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This study examines the policy issues in the current state level master plans for higher education, in those states whose coordinating boards have regulatory powers, in an effort to identify the most significant policy issues facing higher education in the United States during the 1990s and beyond.

The purposes of this study are (1) to identify the major policy issues being addressed by state agencies responsible for coordinating and regulating higher education; (2) to develop a classification system through inductive "clustering" that will aid in the analysis and synthesis of the major policy issues facing state coordinating boards for higher education; (3) to classify these policy issues; (4) to compare the goals and strategies of the various states; (5) to propose a list of significant policy issues that institutions and state agencies of higher education may face through the 1990s and into the 21st century.

The following are the nine significant policy issues identified by this study that institutions and state agencies of higher education may face through the 1990s and into the 21st century:
1. Access to higher education.

2. Diversity of institutions of higher education.

3. The contribution of higher education to the Economic Development of each state (and the nation).

4. The process of determining appropriate Funding for higher education.

5. The process of determining appropriate Governance systems in each state.

6. The process of Management on each campus of higher education.

7. The role and responsibility of higher education to Public Schools (K-12).

8. The process of developing and maintaining Quality in the instructional systems in higher education.

9. The responsibility of higher education to contribute to the Quality of Life of the individual and the state and the nation.

This planning taxonomy is based on the notion that the issues facing higher education do not have permanent solutions, only temporary contingencies. The factors related to each issue may change but the issues will never go away.
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY

In 1980, the Carnegie Council on Policy Studies in Higher Education expressed the opinion:

Discussions of the future of higher education...are often too dominated by gloom and doom, even by a sense of panic; all certain changes are said to be for the worse, and uncertainty additionally is said to be unlimited...Our version of the future is, instead, that problems, even severe problems, lie ahead, but that there are reasonable solutions to most, if not all, of them; that it is better to plan to meet the future effectively than just to fear it as a new dark age. (The Carnegie Foundation [CF], 1980, p. 7)

The Council recognized the hazards of trying to describe the unknown and unknowable, but believed "the view people hold of the future, both when they turn out to be right and when they turn out to be wrong, help shape that future in fundamental ways" (p. 6). For the Council, "The purpose of all policy is to change the future and, thus, how we see the future affects how we seek to change it" (p. 6).
Ten years earlier, in 1970, the Council asked Heinz Eulau to survey the attitude and perceptions of legislators and state officials regarding the problems and issues of higher education and the future of higher education (Eulau and Quinley, 1970, p. vii). Generally, Eulau and Quinley found "a favorable attitude toward long-range planning of higher education and centralized coordination as a means of making good use of resources and of expressing the will of the state government" (p. iii). This level of satisfaction had changed dramatically since 1959, when Lyman Glenny, following his evaluation of the relative merits of statewide governing boards versus statewide planning and coordinating boards declared "that the weakest and most poorly performed function of all agencies was planning" (American Council on Education [ACE], 1964, p. 35). In the United States, the long-range planning and centralized coordination of higher education is the responsibility of the individual states, not the federal government. Glenny proclaimed, "the chief feature which distinguishes the new concept of coordination from the old is master planning" (p. 35). Glenny concluded:

the characteristics which distinguish the master plan from most state surveys are the variety of subjects studied; the volume of data collected; the depth of analyses; the integration of programs, budgets, and building priorities to provide a unity of purpose;
the full inclusion of the non-public institutions; and the means for step-by-step implementation of the plan, with simultaneous review and revision leading to fulfillment of major goals. (p. 35)

Glenny noted "that comprehensive master plans contain certain common goals but important differences in means of achieving them (p. 37). And although Glenny was accepting of this new form of planning, he raised two questions, If master planning is desirable, is it better to have a coordinating board with power to develop and execute plans or to have state executive and legislative agencies perform these functions with advice from a coordinating agency without legal powers? In the long run, which arrangements can fulfill best the promise of a master plan, protect the public interest, and preserve essential institutional autonomy (p. 35)?

Glenny concluded that it was apparent to most leaders of higher education that there was need for coordination and greater central planning (p. 25).

By 1981, Altbach and Berdahl found the political climate had changed from the positive attitudes described by Eulau and Quinley (Altbach and Berdahl, 1981, p. 152). Governors and legislative leaders were dissatisfied with the performance of state boards of higher education "because these boards have too little authority over
governing boards and individual institutions" (p. 154).

Altbach and Berdahl (1981) concluded:

Chief executives and legislators would like to have as many political conflicts as possible settled at a lower level than their own. They want state boards of higher education to 'order' governing boards, presidents, and faculties to take particular actions. They would rather have a state board do the ordering than a state law. (p. 154)

Although some state boards of higher education only have an advisory role, and others have regulatory powers, all have planning responsibilities (p. 148). However, when considering the process of planning, Eulau and Quinley (1970) pointed out:

Planning - letting present policies be influenced by future goals and proposals for their implementation - is not a characteristic feature of legislative decision making. Yet, insofar as planning does enter public policy making, images of the future are relevant and possibly decisive. If these images are unduly optimistic or unduly pessimistic, the plan is likely to be unrealistic and the process of implementing it inconsistent and confused. (p. 169)
The Problem

This study examines the policy issues in the current state level master plans for higher education, in those states whose coordinating boards have regulatory powers, in an effort to identify the most significant policy issues facing higher education in the United States during the 1990s and beyond.

The Purposes

The purposes of this study are (1) to identify the major policy issues being addressed by state agencies responsible for coordinating and regulating higher education; (2) to develop a classification system through inductive "clustering" that will aid in the analysis and synthesis of the major policy issues facing state coordinating boards for higher education; (3) to classify these policy issues; (4) to compare the goals and strategies of the various states; (5) to propose a list of significant policy issues that institutions and state agencies of higher education may face through the 1990s and into the 21st century.

In relationship to the first purpose, the following research questions are proposed:

(1) What are the goals currently included in the state master plans for higher education created by those state level coordinating boards with regulatory
powers?

(2) What are the strategies proposed by those coordinating boards to achieve those goals?

In relationship to the second purpose, the following research questions are proposed:

(1) What are the major clusters formed by grouping the goals specified in the current state level master plans for higher education included in the study?

(2) How do these issues compare to the major issues identified in the related literature?

In relationship to the third purpose, the following research questions are proposed:

(1) What are the major policy issues derived from the clusters?

(2) What are the problems identified by the state coordinating boards with regulatory powers related to each major policy issue?

In relationship to the fourth purpose, the following research questions are proposed:

(1) What comparisons can be made of the goals developed by the state coordinating boards to address the problems related to each major policy issue?

(2) What comparisons can be made of the strategies proposed by the state coordinating boards to address the goals related to each major policy issue?

In relationship to the final purpose, the following
research questions are proposed:

(1) What are the national major policy issues that institutions and state coordinating boards may face through the 1990s and into the 21st century?
(2) What further research questions related to these major policy issues may need to be answered in the future?

Significance of the Problem

In 1964, Glenny declared, "The classic condition of autonomy in higher education still prevails in only ten states. In all others, some rather formal structure, legal or voluntary, advises, persuades, or orders public, and occasionally non-public, institutions into a degree of coordination formerly thought to be impossible and undesirable" (ACE, 1964, p. 25). McConnell identified three broad kinds of agencies organized for state level or statewide planning and coordination: (1) the advisory coordinating board, (2) the regulatory coordinating board, and (3) the consolidated governing board (p. 46). By 1982, only 3 states had no state agency (CF, 1982, p. 41). The 1993 Almanac published by "The Chronicle of Higher Education" lists an address for statewide coordination in every state. Therefore, all state level coordinating offices may need the information in this study.

In 1970, Eulau and Quinley noted,
The American states vary markedly in economic development, social and ethnic stratification, political structure and culture, administrative organization, and popular attitudes toward a variety of matters - from secular and profane to the religious and sacred. Such differences are reflected in the goals which these states set for higher education and in their ability to achieve them.

(p. 31)

Therefore, all state coordinating boards may learn from this study.

If the efforts of the states are accurate, then a state's master plan for higher education is a valid instrument to use to gather data about higher education in that state. An analysis of state master plans should present a significant summary of the major policy issues in higher education in the nation. Planners will be able to compare the policy issues they are considering as important to the future of their institution or state with this summary list of major policy issues in higher education. Researchers can use this list of policy issues to develop research related to the history of each issue or to track the efforts made to solve problems related to each issue. Therefore, this study may be useful to all college administrators and to all faculty and students in the study of higher education.
Altbach and Berdahl (1981) advised "that the success of colleges and universities in achieving a significant role in society has made increasingly clear that they cannot stand apart from the main currents of the society" (p. 30). They warned:

financial austerity, the need to diversify opportunities for higher education, governmental demands for accountability, and other influences have pushed decision making upward in the authority structure both internally and externally. In the course of this development, statewide governing and coordinating boards have come to play an influential, often critical, role in the evolution of higher education. (p. 46)

In 1990, the Bush administration and the nation's governors adopted six goals for public education (K-12) in the United States. Some leaders believe that this attention given to education should also include higher education. In the Fall of 1991, Blenda J. Wilson, Chancellor of the University of Michigan at Dearborn, and, then, chair-elect of the American Association for Higher Education (AAHE), stated, "The AAHE believes that now is the time for higher education to join in the dialogue about national goals and standards [for education], as it is [important] for us to contribute our talents and experience toward achieving a world-class educational system"
The summary of major policy issues in higher education derived from this study can be used in the development of national goals and standards for higher education.

Research Approach

Best warns, "Any attempt to classify types of educational research poses a difficult problem...[as] all research involves the elements of observation, description, and analysis..." (Best, 1970, p. 14). This study will be a qualitative inquiry using techniques and methods derived from the field of policy research. Eisner and Peshkin found that there is "...no general agreement about the conduct of any of the types of qualitative inquiry; perhaps there never will or can be consensus of the sort that is embodied in the standardization procedures of quantitative research..." (Eisner and Peshkin, 1990, p. 1). Likewise, according to Wildavsky, "there can no more be only one approved mode of policy research than there can be only one way of learning" (Majchrzak, 1984, p. 11).

The identification of issues in higher education is an important step in the process of improving higher education. There are several research approaches and sources of data that could be used to identify these issues, such as interviews, attitude surveys, panel studies, and document analysis. This study is a form of
policy research known as secondary analysis: "the analysis and reanalysis of existing databases" (p. 60). The state master plans created by the state coordinating boards of higher education with regulatory powers will be the source material for creating a database.

Peter Rossi and his colleagues proposed that policy research "is a mixture of science, craftlore, and art. The science is the body of theory, concepts, and methodological principles; the craftlore, the set of workable techniques, rules of thumb, and standard operating procedures; and art, the pace, style, and manner in which one works" (p. 11). Majchrzak defines policy research as "the process of conducting research on, or analysis of, a fundamental social problem in order to provide policy-makers with pragmatic, action-oriented recommendations for alleviating the problem" (p. 12). Although there are various types of policy research, Weiss concluded that policy research serves "...as the 'enlightenment function' of social research" (p. 16).

The approach taken by policy research is described by Majchrzak (1984):

Policy research uses an empirico-inductive approach. Policy research begins with the social problem and attempts empirically to induce concepts and causal theories as the study of the social problem progresses. Referred to as empirico-inductive, this
approach contrasts sharply with the traditional scientific hypothesis-testing approach. The hypothesis-testing approach, in which social phenomena are studied primarily in order to test specific theories, has little place in policy research... Instead, the researcher engages in an iterative process whereby information and model building are constantly interchanged. This type of research approach has been termed by some as the "grounded theory" approach to research. (p. 18).

Majchrzak (1984) also noted that "policy research varies as to the academic discipline of the researcher" (p. 17). There are several reasons why policy research relies on the background of the researcher.

The researcher must be able to consider all aspects of the multidimensional social problems, identify and maintain focus on the most malleable variables, study the social problem without imposing predefined theory, consider the efforts of past and future trends on the present, explicitly incorporating values into the research process, and being responsive to study users despite their numerous and sometimes conflicting demands. (p. 20)

Why use "analysis" to identify issues in higher education? Quade stated:
In policy analysis the word "analysis" is used in its most general sense: It implies the use of intuition and judgement and encompasses not only the examination of a policy by decomposition into its components but also the design and synthesis of new alternatives. The activities involved may range from research to illuminate or provide insight into an anticipated issue or problem, to the evaluation of a completed program. Some policy analyses are informal, individual efforts involving nothing more than hard and careful thinking, whereas others require many people, extensive data gathering, and elaborate calculations employing sophisticated mathematical processes. (Quade, 1989, p. 5)

In 1977, Weiss stated that "policy makers use research more to orient themselves to problems and less to arrive at solutions; that they use research to help them think about issues, rather than to provide the solution to practical problems" (Dery, 1984, p. 11). Lindblom and Cohen concluded that the contribution of policy research is a fundamental enlightening of thought (p. 11). However, Dery warned that "the enlightenment model of policy research utilization may indicate retrospective sense making, or rationalization" (p. 11).

Perhaps the most practical reason for analyzing existing data, like state master plans, is offered by
Majchrzak (1984), who states, "This method is, by far, the most cost-effective method for answering policy research questions" (p. 60).

However, if Lindblom is correct about his notion of disjointed incrementalism, "a refinement of a process he had earlier referred to as 'muddling through'" (Quade, 1989, p. 29), then the analysis of state master plans is the "politically correct" way of developing alternatives for policy-makers. Although analysis is necessary for policy-making, according to Lindblom, "what is feasible is policy only incrementally or marginally different from existing policies" (p. 29).

Lindblom concluded "analysis becomes more a device to help a decision-maker by contributing to his bargaining power than a means to help him by providing him with sufficient information for him to make a decision" (p. 29). This notion implies that policy-makers would want to see what other policy-makers are doing about specific issues involving higher education so that they would have a level of comfort with the policies they are considering.

Regarding the purpose of policy analysis, Quade (1984) concluded:

the purpose of policy analysis is to help (or sometimes influence) a decision-maker to make a better decision in a particular problem situation. This is not the same thing as attempting to provide
him with a complete description of what should be done in every conceivable contingency that might ensue. The outcome to be expected from the analysis is almost never a clear recommendation for choice. (p. 13)

In 1984, Quade asked the question: Can public policy analysis be expected to find a solution to any of the world's major problems? (p. 10)? Quade answered:

Perhaps, but even if it did, the problem would still exist until a sufficient number of policy-makers recognize it as the solution and took a series of actions to implement it. Thus far, policy analysis has been more valuable as a means for investigating problems than as a means for solving them, doing more to reveal the complexities of public problems than to facilitate the choices. (p. 10)

Regarding this study, the question is, "Why use analysis to identify the issues in higher education?" The answer to this question is: to improve the planning process in higher education as a step in the overall process of improving higher education.

Brickner and Cope defined planning as "a process by which an individual or organization decides in advance on some future course of action" (Brickner and Cope, 1977, p. 2). They stated that "the ability to plan is a skill needed by the complexity of modern organizations, the
planning process is particularly important for those who are leaders or managers" (p. 4).

In the modern process of strategic planning, the identification of the issues or problems is an important step. King and Cleveland noted:

Terms such as 'long-range planning' and 'strategic planning' connote philosophies and approaches through which the future impact of change is assessed and integrated into current decisions. These terms deal with broad, important, far-reaching forces that beset the organization as opposed to the parochial and short range issues involved in day-to-day operating decisions. (p. 3)

In order to solve a problem, the organization must identify the problem. However, Morrison and Renfro pointed out that one of the problems institutions and statewide agencies face is that they "tend to spend too much time on the issues that seem important now. Important issues tend to be defined as those of the greatest immediacy; thus, even when we are aware of emerging issues, we do not have the time or motivation to address them" (Morrison, Renfro, and Boucher, 1983, p. 10).

Melcher and Kerzner identify scanning the external environment for changing conditions as the first step in the formulation of a strategic plan (Melcher and Kerzner, 1988, p. 1). This study "scans" the state master plans for
higher education and provides an objective, relatively neutral analysis of the issues presented in these plans. The environment is external to each state and institution of higher education in each state.

Contribution to Knowledge

According to Quade (1984), "In a broad sense, policy analysis is a form of applied research carried out to acquire a deeper understanding of sociotechnical issues and to bring about better solutions" (Quade, 1989, p. 4). Quade concluded "the purpose of [analysis for public decision] is to help public policy-makers resolve the issues they face; it is not research for knowledge alone, nor is it concerned with the nature and causes of social or environmental problems or with explanations of behavior, except as such research is required to help formulate decision" (p. 5). This study is designed to help public policy-makers identify how others are proposing to resolve the issues they face.

Quade also stated:

policy analysis can frequently reduce the complexity of problems to manageable proportions (manageable by judgement, that is) by identifying and clarifying those elements about which information exists or can be found... By making information available and laying bare hidden assumptions and value preferences,
public policy analysis can widen the area of informed judgement. (p. 11)

This study identifies and clarifies the problems in higher education which state coordinating boards have identified in each state. A "problem" may be defined as: a discrepancy between 'what is' and 'what ought to be' (Merton, 1961; Kilman and Mitroff, 1979)...

Problems, in this view, are gaps rather than being the equivalent of distressing conditions. To define a problem is therefore to sketch the difference between where we are and were we should be (Rittel and Webber, 1973)...

The common, normative (rational) model of decision making advises one to formulate goals (i.e., sketch the gap), identify alternative means to achieve those goals, and select the best alternative (Dror, 1968; Allison, 1971). (p. 22)

This study identifies the problems and alternative means to achieve those goals, as proposed by the state coordinating boards.

Finally, while some educators (and the general public) may think that the current condition of higher education is the result of sudden, abrupt, and unexpected changes, a review of the literature shows that the signs, signals, and warnings were there. Morrison and Renfro (1983) observed:

During the past twenty years, forecasting for planning purposes has included more and more use of
information about the environment external to institutions. In traditional forecasting and planning, an organization would focus on its own current performance as the basis for its outlook on the future, and early forecasting and planning techniques were developed to support this internal perspective, which assumed that changing conditions in the external world not require reevaluation of internal workings. Nowadays, however, this assumption has become increasingly unacceptable. (p. 5)

Limitations

The primary limitation of this study is the use of state master plans for higher education from states whose coordinating boards have regulatory powers to create the database for analysis. These government documents must be subjected to certain standards of criticism. Best (1970) points out,

Documents used in descriptive research must be subjected to the same careful type of criticism employed by the historian. Not only is the authenticity of the document important, but the validity of its contents is crucial. The burden of proof relies with the researcher. It is his obligation to establish the trustworthiness of all
data that he draws from documentary sources. (p. 133)

This study is based on the assumption that the state master plans analyzed are authentic documents and meet the tests applied to documents used in research, including external and internal criticism. These documents are a part of recent history and most of the questions related to external criticism are not raised. State master plans are authentic sources of information about higher education in each state. Although the authorship is not always completely identified in the state master plan, the state agency responsible for each plan is clearly identified and the participants could be identified through additional investigation. Although every plan does not explain the process or conditions under which the document was prepared, it would be possible to determine this process if this information is necessary. It is assumed that most states appoint committees of educators, politicians, and/or other community leaders representing many attitudes and publics in the state to develop the content of the master plan. Professional staff of the state agency are usually responsible for the actual production of the plan. The plan is usually reviewed by several key committee members for final editing. In some cases, plans are produced by outside consultants. Regardless of the process used to develop the state master plan, external criticism is not a problem when considering state master plans as historical
evidence.

According to Borg and Gall (1989), "internal criticism involves evaluating the accuracy and worth of the statements contained in a ... document" (Borg and Gall, 1989, p. 822). Generally, the state master plans used in this study were produced or revised after 1985 and present plans for the 1990s. Some of the questions regarding internal criticism are: Do the statements in this plan represent the opinions and concerns of the citizens and leaders of the state? Are the data presented in the master plan accurate? Are the statements the product of open and honest meetings or are the statements the product of subjective, biased opinions of a select few citizens? Dery (1984) noted that "...the policy analyst trusts the political process" (p. 5). It is assumed that state master plans are accurate reflections of the opinions of the participants.

Because each state has different factors that contribute to the development of the master plan for each state, it is reasonable to believe that no state would identify all of the issues facing higher education (or recommend all of the solutions). However, a summary of all of the issues identified by the individual states may provide a summary of the majority of major issues facing higher education in the nation.
Delimitation

This study identifies issues for the nineties; therefore, the master plans included had to be current as of 1990. As most master plans are usually designed to address issues five to ten years into the future, the plans to be analyzed were created or updated after 1985.

The number of state master plans included in this study has been limited to those states whose state level coordinating boards have regulatory powers as identified by the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. These coordinating boards have the responsibility and power to make policy decisions (CF, 1982, pp. 37-44). In 1982, the Carnegie Foundation classified the states based on a classification system developed by Robert O. Berdahl (pp. 40-41). The classification of the states is presented in Table 1.
<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Table 1</td>
<td>Statewide Coordination of Higher Education - 1982</td>
<td>(according to Carnegie Foundation)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. No State Agency</td>
<td>Delaware</td>
<td>Vermont</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II. Voluntary Association: None</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III. Coordinating Board</td>
<td>A. Advisory Agencies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>Michigan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>California</td>
<td>Minnesota</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Regulatory Power</td>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>Maryland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>Missouri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>New Jersey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>New Mexico</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>New York</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>Ohio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV. Consolidated Governing Board</td>
<td>Alaska</td>
<td>Kansas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>Maine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>Mississippi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hawaii</td>
<td>Montana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td>Nevada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>New Hampshire</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Assumptions

Glenny pointed out, "coordination did not arise out of the foresight by educators but from demands of legislators and governmental agencies for more efficient use of public monies... The need for coordination and greater central planning is now apparent to most leaders of higher education, especially in the public sphere" (ACE, 1964, p. 25). Dressel, in 1980, "declared that coordination is here to stay and that it will continue to confront institutions of higher education with issues of autonomy and sometimes debatable requirements for accountability" (Altbach and Berdahl, 1984, p. 47). It is assumed that state coordination is not going to end.

Although intellectual freedom in colleges and universities may not be under special threat, Altbach and Berdahl (1982) warned:

Financial austerity causes legislatures, statewide coordinating boards, and even consolidated governing boards to look more critically at institutional roles, at the availability and distribution of functions and programs, at effectiveness, and at educational and operational costs... States and localities are more demanding of education and service, more critical of what they perceive institutions to be doing, more vocal in expressing
their criticisms and desires. Public institutions, always answerable to the general interest, will no longer be excused from defending what they do or don’t do. No longer can a university shunt public criticism aside as a mere expression of intellectual shallowness. It will increasingly have to explain itself, defend its essential character, and demonstrate that its service is worth the cost. (p. 37)

"Accountability" will continue to be expected of higher education. The demands and criticism of higher education will not change any time soon.

Altbach and Berdahl (1982) noted the fundamental elements of accountability, as identified by Dressel, include:

(1) using allocated resources legally and widely to attain those purposes for which they were made available.
(2) accumulating evidence of the extent to which purposes are achieved.
(3) reviewing the evaluation evidence to clarify the avowed goals and their interpretation
(4) considering the relevance, effectiveness, and costs of the processes used to achieve the goals
(5) improving the educational processes used or finding more effective processes. (p. 38)
In 1964, Glenny noted, "the wide publicity given to adoption of the California master plan of 1959-60 provoked other states to emulate the idea, if not the exact features, of the plan" (ACE, 1964, p. 35). The California legislation directed the Liaison Committee:

to prepare a Master Plan for the development, expansion, and integration of the facilities, curriculum, and standards of higher education, in junior colleges, state colleges, the University of California, and other institutions of higher education of the State, to meet the needs of the State during the next 10 years and thereafter... and to transmit that plan... to the Legislature at its 1960 regular session within three days of the convening thereof... (California, 1973, p. v)

In less than seven months, from June, 1959 to January 29, 1960, committees of educators, legislators, and bureaucrats conceived, organized, wrote, and transmitted a plan that has served as the foundation of the organization and management of higher education in the state of California for over thirty years.

Although the California legislature did not define what they expected the plan to look like or how it was to be accomplished, the California master plan, by being the first, established a model for creating a state master plan for higher education. It is assumed that while the model
and process of planning may change from state to state, the concept of statewide planning will not cease to be important.

In most states, master planning has evolved from long-range planning to strategic planning. In the early 1980s, many authorities, among them George Keller, were advocating strategic planning as something new and different from traditional long-range planning. Keller (1983) described strategic planning as:

...a new development of great potential. This type of planning in not the same as the mechanical and deterministic long-range planning that was tried a decade or two ago. Strategic planning deals with a new array of factors: the changing external environment, competitive conditions, the strengths and weaknesses of the organization, and opportunities for growth. Strategic planning is an attempt to give organizations antennae to sense the changing environment. It is a management activity designed to help organizations develop greater quality by capitalizing on the strengths they already have. (p. vi)

In the 1980s, several authorities were explaining the differences between long-range planning and strategic planning. Below, Morrisey, and Acomb differentiate between strategy formulation and long-range planning by
noting that "when long-range planning is done without putting effort into clearly determining an appropriate strategy, it tends to be largely an extrapolation of what has gone on in the past" (Below, Morrissey and Acomb, 1987, p. 56).

Gluck warned that those who rely on the 1970s-style planning (planning driven by operational rather than strategic perspectives) are doomed in the 1980s and 1990s. According to Gluck:

When things are stable, experience is an acceptable basis for decision making and action. But we are in a period of dramatic change. The extent and duration of competitive advantage depend on the vagaries of a constantly shifting economic order. [Institutions] that continue to rely on the past as the best guide to the future get caught in the experience trap - they become rigid in their thinking, set in their ways, and lose the flexibility that is crucial to turning change into opportunity or even effectively responding to it. Reliance on experience becomes the ultimate handicap in an environment that is turning that very experience topsy-turvy. (Gardner, Rachlin, Sweeney, 1986, p. 7)

Although only some state plans for higher education are identified as strategic plans, all state coordinating boards that have developed master plans include some type
of external factors in the development of their plan. But more importantly, whether state coordinating boards develop master plans or do not develop master plans, it is assumed that planning related to issues will continue to occur at the state level.

Chapters

Chapter 2 reviews literature related to issues in higher education identified in previous decades, beginning in 1970 and continuing into the 1990s.

Chapter 3 describes the procedures used to obtain the state master plans and the problems involved in this process. The chapter describes the creation of the database and the problems related to the use of the database.

In Chapter 4, the state master plans are summarized and the issues are classified into clusters in order to answer the questions related to the second purpose of this study. The major issues are explained in order to answer the questions identified in the third purpose of this study.

Chapter 5 presents the issues derived from the analysis of the issues in the state master plans. The questions related to the first purpose of this study are answered. Comparisons are made of different state strategies, thus answering the questions related to the
fourth purpose of this study.

Chapter 6 presents conclusions about the major issues facing higher education in the 90s and presents future research possibilities from the information in this study. This chapter answers the questions asked in the final purpose of this study.
CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

This chapter reviews literature related to attitudes and issues which faced higher education during three periods of time: (a) the 1970s as reported by Eulau and Quinley in State Officials and Higher Education (1970); (b) the 1980s as presented by The Carnegie Council for Policy Studies in Higher Education in Three Thousand Futures: The Next Twenty Years (1980), Clark Kerr in Higher Education in American Society by Altbach and Berdahl (1981), and in Higher Learning in America: 1980-2000 (1993), edited by Arthur Levine; (c) the 1990s as presented by Banach and Lorenzo in The Ten Top Issues Facing America's Community College (1991), by Gilley in Thinking About American Higher Education: The 1990s and Beyond (1991), and by Clark Kerr in Troubled Times for American Higher Education: The 1990s and Beyond (1994). Finally, The Chronicle of Higher Education will be reviewed to identify issues facing higher education during recent years (1991-94).

In the late '60s, The Carnegie Commission on Higher Education asked Dr. Heinz Eulau, Professor of Political Science at Stanford University, to make a report on "how legislators and certain state executive officials perceived the problems and issues of higher education, their
attitudes toward various aspects of higher education, and their expectations of future development" (Eulau and Quinley, 1970, p. vii). The report included responses from states in different regions of the country, some with large, complex systems of higher education as well as others with less developed systems. Using open ended questions, legislators who were more knowledgeable about higher education than the average legislator, e.g. speakers or presidents pro-tem, majority or minority leaders, chairmen of education and finance committees, were surveyed. Because of the nature of the sample, the report did not attempt to present a quantitative study of attitudes and opinions. The authors sought to develop a kind of composite profile of what the respondents had on their minds (p. xii). The authors hoped that the document would "be of some use to those who wish to know how political men assess the problems and prospects of higher education in the third quarter of the century" (p. xiii).

At the time of the survey, of the nine states included in the report, three states (California, Illinois, and New York) had well-established master plans for higher education. Pennsylvania had a new plan and Texas was developing a plan. The other states, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, and Louisiana, did not practice master planning.
Although the report did not seek to identify issues in the master plans, several comments were noted about master plans and the planning process. The California plan (initiated in 1960) was viewed as being out of date and did not satisfactorily resolve problems related to the issue of institutional diversity. There was a perceived need to define the roles and relationships among the various institutions - universities, colleges, and junior colleges.

Legislators in Illinois had mixed opinions about the master plan. While the plan had addressed access by identifying the need for additional geographic locations, it did not address the potential funding problems which were becoming concerns of the legislators.

The responses from Pennsylvania indicated that the plan was too new to evaluate. However, changing the ways of the past and making what "looks good on paper" work, is not an easy task (p. 172).

The major concern in Kansas with the concept of master planning had to do with flexibility (p. 173). This was also a concerned in Iowa along with the concern for fairness, so that it would not be "loaded in any way in favor of one particular group or the other" (p. 175).

The authors concluded that the most frequently mentioned problems were: (1) Financing, (2) Planning and coordination, (3) Enrollment increases, (4) Student unrest (p. 38). Although less mentioned, the authors felt two
other concerns were important issues: (5) Legislators attitudes toward academicians and (6) the public service role of higher education (p. 38).

In his commentary based on the report developed by Eulau and Quinley (1970), David Henry identified six issues facing higher education:

1. It is clear that legislators do not give high priority to expenditures on university research (p. 189).

2. The interviews support the opinions of experienced observers in legislative relations in emphasizing that legislators feel remote from the complex operations of a university, even in relation to finances (p. 189).

3. The interviews make clear that the majority of legislators are more understanding of student unrest than the general public, particularly in the area of free speech and peaceful demonstrations (p. 190).

4. ...the legislators will have little regard for giving students any significant role in decision-making in areas where they have no continuing responsibilities or special competence. On influencing the conditions of student life, legislators are sympathetic (p. 191).
5. The legislative support for the public service activities of the universities is encouraging. However, here lies a problem of deep significance...the academic value system for professional advancement does not give adequate recognition to those engaged in public service (p. 191).

6. Devices and strategies for control of the universities by executive departments of state government have multiplied in recent times by regional and national associations of state governors and legislative leaders... Most legislators, however, recognize that the universities are in the public service just as much as executive departments, that the institutions are not "vested interests" to any greater degree than are other state programs and that, by and large, they have been characterized by high-level professional management in contrast to the turnover in government agencies (p. 192).

In 1981, The Carnegie Council on Policy Studies in Higher Education, following six years of studies from 1974 to 1980, released the final report of the council, entitled, Three Thousand Futures: The Next Twenty Years for Higher Education. This report discusses several fears and develops scenarios related to these fears. The report was addressed to several groups: the leaders of each institution of higher education, state planners, the
federal government, and to all those who can contribute private funds to colleges and universities (p. 6.). The report identifies ten trends that had developed in higher education by the end of the 1970s.

2. Transition from free sector to regulated industry (p. 14).
4. Increasing role of large institutions (p. 19).
5. Changing public confidence (p. 23).
7. The older faculty (p. 25).
8. The institutional stance: from offense to defense (p. 25).
9. The new students (p. 28).
10. The supremacy of the market (p. 29).

1. Rise of the public sector. In 1950, the proportional headcount enrollment between public and private institutions of higher education in the United States was approximately 50% in each (p. 15). According to the data compiled by the Carnegie Council, the proportional enrollment in private institutions of higher education decreased to 21.6% by 1976 (even though the actual headcounts increased). The greatest decreases in enrollment occurred in liberal arts colleges (both public
and private). Most growth occurred in the public sector, especially in two-year public colleges. The Council questioned whether the private sector represented an adequate check and balance to the public sector (p. 14).

2. Transition from free sector to regulated industry. For most of the history of higher education, the governance and management of institutions of higher education have been through self-governing actions. However, by the end of the 70s, the council concluded that "less policy is set by faculties and by boards of trustees and more by state governments, and by federal law and agencies" (p. 14). The council saw the future of higher education including more regulations.

3. Changing sources of financial support - more public money. The council reviewed data related to the sources of funds for higher education. Two long-term changes were noted: "a major redistribution from private to public funds; and the rise of the federal government as a major contributor of public funds" (p. 15). While all forms of government funds had increased (especially federal student aid), the council believed there would be "a stabilization of federal support" (p. 16). The council projected (or hoped) that federal funds would provide increased support for research. It also warned that institutions of higher education would have to reverse the historic trend away from a reliance on private support.
4. Increasing role of large institutions. Enrollment trends during the 70s indicated that large, usually public institutions, were growing and small, usually private institutions, were declining (p. 19). The growing institutions tended to be comprehensive, public institutions with professional and technical programs. The declining institutions tended to be small, private, rural, liberal arts colleges. The exceptions in these classification were the institutions with little student diversity, e.g. black colleges and fundamentalist Protestant colleges.

5. Changing public confidence. The turbulent 60s had a definite affect on public confidence in higher education. While the 70s enabled institutions of higher education to recover some public confidence, the Council warned that "public confidence is basic to public financial support" (p. 23).

6. Changing rates of growth. Growth in higher education brought the problems associated with obtaining new facilities, hiring faculty and staff. The 70s brought about a significant problem for many institutions: over capacity. Many institutions went into the 80s with empty classrooms and empty dormitories. Also, programs designed to prepare future faculty for higher education were faced with an over capacity of graduates. The Council saw changing rates of growth as "worrisome" and "upsetting
factors for higher education" (p. 25), and recommended that "qualitative growth should replace quantitative growth" (p. 99).

7. The older faculty. The Council noted that young faculty (under 30) hired in the 60s will be older, higher paid, less resilient in adjusting to new fields, and farther removed from the age of students (p. 25). The Council believed the positive aspects of this condition would be a stable, loyal faculty which would "add to stability in governance and attention to campus welfare" (p. 25).

8. The institutional stance: from offense to defense. The Council described the 70s using the words "concern," "despair," "survival" (p. 26). Strategies included lowering admission requirements, recruiting nontraditional students, emphasis on retention, lowering grading standards, increased offering of vocational and professional subjects (p. 27). The general campus atmosphere was "avoid controversy," "build consensus," "cut costs," and "recruit, recruit, recruit." While the public appearance of the typical campus was tranquil and cooperative, the internal tension led departments to compete to survive. Campus leadership was focused on innovations in fund raising and student recruiting rather than on instructional innovation (p. 27).
9. The new students. Between the early 60s and the late 70s, test scores for verbal skills declined 11 percent and for quantitative skills the decline was 7 percent (p. 28). The students of the 70s were less political, less interested in academic reform, and less hopeful about the world (p. 29). The large institutions in metropolitan settings saw growth and, generally, saw more cheating, more vandalism, and more defaulting on student loans. The new student was less concerned with the well-being of their group, but very confident about their own individual future.

10. The supremacy of the market. The Council describes higher education as being largely enrollment-driven by the end of the 70s. With most public funds being distributed based on funding formulas which were based on enrollment: "the road to survival now leads through the market place" (p. 30).

At the beginning of the 1980s, the Council characterized higher education as becoming more and more a slow growing, government regulated, publicly funded, system with an aging faculty, primarily teaching on large traditional campuses what students (many who were non-traditional students) wanted to learn. It was this system that was receiving substantial public confidence (p. 31). However, the Council concluded that even with the current situation and possible severe problems facing higher
education, "it is better to plan to meet the future effectively than just to fear it as a new dark age" (p. 8).

The Council urged all institutions of higher education to contemplate carefully their prospective future and to determine the policies that will favorably affect their future, in particular:

1. Improvement of the quality of teaching, research, and service
2. The preservation of an essential balance among the main intellectual stream of academic endeavors against the pulse of the market
3. The enhancement of integrity of conduct on campus
4. Effective adaptations that do least damage to the internal life of the campus
5. The continuation of dynamic adjustments to new possibilities without any compensation increase in resources
6. The more effective use of resources and their better allocation internally
7. The creation of conditions that encourage effective leadership
8. The maximization of private funds to support higher education
9. The preservation, with the cooperation of all of higher education, of the private sector of higher education with its autonomy intact and its diversity
maintained
10. The enhancement of the research capabilities of higher education
11. The maintenance of the quality of internal campus life. (CF, 1982, p. 118)

In 1981, in Higher Education in American Society, a book edited by Altbach and Berdahl (1981), Clark Kerr and Marian Gade presented eleven emerging issues facing higher education:

1. Changing composition and changing numbers of students (p. 113)
2. Quality in college and in high school (p. 115)
3. Serving all of youth (p. 116)
4. Meeting the new competition: Sectors II, III, and IV (p. 117)
5. Still the "House of Science"? (p. 118)
6. Plan or market? (p. 120)
7. Preserving the private sector (p. 121)
8. New financial formulas for rising marginal cost curves (p. 123)
9. The survival of faculty morale after the Golden Age (p. 125)
10. Dealing the uncertainty (p. 127)
11. Renovation of the role of leadership (p. 127)

1. Changing composition and changing numbers of students. The declining fertility rates and differential
fertility rates among racial and ethnic groups, along with immigration, enabled Kerr and Gade to forecast significant changes in demographic factors of the traditional college-going undergraduate students in the 80s (p. 112-113). Their warnings to institutions included "maintaining or raising the quality of education while seeking new clienteles; to remain flexible without losing a sense of identity and mission; and to avoid unfair competitive practices that would destroy public confidence in higher education or make it less possible to retain the capacity to serve the larger numbers of students that are expected again after the mid-1990s" (p. 114).

2. Quality in college and in high school. Comparisons of standardized test scores, including Graduate Record Examination (GRE) and Scholastic Aptitude Test (SAT), indicated that the median scores dropped significantly from the mid 60s to the early 80s. Kerr and Gade concluded that the "quality gap" would be an issue for society and higher education (p. 115) because "as the needs of our technological society become increasingly complex, so too will its need for highly trained and personally competent individuals, able to manage their own lives wisely, to perform productively in the labor force, and to participate effectively in the affairs of the nation and the world" (p. 114). The issue in the 80s, according to Kerr and Gade, was for colleges not only to maintain and increase
their own quality, but to develop ways to contribute to improving the quality of secondary education.

3. Serving all of youth. Higher education, especially community colleges, according to many, had "a residual responsibility for youth," including advising youth of academic and employment opportunities (p. 117). Kerr and Gade recommended that colleges and universities "widen their base of recruitment and the range of services they offer" (p. 117).

4. Meeting the new competition: Sectors II, III, and IV. While the most often studied sector of higher education is Sector I (non-profit, public and private colleges and universities, Kerr and Gade believed that Sector I would experience significant competition in the 80s from Sector II (for-profit or proprietary institutions), Sector III (educational and training programs offered by noneducational institutions, such as corporations, military, etc.), and Sector IV (electronic education, including video discs, computers, and television). As Sector I institutions are unable or unwilling to supply all of the education to meet the labor market and personal needs of individuals, Sectors II, III, and IV will compete for consumer attention. Kerr and Gade concluded that "educational policy makers in Sector I will come face-to-face with the dilemma of how to meet competition from the other Sectors and to serve new needs,
while maintaining institutional integrity and a sense of academic mission" (p. 118).

5. Still the "Home of Science"? Kerr and Gade noted a trend in major universities away from basic research in the early 70s. This trend was due to the change in priorities by the federal government. While the federal government increased allocations for basic research in the mid-70s and continued increasing allocations into the 80s, once the universities made the shift from basic research to applied research, they continued shifting resources (p. 118). This trend had two significant affects. First, because basic research faculties could not expand, the need for graduate students to develop basic research skills diminished, and therefore the enrollments in PH.D. programs in the sciences declined. More importantly, the need to support science as a cultural activity was questioned, thus affecting the direction of scientific research. Research became focused on ultimate payoff to society rather than motivated by the nature of the discipline (p. 119). While "the government-university partnership in scientific research appears to be a permanent one... new rules for the partnership will need to be negotiated" (p. 119).

6. Plan or market? The dynamic growth of higher education after World War II caused each state to evaluate how to plan and coordinate the growth of higher education. By 1980, only one state did not have a mechanism for
coordinating public and private higher education. However, Kerr and Gade warned that the future of these coordinating bodies would included planning for decline (p. 120). These bodies will have to take away resources, reduce personnel, consolidate and or close campuses. The question then becomes will the market place dictate the growth or decline of higher education or will other factors influence planning the future of higher education. Those who trust the market forces were concerned about the political influence on the planning process, about the state intrusion into the governance and management of academic institutions, and about the reactions of various publics (alumni, faculty, donors, employers, etc.) to the state plans (p. 121). However, Kerr and Gade point out that "a major role for planners could be to utilize the market forces constructively" (p. 121).

7. Preserving the private sector. While there have always been more private than public institutions of higher education, the actual headcount of students enrolled in private institutions was down to about 20 percent by the beginning of the 1980s. While the comprehensive, highly selective private liberal arts colleges seemed to be stable at the end of the 70s, the small, liberal arts rural colleges seemed to have a questionable future. Much of the stability of private higher education was because of the state and federal aid to students who attend private
institutions. By the mid 70s, about forty states "had some kind of program to provide state support to private institutions" (p. 123). While private colleges must take responsibility for their own futures, with the possible decline of enrollments in both public and private institutions, there was the possibility that government policy would reduce the state support to private institutions in order to maintain support to public institutions through the 80s and 90s. The Carnegie Council and Kerr and Gade urged that public support of private institutions be continued.

8. New financial formulas for rising marginal cost curves. Most public colleges are funded by enrollment driven formulas, whether the enrollment is actual headcount or full-time equivalent (FTE) headcount. Most states calculate the average cost formula by dividing total expenses divided by FTE. Physical plant usage, counseling services, and other costs vary by the actual number of students or are fixed based on a minimum level of service which must be provided. Also, because different disciplines and different levels (undergraduate vs. graduate) of higher education vary greatly in delivery costs, some states base their formulas on averages of related disciplines. Finally, base periods for calculating average cost formulas and legislative funding formulas inevitably cause funding to institutions to lag two to four
years behind actual costs. Another concern raised about enrollment based formulas was that there was no performance accountability on the part of institutions. Kerr and Gade pointed to the Tennessee plan which would allocate a percentage of institutional funding based on state established performance criteria (p. 125). While the initial proposal was only 2 percent of the educational and general funds, this and other forms of incentive funding were projected as being probable in the 80s and 90s.

9. The survival of faculty morale after the Golden Age. Even though the 60s were years of political unrest, the general morale of faculty did not decline until the 70s when faculty compensation fell behind inflation. The role of faculty in governance either was replaced by business managers or increased, as at Yeshiva University, so that their professional interests could not be separated from the management of the college, thus the faculty was no longer eligible to be represented through collective bargaining. The ageing faculty hired in the 60s and 70s was facing a changing student population: interested in different new fields of study, less academically prepared, more diverse in race, ethnical background, and attitudes (especially regarding women). With little chance for mobility, either to other institutions or to business or industry, little opportunity for economic advancement, either through faculty raises or promotion within the
institution, and with increased pressure to be more productive, either in the classroom or in publishing, the probability of low morale in the 80s and 90s was easy to forecast.

10. Dealing with uncertainty. Most of the issues discussed by Kerr and Gade were predictable once they were identified, analyzed, and the implications understood. However, most of higher education did not identify issues, did not want to analyze the issues, and did not care about understanding the implications of these issues. Kerr and Gade warned that the rate at which uncertain events occur in the future will probably increase, and that "the signs pointing to them may be there now" (p. 127). This uncertainty lead to their final issue.

11. Renovation of the role of leadership. Managing growth is much more satisfying than managing decline (p. 128). Autonomy enables more freedom in decision making than regulations and controls imposed by outside agencies. The public demand for accountability and the internal expectation of "participatory democracy" are viewed by many administrators as contradictory concepts. The leaders of higher education in the 80s and 90s, according to Kerr and Gade, will have to "exercise discretion, adjust rapidly to new developments, [and] handle the sudden crisis" (p. 128).

back at the past decade (1980s) in higher education and make some predictions about the future of higher education. Callan noted that the 1980s was a period of the resurgence of the states in the relation of government to higher education (Levine, 1993, P. 4). The focus by policy leadership of many states on the development of a competitive work force as the appropriate way to improve the living standards and quality of life of the citizens led to the link of economic development with educational reform (p. 5). The 80s became the decade of the reform of higher education, especially undergraduate education.

Although Callan does not find examples of states dictating higher education curricula or trying to do away with accrediting bodies, states did begin to show an interest in more than just fiscal and procedural accountability. The issue of educational quality focused on educational outcomes which became measured by student assessment (p. 7). By 1990, only eight of forty-eight states surveyed did not have plans for some form of assessment initiative. While some states were developing or implementing some form of standardized tests, most states were allowing institutional flexibility regarding how quality was to be measured.

Access to higher education has historically been the result of government intervention. While the 80s was thought to be a time of major improvement of minority
participation in higher education, a 1989 survey by the American Council on Education indicated that only about one-third administrators rated this commitment as high (p. 9). Another survey, conducted by the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, found that only 49 percent of five thousand faculty were satisfied with affirmative action related to student recruitment at their institution (p. 9). Callan believes the equity agenda that is apart of the access issue grew out of the economic agenda (p. 10). States can not be successful in solving economic problems if they are not successful in improving the education of minority groups (p. 10).

Typically, aid to education is the largest expenditure in most state budgets (p. 11). Public schools usually get the largest portion with higher education being the second largest share of the education budget. Generally, the 80s saw dramatic increases in tuition in public colleges and universities. The debate regarding what percentage of an institution’s budget should come from tuition and what percentage of the average cost of public higher education should tuition represent continued. By the end of the 80s, tuition was covering about 30% of current operating expenses (p. 12).

The importance of the independent sector in higher education continued to be discussed in the 80s. While 22 percent of students in higher education are enrolled
in private nonprofit colleges and universities, the Education Commission of the States concluded that these institutions save taxpayers more than $12 billion annually (p. 13). Once again, various sources warned against any weakening of the private sector and called for the continuation and growth of need-based financial aid for students who want to attend private colleges and universities (p. 14).

Although the issue of governance of higher education received much attention in the 80s, there were very few actual changes. Perhaps the most significant change was the establishment of more statewide multi-campus governing boards. Eight states increased the responsibilities and authority of the statewide coordinating or planning boards. Several states reorganized subsystems, such as community colleges or vocational-technical institutions. Generally, changes tended to be toward centralization at the state level, with some states enlarging the influence of the position of governor (p. 14).

Research performed in the 80s has been described by Geiger as "programmatic (i.e., research intended to be useful to outside sponsors)" (p. 70). Geiger indicates that this type of research is not necessarily applied or practical research but it is research with commercial value. The ethics of linking university research programs with research parks and business incubators, of using or
misusing graduate students on commercial ventures, of actually withholding of knowledge because of the possible commercial value became problems and issues for faculty and administrators in the 80s.

According to Breneman, the 80s did not turn out to be the "dark ages" of higher education. The 25 percent decline in enrollments did not occur. The anti-intellectual trends of the 70s did not lead to the projected closing of over two hundred small, tuition-dependent institutions (p. 91). The decade of the 80s was a decade of surprises. While federal deficits grew, state revenues also grew, a positive factor for higher education (p. 92). Although tuition at private institutions increased by an unprecedented 106 percent between 1981 and 1989, Breneman notes that "students were not driven away by these rapidly rising prices, and at many institutions - particularly the most selective ones - applications actually went up" (p. 92). Breneman attributes the difference between the projections of the 70s with the actualities of the 80s "primarily to the upsurge in the economy and secondarily to responses and adaptations of colleges and universities" (p. 92). Many administrators in higher education actually adopted concepts of marketing and strategic planning, thus they "focused intensely on their institution’s niche in the market for higher education services and how it was positioned relative to competition"
However, this market driven strategic planning caused many small private liberal arts colleges to become small private professional schools or preparatory colleges for professional schools at major universities.

Perhaps the most dynamic postsecondary sector of the post-war era has been the community college movement. Koltai described the 1980s as "the end of its era of ready money, rapid expansion, and visionary dreams and the beginning of a period of financial retrenchment, fear of declining enrollments, and skepticism about the future" (p. 101). While the growth rate slowed and the number of associate degrees awarded decreased 9 percent during the 80s, enrollments did increase, primarily due to adults beyond traditional college age turning to community colleges for career and continuing education (p. 101). The accessibility in terms of location and the convenience in terms of extended classroom hours made the community college the college of choice for working adults (p. 102). The services provided by community colleges, such as day care for children of students, enabled single mothers, the largest category of impoverished families, to attend daytime classes (p. 102). Community colleges, through strategic planning, "sought to prepare their students for as-yet-undefined jobs in an uncertain and shifting workplace" (p. 103). Many community colleges created bridges between high school and four-year colleges and
universities through a variety of approaches, including articulation agreements, "techprep" programs, and various developmental programs, especially related to the education of immigrants in need of developing English as a Second Language (p. 104).

The development of faculty for teaching in the community college received much attention during the 80s, with increased numbers of women and minorities finding employment. The use of adjunct faculty is a firmly established practice in community colleges and grew by over 46 percent in the 80s (p. 107). While this continues to be financially beneficial to the colleges, it continues to be an issue of concern and debate.

The 1980s saw an increase in the number of institutional research offices in community colleges. In order to demonstrate student outcomes and successes, research staffs were created to collect data which would not only identify who was being admitted and enrolled, but to assess student progress and to improve student achievement (p. 109).

At the beginning of the 1990s, there are several sources available related to the issues facing higher education. Callan believes "public policy initiatives will remain primarily at the state level... the fiscal problems most states are experiencing in 1990 and 1991 will not automatically end when the national recession runs out"
(p. 15-16). He also believes that the skepticism of governors and legislators about the effectiveness of undergraduate education will continue to be an issue in the 90s. This concern may have a direct link to the issue of the role of higher education in the reform of public schools. As all of education becomes involved in a general reform movement, Callan believes governance and structure could become a focus of state leaders (p. 17). Finally, the involvement of colleges and universities in the fulfillment of national aspirations brought about by a change in political leadership could be significant.

Geiger sees the financial environment for research universities as being uncertain. Tuition and tuition revenue ratio to operating expenses will continue to be an issue (p. 76). While funds for research are relatively stable, the allowances for reimbursement for indirect costs will probably be constrained. The educational reform movement could have a negative affect on research universities as energies and resources become focused on strengthening undergraduate education (p. 79). Those who advocate social responsibility as a role of higher education in society may become more vocal and can not be ignored (p. 81).

Although the accuracy of the forecasts about private colleges have been less than spectacular, Breneman believes the 90s will be a difficult decade for these colleges,
especially those private colleges depending on the traditional college age student. With fewer students available to pay higher tuitions, the price issue will again be discussed (p. 97). The private colleges are experiencing significant competition from the public colleges for donor support. With both tuition revenue and endowment revenue declining, the greatest issue facing small, private colleges in the 90s will be replacing retiring faculty (p. 97).

The community colleges will see many of the issues of the 80s continue to be issues of the 90s. Ethnic diversity and academic deficiencies will be primary characteristics of the community college student of the 90s (p. 110). Developmental education and multicultural courses will become major components of the curriculum (p. 110). As state resources become limited, community colleges will be faced with tough decisions regarding expanding the technical-vocational curriculum and "making winners out of ordinary people" (p. 113).

According to Boyer, academic institutions in the 90s must be purposeful, open, just, disciplined, caring, and celebrative.

By a purposeful community, we mean a place where faculty and students share academic goals and work together to strengthen teaching and learning on campus.
By an open community, we mean a place where freedom of expression is uncompromisingly defended and where civility is powerfully affirmed.

By a just community, we mean a place where the sacredness of each person is honored and where diversity is aggressively pursued.

By a disciplined community, we mean a place where individuals accept their obligations to the group and where well-defined governance procedures guide behavior for the common good.

By a caring community, we mean a place where service to others is encouraged.

By a celebrative community, we mean a place where the heritage of the institution is remembered and where rituals affirming both tradition and change are widely shared (p. 327).

In his book, *Thinking About American Higher Education: The 1990s and Beyond*, J. Wade Gilley "explores three major imperatives that will drive American higher education through the 1990s and into the twenty-first century" (Gilley, 1993, p. vii):

First, colleges and universities must respond to six critical challenges: minority participation, financing quality education, replacing quality faculty, affordability, institutional ethics, and national competitiveness.
Second, strong leadership is required at both the institutional and state government levels. Presidents of institutions must be willing and able to deal with stronger state mandates on social and economic problems. Governing boards must be willing to focus their institutions.

And, finally, the impact of changing regional economics will transform certain institutions located in burgeoning metropolitan areas and foster new forms of higher education designed to meet the challenges of the twenty-first century.

Minority participation. Gilley notes that the problem of insufficient numbers of minorities attending institutions of higher education means that insufficient numbers of minorities are preparing for careers in higher education. By the end of the 80s, less than 10 percent of all bachelor degrees awarded to minority students each year were in the field of education (p. 19). The projections for the mid-90s are that less than 5 percent of the public school teachers in the United States will be African-Americans and less than 2 percent will be Hispanic (p. 19). This trend is directly related to the declining high school graduation rates among minorities. If higher education institutions are to provide minority participation, then these institutions are going to have to participate in the turn around of public education through early
Financing quality higher education. Gilley sees financing quality higher education as a continuing problem in the 90s. A 1985 survey of university presidents indicated funding as the single most critical issue for over a third of the respondents. When asked to predict the crucial issue for five years into the future, a third of the respondents expected funding to still be the top issue (p. 30). Gilley believes that federal and state funding for higher education will provide limited direct benefits to students, such as student loans, and more "pork barrel" projects for selected colleges and universities and/or special allocations based on state priorities (p. 32). According to Gilley, those states who established tuition ratios in the 1980s found this method of setting tuition to be a failure (p. 33). The new funding method will be more direct control by state government of higher education via broad-based, state-prioritized programs (p. 34). Focused funding will probably result in institutions focusing their programs "by doing a few things well" (p. 37). With leaders of colleges and universities facing the reality that they must take an active approach to meeting financial concerns, competition for limited resources will force administrators to create focused and distinctive programs and to seek funds to expand their margins of excellence (p. 39).
Affordable higher education. Based of projections in the early 90s, a private college with an annual cost of $12,000 in 1988 will cost over $34,000 by the year 2000. The same projection model indicated that a state university costing $5,800 per year will increase to $16,555 (p. 43). A survey conducted in 1988 by the Yankelovich organization indicated that influential business leaders, government leaders, and journalists expressed major concerns about the rapid and continuing rise in the cost of a college education (p. 43). Another survey, also in 1988, of high school students indicated that 48 percent did not plan to go to college because they did not think they had enough money to go to college. However, the survey also found that 25 percent of the students overestimated the amount of money they needed by as much as $2,300 and 33 percent of the students thought financial aid was only available to minority students (p. 43). Gilley concludes "that the financing of American higher education ... will undoubtedly mature into a major issue for the 1990s" (p. 53).

Replacing quality faculty. Although the largest single budget category in most college budgets is faculty salaries, a voluntary reduction in salary cost would appear to be the beneficial result of faculty retiring. However, the projected retirement of over 700,000 faculty in the 90s and the first decade of the next century will cause two significant problems: a severe shortage of faculty with
advanced degrees and teaching experience and bidding wars between universities for the experienced faculty who are in the higher education system. Colleges will be faced with actually having to pay more for less qualified faculty. Therefore, while the number of faculty may decline in many institutions, the actual budgets for faculty salaries and faculty development will probably increase during the 90s (p. 54-60).

Institutional ethics. During the 70s and 80s, many institutions were forced by faculty and student protests to reevaluate their stock portfolios, the strings and conditions of private donations, and the activities which took place on campus in the name of research or athletics. Gilley warns that without self-regulation and/or the development of a professional code of ethics to govern American colleges and universities, the 90s "may bring the strong hand of Congress to bear on American institutions of higher education" (p. 73).

Science, technology, and economic competitiveness. While the link between education, especially higher education, and national productivity has a history that dates back to World War I, the relationship between higher education and economic development is expected to be even more dynamic in the 90s. The technological revolution is once again projected "to dramatically improve learning" (p. 82). Higher education is faced with two issues:
responsibility for the development of new technologies and responsibility for training those who can apply the new technologies in the real world (p. 83). In both the science lab and the learning lab, technology is the process and product of learning. Higher education institutions are "faced with the dual challenge of first building critical mass in the form of faculty, programs, and facilities, and then distributing educational services to users" (p. 85). And if the demands of sustaining this nation's economy and quality of life have not put enough strain on the resources of American higher education, in a global society, American institutions are now trying to develop international programs (p. 87). The dynamics of science, technology, economic development, and a global perspective are expected to present unprecedented challenges for higher education in the 90s.

Strong leadership at both the institutional and state government levels. While Thomas Jefferson clearly wanted higher education to be the domain of state governments, throughout this nation's history, the federal government's involvement has gone from more to less to more. "During the 1980s, the attention to educational concerns and financing for initiatives shifted from the federal government to the states" (p. 99). With the public demanding quality education, state leaders are being held increasingly accountable. Through the 80s, the tension
between campus leaders and state leaders appeared to increase. By 1986, a survey conducted by George Mason University indicated that most governors did not rely on higher education leaders for ideas, programs, and policies for state institutions. Instead, they primarily relied on each other and their respective staffs (p. 103). By 1988-89, another survey indicated that most governors saw most college administrators as incompetent and over paid, most college administrators responded that governors create interference, too much state control, too many regulations and lack any clear policy regarding higher education. The relationship between state leaders and college leaders is perceived by Gilley to be an on-going issue in the 90s.

In 1991, The Institute for Future Studies at Macomb Community College published the second edition of The Top Ten Issues Facing America’s Community Colleges. Based on input from two national environmental scanning groups and additional material and opinions of working professionals, a top ten of issues facing community colleges was developed (Banach and Lorenzo, 1991, Foreword). Although the headings are somewhat abbreviated, the list included:

1. Diversity Plus (p. 1)
2. Heterogenius (p. 3)
3. Workforce Strategy (p. 5)
4. Evidencing Strategy (p. 7)
5. Beyond Limits (p. 9)
Diversity Plus. Community colleges should seek opportunities to share insights, strategies, and responses to common issues. However, institutions should respond to the needs of their unique marketplace rather than copying each other. The 90s will be a decade that encourages institutional diversity based on the mission and goals established to meet the needs of customers within the institution’s services area (p. 2).

Heterogenius. The 90s will be a decade were more and more underprepared students will seek academic opportunities through the "open door" of the community college. Community college faculty will face an even larger disparity in ability, age, and aspirations of students in the 90s than they did in the 80s. "Our two-year institutions must nurture the fragile factors which make the difference between giving up and getting through" (p. 3).

Workforce strategy. As the information age emerges, "it is generally unclear what kind of workforce the educational system should produce" (p. 5). While some businesses want generalist who are reliable and obedient
employees, others want technically proficient employees. The issue for the 90s will be to prepare the new age worker to do the jobs that corporate America needs filled (p. 6).

Evidencing effectiveness. The challenge for community colleges will not only be to provide quality programs but also to communicate the effectiveness of those programs to a variety of constituencies (p. 7). This means that community colleges will have to move from a quantitative approach (headcount, credit hours, full-time-equivalent, etc.) of presenting institutional success to a qualitative approach which measures changes in persons and demonstrates individual successes.

Beyond limits. "With every passing day, our system of governance is less up to the task" (p. 9). The level of frustration between campus staff and trustees is growing as the complexity of managing the campus increases. The clear communication of the vision the administration has for the college will need to be presented through goals which the board of trustees can understand and support. Creating a supportive governance system will be an issue for community college leaders in the 90s (p. 10).

Organizational wellness. Although community colleges have a reputation for focusing on the well-being of students and the community, the 90s will be a time when some time will need to be used to focus on organizational wellness (p. 11). "Organizational climate and
institutional performance are mutually dependent" (p. 12).

Double Dilemma. The 90s will see community colleges experience a "turn over" of more than half of their employees. The overall shortage of professional faculty during the 90s will cause community colleges to have to "scramble to find faculty and key support staff" (p. 13). The competition in higher education will be fierce for qualified faculty. The other side of the problem is an aging faculty who do not retire. The community college will need to have faculty who are current in their disciplines and who can communicate with the changing student population. Maintaining quality in both old and new faculty will be a challenge in the 90s.

Proper perspectives. Each institution will need to develop proper perspectives about where it is headed, how it is going to get there, what are the issues which may impede progress (p. 17). Proper perspectives will enable college leaders to make correct decisions based on facts not just opinions. Institutional research will need to replace individual bias in the decision making process (p. 18).

Ethics. As our society reflected on the decade of the 80s, "a value-centered self-examination focused on how yesterday created today, and how we can move from where we are to build a better tomorrow" (p. 19). Once again, society is turning to religious and educational
organizations to provide leadership in values clarification and the development of ethics. The 90s will bring a debate over the appropriateness of an institutional code of conduct and whether there is a place for "ethics" in the curriculum (p. 20).

In 1994, once again Clark Kerr, in association with Marian Gade and Maureen Kawaoka, looked at the future of higher education. Kerr identified four certainties, five probabilities, four changes, four consequences, and three uncertainties.

The four certainties are:

1. The secular trend in attendance rates.
2. Changing size and composition of the population.
3. Shifts in racial and ethnic composition of the population.
4. The fluctuating rates of payoff to higher education.

1. The secular trend in attendance rates. Kerr believes more people will want to attend institutions of higher education and will attempt college level courses. The facts are that while only 16 percent of the traditional college age cohort (18-21) attempted a college education in 1940, by 1990, 40 percent of this cohort enrolled in colleges (Kerr, 1994, p. 6). By the year 2000, Kerr projects 50 percent of this cohort will enroll in some level of college.
2. Changing size and composition of the population. There will continue to be older students returning to higher education. The affect of the "baby boom" after World War II will continue to be felt in higher education for another 50 years (p. 6).

3. Shifts in racial and ethnic composition of the population. By the year 2000, 30 percent of students in higher education will be non-white. Kerr believes this will have two inevitable affects on the curriculum:
   (1) more and more concern with racial and ethnic issues and
   (2) more remedial education will need to be provided (p. 7).

4. The fluctuating rates of payoff to higher education. As the earning rate of college graduates continues to increase over that of high school graduates, the interest in college level courses will continue. Kerr recommends that "the collection and analysis for estimating these rates should be refined and followed closely in total, and field by field" (p. 7).

There are five probabilities that will be factors (or non-factors) in the future of higher education:

1. Massification.
2. Unionization.
3. The private sector.
4. Electronic technology.
5. Shared governance.
1. Massification. Rapid and large growth in campus enrollments will no longer be issues for college planners. Furthermore, most large institutions have grown beyond any clear gains in reducing per-unit-cost. The bureaucratic burdens of being big mean many large departments in large universities have passed the size of maximum effectiveness (p. 8).

2. Unionization. The union movement on college campuses has stabilized and will probably continue to decline. There will probably be little change in the work conditions for faculty therefore there will be little interest in unionization (p. 8).

3. The Private Sector. There will probably be little change in the role and status of private colleges. Enrollments in most private colleges have reached a stable level and there will probably be little change. There is general recognition of the contributions of private colleges and public policy will probably not change concerning the recognition of the private sector (p. 8).

4. Electronic technology. Kerr believes new electronic technology may continue to advance in the administration of the campus and in research, but he sees very slow change in the use of technology in teaching (p. 8).

5. Shared governance. The state coordinating boards will continue to determine the mission and financial
resources of public institutions of higher education. Student interests will determine the size of campuses and fields of study. Although campus management systems seek to include faculty, Kerr notes that more and more faculty are withdrawing from committee work. He believes that faculty may choose to forfeit their participation in shared governance (p. 9).

The four changes that Kerr projects include:
1. The advancement of specialized and vocational courses - the supremacy of the labor market.
2. The force of knowledge.
3. Shifts in areas of new knowledge.
4. The globalization of learning.

1. The advancement of specialized and vocational courses - the supremacy of the labor market. Only 30 to 35 percent of undergraduate enrollments are in general education courses. The growth of higher education enrollments have been in vocational and technical programs. Although there is attention being given to the need for liberal education, Kerr believes this a laudable goal but a fantasy. The big changes in fields of study will be based on the technological demands of the labor market (p. 9).

2. The force of knowledge. Kerr sees new knowledge and the application of that knowledge as "the greatest single driving force around the world" (p. 10).
3. Shifts in areas of new knowledge. Kerr identifies electronics (including computers), energy and energy conservation, new materials, biotechnology, environmental sciences, and mathematics and statistics as the dynamic fields of studies for the future (p. 10).

4. The globalization of learning. There is a trend to have the curriculum reflect a global perspective. There may be a time when the curriculum is adopted globally with all students around the world studying the same subject matter (p. 10).

According to Kerr, these certain or probable factors affecting the future of higher education will cause at least consequences:

1. Expansion of functions.
2. Changing locations for expanded functions.
3. The intensifying struggle over resources.
4. Continuing conflicts.

1. Expansion of functions. Consequences for the curriculum will include more remedial courses, more support services to address a number of problems which a diverse youth population will bring to college, and more cultural awareness. Research will be directed more to applied research and to the social problems of society. The focus will be on "thought about the great problems of the present and the future" (p. 10).
2. Changing locations for expanded functions. The community college and the research university will get the most attention because of the focus on remedial education and research described above. Technical training at all levels will continue to grow, especially in the form of the "corporate classroom" and "for-profit" trade schools (p. 11).

3. The intensifying struggle over resources. The competition for public dollars will continue and higher education, because of the changes in function described above, will need more resources in order to accomplish the changing and expanded role. Private funds and tuition increases will be the primary sources of new income for higher education. More students will have to finance their education through loans rather than relying on family assets. Although partisan politics are a factor why politicians fund higher education, the result has and will continue to be beneficial to higher education.

4. Continuing conflicts. There will be numerous issues which put merit and equality in conflict - personnel, financial, access. Institutions will continue to experience conflict as they are forced to differentiate themselves. Those responsible for governance of institutions of higher education will continue to debate their responsibility for direction versus their role in control of the campus (p. 12).
For Kerr, there are three uncertainties with unclear consequences facing higher education:

1. Citizenship responsibilities.

2. Student (and faculty) political activism.

3. Changing mentalities.

1. Citizenship responsibilities. The role of faculty in the governance and management of the campus has not changed but the willingness of faculty to participate in the governance and management of the campus is changing, especially among tenured faculty. This change in the internal "community" of the college campus along with separation due to race/ethnicity, gender, political orientation, and by status (old-guard citizens versus guest workers) has Kerr and others worried and uncertain what the full repercussions of this attitude among faculty may be (p. 12).

2. Student (and faculty) political activism. If history repeats itself, as it did in the 30s and the 60s, then the college campus may be due for another period of unrest. Although Kerr does not believe there will be a single unified "revolution," he does believe there will be "tribal warfare" between various groups with differing opinions, including racial, gender, political. The activists will be non-violent but their affect will be equally disruptive (p. 13).
3. Changing mentalities. Just as activism movements have cycles, Kerr believes "mentalities" also have cycles. The 60s had a theme characterized by dissent and experimentation. The 70s and 80s were characterized by self-gratification. The challenge facing higher education is to have a faculty and student body with the "mentality" to accept the role and the responsibilities placed on higher education.

Arguably, the most current source of information about higher education in the United States is *The Chronicle of Higher Education* (The Chronicle). Tables 2, 3, and 4 present the issues identified in The Chronicle between August 1991 to January 1994. Using a keyword classification system, the issues for 1991-92, 1992-93, and 1993-94 are presented respectively. The issues are ranked by the number of states indicating the issue as a political concern, according to The Chronicle.

The recession of the late 80s had most states evaluating their spending priorities as they saw budget deficits escalate in the 90s. As higher education must compete with many other social services and state agencies for a piece of the state revenue pool, it is not surprising that most state supported colleges and universities saw the state contribution decrease. As the state contribution to operating budgets decreased, it was inevitable that tuition would increase. Most states only debated how much should
the increase be. While some states looked at dollar amounts, many states indexed tuition to a percent of cost of instruction. In-state tuition ranges from about 25% to 40% with more and more states settling around 30%. Out-of-state tuition seems to be settling around 100%. Access to higher education certainly starts with cost. As tuition increases, states must rely more on federal dollars for student aid. As these dollars become limited, states have to allocate more funds for low-interest loans. But access is also the result of space available and academic preparation.

Table 2

(as identified in The Chronicle of Higher Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ISSUES</th>
<th># OF STATES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Funding</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governance</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Reform</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Education</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K-12 Reform</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuition</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate Education</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accountability</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethics</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Improvements</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race Relations</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desegregation</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Development</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Diversity</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduation Rate</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Education</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Involvement</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loan Defaults</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Relations</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
When budgets decrease, the educational reform movement momentum increases. The educational reform movement has tended to focus on raising admission standards, limiting or restricting funds for remedial education, and the reduction and elimination of course offerings. Educational reform also addresses the quality of undergraduate and graduate education.

When institutions do not react fast enough, governance structures usually become the target of legislators. Some legislatures create or give statewide coordinating boards more authority. Other legislatures eliminate or transfer

Table 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues in Higher Education: 1992-93</th>
<th># of States</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Funding</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuition</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Reform</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governance</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accountability</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Diversity</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Improvements</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K-12 Reform</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Development</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethics</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Education</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Education</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate Education</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduation Rate</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desegregation</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race Relations</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Involvement</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loan Defaults</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Relations</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
power from the coordinating boards to legislators or to the
governor. Occasionally, legislators will transfer
authority to the individual college or university system.
Usually, there are accountability factors associated with
measuring or determining accomplishment. The factors that
have become standard include graduation rates, ethnic mix,
cost of instruction, and faculty workloads.

Faculty were scrutinized in the past and will continue
to be scrutinized during the 90s. Although most
legislators and administrators acknowledge the need for
adequate salaries to retain or attract superior faculty,

Table 4

Issues in Higher Education: 1993-94
(as identified in The Chronicle of Higher Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ISSUES</th>
<th># OF STATES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Funding</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuition</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Reform</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Improvements</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governance</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accountability</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Diversity</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate Education</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethics</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K-12 Reform</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Development</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Education</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Education</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduation Rate</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desegregation</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Relations</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Involvement</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loan Defaults</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race Relations</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
many legislators question the productivity of the average faculty member. Through graduate-level research, the faculty is expected to contribute to economic development, technological advancement, and to various social situations, especially the K-12 educational reform movement. However, even though faculty research may be important, many states are questioning the teaching abilities of even senior faculty. Once again, technology is being viewed not only as being a more effective means to teach many courses, it has been accepted by many states as a more efficient way to teach, especially when distance learning or small enrollments are factors.

As the realities of limited resources become apparent, and cost reduction measures begin to take effect, higher education will begin to stabilize. Unfortunately, a decade of deferred maintenance, delayed purchases of capital equipment, and projected increased enrollments will again put demands on states to raise money, usually through bonds, for significant capital improvements throughout the latter half of the 90s.

All of these issues seem to center on institutional diversity. As states tend to move institutions to unique, focused mission statements, limited goals and course offerings, there is also the concern that there are clear understandings and communications between institutions, so that students may transfer appropriately between
institutions. Rather than duplicate courses or services, more and more state legislators are expecting students, especially average or below average students, to progress from technical or community college to state college to university graduate school. In some states, this institutional cooperation has improved during the 90s. However, in some states, competition is the natural relationship between institutions.

A final note regarding the issues presented in The Chronicle. Although dynamic events caused dramatic changes in countries around the world, most states have not had the resources to allocate to higher education to enable very many colleges and universities to be participates. During the later half of the 90s, states will need to develop strategies to address the relationship between institutions of higher education and the issues facing individual nations and the global society.
CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

Method of Procedures

This study is an exercise in policy research, a field that uses qualitative research. According to Majchrzak (1984):

Because policy research operates at the boundaries of research methodology, there is no single, comprehensive methodology for doing the technical analysis of policy research (Coleman, 1975). Without the constraints imposed by a singular methodological approach, policy researchers have been free to pursue a variety of methodological directions in technically analyzing social problems. (p. 58)

Miles and Huberman (1984) noted "a chronic problem of qualitative research is that it is done chiefly with words, not with numbers. Words are fatter than numbers, and usually have multiple meanings. This makes them harder to move around and work with" (p. 54). However, they cite Geertz who stated that while words may be unwieldy, they enable thick description, "that is, they render more meaning than numbers alone, and should be hung onto throughout data analysis. Converting words into numbers, then tossing away the words, gets a researcher into all
kinds of mischief" (p. 54).

The qualitative research approach is similar to environmental scanning. According to Morrison and Renfro, in an environmental scanning process, the screening criteria should be very clearly specified with the intent of the process being to identify "emerging issues, trends, and future events that may signal changes in the external environment..." (Morrison et al., 1983, p. 23).

When Miles and Huberman (1984) begin their research, they create a "start list" of codes prior to fieldwork (p. 57). However, they also stated:

...a more inductive researcher may not want to precode any datum until he or she has collected it, seen how it functions or nests in its context, and determined how many varieties of it there are. This is the more empirically "grounded" approach advocated by Glasser (1978), and it has a lot going for it.

(p. 57)

During the data gathering process, "analytic files" are created.

Each analytic file contains material on some major issue, theme, code, or family of codes. New analytic files get generated as the fieldwork proceeds...

Material in one file may be cross-referenced to another. A loose-leaf notebook can also be used...
Cards and file folders are reasonably workable if the number of sources is small and the data collection not extended... The obvious way to store and retrieve text quickly and easily is to use a computer. (p. 67)

Using a simple microcomputer database program, PFS: Professional, a database was developed. Datafields were created to include each state, state goal, state objective, and state strategy in each master plan to be entered. There were also blank fields for classifying issues and sub-issues. The classification process was based on the concept known as "clustering."

Clustering is a tactic that can be applied at many levels to qualitative data: at the level of events of acts, of individual actors, or processes, of settings/locales, of sites as wholes. In all instances, we are trying to understand a phenomenon better by grouping, then conceptualizing objects that have similar patterns or characteristics. (p. 219)

According to Miles and Huberman (1984), When one is working with text, or less well-organized displays, one will often note recurring patterns, themes, or "Gestalts," which pull together a lot of separate pieces of data. Something "jumps out" at you, suddenly makes sense...The human mind finds patterns so quickly and easily that it needs no how-
to advice. Patterns just "happen," almost too quickly. The important thing, rather, is to be able to (a) see real added evidence of the pattern; (b) remain open to disconfirming evidence when it appears. (p. 216)

Sources of Data

State planning varies from state to state. Table 5 summarizes the status of master plan development in each state as of 1991. As of the end of academic year 1991, thirty-five states had developed master plans. However, two of these states, Massachusetts and Missouri, had suspended or discontinued their plans. Six states were involved in the process of developing a master plan. Ten states did not have a master plan. This study focuses only on those state coordinating boards with regulatory powers as identified by the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. Of the 19 states in this classification, 14 have master plans. Table 6 lists the states included in this study.
Table 5  
Status of State Master Plan Development as of 1991

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Montana</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alaska</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>New Hampshire</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>New York</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaware</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>North Dakota</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaii</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Rhode Island</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>South Dakota</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maine</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Utah</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>Vermont</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>West Virginia</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Wyoming</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* - In Progress  
X - Suspended

Table 6

State Coordinating Boards with Regulatory Powers with Master Plans for Higher Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>State</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>Ohio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>South Carolina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>Tennessee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>Texas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>Virginia</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER 4

IDENTIFICATION OF MAJOR ISSUES

There is not a model for the development of a state master plan for higher education. Although many believe higher education to be a legitimate field of study in education, there does not seem to be universal acceptance of a standardized language by those involved in higher education. Therefore, when analyzing the state master plans for states with coordinating boards with regulatory powers, various words are used to describe similar concerns and issues. Table 7 presents the issues identified in the 14 state master plans reviewed in this study. The issues are identified by the "keywords" that summarize a particular issue or goal in each state master plan.

From the words used in the individual state master plans, a summary of "keywords" was created. These keywords (listed in Table 8) represent the common ideas or notions associated with issues presented in the 14 state master plans included in this study. A review of the concerns expressed in the state master plans led to the identification of 9 clusters which summarize the major policy issues of higher education that are identified by state coordinating boards with regulatory powers. Table 9 presents these clusters of issues.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Issues</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>Governance, Financial, Educational, Quality, Economic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>Educational Excellence, Student Access, State and Social Needs, Use of Resources, Public Awareness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>Extending Opportunity, Diversity, Student Services, Society’s Needs, Excellence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>Improve Education, Quality, One National Quality Univ., Resources, Economic Development, Quality of Life</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>Access, Opportunity, Diversity, Financial Support, Responsiveness, Cooperation, Responsibility, Integration, Enhancement, Cooperation - Geographic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>System, Quality, Public Schools, Role of Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
<td>Academics, Improve Graduation/Retention, Quality, Core Curriculum, Mission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>Participation, Quality of Life, Economic Resurgence, Use of Resources, Enrollment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>Quality, Lifetime ... Careers, Economic/social Change, Financial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>Quality, Access, Financing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td>Academic Affairs, Finance, Facilities, Desegregation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 7 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TENNESSEE</th>
<th>TEXAS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Needs of People</td>
<td>Quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparing Students</td>
<td>Access</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partnerships</td>
<td>Diversity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality Participation</td>
<td>Funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Leadership</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

VIRGINIA
Global Education
Funding
Aging Faculty
Student Assessment

TABLE 8

ALPHABETICAL LIST OF ISSUES IN 14 STATE MASTER PLANS

Academics
Academic Affairs
Access
Aging Faculty
Board Interaction
Capital Funding
Cooperation
Cooperation - Geographic
Core Curriculum
Delivery of Services
Desegregation
Diversity
Economic
Economic Development
Economic Resurgence
Economic/Social Change
Electronic Interconnection
Enhance Equity
Educational
Elementary/Secondary Education
Enhancement
Enrollment
Excellence
Extending Opportunity
Facilities
Finance
Financial
Financial Support
Funding
Global Education
Governance
Health Care
TABLE 8 (continued)

Improve Education
Improve Graduation/Retention
Increase Efficiency
Integration
Leadership
Lifetime ... Careers
Management
Mission
Needs of People
One National Quality University
Opportunity
Participation
Partnerships
Preparing Students
Public Awareness
Public Schools
Quality
Quality of Life
Reduce Program Proliferation
Research
Resources
Responsibilities
Responsiveness
Review Major Programs
Role of Commission
Social Justice
Society’s Needs
State/Social Needs
Student Access
Student Assessment
Student Services
System
Uniform Courses
Use of Resources

TABLE 9

CLUSTERS OF ISSUES FACING STATE COORDINATING BOARDS

ACCESS
Desegregation
Extending Opportunity
Integration
Participation
Student Access
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 9 (continued)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>DIVERSITY</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Articulation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooperation - Geographic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhance Equity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partnership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uniform Courses</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Delivery of Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Resurgence</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>FUNDING</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Financial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>GOVERNANCE</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Board Interaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role of Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>System</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>MANAGEMENT</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aging Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhancement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrollment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve Graduation/Retention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduce Program Proliferation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review Major Programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsibilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of Resources</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>PUBLIC SCHOOLS</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elementary/Secondary Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve Education</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>QUALITY</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core Curriculum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education Excellence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electronic Interconnection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excellence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Care</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The specific use or meaning of the "keywords" may vary from state to state. Different words may be used by different states to identify the same issues. However, there are some general meanings or notions associated with these words according to the use of these words in the goals and strategies in the state master plans. An analysis of these goals and strategies can provide enlightenment regarding the meaning of these keywords. The following is a cursory analysis of the notions and concerns associated with the major policy issues identified.

### Access

The keyword "Access" has several synonyms: desegregation, integration, participation, extending opportunity, student access. Louisiana, Pennsylvania, and Texas use the word access to mean all citizens of a state should have the opportunity to enroll in public
institutions of higher education, regardless of race, age, gender, physical conditions, religious affiliations, socio-economic conditions, or ethnic background. Several states specifically identify concerns related to minority participation in higher education. Access includes the placement of institution and the programs taught at those institutions. Access also includes the resources and support services necessary to promote the possibility of success. Although states may want equal access, they also want to reduce duplication and therefore look to admission standards as a way to match the academic abilities of students with the programs and services provided at the various institutions of higher education.

Diversity

The keyword "Diversity" is commonly used when the states are addressing concerns related to the variety of institutions of higher education in the state. It is generally agreed that all institutions can not and should not be all things to all people. This issue usually focuses on the role and mission of each institution being appropriate to the needs of the community or region of the state where the institution is located and being in accord with the priorities and resources of the state. There are usually concerns regarding the understanding and recognition by state leaders of the unique history and
character of each institution, including private colleges and universities. Also, this issue involves the establishment of partnerships and levels of cooperation, particularly between institutions in geographic proximity to each other, so that resources, institutional strengths, and efforts to meet student needs are maximized. This may include the creation of consortia, joint degree programs, and/or academic tracks that provide a smooth transition from associate degree to bachelor degree to master's degree to doctorate. These academic tracks may be either through mutually agreed upon articulation agreements or may be the result of legislative action.

Economic Development

Many states now expect institutions of higher education to be active participants in the economic development and/or economic recovery of communities, regions, and the state as a whole. Not only concerns related to vocational and continuing education, basic and applied research, and social services are discussed in various state master plans, but also other areas of concern related to economic development, such as general and technical education, teaching communication and computational skills, and contributing to the cultural and recreational activities are included in this issue.
Funding

The keyword "Funding" usually refers to state level appropriations to institutions of higher education. Many states utilize enrollment driven formula funding to determine the appropriations to higher education. However, this issue has several additional concerns, including student tuition and fees, local participation through taxes, services, etc., federal government funds (through student loans and research grants), grants from private foundations, contributions from alumni, corporate grants and sponsorship of research, and any other source of revenue.

Governance

The keyword "Governance" includes concerns at all levels of higher education. Each state must wrestle with concerns regarding the type of state level coordination of higher education and the amount of autonomy each individual institution within the state will have. The issue of diversity makes this issue more complex. Questions must be answered regarding regional coordination versus the coordination by institutional type versus systems versus autonomous institutions. The role of politicians in the governance of higher education is a major concern. In some states, the governor is not only influential but has direct control of colleges and universities through appointments,
budget recommendations, and the power of executive order. In some states, the legislature not only has the power of the purse but can also legislate administrative priorities, organizational structure, and academic programs.

Management

The keyword "Management" includes both concerns related to process as well as specific issues which management must seek to find solutions. As a process, state level concerns include the recruitment and employment of leaders with vision and administrative skills. These leaders must apply their administrative skills to finding solutions to issues related to enrollment management, facilities maintenance and utilization, the development and utilization of resources, and human resource recruitment and retention.

A post-war problem that is a growing concern in various states is the possible retirement of large numbers of faculty in the next few years. Higher education experienced rapid growth through the 1950s. Therefore, a large number of faculty are now over sixty. For various reasons, they will be leaving teaching. With the slowed growth of higher education in the 1980s, there has not been the need, desire, or possibility for younger scholars to enter the teaching profession. The downsizing of many institutions of higher education because of shifts in
student interests, social needs, and financial limitations and the maintenance of academic quality is an administrative dilemma. Many legislators are convinced that states do not get sufficient productivity out of faculty and have passed legislation requiring explanations and justifications of teaching loads.

Also, there may be a leadership void created as large numbers of experienced administrators return to teaching or decide to retire. Finally, rapid technological change and social change is creating gaps in the administrative skills current leaders have and the administrative skills current leaders need.

Public Schools

Although the number of issues that connect higher education with public schools (K-12) is a short list, the magnitude of the issues is significant. Higher education must rely on the public schools to produce the majority of the students who enroll in higher education. The preparation students receive in public schools, the expectations and desires students develop in public schools, the accomplishments and failures students experience in public school are significant factors in the success students experience in higher education, if they even choose to enter higher education.

To some degree, public schools are the product of
higher education, from teacher preparation to administrative styles to learning theory to the use of technology. Higher education must take responsibility for the public schools and must continue to be in partnership with efforts to improve public education.

Quality

The keyword "Quality" is perhaps the most difficult issue to define and to achieve. All states are concerned with the quality of the instruction and the student services provided by institutions of higher education. However, the definition of quality tends to focus on effective instruction. Institutions are faced with balancing the concerns related to access with the concerns related to how prepared the student is for college level courses of study. The use of technology in the instructional process is also a factor of the quality issue. Overall, the desire for quality can be matched with the resources or whether the level of quality is below acceptable standards and the resources are not available to continue a specific program.

Quality of Life

A primary concern expressed by the states related to this "keyword" issue regards the change that occurs in the individual and society as the result of higher education.
The assumption that individuals are better because of higher education is no longer automatically accepted. Life long learning is a notion that is implied, if not directly identified, in the concerns addressed in the state master plans. Higher education is expected to provide evidence that the investment made by individuals and state legislatures in higher education provides a return on that investment.
CHAPTER 5

ANALYSIS OF MAJOR ISSUES

Access

There is an anecdote in the oral tradition of higher education that goes something like this. Following a very successful financial campaign, the President and Provost of a small private college put forth the following announcement to the faculty: If the faculty will agree to a 10 percent cut in salary, this college will no longer have to enroll students.

Lest anyone forget, the education of students is the first priority of institutions of higher education. Enabling access to institutions of higher education is a universal issue for those who plan and coordinate higher education. But this issue has many factors which must be considered and the state master plans present a variety of notions regarding these factors. While Colorado believes geographic access is important for general education, the master plan calls for limited placement of doctoral and certain, specialized programs. One of the goals in the Illinois master plan is to extend educational opportunities to all. However, the leaders in Illinois see a need to also limit access to higher education to only those who qualify and the state will assist with the educational
development of Illinois citizens of all ages to the limits of their capacities. Louisiana has goals for higher education that include meeting the diversified needs of all the state's citizens without regard to race, age, sex, physical condition, religion, socio-economic status, or ethnic background to the extent of their abilities and motivations. The Ohio master plan is charged with developing a ten-year program that will provide greatly expanded access to assure that all Ohioans are prepared for a lifetime of changing careers. Texas wants a higher education system that is accessible to all those who seek and qualify for admission. Tennessee wants to have educational opportunities to ensure a well-educated and trained citizenry competitive in all regions of the state and at least equal to national rates or averages.

It is very common for state master plans to set access goals that demonstrate minority participation based on data comparative to other states, sometimes in the same region of the nation, sometimes with states with similar populations, and sometimes with national data. While several states voluntarily set enrollment goals, many southern states are involved in desegregation court orders. While some master plans express a "commitment" to the recruitment of minorities, in New York, institutions are encouraged to adopt written, formal plans, measure their progress, and the Regents direct the State Education
The Department is further directed to analyze the programs in order to identify common elements and to communicate their findings with all institutions in the state. Texas has set goals through the Texas Educational Opportunity Plan (TEOP). It is common for state master plans to refer to external documents, such as the TEOP.

Not only do state master plans address the need to recruit minorities to undergraduate education, some plans target specific institutions as entry points for minority students. The New Mexico plan recommends both comprehensive and two-year institutions recruit and serve students from groups traditionally not well represented in higher education. This strategy is based on the belief that these institutions have the ability to provide the individualized instruction and support services that these students need to be successful.

Several state master plans specify specific graduate and professional programs which should target under-represented groups. Virginia has targeted young minority students to replace faculty who will be retiring soon. Illinois is concerned with targeting students for health professions and engineering programs.

Another common feature of state master plans are recommendations related to special funding for state priorities. The Connecticut plan has a strategy which
states that public colleges should set goals and receive incentive funding when they increase the enrollment and retention of Black and Hispanic students. Funding is seen as a very important factor related to access.

One of the first considerations related to access is geographic locations. It is typical for state coordinating boards with regulatory powers to have planners who are charged with determining the location, building, and maintenance of campus facilities. But many states have recognized that the traditional "brick and mortar" way of building colleges is expensive, both to build and to maintain. New Mexico encourages alternative approaches, such as shared facilities rather than independent facilities.

Many states are looking to technology to provide alternative delivery systems. Oklahoma has invested in an exceptional telecommunication system. A strategy in Oklahoma is to aggressively pursue electronic means for program delivery and library enhancement. Kentucky, New Mexico, and Texas also have included strategies which include instructional technology. Although Pennsylvania recognizes the need to increase access through technology, there is still a concern regarding quality. Because college and university faculty are traditionally slow to accept technological advances in teaching, it is not surprising that most state master plans have limited
strategies regarding technology.

Several state master plans introduce another new notion in planning for ways to provide access to higher education: involve students, businesses, and communities in the planning. Illinois believes the integration of higher education into society should be through the involvement of both the public and private sector in planning and coordination. The Louisiana plan includes a recommendation by the Board of Regents that each institution monitor student interests and remain flexible in the planning process to adjust to student interests and manpower demands. New Mexico and Virginia both have access strategies that include needs assessment to determine how higher education can serve the needs of the public, the economic development of the region, and the needs of the students.

Usually when the word "assessment" is used in a state master plan, it refers to the assessment of the academic abilities of students. Pennsylvania warns that there must be a balance between access and quality. To achieve quality may require institutions to offer preparatory courses and personal and academic support services. The Connecticut plan requires public colleges and universities to assess the skills of entering students and fund appropriate remediation, counseling, and support so students can succeed in college. Tennessee suggests a
strategy that all incoming freshmen be assessed and be placed in the appropriate level of instruction.

Many states are concerned with placing students in the appropriate level of instruction, but the financial limitations of most state budgets are forcing states to consider setting admission standards for different levels of institutions. South Carolina has a strategy that calls for different criteria for universities, four-year public colleges and the technical colleges. Colorado, Kentucky, and New Mexico endorse open enrollment to community colleges but call for selective admission criteria for universities. While most states view the community and/or technical colleges to be the point of entrance for anyone, especially minorities, there is still an expectation that students in two-year institutions must reach a level of academic performance. Texas requires students to pass the Texas Academic Skills Program (TASP) before they can advance to upper level instruction. Most states recognize that a greater variety of academic and support services, including remedial or developmental courses, counseling, child care services, and other student services, are required at the freshman and sophomore level. Illinois, Louisiana, and New Mexico call for remedial or developmental education to be reduced or eliminated at colleges and universities and that community colleges be the sole provider of this type of academic support.
Colorado is willing to allow developmental course work at baccalaureate institutions after the implementation of admission standards.

States have developed a variety of strategies to restrict the access to four-year colleges and to university graduate programs. Many states are establishing a minimum core of high school courses that will be acceptable. Some states are developing enrollment management strategies that restrict the number or percentage of non-resident or foreign students that public colleges may enroll. However, Virginia encourages foreign students to attend all Virginia colleges and universities.

States not only see a need to establish various admission criteria, they also accept a responsibility to publicize these criteria and to recruit students accordingly. There is also concern about the effect of admission criteria and recruitment strategies. Kentucky and New Mexico both include strategies which include monitoring and evaluating the quantitative and qualitative results of these policies and activities.

A major barrier to access to higher education relates to financial resources. There are concerns related to the actual cost of higher education and the perceived, long term debt as the result of student loans. There is an ongoing debate between need based and merit based financial aid. Colorado wants to establish a priority for financial
need over merit. Oklahoma wants to require minimum performance levels in order to receive financial aid. Tennessee and South Carolina want to provide sufficient scholarship support to assure retention of a larger percentage of Tennessee's brightest high school graduates within the state's system of higher education. New Mexico wants a Merit Scholarship Program that would pay 100 percent of tuition and fee charges for the most talented and motivated students graduating from New Mexico high schools. Also, New Mexico wants the New Mexico Incentive Grant (NMSIG) program to equal all the costs (less other available aid) for the neediest students attending state public institutions. New Mexico has the System Tracking of Aid Recipients file (STAR). The master plan proposes that this system be evaluated and modified as needed to ensure that necessary information is available to evaluate financial programs. There is also a strategy in the New Mexico plan to set aside money so that two percent of under-represented groups, particularly minorities and women, will be able to enroll in targeted graduate programs. The Regents of New York state want to identify the gaps in student-aid met by current state-supported student aid programs and prepare legislation to assure student aid to address these financial needs. The Connecticut master plan calls for a review of the array of state financial aid programs to assure their effectiveness.
in ensuring student access. Texas is calling for an integrated policy that takes into account tuition and financial aid so that the state can assure quality education and equity for the largest number of Texas citizens.

The discussion regarding financial aid also includes discussing the amount of aid which should be made available between full-time and part-time students. Pennsylvania only recently requested funds to extend financial assistance to part-time students. New York has endorsed the strategy which acknowledges that part-time students require the same amount of many services as do full-time students and, therefore, should be entitled to the same level of financial assistance.

Another concern in the discussion includes a debate about the wants of the individual student and the needs of the state. Colorado supports a strategy which provides targeted financial aid programs to meet state needs in critical fields.

At the graduate level, the discussion includes the concern about state resources to educate non-resident and foreign students. While several states have reciprocal agreements at the graduate school level as a way of reducing duplication of expensive graduate programs, many states are very protective of their in-state programs. Although Kentucky limited dental education to state
residents, Kentucky wants to extend reciprocity agreements with Ohio and West Virginia in other programs. New Mexico has forgiveness loan programs for selected programs of study needed by the state. A Texas strategy to increase minority participation at the doctoral level and to increase minority faculty in Texas colleges proposes that a loan forgiveness program be established for minority doctoral students who teach in Texas colleges.

Perhaps the hottest topic in the financial aid discussion is the use of state funds to provide access to private colleges and universities. Connecticut and Texas both have strategies which provide funds for students to attend independent colleges.

As states develop strategies to enable students to have access to undergraduate and graduate programs, literacy and job training programs, professional and continuing educational programs, cultural and various other enrichment activities, they must also wrestle with ways to balance access by rural and urban population, rich and poor students, various racial, ethnic and religious groups, men and women into various professional programs, and access past any and all other barriers to higher education.

Diversity

Institutional "diversity" can take many forms in higher education. The 1994 Carnegie Classification system
includes ten categories of institutions:

Research Universities I
Research Universities II
Doctorate-granting Universities I
Doctorate-granting Universities II
Master's (Comprehensive) Universities and Colleges I
Master's (Comprehensive) Universities and Colleges II
Baccalaureate (Liberal Arts) Colleges I
Baccalaureate (Liberal Arts) Colleges II
Associate of Arts Colleges
Professional Schools and Specialized Institutions
(The Chronicle, 1994, April 6, p. A17)

This classification system uses criteria such as range of baccalaureate programs and graduate programs, the number of Ph.D. degrees awarded each year, the amount of federal dollars received annually, and enrollment as factors in determining the classification of institutions. Both public and private institutions are included.

Although no state master plan identifies quantitative limits or goals for the number of institutions in each classification, Kentucky has a goal of having at least one statewide institution that is nationally recognized for the quality of its scholarship, research, and graduates. Furthermore, the Kentucky plan assumes only the public university sector will provide professional programs in medicine, dentistry and law.
Several state plans address diversity. Colorado, Illinois and Texas specifically identify state goals related to maintaining diverse educational opportunities. Although several of the state plans call for establishing differentiated role and mission statements for each institution, the plans also call for cooperation among all sectors of higher education. Not only does Colorado believe institutions should be differentiated by academic programs, research, public service, residential or community orientation, admission standards and size, the state plan calls for restraint so as to avoid program duplication, especially in programs beyond the core curriculum. Illinois believes each institution should have special direction and scope to their programmatic offerings and specifically rejects new programs which merely increase the comprehensiveness of an institutions programs. The New Mexico plan states that the mission statement should be broad and include the aspirations, values, and purposes of each institution. Oklahoma recognizes the need to provide a comprehensive range of programs within the state. The state plan calls for each institution to focus resources on selected programs, especially at the graduate and professional level. A strategy in South Carolina requires each college and university to provide the Commission with a summary of its academic and facilities plans. Texas calls for public institutions of higher education to define
their mission and role and scope in a way that captures their distinctive characters, focuses on their specific strengths, guides their development, and provides sufficient flexibility.

The Tennessee plan includes the most detailed guidelines for developing a mission statement. In Tennessee, the mission statement identifies whether the institution is regional or comprehensive, specifying the primary service area. The statement describes the mix of students, including factors such as undergraduate and graduate enrollments, types of students (e.g., traditional college-age, older students, residential and commuter students, full-time and part-time), racial mix, and the mix of on-campus and off-campus enrollments. The guidelines require each institution to indicate any significant changes in these factors and to project trends and goals. The statement identifies the level of non-degree and degree instruction offered by the institution. Each institution must not only identify the level of instruction, research, and service in each program but also indicate plans for significant expansion or reduction of commitment for the next five years. Instructional sites must be identified and plans to expand, reduce, or change the sites must be explained. The five year plan, two to five pages in length, may also include a range of alternatives to be developed during the five year period.
The mission of community colleges are specifically concerned in Illinois and New Mexico. Although New Mexico encourages communities with sufficient needs, demands, population, and community support to establish a comprehensive community college with a full range of programs and services, the Commission does not foresee the need for any additional two-year institutions. In fact, the state plan directs the Commission to evaluate the status of those two-year institutions with declining enrollments and, if necessary, close the institutions. The plan calls for the use of "off-campus" programs to meet the needs of communities with limited resources. The Kentucky and South Carolina plans include the consolidation and/or closing of vocational and small two-year institutions.

The Illinois plan identifies the basic mission of community colleges: to provide credit and non-credit public and community service activities designed to meet the needs of individuals, organizations, commerce, and industry within the district. These activities include remedial and adult basic and secondary education programs designed to prepare individuals for further education; occupational, vocational, technical, and semi-technical programs leading to a certificate or the Associate of Science degree; and Associate of Arts and Associate of Science degree programs designed to qualify students to transfer to a college or university program.
The most often identified concern related to institutional diversity regards the ability of students to transfer between levels of institutions. Connect, Colorado, Illinois, New Mexico, Oklahoma, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, and Texas call for the development of strategies to ease the transfer of students.

The New Mexico plan instructs the Commission to coordinate the development and execution of a statewide transfer agreement binding all state-supported institutions of higher education. The agreement should insure that all students with Associate of Arts and Associate of Science degrees will transfer as juniors to four-year institutions. All institutions are required to notify students of any graduation requirement which may not be met under the articulation agreement. Any institution which does not accept a course for transfer must provide a explanation to the sending institution. All institutions should have a means of informing sending institutions of the performance of transfer students. The plan stresses that the criteria for judging the transferability of courses should be understandable by any reasonable person. Finally, receiving institutions should not only accept the credits of the transfer student, but they should develop ways to guarantee the successful matriculation of transfer students.
Acceptance of transfer students is only one factor in cooperation between institutions of higher education. Louisiana seeks to establish a permanent means of cooperation between institutions in geographic proximity. In Pennsylvania, institutions should seek voluntary cooperation in order to achieve flexibility, cost savings, program improvements, and compliance with various accrediting and certifying agencies. South Carolina does not rely on voluntary cooperation. For instance, when a technical and academic college are located near one another, the technical college should only provide those academic courses required of all technical college students.

New Mexico is specifically concerned about the cooperation between institutions of higher education regarding technology. A strategy to improve the cooperation between institutions delivering non-traditional education is to establish a consortium of all institutions within the state involved in alternative methods of delivering education. The consortium should develop a set of specifications to ensure the compatibility of telecommunications equipment, identify overall state planning needs, and to develop campus-to-campus programs which will enable the sharing of faculty.

Most state plans express a concern about preserving the private sector of higher education. The master plans
of Colorado, Kentucky, Louisiana, New York, South Carolina, and Texas have specific strategies addressing the encouragement and preservation of private and proprietary institution. South Carolina seeks ways to include the private colleges because they might provide services that are needed by the state. Colorado acknowledges that it may cost the state less to assist students through financial aid than it would be to create and support a state-supported program. The Louisiana master plan recommends the assessment of state policy in order to find ways to increase cooperation between the public and private sector.

**Economic Development**

In most states there is a direct relationship between funding for higher education and the strength of the economy of each state. When state revenues go down, the proportion of state revenues allocated to higher education usually go down. However, only recently have states started to view higher education not just as a consumer of state resources but also as contributors to solving state economic problems. Connecticut noted that economic prosperity depends on an educated work force. In Colorado, the Colorado Commission on Higher Education will advance the state economically through the postsecondary education system. Colorado is concerned not only for preserving a
high quality of life for its citizens but also in order for the state to have a place of leadership in the world economy. The Kentucky plan notes that agriculture will contribute less employment opportunities in the future and that the state will need to develop new job opportunities for its citizenry. Pointing to examples in Massachusetts, North Carolina, and Ohio, the Pennsylvania plan calls for a comprehensive system of postsecondary vocational-technical education in the attraction and retention of business and industry and economic revitalization.

The common thread in this issue relates to higher education developing partnerships with business and industry in order to produce a trained workforce. The states are faced with not only identifying future trends and needs in the workforce but also training students to be able to become employable now.

The state plans call for general levels of cooperation and also identify specific agencies to work together. The Colorado master plan supports the authorization of customized training for specific companies. In Oklahoma, the state higher education system will develop a plan for working with employers to meet the changing needs for an educated workforce. Whereas, in New Mexico, the Commission for Higher Education will work specifically with the State Departments of Labor, Economic Development, Education, and Human Resources to identify manpower needs of the state. In
Tennessee, the strategy encourages interinstituional cooperation with local and state government, especially the Department of Economic and Community Development.

Pennsylvania and Tennessee have strategies which call for higher education to be a repository for workforce information. The challenge is to transform this information into career information and to provide the educational programs to prepare students for those careers.

In Connecticut, the strategy is to increase the number of students who pursue technical and scientific careers. Incentive funds are to be used to strengthen and broaden the quality and availability of two-year programs, certificate, and non-credit offerings. However, in order to be responsive to changing technologies, the state planners realize that there must be a streamlined process for approving new programs so that short-term programs may be introduced quickly. A strategy in Ohio also calls for incentive programs to encourage colleges and universities to provide leadership in the development of collaborative strategies for economic and social change.

Although most of the attention of the states is focused on adult basic education, certificate programs, and two-year technical and vocational programs, several of the state master plans identify a role for graduate studies and research as being crucial to the economic development of a state. Several state plans call for the creation of
committees or consortia to identify ways to maximize the benefits from research to economic recovery and development. The strategies in Kentucky, Louisiana, New Mexico, New York, Ohio, and Tennessee include this approach. The Board of Regents in Louisiana want to establish the Louisiana Universities Marine Consortium as a premier marine research effort. In New Mexico, the strategy is well defined. The three research institutions are given the primary responsibility to identify and develop promising new technologies. New Mexico State University is designated as the lead institution and the Cooperative Extension Service is charged with the coordination and dissemination statewide of technology transfer. In New York the strategy of the Regents directed the Department of Higher Education to explore with the Science and Technology Foundation and the Department of Economic Development a jointly sponsored statewide conference to make college-based researchers aware of the potential of converting their research results into useful products. The Regents also directed the Department to encourage university-industry collaborative research and faculty-staff exchanges with Federal research laboratories under the Federal Transfer Act of 1986. The Ohio master plan calls for the establishment of the Ohio Council on Research and Economic Development as an on-going advisory panel to stimulate science and technology development.
efforts in the state. The Tennessee strategy calls for partnerships between business and education to include, but not be limited to, such initiatives as research parks and instructional contracts.

An area that offers great hope for higher education and the economic development of the states is participation in global markets. The Colorado master plan calls for a study that determines the current capacity and future needs of Colorado higher education to provide appropriate programming in foreign languages and cultural studies. The Regents in New York supported the Governor’s request for funding for the state’s International Partnership Program and encouraged all higher education institutions to participate in this program through research or scholarly exchange with foreign universities or through consultations with New York State firms that establish contracts with foreign firms. The Virginia strategy encourages colleges and universities to work with foreign-owned businesses to develop international internships, language and cultural instruction, and cooperative research.

Although higher education is viewed as important to the economic development of the states, the Louisiana and Pennsylvania master plans note that there is a problem attracting students to certain degree programs. The Board of Regents in Louisiana recommends that each higher education institution make degree programs in agriculture,
biology, and natural resources more attractive to students. In Pennsylvania, the decline in enrollments in graduate programs, even programs where there is an acute demand, is attributed to a diminishing societal inducements for the pursuit of graduate studies.

Funding

As advocates for higher education, it is expected that coordinating boards with regulatory powers would set goals related to adequate funding for higher education. The Louisiana master plan calls for optimal financial support. The Texas plan notes that adequate funding is critical if higher education is to achieve its purposes.

It is common for state coordinating boards to compare the level of funding provided by each state. For instance, the Colorado Commission on Higher Education set an goal of raising the per capita spending for higher education to place the state of Colorado in the top 25% of the fifty states. The Texas plan sets a state goal of funding higher education equal to the national average by 1995 and equal to the average of the 10 most populous states by the year 2000.

Another way of comparing levels of funding is by comparing funding between similar institutions. The Colorado plan calls for identifying peer institutions across the nation and funding institutions in Colorado so
as to place them in the top 50%. The New Mexico master plan notes that the state Commission is charged by statute with the responsibility for recommending adequate funding of institutions of higher education and for the equitable distribution of the available funds. The strategy in New Mexico also includes peer cohorts of four-year and two-year institutions. However, because of the sensitivity of identifying peer institutions, the Commission recommends contracting with an independent organization to create the peer institution list.

However, coordinating boards are not only advocates for higher educations, in most cases, they are also responsible for holding higher education accountable to the state legislators and the public. The New York Regents are committed not only to seeking public support for higher education but also to requiring the institutions of higher education to demonstrate their accountability for expenditures. The strategy in New York is to develop papers on costs and fiscal indicators for postsecondary education in order to provide critical information for the development of sound recommendations on financing postsecondary education.

In Kentucky, the Council seeks to balance its duties as advocate for both campus and public interests. While it seeks to advocate the benefits of higher education it also holds higher education accountable and expects wise
expenditures of funds. The Texas master plan sets as a state strategy to effectively and efficiently use available funds to achieve goals which are beneficial to the state and its people. Both the master plans of Pennsylvania and Louisiana recommend that the state appropriation formula continue to be reviewed annually with emphasis placed on appropriate factors that relate to institutional role, scope, and mission differences. But how do state coordinating boards determine what constitutes an appropriate level of funding and who will distribute the funds? Will state legislatures appropriate funds directly to the colleges and universities or will funds be appropriated to the state commission for higher education for disbursement to the colleges and universities?

Formula funding is a process which should provide a quantitative way of providing adequate funding to institutions of higher education. Simply stated, through a systematic analysis of costs of the delivery of instruction, a state average cost (usually per discipline) is calculated on a per student basis. This average cost becomes a part of a formula which is used to calculate the revenue allocated to each institution of higher education. Unfortunately, several state legislatures developed another factor to include in the formula when appropriation bills are adopted. Many states only allocate a percentage of the appropriation. The political realities of the funding
process have caused at least five state master plans, Kentucky, Louisiana, South Carolina, Tennessee, and Texas, to include goals and strategies that call for full funding for higher education.

The New Mexico master plan has the most criteria identified as a part of the state strategy to create new funding formulas. In the New Mexico plan, the strategy of the Commission includes regular cost studies, comparisons of revenue and expenditure patterns of peer institutions, and on-going reviews of funding formulas. The new formulas must result in providing sufficient resources for four-year and two-year institutions to meet their role and mission. The formulas should promote greater participation in higher education by individuals from traditionally under-represented groups. There is a concern that funding formulas reflect the increases and decreases of costs resulting from changes in enrollment. The emphasis growing in state planning for funding formulas to provide incentives for enhanced productivity and attainment of system goals is included in the New Mexico strategy. The strategy also provides for incentives for efficient management and cost savings. There is also a trend for master plans, such as in New Mexico, to call for the funding of joint programs and resource sharing. Although it seems inevitable for funding formulas to be tied to enrollment, the New Mexico strategy is to tie the funding
formula to institution and state enrollment management polices. In order to promote institutional cooperation between two-year and four-year institutions, the new funding formula will encourage transfers from the two-year system. Finally, the new funding formula should reward institutional planning and assessment.

In the New Mexico master plan, there are specific concerns regarding funding for quality improvements in higher education. In New Mexico, there is a need to increase sponsored research programs. Because of the specific requirements of special accreditation agencies, New Mexico recognizes the need for additional funding for these programs. One of the specific incentives that the New Mexico plan wants is special funds for efforts to hire minority and women faculty. The New Mexico master plans seeks funds to increase the retention of minority students according to specified goals. Special funds are needed in New Mexico to establish institution-wide assessment programs on all campuses. In order to promote technology transfer activities, the New Mexico master plan requests special funding.

However, New Mexico is not the only state seeking special funding initiatives and incentives. In Connecticut, there is a concern that the funding method recognize the growing demands placed by part-time students on such services as admissions, counseling, tutoring, and
record-keeping. In Colorado, there is a concern about funding off-campus instruction delivered through telecommunications. The Texas master plan seeks funding for requested incentives and special initiative programs to be named as need is identified.

Although the New Mexico, Texas, and Virginia master plans request funding for enrollment growth, specifically based on the achievements of minority enrollment increases, most of the state master plans are concerned with funding qualitative improvements in higher education. Most state master plans are rather general in their recommendations. The Louisiana plan asks for increased incentives to encourage and reward quality and the South Carolina plan seeks funds to support the improvement of higher education. Tennessee wants categorical funding directed at specific programs which influence quality. In New Mexico the strategy is to maintain the funding of special initiatives which demonstrate excellence while the Kentucky plan endorses the development of matching incentive grants to promote excellence. The Illinois master plan calls for incentives to specifically improve undergraduate education.

A few states have identified a specific way to improve the quality of instruction: reward faculty. The Tennessee strategy seeks increased resources for faculty salaries to encourage a commitment to all aspects of undergraduate programming, including general education, major
disciplines, and vocational or technical education and training programs. The Texas strategy is to establish and maintain faculty salaries equal to or exceeding those offered in the 10 most populous states. New Mexico and South Carolina have both developed strategies to establish endowed faculty chairs. The goal in New Mexico is to have each chair endowed with a minimum of one million dollars, with equal portions coming from the state and private sources.

The need for institutions for higher education to secure funds from private sources is an accepted assumption in the funding of higher education in the United States. Kentucky not only acknowledges this assumption, the Kentucky plan encourages the public institutions to cultivate new areas of financial support in the private sector. Another strategy in Kentucky suggests that the state investigate alternative funding mechanism including bonding authority for pooled purchases of equipment and debt financing. The Louisiana plan describes any chance of increased state general fund appropriations as dismal and recommends that institutions substantially increase their activities to generate revenues from all possible non-state sources. Furthermore, the Board of Regents of Louisiana recommends that each institution actively solicit external support for its research efforts from the federal government, foundations, businesses, industry, labor,
alumni, and all other sources. The Ohio plan urges the creation of an on-going organization of non-governmental leaders to foster investment in higher education. The plan encourages colleges and universities to do all they can to leverage federal, state, local, and private resources in order to supplement existing higher education support. The New Mexico strategy directs the universities to develop plans to increase the portion of private industry sponsorship in research programs. In Tennessee, the strategy to fund basic and applied research is to develop partnerships between higher education and business, industry, and public agencies, and to increase the level of support from private foundations. The Texas strategy directs institutions of higher education to become more competitive in obtaining all types of non-appropriated funds, especially grants and contracts.

One area of funding for higher education has become a problem: athletics. Only two states, Louisiana and New Mexico, specifically address accountability in athletic funding. Although the New Mexico plan acknowledges the need for a base level of funding for athletics, there is a concern for strong fiscal controls and accurate revenue forecasts. In Louisiana, the Board of Regents recommend that the impact of intercollegiate athletics on the institution and the student athlete be evaluated. Also, penalties are imposed on institutions that subsidize
intercollegiate athletics.

In several state master plans there is also a concern regarding funding developmental education. Both New Mexico and Oklahoma have strategies that direct the majority of funds for developmental education to two-year institutions. The recruitment and support of at-risk students should be limited to two-year institutions.

Even with full formula funding and successful endowment campaigns, there is still an expectation that students must bear some burden for funding higher education. The Colorado plan seeks equitable cost sharing between society and students. The Connecticut plan states that there should be an appropriate balance between state and student support of the costs of public higher education. A strategy in the Ohio plan is to reduce the student’s share of the cost of higher education. Illinois set as a general goal to keep the price of higher education affordable for the individual. In Kentucky, the strategy is to maintain in-state tuition at a level that reflects the shared responsibility without restricting access. The Virginia plan wants to keep the price of higher education as low as possible for Virginia students.

The state planners are sensitive to the relative cost of higher education in their state when compared to other states and similar institutions. There are two factors usually considered when calculating the students
contribution: tuition and fees. The Louisiana plan calls for comparing student contributions to comparable institutions in the southern states. New Mexico wants its state tuition to remain at or below the rank of 30 out of the 50 states. Tennessee uses an indexing process to establish the appropriate balance between state resources and student fees.

Although most states set out-of-state tuition at 100 percent of the total instructional and general cost, states, such as Ohio and Louisiana, are attempting to set in-state tuition at four-year institutions at around 30 to 33%. Most states recognize the special role of community colleges and set tuition at a much lower percentage. There does not appear to be a consensus regarding tuition at off-campus locations or instruction provided through alternative methods of delivery, such as television or other distance learning programs.

A relatively new concern by the states is how the student will be able to pay tuition and fees. There are various ways through the private sector that a parent can prepare to pay for a college education. However, three states, Connecticut, New Mexico, and New York, have strategies involving the creation or continuation of state sponsored savings plans.

There is also not a consensus regarding the use of student fees. For instance, in the South Carolina plan,
student fees are deposited with the State Treasurer for use in the rehabilitation and renovation of existing facilities. Generally, there is little discussion in the master plans regarding student fees.

Governance

In 1982, the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching raised many questions about the governance of colleges and universities when it published the essay, *The Control of the Campus: A Report on the Governance of Higher Education*. Although this study did not find any direct reference to this essay in the state master plans analyzed, many of the questions and issues identified by the Carnegie Foundation are addressed in the state master plans.

Generally, commissions of higher education serve as advisory boards to the governor of each state. In Colorado, there is a regular, formal, structured gubernatorial performance review of the Commission, the Commissioner, governing boards and governing board members in relation to institutional goal accomplishment.

The Kentucky plan notes that both the legislative branch and the public expect greater accountability of state tax dollar expenditures from state institutions, especially institutions of higher education. In most states, at least one group designated with the responsibility for providing measures of accountability is
the state office responsible for coordinating higher education. The level of responsibility varies from state to state. The Louisiana master plan acknowledges that certain functions related to higher education are assigned by the people through the state constitution and acts of the legislature. However, the South Carolina master plan requests the General Assembly of South Carolina to clarify the role of the Commission of Higher Education with respect to facilities and land owned by the higher education and technical education institutions, especially regarding the Commission's role in the recommendation or approval of acquisitions, leases, or improvements of facilities.

The Colorado master plan not only includes a general goal related to the coordination of the resources and the programs of postsecondary education but also a specific strategy to study and improve the governance system of Colorado higher education. In the Oklahoma master plan there is also a strategy which calls for the examination of administrative and governance structures with the intent to create a more efficient system.

However, not all plans support changes in the current governance structure. The Illinois master plan notes that all public higher education institutions are coordinated by the Illinois Board of Higher Education and are governed (or coordinated) within the jurisdiction of one of the five public higher education systems. The Board of Higher
Education in Illinois finds no compelling reason to change the existing organizational structure of higher education in Illinois. The Board's position is that the creation of additional governing boards would unnecessarily complicate the structure of higher education in Illinois and the effort to reduce the existing number of boards and restructure the higher education systems in Illinois would significantly detract from the current program goals of the Board.

Although the Tennessee master plan seeks ways to improve articulation between public higher education institutions, independent colleges and universities, and elementary and secondary schools and the New Mexico plan has a strategy which seeks to develop a holistic view of the state's educational enterprise and seeks to improve the division of labor, articulation between the diverse institutions within the state, develop consortia and joint programs, and improve cost effectiveness, neither these master plans nor any master plan analyzed in this study called for a single education board for all institutions of education in any state. The Pennsylvania master plan acknowledges an evolving state role in identifying and supporting inter-institutional cooperation but it stopped short of any unification movement.

A fundamental responsibility of most commissions of higher education with regulatory powers is defining the
role and scope of each institution within the state system of higher education. In New Mexico, the Commission has statutory responsibility to plan for the state system and to allocate resources.

However, as one reviews the organization of higher education from one state to another, the relationship between state colleges and universities, community or junior colleges, and technical and vocational institutions in the governance structure is not consistent. There is not a consensus of opinion whether governance systems should be statewide, related to like institutions, determined by geographic regions of a state, programmatic, or whether each institution in the state should be autonomous from every other institution and have its own governing board.

Besides the coordination of public institutions, state master plans also express concerns about private institutions. The South Carolina and the Tennessee master plans call for communication between the state commission and the private colleges within the state. The Colorado master plan acknowledges the need for a strong, independent higher education sector. However, the Ohio master plan expresses a concern that the state commission have the authority over any non-profit, independent institution or out-of-state institution seeking to offer any collegiate level instruction in Ohio.
There is also a concern in some state master plans about the growing number of private, for-profit schools which are establishing campuses throughout the United States. The New Mexico master plan specifically identifies state level responsibilities in the oversight and quality control of these schools.

An equally important issue with "Who will be governed?" is the issue of "Who will govern?" South Carolina is the only state that discusses specifically the appointment of members of the Commission on Higher Education. Members are appointed by the governor with the consent of the General Assembly for a six year term. This has become the norm for selecting most members for state commissions and boards of regents at four-year colleges and universities. The New Mexico master plan identifies stability of board membership as a concern. The strategy in New Mexico is to provide the same protection to appointees of the commission as the protection provided to members of boards of regents: once confirmed by the State Senate, members should only be removed by action of the New Mexico Supreme Court. New Mexico also has a statutory provision that prohibits Commission members from succeeding themselves.

New Mexico is the only state which included student representation on the Commission on Higher Education. New Mexico statutes specify that student members from
institutions coordinated by the Commission serve for two years. The Commission has two student members, one voting and one non-voting. The voting member is the President of the Associated Students of New Mexico, the statewide organization of student government. If the President is from a four-year college, then the non-voting member is from a two-year college and vice-versa.

The state master plans have very few goals or strategies related to boards of regents or trustees. The Kentucky master plan notes that the Council should sponsor workshops about the goals of the higher education system for new Council members and that these workshops should be made available to new university governing board members. In New Mexico, the Commission has statutory responsibility to provide training to members of boards of regents.

The South Carolina master plan summarizes the duties of the Director of the Commission on Higher Education (often identified as the Executive Director or Commissioner in other states). The Director reviews the accomplishments of the prior year, briefs the Commission on emerging issues, and recommends an agenda of major activities for the coming year. The Director is also identified as the spokesperson for higher education in the state. Through the state master plan, the Commission directs the Director to work closely with the Council of Presidents of State institutions of Higher Learning and encourages the Council
to serve as a forum for the identification and discussion of state-level higher education policy issues.

Planning is a recognized role of state level coordinating boards of higher education. The master plan of South Carolina directs the Commission to make planning a major function. The master plan includes a strategy which instructs the Commission to develop a thorough, statewide information base and to use it to analyze planning issues, identify strengths and weaknesses of the higher education system, and to monitor improvement efforts. Also, the Commission is to identify the major components of an academic plan and to require each public institution to develop such a plan. In Kentucky, the Council is charged with planning for the academic, physical, and financial well-being of each campus. The Council is also charged with determining the relevance of national issues to Kentucky and with supporting the reauthorization of the Higher Education Act of 1965.

Planning is also a concern in the New Mexico master plan. The Commission requested additional funding to enhance the Commission's internal capacity for data collection, analysis, and research in order to expand the ongoing planning and program review activities of the Commission. Illinois is also concerned that planning be conducted on a continuous basis and the Illinois Board of Higher Education is charged with determining and assigning
topics for study.

A primary planning function of coordinating boards with regulatory powers relates to the academic programs offered by public institutions of higher education. In Illinois, the Illinois Board of Higher Education, with the cooperation of the colleges and universities, must maintain an inventory of all programs approved for degree credit. The level of control is not the same in each state. The South Carolina master plan requests legislation authorizing the Commission to have sole responsibility and final authority to approve new programs and to terminate existing programs.

In Texas, not only is there concern about programs, there is also concern about the establishment of new colleges or the expansion of existing ones. The Coordinating Board is charged with developing a coherent public policy.

Although the relationship between the state level goals as developed by the state coordinating boards and the campus level goals and strategies is not always clearly identified in the state master plans, in Illinois, each college and university is required to examine and, if necessary, reformulate its goals and strategies to assure that they are consistent with the state-level goals and policies. Each institution is required to make an annual report for its respective campus community and for state
officials about the institution's performance with respect to its goals. The Board of Higher Education is required to summarize these individual reports into an annual report for the public about the condition and performance of higher education with respect to its goals.

Two goals in the South Carolina master plan will probably become the norms in many states throughout the 90s. As the Commission seeks to increase its visibility among policy makers and citizens in a variety of ways, its should also increase its contact with the colleges and universities. Second, as the Commission goes about its business of developing policy positions, it should make extensive use of broad-based advisory groups. As the business community recognizes the need to acknowledge feedback from the external world, higher education will be expected to expand its sources of feedback.

Management

Traditional management theory identifies the role of management as being an active leader, creating a positive work environment, providing opportunities for employees to achieve high performance, and to provide incentives that motivate employees (Bateman and Zeithaml, 1993, pp. 7-11). Perhaps an awareness of these roles caused the writers of the Virginia plan to state that salaries and benefits must keep pace, needs for equipment and new technology must be
met, classroom and office space must be adequate and well maintained to provide faculty with a positive work and teaching environment.

This tradition of management theory also identifies the key management functions as planning, organizing and staffing, leading, and controlling (pp. 14-16). Perhaps it was an awareness of this traditional role of management which caused those who wrote the Colorado plan to emphasize educational delivery over administrative and control systems.

The issues classified by this study under the management heading identify concerns related to the management process as well as identifying specific issues related to the role of management. Perhaps the word which symbolizes the current overriding concern related to management is accountability. The Connecticut plan includes the awareness that in order to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of higher education expenditures and to demonstrate accountability for public support, the Board of Governors for Higher Education must identify and recommend ways to assure public colleges and universities have the fiscal and management flexibility required for innovation, responsiveness, and maintaining competitiveness in the national arena of higher education, and the board must work with state officials to implement these improved practices. The state of Colorado notes that
the leadership of Colorado public education is accountable to the students, the parents and the elected representatives of Colorado. In order to meet this goal of accountability, the Colorado plan calls for a systematic review process of all Commission policies to determine their relevance to a changing educational environment. Colorado holds all employees accountable to students, parents, and elected representatives and requires personnel and faculty evaluations in terms of the full range of individual responsibilities. The New Mexico plan calls for a statewide accountability program to determine the effectiveness of its institutions of higher education.

The state of Texas master plan recognizes not only the need for capable and creative leadership but also the fact that the people of Texas are entitled to this type of leadership in order to support the economic and social diversity of the state. In Illinois, leadership in higher education is charged with assuring excellence by increasing both the quality and the cost effectiveness of all programs and services provided. The Illinois plan directs all leaders to improve the use of all resources available to colleges and universities. And in Kentucky, the leaders are expected to maximize the effectiveness of higher education’s resources through astute management and stewardship.
The Texas master plan identifies two sides of the management dilemma. On the one hand there is the need for and the desire to have more information on which to make decisions. On the other hand, there is the desire to avoid unnecessary reporting requirements. The Colorado plan acknowledges the need to restrain administrative costs, which, of course, local, state, regional, and federal reporting contribute to increased administrative costs.

In Illinois, although the state expects each college and university to prepare an annual report for its students, prospective students, and parents about student success and satisfaction with the institution, there is a strategy which calls for the Board of Higher Education and the colleges and universities to work cooperatively to determine the kinds of data that will enable Illinois higher education to report about its performance with respect to its goals and policies. This collaboration includes the elimination of data reporting requirements that are no longer needed. The state of New York also requires an annual institutional report which contains trend information on such elements as degree completion, tuition and fee rates, enrollment, representation of minority and disabled persons in the student body and faculty, and faculty and staff instructional costs.

Several states have goals and strategies in their master plans which call for increased planning activities
by campus leaders. The master plans in Louisiana, Kentucky, New Mexico, and Ohio call for colleges and universities to devote more effort to strategic planning. The Louisiana plan specifically calls for the integration of academic program planning, financial planning, and budgeting. The Ohio plan specifically encourages the colleges and universities to continue strategic academic planning in order to build excellence in undergraduate education.

The Kentucky master plan states that the key to raising Kentucky's national rank in educational attainment is the implementation of the 1985 Strategic Plan. In order to plan for the academic, physical and financial well-being of each campus and to be able to be both an advocate of the benefits of higher education and to account for the wise expenditure of funds, the Council charged the Conference of Presidents and other higher education groups with developing the an implementation schedule, establishing a common data-oriented format for annual self-assessment of plan-related goal achievement by the universities, publishing an annual report of systematic progress, including the contribution of each campus to advancement of statewide goals, and annually updating the Strategic Plan.

The New Mexico master plan requires each four-year and two-year institution to prepare a written five-year plan and update the plan annually according to the guidelines
established by the Commission. The plan should be comprehensive and present an integrated approach to program, facilities, and resource planning. The master plan also directs two-year institutions to develop plans to address the needs of students and the community, including such factors as scheduling, academic regulations, admission policies and procedures, calendars, tenure, and faculty and staff attitudes toward students. In order to assist the colleges, the Commission proposed to develop a database containing relevant information which will provide statewide accountability and which can be used in system-wide planning. The database should include basic enrollment and completion data, be able to provide achievement information to high schools, include an enrollment projection model, assist in research and planning for student financial aid, and require a minimal amount of data submission by institutions.

Pennsylvania also has a strategy which calls for the development of a Postsecondary Data System, which will provide the Commonwealth information necessary to plan more effectively, to match Commonwealth needs with institutional strengths in the support of differentiated mission, and to monitor the effects of higher education on society.

The management of personnel is a primary issue in any organization. The evaluation of the performance of administrators, faculty and staff must be a concern of
institutions of higher education. In Colorado, the evaluation process starts at the top. The Colorado master plan calls for the governing boards to review the performance of the chief executives in relation to institutional goal accomplishment. This same criteria is to be applied to all administrators and faculty. In Texas, institutions are expected to identify and hire, on a competitive basis, managers who are outstanding and capable of carrying out the goals of higher education.

Although some states, like Louisiana, have strategies that focus on the fiscal impact of personnel policies and calls for institutions to carefully review personnel staffing patterns and tenure ratios, a significant goal of all of higher education is summarized in a strategy of the Colorado plan to attract and retain high performance people in teaching careers. That concern is amended in most states to include the strategy of Connecticut which seeks to determine the present and future supply of faculty and to explore ways to meet the demands through cooperation regional and national efforts to encourage minorities and other under-represented groups to enter the professoriate. Colorado and Texas also have strategies related to increasing the number of women and minority faculty members.

The Virginia plan, faculty aging trends are to be analyzed by discipline, because there is a wide divergence
of age distribution by discipline. Colleges and universities are encouraged to explore less traditional ways of attracting faculty. The Virginia plan recognizes the fact that many persons who wanted to enter academia in the 70s and 80s were forced to take jobs outside the community of scholars. A junior hiring program is proposed, allowing departments with a high percentage of older faculty to hire outstanding junior faculty before actual vacancies occur.

In New York, the Regents plan to seek the enactment of bills to establish state-supported fellowships for doctoral study in key fields and state-supported teaching assistantships for persons studying for doctorates in specific fields. The Regents require each of the state's 41 doctoral institutions, during each of the four years of the state plan, to increase by at least one, annually, the number of doctoral students who are members of under-represented minority groups and to increase the number of female doctoral students by the same measure. Also, the New York plan recognizes that faculty serve as role models and are important in the attracting and retaining of students, especially women and minority students. Therefore, funds will be requested to identify and reward those departments who are successful in expanding diversity in both the faculty and the student body.
Tenure is a personnel management issue that is addressed by several state master plans. In Louisiana, the Board of Regents recommends that institutions continue to guard against becoming tenured-in. All state universities are directed to develop personnel programs designed to reduce the number of tenure employees. Furthermore, each institution is directed to address the issue of retrenchment through the development of a written plan. In Tennessee, the state master plan suggests the creation of early retirement plans for faculty and staff but also proposes a strategy which includes adequate credit for out-of-state employment so that the retirement program in Tennessee will make employment in Tennessee higher education more attractive.

In the New Mexico plan, institutions are directed to review their management of tenure and other related policies such as performance pay, tenure density, and incentive retirement to ensure that effective teachers are rewarded. Alternatives to tenure are to be explored, including special tracks for teaching and research faculty, incentive retirement, and special contracts. The Colorado plan also emphasizes promoting faculty evaluation based on quality teaching. There is further discussion of faculty and quality teaching in the "Quality" section of this chapter.
A major management problem in higher education has been the maintenance of campus facilities. Several state master plans have strategies designed to address this issue. In Pennsylvania, deferred maintenance needs exceeded $100 million. In Oklahoma, the estimate for deferred maintenance funding exceeded $1.2 billion. The Texas plan notes that of the $313 million needed for deferred maintenance, $130 is critical. The Texas plan sets a goal of reducing the backlog of deferred maintenance by 50 percent by 1996. South Carolina needs $124.4 million in special funding for the rehabilitation and renovation of existing buildings. The South Carolina plan asks for only $61.2 million over a five year period.

In Connecticut the emphasis is on restoring, maintenance, preventive maintenance, and equipment replacement. There is also a focus on reducing the time and cost required to complete construction and to purchase equipment. The New York plan asks the Governor and the Legislature to enact legislation that will assist institutions to upgrade deteriorating or obsolete academic facilities and equipment.

The New Mexico plan requires, as a part of the planning process, each higher education institution to project its five-year capital outlay needs, detailing the institution's needs for facilities development. All requests for state capital funding must be based on the
five-year plan and should be updated annually. In order to have adequate information, each institution is to update the Space File on facilities utilization. The institutions are also requested to develop a systematic method for ensuring the ongoing maintenance of facilities.

The Louisiana plan presents a priority list which should be utilized when determining what facilities and other capital improvements and expenditures are needed. First priority must be given to bonafide emergencies and safety hazards. Second priority must be given to those repairs and improvements required by the courts. Additional considerations included improvements which would reduce operating costs, repairs and renovations designed to protect or upgrade existing facilities, replacement of existing facilities when renovation is impractical, and improvements deemed essential to accommodate enrollment projections.

Besides capital expenditures related to facilities, the management of expenditures related to technology is a continuing problem. In Kentucky, the master plan calls for the development of an inventory of major research equipment and for a plan to maintain that equipment against obsolescence. The New York plan seeks legislation for the acquisition of specialized instructional equipment and learning aids designed to assist persons with disabilities. In Colorado there is the need to develop a plan to
coordinate the use of technologies in libraries, academic computing, and telecommunications.

Although the introduction and expansion of the use of technology may be to improve the quality of services and learning, often, as in South Carolina, the motivation is the desire to seek greater efficiency and to reduce costs. There is additional discussion of the use of technology in the "Quality" section of this chapter.

An issue that receives little direct comment in master plans but which is addressed in many indirect ways is the issue of enrollment management. The assumptions expressed in the Kentucky plan summarize two prevalent opinions in higher education: a way to control costs is to offer fewer academic programs; due to changes in demographics, special efforts will need to be made to increase college-going rates. The Louisiana plan recommends that academic program review and master planning be integrated to assure that all planning issues identified through the review process are addressed in a timely manner. Obviously, enrollment trends and projections would be a consideration in any academic program review.

The level of higher education which comes under the most scrutiny in enrollment management is graduate education, especially doctoral programs and professional schools. In Colorado, a strategy in the master plan is to differentiate publicly supported institutions of higher
education by limiting the duplication of graduate programs. In Illinois, the plan makes provisions for adjusting the number of graduate programs offered based on student interests and occupational opportunities due to changes in economic, social, and technological priorities. Therefore, new doctoral programs in public universities in Illinois will be approved only when need can be clearly established based on an examination of existing doctoral capacity, student demand, occupational trends, and the importance of the proposed program for the overall conduct of a quality doctoral educational program. In South Carolina, no new doctoral programs should be considered outside the three universities and they should be considered at these universities only when there is the existence of a strong undergraduate and graduate program in the same or closely related area.

A management issue which is of great interest to state coordinating boards and state legislators is the concept of interinstitutional cooperation. In Pennsylvania, in the 70s, federal and state funds were available to establish ten planning regions. The purpose of these regional planning councils included fostering information exchange, stimulating institutional cooperation, eliminating unnecessary duplication of programs, enhancing the sharing of resources, and extending postsecondary educational opportunities. After the external funding ended, all but
two of the regional councils ceased to function.

However, several state master plans still promote and encourage interinstitutional cooperation. The Colorado plan supports better approaches to resource sharing between community colleges. The Texas plan includes a strategy which encourages the sharing of critical resources. In order to develop nationally competitive proposals, the Tennessee plan promotes intra- and interinstitutional cooperation. Technology, specifically telecommunications, is identified as a way of developing interinstitutional networks within both the public and private sectors in Tennessee. In South Carolina, the plan includes encouraging interinstitutional cooperation with strategies which establish interinstitutional advisory groups which would promote research, complimentary graduate program offerings, and the exchange of faculty and students. The Oklahoma plan also recommends a greater sharing of faculty, joint administrative efforts, and additional resource coordination.

The New Mexico plan identifies two types of organizations which can be used to promote interinstitutional cooperation: compacts and consortia. New Mexico participates in one of the largest interstate compacts, the Western Interstate Commission on Higher Education (WICHE). The New Mexico plan suggests that WICHE be explored as a way to expand newly needed content areas,
such as specialized foreign languages, Pacific Basin economic development, Native American education, and others.

The New Mexico plan has several strategies related to consortia in order to foster interinstitutional cooperation, to identify ways to pool resources, to increase cost efficiencies, and to increase effectiveness. The plan suggests that an institution with particular expertise in a field be designated as the coordinating institution for each consortium. Some of the consortia suggested in the New Mexico plan include technology transfer, teacher education, student recruitment, rural education, student outcomes assessment, libraries, conventional and non-traditional delivery systems, such as instructional telecommunications, distance education programing, quality and accountability, service areas, special statewide programs, and governance. The New Mexico plan also recognizes the need for developing and enacting policies on the establishment, evaluating, and funding of consortia.

Public Education

Although there may be good reason to discuss the issues related to this classification under the headings of "Access" and "Quality," the significance of the issues related to this classification merit a separate discussion.
The Kentucky and Texas plans express a general concern about promoting the value of higher education and increasing the number of high school graduates who are prepared for college. In the Tennessee and Louisiana plan there are strategies which call for colleges to work with elementary and secondary schools to influence student to know and understand admission and retention standards for college and to influence students to achieve and maintain these standards. In the New York plan, the Regents not only urge colleges and universities to work with elementary and secondary schools in order to find the most effective ways to help students complete high school, but also to undertake increased efforts to attract New York high school graduates to attend college in New York. They promote a "I Love New York Colleges" campaign.

The Kentucky plan expresses the basic assumption that educational reform will focus primarily on elementary and secondary education. Both the Kentucky and Texas plan support having a strong public school system. Several states express the need for a college preparatory curriculum.

The New Mexico plan calls for career and educational awareness programs beginning at the elementary level. Furthermore, the plan defines the development of a college preparatory curriculum. The plan calls for colleges and public schools to jointly define the skills, attitudes, and
knowledge required of college-bound high school graduates. The state Commission and the State Department of Education have the responsibility of defining the minimum competencies required in core curriculum requirements, including competencies in English, mathematics, the sciences, social sciences, fine arts, and foreign languages. Although several states have adopted a statewide testing program to assess student competencies, this was still a proposal in the New Mexico plan. In New Mexico, each four-year institution is to adopt an acceptable high school core curriculum for regular admission for high school students. The plan also proposes the development of two-plus-two programs between the public schools and the four-year colleges. In an effort to further define and implement entry competencies, higher education institutions should provide feedback to New Mexico public schools on the participation, performance, and retention of their graduates.

Texas and Connecticut both have objectives in their state plans related to at-risk students. Connecticut provides information to eighth graders about college entrance requirements and has several programs, such as Upward Bound and HOPE (Help and Opportunity to Pursue Education) to provide academic and financial help and mentors for at-risk students. In New York, the Regents call on colleges and universities to help improve
counseling and guidance services in the public schools and to better prepare teachers to work with at-risk students. But the states are not only interested in at-risk students. There is also interest in enrichment programs and advanced placement for public school students. In Tennessee, the plan suggests the use of telecommunication equipment in the partnership between colleges and elementary and secondary schools. The New York plan promotes relationships between secondary schools and colleges through science, mathematics, and foreign language courses. Both South Carolina and New Mexico have strategies which include high schools and colleges participating in advanced placement programs.

The New Mexico plan also seeks to establish a strong linkage between public schools and higher education through research. Higher education should be able to study the social, economic, and educational issues facing public education. Not only should the state Commission and the State Board of Education work together to identify issues of mutual concern, but individual institutions should also work with local public schools to identify issues. The New Mexico plan proposes the creation of a statewide foundation, the New Mexico Educational Research Foundation, to support research, development (fund raising), policy studies, and evaluation.
The recruitment and preparation of teachers for public education is a concern specifically expressed in the plans developed in Kentucky, New York, New Mexico, South Carolina, Tennessee, and Texas. In the Kentucky and Tennessee plan, the strategies call for teacher preparation programs to be aware of and aligned with elementary and secondary school reform. In South Carolina, the plans focus specifically on improving the teaching of science and mathematics. In New York, the Regents believe teacher preparation programs should provide a strong liberal arts education, a command of subject matter, and seek to produce dynamic and resourceful professional teachers. The Regents are also concerned with the decline in students studying foreign languages and special education.

The New Mexico plan identifies several strategies related to the education of teachers. The New Mexico plan notes that teacher education needs to receive attention and strong support from the governor, legislators, the state Commission, members of boards of regents, administrators, faculty, and students. Besides the need for funding of scholarships, internships, and research, the New Mexico plan calls for professional development activities through alternative delivery systems, off-campus and summer programs. The plan calls for teacher education programs to establish degree requirements which exceed state credentialing requirements. Efforts to recruit students
into teacher education programs must include not only efforts to recruit racial minorities but also must focus on needs of both rural and urban schools. Because early childhood education is particularly important to the success of the entire education system, teacher education programs should strive to prepare qualified personnel and promote the application of research at all levels of the education of children and youth. Finally, the New Mexico plan calls for the creation of a consortium for Teacher Excellence. This consortium would promote both specialization and cooperation in teacher education programs including in-service and graduate education, reduce redundancy, and foster cooperative approaches to the improvement of education.

Quality

According to the South Carolina plan, the first step in the assessment of the quality of higher education is defining quality. In Kentucky, the higher education community was to undertake a potentially controversial but highly significant project: defining quality, identifying how quality can be assessed, and deciding how institutional mission affects qualitative considerations.

Not only is it difficult to define quality in instruction and instructional services, there is not agreement in higher education as to who should define
quality. According to the Virginia plan, the national Association of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges singled out the Commonwealth of Virginia for allowing each institution to develop the criteria and to define the indicators of quality appropriate to the missions and goals of the institution as derived from state-wide goals and standards. The South Carolina plan identifies the state Commission as being responsible for the statewide assessment of quality.

The Kentucky plan notes that the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS) includes institutional effectiveness criteria in the accreditation process. In New Mexico, all public and non-public postsecondary institutions which offer instruction or training in academic, vocational, or professional studies must be accredited by an appropriate agency recognized by the Council on Postsecondary Accreditation (COPA) or the United States Department of Education. This implies that the accreditation process may be the appropriate time and way that the institution evaluates and improves the quality of instruction and instructional services.

There are several ways to assess quality presented in state master plans. One measure of quality is reputation. The Kentucky plan suggests the use of opinion polls and other measures of the public’s view of higher education as a way to assess quality. Both the Texas and Kentucky plans
express the desire to establish and maintain institutions with national and international recognition. The Colorado plans recommends discontinuing doctoral programs which are not nationally competitive.

One measure of quality identified in the state plans of Colorado, New Mexico, and Texas is the achievement of goals established in the planning process. Several state plans acknowledge the need to publish annual reports identifying the accomplishments of higher education.

The Virginia plan also notes the side effect of assessment of institutional quality: communication. Assessment enables or causes faculty and administrators to consider what they are really trying to accomplish and to try to determine if they are achieving those goals. The plan identifies several components in the assessment process, including student achievement in general education and in the major, surveys of alumni, tracking the success of community college students who transfer to four-year institutions, and the eventual success of students who take remedial courses. In Illinois, tracking of students who require remediation is also linked to notifying high schools about the preparation of students for college.

Several states include retention and graduation rates as appropriate information to be included in the measurement of instructional effectiveness. In New Mexico, the state plan also calls for follow-up studies on
graduates from both two-year and four-year institutions in order to assess the success of students in the continuation of their education or in their continued employment. The Tennessee plan also includes tracking student performance on licensure and certification examinations. Although the details of the Performance Funding Program are not presented in the Tennessee plan, it is implied that special funds are allocated to institutions which demonstrate excellence in the outcome measures used in Tennessee.

In the Colorado plan, quality is related to the acquisition and maintenance of the physical plant and the equipment that is used in the teaching/learning process. The Pennsylvania plan notes the past dependence of the teaching/learning process on faculty-student interaction. However, this process is now joined by costly technologies which require facilities to be renovated, new labs to be built, and expensive data processing and telecommunications equipment to be bought. Not only the graduate and professional programs need adequate libraries, laboratories, and computer resources, but the Tennessee plan notes that the undergraduate curriculum also needs these resources. The quality and efficiency of a higher education library is a issue that caused the New Mexico plan to recognize the need for new funding formulas to address not only the requirements of individual academic programs but also the cost related to the technological
operation and increased material costs of both campus libraries and statewide library systems.

An accepted component of the process to determine quality is the use of program reviews. The Kentucky plan calls for the development of explicit measures of quality for use in the program review process. The Board of Regents in Louisiana recommends that each institution assess its academic programs using the characteristics of commendable programs in the state or nation. The use of comparative data between similar programs within a state or comparative institutions and the adoption of exemplary aspects of programs recognized for their high quality are recommendations in the plans from Ohio and Oklahoma.

The issues related to the review process in New Mexico is explained in the state plan. The plan calls for the review cycle to be reduced from eight years to five years. Terms, such as degree, specialization, concentration, major, option, etc. need to be defined. There needs to be an external evaluator included in the review process in order to provide perspective and objectivity. There needs to be an adoption of more rigorous criteria for flagging programs, including enrollment trends, program costs, accreditation status, responsiveness to statewide needs, affect on economic development, placement of graduates, and the relationship to system goals. Inactive programs need to be deleted from the inventory of approved programs.
Procedures are needed to initiate program reviews independent of the state-level review cycle. This unscheduled review may be due to issues in the field, loss of faculty or sudden changes in enrollment. The plan calls for the integration of program review and approval, data collection, and formula funding which will ensure programs of quality, relevance, and utility.

Undergraduate education has received much attention in recent years and several state plans called for increased quality in undergraduate degree programs. In Virginia, the focus is less on what kinds of courses students should take and more in terms of what they should know and be able to do. In the Colorado plan, a quality degree program assures competence in a core body of knowledge, acquisition of learning skills and an appreciation of societal values. In Louisiana, the Board of Regents directed each institution of higher education to examine its existing curricula in all fields to assure that each curriculum not only transmitted knowledge but also equipped students to utilize knowledge through critical thinking, problem-solving, and the synthesis of diverse information.

Although the Illinois plan acknowledges excellence in teaching, the interaction of faculty with students in scholarly and community service activities, and student commitment to learning and academic achievement are contributing factors to a quality undergraduate education.
It also states that general education and the liberal arts and sciences are central to baccalaureate education.

Kentucky, Louisiana, Oklahoma, and Tennessee all have strategies related to improving undergraduate education through the development of a core curriculum. In Kentucky, the review places programs in one of three categories: related to centers of excellence, part of the nucleus of undergraduate degrees, or substantiated for a special reason.

Four states, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, and Virginia, have introduced a new dynamics to undergraduate education: international awareness. All of these states, except Texas, specifically encourage study abroad. In Virginia, there is not only a request of each institution to examine their current foreign language competency requirements, there is also a concern about all aspects of the curriculum having a global dimension.

Some states acknowledge that support services contribute to the quality of the educational system. In Colorado, institutions of higher education are expected to provide academic support services, such as tutoring labs, diagnostic services and faculty accessibility and learning support systems, including libraries, learning technologies and facilities. The Tennessee plan seeks to enhance undergraduate programs with comprehensive student services, including academic advisement and special counseling and
skill development services designed to facilitate student retention rates and to increase graduation rates.

Program review includes not just undergraduate programs but also graduate level programs. In Illinois, if serious quality deficiencies are noted when evaluating a program, the governing boards of public universities will be advised that the program is no longer educationally and economically justified. The factors reviewed in new doctoral programs include the strengths of the faculty, faculty resources available in supporting disciplines, student and institutional potential for high program quality, and the readiness to implement the proposed program.

In Louisiana, the Board of Regents recommends that each institution review graduate degrees to assure that they are relevant to society’s needs. Furthermore, if a college or university identifies resources for a new program, it must assure the board that sufficient resources are being provided to all existing programs.

The Regents in New York view a quality professional program as disseminating information on the ethics, laws, and rules related to the various licensed professions in New York. The Regents will continue to study different approaches in graduate education to assure continued competence in the preparation of professionals.
In order to provide quality graduate and professional education which has regional and national distinction, the state of Tennessee sponsored a conference of graduate schools. From this conference came a list of standards which are to be included in the graduation requirements of all master's programs.

A common factor used to evaluate graduate education is the quantity and quality of productive research. The Oklahoma plan seeks incentive funding to help develop research centers of excellence, cooperative efforts, and faculty mentor/fellowship programs. The Ohio plan seeks to strengthen graduate education through the creation of research institutes in basic scientific fields urgent to Ohio's needs. Also, in order to enable faculty members with common research and graduate education interests to work together and disseminate new knowledge, the state plans to form the Ohio Academic Network.

In Virginia, it was noted that in order to have a quality graduate and research program, funds must be provided to develop a larger pool of graduate teaching and research assistants. However, in Pennsylvania, the state plan questions the linkage of graduate education and research. With declining enrollments in some graduate programs, there is pressure to uncouple hiring in research programs from the teaching needs of the graduate programs.
Perhaps the most important factor in the measurement of quality is the evaluation of the quality of instruction, usually associated with the evaluation of the faculty. The Pennsylvania plan expresses the belief that the faculty hired in the 50s and 60s is getting ready to retire and the community of scholars will be diminished by a loss of talent and its ability to produce knowledge critical to the evolution of society and to the economic development of the state.

In Oklahoma, ways to increase the quality of undergraduate teaching include reducing class sizes, improving instructor language skills, and using top professors to teach lower level courses. The Colorado plan identifies several characteristics of top professors. Top faculty set high performance expectations. They act decisively within the framework of a coherent educational philosophy. As role models for students, faculty provide a breadth of cultural perspectives in the classroom and in their relationships with students and peers. The notion that faculty are role models has caused several states to view faculty diversity as an indicator of the quality of a program. Therefore, emphasis is being placed on recruiting women, racial minorities, business and community professionals as faculty.

The Illinois and Texas plans both call for faculty to take responsibility for the design, assessment, and quality
of instructional programs. However, with the trend to incorporate a variety of skills, including communication, mathematical, critical thinking, and analytical skills, across the undergraduate curriculum, faculty may have varying abilities. Therefore, several states recognize the need for professional development opportunities for faculty.

In Colorado, the plan calls for the first priority for state funding off-campus education delivered through technology to be the establishing of continuing education for teachers and administrators in postsecondary education in Colorado. Colleges and universities in Illinois are to make special efforts to emphasize the importance of instruction in orientation programs for new faculty members and in aiding faculty members and teaching assistants to develop teaching skills.

There are a variety of ways to provide faculty development. In New York, the Board supports internships with appropriate state agencies. In Tennessee, release time for research, travel to other countries, and faculty exchange programs are supported. In New Mexico, faculty development programs include faculty renewal, in-service educational activities, and professional development experiences. Sabbaticals are acknowledged as an appropriate renewal experience. Each institution is encouraged to establish a center for teaching excellence as
a resource for the development and nurturing of skills in effective colleges and university teaching. Faculty are also encouraged to participate in professional organizations beyond the campus.

The Colorado strategy of recognizing and rewarding superior teaching performance is a strategy reflected in several state plans. The Illinois plan suggests that the colleges and universities recognize the importance of undergraduate teaching when determining salary raises, promotions, and tenure. Tennessee and Texas also recommend personnel and funding policies that emphasize and reward excellent teaching. Kentucky, New Mexico, Pennsylvania, and South Carolina have strategies which call for the use of state and private funds to establish faculty chairs which recognize excellence in teaching.

Finally, another factor used in determining the quality of programs includes public service. This is especially true when evaluating professional schools.

Quality of Life

Just as legislators and citizens hold higher education accountable in the day to day management of resources, there is a growing movement in each state to hold higher education accountable for the quality of life in each state. In Connecticut, there is an expectation that higher education can combat drug and alcohol abuse, stem the
spread of AIDS, and eliminate racism and intolerance. In Illinois, higher education is expected to contribute to public understanding of society's needs and problems and to respond to the meeting of those needs and the solving of those problems. In Louisiana, the Board of Regents notes that state support brings with it the obligation for accountability. The Board recommends each institution to launch a campaign to assure that the governor, the legislature, and the citizens of Louisiana are aware of the benefits of research efforts at higher education institutions in Louisiana. The New Mexico plan calls for institutions of higher education to actively pursue opportunities to assist other agencies such as public schools, public health, public welfare, and correctional facilities not only through the preparation of highly-skilled and motivated personnel, but also through targeted research, technology transfer, and policy studies.

Whether directly expressed in the state master plan or not, most states have traditionally seen higher education as the Kentucky plan states. Higher education has been expected to improve the educational attainment for the people of the state. Institutions of higher education will enrich the intellectual, cultural, and aesthetic life of the citizenry. Professional schools, especially dental and medical schools, contribute to the improved health and wellbeing of those who have access to the services
provided. But the Kentucky plan calls for the institutions of higher education to develop ways to identify the value added by higher education programs and conduct a statewide campaign to increase awareness of the value of higher education.

It is no longer acceptable for colleges and universities to just emphasize liberal arts as a way to better the individual and society, states, such as Tennessee, expect institutions of higher education to demonstrate that they directly contribute to the betterment of the individual and of society by reporting and increasing the rate of job placement for which graduates are trained. The master plan in Pennsylvania notes that there may be actually diminishing financial rewards for some graduate studies, therefore the plan suggests that career/education guidance be future-oriented and that it help individuals to avoid over-specialization which may prove to be limiting over a career lifetime. It is the conclusion of the Pennsylvania plan that the notion that an insulated educational experience will be followed by a single lifelong career is disappearing. The future, according to the Pennsylvania plan, will be a continuing combination of education and work which will enable people to pursue a number of perhaps unrelated careers.

The notion of lifelong learning is evident in several state master plans. In the Ohio plan, a first-class system
of higher education is not only consistent and high quality but also responsive to the state need to train and retrain a workforce which will experience a lifetime of changing careers. The Texas plan notes that the need for lifelong education will be due to rapidly changing technologies. In the New Mexico plan, lifelong learning may be needed to facilitate career planning and preparation due to individual growth and change throughout life. The New York plan also notes that colleges and universities are founded not only for the purpose of preserving, expanding, and transmitting knowledge but also have a responsibility to lead in applying the values and principles of our culture to the social, aesthetic, economic, educational, and environmental problems and therefore must provide training of lifecoping skills.

The Colorado master plan has the most to say about the contribution of higher education to the quality of life of the individual and to society. The Colorado plan states that higher education should increase the capacity of the individual in specific skills related to occupational, professional and vocational education. Undergraduate education curriculum should enable individuals to speak, write, and compute clearly and accurately. It should advance the individual's capacity to think logically and critically. There is the belief in Colorado that individuals will internalize and exemplify humane values if
the individual understands in depth a variety of psychological, historical, cultural, aesthetic and scientific realities. The Colorado plan indicates that a graduate education will prepare the individual for entry into advanced professional work requiring high levels of administration, theoretical cohesiveness, scientific inquiry, synthesis of new knowledge with the established body of knowledge and a value system that preserves the integrity of their chosen discipline.

Although the Colorado plan notes these benefits to the individual, the plan notes many benefits which should result to society because of higher education. The Colorado plan recognizes the need for higher education to be self-serving, that is, to provide scholars and researchers who can test new theories, concepts and ideas, generate new knowledge and technological advancement in theory, techniques and products. However, higher education must contribute more to the state and to society if it expects to get support from the state and society. Higher education must contribute to the society’s economic well-being by training men and women to function at all levels of the world of work and as alert and informed consumers. Through institutions of higher education, society’s experience cultural advancement, not only through the training of talented artists but also through appreciative and discerning readers, viewers and listeners.
The society not only develops and maintains its own common culture, but it also examines and learns from other cultures in the world. Higher education must not only play a role in the transmission of the moral and ethical notions and traditions of society, it must also be involved in the development of the moral and ethical integrity of society. The political well-being of a society is dependent not only on an informed citizenry but also on the wise and effective leaders selected by the citizenry and the policies developed by those leaders. According to the Colorado plan, higher education must play a role in informing the citizenry and the development of wise and effective leaders who develop wise and effective policies. In summary, according to the Colorado plan, higher education must take responsibility for the survival of the society. Higher education must provide the members of society with the understanding that the interdependence of human beings and the natural environment require the prudent use and preservation of all of society's resources.
CHAPTER 6

CONCLUSION

The Problem

This study examined the policy issues in the current state level master plans for higher education, in those states whose coordinating boards have regulatory powers, in an effort to identify the most significant policy issues facing higher education in the United States during the 1990s and beyond.

The Purposes

The purposes of this study are (1) to identify the major policy issues being addressed by state agencies responsible for coordinating and regulating higher education; (2) to develop a classification system through inductive "clustering" that will aid in the analysis and synthesis of the major policy issues facing state coordinating boards for higher education; (3) to classify these policy issues; (4) to compare the goals and strategies of the various states; (5) to propose a list of significant policy issues that institutions and state agencies of higher education may face through the 1990s and into the 21st century.
Summary

Using the state master plans from 14 states whose coordinating boards have regulatory power, the major policy issues being addressed by these state agencies are identified. Using a "keyword" identification system, "clusters" were developed which identify nine major issues facing these states:

1. Access
2. Diversity
3. Economic Development
4. Funding
5. Governance
6. Management
7. Public Schools
8. Quality
9. Quality of Life

Using the "keywords" and the "clusters," factors identified in the state master plans were classified. These classifications are discussed in Chapter 4. The goals and strategies from the state master plans related to each of these issues are discussed in Chapter 5.

The following are the nine significant policy issues that institutions and state agencies of higher education may face through the 1990s and into the 21st century:

1. Access to higher education.
2. Diversity of institutions of higher education.
3. The contribution of higher education to the Economic Development of each state (and the nation).
4. The process of determining appropriate Funding for higher education.
5. The process of determining appropriate Governance systems in each state.
6. The process of Management on each campus of higher education.
7. The role and responsibility of higher education to Public Schools (K-12).
8. The process of developing and maintaining Quality in the instructional systems in higher education.
9. The responsibility of higher education to contribute to the Quality of Life of the individual and the state and nation.

These nine issues have factors which are in dynamic relationships with each other. The strategies developed to address these issues must not only take into account the dynamics of these factors but also the dynamics between these issues.

1. Access to higher education. The geographic proximity of students to institutions of higher education will continue to be a factor in the issue of access. The questions for the next century is whether students will go to institutions of higher education or whether institutions of higher education will have to go to where the students
are. Although the technology will be available to deliver education through non-classroom activities, each state will have to make decisions about the funding of technology and each college will have to determine the use of technology. As the next decade brings the potential reduction in faculty, if the access to higher education will be through technology, then the qualifications of the replacement faculty may be different from current standards. One strategy to increase minority access to higher education will be through "temporary" facilities in minority communities.

Because state funding for higher education will continue to be limited in the next century, institutions of higher education may have the niche they will serve defined for them. As institutions seek to find a match between student interests, faculty abilities, and state needs, assessment testing and minimum scores may be used more and more to control which students are allowed to enter each type or level of public institution of higher education. If this occurs, the community colleges will likely be designated as the entry institution into higher education, especially for under represented groups and students needing developmental or remedial education.

Although the use of assessment testing and various standardized tests as a criteria for admission has been controversial, it will still probably be increasingly
utilized. Research will need to continue not only to monitor the predictive validity of these tests, but also to analyze the effect of this testing on enrollment strategies and student performance.

Financial aid will continue to be a significant factor in the access issue. Determining the amount of aid and the sources of that aid (local, state, federal) could also contribute to forcing community colleges to be entry level institutions. Traditionally, tuition at community colleges is substantially less than the tuition at state colleges and universities. Therefore, legislators may realize that they get more access for the dollar when marginal students attend community colleges rather than going to state colleges and universities. The use of financial aid to equalize racial or gender access in state colleges and universities or specific academic programs will probably increase during the next ten years.

The access to graduate education will continue to become limited at each college and university. The strategy by state coordinating boards to reduce institutional educational costs through the limiting of the placement of graduate programs will result in the increased need for financial aid for graduate students.

Although state coordinating boards and legislators generally want the private sector to be strong, the use of state financial aid for students to have access to private
colleges and universities will probably once again come into question. If various academic programs are removed from the curriculum of certain state institutions of higher education, then it may make sense to continue to provide state funds to students who want to major in those programs not available in public colleges and universities. It will certainly make sense to look at cooperative efforts with the private sector before expanding graduate programs. As state planners look at the viability of various rural institutions, it may also make sense for public funds to provide financial aid for students to attend private colleges rather than for the state to expand or maintain some rural campuses.

2. Diversity of institutions of higher education. State coordinating boards will continue to have control of the placement of academic programs and new programs will be difficult to get approved. The trend will be to continue to "downsize" academic curriculums and to raise minimum enrollments to make academic programs cost effective. As the trend to force state colleges to focus their mission statements and to narrow the scope of their academic programs continues, there will be the tendency for state coordinating boards to reinforced this policy by mandating institutional cooperation, especially through articulation. If the programs that students want to take are not available when and where they want the programs, then there
will be an expectation that they will be able to move from institution to institution with minimal effort and with little or no redundancy in their matriculation. There will also need to be an increased understanding by both students and faculty that there are not negative implications associated with moving from institution to institution.

The expectation of cooperation between institutions will include more than just the transfer of students. The increased availability of technology, such as the information super highway, will create the expectation of the sharing of information in new ways. The perspective that this will be a way to reduce costs through faculty sharing, shared databases which will reduce administrative costs, and innovative cooperative efforts through institutions of higher education and state agencies and private business will grow. However, if faculty and administrators are not willing and able to use the technology, these expectations will not be met. Also, if the state legislators are not willing and able to provide the up-front funding for this technology, it will be a technological breakthrough that did not happen.

3. The contribution of higher education to the Economic Development of each state (and the nation). It is becoming obvious that the future of most institutions of higher education will not be tranquil places with ivory towers and ivy covered walls. Instead, there will be the
expectations that state supported colleges and universities will be directly involved in creating economic prosperity not only for the students who pass through their halls, but also the colleges will be actively involved in the economic recovery and growth of the state. The responsibility of the community of scholars to create new knowledge will be expanded to include a responsibility to create new jobs. This expectation will not only include institutional cooperation but it will force institutions of higher education to seek and develop new relationships with business and industry.

State agencies that compete in the state budget process for state funding, will see legislators appropriate more cooperative dollars and mandate interagency cooperation. The projections by various state agencies regarding the workforce needs in the state may have dramatic affects on the academic and technical programs and the related equipment and facilities that legislators are willing to fund. However, this information may also force colleges and universities to go in directions they did not plan to go and make decisions they did not plan to make.

There will be a significant push to have research efforts to contribute directly to the economic development of the state and to state businesses. The expectation that every dollar spent on research will produce technological transfer could cause many faculty to give up because of the
The role of higher education of the United States in the changing social, political, and technological environments around the world will be redefined during the 90s. If the state planners do not have the vision or resources to participate and the federal government does not provide the opportunities through funding and economic agreements with foreign governments, then the cooperative efforts between institutions of higher education and global and multinational companies will be even more important. However, this expectation of higher education as contributing to the economic development of states, the nation, and the world is dependent on the availability and motivation of students in the designated fields.

4. The process of determining appropriate Funding for higher education. The funding of higher education is an issue that has received the most attention in recent years and will continue to get attention into the 21st century. It is probable that formula funding (enrollment driven) will continue to be the funding process of choice in most states. Comparing spending by state and by institution will probably continue to be part of the arguments presented in budget hearings. However, the accountability movement will cause these arguments to have little affect in state legislatures. State coordinating boards and state legislators will continue to expect state colleges and
universities to control costs and to increase productivity.

The questions that will be asked more and more during the 90s are: What is productivity in higher education and how can we measure it? To some degree, productivity can be linked to institutional planning. Therefore, funding may be tied to the planning and implementation process at state supported institutions of higher education. If institutions develop goals and plans that contribute to the fulfillment of state expectations, and implement those plans and reach those stated goals, the funding process in each state will be more likely to reward those campuses. Those campuses that develop plans, fail to implement and continually fall short of expressed goals will probably see the funding process as a indicator of the effectiveness of campus management. Ineffective management will not be tolerated in the future.

Legislators have used the "carrot on a stick" philosophy of funding in the past and will continue to use this philosophy in the future. Those issues, programs, initiatives, priorities, etc. in each state will have special funding. This has and will continue to be a way for the legislators to get the academicians to go in the direction the legislators believe to be important. There will probably be many debates in state legislatures as to what will be important in the last half of this decade and the beginning of the 21st century. Minority recruitment
and participation will continue to receive special funding. In those states where technology is identified as an important administrative system and a viable alternative delivery system for instruction there will have to be special allocations in the next five years. In order to stimulate more institutional cooperation, some funding for consortia and other cooperative efforts should be made available. Finally, if legislators want excellent teaching in higher education to be rewarded, there will probably need to be special funding designated to encourage institutions to identify and reward effective teaching.

Where institutions get funding and how the funding is used will continue to be debated into the 21st century. It is very possible that in the 21st century, state institutions of higher education could see state guidelines which indicate that only one-third of their funding will be directly from the state and that one-third funding will be from tuition and fees and one-third of the funding will have to be secured and generated by each campus from contributions, grants, and other external funding arrangements. Although the colleges and universities will be expected to generate more of there own income, the control of the spending of these funds will probably be guided by state regulations and monitored by state auditors.
The potential debt that may be created for a student and a student’s family will be a factor in determining the percent tuition will play in the funding of higher education. Whether states should administer tuition payment plans or whether the private sector (various financial institutions) should administer these plans will be an ongoing debate into the 21st century.

5. The process of determining appropriate Governance systems in each state. How will higher education be governed in each state? This question must be answered by each state. There is no "best way" to govern higher education. The major components are the same in each state, but the legal and regulatory relationship of these components may vary in many ways. The role and responsibility of the governor, the legislature, the coordinating board, the state executive director, the college board of regents, the university chancellors and the college presidents must be defined and understood by all of the participants. The accountability movement expects the clear delegation of responsibility and authority so that there can be clear identification of accountability. Therefore, states will need to be willing to review periodically the governance structure of higher education and be willing to change ineffective structures. The political and emotional factors associated with this process will not make this periodic review an easy task.
State colleges and universities must accept the fact that autonomy is an illusion that no longer exists for any institution. Dependence on the external environment for support and feedback force institutions to give up their autonomy. Therefore, colleges and their board of regents must learn to work within the governance structure of the state. The development of cooperative relationships among similar institutions and between institutions at different levels of the state structure will be expected in the 21st century.

The role of the state level coordinating board and the staff will be debated in each state. Just as there are currently different levels of coordination in each state, there will probably continue to be different levels of coordination. Some states will have a strong commissioner and some will have a weak commissioner position.

Planning and evaluation will continue to be important in the governance process. The exact form of the planning will vary from state to state. This planning and evaluation function will continue to put the coordinating boards in the role of advocate for and advisor to institutions of higher education.

Although the individual colleges and universities may not like it, the role of coordinating boards in the expansion or reduction in academic programs will probably continue. The creation of new academic programs is
accepted as inevitable. Unfortunately, it is also now inevitable that some programs at some institutions will be reduced or eliminated.

6. The process of Management on each campus of higher education. Management of the campus in the 21st century will certainly include enrollment management, personnel management, and facilities management. Effective management of each campus will be expected in the 21st century. The creation of a positive work environment while controlling costs and increasing productivity will be a challenge for the administrators of the 21st century. Although the phrase "management by objective" may not be used, the expectation of colleges to develop and implement plans that meet state and local goals will be a factor in the evaluation process. The strategic management process calls for an on-going analysis of internal and external environments and college administrators will be expected to do even more analysis and evaluation of their institutions.

The gathering and analysis of data both for the decision making process and for the evaluation process will be even more predominant. Technology will be available to expedite these processes but whether campus administrators will be willing and able to use the technology is not clear.

Who will lead the campus of the 21st century is a question of great significance. Great academicians do not
necessarily make great administrators. But managers who do not know or understand the classroom do not make great administrators either. The strategic management process requires cooperation at all levels of the organization in the development, implementation, and evaluation of campus plans. The creation of a cooperative atmosphere, a community, on the college campus will be the challenge of college administrators throughout the rest of this decade and into the 21st century.

Creating community while debating tenure, reducing personnel, eliminating programs, evaluating the effectiveness of support services, and developing external funding will not be an easy task. In fact, finding administrators who will do this for very long may see administrative positions as being more like revolving doors than life-long positions of institutional service. The education and preparation of administrators who will manage the campus in the 21st century will be a significant problem for the rest of this decade.

The management of faculty will be a particular challenge in the 21st century. There appears to be a significant concern inside and outside the academic community regarding the need for faculty to emphasize teaching/learning and the tendency of the reward system to emphasize publish or perish. The 21st century may see a resolution of this issue in the establishment of two career
tracks and two reward systems. If the technological revolution does come to the classroom, faculty who are willing and able to use technology in the teaching/learning process will be rewarded by being given the time and resources to teach. The faculty who can develop and secure grants and other external funding to do research and publish may be rewarded by being given the time and resources to do research. This separate but equal status for faculty may develop in the 21st century. The evolution of this system will be a management issue for the administrators to ponder through the end of this century.

Management decisions made in the next five years regarding facilities will shape the future of higher education in the 21st century. Whether to maintain and restore existing campus facilities or whether to remove and replace these facilities with new and modern facilities or whether to prepare for downsizing and alternative instructional delivery systems including distance learning strategies will be crucial in the evolution of higher education. It is probable that no campus will have the resources to do all three facility strategies: restore the old, build the new, and develop the alternative systems. The campus management will have to weigh carefully the long-term affects of each strategy on their campus. Will enrollment management dictate to decisions related to facilities management or will the facilities of the future
dictate the enrollment in the 21st century?

7. The role and responsibility of higher education to Public Schools (K-12). The education reform movement probably views higher education and public education as codefendants in an indictment of all publicly funded educational institutions. The education departments in state supported institutions of higher education have been under attack in many states and this public scrutiny will probably not diminish during the last half of the 90s. Just as there will be a mass exodus of college faculty during this decade due to retirement, there will probably be a corresponding exodus of public school teachers. The classroom teachers of the 21st century will be the products of the colleges of education of the decades of the 60s, 70s, 80s, and 90s. The debate between educational process and academic content will continue into the 21st century. As recent presidential administrations have had neither the resources nor the attitude to support education, such as the Johnson administration in the 60s, the possibility of massive intrusion of money for new technology seems unlikely for K-12 schools.

The linkage between college preparation and classroom performance will be a significant challenge for both education faculty and public school administrators. The problems of the public schools must be dealt with in the college preparation curriculum without scaring off all
potential public school teachers.

The problem, when viewed from the other direction is even more significant. The preparation of school children for college performance must be the accepted role and responsibility of the public schools. Feedback to school districts regarding the performance of their graduates is one way to help identify strengths and weaknesses in the public school system. Although the need to develop articulation between colleges and universities implies the designation of geographic services areas, this will probably not occur. There will probably be many state debates about core curriculum which are necessary to prepare students for college. Others will debate the minimum skills that are necessary to both graduate from public schools and to qualify to enroll in college. Whichever strategy a state choices, both strategies will require communicating these expectations to students and creating initiatives at every level to put students back on track should they get off.

In order for colleges and universities to have students who are prepared for college level work, they must communicate their expectations early to parents and children. The concept of strategic planning being a five year rolling plan takes on a different perspective when one considers that the quality of the 18 year old freshman is dependent on the care and nurture that the 3 year old
receives in day care. In the 21st century, colleges will be equally concerned with the sophomore and the second grader.

8. The process of developing and maintaining Quality in the instructional systems in higher education. The word quality has become the academically accepted way of saying effective. There will be much debate throughout the rest of this decade about effective education. Most states will commit to technological strategies long before the quality debates are over (if they will ever be over). This issue may indeed be the essence of the practice of education and therefore, only temporary contingencies may ever be developed.

Undergraduate education will continue to receive attention and criticism in the 21st century. Most curriculum reviews begun in the first half of this decade will probably not be totally implemented until the 21st century. Changing the curriculum and measuring the effect of the change in the undergraduate curriculum typically takes at minimum of six years. The debates in each state regarding core curriculums will probably not be over before the 21st century begins.

The evaluation of faculty will probably gain more attention in the 21st century. Even with technology, faculty will continue to be the dominant factor in the evaluation of the quality of any program. Efforts to
create diversity in the faculty of public colleges and universities will continue. However, even if efforts begun in the first half of this decade to recruit current college graduates into graduate programs are successful, it will be into the 21st century before those students complete doctoral programs.

With technological change and a continued emphasis on teaching and learning strategies, faculty development activities will receive significant attention in the 21st century. With limited funding for such activities, state supported institutions of higher education will probably find faculty development to be an area where there can be productive institutional cooperation. This will probably lead to the creation of numerous state and regional consortia with the primary purpose being faculty development.

Unfortunately, whether a state knows or does not know what quality is, education will have to continue and various criteria will have to be used to determine the effectiveness of education at each public college and university. Reputation, program reviews, and accreditation will continue to be factors in determining quality well into the 21st century.

9. The responsibility of higher education to contribute to the Quality of Life of the individual and the state and nation. The last half of this century will be a
time when institutions of higher education will have to spend more time and energy identifying how they contribute to the improvement of the quality of life of individuals and this society.

Those institutions that can demonstrate efficient and effective services that improve the quality of life of students will probably be successful in the 21st century. There will be an expectation on the part of parents and students for colleges and universities to take responsibility for informing them about the benefits of receiving an education at a specific institution.

The public and their representatives (legislators) will expect institutions of higher education to identify and demonstrate how the funding appropriated to each institution benefits society. Efforts to secure funding by complaining about what the colleges can not do will probably have little affect on legislators in the 21st century. State supported colleges and universities will need to publicize their strengths and how they benefit society. Furthermore, the role of continuing education in the life-long learning process will be even more important in the 21st century. Technology will make continuing education available in a variety of ways. Institutions of higher education will need to decide whether they will be participants in life-long learning of whether they will focus on the traditional college student and continue to
educate in the traditional classroom environment. Whichever way an institution goes, it will still need to be prepared to demonstrate the contribution it is making to the quality of the life of the student and to society.

General Conclusions

The following are the general conclusions derived from this study:

1. The issues facing higher education do not have permanent solutions, only temporary contingencies. The factors related to each issue may change but this nine major issues will never go away.

2. All states do not address all of the issues identified in this study. When the issues identified in the 14 state master plans from states with regulatory powers are compared with the predictions by various writers about the future of higher education, including Boyer, Callan, Geiger, Gilley, Kerr, and Lorenzo, it can be noted that not all states include all of the issues discussed by these writers. There are at least two possible explanations that can be theorized about the differences: (1) not all of the issues predicted in the literature will be experienced by all states or (2) the state planners have not considered all of the possibilities. It is not the problem of this study to resolve these differences.
3. Perhaps the most important issues are governance and institutional diversity. Until each state develops a clear public policy as to the role of the governors, legislators, state level coordinating boards, local board of regents, college administrators and faculty in the governance of higher education and the role of each institution in the educational process, the strategies to improve all other issues facing higher education may be tenuous.

4. Although the factors that are most often discussed in the literature and in the state master plans relate to the issues of access, economic development, funding, management, public schools, and quality, the word least used in the literature and in the state master plans is "management." State and campus leaders need to learn and understand the principles of management and to apply these principles to the management of higher education.

5. The feature of this taxonomy that ties this system together is the concept that higher education must play a direct, identifiable role in the improvement of the quality of life of the individual, the community, and the state. If higher education does not recognize and accept this responsibility, the missions of the institutions and the strategies of the campus administrators and faculty may very well be misconstrued and misguided.
6. Higher education exists in a political environment. If administrators and faculty have concerns related to these nine issues (or any other issues which may develop in the future), they must be willing to work to get those concerns included into the planning process if they want strategies to be developed and implemented related to these concerns.

Implications

This study proposed three ways that it could be significant to the field of higher education:

1. All state coordinating boards may learn from this study.
2. This study may be useful to all college administrators and to all faculty and students in the study of higher education.
3. The summary of major policy issues in higher education derived from this study can be used in the development of national goals and standards for higher education.

1. All state coordinating boards may learn from this study. State master plans can be a source of information when state coordinating boards are doing environmental scanning. This study focussed on the goals and strategies of 14 state level coordinating boards. State coordinating boards can compare the issues being addressed in their state with the taxonomy of issues presented in this study.
If they do this, they may realize that there is not a common language used to identify and discuss issues in higher education.

In 1948, the American Psychological Association met in Boston to begin a series of meetings in order to begin the process of classifying educational objectives and defining them in more precise behavioral terms (Alcorn, Kinder and Schunert, 1970, p. 118). This was necessary in order for examiners to conduct research and to communicate consistently with each other. It took eight years before a special committee was able to make its report. It took another eight years (1964) before the process was finally completed. This sixteen year process resulted in what has become known as Bloom’s Taxonomy of Educational Objectives. Perhaps state level coordinating boards (or the Carnegie Council or the Education Commission of the States or some other organization in higher education) needs to develop a common language to use to identify and discuss issues in higher education so that examiners in higher education can do research and communicate with each other. This need for standardized definitions and the use of standardized terminology could lead to a series of research questions for faculty and students of higher education.

An even more valuable activity for coordinating boards regarding other state master plans is reading the various scenarios developed in the master plans related to the
issues in each state and the goals and strategies developed to address those issues. Through the study of these scenarios, state coordinating boards could broaden their perspective of the issues facing higher education (or which may face higher education) in each state. Faculty and students of higher education could facilitate these comparisons by developing studies to compare and track the development, implementation, and evaluation of each issue and the various scenarios related to these issues.

There are various sources of data that state coordinating boards may use to compare higher education in their state with other states. If there were guidelines established as to the type of data to be included in state master plans, the master plans could become a common source of these data. This study was not concerned with either the process of developing state master plans or the form of the actual documents developed by each state. It is somewhat obvious that much research could be focused on the way states develop and use (or do not use) their master plan. There also needs to be research not only to collect data related to higher education (input and output information) but also models need to be developed to improve the reliability of these projections.

2. This study may be useful to all college administrators and to faculty and students in the study of higher education. Although it may be assumed that the
local college administrators and the faculty and students
in higher education programs in each state are familiar
with and utilize the state master plan for their state as
sources of information about higher education within their
state. Research regarding the use and usefulness of state
master plans in each state would probably produce some very
interesting findings. Comparing state goals and strategies
with local campus goals and strategies would probably
produce some interesting findings. These documents (i.e.,
campus master plans and state master plans) could provide
useful documents in analyzing the evolution of college and
state policy regarding issues and in comparing policy
between institutions and states.

The faculty and students of higher education need to
continue to expand their involvement in the development,
implementation, and evaluation of policies related to the
nine issues identified in this study facing higher
education. With over 80 programs of higher education which
include over 350 faculty and over 5,000 graduate students
(these numbers are based on unpublished research I did in
1990), there are tremendous resources available to both
local college administrators and state level coordinating
boards to produce research data and to provide analysis of
that data in order for policies in higher education to be
improved.
3. The summary of major policy issues in higher education derived from this study can be used in the development of national goals and standards for higher education. Although the oversight of education is constitutionally assigned to the states, it is not unreasonable to identify nationally recognized issues and nationally accepted standards and norms related to these issues. If an appropriate forum can be identified or created to continue the process of identifying factors related to the nine issues identified in this study and to discussing these issues, state and national resources may be directed to developing and implementing strategies to improve the status of these issues that face higher education in the 90s and into the 21st century.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATE</th>
<th>STATE MASTER PLAN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alaska</td>
<td>Alaska Commission on Postsecondary Education: A Report to the Governor and the Legislature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>Arizona Board of Regents’ Strategic Plan: Toward the Year 2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>A Master Plan for Higher Education: 1960 - 1975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Master Plan Renewed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Preparing for the Twenty-First Century: A Report on Higher Education in California</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>An Executive Summary of Colorado’s Statewide Master Plan for Postsecondary Education: 1987 - 1992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>The Master Plan for Florida Postsecondary Education: 1988 Update</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Challenges: The State Board of Community Colleges 1988 Master Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>The University System of Georgia’s Long Range Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaii</td>
<td>A Statewide System and Beyond: A Master Plan for the University of Hawaii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>Title</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>Strategic Plan for Higher Education in Kentucky: 1985</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strategic Plan for Higher Education in Kentucky: Biennial Status Report 1987/89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>Excellence in the 80’s: The Master Plan for Higher Education in Louisiana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>Report to the Governor and the 1991 Legislature.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montana</td>
<td>Montana Higher Education in the Nineties: Report of the Nineties and Beyond</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td>Nevada 2000: Future Directions for Nevada’s Colleges and Universities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>Planning for the Class of 2005: A Vision for the Future</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Regents Progress Report for the Regents Statewide Plan for the Development of Postsecondary Education in New York State (Volume I)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>Report Title</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>Toward the Year 2000 (Volume 1 - 2 - 3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>Charting the Course: The Future of Education in Oregon - Goals, Objectives, and Guidelines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>Master Plan for Higher Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhode Island</td>
<td>Master Planning Process for Rhode Island Public Higher Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td>Summary of the 1984 Review of the South Carolina Master Plan for Higher Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Higher Education in South Carolina: An Agenda for the Future Planning Prospectus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Higher Education Serving Tennessee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>Master Plan for Texas Higher Education - 1990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah</td>
<td>The Challenge of Change: Master Planning for Utah Higher Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vermont</td>
<td>Report of The Vermont Higher Education Study Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>The Virginia Plan for Higher Education - 1989</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Case for Change: Commonwealth of Virginia Commission on the University of the 21st Century</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Report Title</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Virginia</td>
<td>Agenda for Action 1985 - 1990: A Master Plan of Goals and Service for Public Higher Education in West Virginia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The University of Wisconsin System: Design for Diversity</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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