Twenty-fourth David Dodds Henry Lecture: Public Higher Education: Is the Public Lost? by Constantine W. Curris, Ph. D.

Public Higher Education: Is the Public Lost?

by Constantine W. Curris, Ph. D.

President

American Association of State Colleges and Universities

Twenty-fourth David Dodds Henry Lecture

University of Illinois at Springfield

Public Higher Education: Is the Public Lost?

by Constantine W. Curris, Ph.D.

President

American Association of State Colleges and Universities

Twenty-fourth David Dodds Henry Lecture

University of Illinois at Springfield

March 30, 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

Good afternoon. I'm Richard Ringeisen, Chancellor here at UIS. It's my great pleasure to welcome you to the David Dodds Henry lecture at the University of Illinois. The lecture's named after one of the foremost former University of Illinois presidents, Dr. Henry, who served as the 12th chief executive of the University of Illinois, president for 16 years until his retirement in 1971. You will hear that our keynote speaker today actually has a connection to Dr. Henry. We're very excited to have all of you here and all of our special guests and our opportunity this year to host this very special event for the University of Illinois.

The lecture always deals with an issue that's of importance to higher education and it rotates among the three campuses. So this is UIS' turn. I'd also like to thank those people who organized today's lecture: They're Cheryl Peck from my office, Director of Public Relations; Dr. Keith Miller from Computer Science; Dr. Nate Anderson, Visiting Professor in Educational Leadership; Pinky Wassenberg, our Interim Dean of Public Affairs & Administration; and Joan Sestak, from my office, who does all this sort of thing all the time and does it very well.

Here's what's going to happen today. The format today is going to be a lecture by our keynote speaker, Dr. Constantine Curris, who I have a lot of trouble (calling) Constantine ... everybody knows this man as Deno.

Then we'll have responses from three people. Those three people are Mr. Michael Lawrence, Director of the Paul Simon Public Policy Institute at Southern Illinois; Dr. Margaret Noe, Associate Chancellor for Access & Equal Opportunity here at UIS and Assistant Professor of Educational Leadership here; and then Dr. Gary Alexander, Deputy Director of the Illinois Board of Higher Education.

Now, your program indicates that Tom Lamont, Executive Director of the Board, was going to be here today, but he had a last-minute schedule change and we're very sorry he couldn't make it. He's a very good friend of ours. But we're also delighted that Chief Deputy Director Gary Alexander is going to be replacing him on the schedule. Then after those three people, there will be a question and answer session, sort of an open forum for you to ask any one of our three speakers anything. After the discussion then, there will be a reception in the PAC Restaurant down the hall.

In just a minute, President White will formally introduce today's keynote speaker. First, I really need to add my own thanks to Dr. Curris for being here today. I've known Dr. Curris for several years. We have Clemson University in our past, although we weren't there at the same time. I've also gotten to know him much better over the last few years because of my own involvement in AASCU. So it's really kind of a personal pleasure to have this delightful, delightful gentleman, true gentleman, at our university. So welcome, Deno, from me and all of UIS.

Now I want to introduce you to President Joseph White. He's been president now for quite some time—two months—at the University of Illinois, since February 1st, and he's already been to UIS several times. It's been my great pleasure, honest pleasure, to get to know and work with Joe White over these months. He's a dynamic leader. Yesterday he spent all day leading a strategic planning retreat summit at the University of Illinois. We discovered what a high-energy person he is all over again. He started that by setting our goals for the day and I think this is significant—aim high and to find a way to control our own destiny. The optimism that was in that room when we all left at 4:30 yesterday was significant.

Joe came to the U of I from the University of Michigan. He got his doctorate actually at Michigan in Business Administration and served as a faculty member. He was also interim president and dean of the business school. Dr. White is a native of Detroit and was reared in Kalamazoo. He earned his bachelor's degree in international economics from the Georgetown University School of Service and an MBA from Harvard University. He has written, taught and lectured extensively on leadership, management and organizational matters.

President White also has significant private sector experience. At Cummins Engine Company in the 1980s, he was Vice President for Management & Development, and then also Vice President for Personnel & Public Affairs.

Joe is an independent (director and trustee of several companies, including) Equity Residential, headquartered in Chicago, and Gordon Food Service. He's also director of the W.E. Upjohn Institute for Employment Research and he's chaired actually several boards of large health care organizations, including University of Michigan Health System. So a man of varied experience bringing many skills to those of us at the University of Illinois. It's our great pleasure to welcome President White.

Richard Ringeisen
Chancellor
University of Illinois, Springfield

Preface

Good afternoon, everybody. Well, I'm really looking forward to the remarks today. A new president has to spend an awful lot of time broadcasting, and I prefer listening to broadcasting. And so I'm looking forward to Deno's remarks so I can learn and get intellectually refreshed.

I have a warm feeling about this lecture. When my wife, Mary, and I moved into the president's house, we were browsing through the bookcases in the library and we found a volume on David Dodds Henry, and I just sat down and read through it cover to cover. And he was really a great man. And I think (that) this lecture series has had so many distinguished lecturers, including today's, is a fitting tribute to him.

I also have a warm feeling about it because I learned in browsing that material that he spent time in Battle Creek, Michigan, adjacent to Kalamazoo, where I grew up. He spent his summers at Gull Lake, between Kalamazoo and Battle Creek, where we spend our summers. He went to Wayne State University in Southeast Michigan, and I spent most of my career thirty miles away at the University of Michigan. So I feel some kinship with President Henry.

My office in Urbana is in the Henry Administration Building. We've honored David Dodds Henry a lot in a lot of different ways. There's a display on the first floor of that building that calls him a scholar and a leader and a visionary.

His specialty was higher education. But mainly, he was a man of tremendous achievement. For example, David Dodds Henry and Mayor Richard J. Daly jointly envisioned and built a brand-new campus on Chicago's west side, the Chicago Circle Campus, and UIC, a member of our family, is a living monument to both of them.

If you turn on public broadcasting, PBS, you'll see another Henry legacy. He led the national effort to create and then broaden what used to be called educational television, now called PBS. He led the national effort to redefine graduate education, which is especially important for our university. He was really a national leader, as well as a hometown hero. Amazingly, he led all five national higher education organizations, and he did so effectively.

Henry retired from the University of Illinois presidency in 1971. And I want you to know what he said at the last commencement in Chicago and Urbana in 1971 because it's as relevant today as it was then. He said:

> Whether our hopes for the University of Illinois are fulfilled will depend in large measure upon the confidence of the people, confidence in the merit of giving education the priority it has enjoyed in the past, confidence in the leadership of the institution and its faculty and students, and confidence in its mission. With that public confidence, with the resources at-hand, with the momentum of a proud tradition at U of I, great days lie ahead.

It was a good forecast that states well the challenge that we face today. I think today the 24th David Dodds Henry lecture goes right to the heart of contemporary issues in education, particularly public education. The title is "Public Higher Education: Is the Public Lost?" I can't wait to hear the answer. That's a provocative and important question to us.

Dr. Constantine "Deno" Curris, with whom I had the pleasure of getting acquainted at lunch, is absolutely the right man to ask and answer that question. He's president of the American Association of State Colleges and Universities.

He has been at that post ... this is his sixth year. He's a former president of Murray State University, University of Northern Iowa and Clemson. So he's widely experienced on the regional and national stage, serving on the Commission on the Future of the South, Kellogg Commission on the Future of State and Land-Grant Universities, and many more.

Between his Bachelor of Arts and his Doctorate of Education in Kentucky, he slipped across the border, and we're pleased he did, to earn a Master of Arts in Political Science from the University of Illinois. I hope that was the very best part of your education. And I think that your being here today is completely consistent with the prominence and the stature of the previous presenters of the David Dodds Henry lecture. Clark Kerr, Howard Bowen, Frank Rose, Donna Shalala, Stan Eikenberry, and Jim Duderstadt have been a distinguished group and you're adding to it. I'm very proud to welcome Deno Curris back to the U of I.

B. Joseph White
President
University of Illinois

Public Higher Education: Is the Public Lost?

Constantine W. Curris, Ph.D.
President
American Association of State Colleges and Universities

President White, Chancellor Ringeisen, thank you very much for the warm hospitality. And friends, delighted to be here.

There is an oft-repeated adage, probably derived from a Tarzan movie, that lions roar when food is scarce. And clearly for the higher education community, food has been scarce and we have bellowed our discontent. These unsettled times have led both policymakers and educators to re-examine the relationship between state government and its public universities. Central to that examination is the recurring question of whether this period of stagnant or declining appropriations is ephemeral, or whether we have entered a new era of diminished public support. We ask: Is higher education being privatized? Is the "public" disappearing from "public higher education?"

It is an honor to present the 24th annual David Dodds Henry lecture. An honor more deeply felt, I should add, because I pursued graduate studies during his tenure as president at the University of Illinois. For we aspiring political scientists, President Henry was a distant figure, read but not seen, yet symbolic of that great university where we debated, among many stimulating topics, whether there is "a public interest" or merely competing vested interests. I did not agree with Professor Hagen's postulate, which probably impacted his assessment of my studies; on the other hand, pursuing this elusive concept of the public interest has in good part defined my career and resurfaces in this lecture.

The economic difficulties facing higher education these past few years could not have occurred at a more inauspicious time. Globalization, entailing the free flow of capital across national borders and accompanied by domestic economic dislocation, has merged forces with modernization with its extraordinary explosion of college attendance in developing countries and formerly restrictive societies and the near universal adoption of English as a second language.

Amidst these global developments, higher education domestically has been beset by serious economic difficulties in most states, record federal budgetary deficits and political polarization, which has strained the academy's work and made it distressingly difficult to maintain higher education as a non-partisan enterprise.

As we struggle to sustain our institutions amid economic difficulties, ironically, many campuses, including the University of Illinois at Springfield, are being called upon to accommodate growing student populations. In effect, we're being asked to do more with less. Out of this milieu have come proposals which would markedly change the relationship between states and their universities. In a few states, such as Florida and Washington, proposals have surfaced to negotiate "performance contracts" by which funding increases are tied to the achievement of specific goals; in other states, such as South Carolina, for example, the Governor has offered to convey all state-owned assets to the public universities if they would go private. (The legislature and the university leaders scoffed at that idea.)

Elsewhere, campus initiatives were presented in the name of greater autonomy from state control. Colorado, for example, adopted a voucher system in order to offset draconian funding reductions, and Miami University of Ohio requested and was approved to raise tuition to private college levels,

while offering scholarships to all resident students. Recently, three Virginia institutions (the University of Virginia, William and Mary, and Virginia Tech) sought to be granted "charter status," which would free them from virtually all state controls.

Of course, these campus initiatives are focused on achieving greater autonomy in setting tuition and growing revenue. David Breneman, noted policy analyst and Dean of the Curry School of Education at the University of Virginia, succinctly decoded one such initiative, writing: "Freedom to set prices without state intervention appears to be the gold standard of this broad reform movement. While reduced state regulations promise efficiency, one has a sense that the core issue is control over price."

Breneman is right. In transferring the cost of higher education from taxes to tuition, we are seeing the realization of a prophecy made a decade ago by another astute observer, Alice Chandler, President-Emerita of SUNY-New Paltz, who warned that the movement to privatization would be the transfer of higher education from, and I quote, "a public good supported by the public purse to private benefit financed by personal debt."

The major concern on many campuses is the impact of these proposals on their own state legislatures. As Breneman continued: "Concentrating energy and ingenuity on new models threatens to make continued decline in state support a self-fulfilling prophecy, as legislators conclude that higher education is willing and able to live with reduced funding."

These developments bring us to a central question: What does it mean to be a public university? Are we, as Robert Zemsky asked several months ago, "a place that has learned well to be market-smart, yet often at the expense of being mission-centered?"

(To) better to understand these policy alternatives we go to another question: What distinguishes public higher education from private higher education? The response to that question from people inside the academy, as well as from citizens at large, would distinguish public from private higher education solely on the basis of funding. Common wisdom would tell us that public universities receive state appropriations; private institutions do not, and as a corollary, state universities have more affordable tuition. And that's all that people would say distinguish(es) public from private institutions.

While, granted, private higher education is far (more) similar to its public counterpart today than it was a century ago, I suspect that the early pioneers in public education, including the architects of the Morrill legislation and President Abraham Lincoln, would be dismayed to know that we now draw distinctions on the basis of funding sources rather than on the basis of mission. Public universities were founded and have been sustained to fulfill public purposes, not as public-funded alternatives to private counterparts.

At the heart of my comments is a focus on the distinctive mission of the public university, a focus that expresses my understanding of the public purposes for which our universities exist. I want to talk about the seven areas: access, affordability, economic advancement, public education, homeland security, scientific research, and citizenship education. For each of these purposes, I will draw on historical antecedents but, more importantly, I will try to focus on contemporary challenges.

Let's start with access. Historically, the most salient characteristic of public universities has been that of affording access to higher education for all citizens qualified to enter and a few that maybe weren't qualified to enter. The great vision of Justin Morrill embodied in the land-grant legislation has been fulfilled: The doors of higher education have been opened to the

sons and daughters of the working classes. To President Lincoln it was the embodiment, in his words, of "the right to rise." And in the 1940s, when the G.I. Bill was enacted, its most dramatic provision, higher education opportunity for thousands of returning veterans, was projected at the time to be of little consequence. But once the doors were opened, to the surprise of the bill's framers, veterans flooded the campus and American society was transformed. And in the '60s, the community college movement bloomed and higher education was extended to yet tens of thousands more. In the later decades of the 20th century, public higher education strove with considerable success to expand enrollments and sustain achievement from greater numbers of students from under-represented classes, as well as to extend a range of full opportunities to women.

Many private institutions have likewise engaged in ensuring the doors were open to all Americans. Their contributions to access and opportunity are not minimized when we acknowledge that the difference between public and private higher education is that we as public universities have an obligation, a societal responsibility—a public purpose—to make sure that educational opportunity extends to all segments of society. For state universities it's not a matter of discretion. The immense challenge facing public universities, where applicant demand exceeds available admissions, is to fulfill our public responsibilities in a legally acceptable manner. San Diego State University, for example, had by last December 49,000 applications for 7,500 undergraduate admission slots. Given its mission in a city with remarkable diversity, including an expanding Hispanic population, the leadership of that university wrestles with its public responsibilities as it chooses what criteria (to) use to select the 7,500.

Indeed, the national debate over affirmative action, triggered by the admission policies at the University of Michigan, is best understood in the

context of guaranteeing equal protection to the individual while fulfilling the public university's abiding commitment to access, access not for the specific individual who may want to get into law school, but for the larger public purpose of ensuring that all groups in American society—Native Americans, Asian Americans, African Americans, newly immigrant groups such as those from Bosnia—can all be a part of an educated citizenry.

The second public purpose for the public university is that of affordability ensuring that financial barriers do not preclude enrollment and timely graduation. You know, our universities have a remarkable legacy of helping even the poorest student scrape together sufficient resources. The past 20 years have been especially challenging given the remarkable and, in my judgment, unhealthy tuition increases that have been born of increased costs and stagnant or declining state appropriations and have been compounded by a nominal retreat in federal support of need-based aid and federal tax policies which have further skewed the wealth distribution. Irrespective of cause, the outcome is troubling. High school graduates with wealthier means pursue higher education in greater numbers than graduates from low-income families. The playing field is not even. It is not level. The startling facts are that when student ability and family income are expressed in quartiles, data indicate high-ability high school graduates from low-income families enroll in higher education only at the same level as low-ability high school graduates from high-income families.

Clearly, financial barriers exist. Equally pernicious is the rise these past few years in levels of student indebtedness. Because data compilation trails reality, it is estimated that the typical graduate of a public university this May will carry with him or her from expenses (not from car payments or credit card debt, but for college expenses) a debt load of $20,000. And if the typical graduate, God forbid, falls in love with another typical graduate,

the two begin married life with a combined educational indebtedness of over $40,000. Truly marital bliss.

Rather than ensuring affordability, public universities have become instruments of a social policy which is creating a new debtor class—our students. The social implication of these levels of indebtedness have not been fully explored. We need to ask: Will students with onerous debt loads pursue careers in such fields as teaching, youth work and public health, which carry high social importance, but low compensation? Will higher debt loads further propel graduates to relocate in urban areas and in those geographic regions where higher wages are common?

Private universities are likewise troubled by these issues, but theirs is not the mission of ensuring affordability. And, on top of that, they have tuition-discounting flexibility, which is denied to most public universities.

There are no easy answers for public universities, but these problems will not disappear. Advocacy for our students must be a key part of our work.

It is in this context I tell you I must express dismay over proposals to increase dramatically tuition charges. Their proponents argue with evidence that the market will bear those charges. But to me, the issue is not one of economic elasticity, but of public purpose.

The significance of high tuition advocacy to public support for higher education should not be overlooked. Public opinion polls, the latest I have seen being The *Chronicle of Higher Education's* poll last spring, consistently on the part of the public give high marks to higher education, save for two areas of public concern—tuition costs and levels of student indebtedness. The challenge to our universities is one of transforming public criticism of universities into public advocacy for greater state funding.

The third area that distinguishes a public university is economic advancement. Now, all universities, public and private alike, hail the accomplishments of successful alumni as we cultivate relationships with our wealthier alumni, and rejoice in their munificence. You know, for many institutions, individual philanthropy has been instrumental in weathering the economic difficulties of the recent decades.

While all higher education acclaims alumni success, public higher education has a responsibility extending beyond the individual. Part of our public purpose is the economic advancement of the region we serve. The 19th century land-grant movement soon embraced the cause of restoring an agricultural economy which had been wrecked by the Civil War. Higher education's responsibility extended beyond teaching the sons and daughters in farm families to that of enhancing the viability of agriculture through education, research and, later, extension.

In the same historical period, normal schools were established throughout the country—and especially here in the territory known as the Northwest Ordinance. Their purpose was to provide teachers for the newly established public schools. Soon those normal schools developed their own "extension" venues, helping communities build viable educational programs. That public mission to advance society subsequently extended to manufacturing, small businesses, and the professions. During the 20th century, public universities have become embedded in the economic fabric of our society, assuming in good part responsibilities for the economic viability of the regions they serve and contributing in untold ways to the remarkable standard of living most Americans enjoy.

Today, when hospitals face nursing shortages, they come to our Schools of Nursing for help. When the Bar Association seeks continuing legal educa-

tion, they come to our Schools of Law. Communities struggling with economic difficulty turn to business schools for assistance and often petition state legislatures to establish a university branch or a community college in their midst. Major industrial concerns, particularly those built around science and engineering, prefer to locate near universities in order to access cutting-edge research and to develop productive relationships, including those built around commercialization. Increasingly, public universities are seen as engines of economic growth.

In the United States, unlike the rest of the economically developed world, public higher education is embraced as an integral part of (the nation's) economic future. Public universities are stewards of place. They serve the public by an active engagement with their community and region—strengthening them through university expertise while benefiting from community teaching and research resources. The immense impact of globalization and modernization, seen and projected, will only expand our responsibilities to the public.

The next area I want to mention is public education. Since the onset of the normal school movement, public universities have been engaged with elementary and secondary (now P–12) education. Historically, our state universities have assumed the responsibility for preparing teachers, administrators and counselors, consulting in school design and construction, facilitating college preparatory curricula, and helping extend universal education.

In recent years, however, as the public school movement matured, as legislatures and state departments of education affected complex governance regulations, as teachers' associations and unions grew in number and political clout, higher education's role in P–12 education diminished markedly. Today, higher education has limited means to influence our public schools.

Yet in the eyes of policymakers and the general public, we are still seen as (and expected to be) a salutary force to improve public education.

Wide disparities in the funding of public schools and in the performance of their students, accentuated by social and economic conditions in many neighborhoods, are major public concerns. In some parts of the country, public education is viewed as being "in crisis." Improving public education has resurfaced as a major challenge, with legislatures turning to state universities to help solve P–12's many problems and, in some instances, criticizing us. I believe we have no choice but to respond—and to respond aggressively.

There's a real danger here that public higher education will not be proactive or, on the other end of the continuum, overreact and assume expensive burdens which cannot be shouldered. Higher education is and should be accountable for the quality of its teacher education graduates. It should also be accountable for the relevance and depth of its continuing education programs, including the professional master's degrees, and it should be a partner in school reform efforts, in curriculum planning, high school/college articulation and in alternate certification activities. It should not, on the other hand, assume responsibility for workforce issues, including teacher placement and effectiveness, nor should higher education assume responsibility for student performance in public schools. Jim Votruba of Northern Kentucky University, president of an institution actively engaged in the greater Cincinnati community, encourages higher education to respond from its educational expertise, but cautions (us) "not to assume ownership for community problems."

Within these parameters, public universities have an extraordinary opportunity not only to fulfill a historic public mission, but to reaffirm our relevance to achieving the public good.

Talk for a moment about homeland security. The 1863 Morrill Act stipulated that land-grant universities would teach military tactics—no doubt to replenish the Civil War-ravished state militia. Congress' early expectation for military training for male students served to distinguish the land-grant institutions and, in the larger sense, public universities. These expectations gave birth to campus ROTC programs, which for most institutions, including my undergraduate alma mater, required a mandatory two-year ROTC course in drill work, and enlisted public universities in the cause of national defense. While the number of ROTC programs has declined in recent years, they are still predominantly found on public university campuses. And with the recent and significant decline in the ability of our military services, particularly the Army, to recruit sufficient members, we may again see a renewed interest on the part of the Pentagon in expanding ROTC programs.

But to focus solely on reserve training programs undervalues the extensive contributions higher education makes to homeland security. Most research universities are significantly engaged in efforts directed toward and preponderantly funded by the Department of Defense. As our military becomes even more technologically dependent and military appropriations expand, university engagement with military-beneficial research will continue to grow. And there's a more recent impetus for our role in homeland security. Relatively unnoticed in the months preceding 9/11, the report from the United States Commission on National Security for the 21st Century received remarkable coverage in the aftermath of that day of terror. The Commission, formed through the collaboration of President Clinton and Speaker Gingrich—let me mention that again, President Clinton and Speaker Gingrich collaborated—is notable in its ominous conclusion that in the 21st century our nation's greatest threat would be terrorism and its prescient recommendation that we needed to establish a Department of Homeland Security.

But given less publicity and in many ways far more significant, especially for those of us in education, is this conclusion from that report, and I'm quoting:

> In this Commission's view, the inadequacies of our systems of research and education pose a greater threat to U.S. national security over the next quarter century than any potential conventional war that we might imagine. American national leadership must understand these deficiencies as threats to national security. If we do not invest heavily and wisely in rebuilding these two core strengths, America will be incapable of maintaining its global position along into the 21st century.
>
> We therefore recommend doubling the federal research and development budget by the year 2010, and instituting a more competitive environment for the allotment of those funds.
>
> ... And we recommend a new National Security Science and Technology Education Act to fund a comprehensive program to produce the needed numbers of science and engineering professionals, as well as qualified teachers in science and math. And this Act should provide loan forgiveness incentives for those who have graduated and scholarships for those still in school in exchange for a period of K–12 teaching in science or mathematics or of military or government service.

While these recommendations speak to the entire higher education community, and we recognize the stellar work of our private institution counterparts, it is easily apparent that the bulk of these educational and research challenges will fall on public universities. Indeed, the vast major-

ity of graduates in math, science, engineering and teaching in these areas come from our institutions—and it is to their universities that the public turns in times of need.

Scientific research. The significant role of scientific research in the American university is well understood, and it's certainly not peculiar to public or private sector. However, we must note that the 1887 Hatch Act, which created agricultural experiment stations, stipulated that land-grant universities undertake scientific research to improve agricultural productivity. This legislation marked the beginning of our major responsibility for public universities—scientific research to address social problems. Today, the scope of federally funded research extends to all aspects of human endeavor, far beyond just agriculture, and is open to researchers irrespective of institutional affiliations. However, at the state level, it is the public university which is expected to focus its research efforts—and is often so funded—on social problems ranging from juvenile delinquency recidivism to water quality analysis. It is the public university in the main which is called upon to research and help solve our social problems.

But a few years ago a Senator from a neighboring state conferred the "Proxmire Awards" for wasteful governmental spending, frequently lampooning university research projects. Today, in contrast, there is heightened appreciation for university research as the public connects advances in medicine, technology and scientific exploration to the investment that they have made in higher education. Scientific research affords opportunities for us to rebuild public confidence and fiscal support for our endeavors. We have yet to fully capitalize on these efforts.

More notable is a concern over personal aggrandizement rather than public service. Exclusive proprietary agreements, such as the now-expired arrange-

ment between the University of California-Berkeley and the Novartis Corporation, can undercut the long-held view of the public that these universities are places of public purpose.

As the recently released report from The Futures Project warned: "The lure of corporate sponsorship cannot be allowed to supersede the integrity of scholarship ... Once lost, trust in university-based research will be difficult to recover."

Lastly, I want to talk for a second about citizenship education. You know, American citizens have long looked to education to teach citizenship to their youth and to prepare future civic leaders. These lofty ideals were expressed by two of our nation's founders. John Adams, in drafting the Massachusetts Constitution, wrote, "Wisdom and knowledge, as well as virtue, diffused generally among the body of the people, being necessary for the preservation of their rights and liberties." And his political nemesis, also a president, Thomas Jefferson, penned, "Above all things I hope the education of the common people will be attended to, convinced that on their good sense we may rely for the preservation of liberty. Light and liberty go together."

From these words two centuries ago to words three months ago, when Senator Robert Byrd of West Virginia inserted in the omnibus appropriation bill the requirement that all colleges on September the 17th teach students about the Constitution (September the 17th is a Saturday). That raises another issue, but we won't go into that today.

During this entire time span, universities have been charged with the responsibility for citizenship education. We are the keepers of the flame. Society turns to us to strengthen and preserve our democracy and the sense of community born of civic engagement. It is an expectation which

for years we largely ignored, and in truth our private college counterparts did a better job than we did because they saw it as critical to the provision of a liberal education.

But it is only after we confronted declining electoral participation that we recognized this benign neglect of citizenship education. The fact that voter participation among our students and recent graduates is distressingly low punctuates the need for public universities to reorient their energies to a renewal of citizenship education. While a breakdown from the 2004 election has yet to be publicly made, and we know that everyone voted in greater numbers, which we think is very good for the country, data from the 2000 and the 2002 national elections are not comforting. In both elections, the voting participation of college students and college graduates age 25 and under was less than the participation of high school dropouts age 65 and over. That level of civic engagement, where 65 and older high school dropouts vote in greater numbers than college graduates 25 and under, may well explain why elected officials will not dare change Social Security entitlements and Medicare benefits, but show no reluctance to place greater tuition burdens on our young.

When issues of controversy or unpopular speech occur on a campus, public universities come under greater scrutiny. The pre-election visits of filmmaker Michael Moore and the pronouncement of Dr. Ward Churchill have inflamed partisan passions on all campuses, but especially on the public ones. The push of the so-called economic Bill of Rights by David Horowitz and his legislative compatriots focuses not on higher education, but on state universities. While a few campuses find themselves in the proverbial "hot seat," all public universities need to address the importance of teaching the meaning and the significance of the Constitution and its provisions,

including the Bill of Rights. Clearly, especially in times of heightened passion, citizenship education is fraught with political dangers. But we cannot neglect that responsibility. We hold, as former university president Evan Dobelle noticed, "a special public trust because we are repositories of civic values, ideals and aspirations."

Now, I have talked about these seven areas of university activity—access, affordability, economic advancement, public education, homeland security, scientific research, and citizenship education—to argue that public higher education has distinct purposes, not the responsibility of, nor necessarily found, in private higher education. We were intended to be—and for the most part still are—places of public purpose.

We have not, I would suggest to you, communicated this mission effectively to policymakers and to the public as a whole. The one message we have gotten across, and I include myself as someone who has been guilty of this, we have communicated to the public, "Attend college and you will earn more in your lifetime than if all you did was graduate from high school." We succeeded. The public believes that. But in the process we have made the case that higher education exists for personal gain, not for public good. So it's not surprising many of our citizens believe that higher tuition is warranted because college graduates will earn more and, therefore, they can afford to pay. If the public is lost from public higher education, it may be because we lost the public.

Higher education's leaders compound their difficulties by using the phrase "state subsidy" to categorize state appropriations. Inasmuch as public universities are creatures of the state, why do we characterize public support as a subsidy? State highway officials don't describe state appropriations for highway construction and maintenance as a "subsidy." In fact, I know of no

state government activity where the recipient agency or officials describe its appropriation as a subsidy. If we continue to use a pejorative term such as "subsidy," not only will more policymakers come to believe that the state does not have a responsibility to support its public institutions, but the debate will be transformed as to whether any subsidy is justified or, more likely, whether public institutions should receive greater subsidy than that currently extended to private colleges—particularly so if a state's private colleges, unencumbered by public responsibilities, produce data showing how the cost of undergraduate education at their institutions is less than it costs the state at public institutions.

Now, if you conclude from my comments that I think some of our difficulties have resulted from self-inflicted wounds, you are correct. But let me make it clear. I do not believe the cause of the public higher education is lost. Far from it. I believe that our public purposes are as relevant today as they were in earlier years. Effectively communicating to our citizenry the public purposes our universities fulfill is an essential ingredient in rebuilding public support for our institutions.

Now, if developing a persuasive message would be in and of itself sufficient, our task would be simple. All we have to do in higher education is but select and fund a proven marketing firm to shape and communicate a powerful message. You know, perhaps a firm on the winning side in the last presidential election would be a stellar choice.

Unfortunately, the challenge facing higher public education extends beyond acquiring marketing prowess. Too few of our faculty and staff understand, much less appreciate, our public heritage. The message that our universities have public purposes must be discussed with literally thousands within the academy who shoulder the work. No message, no

campaign can be effective if those entrusted with that work neither know nor inculcate that public mission.

And in addition, we must take a look at leadership which, in lieu of championing a renewal of historical covenant between the public and universities, proposes the dissolution or dismemberment of that covenant. The academy needs presidents and chancellors who envision stronger ties between the universities and their publics and seek to fulfill public purposes rather than be unshackled from them.

Some universities, facing dreadful funding prospects, see no option to restoring institutional viability other than freedom from state limitations. Such is the case in Colorado, where constitutional provisions and tepid elected leadership threatens the future of public higher education. In other states, there are campus leaders troubled by declining state appropriations who wonder whether some form of charter status, accompanied by the license to raise tuition, may be the preferable alternative. But there are a few leaders—and gratefully, but a few—who see no meaningful distinction between public higher education and who are lured to the perceived stature and freedom of the independent sector.

Before public universities can renew (and) rebuild the covenant with our citizens and our elected representatives, we must believe in that covenant.

Ultimately, success in renewing the covenant between the public and the universities will depend on how well our teaching, scholarship, creative endeavor, and our engagement with our fellow citizens is received by those who bear the burden of taxes and make the sacrifices to sustain our work. The first steps in rebuilding that public trust and support call upon state universities to redefine their historic public responsibilities and to renew their individual commitments to being places of public purpose.

These steps must be undertaken in difficult times. The ultimate challenge is for the public university to adapt its public mission to this new century, addressing public needs such as those expressed through questions such as:

1. Can public universities ensure that their graduates will be able to compete in a global labor market where fluency in (the) English language is commonplace?

2. Can universities build the nation's capacity to educate sufficient numbers of scientists, mathematicians, engineers, and highly qualified teachers for our public schools?

3. Can the playing field be made level so that all can partake of educational and economic opportunity, irrespective of ethnic origin or family income?

4. Can the flagging fortunes of rural America be renewed?

5. Will public universities be fully responsive to the continuing education needs of our workforce—irrespective of its geographic disbursement?

6. Can our public universities help address the towering social problems of urban America ... especially youth found in struggling, increasingly segregated public schools or even on the streets?

7. Can our universities prepare well (their) graduates (for) citizenship—better capable of discerning fact from opinion, logical reasoning from emotional appeals, and guided by ethical values and civic-mindedness?

Of course, there's no easy answer to any of these questions. But they represent the challenge every state university faces as it addresses public expectations inherent in being a place of public purpose. You know, the

extraordinary contributions of today's universities flow from unstinting efforts of an earlier generation of educators who passionately believed in their work and exhibited a deep commitment to respond to the needs of their fellow citizens. By their good work, the value of public higher education was communicated and embraced. Public support of higher education was not lost then, nor need it be lost now.

I close on a personal note. (I was) born in Kentucky a few miles from the Great Emancipator's birthplace; my studies on the Urbana campus were in Lincoln Hall. Yesterday morning I departed home, driving past the ever-inspiring memorial in his name, and I have arrived here in the heart of the Land of Lincoln, where the library will soon be open.

The honor of serving as the 2005 David Dodds Henry lecturer is equaled by the privilege of addressing the future of what President Lincoln acclaimed not as public universities, but as the public's universities. His vision continues to inspire us all. Thank you for being an attentive audience.

Michael Lawrence Introduction, Richard Ringeisen

Dr. Ringeisen: Wow. Thank you, Deno. I'm glad that we have had this televised so that others can see it. And also, I should mention that the University of Illinois Press publishes the David Dodds Henry lectures. So this will be a published document. I thought you might like that.

Oh, I don't know how we begin. I'm not jealous of the three people who get to respond. First, and next in line, we will hear from Michael J. Lawrence, Director of the Paul Simon Public Policy Institute at SIU.

Mike lived and worked in Springfield for many years. He was press secretary and senior adviser to Governor Jim Edgar for nearly a decade. He joined Edgar's staff after working as a journalist for 25 years. He served as managing editor and editorial page editor of the *Quad-City Times* (and) wrote a political column that was syndicated in more than 40 newspapers in Illinois. He then capped his newspaper career as chief of the State Capitol Bureau for the *Chicago Sun-Times*. He is a friend of many at UIS and, along with Governor Edgar, is on the Board of our *Illinois Issues* magazine. A reporter went into government service and is now bringing along the next generation at SIU ... Michael Lawrence.

Response, Michael Lawrence

Well, it's a privilege to be here today. And I thank the Chancellor for giving me this opportunity. Dr. Curris' provocative and cogent analysis helped stimulate and solidify some observations I offer today with respect to the future of public universities in Illinois.

Obviously, state universities are not prominent on the radar screens of most Illinois public officials. Relatively few lawmakers have a state university in their district. The constituents of most lawmakers are far more concerned about other matters, such as elementary and secondary education, health care, childcare and jobs.

University leaders in recent years have been passive. They have been hesitant to aggressively challenge budget cuts for fear of offending this Governor, his predecessor, and other Statehouse heavyweights who have accorded higher education a low priority.

But state universities will continue to take a beating unless they are willing to build their case for more respect and make (their) voice heard. We need to do a better job of mobilizing our alumni. We need to tap into and marshal much greater support from the corporate community, which particularly prizes higher education.

Overall, state universities need to raise their profile in Springfield by more effective marketing, more assertive and strategic lobbying, and even better performance. We also must do a more effective job of establishing in the minds of the public and the General Assembly the strong link between state appropriations and affordability.

Illinois not long ago led the nation when it came to affordability. It has sunk to the middle of the pack. We must become more important and more rel-

evant to the people of this state. A major component of this is rededicating public universities to fulfilling their public purposes, the compelling motif in Dr. Curris' lecture.

We need to provide access to students who otherwise might not be able to pursue higher education. But we can't stop there. We need to help disadvantaged students meet special challenges. Many of them are the first in their families to attend universities. Many have overcome great obstacles to reach our campuses. These students often require remediation, individual attention and extra encouragement. State universities must be responsive and affordable to these students and others struggling to finance their education.

We must improve retention and graduation rates. We must accommodate students who often attend several universities and community colleges before they graduate. We must dedicate ourselves to diversity of our faculties so minority students have more teachers with whom they can readily identify and from whom they can gain inspiration and confidence.

We must become student-focused instead of institution-focused. Universities cannot shift the entire burden to students during difficult fiscal times.

We must become more efficient and cost-effective and, to the extent allowed under our tenure and personnel systems, demand more productivity from people who should be more productive.

Universities have a tendency to spell process with a capital "P" and product with a small "p." We need to reverse that. We must also dramatically escalate efforts to raise private dollars so we can provide scholarships and state-of-the-art facilities in good and bad fiscal times for state government.

Indeed, cutting edge research also can potentially enrich universities through lucrative patents, as well as deliver tremendous benefits to society.

But universities must create an environment that stimulates, nurtures and facilitates creativity and entrepreneurship.

State universities must become economic engines in their region and in the state. SIU, where I have the privilege to work, is the largest employer in southern Illinois. It is located in a region that includes what I can best describe as a Little Appalachia. Its beautiful topography masks blinding rural poverty.

SIU must use its vast resources to lift our region economically and educationally through research parks and high-tech initiatives. It must train and retrain the current and future workforce. Moreover, it must educate future and current elementary and secondary teachers and develop innovative approaches to addressing community problems that affect the kids in their classrooms.

SIU must help broaden access to quality health care in our rural part of the state. It must help administrators and teachers identify and respond to physical and mental disabilities and to the by-products of poverty. SIU should be seeking ways (of) helping local school officials seek ways to stimulate parental involvement. SIU and other state universities must become part of the solutions if we want legislators to appreciate and address our problems.

Universities need to offer and then gladly provide their expertise to community and state leaders. To do so and to establish a new rapport with governors and legislators, we need to deal with the condescending attitude that too many people on our campuses have toward those who are in the public policy arena.

We are, after all, public universities and we should remain public universities. That means engaging in the arena with commitment, conviction and courage, and without conceit.

Margaret Noe Introduction, Richard Ringeisen

Thanks, Mike. I think those words or expressions of concern are familiar to those of us who took the opportunity to read your column.

Our second respondent today is Dr. Maggie Noe, the Associate Chancellor for Access and Equal Opportunity and Assistant Professor here at UIS.

Every now and then, whether you mean to or not, you get something right. And a year or two ago when I asked Maggie to come to our office to take over that position, I did something right. And you're going to find that out with me in just a few moments.

She received a Ph.D. in Educational Administration and Foundations from Illinois State University and her law degree, the doctorate of jurisprudence, from Southern Illinois University at Carbondale.

Her professional experience includes a variety of positions in public and private institutions in Illinois as a teacher, as an administrator, as a school superintendent, as a consultant, as a university professor and as an administrator.

Dr. Noe's areas of specialization reflect her interest in law and leadership, including civil rights, employment law, labor law, health law, mediation, arbitration and public policy—not very busy at all. She is a frequent presenter at national, state and local conferences on educational law and public policy, and she is active in professional associations in both education and law. Let's welcome Dr. Maggie Noe.

Response,
Margaret Noe

Thank you, Chancellor Ringeisen. Welcome, Dr. Curris. Welcome back to the Midwest, America's Heartland. Welcome to Illinois, the Land of Lincoln. Welcome to the University of Illinois, a great university system. And especially welcome to our campus, the University of Illinois at Springfield.

I consider it a great privilege and an honor to be selected to respond to your remarks on behalf of the faculty and the University because as a teacher, administrator and member of the Horace Mann League, an honorary society dedicated to preserving the public schools, I share your fundamental belief about the purpose and mission of public education.

Dr. Curris has reminded us about the fundamental purpose of public higher education and the covenant between the state and its citizens. He has challenged us in higher education to redefine our public responsibility and purpose and to renew our commitment to maintaining universities as places of public purpose.

I would like to focus my remarks toward formulating ideas for an Illinois response to his challenge in two parts—first, by commenting on a few issues that he raised. And he raised many good issues: affordability and accessibility, diversity and P–12 education. And by responding to his challenge, addressing our collective responsibility for leadership, I believe the answer lies within ourselves, in our capacity for leadership and our tradition of public service.

As Dr. Curris has demonstrated, we have many challenges in public higher education. Challenges that are both external and internal, challenges that require redefinition and renewal, challenges that will require us to think

and respond in non-traditional ways. This is the same kind of challenge that Abraham Lincoln faced as a newly elected president of the United States when he sought to preserve the Union during the Civil War.

Lincoln was able to communicate the need for creative leadership as a means to adapt (to) change and challenge in his second annual message to Congress in 1862 when he said: "The dogmas of the quiet past are inadequate to the stormy present. The occasion is piled high with difficulty and we must rise with the occasion. As our case is new, so must we think anew and act anew." Lincoln realized that traditional thinking, methodology and responses would not be sufficient to meet this momentous challenge facing our nation. Just as Lincoln created a strong legacy for our nation in times of crises, we will also create a legacy for the future of higher education in Illinois. To create a legacy for lifelong purposeful learning in our universities will require active, engaged and focused leadership and a continued commitment to public service. As our case is new, so must we think anew and act anew.

First, I would like to examine three issues raised by Dr. Curris—affordability and accessibility, diversity, and P–12 education—addressing ways in which the University can successfully fulfill its public mission.

Indeed, these are difficult times for higher education. When I began my career in education, Illinois ranked third in the nation in financial support for public education. Now Illinois ranks 49th. This is both a tragedy for Illinois and a challenge for all of us in public higher education.

Illinois deserves better. It isn't just a question of how can we as a state afford to support education in Illinois. The question is: How can we afford not to support excellence in education?

We must make accessibility to higher education programs and services and affordability for student tuition and fees among the highest priorities for our citizens. We have fulfilled our mission in higher education in Illinois, and we need to remind our public of our contributions.

Higher education has contributed to the leadership role of Illinois in agriculture, commerce, industry, the humanities, medicine, technology and public service. We have prepared leaders for our communities, our state, our nation and the world. We cannot afford to regress from this time-honored tradition of excellence.

Moreover, we need to be proactive and state our case to the public in persuasive, even media-savvy ways. We need to do what we do best: teach, educate, inform and enlighten the public about our collective and individual achievements.

Illinois institutions of higher education recognize the value of attracting a diverse student body, faculty and staff. Admissions, human resource and search committees have worked diligently to attract the best and the brightest students, faculty and staff, reflecting the diverse population of Illinois in society in order to enrich student learning and campus life to prepare our students to succeed in a global society.

We have done well, but we can and we must do better. We need to continue our efforts to support diversity, accessibility and affordability. We need to ensure that all of the students we enroll are offered opportunities for success once they arrive. We want to ensure that women and minority faculty and staff are supported in their teaching, research, service and leadership. We all win when our students and staff are successful.

We need to acknowledge what business, industry, the medical profession and the military already know—that frequent turnover in personnel is expensive and counter-productive to the institution's ability to achieve its goals. It is in all of our best interests to ensure students and employee success and retention.

Illinois is a great state with great traditions. But our most precious resource is not corn, coal or computers. It's character, the character of our people. For us in higher education, this character of our people translates into the best students, faculty and staff. But Illinois is in danger of losing the leadership and talents of these people because we, as a state, fail to provide the necessary resources to support higher education.

We cannot afford this brain drain. We cannot afford to lose our best and brightest innovative leaders and high caliber students. We cannot afford to lose valued experience, knowledge and expertise. We can and we must address this problem through an organized sustained effort to educate the public and our political leaders about the value of higher education for our state and for our citizens.

Here at the University of Illinois at Springfield, we are actively engaged in leadership and public service. Students and faculty engage in active service learning and leadership opportunities, conducting scientific and technical research, contributing to the humanities, teaching in inner-city and rural classrooms, protecting the environment, addressing equity issues in Central America, collaborating with business leaders around the world, forming partnerships with social service agencies to improve student learning, networking throughout the world via appropriate uses of technology, contributing to efforts to ensure equity and justice in our judicial system, and providing leadership in governmental service.

At UIS we prepare leaders. We prepare leaders by providing leadership opportunities and support as an integral part of our students' college experience led by faculty with administrative and staff support.

Higher education does have a role to play in providing leadership in a variety of settings, as Dr. Curris indicated when he cited the leadership role of higher education with elementary and secondary education. We do have a vested interest in improving the quality of educational opportunity for public school students.

Through research partnerships, professional preparation programs, collaborations with other stakeholders and public policy initiatives, colleges of education can and will continue to provide a leadership role in P–12 public education, just as we do at the University of Illinois with our P–16 initiative.

Our campus has provided leadership for P–12 in all of these ways, including effective utilization of technology and online learning to meet professional development needs of teachers, administrators, board members and parents.

In addition to the opportunity for us to assist P–12 educators to achieve their goals, however, we can also learn from their experience. This leads me to the second part of my response to Dr. Curris' address. How can we in higher education respond to these challenges?

Elementary and secondary school leaders and faculty have faced many challenges. And in order to meet these internal and external challenges, they have formed broad-based coalitions and alliances to advocate for education and to promote communities of lifelong learners.

Leaders in K–12 education learned that in order to fund their schools and to cultivate broad-based community support for education they had to advocate not only for the children of their own districts, but for all children in

Illinois. They realized that a strong system of public education is important to all of us in Illinois. It's important to our commercial viability, economic growth, social health and political future.

They know that when children are successful in public schools in Chicago, Springfield, East St. Louis or rural districts in Illinois, we all win. Parents, leaders, faculty and staff have set aside their special interest agendas and turf battles to unite their efforts, educating the public and advocating for increased state financial support of public education.

We in higher education could learn from their example of building strong partnerships, coalitions and alliances in order to garner increased financial support of higher education in Illinois. We need to focus on the greater good, the true mission of public education and the covenant with our public.

When we have a strong system of public institutions of higher education in Illinois, we all win, whether those universities are located in Chicago, Urbana, Springfield or Carbondale. Just as it is in our best interests to have a strong system of public education K–12 throughout the state of Illinois, it is also in our best interests to have a strong system of higher education throughout Illinois. A strong system of public higher education in Illinois is critical to our future.

Now, there are some faculty and leaders in higher education who may question the role of the educator as being involved in the politics of education as though there is something unseemly about such a practice.

Advocacy on behalf of issues of public policy and public concern is a noble endeavor. Public policy and politics need not be mutually exclusive. It is possible to demonstrate moral principle-centered advocacy in public policy initiatives utilizing political skill.

Worthy moral outcomes and advocacy for the public mission of higher education can be achieved through effective leadership and collaboration, motivating and inspiring others, and utilizing political skills. That's what true public service entails.

Money alone, however, is not the answer. The answer lies within ourselves and in our capacity for change. Here again, we in higher education can learn from the P–12 experience, where school leaders have engaged in purposeful school reform and demonstrated leadership and creativity to meet challenges.

Successful school leaders have refused to look solely to external sources for assistance, but rather they look inward. They recognize that schools cannot be all things to all people. They manage change by maximizing internal and external resources, implementing shared governance, creating coalitions, building on institutional strengths, defining priorities and allocating resources to fulfill the institution's mission.

Effective P–12 schools capitalize upon their gifts, talents and resources to create strong learning communities and make effective use of available resources.

Effective school leaders and change agents understand their role: to preserve the best and improve the rest. We in higher education can learn from the effective K–12 leaders who exemplify collaboration, advocacy, building alliances and seeking creative ways to deal with change.

Today we have discussed our heritage, legacy and the mission of public education. Thank you, Dr. Curris, for sharing your ideas with us today. You have thoughtfully asked us to examine our relationship between the public and the University and the covenant between a government and the

citizens of the state. You have challenged us to redefine the public responsibility and purpose of higher education and to renew our commitment to creating places of learning and public purpose at the University.

I believe that we in Illinois are uniquely positioned to respond to your challenge in meaningful ways. If we learn from the lessons of the past, examine and reflect upon the challenges and opportunities of the present, and create a clear vision of the future, we can provide the leadership to create a legacy of learning and public service for higher education in Illinois.

I believe we can make effective use of our resources, especially our human resources, to respond to this challenge. In order to respond to this new challenge, we must think anew and act anew. Thank you.

Gary Alexander Introduction, Richard Ringeisen

Thanks, Maggie. One of the nice things about ... UIS being in the state capital is we can call on leaders from the state easily and often because we're all friends. As I said earlier, Tom Lamont is on your program, but he's not able to be here today. We are happy that we were able to get his deputy director, Dr. Gary Alexander, as our third respondent.

Dr. Alexander is Deputy Director for Academic Affairs at the Illinois Board of Higher Education. He has a master of divinity from Lexington Theological Seminary in Kentucky and a master's and Ph.D. degrees in religion and psychological studies from the Divinity School of the University of Chicago. He has taught at Penn State University and the University of Wisconsin-Stevens Point.

Before going to IBHE in 2001, he was the senior academic planner in the University of Wisconsin system. So it's our great pleasure to welcome Dr. Gary Alexander.

Response, Gary Alexander

Thank you, Chancellor. It is indeed an honor to respond to such a distinguished speech and to follow such fine and thoughtful respondents.

It's always difficult to respond to a talk that takes a position with which one substantially agrees. You arbitrarily pick a fight, you know, start throwing tomatoes, or simply go belly up in agreement. I am much nearer to the latter position than the former, but I certainly appreciate the opportunity to make the effort.

Dr. Curris has clearly and emphatically sounded a call to reclaim the public component of public higher education. And I've spent the better part of two decades as a faculty member at two public universities, have worked on the staff of two state level-one system administrations and now a state coordinating board, and I can do nothing but agree with his clarity and call.

Since I first walked into a classroom in 1976 until the present, I have, with you, experienced our national transition from viewing higher education as primarily a public good to the one that seems to predominate today; namely, that higher education is essentially and primarily of economic benefit to the individual.

Those of us who work in and on behalf of public higher education will be well served to accept Dr. Curris' challenge to reengage what it means to be a public institution in the 21st century.

The Illinois Board of Higher Education has recently added a preface to its Illinois commitment, this being the document that basically delineates the Board's strategic plan that guides higher education in the state. This preface stresses the role of Illinois' higher education institutions in enhancing the social, the economic, (and) the civic well-being of the state and its residents.

Now, these are admittedly just words. But as Dr. Curris' remarks and my colleagues' remarks attest, make clear, rhetoric does matter. How we say what we are helps create the image of who we are in the eyes of the public. It is, however, indeed our obligation to put these words into practice to convey our very real sense that while a college education certainly benefits the individual, Illinois' public higher education is likewise intended to benefit the collective well-being of the state and its citizens.

I have just a couple of other specific reactions to Dr. Curris' remarks. First, I would underscore the need to engage public university faculty in any effort to reintroduce the public into our public universities. And speaking as one who spent the bulk of his career as a public university teacher, I have been exposed in that career to the high degree of disaffection within many university faculties.

This is no secret, but it is a concern that must be addressed internally, even as public universities are pressed to respond to external calls for accountability. I recall my days chairing a faculty senate when many of my colleagues expressed extreme distaste for the campus administrators, for those idiots at (the) system, one of which I did subsequently become, and for public officials whom they believed ... to be intruding on their turf with calls for accountability.

One reads in the *Chronicle of Higher Education*, I hear on campus regularly, that shared governance is dead. As Dr. Curris so aptly points out, too few of our own faculty and staff understand, much less appreciate, our public heritage. We are obligated to deal with this disaffection as we work to correct that lack of understanding.

And secondly, I would stress the fact that public institutions cannot effectively operate in isolation from the other sectors of higher education. The

Illinois Board of Higher Education serves as an advocate for both higher education and for the people of Illinois. Now, this practically means that we serve as a buffer between the institutions and state government, between the institutions and the state's citizens. And this, as you may surmise, is not always a comfortable position.

We strive to guarantee, for example, that when we approve new programs they meet high standards of quality and, in so doing, we increasingly find ourselves negotiating a complex interaction of public and independent universities, the latter comprising both private not-for-profit and independent private for-profit institutions.

The non-public sector, especially the non-traditional and proprietary realm, while still relatively small, has the capacity to target programs—for example, in education, in the health professions—to lobby aggressively on behalf of its concerns. Public higher education is not the only player in the game. And though I fully agree with Dr. Curris' basic premises, I caution that we must remain very cognizant of the other players competing in the educational market.

Now, as an old religious studies professor, I want to conclude with an observation taken from the Hindu Upanishads, among the oldest of the world's philosophical religious texts, which translates simply as "you are what you do." I thought of these words (while) attending a meeting yesterday devoted to the subject of reforming educational administration programs. One of the participants reminded us that accountability works two ways: That public educators are certainly accountable for the responsible allocation of resources and for the quality of their research and teaching—as Dr. Noe points out, the things that we do best (and) the state is responsible to provide the resources necessary to produce a quality product.

This is not easy to do in difficult economic times. It requires the acceptance of mutual accountability and mutual responsibility. But in the end we will be measured by what we do, by whether and how we respond to Dr. Curris' challenge to communicate the public good that public universities do. Thank you.

Questions and Discussion

Dr. Ringeisen: Now what we want to do is have a good discussion about this topic, so the floor's open to anybody with any question. And I'll try to moderate these questions. Any one of these four individuals up here is eager to respond to questions from the audience. Does someone have one to start us off? Margo.

Audience Member: First of all, thank you very much for your remarks, Dr. Curris. I think practically everybody in this room would agree with the premise that you made, and some of the respondents, that we need to argue a stronger case of performing a public good as institutions of higher education.

I wonder if the problem that we face, though, goes beyond the issue of essentially better advocacy on our part, (if) there isn't a deeper cultural malaise going on that we have to understand and address that we've lost as a society, or if the sense of a public good as a whole or community interest as a whole is getting dissipated, has eroded over time, and the traditional strengths of America, really individualism, in a way is trapping us. That the balance in our culture is now to perceive things in terms of individual self-interest and we have lost collectively a sense of the public good. And we have to understand psychologically what's happening in order to kind of impact effectively on the debate.

Dr. Ringeisen: Do you have comments, Deno?

Dr. Curris: I think your point's well taken. I would just respond by saying if one looks at the history of our country, we have had these peaks and valleys as we have wrestled with the degree to which we support the individual, allow individualism, and to the degree we act collectively.

And where we are right now, I'm not sure. We've certainly been in a period that moved toward individualism being highly valued. But the events of 9/11 have created a new impact in terms of our collectivization.

I would finally just basically say there is a major cultural issue here that you touched upon, and that is my parents' generation and the generations before them basically operated from a premise that it was important for them to make sure that their children had a better life than they did. And the concept of sacrifice for future generations was a key part of their ethos. That has changed. I don't know if it's permanently changed. But we are now in a period in which we expect our children to sacrifice so that we can benefit, and that is disturbing.

Dr. Ringeisen: Anybody else want to respond to that?

Dr. Lawrence: I have a couple of responses. First, picking up on Dr. Curris' last point, it may be the parents feel that way. My sense of the problem is the policymakers feel that way. ... In the state of Illinois, a couple of years ago, we borrowed $10 billion for operations and then we back-quoted the debt repayment.

There have been other measures, instead of squarely facing up to our fiscal problems, where we have put off payment to future governors, future legislators and future generations. I don't say that in a partisan sense. I think it's a bipartisan result. And I think it's unfortunate at the federal level we have an acceptance of building up a huge deficit, in general satisfying today's appetites with tomorrow's dollars. And I think it's disgraceful on the part of policymakers particularly to take that position. I wonder if they do that in their own families. They're certainly doing it with the state of Illinois.

Now, with respect to your other point, which I think is a very good point, I guess I would say that we need to be leaders by example and by what

we do in trying to show the benefit of the public good, doing good works for the community and, in a selfish way, teaching and showing people the fulfillment you can get as an individual by making a contribution to the community. And in my remarks I alluded to some of the things I thought SIU should be doing in our region. I don't think it's just limited to SIU and the region.

But if you can take students out into the region where there are problems and you can have them working on those problems, and if you can take professors out there, you really combine service, research, and classroom education, but ... you also serve the idea of good citizenship, as well.

And so I view that as a challenge that we have to take on, not only to solve problems that are there today and even look forward and anticipate problems that are in the future, but I think it is an opportunity to teach by example, that there is a tremendous amount of fulfillment that could come out of serving the public good.

Dr. Ringeisen: Thank you. I think we'll go to another question, if someone has one. Yeah, Chris.

Audience Member: Chancellor, I was just thinking, yesterday we had a wonderful dialogue that was based in reality for us. Not only as a university here, but the collective university. And in that reality, we were able—during our discussion about this reality, there were some very salient issues that were, in fact, crystallized for us.

Now, with that being said, within this whole genre of higher education, we also have a duty and a duty to act and to be responsive and to take up these challenges.

Now, we talked about the concept of private enterprise and with a public mission. I don't perceive those to be mutually exclusive—not at all—in that they can actually work for us. If we are in a situation where we are creating our own destiny, how is it that we don't think about doing things differently? And I think, Dr. Curris, you had made some reference to that.

Dr. Ringeisen: Anybody want to take that on? Do you want to start again, Deno?

Dr. Curris: ... A lot of places are thinking differently. I don't think there's any question about that. And I think they have to. And I really liked Maggie's use of President Lincoln's comments to think anew. I think that is occurring.

The question, the only caution that I make in that process is we need to avoid being market-savvy, as quoted, at the expense of being mission-centered. There are perils out there. It doesn't mean you ought not to take the journey.

Dr. Ringeisen: Anybody else have comments on that?

Dr. Alexander: One thing I might just add briefly is, I think on the issue of mission-centered, is the imperative that institutions be clear about their missions and the things that they can and cannot do. We've been going through a time when it would appear that we've ... I come most recently out of comprehensive universities and that tendency to try to do everything. And I think having a focused mission, knowing what you can do, engaging your faculty in doing it, is the active way to engage.

Dr. Ringeisen: Joe.

President White: Deno, would you cite one public university nationally that's doing the best job both being relevant and communicating its relevance?

Dr. Curris: You know, that's an awfully good question. And I've been impressed by a lot of things that are going on in the North Carolina system, so I do want to say that.

In response to an earlier question, I've been very impressed with what's going on at Northern Kentucky University. I have been struck by just how successful the president of Northern Kentucky University has been in mobilizing his institution and relating to his constituents.

And it was very interesting in this last legislative session how much the Governor has some play in that state. But the legislature is divided between a Republican Senate and a Democratic House, so you've got kind of horse trading. The big winner in that legislative session was Northern Kentucky University, in my judgment.

President White: Don't be insulted.

Dr. Ringeisen: I won't be insulted. Thank you for being here, Joe. Another question? Pat?

Audience Member: This is a question about multi-national economics and the move of what used to be American corporations and, therefore, employers, the buyers of people with knowledge ... to a global economy.

And the question is—you know, there's been arguments made in manufacturing that it's a race to the bottom, of plants moving to Mexico, then they move to Nicaragua because it's cheaper there, then they move to China because it's even cheaper there. And we were ... I was having some discussion. But we all know that at this point, a lot of those organizations used to

be American identified, identified collectively as part of the United States; therefore, (it was) in their interests to have an educated workforce in the United States.

There was a discussion yesterday about being able to get an engineer for $13,000 in China, and a very good engineer. And so I guess one of the questions is, we look at state budgets and the federal budget. You know, to what extent is this going to really make things worse as the production of knowledge and the ability to create knowledge shifts out of the United States to places that could produce that knowledge far more cheaply and (that), in fact, are spending as governments substantial amounts of money on higher education relative to their income and governmental spending?

Dr. Ringeisen: I happen to know that Deno has things to say on this subject because he was talking about them. I thought particularly, Deno, the remarks you made earlier today about the number, percentages of people studying English. Not to prompt your answer or anything, but ....

Dr. Curris: I'll give you several comments, which are not necessarily consistent with one another ....

The point that the Chancellor just made was that English has been adopted as a second language. And the monopoly that our graduates have had on the language of commerce has been lost. And so consequently, we have to think in terms of our graduates being in a worldwide pool, employment pool, international labor market. And quite obviously, there are other countries, individuals, who can be employed at lesser amounts than what ours are being employed at.

So the question is: What value added can we as universities give to our students inasmuch as they are losing their monopoly on degrees and on

the English command influencing the English language. And that would suggest major changes internally that we need to do to make sure that we provide superior education.

The other thing that I would say—it sounds a little contradictory—is we need to recognize that we have exploited the international labor market. And I don't say that in an ugly sort of way. I'm saying we have built our scientific and technical prowess on the ability to attract graduate students, some undergraduates, professors, from other countries by virtue of our wage scales.

We still will have that capacity. So in terms of our ability to be cutting edge in scholarship and research, I don't think we're going to be challenged there ... other nations ... in my lifetime. I mean, it's going to come with time. But we still have inherent advantages that other countries do not have. But the point (where) I think we're most vulnerable is in terms of the capabilities of our graduates and their ability to compete in the worldwide marketplace.

Dr. Ringeisen: You said something ... I was trying to remember, but you mentioned something about the number of people studying English in China, which struck me.

Dr. Curris: Well, the little factoid of the day is, you know, that the number of Chinese studying English today is greater than the number of people who live in England.

Dr. Ringeisen: And English is the language of commerce.

Dr. Curris: English is the language.

Dr. Ringeisen: Maggie, you wanted to say something on the last question.

Dr. Noe: Yes, I'd like to respond to Chris' challenge, and I think it's a good one, about when is it appropriate to think in new ways and to form partnerships with commerce and industry and service agencies and professional associations.

I think there is a time and place, and I think it is appropriate to think creatively and think outside the box. I think we need to be very thoughtful and careful, though, as we (must) form those contractual relationships with the University providing a service for the client, if you will, whether it's a partnership or a delivered service.

I think what we have to realize and respect is the tradition of excellence at the University of Illinois and we not compromise in any way our standards of excellence and what it means to earn a University of Illinois diploma. In our particular field in education, we do receive requests for professional development, sometimes from school districts, sometimes from cooperatives who say we have a specific need. We want to recruit for diversity, we want to do long-range planning, we want to do in-house staff development. And we're very thoughtful and careful about that because what we have seen some institutions do, in rushing to provide a service, to form a collaboration, a partnership, in some cases they have lowered their standards and they have bought in so much to the individual institution's request that they've compromised their own academic integrity. And I think we have to be very thoughtful and careful about what kinds of partnerships we form and what kinds of responsibilities we assume responsibility for and what we're willing to do.

Audience Member: Another question. The question is then, well, what do we do in the interim? And I know Dr. Curris had made reference to the fact that when we talk about tuition and increase in tuition, essentially

pricing students out of the market as such and not creating opportunities for them, what would be your suggestion in the interim in lieu of the fact that there are really no significant changes on the horizon with regard to state support for institutions, especially within this state? So what would your recommendation be in terms of how we maintain quality which, once again, we have a duty to do? What are your thoughts on that?

Dr. Ringeisen: That's an easy one.

Dr. Curris: I don't think you can be all things to all people in difficult times and something has to give. Either you give on quality, you give on convenience, or you give on numbers. And we try to do all three, or we can do all three.

But I do go back to that premise, there are some states in the country that have never been supportive of higher education to a justifiable degree. And I truly feel for people who live in those states simply because there's nothing to build upon. But Illinois, as was pointed out by several of the commentators today, was at one time leading a support of public higher education. I don't think that's lost. I think it may be in suspension. But it can be reclaimed. And I do want to make that point.

Dr. Ringeisen: Well, on that optimistic note, it might be a good time (to end). And one more time, I would like to thank not only Deno ... it's been wonderful to have you here for a 24-hour period ... as well as our other commentators.

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 Dr. 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 Dr. Freeman A. Hrabowski, III, November 2003

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. 06.134. The University of Illinois is an equal opportunity, affirmative action institution.