of professorial rank has increased from an average in 1932-33 of 2.8 to an average of 3.8 per staff member in 1940-41.

Obviously, a question could be raised regarding the quality of the publications just reported in quantity only. The Commission is fully aware that no consideration has been given to this factor, nor was it possible within reasonable limits of time available to make such a study. Hence, the conclusion can take
into account volume only and say that in so far as this is a criterion of the quality of a faculty, the faculty of the University of Illinois has not deteriorated but, on the contrary, has improved since 1934.

Faculty Ratings on a National Basis

It will be recalled that the Hughes Report on graduate instruction, made in April 1934, contained the judgments of well-known scholars in various fields concerning the rating of departments in various universities with respect to the adequacy of the staff and equipment to prepare candidates for the doctorate. This report rated departments as approved or not approved. The 20 percent of the institutions rated highest for any given department were starred for this department. Out of 29 departments passed upon at the University of Illinois, 28 were given a rating of "approved," four among the 28 approved were starred. These four departments named in order as rated by the report were chemistry, civil engineering, political science, and mathematics.

In order to obtain a comparison between 1934 and the present the Commission felt it wise to take a sampling of the departments at the University of Illinois and request contemporary opinions of eminent scholars in the fields concerned as to whether these departments at the University of Illinois are today: (1) about the same as, (2) better than, (3) not so good as, they were about ten years ago. Twelve departments were chosen and from nine to twenty-three judges were asked to rate the departments. An excellent response was received from this inquiry. To 138 letters written, 120 replies were received and only nine individuals who replied declined to rate the departments as requested. The Commission does not for one moment assume this gives results comparable in reliability with the Hughes Report. Nevertheless, the results are at least indicative of what would likely be found by a more comprehensive study.

Of the four departments rated as outstanding in the Hughes Report, three were rated as being currently about the same as

---

they were then, and the fourth one, that of chemistry, was rated as being better. Of the remaining eight departments selected by the Commission, two (agronomy and psychology) were judged better than they were ten years ago, while the other six (bacteriology, economics and business, education, history, mechanical engineering, and zoology) were rated as about the same.

The above ratings really constitute indices of the graduate standing of the departments named as judged by a limited number of persons.

There are two well-established and highly regarded publications of biographical sketches of individuals who for one reason or another are considered to be of national reputation: *Who's Who in America* and *American Men of Science*. In so far as listing in these volumes can be regarded as an index of reputation on a national scale, listing in them of the members of the faculty of the University of Illinois may be used as one criterion by which to compare the faculty of 1934 with the faculty of today.

In 1934-35, out of 323 persons of professorial rank on the Urbana campus, 118 or 36.5 percent were listed in *Who's Who in America*. In the current edition, of 437 persons of professorial rank, 134 or 30.7 percent were listed.

There have been six editions of *American Men of Science* published between 1906 and 1938. In this publication names of especially prominent persons are starred. Of the 25 University of Illinois faculty members on the Urbana campus starred in the 1933 edition: 5 were listed in 1906; 4 in 1910; 5 in 1921; 4 in 1927; and in 1933 there were 25; in addition, there were 175 simple listings in 1933 making a total of 200 listings in that year. In the last edition (1938) there were 174 simple, unstarred listings from the staff of the University and 32 starred, making a total of 206 listings.

The size of the faculty, however, has increased approximately one-third since 1934. Therefore, the relative number of faculty members listed from that date to 1942 in *Who's Who in America* has decreased appreciably. And, although the absolute number listed in *American Men of Science* from 1933 to 1938, the latest edition of that volume, has increased
slightly, the percentage listed has decreased. The net relative standing, therefore, of the faculty in terms of these limited criteria is slightly lower now than it was in 1934.

Salaries Paid Faculty Members

Another index of faculty quality is the salary scale which an institution maintains. This is true for two reasons: It determines: (1) the power of an institution to hold its younger and developing men, and (2) the ability of an institution to attract scholars who have already attained eminence elsewhere. Exclusive of administrative officers, the average salary paid full professors at the University was $5,716 in 1932-33. By 1934 this average had fallen to $4,869. This decrease is a direct result of a series of salary cuts put into effect during the depression years and reflects a condition almost universal in the universities of America. There has been a steady increase in the average salaries paid professors, from $4,967 in 1935-36 to $5,389 in 1941-42.

The United States Office of Education has recently issued figures on the median salaries of the five largest land-grant institutions for 1935-36 and for 1939-40. Since Illinois is one of this group, its median salaries may easily be compared with those of its sister institutions. For its regular teaching staff, salaries at the University of Illinois in 1935-36 at every rank level were consistently slightly above the median of the five institutions taken as a group. The same was true in 1939-40, with the exception of instructors' salaries which were about $25 under the median of the instructors' of the five institutions taken together.

To be sure, the salaries at the University of Illinois are not up to the predepression level (in 1932-33), but it is also evident that other state universities of similar rank have also been unable fully to restore the cuts made during the depression. The present salaries of the instructional and administrative staffs at the University of Illinois compare favorably with salaries paid similar personnel at other state universities.

A careful examination of salaries at the University reveals that there are two and sometimes three typical salaries within a given rank. There is also a tendency to establish maxima for the various ranks. The Commission is of the opinion that
it is good institutional policy not to set up a rigid salary scale, and believes that it would be well to maintain a flexible salary scale in order to hold promising individuals of less than full professorial rank and to attract and hold distinguished persons.

The Relative Importance of Scholarship and Teaching Ability
The relative importance of scholarship and teaching ability among faculty members has been much discussed by educators. On the whole there has been a tendency to emphasize scholarly productivity to the detriment of undergraduate instruction. Younger men who early learn that their promotion lies only along the road of scholarly productivity, tend to bury themselves in these pursuits instead of interesting themselves in the improvement of instruction, or of providing for the changing educational and social needs of the undergraduate students. This condition, coupled with the fact that such matters of educational policy lie almost wholly in the hands of the full professors, is another factor in the younger man's dissociating himself from anything but a life devoted to scholarship and research in which his teaching, particularly at the undergraduate level, becomes simply a means to earn a living.

The time has come when the University ought to find a place for the man who is interested primarily in teaching, and should make it possible for good teachers to achieve careers which are recognized by the administration and by faculty colleagues to be of as high professional standing as careers of teaching plus research.

The Commission has no evidence which would justify the conclusion that the undergraduate teaching in the University is inferior today to what it was in 1934. At the same time it would be a dereliction not to call attention to the facts that teaching which was good in 1934 will not meet the instructional needs of today as well as it did at the previous date, and that one of the present pressing needs of the University is improvement in its undergraduate instruction.

Factors Affecting Faculty Morale
Three factors of great importance in determining the morale of a faculty are: first, that members shall be able to carry on their normal work of instruction, research, and production
without undue restrictions; second, that they may carry on their work in the full realization that their tenure will be continued under proper safeguards; and, third, when the period of their effective activities draws to a close they will be assured adequate income for the remainder of their lives.

The first of these factors was investigated in interviews with members of the staff. In these inquiries an attempt was made to learn whether there had been any infringement upon the academic freedom of faculty members. The Commission failed to find any instance of interference with the teaching duties and privileges of a member of the faculty. It did discover one case where a member of the faculty had been advised to modify his outspoken statements to public audiences upon certain phases of the present world situation. Since this incident took place before the United States was officially engaged in the war, it seems to the Commission that this constituted at least a near infringement upon academic rights. This was the only instance the Commission found where it would appear that there were restrictions to academic freedom.

Tenure is provided for in a statute of the University adopted in 1932 wherein provision is made for the appointment of professors and associate professors for indefinite terms. First appointments at the University to professorships and associate professorships may be for limited terms, but re-appointments following shall be considered as for indefinite terms.

Appointments below the rank of associate professor are made for definite terms. Tenure may be terminated by: (1) honorable retirement, (2) acceptance of resignation, or (3) discharge for cause. Cause for discharge will consist of conduct seriously prejudicial to the University through deliberate infraction of law or commonly accepted standards of morality, through neglect of duty, or inefficiency, or incompetency. No appointee shall be removed before the expiration of his term of service without first having been presented with a written statement containing the charges against him together with a summary of the evidence in support of the same. After the presentation of charges he shall have the opportunity of a hearing before the Board of Trustees.
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The provisions with respect to tenure were inaugurated just prior to the period which this study has under immediate consideration. Their operation, however, has fallen almost entirely within this period and has contributed directly to the faculty morale existing within the same time.

With respect to retirement of its faculty members the University of Illinois did not have the best plan prior to September 1, 1941. Up to that time it was operating upon the so-called Kentucky plan under which retirement allowances were paid wholly out of current revenues. Under this plan any member of the teaching, administrative, or mechanical staff, who had been in the service of the University for fifteen or more years (at least the last seven of which was continuous service), was eligible for retirement at age 68 with a retirement allowance equal to 25 percent of the average annual cash portion of the compensation paid him during each of the last five years prior to his retirement, together with 1 percent of such average amount additional for each year of his service at the University. The maximum payment, however, could not exceed 30 percent of such average amounts and could not be greater than $3,000 a year, except that deans or other general administrative officers could receive a maximum of $4,000 and a president, $6,000.

In addition, cash death benefits were to be paid upon a sliding scale of 10 percent of the cash portion of the individual's annual compensation if death occurred during his second year of service up to a maximum of 50 percent of the cash portion of his annual compensation if death occurred during the tenth or any succeeding year of his service.

In 1941 the University sponsored an act to provide for the creation, maintenance, and administration of a retirement system for the benefit of staff members and employees of the University and of certain other state educational and scientific agencies. This act was passed by the Sixty-second General Assembly on July 21, 1941, and made effective as of September 1, 1941. The purpose of the act was to provide retirement annuities and disability and death benefits for staff members and employees of the University, of the state teachers colleges, and of the state scientific surveys at the University. This is a funded, contributory, compulsory system for all employees.
of age 30 or over, certified by their employers as being under permanent and continuous employment. Other employees may elect to participate in the system.

The retirement system is administered by a board of trustees consisting of five persons, three of whom must be members of the Board of Trustees of the University of Illinois and chosen by that Board, one of whom must be a member of the Normal School Board and chosen by that Board, and one of whom is ex officio the State Director of Registration and Education.

It is the judgment of the Commission that in the provisions which the University has set up concerning academic freedom, tenure, and retirement, the University of Illinois has made decided progress in the last decade and should be distinctly commended.

**Ability to Hold and Attract Talent**

The Commission has fortunately been able to secure some additional light on the quality of the faculty through finding out, first, why some persons left positions on the faculty of the University of Illinois and, second, why some persons who were offered positions there did not accept them.

Although information was secured from only a limited number of persons, it was consistent in nature and therefore seemed sufficiently significant to include here.

Individuals who have left the University of Illinois, when consulted by the Commission, stated that they felt that younger men have very poor chances for advancement in rank and salary until they have been on the faculty for a long time; that advancement comes only as a result of productive scholarship no matter what kind of teaching is done; and that the institution is run by the senior professors in such a way as to exclude younger men of the lower ranks from participation in policy making.

The reasons given to the Commission by persons who had refused offers of positions at the University of Illinois were that there is a lack of dynamic educational leadership in the institution; that the conservative and sometimes reactionary senior professors and administrators, although few in numbers, have such strong influence on policy making that the University is not a desirable place at which to work; that the ad-
ministration lacks the ability to obtain wholehearted support for new programs; and finally that the inertia of the educational policy-making setup is such that simple reforms can be effected only over a period of years.

The quality of the faculty has been reviewed with regard to (1) degrees held, (2) institutions where degrees were obtained, (3) distribution of the faculty as to ranks, (4) scholarly productivity, (5) ratings of individual members, (6) salaries paid, (7) relative importance of scholarship and teaching ability, (8) faculty morale, and (9) the ability of the University to hold and attract outstanding talent. A careful appraisal of these factors reveals that the University has improved significantly in some respects, that it has maintained the status of 1934 in others, and that it has fallen slightly below the standard of 1934 in still others. Considering the total situation with regard to faculty quality, however, it is the opinion of the Commission that that situation in the University is no worse than it was in 1934.

THE GENERAL CHARACTER AND DIRECTION OF THE EDUCATIONAL PROGRAM

The University of Illinois started in 1867 as a small institution with about fifty young men students, three teachers, and a "herd farmer." One of the teachers was its Regent, Gregory. During its early struggles for existence, there was little need for faculty organization when food, shelter, and clothing were uppermost problems. Early law defined the faculty as "the chief instructors of the departments." As the University passed through the administrations of Gregory and Peabody, and came to that of Draper, who was an administrator more than a scholar, it began to find itself and take its place in the life of the State. Draper had trouble with his Board of Trustees who interfered with the internal administration of the University. At his instigation, the Board in 1898 passed resolutions clarifying its relations to the President and the University.

At the opening of the century the enrollment had almost reached 3,000 and the faculty about 250. As an administrator, Draper saw the need for getting an all-university body of faculty members to work on educational policy. As a result a University Senate of full professors was organized in the fall
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of 1901; thereby the principle of democratic control of educational policies was openly recognized and adopted.

Unfortunately the principle of democratic control which was adopted in 1901 has since become in practice control by the full professors of the faculty. The manner in which this practice has developed will be best understood by discussing in some detail the steps which have taken place in the organization of the University since 1901 and by pointing out in this discussion some of the changes that might now be made in order to revivify the democratic principle. This discussion will deal explicitly with the organization of the department, the college faculty, the graduate faculty, and the University Senate.

The Department

The University statute covering the organization of a department was first adopted in December 1908 and remained unchanged in the revision of December 1926. It provides that the ranking professor of the department shall, unless otherwise directed, be head thereof, "and, subject to superior authority as to policy and course of procedure, he shall be responsible for the quality and efficient work of the department, and all subordinates in the department shall conform to his views touching departmental policy, while they may exercise their own originality and genius in carrying such policy out." The Statutes further specifically state that subordinates in a department and particularly associate professors are entitled to offer to the head professor thereof such suggestions as they may see fit concerning the general policy of the department. But the final determination of that policy "shall rest with the head thereof and with the authorities superior to him." It provides that the department head shall "make all departmental reports, prepare estimates for the expenses of his department and be responsible for the distribution and expenditure of funds assigned to it."

The Statutes approved in March 1936, however, make a radical departure from the earlier ones. First, they provide that a department may be organized with a chairman or with a head. The latter form of organization provides that "the head

---
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of a department shall be appointed on indefinite tenure by the Board of Trustees on nomination presented by the President after consultation with the dean of the college and all the members of the department of professorial rank." Further it is provided that

In each department organized with a head, that officer shall have general direction of the work of the department. He shall consult with the other members of the departmental staff on indefinite tenure, or with the heads of the several divisions, organized as an advisory committee, in regard to the departmental policies, and with each member of the department regarding the nature and scope of the work in his charge. He shall call meetings of the departmental staff for explanation and discussion of policies, educational procedure, and research. The head shall be held responsible, however, for the organization of the work of the department, for the quality and efficient progress of that work, and for the formulation and execution of departmental policies, and the execution of university and college policies in so far as they affect the department. He shall report on the teaching and research of the department, have general oversight of the work of students in the department, prepare departmental budgets, and be responsible for the distribution and expenditure of departmental funds, and for the care of departmental property.

In the administration of his office the head shall recognize the individual responsibility of other members of the department for the discharge of the duties committed to them by their appointments, and shall allow proper scope to the ability and initiative of all members of the department."

[The chairman of a department is] appointed biennially by the Board of Trustees on nomination presented by the President after consultation with the dean of the college and the executive committee of the department concerned.

In each department organized with a chairman, the voting faculty shall consist of the instructors, associates, assistant professors, associate professors, and professors. In consultation with the executive committee the chairman may invite other persons to attend departmental meetings.

In each department organized with a chairman, there shall be an executive committee composed of men of the rank of assistant professor or above elected annually by the voting members of the department. The chairman of the department shall be ex officio a member and the chairman of this committee. The chairman and the executive committee shall be responsible for the preparation of the budget and for such matters as may be delegated to them by the voting faculty of the department. . . .

"See University of Illinois Statutes, March 10, 1936, p. 5.
In each department organized with a chairman that officer is responsible for the formulation and execution of the departmental policies and the execution of university and college policies in so far as they affect the department; he shall have the power to act independently in such matters as are delegated to him by the executive committee; . . . The chairman together with the executive committee is responsible for the work of the department and for the quality and efficient progress of that work.

In the administration of his office the chairman shall recognize the individual responsibility of other members of the department for the discharge of the duties committed to them by their appointments, and allow proper scope to the ability and initiative of all members of the department.\textsuperscript{3}

The Statutes of 1936 provide further:

On the written request of at least one-fourth of the members of the department of the rank of assistant professor and above . . . to change the form of organization of the department, it shall be the duty of the dean to call a meeting to poll by ballot the members of the department of the rank of assistant professor and above, and transmit the result of the vote to these members of the department and to the President together with his recommendation, and if a change of organization is advised, the President shall thereupon make a recommendation to the Board of Trustees.\textsuperscript{4}

In no college of the University have any departments been organized on the basis of chairmanship, other than in the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences. At present the Departments of Classical Languages, Political Science, Social Administration, and Sociology are organized with chairmen. The Department of History has just changed from chairmanship to headship after having had a chairman for something more than one year. The Department of Zoology was organized under a chairman for about a year and a half and now has returned to the headship plan. Similar changes have occurred in some other departments.

\textbf{The College Faculty}

In the University Statutes as adopted in December, 1908, it was provided:

The faculty of each college or school may exercise legislative functions touching any matter appertaining exclusively to the internal work of that college and the progress of students therein. It shall not, however, have authority to take away from any student any University privilege, nor shall it do anything trenching upon the executive

\textsuperscript{3}Ibid., pp. 4-5.

\textsuperscript{4}Ibid., pp. 5-6.
duties of the dean. It must be understood that the college organization is only for convenience within University circles, and that no college shall take action not well supported by rule or usage for which the general officers of the University may be called upon to answer. All matters of general policy, or matters involving the interests of outside parties, must be determined by general University authority."

No change was made in the revised statutes issued in December 1926, with reference to the college faculty other than the insertion of the statement "nor shall it take action rendering nugatory any action of the University Senate."25

About ten years later, in the Statutes approved March 10, 1936, it is provided:

The [college] faculty shall consist of the President, the dean and the assistant dean of the college, and all professors, associate professors, assistant professors, associates and instructors within the group it comprises, together with a representative of each such other department or group as may be entitled to representation by virtue of participation in the program of instruction in the college, and finally such other officers of the University as the President may assign thereto."

No change has been made in the jurisdiction of the college over its own educational affairs. The current Statutes also state that "the college shall have the fullest measure of autonomy consistent with the maintenance of general University educational policy and correct academic and administrative relations with other divisions of the University."

The Statutes of 1936 further provide:

There shall be an executive committee of two or more members, composed of or selected from the professors and associate professors in the college, elected annually by the faculty, to advise the dean in the administration of the college and to transact such business as may be delegated to it by the faculty. The dean shall be ex officio member and chairman of this committee."26

The executive committee is the only committee prescribed by the University Statutes for the college. In actual practice, however, most of the colleges of the University have, in addition to their executive committees, certain other standing committees, chief among which is the college policy committee. There are other standing committees found in the

26See University of Illinois Statutes, December 1926, p. 5.
27See University of Illinois Statutes, March 10, 1936, p. 3.
28Ibid.
colleges such as scholarship, freshman week, exhibits, lectures, admissions, library, employment and placement, honors, graduate studies, programs, curriculum, and the like. Of course, numerous special committees have been appointed as needs arose.

Regular faculty meetings are held, the times varying among the colleges from annual to weekly. Statements made by several heads of the colleges in November 1935, relative to the percentage of faculty time devoted to various matters show the following ranges: routine administration from no time to 70 percent of the time, the average amount being about 23 percent; legislation regarding educational policies from 25 percent to 90 percent of the time or an average of about 65 percent. No time is devoted to student discipline in the college meetings since that is a University Senate affair. About 10 percent was the average remaining time and was devoted to the discussion of matters related to faculty welfare. Statements from the relatively few faculty members recently heard by the Commission indicate that much less than 50 percent of the time in college faculty meetings is devoted to discussion of educational policy. It also appears that, as reported by some assistant professors, the really important discussions of educational policy are held in the college policy committees rather than in general college faculty meetings.

Since these committees seldom include junior members of the faculty, it is obvious that such members do not have adequate opportunity even to discuss in formal session educational policies affecting the schools where they teach. Furthermore, as has already been pointed out, since some of the recommendations most significant for educational progress in the University have emanated from these junior members, the institution could well profit by placing such members on their college executive committees.

The Graduate School Faculty

The current Statutes provide:

The teaching faculty of the Graduate School shall consist of the President, the Dean and all those who, on recommendation of the de-

--- See Schedules of Information prepared for the North Central Association of Colleges on file in Chicago office.---
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partment, have been approved by the executive faculty of the Graduate School to be in independent charge of courses designed for graduate students or of theses to be submitted for higher degrees.

The executive faculty shall consist of ten or more members chosen annually from the teaching faculty and the Dean who shall be ex officio a member and chairman of the executive faculty. Of this number, the teaching faculty shall elect three, and the remainder shall be appointed by the President in consultation with the Dean and the three members elected by the teaching faculty. The executive faculty shall advise the Dean in the administration of the school.

There are usually two committees of the executive faculty of the Graduate School: one on graduate scholarships and fellowships, and another on staff and courses.

The Committee on Staff and Courses recognizes three types of appointees to the graduate faculty. First, there are extraordinary appointees, usually a few of the younger staff members authorized to give specific courses. In such cases it is the problem of the Committee to determine whether the staff member in question is competent to take full responsibility for a particular course. Persons elected to this class of membership are not considered regular members of the Graduate School teaching faculty. There is a second group of appointees composed of those who are considered regular members of the teaching faculty and are elected to what is called master's degree standing. Such persons are authorized to take responsibility for any part of a student's work in candidacy for a master's degree including the direction of the work on the master's thesis. They may also teach other suitable courses assigned to them by the departments and receive into those courses persons who are working toward the doctor's degree. They may not, however, guide the program or direct the investigation of candidates for the doctor's degree. Here it is the Committee's responsibility to determine whether an individual offered for such appointment has the intellectual and scientific or scholarly achievement which would justify putting such responsibility into his hands.

Third, there are those who are elected to full standing on the Graduate School teaching faculty. Such persons are authorized to teach courses at any level and to be responsible for any aspect of the graduate training of a particular student.

See University of Illinois Statutes, March 10, 1936, p. 6.

See page 35.
In electing anyone to this standing it is the responsibility of the Committee to make a careful scrutiny of his intellectual achievements and of his demonstrated ability not only to do research and investigation of an excellent character, but also to train and direct other persons who are acquiring the ability and skill to carry out scientific research or scholarly investigation.

The recommendations of the Committee on Staff and Courses, regarding admission to the teaching of the Graduate School, are subject to the approval of the executive faculty of the Graduate School.

**The University Senate**

In 1901 the University enrollment stood at about 3,000. In that same year the Board of Trustees passed a resolution amending the University Statutes and setting up a University Senate composed of full professors, ranking department heads, deans, and the President. Previously the general faculty of the University, defined as all persons who gave instruction in any department of the University together with administrative officers, had exercised general legislative functions touching the educational policy of the University. Thus, in the thirty-fifth year of its existence, the University of Illinois formally handed over the formulation of its educational policy to the senior members of its faculty.

Throughout the history of the University there has been consistent emphasis upon rule by the senior professors. Under the earlier Statutes the ranking member of a department was automatically its head. As the University grew, and its colleges, schools, and departments increased, the development of the Statutes show a continued adherence to this rule of seniority. The trends disclosed by the history of the organization of the University naturally resulted in the organization of a Senate composed of full professors. This organization still obtains.

The college executive committees must be selected from the full and associate professors. In departments organized with chairmen, the departmental executive committee must be composed of men of the ranks of assistant professor, associate professor, or professor. In the case of a department organized
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with a head, he shall consult with the other members of the departmental staff who are on indefinite tenure; that is to say the associate and full professors.

During the first year of the administration of President Chase he wrote a letter to the University Senate asking that it devote its attention to the making of a "comprehensive study of the general educational organization and administration of the University." The Senate went to work on its task at its meeting on December 1, 1930, by appointing a Committee of Nine to make the study and present it for the Senate's consideration. The Committee of Nine set up fifteen subcommittees to work on various aspects of the problem and itself set to work on the revision and amplification of the University Statutes.

The Committee worked throughout the remainder of the academic year 1930-31. The proposed Statutes were submitted to the Senate during the spring of 1931 as the Committee of Nine completed sections of its work. Subsequently, at meetings of the Board of Trustees in September and November of 1931 and May of 1932 these Statutes were approved.

From time to time there have been efforts to permit a larger opportunity to members of the faculty of less than full professorial rank in the formulation of educational policies. For example, one of the original recommendations of the Senate Committee of Nine (charged among other things with the redrafting of the University Statutes) was that the University Senate membership be expanded to include assistant and associate professors. For this proposal, however, to get before the President and hence to the Board of Trustees, it was necessary for the Senate (composed of full professors) to approve the recommendation. This approval was not forthcoming.

The Commission has interviewed a number of individuals of less than full professorial rank and has conferred with persons formerly on the faculty of the University of Illinois and with administrative officers at the University. It has heard opinions on both sides of the issue. Some administrators have expressed themselves as being in favor of representation on the University Senate for assistant and associate professors. Most of the persons of less than full professorial rank interviewed by the Commission have been of the same opinion.
From its study the Commission has received the impression that in general the younger men feel themselves left without the opportunity to make themselves heard or to participate in discussion or legislation regarding educational policy, both in the college and in the Senate. The Commission is of the opinion that the government of the faculty may be characterized as an Athenian democracy, a rule of the elders. It is further of the opinion that the present organization actually weakens the operation of the University by excluding representation of such a large portion of its teaching body from deliberations and legislation concerning educational policy.

As already stated, the pattern of organization and administration of the educational program of the University was set some decades ago and has been consistently followed in its main outlines for a considerable time preceding the present administration. There has, therefore, been no important change in this respect during the present administration. However, as already pointed out, the Commission is strongly of the opinion that this pattern needs modification in the direction of those of full professorial rank sharing organizational and administrative responsibilities with faculty members of lower rank. This comment holds true with reference to graduate as well as to undergraduate levels.

THE QUALITY OF EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP

There is a fundamental difference between the delegation of administrative powers to assistants and the exercise of central educational leadership. The president of a university is responsible to the board of control for the conduct of the university. In this relation he should see that the measures adopted by the board are carried out wherever they apply. In the discharge of this responsibility he comes into official relation with all phases of the university—educational, financial, and physical—as well as in its relation to the public.

But he also has a responsibility to the faculties of the institution in addition to seeing that the policies as adopted by the board are adhered to. He should be the educational leader of the university. In this capacity, he should stimulate faculty members and initiate sound educational policies as well as encourage those originating from other sources. His duty as head of an educational institution is not discharged merely
by maintaining the operation of the institution, educational and otherwise, at its highest continuing efficiency. He should be the central figure in constant leadership toward educational improvement.

In a university the size of the University of Illinois, it is inconceivable and humanly impossible for the president to give personal attention to all the numerous details which are involved in the discharge of his responsibilities, both as the executive agent of the board of trustees on the one hand and as educational leader on the other. In order that these duties be properly taken care of, it is necessary for him to delegate many of them. The crucial issue lies in the nature of what he delegates and what he himself does. The danger lies in the operation of the delegated powers; because of the constantly growing heavy demands upon his time, he may more and more come to depend upon the recommendations of those who are his immediate advisers and assistants and become himself an educational figurehead. This danger is particularly real in connection with the educational program of the institution, which at best is highly complex. The avenues through which the president delegates authority and the methods by which these delegations are exercised finally come to determine the centers of educational leadership and control over the institution.

The Provost

According to the Statutes of the University of Illinois, "the Provost, or such university officer as may be designated by the Board of Trustees, shall exercise the functions of the President in his absence and shall at all times be of such assistance as he can to the President by the exercise of such functions as the latter may delegate to him." It is very clear from the foregoing quotation that it was not the intention of the framers of the Statutes that responsibility for the educational program of the University should be delegated to a general administrative officer subordinate to the President of the institution. From an analysis of the actual duties performed by the Provost, as submitted to the Commission by the President of the University, it is found that he is concerned with: (1) advisory matters, (2) administrative matters, and (3) re-
search in connection with improving the instructional program of the University.

Under the first category he (a) advises the President on questions of educational policy, (b) advises the deans and directors of the schools on educational problems and determines lines of jurisdiction in questions of educational policy which cut across college or departmental lines, (c) advises other university officials and members of the faculty on administrative, professional, and personnel problems, (d) functions as the chairman of certain general committees such as the Committee on Fees and Scholarships, Advisory Committee on University Extension, Advisory Committee of the Bureau of Institutional Research, and the University War Committee.

Under the second category, the Provost acts (a) as chief executive officer of the University in the absence of the President, (b) for the President concerning additions of new courses and changes in existing courses or curricula, (c) as administrative head of the University-wide Personnel Bureau, and (d) for the President in conferences with other institutions of higher education in the State.

Under the third category he (a) directs a staff attached to his own office which is concerned with tests and problems in various university course offerings with a view toward improving the efficiency of the instructional program, and (b) advises the instructional staff on teaching problems such as experiments in teaching methods and in the development of improved examination techniques.

The Statute quoted above which authorizes the office of the Provost, gives wide latitude to the President as to the use he may make of this officer. Whether the duties now under the jurisdiction of the Provost were those contemplated when the Statute was enacted is not for the Commission to say. It is quite apparent, however, that the office of the Provost has developed into one of the very few centers of major educational control of the University.

The Bureau of Institutional Research

Although the establishment of the Bureau of Institutional Research was initiated in 1933 in connection with problems concerning the biennial budget, it was not until the fall of
1934 that the Bureau was organized on its present basis. The Director of the Bureau is immediately responsible to the President of the University. With the support of its advisory committee, "the Bureau studies the teaching, research, budgetary, and other aspects of University operation in their relation to one another, to educational policies and objectives, and to the social needs of the State. The results of a continuous internal appraisal of the operations of the University are made available to the President in special memoranda."  

In actual practice, however, it appears that the Bureau has exerted a determining influence on educational policies and administration. For example, it has submitted almost three hundred memoranda on problems of integration between the administrative, educational, and budgetary practices of the University. This influence is probably due in the main to the fact that the membership of the Advisory Committee includes such officers as the Provost who is its chairman, the Dean of the Graduate School, the Dean of the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences, the Comptroller, and the Registrar. A recommendation coming from the Director of the Bureau of Institutional Research, with the sanction of such a committee of administrators, tends strongly to stand as an administrative judgment rather than to be merely advisory in character.

**Frustration of Attempted Educational Developments**

The President, certain other higher administrative officers of the University, and some faculty members are conscious, even to the point of being self-conscious, of the need at the University for the development of an adequate undergraduate educational program. In the attempt to make the faculty conscious of this need and to take proper steps to meet it, the administration has used several devices. It has developed a staff of educational consultants in the office of the Provost. It has greatly strengthened the Bureau of Institutional Research with its influential Advisory Committee. After some years of effort it has set up under the administrative control of the Provost, a Personnel Bureau exercising a University-wide function. Despite these attempts on the part of the adminis-

---
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tration to initiate educational developments, many have met with frustration.

The Bureau of Institutional Research has probably the most comprehensive tabulation of institutional data that can be found in any university. It has brought these data to bear on administrative problems through its memoranda to the President, in a highly effective manner. Further, it has done research on internal educational problems. It has made comprehensive studies and reports on such matters of educational policy as the establishment of the General Division, the improvement of research facilities, the freshman guidance program, effect of changing admission requirements, and effect of changing fees. The Provost's staff has conducted experiments in teaching methods and in examination techniques, and has aided departments in the solution of their educational problems where help has been requested. The Personnel Bureau was made an all-University organization in July 1942.

In spite of these efforts, however, there appears to be a failure to deal effectively with educational problems. There appears to be a lack of coordination of effort and an absence of interest on the part of a large proportion of the faculty. Instead of ultimate solutions there have been repeated frustrations.

The Commission highly commends the administration for the goals which it has sought to attain through these administrative devices, and deeply appreciates the constructive plans covered by them. It believes that these efforts represent good illustrations of what desirable educational leadership in a university should be. It is of the opinion, however, that greater progress in such matters can be achieved by making it possible for a more active and wider participation on the part of the faculty as a whole, especially by lending encouragement to full participation on the part of those members of the faculty who by time and tradition are not so fully committed to the continuation of those traditional administrative and educational policies now prevailing.

**EDUCATIONAL GOALS**

Much of the preceding discussion has dealt with formal considerations especially such as department, faculty and senate organization, and sources and direction of educational leadership and control. Little has been said of educational goals.
For a university to say that it is providing opportunities for higher education gives no indication of its real purposes. For a college of liberal arts to say that it offers a college education really says nothing definite. Any educational institution should be clearly conscious of just what it is trying to do for its students, and should have reliable information as to how well it is succeeding.

But it is not enough to know these matters merely with reference to the present. A university should have a constructive educational program as it faces the future. An institution that looks mainly to maintaining its own internal organization and its own administrative checks and balances cannot do this. It must be keenly alert to the needs which mean educational services in terms of its clientele's needs; it must be constantly studying those needs and projecting its thinking into formulating programs for future educational development.

The Commission has been impressed by the serious, conscientious attitude of all the interviewed administrators and faculty members toward the duties which they believe to be theirs. Nowhere has there been observed any indication of taking duties lightly. At the same time the Commission records with deep concern the over-emphasis on the "mint and annis and cummin" to the neglect of the weightier matters of educational goals and programs. There is a marked lack of clearly defined educational goals in general education and of progressive construction of educational programs to give definite direction to the University's future educational development.

Again in justice it should be said that as far as the Commission has been able to observe there has been no further dereliction in this respect since 1934, although by force of necessity perhaps first attention has been given to providing for urgently pressing physical needs. At the same time it has been during this period that the needs of a well-formulated, well-administered educational program have been thrust to the front because of the unprecedented increase in the number of students enrolling in the University.

It is the judgment of the Commission that there is a lack of coordination and over-all educational planning for the institution.

8Matthew 23: 23.
One of the immediate and urgent tasks to which the administration and faculties of the University should address themselves is the question of what should be the long-term educational program of the University, both as a whole and also in its several departments, and what is the best plan of administrative organization to achieve these programs most effectively.