The California System: Governing and Management Principles and Their Link to Academic Excellence

by David P. Gardner, Ph. D.

President Emeritus

University of California

Twenty-fifth David Dodds Henry Lecture

University of Illinois at Chicago

The California System: Governing and Management Principles and Their Link to Academic Excellence

by David P. Gardner, Ph.D.

President Emeritus

University of California

Twenty-fifth David Dodds Henry Lecture

University of Illinois at Chicago

October 20, 2005

David Dodds Henry
President, University of Illinois
1955–71

The David Dodds Henry Lectures in Higher Education are endowed by gifts to the University of Illinois Foundation in recognition of Dr. Henry's contributions to the administration of higher education, including his career as president of the University of Illinois from 1955 until 1971. The lectures are intended to focus upon the study of the organization, structure, or administration of higher education, as well as its practice. The selection of lecturers is the responsibility of the chancellors of the three campuses of the University. Presentation of the lectures is alternated among the Chicago, Springfield, and Urbana-Champaign campuses.

Contents

Welcome, Sylvia Manning

1

Preface, B. Joseph White

2

Introduction, Sylvia Manning

4

The California System: Governing and Management
Principles and Their Link to Academic Excellence
David P. Gardner

5

Stanley O. Ikenberry Introduction, Sylvia Manning

25

Response, Stanley O. Ikenberry

27

Questions and Discussion

33

Welcome

Good afternoon everybody and welcome to the 25th annual David Dodds Henry lecture. I'm Sylvia Manning, and it's my pleasure and privilege to serve as chancellor on this campus. The University of Illinois is a family, but sometimes it seems to me that we're family that is what a family would be like if there were no words and no very clear concepts for things like father, mother, sister, brother, parent, child. We sometimes seem beset by sibling rivalries and a really confused notion of the roles of parents and children.

But there are some things that bring us together very nicely and one is that we pass from campus to campus, with great ease, the privilege of holding the annual David Dodds Henry lecture; it is something that brings us together in a special way. We share this opportunity to have a distinguished speaker, and we share it the way you always wished your children would share their precious things. I welcome you to this occasion.

Before we begin, I do want to express public thanks to our provost, Michael Tanner, under whose guidance this event was brought together this year, and through whom, among other things, we obtained our superb lecturer for today. As we start, it is my pleasure to introduce to you somebody you all know very well, our president, Joe White, who will say a few words. (Applause.)

Sylvia Manning
Chancellor
University of Illinois, Chicago

Preface

Thank you, Sylvia. Good afternoon everybody. I'm delighted to be here with you today. I'm going to be extremely brief because I am the most motivated student in the audience to hear what our guest has to say, and boy, I hope he came with a lot of answers, because I sure am dealing with a lot of questions. (Laughter.) Dr. Gardner doesn't know this, but I'm now going to tell him, one of our most retentive staff members gave me, two days ago, the test of remarks you made to a university management group 25 years ago. I read them over, and I knew your thinking at the time. I wanted to see how it's evolved and changed, but actually the main thing I enjoyed was the introduction of you that was given by a faculty member. It reminded me of how faculty keep us humble, in our roles as presidents and chancellors and deans and so on.

This faculty member introduced Dr. Gardner by saying that he was extremely excited to do the presentation because he thought he was going to be introducing Dr. John Gardner, the famous leadership guru, whose work he had admired for 25 years. And it was only when he arrived to do the presentation that he discovered that it was not that Dr. Gardner, rather than you, and even though he was very disappointed, he proceeded to give you a nice introduction. (Laughter.) I thought this is really why we love our faculty colleagues and it's the way they keep us humble.

I knew who you are; I know who you are; I knew who was going to be here. I'm looking forward to your remarks. I just want to say one thing about the namesake of the lecture series, David Dodds Henry. He was a monumental figure at the University of Illinois, in establishing this campus and in higher education. You may not know that David Dodds Henry was one of the three 16-year tenure presidents of the University of Illinois. Another,

Dr. Stanley Ikenberry, is here with us today; and Edmund James, who is the third 16-year president of the University of Illinois.

David Dodds Henry had an enormous influence in the development of the University of Illinois, and particularly, on the development of this campus and it's very, very fitting that we remember him today, here at the University of Illinois at Chicago, and with remarks by Dr. Gardner. Welcome to our university. Sylvia. (Applause.)

B. Joseph White
President
University of Illinois

Introduction, Sylvia Manning

It's a great, great pleasure and an honor indeed to introduce David Pierpont Gardner, a highly regarded, truly visionary person in higher education, and you all know that, because that's why you're here. He's recognized nationally, of course, for his leadership of the 10-campus, actually then I suppose nine-campus University of California system, where he served as its 15th president between 1983 and 1992.

Prior to that, he served as the president of the University of Utah for 10 years. He set a very high standard for excellence in leadership in higher education, and he continues to influence higher education policy and reform through service on a variety of commissions, boards and so forth, including service as president of the William and Flora Hewlett Foundation from 1993 to 1999 and as chair of the board of the J. Paul Getty Trust from 2000 to 2004.

He also served, earlier than that, as chairman of the National Commission on Excellence in Education, which produced the report that remains a by-word in American education, the 1983 *A Nation At Risk*. That report shook our whole country into recognition of a silent crisis and sparked decades at attempts of reform. He is, of course, the author of several articles and several books on higher education reform and policy.

Most recently, *Earning My Degree*, is a collection of memoirs recounting his experiences leading the University of California system, surely one of the most complex and distinguished institutions in the country, and indeed in the world. We are really pleased to have David Gardner here to deliver this 25th David Dodds Henry lecture entitled, "The California System: Governing and Management Principles and Their Link to Academic Excellence." David. (Applause.)

The California System: Governing and Management Principles and Their Link to Academic Excellence

David P. Gardner, Ph.D.

Thank you for that introduction Chancellor Manning, Presidents White and Ikenberry and friends, ladies, and gentlemen. The University of Illinois is not the only place that knows how to keep presidents humble, as President White has already made clear. When I had been at the University of Utah for only a couple of weeks, I was told that it was customary for the President of the University to visit the football team. I said, well, I'm happy to do that, and asked my assistant if she'd get together all of the information relevant to the team and its prospects, the name of the coach and all of those things.

I did my homework and visited the team practicing on the nearby athletic field. I asked the coach to whistle the team in. The first young man came in much more quickly than the rest of the team. The rest kind of lumbered in. I knew then what kind of season we were going to have. (Laughter.) So, I'm standing there looking at this young man and said, "I know who you are" (I remembered because I'd done my homework); and "you're a graduate of Berkeley High School." "Yes I am," he said; I said, "Well, so am I." "Oh yeah," he said, "who the hell are you?" (Laughter.) Anyway I was off to a great start there. (Laughter.)

I am greatly pleased and honored to be here today, and appreciate the chance to visit with friends, colleagues, and others who have come to share in this discussion. I'm also pleased because this is my first visit to the Chicago campus of the University of Illinois, and I'm much impressed. We had a tour of the campus this morning. Unfortunately, it is very cold and ours

was a driving tour. We came only with a California dress on, suit I mean. (Laughter.) Well in California, you never know right? (Laughter.)

But more importantly, I'm honored because I am invited to deliver the David Dodd Henry lecture, the 25th anniversary lecture; so I feel especially honored. I also remember how much President Henry influenced the character and course of American higher education, not just the University of Illinois'. I'm also happy to be here today because so many friends of mine have been Henry lecturers over the years, including Clark Kerr in 1972, Howard Bowen in '78, Hanna Gray in '81, Martin Trow in '84, John Slaughter in '85, Frank Rhodes in '90, Walter Massey in '94, Jack Peltason in '95, Ann Reynolds in '98, Jim Duderstat in '99, and Stan Ikenberry in 2000; so I feel very comfortable being here.

I've titled my lecture "The California System: Governing and Management Principles and their Link to Academic Excellence;" and I've done so for the following reasons: In the literature on higher education and in the conversations we have about our colleges and universities, we tend to disaggregate the component parts of this vast enterprise, but then often fail to connect these parts, or at the very least, to mark their inner connectedness within the whole.

For example, we offer separate courses and write articles and books about governing arrangements in the structure, management techniques, and styles of leadership, about university finance and the politics of seeking and securing funding, and about the changing character of our students and the evolving nature of the professoriate, along with the steady increase in the number and proportions of part-time temporary faculty members teaching in our institutions. We tend to deal with all of these in a disaggregated way.

We lament the deficiencies in our undergraduate programs and the sometimes excessive specialization in our graduate schools. We call for greater ethnic and racial diversity within the student body of our more selective colleges and universities. We take account of the disturbing levels of political correctness on our campuses, and the increasing tendencies of governors, legislatures, and even governing boards to reach in and seek to influence the most subtle and private aspects of our professional work, and the culture and customs that envelope it. We struggle to understand and then allow for the differing ways people learn and the impact of new technologies on the way we teach.

When we think about these issues, in other words, we tend to divide our course work, research, and writing into their component parts. These parts, of course, are deserving of study and analysis and of rigorous examination in their own right. But they are also deserving of more than just the unworkable answers that so often are the result of these endeavors failing, as they not uncommonly do, to take account of the totality of the enterprise and the dynamic of the whole in relation to its varied and separable parts.

If we are to have solutions and not just unworkable answers from these studies, the inner-connectedness of these issues will require more attention and explication than they are receiving today. Therefore, in my remarks, using the 10-campus University of California system as a surrogate, I intend to link certain governing and management principles to other essentialities at my institution and then to tie these matters to the reasons for the University of California's rapid rise to prominence, now generally acknowledged to be the most distinguished public university in the world, and its Berkeley Campus, the best balanced and most distinguished of them all.

One of my illustrious predecessors at the University of California and a mentor and close friend of many years was Clark Kerr, recently deceased. In the early part of his 1963 Godkin lectures at Harvard, famously entitled the "Uses of the University," now in its fifth edition, Kerr observed that "about 85 institutions in the western world established by 1520 still exist in recognizable form, with similar functions and unbroken histories, including the Catholic Church, the Parliaments of the Isle of Man and of Iceland, and of Great Britain, several Swiss cantons, and 70 universities. Kings that ruled, feudal lords with vassals, and guilds with monopolies are all gone. These 70 institutions, however, are still in the same locations, with some of the same buildings, with professors and students doing much the same things, and with governance carried on in much the same ways."

These institutions count in our world and so do their more modern counterparts, and one might ask how is it that these institutions, so conservative about their own affairs and so liberal about everyone else's, possess such inner strength and resilience, adaptability, and steadfastness to have overcome the centuries; and how have some emerged triumphant while others waned or withered?

To answer these questions, of course, would require a reach well beyond the boundaries of today's lecture. But by reference to the University of California's 137 years of experience, some insight might be gained.

I should now mention something about the State of California. There are nearly 40 million people in the State of California; and as most people have suspected for a long time, California's a unique place. Well, it's certainly on the far reaches of the West Coast, and in a way, it's a nation state of its own. When we talk about a system of higher education, we're not talking about a state of 1.8 million as in Utah or other parts of the west, or even some of the

smaller states in other parts of the country. That there are 40 million people in the State of California makes a difference and influences every policy decision and controversy.

The University of California is at the top tier of a tri-partite system of public higher education in California. The other two tiers include the California State University and the Community College System.

Each of these three public systems: the University of California, the California State University System, and the Community College System, has an assigned mission under the master plan for higher education in California distinct in some ways but overlapping in others. The pool of students eligible for admission to each system is differentiated, just as are the formulae used by the legislature in budgeting state funds for each of them. Each system has its own governing board; and students in the two-year community colleges can be assured of transfer rights at the completion of their sophomore year, either to the California State University or the University of California, assuming eligibility.

Since 1960, the system has operated under terms negotiated by the leaders of California's colleges and universities, private and public alike. The plan was enacted into law in 1960 and called the California Master Plan for Higher Education. The plan has been studied worldwide as a model for those states or countries wishing to increase access to higher education, while improving its overall quality, not believing that by increasing access a dimunition of quality necessarily follows. Both can be attained.

With minor changes, the plan has remained in force to this very day, although adverse budget pressures in California are presently stressing the plan, and the ability of the public colleges and universities to honor it.

It should also be noted, however, that the master plan could never have been conceived by state government acting alone, much less put into effect. It required not government, but the voluntary collaboration of the state's higher education leaders to accomplish this task.

Enough now of the context and on to the University of California's place within it. The University of California is one of the world's most complex and sophisticated institutions. It enrolls some 215,000 students on its 10 campuses. It employs some 180,000 persons, and it manages five major medical centers and three national laboratories for the Federal government.

The national laboratories are owned by the U.S. Department of Energy and managed by the University of California. They are located at Los Alamos, New Mexico and at Livermore, California (which because they are engaged in planning and designing the nation's strategic arsenal of nuclear weapons are the object of not inconsequential controversy) and the third is the Lawrence Berkeley Laboratory.

The annual budget for campus operations at the University of California (UC) is $15 billion, excluding the national laboratories.

The University is a formidable enterprise to govern and manage, not only because of its public character but more because of the work it does and of the highly educated and independent people who do it.

As a student of UC's history, as a former undergraduate and graduate student at Berkeley, as a vice chancellor at its Santa Barbara Campus during the years of student unrest, in the late to mid-1960s, and as a vice president and president of the University, I have come to believe that there are eight main reasons for the University's rapid rise to eminence. As I identify them now, I will also point out how they link to the University's ability to seek for excellence in all it does.

Now, I wish to point out that my views are not singular; they're shared by a significant number of people within the University of California. My own views have been influenced by my acquaintance and, in many instances, friendship with most of the University's leaders over the larger part of the 20th century.

For example, of the 59 persons who served as chairman or vice chairman of the board of regents since 1920 to the date of my retirement in 1992, I've known 53 of the 59. I'm older than I look. (Laughter.) Anyway, be that as it may, of the University's 18 presidents since 1869, I've known eight; of the university's 49 chancellors, I've known 45; of the 29 members of the faculty who chaired the Senate's Academic Council and who represented the voice of the faculty at regents' meetings, I've known 20. Thus, the eight reasons that I'm now going to share with you were not merely a consequence of my own study and observations, but also of the collective judgment and opinions of most of the university's principal leaders during the last half century and beyond.

The eight, having a rough order of descending significance follow: **FIRST**, the university's favored constitutional position from which flows a nearly absolute level of autonomy over its own affairs, both *de jure* and *de facto*.

Article IX, section IX of the State Constitution provides for the creation of the university. It wasn't created by an action of the legislature. It's embodied in the state's highest law, the state constitution.

Article IX, section IX of the State Constitution vests unqualified authority to govern the university in the board of regents, and requires the regents to keep the university free of sectarian and political influence in the conduct of its internal affairs.

Those writing the constitution were determined to put as much distance as possible between the university and the legislature's judgment about university operations, programs, policies, teaching, research, and public service. They chose to do so by creating, in effect, a fourth branch of government in California, in addition to the executive, legislative, and judicial branches, namely, the University of California.

In practice, and by custom, this means that the university has control of its own personnel (academic and non-academic alike), including conditions of employment, compensation, pensions, and so forth.

It fixes its own admissions policies (within the boundaries of the master plan, which the regents voluntarily accepted as the university's own, as it couldn't be imposed); determines the curriculum; establishes new schools, colleges, departments, institutes, bureaus, and centers, or their disestablishment; sets the standards and requirements for earning degrees; adopts its own code of student conduct and a code for faculty as well; negotiates its own contracts with unionized personnel (mostly staff, not faculty); appoints and removes university officers; approves its own bylaws and standing orders; constructs and owns its own physical plant; enters into contracts with others; invests its own funds and has the ownership and fiduciary duty over all assets of every kind owned by the university, including funds appropriated by the state; adopts its own policies, or revisions or rescissions thereof; and fixes student fees and tuitions.

While these rights and duties taken singly may not appear to be telling, taken together, they form a fabric of protection against the disposition of powerful persons and public and private institutions in our society, whose judgment about critical university matters would otherwise come to replace or unduly influence that of the university's.

Thus, the governing structure put in place well over a century ago has proven to be the footings and foundation of a sturdy structure, capable of withstanding the wear and tear of criticism, pressure, hostility, and resentment that from time to time focuses on the university from interested and/or agitated parties, both from without and from within, and in recent years, increasingly from within.

Allow me to illustrate this point. In the 1980s we were having a disagreement with certain legislators on an issue; and they managed to put into the appropriation act instructing language as regards this matter, and said that if we didn't do what they directed, a million dollars would be stricken from the president's budget. Of course, we didn't do it. Thus the next year, when I appeared before the same committee, the chairman said, "Well, President Gardner, I see that once again, the University of California has disregarded the express wishes of the California State Legislature."

No, I responded, not once again as this is the first time we've had this kind of impasse since I've been here. Secondly, we did not disregard your admonition. We regarded it, but we simply disagree with you. Senator Tom Hayden was sitting there and said, "Well, so much for the California State Legislature." I then observed that he and his fellow legislators had their constitutional responsibility, just as we had ours. We disagree with you on this matter for the reasons with which you are well informed. We are not going to do it even if you put it into the budget again. I made the point very nicely, and with some humor, but the message got across, nevertheless. (Laughter.)

SECOND, is the conduct of the board of regents and the crucial decisions the board has made the last 137 years.

Twenty-six regents govern the University of California. Eighteen are appointed for 12-year terms. They're appointed for 12-year terms so no one governor can control the board. (I don't mean they might not try; it's just by and large that they can't.) Eight others hold voting, but ex-officio, seats as regents for as long as they hold the following positions: the governor, lieutenant governor, speaker of the assembly, superintendent of public construction, president of the alumni association, vice president of the alumni association, president of the university, and a student regent appointed by the board for a one-year term.

Non-voting members with the right to sit at the table and to comment but not to vote include two faculty members (the chair and the vice chair of the Academic Senate).

How the regents meet their responsibilities, interact with the president and key administrative officers, organize themselves and their work, and make decisions is crucial. How they do their work, in other words, is critical.

The president of the university is responsible for fixing the board's agenda. This is no small matter. One cannot get an item on the agenda without the president putting it on, unless the committee of cognizance hearing the issue votes unanimously to put it on, which won't happen because the president is an ex officio member of every committee, except audit; or if the full board of regents, by two-thirds vote, votes to put something on over the president's objection and that's not very likely either, all things considered. The president's authority in this matter is critical in the working of UC's governing system.

To track the preparation of an agenda item for the regents would require charting the university's deliberative, consultative and decision-making process, involving staff, faculty, and sometimes students, administrators,

and university officers throughout the nine campuses. The issues are usually complex and often contentious and require substantial lead time and multiple layers of review before reaching the president's desk for final consideration and approval, and for calendaring as an item for general information, discussion, or action. The regents, of course, do not live in our world. Most of them live in a corporate, legal culture, and the university's academic culture sometimes produces impatience, lack of understanding and therefore, unneeded and unhelpful controversy. Moreover, they are mostly political appointees, but at the same time, expected to safeguard the university's political neutrality. In fact, they're bound to do it, under article IX, section IX provisions of the Constitution. Even though being beholden, at least in part and early on, to the political forces that led to their serving as regents, time tends to socialize regents to their duty, with the longest serving regents often being the most influential and the most independent, and for that reason, the most effective. And with 12-year terms, no one governor can control the board, even if disposed to do so.

The reality, however, is that with three or four notable exceptions, the members of the board of regents have, for nearly 140 years now, proven to be real champions and protectors of the university, dedicated to its welfare, jealous of its autonomy, demurring to its presidents most of the time, and willing to assert their constitutional role, when need be in encounters with other influential constituencies within the university's encompassing orbit of interested parties.

THIRD, the steady and diligent commitment to the concept of the University of California as a single university operating on 10 campuses.

The university is a single corporate entity; it is governed by a single board of regents, possessing nearly unqualified constitutional authority. There

is one president appointed by the regents, to whom sufficient authority is given to exercise UC's central executive authority. There is one Academic Senate, with branches on each campus, or divisions as they're now called, exercising authority delegated directly to it, not by the administration, but by the board of regents. There is a single consolidated university budget for the state's share of UC funding, recommended by the president, approved by the regents and submitted by the board to the governor and legislature for review and action.

As to the operating budget, one cannot tell from a reading of UC's budget how much money is going to each campus. It's a consolidated budget for all of the campuses, by object of expenditure. It is not budgeted by campus. When it's submitted by the regents to the governor, and when the appropriation is made by the legislature, the budgeted funds are allocated within the university by the president, not by the regents. So the regional or parochial considerations that are not uncharacteristic of the governing arrangements in much of American higher education, by and large, are mostly absent in the University of California.

There is a single set of personnel policies, salary schedules and policies for UC faculty and other academic personnel. There are university wide negotiations with the unionized staff, and common fees and charges for all students across all 10 campuses, except for some campus-specific programs or facilities.

There is a single voice speaking on behalf of the university to state and federal governments, under the direction of the president, who has the authority to decide what position the university should take on any piece of legislation of interest to UC, either in the Congress or in the state legislature. This helps to insulate the campuses from direct political interference and focuses the pressure on the president instead.

The concept of a single university operating on 10 campuses permits the university to reconcile and resolve its internal differences internally. It allows for a budget process that, when ready for regional and state review, enjoys the confidence of the entire institution, thus instilling unexpected levels of internal self-discipline among and between all interested parties and campuses.

For example, the operating budget, as I've noted, is a comprehensive object of expenditure budget for the UC system, not a budget showing expenditures by campus. The capital budget, in contrast, is by necessity a list of buildings by campus. However, when once decided by the president, following extensive consultation and internal negotiations, the operating and capital budgets then move to the regents for approval and submission to the governor and for action by the legislature.

I'd like to point out that on the capital budget, which is identifiable by campus, any chancellor who would undertake to lobby the regents or the governor or the legislature to change the regents' priorities to the advantage of his or her campus, wouldn't be there very long. So, there's an internal self-discipline that keeps that natural tendency in check.

This unified approach should not be understood as precluding the campuses from participating fully in the process of securing funds from the state for UC's overall operating and capital budgets. We count on the chancellors to help with this task. Similarly, legislation at the Federal government level enjoys comparable coordination and involvement on matters of interest to UC: research policies and funding, student financial aid programs, intellectual property rights, patent and royalty protections, privacy laws, and so forth.

The university, therefore, is enabled to speak to such issues and matters as a single institution, with its many parts on the same page, and with a

common agenda, whatever the differences may have been in the process of putting the budget together.

This is the expected consequence of a university possessing an embedded system of shared governance with the academic senate and administration, a diligent governing board reserving only to itself what authority it must retain to meet its obligations, and a state constitution that anticipates governing arrangements that would meet the founders test of keeping the university free from sectarian or political influence in the administration of its internal affairs.

FOURTH, is the willingness of the board of regents to delegate nearly all of its constitutional authority to the president and of the president, in turn, to delegate most of his or her authority to the chancellors on the 10 campuses.

The role of the president is pivotal to the sustainability of the university as a single institution; the effective functioning of the governing board, and of the academic senate; the securing and allocation of UC resources; the appointment of its key officers; and, the coherent exercise of its executive powers, the preservation of its constitutional autonomy and the discharge of its ceremonial and symbolic obligations.

The president holds the single position within the university that is accountable for the totality of its endeavors. The chancellors are responsible for advocating for their campus, the vice presidents are staff to the president in their respective areas of responsibility, and the regents can only act collectively, with respect to the institution as a whole. It is only the president who has responsibility for the whole enterprise.

It cannot be said that UC's president lacks authority. The position possesses it in abundance, but it is only in the exercise of this authority that its usefulness to UC and its effect within the university can be judged. The

realities are that the president, the vice presidents, the chancellors and the academic senate must work as colleagues, in collaboration and with mutual respect and regard for UC's system of shared governance, for it to work at all; and, the regents count on it working that way.

This custom of deliberative, consultative and professional and collegial approach to problems, as well as to opportunities, helps to sustain UC's independence while steadying it during times of travail. But it does not hinder its forward momentum when more favorable conditions prevail.

I am aware that these comments may be misunderstood. They may be interpreted to mean that UC is not much different than most other universities thought by the public to be hopelessly burdened with a system of consultation and collegiality that is hurtful, if not debilitating and destructive to the efforts our colleges and universities are making to confront the difficult issues and to make the hard decisions. I don't mean to suggest that at all. Indeed, I mean to covey a message entirely different than such a misinterpretation would suggest.

One often reads in the literature of higher education that university presidents are powerless, that the faculties are hopelessly resistant to change, that the unions have immobilized the staff and sapped their institutional loyalty, that the students attack whatever the administration does, and that the governing boards afford the president precious little discretion, while holding him or her responsible for virtually everything.

I did not find these pessimistic, if not cynical, assertions to be in the least bit true, not in 10 years at Utah and not in nearly a decade in California. University presidents not only have substantial authority but also possess abundant influence and power. Although none of these attributes makes much difference if not fully exercised or fully engaged.

FIFTH, the regents' decision in 1920 to delegate direct and full authority to the Academic Senate over courses of instruction and curricular requirements and for the setting of UC's academic standards for student admissions. The Academic Senate has the right to organize itself in the University of California as it wishes, to create and to appoint members of its committees as it chooses, without interference from either the university's administrative officers or the regents.

While not technically part of management, the Senate plays an indirect part in virtually every major decision within the university. Funding of new academic initiatives for example, funding for the construction of new or the renovation of older facilities, for our libraries, computer centers, clinics, and hospitals and the like; issues of compensation for all personnel, allocation of faculty positions across the university, fellowship funds and so forth, all involve consultation with the Senate.

Contrary to popular belief, my experience both at Utah and California was that the faculty nearly invariably acted and advised in the most thoughtful and rational of ways, respectful of both their roles and of others. While this is not necessarily the same judgment I would make about some of the opinions and counsel received from individual faculty members, it was true of the interactions I had with the Senate in its many forms over a 20-year period.

SIXTH, the adoption of a common standard for freshman admission to all nine UC campuses which makes eligible for freshman admission the top 12 1/2 percent of students completing high school in California in any given year. Such students are eligible for freshman admission to the University of California, and a place is found for every one of them on one of our campuses, although not necessarily on the campus of their preference, or in the

major of their choosing, but we provide them their chance. We also admit the top 4 percent of the students graduating from any given California high school in any given year, a new policy recently adopted by the Regents.

This standard, while mandated in 1960 by the California Master Plan, approximated UC's historic standards for admission since the early part of the 20th century. To be eligible for freshman admission to the University of California it requires the completion of certain courses grades nine through 12, with a minimum grade point average of 3.3 in the courses required for admission, and competitive scores on certain standardized tests. In actuality the entering freshman class within the University of California averages about 3.89.

These standards have been refined in recent years, but only at the margins. Our affirmative action programs also impacted the admissions process, as will the pending changes in the SAT examinations, prompted by UC president Richard Atkinson's criticism of these tests three years ago. These admission standards help assure that UC will have a student body of exceptional promise and ability, thus attracting to our campuses faculty members wishing to teach such students and to engage them in their own research endeavors.

SEVENTH, the university's development of multiple sources of revenue to augment, indeed even to leverage, the core support provided by the state. The university chose to follow this path of multiple sources of funding well over 40 years ago, not because of waning state support or a dearth of students, but instead at the very time state budgets were favorable and enrollments were expected to double. This effort to broaden the base of our financial support came when everything else was looking promising, not when things were looking unpromising.

Today, some 11 to 12 percent of the federally funded research in our nation's universities is done by campuses of the University of California, excluding the national labs. Ten to 12 percent of the country's Ph.D.'s are received from the University of California and UC receives over a billion dollars a year from the private sector in the form of outright gifts. UC's auxiliary operations are run without any state support whatsoever. For example, UC enrolls 360,000 students in its far-flung extension programs, which are entirely self-supporting. Eighty percent of UC's operating budget comes from other than state funds and fifty percent of UC's capital budget comes from other than state funds.

These varied sources of support, together with the discretion to allocate state appropriations as the university thinks best, permits UC to make budgetary adjustments based more on their merits than in response to pressure groups or political, gubernatorial, or legislative mandates or preferences, usually expressed in the form of threats or promises or both.

It's hard to overstate how important this reality is for it enables the university to make decisions to strengthen academic programs and so forth, while curtailing or eliminating poor ones.

EIGHTH and final, the pride in the university held by the people of California and the generous level of state support they have historically provided over the years. While it is not true that state funds for UC have been constantly favorable, or always sufficient, it is fair to say that on balance and over time, they have been and they come from the state to UC in the form of a block grant rather than as earmarked funds.

It has been my experience that the people of California do care about the University of California. They respect its capability, high standards, and accomplishments and identify their own ambitions with what UC offers to

persons prepared to study there. The people support us when things are going well, but send us a message, via the state budget, when they are furious with us, as during the loyalty oath controversy 1949 to 1952, the free speech movement at Berkeley in 1964, and the anti-Vietnam war protest in the late 1960s, among others. In any event, Californians do care about the university. Public indifference toward the university is not a problem.

While these eight reasons bear directly upon UC's rise to prominence and the excellence of its programs, I have not elaborated on them as I could, given our time constraints today. I've also omitted reference to UC's historic commitment to the underlying values of academic life, shared with free universities everywhere, and as with all such institutions UC is determined to secure and protect these values within a system of governance and management, which in large part was itself designed to secure these very objectives.

In remarks made to the university's board of regents in 1985, during the controversy over South African divestment, (some of you may recall that controversy), I made the following reference to these most basic of academic values. I conclude today by quoting from my remarks made at that time:
"The University of California, like all universities in America, is committed to the established values of academic life. Patient inquiry, the sequential development of ideas, the emphasis on reasoned discussion and criticism; and the continued reference to evidence. These values affirm the university's faith in intelligence and knowledge and its obligation to ensure the conditions for their free exercise. Ideas are to be welcomed, exchanged, critically examined, freely debated, and respected.

"These values are the means by which the cause of truth is carried forward. They are the values that distinguish the university from governments,

churches, businesses, and other institutions, parties, groups, and associations in our society. They form the core of the enterprise and the basis of whatever respect and freedom the university can hope to command from a larger society. They should be nurtured and protected, not contravened. These values stand in contrast to economic sanctions, boycotts, institutional pressuring, and similar means of effecting change, which are more coercive than they are authentic expressions of the human will."

Within the context of the divestment controversy, these remarks were unevenly received; but that's my view of it and, while it may go without saying, it is also helpful to remember that these values have been honored and mostly sustained from the 12th century on by our predecessors who somehow managed, in the face of complexity, indifference, ignorance, hostility, or despair, to raise the university's lamp high enough to illuminate not only the university's sense of its own purpose and future but also its link to a more broadly civilized and cultured society. *Fiat lux*, Let There be Light. Thank you. (Applause.)

Stanley O. Ikenberry Introduction, Sylvia Manning

Sylvia Manning: Thank you so much David. You have given us, at least me, so many different things to think about that I'm very grateful that my next task is not to offer a coherent response but merely to introduce our official responder, after which there will be questions and answers, with questions and comments welcome from the entire group.

UIC as we know it today was formed in 1982 by the merger of the University of Illinois Health Sciences Center, what we now refer to as the west side of this campus, and the then University of Illinois at Chicago Circle, what we now call the east side. I have taken, in recent years, to describing this merger sometimes as a shotgun marriage. I now present to you the man who was holding the gun. (Applause.) Stan Ikenberry served as the 14th president of the University of Illinois, from 1979 to 1995, and after that as the 10th president of the American Council on Education (ACE). In addition to taking responsibility for the merger that created UIC, as we all now know and love it, he posted several accomplishments in Urbana, including the creation of the Beckman Institute for Advanced Science and Technology and the National Center for Supercomputer Applications. He led the university's first major capital campaign and then launched a second one in the late '80s, raising over one billion dollars.

He also significantly increased the quality and the diversity of the student body, including programs such as the PAP, the President's Advancement Program. As ACE president, among his accomplishments, he led the higher education community through the development and passage of the Clinton Administration's Hope Scholarship and Lifetime Learning Tax Credits, a significant transformation of the relationship between the financing of higher education and the tax code.

He returned to the Urbana campus in 2001, where he now serves as Regent Professor as well as President Emeritus and continues to infuse in all of us his remarkable energy for the support and transformation of higher education. And as David Gardner mentioned, in 2000 he was on this campus to present the David Dodds Henry lecture himself. Now, to respond, Stan.

(Applause.)

Response,
Stanley O. Ikenberry

Thank you, Sylvia, and thank you, David, for being here. David Gardner and I have been close friends and colleagues for as long as either one of us can remember and that, as David acknowledged, that is a long time indeed. It is wonderful to have you here.

It is especially fitting that this particular lecture is located on this particular campus since there are such strong similarities between UCLA and the University of Illinois at Chicago. I often have reflected on the similar institutional growth patterns shared by these two urban campuses.

Your story, David, of "who the hell are you" did remind me how easy it is to be humbled in these jobs on occasion. Not in the role as president, but as a young first time academic dean at West Virginia. I had just been appointed dean at about 29 years of age. I was driving to campus one Saturday morning to attend a meeting. No campus in the world has a more difficult parking situation than West Virginia, built on hillsides with no flat place to park a car. I pulled into the building where I was headed and found a barricade across the entry. I stopped and a gentleman came out from the shadows of the building walking toward my car. I rolled down the window of my Volkswagen as he told me there would be no parking here today. I pleaded since my meeting was starting in just a few minutes, but he explained, "this is the day of PIT WVU football game." I continued to plead, explaining I had a reserved spot, to which he responded, "I'm sorry the dean has said there is no parking here today." (Laughter.) I looked at him and said, but you don't understand, I am the dean!! And he smiled and said, "You damn kids'll try anything!" (Laughter.) Now that's not quite as good as "who the hell are you," but I think it's in the same file folder. (Laughter.)

As David Gardner points out, no public university, no state master plan for higher education is as widely modeled, highly regarded, well-known, and emulated as is California's. In a very real sense, the late Clark Kerr who you mentioned as your mentor was, in many ways, responsible not just for the California Master Plan in which he was the central figure, but also for transforming the University of California into what we know it today.

Eight crucial building blocks have been identified as having made the difference for the University of California, and for the most part, I agree. All eight elements, especially if taken together as a coherent whole, were crucial.

Take constitutional autonomy for example. Illinois, for good or ill, does not enjoy constitutional autonomy. Our autonomy, such as it is, is merely statutory, not constitutional. Still, autonomy in whatever form, confers academic and operational freedom and gives the university the capacity to conduct its own affairs.

The issue is not one of power and control, but one of integrity of inquiry, pursuit of truth, absent political intervention. It is that freedom that lends significance to constitutional autonomy, or autonomy in whatever form it may take.

The point illustrates a broader principle those of us in academic life too often take for granted: that the grant of autonomy ultimately comes from the society of which we are a part, from the American people, from Californians. Americans have been willing to grant universities and colleges, both public and private, a remarkable degree of freedom or autonomy.

Universities are not treated as if they were the state highway department. We are not organized that way, nor do we manage our affairs that way. Universities have close relationships with state government, but we are

not "part of" government itself. I would argue these roots of autonomy and academic freedom are in fact, culturally derived from the democratic society in which we live.

The values so eloquently cited by President Gardner, in conclusion, patient inquiry, the value of ideas, reasoned discussion and criticism, reference to evidence, faith and intelligence, and the free exercise thereof; these values are absolutely fundamental to academic life. They are also in an equally fundamental way, rooted in the culture of which we are a part. Whether the application takes the form of constitutional autonomy, or whether it emerges more generally as a wise and gentle legislative deference, the crucial element is the university's right to govern its own affairs.

The autonomy we enjoy is derived from the value system but it is also a matter of public trust. We must be attentive to nurturing both the societal value system and in fact merit the public trust so that, at the end of the day, academic institutions can preserve the academic freedom and autonomy so central to our function as a free university.

I was especially intrigued, David, by your reference to the single-university 10-campus University of California concept. Here at Illinois I often used similar language referring to "one university," and at the time, two campuses. The concept of a single university with multiple campuses provides an interesting conceptual point to reflect on.

For some universities to make the "single university" claim—let's think of the University of Wisconsin, for example, or the University of North Carolina, to cite another—for these systems to make the claim of one university with multiple campuses I think would be a bit strained. In the case of the University of California, UC makes the valid claim because of its origins, growing from Berkeley to UCLA and to ultimately including the expansive

10-campus system we know today. The University emerged organically from the initial deep and productive roots in the soil at Berkeley.

That same pattern of organic growth characterizes the University of Illinois. The health sciences center in Chicago was an important part of the University of Illinois from the university's earliest origins. Ultimately, it was joined by Navy Pier, this university's response to the baby boom. From that grew the Chicago Circle Campus and the University of Illinois at Chicago.

Given what I would argue was "organic growth" at Illinois is not to suggest the absence of tensions and differences of view and perspective. Still, it is the wholeness of the academic enterprise that lends the university its strength.

This is worth mention because, for all the reasons President Gardner asserts, there must be accountability and public trust. A university, be it the University of California or the University of Illinois, must have a strong, clear, ultimately accountable and unambiguous voice speaking for it. Amidst all of the delegation and the incredible decentralization that takes place in the academic enterprise, there must be one ultimately accountable person of authority. The president must manage the interface between the university community on the one hand and the much broader, comprehensive outside world on the other, with particular attention to accountability, trust, and confidence. We often misunderstand the complex systems within which we function.

Let me turn to the California Master Plan for a second. With all of the good the Master Plan has accomplished, and the many times it has been emulated, I would be interested in learning more about President Gardner's judgment as to whether there have been downsides, or unintended consequences, of the California Master Plan.

The Plan was designed, as I read it, to differentiate roles and functions among the higher education institutions in the State of California. This was terribly important at the time of the Plan's creation and it helped guide the growth of the massive California higher education system over almost half a century. It enabled the State of California to manage that expansion wisely and creatively.

Still, did the simplicity and clarity of the California Master Plan make it more difficult for California higher education to adapt and respond to the changing demands for access to higher education in one of this country's most populous and growing states?

Does the Plan continue to address the cultural issues, the economic and social issues that today are driving California? Put another way, should we assume Clark Kerr's negotiated masterpiece will endure throughout the ages unchanged?

Let me conclude by returning to the question of public trust, since that is crucial to understanding the social compact between public universities and society. Growing out of the land grant tradition we both share, the societal compact was clear. The commitment was one of broad access, low or no tuition, which the University of California enjoyed for a long time. The commitment was to a curriculum that was responsive to the changing needs of the society and a pledge to put knowledge to work in service to the people. In return for these fundamentals was society's pledge of sustained public investment.

The terms and conditions of the social compact, however, have shifted today, on both sides. My second question to Dr. Gardner would be: how would California and Illinois describe the social compact of 2005? The terms of access are certainly more selective and restrictive; the price of tuition is

considerably greater; the range of studies is much broader than any of us could have imagined, so broad that at times, for undergraduates, we worry if the central academic core may have been blurred or lost. Public investment in California, and in most states, has experienced sharp swings. In this state, and in most states across the country, there have been sharp swings up and down but an unmistakable trend of diminished public support.

Some use the "P" term (Privatization) that I find a bit distasteful. It does, however, go to the heart of the social compact and the very nature of public universities, such as the University of California and Illinois. So one could ask, how will today's Clark Kerr and today's David Gardner navigate these choppy changing waters? And how will today's vision of the Master Plan ultimately be modified and redefined to reflect and reinforce the new social compact?

Having asked those questions, I want to thank you again for coming here, for adding such luster to a series of lectures that honor truly one of the great presidents of the University of Illinois, David Dodds Henry. If he were with us today, I am sure he would be applauding your very thoughtful remarks. Thank you again for favoring us with your presence. (Applause.)

Questions and Discussion

Sylvia Manning: We would welcome comments and questions. It's always these people who you know have questions ... there you are, you're bursting, go ahead.

Audience Member: (Inaudible.)

Sylvia Manning: She's right down here in the second row. We've got a microphone for you here; you have a gentle voice.

Audience Member: Thanks. Pride: you said about trying to nurture pride in the community or in the state for the college system, how do you go about doing that, because I think that's lacking, acknowledgment of the value of the university and, therefore, they're not willing to support it.

Dr. Gardner: We rely on our alumni to help us in that respect. We have 10 campuses strategically sprinkled across the state. Members of our faculty and staff and students are an integral part of these communities, or neighboring ones. We encourage their active participation in the civic life of the communities. There are no walls around our campuses. People are invited on for various functions: cultural, intellectual, athletic, social, and so forth.

Each part of the university also undertakes to create its own constituency: the library does, the athletic program does, each of the schools and colleges do, and so forth. Beyond that, we make sure that we're as transparent as possible, with the people and the press. We're available; we respond. I used to go out and meet with the editorial boards regularly. I tried to alert them to what was going on, the problems we were having, where we succeeded and where we failed. So we're as transparent as we could possibly be.

Sylvia Manning: Thank you. Susan.

Susan: As you know, I was part of the UC system for 20 years, and we don't have a formal master plan here in Illinois, but we do have a similar set of tiers, in the sense of university and then something like the California State Colleges. One of the things that I saw happening and still see happening in California and can be an issue here, I'd like your thoughts on, is what I call "mission creep," where you're supposed to have the 10 university campuses and then the state system, and you're supposed to have some divisions of labor but the state system is starting to encroach a little on the university mission. Is that good or bad and how do, how would you address it, or how should we be thinking about it?

Dr. Gardner: Well, we address the issue by pointing out how such "mission creep" is inconsistent with the master plan. This always helps because there is a plan and it cannot unilaterally be amended by any college or university. The legislature and governor would have to agree to amend it. This was, of course, one of the foreseen problems; it was not an unforeseen problem. Such pressure was expected when the master plan was developed. It's also true that no small percentage of the faculty serving in the California State University system were educated as graduate students at the University of California. Naturally, they bring their own academic experiences to their own faculty position and they like what we have and often resent that they cannot duplicate it in the California State system. There are also institutional reasons why the state university wishes to be more of a research university. The teaching loads are half in the University of California of what they are in the CSU system and the research role is built into UC's personnel policies but it is not in CSU's by way of example.

Thus, the assigned missions under the Master Plan have held, as has the Plan's expectation for joint Ph.D. degrees between UC and CSU. The prob-

lem is not the willingness of the University of California to cooperate in this respect, but that there's less enthusiasm for the joint doctoral program on the part of CSU because if these programs proved to be popular, their success would tend to preempt their opportunity for mission creep. In other words, if CSU cooperated too much, they would have undermined their own argument for a change in their mission. I'm speaking very frankly because I don't have this job anymore. (Laughter.) You also get mission creep from some of the community colleges wishing to become four-year institutions. My view on that has always been that the master plan may not be perfect, but it's preferable to any other option anybody has proposed, because the cost to the State of California, if mission creep were to be permitted, would result in the unit cost of instruction to the state rising significantly, taking the three public systems as a whole; and the state can hardly afford what it has now.

Sylvia Manning: Robin. Just yell.

Robin: (Inaudible, no microphone.)

Dr. Gardner: Well, I can't presume to advise the University of Illinois. Each institution has its own history, culture, expectations, division of responsibility, and views on these matters. As to the University of California, we do our planning bottom up. We do not do our planning top down. For example, we knew in the mid-1980s that enrollments in the University of California would grow by some 60,000 students by 2020. The question was how do we accommodate these students and where within the system could we put them?

If we did not plan for them but simply allowed the present system to respond as best it could, Berkeley would go to 40,000 students; UCLA would go to 50,000; Santa Cruz would go to 20,000; and so forth. For reasons tied

to the capacity of our host communities, the space limitations of campuses, the effect of size and scale on certain campuses, the uneven distribution geographically of the existing campuses relative to the state's growth patterns and demographics, among other considerations, it was decided to plan for this growth and not just let it happen.

I asked the chancellors of our nine campuses to prepare a long-range growth plan (to the year 2020): a long-range academic plan, a long-range enrollment plan, a long-range physical plan, and a long-range financial plan. This was a two-year assignment.

The role of the president was not to start this process substantively, but to start it procedurally within the context of enrollment growth of some 60,000. Then once the campuses had done their work, the president became involved.

We managed to negotiate most of the differences. By way of example, the Berkeley Campus then had about 31,500 students on a campus meant for 27,500; and the reason Berkeley had taken the excess students was because the state money came with it. I thought the enrollment was too high and met with the chancellor about it. I said, "We need to reduce the enrollment at Berkeley. The City of Berkeley is pushing back at this number, the infrastructure of the campus was not built to accommodate this number," and so forth. The tendency is to do in the future just what you've been doing in the immediate past. If so, Berkeley will soon be at 35,000. We may reach this number some day, but we can't in the foreseeable future. Thus, we need to shrink the enrollment of Berkeley, at least for now.

The chancellor said, "I can't do that. Every student you take away costs me money." I answered, "Not necessarily, because the enrollment growth at Berkeley has been at the undergraduate, not at the graduate level; and un-

dergraduate students cost less than graduate students." So we traded. We cut back the undergraduate enrollment by a couple of thousand students, 2,500 or something like that, and added some 800 to 900 graduate students. But we added far fewer graduate students than the number we reduced at the undergraduate level. The differential cost to the state between the two was allowed for in setting the smaller number of undergraduate enrollments and in fixing the growth of graduate students. Thus, the budget impact was neutral but the total number of students enrolled dropped by roughly 1,750.

We went through the whole system in this way, including fixing the number and location of new professional schools, graduate programs, and the like, until the 60,000 were accounted for by campus. (Three new campuses were proposed for construction between 2000-2005 as part of this process to accommodate the 20,000 of the 60,000 students we concluded could not be placed on our existing campuses.) Thus, when the presentation was made to the board of regents, all of these matters had been negotiated internally. The regents didn't have to deal with the particulars, only the big picture.

Sylvia Manning: Through the strange powers of psychiatric control, I think our dean of medicine has claimed the last question. (Laughter)

Dean: (Inaudible, no microphone.)

Dr. Gardner: Yes, thank you. Well this is a tough arena. I congratulate you for taking on your responsibilities. This is a tough arena, but a critical one, not only for the university but for society and the general well being of our people.

UC has five major medical centers in the University of California. There's no medical center at Berkeley but there is one at UCLA, one at Davis, one at Irvine, one at San Diego, and at San Francisco, of course. This means that at

Santa Cruz, Santa Barbara, and Riverside, there is no medical center. It's not imperative that there be a medical center at every general campus of the University of California.

Now the University of California does not need five medical centers for us to be a university. We don't need all five of them; but the state needs them. We don't. We're not going to transfer money from the University of California to sustain the financial viability of any medical center. I confronted this problem in 1984 with our Irvine medical center. We were nearly bankrupt there and needed an infusion of state support for it to survive. In meeting with the state, I made clear the point just made, namely, that the state needed this medical center, but UC didn't. If the state did not wish to fund it properly, UC would close it.

The state responded by providing $50 million a year for an operating subsidy and funded a couple of hundred million dollars worth of facilities to bring in more private paying patients, and so forth. But the point I wish to make is that if the University of California did not have an independent position within the state government, I'd have been very hard pressed to have that conversation or to have achieved this outcome.

Sylvia Manning: I think in the back of the room there is food and there is drink, and I know there are many more questions, but I invite you to grab some food, grab some drink and mob David Gardner.

Dr. Gardner: Before you give it up now, chancellor, president, President Stan asked an important question and I would welcome the chance to comment on it.

Sylvia Manning: Shotgun Stan, he likes that.

Sylvia Manning: Please.

Dr. Gardner: And I'll close with this. Stan asked about the social compact between the people of the country and our universities. It's the most important question asked today as we are presently experiencing an absolute decline in the funding of our universities and colleges from state sources. Why is that? Well we know that we can't compete with prisons, we can't compete with Medicaid, we can't compete with the welfare programs, or even K-12. Why is this?

This is my take on the question. There has been a shift from the 19th century and most of the 20th century view of the university as a source of dispassionate, impartial and disinterested scholarship in teaching and research. Our universities were the only institution in our society to which the people could look for a fair, impartial, thorough, dispassionate exposition of the truth, as it would be understood at the time, or the facts on any issue as they were then understood. The people believed they could look to the university and count on getting knowledge and information devoid of commercial, political self-interested or other distorting influences; and that in the teaching of their children this standard would hold rather than yield to a more ideologically inclined classroom, not only in the teaching but also in the judging of student performance.

It is my view that there was a shift away from that standard in the 1960s and since, when many of you here today were at the university; and so was I, but I was on the receiving end of most of your protests. This trend has grown in size and scale within our universities to the point that we are today perceived as having a more ideologically committed and politically engaged intellectual community than ever before. If this is what the public perceives us to be, and if the universities continue to be in denial about this change, then this trend, if not addressed, will have an enduring and

profound effect on the public's willingness to fund higher education and to regard it with the confidence and respect it once enjoyed.

History holds some lessons in this respect. In 1949, the regents of the University of California enacted a loyalty oath and required every member of the university's faculty and staff, as a condition of continuing employment or initial appointment, to sign this oath. It was not an oath swearing allegiance to the Constitution of the State of California or to the nation's Constitution. Such oaths, without protest, had been a requirement for many years. But faculty members were asked in 1949 to sign a Communist disclaimer affidavit as well.

The position of the regents on this was that if you were a member of the Communist Party, you were by definition subject to the discipline of the party, and, therefore, for you the truth was given and could not be freely sought or shared. Such ideological commitments, therefore, were thought to compromise one's impartiality as a scholar and teacher, and rendered one unfit to serve in those roles of responsibility and trust. The response of the faculty was that that may be true in general for communists, but it may not *always* be true. Each case merited its own consideration and such judgments needed to be made case by case.

The question is: does the academy today honor the standard of impartiality in scholarship and teaching as enunciated by UC's faculty and regents during the loyalty oath controversy of 55 years ago, and does the public still expect it of our universities today. My own view is that, at present, there is a disconnect between the prevailing view of these matters within our universities and the publics' expectations, the former being less insistent about adhering to such standards and the public holding to the more traditional views and suspicious of any move to modify them in theory or in practice.

Frankly, I believe we are somewhat confused about all of this in American higher education today, and it's not helping in our ability to represent these institutions to the public and to invite and enlist their support.

That's my personal view of it. We ought not to be reluctant to talk about this matter. We shouldn't be scared away because it's not popular to talk about. We ought to discuss it and to try and find some way out of our present dilemma because the present trends, if left unchecked, are going to be devastating to American higher education in the long run. Thank you.

Stan Ikenberry: Thanks for the answer.

(Applause.)

Sylvia Manning: Please stay around for the reception.

Portions excerpted from David Pierpont Gardner, *Earning My Degree: Memoirs of an American University President* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2005). Reprinted by express permission of the Regents of the University of California and the University of California Press.

The David Dodds Henry Lectures in Higher Education

"The Administration of Higher Education in an Era of Change and Conflict," by Clark Kerr, October 1972

"Can We Maintain Quality Graduate Education in a Period of Retrenchment?" by David Riesman, April 1975

"The Administration of Education for the Health Professions: A Time for Reappraisal," by John R. Hogness, April 1976

"The Education of Administrators for Higher Education," by Harlan Cleveland, April 1977

"Socially Imposed Costs of Higher Education," by Howard R. Bowen, April 1978

"Quality and Equality in Health Professions Education and Service," by Lloyd C. Elam, April 1979

"How We Talk and How We Act: Administrative Theory and Administrative Life," by James G. March, September 1980

"The Liberal Arts Revisited," by Hanna Holborn Gray, October 1981

"The University Presidency: Comparative Reflections on Leadership," by Martin A Trow, October 1984

"Innovation and Tradition in Higher Education," by John B. Slaughter, October 1985

"Mandate for a New Century: Reshaping the Research University's Role in Social Policy," by Donna E. Shalala, October 1989

"The New American University," by Frank H. T. Rhodes, October 1990

"Beyond Conservation and Liberation: The Education of Our Aspirations," by Linda S. Wilson, February 1992

"(R)evolution in American Higher Education," by Donald N. Langenberg, December 1992

"Higher Education and the Concept of Community," by Alexander W. Astin, October 1993

"The Public University of the Twenty-First Century: Beyond the Land Grant," by Walter S. Massey, October 1994

"Reactionary Thoughts of a Revolutionary," by J. W. Peltason, October 1995

"Adding Value and Virtue to Higher Education," by William C. Richardson, March 1997

"Beauty in the Bureaucracy," by W. Ann Reynolds, April 1998

"A Society of Learning: A Vision for the Future of the University in the New Millennium," by James J. Duderstadt, November 1999

"New Deal, Big Deal: Higher Education in a Conceptual Era," by Stanley O. Ikenberry, November 2000

"TQM and Other Managment Fads: Why has their Impact on Higher Education been so Small?" by James V. Koch, March 2003

"Supporting the Talented Tenth: The Role of Research Universities in Promoting High Achievement Among Minorities in Science and Engineering," by Freeman A. Hrabowski, III, November 2003

"Public Higher Education: Is the Public Lost?" by Constantine W. Curris, March 2005

Produced for the Office of the President by Creative Services | Office of Public Affairs, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign. Illustration of David Dodds Henry by Jack Davis. 07.129. The University of Illinois is an equal opportunity, affirmative action institution.