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The purpose of this study was to develop a standard instrument for determining the basic elements to be contained in a state of national long-range plan for higher education and to utilize that instrument in evaluating the current planning efforts in Nigeria. In order to fulfill the purpose of the study, answers were sought to seven research questions and procedures were worked out for ten experts in higher-education planning to validate criteria statements about the major elements of a model long-range plan for higher education in a political unit.

Chapter I includes a statement of the problem, purpose of the study, research questions, background, and significance of the study. Chapter II is a review of the related literature, and Chapter III presents information on the procedures followed in the collection and treatment of the data. The analysis and evaluation of the findings is presented in Chapter IV, and the conclusions and recommendations are presented in Chapter V.

Findings: The study revealed that the major elements of a long-range plan for higher education consist of
(1) the organizers of the planning effort, (2) the participants who supply the input, (3) the methods and procedures adopted in the formulation of the plan, (4) the content or issues addressed in the plan, and (5) the underlying planning premise. The degree of the presence of these elements and the manner in which each element is treated, determine the quality of the plan that is being evaluated.

An evaluation of the planning effort in Nigeria revealed certain strengths and weaknesses, where strengths are considered to be those elements clearly meeting the criteria stated in the model, and weaknesses are those elements not meeting the criteria. Some strengths of the Nigerian plan include (1) the presence of a permanent and well-organized planning unit that is not part of any of the Nigerian universities; (2) the planners have demonstrated a commitment to democracy by involving different groups of citizens in the planning exercise, and the broad range of topics considered in the plans show comprehensiveness; and (3) goals and objectives to be achieved are clearly stated in the planning documents, with definite programs to meet these goals, and specifically to meet the manpower needs of the nation. Weaknesses, on the other hand, include (1) lack of evidence of needs assessment prior to the planning exercise, (2) failure to adopt a definite step-by-step procedure to arrive at recommendations, (3) the exclusion of students in the planning exercise, (4) a lack of guidelines for
attracting, developing, and retaining teachers, (5) the roles of the different institutions are not described, (6) there is no definite time span covered by the planning exercise, and (7) the frequency of review is not stated.

Conclusions: The findings of this study appear to warrant the conclusions that (1) state or national plans for higher education contain similar major elements and have certain underlying assumptions, (2) long-range planning documents can be evaluated using established criteria, (3) Nigerian planning for higher education has been somewhat systematic but lacks thoroughness, and (4) Nigerian planning for higher education can be strengthened and improved if future planning activities more closely meet established criteria of the model used in this study. Recommendations are offered which could strengthen the existing plan and aid future planning exercises in Nigeria.
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

"Planning" has been defined as deciding in advance what to do, how to do it, and who is to do it (10, p. 31). Alternatively, it is the continuous process of establishing goals, gathering data, forming and assessing alternative means of goal achievement, and making decisions about these alternatives. Through planning, enterprises have been able to bridge the gap between where they are now and where they want to be. Basically, the planning process involves selecting organizational objectives, setting departmental or subunit goals, consciously determining programs and courses of action to attain them, and basing the chosen course of action on purposes, facts, and considered estimates. Educational planning, in its broadest generic sense, is the application of rational systematic analysis to the process of educational development, with the aim of making education more effective and efficient in response to the needs and goals of its students and society (4, p. 14).

Planning was first stressed in the military where the importance of carefully conceived long- and short-range plans was recognized. The logistics of moving men and supplies demanded careful attention to skillful and sagacious
planning. Later, in business and industry, production managers found that lack of planning could cause production lines to come to a halt through the lack of a needed component, company checks could bounce due to inadequate finances, or other embarrassing situations could occur that astute planning would have prevented. In the last twenty years the interest in planning has spread beyond the military and industry to include governments and educational institutions. Koontz and O'Donnel report that "a strong aspect of the managerial revolution of the last two decades has been a tremendous interest in planning by all forms of enterprise—business, governments, education, and others" (15, p. 31).

The trend is even stronger in the field of higher education where there has been increasing concern with, and attraction toward, centralized planning and coordination at state and regional levels (1, p. 5). Several states, including Louisiana, Georgia, Virginia, and Connecticut, have instituted comprehensive master plans to project and give guidance to their states' development of higher education. France, the United Kingdom, and other industrialized European countries have tackled educational planning in various ways that befit their traditions and preferences (2, p. 20).

Emerging nations, each faced with the problem of developing primary, secondary, and higher educational programs that are compatible with the goals and philosophy of the
individual nation, are also resorting to centralized planning. Whatever compelled the industrialized nations to seek and adopt new approaches to educational planning, applies with even greater force to the developing nations (the manpower shortages, the explosive increases in student numbers provoked by the current desire to democratize educational opportunity, the rising costs, and many other factors). It is clear to all, including the most ardent believers in laissez-faire, that some degree of centralized and coordinated planning is necessary if emerging nations are to make the best use of the acutely scarce resources. Alternatively, they will find themselves reacting in a uncoordinated manner with short-run measures to each of the pressures and problems. Education is too important to society and individuals to be left to chance. In many such nations, educational plans are a part of an elaborate five-year economic development plan.

Nigeria's planning experience dates back to 1946, when the government accepted systematic economic planning as an instrument for an effective management of the national economy (5, p. 33). However, the first comprehensive six-year national economic development program was started in 1962 and extended to 1968. The next plan covered 1970 to 1975, and the latest plan, the Third National Development Plan, covers 1975-1980 (6). In each of the plans, education has generally enjoyed a proportionately high priority
of the financial resource allocation; up to this point, nothing has been done about the evaluation of the plan for effectiveness, for quality, or for content.

Any educational plan, if it is to be worthy of the designation, must meet certain acceptable standards. It must address itself to certain key topics which are generally considered integral to a comprehensive planning effort in higher education. It is the unique combination of these multiple elements, each functionally distinct yet mutually supporting, that distinguishes a plan from a survey or special study (9, p. 21).

Fincher (7), Brumbaugh (2), Candoli (3), and Parekh (12) all agree that planning is not a one-time activity and that constant evaluation and appraisal of educational plans are necessary. The conditions affecting higher education in Nigeria are not static, and predicting any environmental changes is difficult, if not impossible. Therefore, the constant evaluation and updating of the plans for higher education in Nigeria is necessary because "all plans die of obsolescence unless evaluation continually revives them" (12, p. 71).

The duplication of programs, constant campus unrest, complaints about lack of funds, shortage of staff, and many other problems that have afflicted Nigerian higher education, suggests the need for an immediate assessment of the long-range plans for the educational future of the country.
Statement of the Problem

The problem of this study concerns the establishment of a model for developing long-range planning for higher education in Nigeria.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study is to develop a set of criteria to be used in establishing a model plan for higher education in Nigeria. This study is intended to accomplish several objectives, among which are

1. To develop a standard instrument for determining the basic elements to be contained in a state or national plan for higher education to ensure quality;
2. To use this instrument as a criteria for establishing a model planning document for higher education in Nigeria;
3. To determine what deletions, additions, or modifications are necessary to bring the existing plans in line with a model master plan;
4. To draw conclusions and make recommendations to the Federal Ministry of Education in Nigeria.

Research Questions

To accomplish the above objectives, answers will be sought to the following questions:
1. What major elements should a model plan for higher education contain?

2. What are the generally-accepted premises or guiding principles that serve as a basis for establishing higher-educational objectives?

3. Who should be directly responsible for developing a long-range planning document for higher education in Nigeria?

4. Who should be involved in the planning process, and how should the input and data be obtained?

5. (a) How does the Nigerian planning document or set of documents compare with standard criteria? (b) How was it developed? (c) How often is it reviewed?

6. What additions, deletions, or modifications are needed to bring the National Plan in line with a model master plan for higher education?

7. What specific suggestions and/or recommendations could be made to the Federal Ministry of Education that would result in increased educational opportunity for all Nigerians and more efficient use of national resources in the area of higher education?

Background and Significance of the Study

A common trend today is for individuals, business enterprises, governments, and educational institutions to
utilize the planning process as a first step in the orderly development of long-range guidelines for the attainment of desired objectives. The time is long past when educational institutions and school systems could afford to survive without plans or could afford to plan their activities against a time perspective extending for only a few months or several years. Many state legislatures are directing boards of regents and coordinating boards to develop master plans and similar comprehensive documents to aid in the efficient use of available state resources to meet the requirements of post-secondary education. This is a clear example of the application of a basic business procedure to the administration of the educational enterprise. The importance and relevancy of planning cannot be overemphasized. Goetz states:

Plans alone cannot make an enterprise successful. Action is required; the enterprise must operate. Plans can, however, focus action on purposes. They can forecast which actions will tend toward the ultimate objective . . . which tend away, which will likely offset one another, and which are merely irrelevant. . . . Without plans, action must become merely random activity, producing nothing but chaos (8, p. 63).

Planning also helps the enterprise to offset future uncertainty and change (10, p. 92). Well-considered overall plans, besides focusing attention on objectives, also unify the activities of the subunits. Planning minimizes cost and increases efficiency; above all, planning facilitates control.
The adequacy and effectiveness of planning and coordination of higher education in Nigeria are of consequence to millions of students, teachers, citizens, and the government of Nigeria. Some educators believe that the tendency of some Nigerian colleges and universities to assume competitive roles is not in the best interests of the country and that the needless duplication of programs is a waste of resources. The resulting over-staffing and financial problems are said to be retarding progress. These and many other problems would be minimized by adequate and effective planning at the state and institutional levels.

There is an assumption that a relationship exists between planning and change. This assumption is underscored by Morphet's statement:

Change can occur without planning, and planning can be accomplished and have no tangible results. But as educational leaders attempt to develop more effective plans that are designed to bring about needed changes in educational environment, they will need, to a greater degree than ever before, to understand the intimate and interdependent relationships that exist between planning and change, and to find ways of capitalizing upon the inherent strengths of these relationships (11, p. 91).

Nigeria, like most other developing nations, is attempting to change at a speed greatly exceeding that attained by most developed nations. While political, economic, social, and technological changes took place gradually (and sometimes by chance) in the older nations, the emerging nations are resorting more to systematic planning
to effect these changes; they are placing enormous demands on the educational system to produce the manpower needed for their national development.

This is not to say that the most astute planning will solve all our educational problems; it is to say that lack of planning or ineffective planning would be a waste of resources. Nor must we assume that education alone will bring about needed progress and development. However, it is an indisputable fact that education improves the quality of life, and therefore the developing nations can no longer afford to leave the education of their youth to chance.

To underscore Nigeria's reliance on education as an instrument of change, the Federal Commissioner for Education, Col. A. A. Ali, at the inaugural ceremony of the Implementation Committee on National Policy on Education in Lagos, declared that

The new national policy on education was aimed at making education an instrument of socio-political as well as economic change, with far-reaching consequences for individuals and the society. . . . The essential character of education should be seen in its capacity to meet declared national objectives, including the inculcation of national consciousness, unity and the right values and attitudes (13, p. 2181).

Recent events concerning Nigerian higher education make an evaluation of the plans worthwhile. Most institutions of higher learning are experiencing financial problems. An example is the experience of Benin University. The West Africa magazine reports that a thirty-million-dollar
contract for facility enlargement was slashed to fifteen million because of a shortage of funds (13, p. 2181). Admission crises have hit many Nigerian states as evidenced by a report that in 1976 some states could place only twenty-five to thirty per cent of the students seeking admission (14, p. 1467). The exodus of students to overseas universities, with its resultant outflow of funds, suggests the need for an evaluation of the nation's plan for higher education for effectiveness and adequacy.

Despite the consensus of opinion that all plans should be constantly re-assessed to ensure direction and accomplishments, it appears that such an exercise has not yet been carried out with regard to Nigeria's national plans for higher education. The results of this study, therefore, will be beneficial for and significant to students of administration in higher education. The findings and recommendations will also aid the Nigerian planning staff.

Curle (5), Anderson (1), and Coombs (4) agree that although knowledge about educational planning has been growing rapidly in recent years, there has been no development of "a theory of planning," and even less is there "a theory of educational planning." Coombs suggests that a sound and relevant theory will only emerge and be molded "by hands soiled by contact with the untidy realities of actual situations" (4, p. 57). Thus, the unique opportunity is present for this study to add to knowledge in this field.
Summary

Chapter I has defined educational planning as the application of rational systematic analysis to the process of educational development with the aim of making it more effective and efficient in responding to the needs of students and society. This idea is currently in vogue, and it has captured the interest of political leaders and legislators, administrators, teachers, students, and citizens the world over. Many states and nations are developing master plans to provide the necessary guidance and coordination in public institutions of higher learning. The rapid expansion and many problems of higher education in Nigeria suggest the need for such a comprehensive plan and a federal agency to coordinate and, to some extent, control the Nigerian institutions of higher education.

The problem of this study therefore concerns the establishment of a model long-range plan for higher education in Nigeria. The study is intended to accomplish at least four different objectives. To accomplish these objectives, answers will be sought to at least seven different research questions. Several reasons have been offered to substantiate the need for this study.

Chapter II presents a review of related literature; Chapter III presents the procedures used for the collection and treatment of data; Chapter IV is the presentation,
analysis, and evaluation of the findings; Chapter V is a summary of the findings, the conclusions, implications, and recommendations.
CHAPTER BIBLIOGRAPHY


CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

In reviewing the literature related to educational planning, it was discovered that prior to 1950 the term "educational planning" was seldom used, but that in the last twenty-five years the use of that term has soared. People who are concerned with the future of education all over the world are showing such renewed interest in the orderly development of educational systems that a large body of scholarly literature has developed and the amount is almost doubling each year. The concept of educational planning, as it is known today, is growing rapidly, and the literature is covering such topics as economic development, manpower, curriculum, teaching techniques, finance, and fiscal policy.

Each of these areas is being researched and reported on by social scientists, who have such different approaches, interests, and backgrounds that a reviewer of this literature needs, as it were, a motion picture rather than a snapshot to view the available materials in this field. For this study, the review of the literature related to educational planning will be grouped under the following headings: (1) the purpose and value of educational
planning, (2) comparative planning systems, (3) campus and building planning, (4) issues and theoretical considerations in educational planning, (5) planning methods, statistics and analysis, (6) mater plans, (7) admissions, (8) role and missions of institutions, (9) finance, (1) governance and coordination, and (11) summary.

Purpose and Value of Educational Planning

The field of educational planning is so new that no generally-accepted definition, much less an acceptable theory, exists. For our purposes, the field of educational planning is defined as a process of study and foresight which generates action to achieve the desired educational goals.

Coombs warns that whatever educational planning is, it is certainly not a miracle drug for aiding educational systems, nor, conversely, is it a devil's potion that breeds only evil (21, p. 14). The common recognition of educational planning as a key tool of economic and social development seems to account for its popularity among political leaders, legislators, administrators, teachers, and students.

Poignant (64) argues that education should have a privileged position in the national plan because it trains future workers with the aim of raising production and the standard of living, thereby improving every aspect of human
society. He also states that education is a long-term national investment and that the future active population of a country will benefit from the expanding flow of better-educated and trained young people. This, he says, will gradually transform the intellectual and vocational structure of the population (64, p. 47).

The higher skills of the active population will allow for continuing improvement of production techniques with the resulting steady progress of economic expansion. Poignant concludes that "the advantages of this type of investment are not restricted to the sort economists try to calculate but are felt in all spheres, whether social, domestic, cultural or democratic" (64, p. 48).

Several other authors argue in the same vein, and trace the relationship of education and educational planning to economic development. Fernandez (31) says that educational planning has a special place in national development. After reviewing the planning activities in Latin America and elsewhere, he makes a rather strong ideological justification of educational planning as a tool of development.

McCusken and Robinson (54) made a study in 1962 of the educational system of the Republic of China and found that it played a significant role in the economic development of the Republic. Rodriguez-Pacheo (67) studied the long-term needs for economic development of Puerto Rico and concluded
that the educational system must be expanded to meet the Commonwealth's trained manpower requirements; he recommended the establishment of an educational planning body. Vaizey (76), considering education as an economic phenomenon, supports the manpower approach to educational planning since he sees a direct relationship between education and economic development. Dennison (27) attempted to measure education's contribution to economic growth, particularly in the United States. The Japanese Ministry of Education (56) acknowledges the "quantitative and qualitative contributions of education to the economic growth of Japan, relating this contribution to the increase in public expenditure in education."

Most authors seem to agree that nations should increase the proportion of their revenue that is allocated to education because of the impact of education on national development and economic growth. Educational systems world-wide seem to be in the "man-power business" because they are called upon to meet the ever-expanding and increasingly-sophisticated requirements of national economies. The consensus of studies reported in the literature is that training plans for skilled and highly-skilled personnel should, in principle, be kept intact since they are an actual condition of economic growth. It should, however, be pointed out that no studies have yet revealed a clear-cut causal relationship between the financial investment in
education and successful national development. As Harbison points out, education of the wrong kind may even impede growth (42, p. 33). Thus, as suggested in the literature, the single most important reason for educational planning for both industrialized and underdeveloped nations is for efficient allocation of resource revenue that will produce the manpower to keep the economy going.

No longer is education viewed as a non-productive sector of the economy which absorbs "consumption expenditure"; it is now viewed as an essential "investment expenditure" for economic growth. Coombs observes,

Wearing this impressive new investment label, education is able to make a more effective claim on national budgets. But to justify the claim, educators themselves would have to become more manpower-minded. They would have to plan and try to govern their student intakes and outputs to fit the pattern of manpower requirements certified by the economists to be necessary for the economy's good health (21, p. 22).

The literature, although thin on the relationship of education and educational planning to social development as distinct from economic development, does contain some arguments in favor of educational planning for non-economic reasons. The old saying is that "man is a social animal" (although more and more he is tending to be an economic robot); therefore, for the sake of the individual, education unquestionably must contribute to the vital non-economic dimensions and forces of national development.
Authors who have backgrounds in education and sociology and who were nurtured on the liberal, humanistic tradition, argue that through a lack of planning the educational systems continue to leave large underdeveloped reserves of the populations' abilities. The systems prefer to fight for bigger budgets and higher investments in education, arguing that education is the right of every person who can benefit from it. In other words, the moral conception of education in the twentieth century is the principle of formal equality of educational opportunity.

The Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) has sponsored several studies on the social objectives in educational planning (59, 60). Anderson (1, p. 31), Vaizey (76), and Weinberg (78) deal with the concept of education as a tool of social development; several studies have been made to support equal educational privilege and opportunity. They see a need for further expansion of educational opportunity, observing that "educational expansion has not led automatically to more equal participation as between the social strata" (59, p. 26).

The consensus is that the nature of a modern industrial society requires that citizens undergo an education which is essentially intellectual in content in order for them to become useful citizens. Thompson and Fogel (74, p. 16) state that universities cannot determine social
mobility as such but they can contribute to it; in dealing with education we are dealing with "values."

Curle (24) and Bernier and Williams (8) make the same non-material argument for educational planning. Bernier states,

"Education, then, beyond all other devices of human origin, is the great equalizer of the conditions of men—the balance-wheel of the social machinery. . . . it gives each man the independence and the means by which he can resist the selfishness of other men. It does better than to disarm the poor of their hostility towards the rich: it prevents being poor. . . . Moral education is a primal necessity of social existence" (8, p. 274).

Supporters of the social objectives of education believe that if education helps the economy, so much the better, but that education should not be economy's slave. Educational planning should aim at developing the recipients as individuals first and foremost and not just as manpower statistics.

Proponents of both economic development and social development agree on a "planful" approach in coping with the enormous concrete tasks that face educational systems all over the world. Sociologists and others who are concerned with social development have some very convincing arguments; there remains, however, some distance to cover in translating social and human development objectives into sufficiently-specific terms so that they will be operationally useful for educational planning and programming.
The consensus is that systematic, educational planning is necessary for the following reasons:

1. To cope with the increase in student numbers provoked by demographic expansions;

2. To enhance the almost universal acceptance of the principle of equality of educational opportunity for all;

3. To enhance the need for skilled manpower for economic growth;

4. To minimize wasteful imbalance within the educational systems, and to allocate and utilize available resources efficiently and effectively;

5. To alleviate many non-financial bottlenecks (shortage of staff, faculty, and physical facilities);

6. To provide a commonality of understanding about the mission and goals of the system (and institutions) along with the strengths to implement them;

7. To help direct energies away from the non-essential to the essential activities;

8. To make objective evaluations simultaneously with implementation;

9. To assist in generating funds by strengthening the institutional and system-wide case with governmental and private granting agencies;
10. To help ensure the survival and growth of the system and its component institutions through the meeting of individual and common needs.

Comparative Planning Systems

The degree and effectiveness of educational planning depends on the educational and governmental structure. Each country's system of government and system of education is different. In some countries there is one nationalized system and one sector; in others, there is one system and multiple sectors; in still others, educational authority is divided between the local, state, and federal government. According to Clark (19, p. 29), a broad understanding of other structures can give a fresh perspective on our own planning problems, capabilities and limitations.

In their study, Kerr, Millet, Clark, MacArthur, and Bowen (49) compare the national systems of higher education of twelve countries. Using the basic characteristics of goals, planning and management, coordination, flexibility, and innovation measurements of efficiency and comparative effectiveness, they conclude that, in all systems, coordination is affected by "market interaction" as well as state authority, and by senior professors as well as state officials. They also conclude that the task of planning is to understand the contributions of each of the major forms of coordination and to encourage a fruitful balance among them.
This is of basic importance because a planning program will succeed only if the plans and the process of planning have the same meaning for legislators as for university chancellors, for the president's office and academic departments as for the Ministry of Education.

A research group at Yale (77) analyzed how power is distributed within the national systems of higher education of West Germany, Italy, France, Sweden, England, the United States, and Japan; they found that, historically, educational planning has been weak in all of these seven national systems. Planning has emerged as a strong force in Sweden, however, because of the size of the country, the cultural homogeneity, and the planning capability that has evolved over the years in other governmental areas.

Alain Bienayme (9), in his study of the French experience in planning, found that France has been trying to organize higher education into a national system for a century and a half—since the days of Napoleon—but that the various grandes écoles (an elitist group) disperse control and make overall coordination extremely difficult. Planning in France is also bogged down in a struggle for power among government officials, university personnel, and students, with the result that the plans of the central staff are automatically resisted, compromised, and severely attenuated. In France, the politics of university-state relations determines basically what is done; currently,
public and political respect for universities is diminished and the universities are "pervaded by a feeling of gloom."

Sheffield, Campbell, Holmes, Kymlicka, and Whitelord (70) studied and reported on the Canadian system, while Premfors and Ostergen (65) reported on the Swedish system. In Sheffield's opinion, Canadian planning for higher education is inadequate. He concludes, however, that decentralization has enabled Canadian higher education to be responsive to regional needs. The other studies found that, of all the systems in Western Europe, Sweden's has undergone the greatest amount of change since 1960—especially planned change. The authors point out that Sweden has been oriented toward democratic nature of planning and that the term planning has positive correlations.

Williams (80) reviewed the growth of system planning in Australia and noted the abundant use of commissions. In a similar report on Japan, Marita (57) describes the many difficulties of planning in the Japanese system because it is large, diverse, and complicated. Whereas the United States moved into mass higher education by expanding the public sector, Japan did so by expanding the private sector: 75 per cent of the institutions are private and they enroll about 77 per cent of the students.

Of the problems confronting an educational planner in the context of national planning in a developing society, two classic examples are presented by Curle (24) on
Pakistan, and Levy (52) and Benveniste (7) on Mexico. Curle emphasizes the crucial role of expatriate advisers in Pakistan's planning exercise; he notes that in Pakistan planning is easier than implementation. Benveniste concludes that in Mexico there is a wide discrepancy between the prevailing theoretical concepts of planning and the processes which actually take place. The process, he says, is inherently political, involving the accumulation and use of power.

Campus and Building Planning

Green (39, p. 11) says that a college or university campus is more than the sum of its buildings. The physical plant is a physical expression and impression of the institution, its activities, and purpose.

Literature on campus and building planning is somewhat limited. Green, on this subject, divides the works into three sections: (1) planning issues and resource allocation, (2) environmental issues, and (3) facility types (39, p. 11).

In The Graying of the Campus (79), Weinstock reviews the characteristics of the older students—those over fifty-five—and provides guidance on physical barriers, transportation, information systems, lighting, acoustics, thermal comfort, special seating facilities, out-reach sites, and other environmental management services to fit the needs of the older students.
In *Architecture and Energy* (72), Stein analyzes how and why our campus facilities are expensive to heat, light, maintain, and operate. He, however, offers no ideas or tips on energy conservation. This gap is filled by *Energy Management* (29), one of the most comprehensive works in the field of energy conservation. This manual, which was developed for energy-management workshops, is specifically written for higher education, for physical-plant directors, and the chief business officers of college and universities.

The United Nations Educational Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) has developed a "Planning Guide" (75) for developing countries that are planning higher education institutions. It is intended for the use of administrators, architects, and project managers, and it breaks the whole planning and construction of facilities into sixty-three procedures.

Banghart and Trull (5) attempt to provide a framework by which educational planners may use new tools or develop new approaches for solving the physical planning problems for an educational environment. Lerup, Cronrath, and Liu (51) present a framework for the integration of five safety and related issues into the larger context of the architectural design process.

De Chiara and Callender (26) provide a professional guide for the design of gymnasiums, physical education and sports facilities, field houses, dormitories, libraries,
student unions, computer centers, communication centers, regional education centers, and large group facilities. Metcalf (55) deals with the planning of academic- and research-library buildings, while Lewis (53) provides a classic reference book for designing laboratories for collegiate teaching and research, moving from general considerations to such specifics as plumbing, ventilation, and the electrical wiring of chemistry laboratories, and other specialized types of campus facilities.

The Theoretical Considerations of Educational Planning

According to Anderson and Bowman (1, p. 11), at the present there is nothing like a theory of planning and even less is there a theory of educational planning. There are, however, theoretical or analytical correlates—systematized analytic propositions of one approach versus another to economic and educational planning. The three leading approaches to education planning are (1) the manpower-requirements approach, (2) the social-demand approach, and (3) the cost-benefit approach.

From the mid-1950s to the early 1960s there was an increasing demand in the United States for secondary and higher education that persistently outpaced the educational systems' capacity to satisfy. Educational leaders, economists, and political leaders felt that some innovative approaches were needed to meet these demands. Many meetings,
discussions, and seminars were conducted at all levels—out of which came some general propositions that were endorsed, in principle, by most educators and economists.

Propositions calling for educational planning to take a longer-range view, and integration with broader economic and social developments for effective contribution to individual and national development, won the universal endorsement of all groups. In principle, it was also agreed that educational planning should be comprehensive, closely tied to the processes of decision-making and operations; it should become an integral part of educational management. Furthermore, it was agreed that educational planning should not be concerned only with quantitative expansion, but it must also deal with the qualitative aspects of educational development.

Such general propositions did not cause any serious disagreements; they served as spring-boards for further explorations, discussions, and research. As the research and explorations continued, and educators and economists sought ways of implementing these propositions, certain questions had to be answered—questions which every nation faces and which often get answered more by default than by design. As in all instances of theory development, in an attempt to answer key questions, different people are forced to speculate, hypothesize, and analyze the facts that could lead to the answer or truth.
For example, when educators passed the exploratory stage and actually put pen to paper, they had to answer such questions (13) as, "What should be the primary objectives and functions of the educational system and of each of its subsystems?" "What are the best of the alternative ways of pursuing these various objectives and functions?" "How much of the nation's (or community's) financial and real resources should be devoted to education as opposed to other things?" "Who should pay for education, or how should educational costs and sacrifices be distributed between students, parents, and society at large?" "How should the total resources available to education be allocated among the different levels (primary, secondary, and higher) and types (technical, vocational, and general)?" These are the key planning questions that face modern-day educational planners; they have provoked much thought and debate among educators and economists.

In the literature, there is no agreement on the answers to these questions, and to that extent there is no theory of educational planning. Nevertheless, the literature confirms three distinct approaches that economists and administrators have adopted in an attempt to answer some of the key planning questions. Following is a description of each of these approaches to educational planning.
The Manpower Requirements Approach to Education Planning

The question of economic development and economic growth is one that faces all the nations. Some economists argue that the production of skilled manpower which the economy requires should preoccupy the educational systems. Coombs (21) says that "the development of human resources through the educational planning system is an important prerequisite for economic growth and a good investment of scarce resources, provided the pattern and quality of educational output is geared to the economy's manpower need" (21, p. 40). Halstead (49) says that although a free society does not countenance programming students into specific occupations, yet when certain manpower shortages occur, the educational system and its institutions are obligated to review their policies and capacities and to encourage students to enter those occupations in which shortages exist (38, p. 367).

The manpower-requirements approach consists of picking a target figure for the Gross Domestic Product of the nation for ten to fifteen years, and planning for the education system to produce the manpower that will be needed to meet that GDP (GDP = the total economic output of a nation). The basic question is, "How many educated individuals of different levels and types will be needed to meet the GDP target?" The following steps may be taken to arrive at an
answer. (1) the GDP target is broken-down into economic sectors (manufacturing, transportation, agriculture, services, etc.); (2) An estimate of the number of workers required to produce one unit of output is made for each sector. (This estimate is called the labor-output coefficient. The coefficient, multiplied by the output targets in (1), gives the number of workers required to produce the target figure for each sector); (3) A classification of occupations in the labor force is drawn up. (Clerks, mechanics, doctors, teachers, and the total number of workers obtained by step (2) are distributed among the number of occupations); (4) An estimate is made of the minimum level of formal education that is required to carry out an occupational task. These steps produce a list of the number of people, specified by educational attainment, who will be necessary to produce the GDP figures in the target year.

Critics claim that this approach has too many flaws. Every step of the exercise is subject to the problem of accurately predicting the future from the past performances and present tendencies. The practical application is difficult. Concerning this approach, Coombs (21) observes that the employment classifications, the ratios, and the qualifications required for each category of job, that were used in studies by most developing countries, were borrowed from industrialized economies and so did not fit the realities of the underdeveloped economies.
In spite of these flaws, the manpower approach has been widely used. Parnes (62, p. 149) and Hollister (45, p. 50) argue that it would be wrong to conclude that this approach is so inaccurate and subject to such uncertainty that the entire approach should be rejected. Several reports and studies by UNESCO indicate that the organization used the manpower approach extensively in its work in Africa, Asia, and Latin America (41, p. 382). The OECD also used the manpower approach extensively in most of its studies in European countries.

The Social-Demand Approach

This approach, otherwise called the social-need theory, is based on a moral (or "value") principle. It proposes that a "shortage" exists in any occupation whenever fewer persons than "ought" to be are employed in the occupation (41, p. 386). This approach stems from the premise that certain enterprises require a certain number of employees if they are to operate effectively and in the best interest of the public and the economy. Thus, by this concept, a teacher shortage occurs if too few qualified teachers are teaching too many students, or if government, business, and industry have more openings for qualified accountants than there are accountants.

The social-demand concept of shortage must be carefully distinguished from the economists' concept of shortage which
means unfilled positions at current salaries. Defined in the social-demand concept, a shortage will not disappear by normal market action because it is not based on employer or consumer demand. It is based on value judgment and will disappear if society places more value on that occupation and devotes more resources to it.

The now classic example of the social-demand approach to educational planning is the Robins Report on Higher Education in Great Britain (32, p. 87) with its axiom that courses in higher education should be available for all those who are qualified by ability and attainment to pursue them and who wish to do so. Like all other approaches, this concept has some flaws. How can social demand be measured or how can shortages be determined, especially in developing nations where demographic data are not readily available? Furthermore, this approach ignores the larger national problem of resource allocation, assuming that whatever volume of resources goes to education is "resources-best-used." It ignores the patterns of the manpower needs of the economy with the result that some areas could be overcrowded while some are deficient. In situations where this approach has been applied to education, there has been a tendency to stretch resources too thinly over too many students, thereby reducing the quality of education. Educators, however, tend to favor this approach because it is
liberal; if the resources are available, it presents fewer or lesser planning headaches.

### The Cost-Benefit or Rate-of-Return Approach

This approach is principally an allocation approach. A group of economists who take issue with manpower advocates argue that a rational individual, having money to spend, will examine the alternatives, weigh the costs and benefits of each approach and the corresponding satisfaction or utility of the purchase. He will then choose the particular option within his means that provides the highest ratio of benefits to cost. The economists argue that educational planners should use the same logic when allocating educational systems' total resources among the various units or subsectors.

Although the logic of this approach is undisputable, other economists point out the difficulty of actually measuring the costs and the benefits in a largely subjective area like education. Educators tend to stay away from this controversy, thus making it an inter-professional battle among economists only. Yet, Smyth (71, p. 299) shows that a rate-of-return calculation can throw some light on the decisions that an educational planner has to make. Others, like Hunter (46, p. 242) and Callaway (12, p. 257), place less emphasis on quantitative types of cost-benefit analysis for educational investment decisions.
It is generally agreed that the rate-of-return approach, like the manpower and social-demand approaches, has a relevance and utility for educational planning. The need to examine alternatives is emphasized, even while quantity is also emphasized; much serious consideration must also be given to relevance and quality. A synthesis is needed of the existing approaches plus any new ones that would emphasize change, not just for change's sake, but to make education more relevant, more efficient, and more productive.

Some Examples of Educational Planning

Many developing countries including Nigeria (30), Central America, Panama, and Mexico (28), Australia (47), Tanzania, Uganda, and Kenya (35, p. 139) have used the manpower and human-resources approach to educational planning. In the 1960s Harbinson and Myers (43) made a global analysis of human-resource development in qualitative terms using four groups of countries that were at different levels of development. They found a direct relationship between human-resource development and economic growth; thus, they advocated an integration of manpower planning into general development planning. Two international organizations, UNESCO and OECD, have been foremost in stimulating an interest in educational planning. UNESCO has been chiefly concerned with underdeveloped countries, and OECD has confined its studies to Europe and North America. Both organizations
have, in the past, relied exclusively on the manpower approach, but they are now beginning to be interested in the use of other approaches.

In describing the studies, Philips (163) reports that "UNESCO has sent seventy-nine short-term missions since 1960 to advise on the administrative requirements for educational development (including the establishment of planning units within the ministries of education) and to assist in the selection of priority areas in the plan" (63, p. 386). Parnes (62, p. 149), Gass (35, p. 139), and Hollister (45, p. 161) indicate that OECD has been preoccupied with the manpower approach in its work in the Mediterranean Regional Projects. Parnes says, "It is true that most of the MRP (Mediterranean Regional Projects) national reports appear to give major emphasis to manpower considerations in developing their policy recommendations with respect to education" (62, p. 155).

Planning Methods and Statistical Needs

In modern educational planning, the "number work" is as essential as the topics or elements covered. As Chesswas (18) puts it, "Anyone who sets out to diagnose the present condition of an educational system in order to plan its future development in a rational manner had better know his 'sums,' and how to apply the right calculations to the system's dynamic quantitative dimensions" (18, p. 5).
Nevertheless, there are not too many "how to" books regarding the data collection and methodologies of analyzing statistical data in planning. Chesswas presents an intricate and complex pattern of paths to follow that consists of six stages and the information needed for each stage. He feels that mechanized processing of data is essential to quick, efficient, and accurate analysis and reporting.

The OECD has also compiled a useful handbook (59) that enumerates recent methodological approaches to long-term planning. The statistics discussed are those required to project, in the medium- and long-term, the magnitudes in the educational system; included are statistics on students, teachers, building and equipment costs, and expenditures. The author also discusses the collecting and processing of pertinent data. Many other authors present mathematical models that simulate changes in the system; they also illustrate how to deal with those changes if and when they occur.

Salmon (68) presents the Higher Education Long-Range Planning (HELP) program which involves (1) the philosophy objectives (the "why" questions associated with the institutions), (2) the "what" questions, dealing with goals, (3) the "how" questions, dealing with the programs, and (4) the resources (the allocation of personnel, facilities, time, and funds). Savard's Model (69) lists steps which include evaluating resources, matching resources with aims,
and formulating plans. A vital part of the model is a comprehensive information system composed of six major subsystems—students, personnel, staff personnel, physical facilities, material instructional programs, and budget and finance.

Brieve, Johnson, and Young (10) feel that the day of unplanned educational systems is gone because (a) the systems are becoming larger and more complex, (b) federal and state governments insist on plans as a basis for giving support, and (c) the growing public concern for accountability. They present a ten-step process that consists of: (1) establishing goals, (2) assessing needs, (3) identifying resources and restraints, (4) formulating objectives and priorities, (5) generating alternatives, (6) analyzing alternatives, (7) selecting alternatives, (8) developing and implementing objectives, (9) evaluating and process and performance, and (1) modifying the system.

Several authors present projection techniques to use in the development of enrollment data. One of these techniques is the time-series analysis that graphically depicts the movement of data across time. The correlation technique is considered to be more accurate; it employs multiple correlations and regression analysis to measure the effect of each factor on enrollment. The "cohort-survival" method forecasts enrollment on the basis of the survival of students from one grade-level to the next; in this method, "mortality"
is defined as those students who drop out for whatever reason, and "survival" means those who pass to the next grade or level.

In each of these techniques, the basic assumption is that the enrollment will be a proportion of some other quantity, and that each projection will be modified by social, economic, and political factors that affect education. The literature emphasizes the need for all forecasts to be based on reliable, comparable, and comprehensive data, because, "enrollment forecasts can never be any more reliable than the data on which they are based" (41, p. 720). This points up the need, especially for developing countries, to develop and build an information base that will aid educational planners in projecting future enrollment needs.

In Nigeria, Harbison was severely hampered by this lack of statistical information (42); he had to rely on estimates to analyze the needs of the 70s. His targets are considered "realistic," but it is evident that except for the post-war economy (which was not considered in the study), his targets would have been too high. Glenny, Berdahl, Palola, and Paltridge (38, p. 76) state that "data about all major aspects of the state's institutions, when thoroughly and appropriately analyzed, help implement every objective of the board." The authors observe that, to date, no state has developed a system that is comprehensive (or mutually supportive) and compatible within all information subsystems.
The development of such systems and the documentation of the process will be of much value to practicing educational planners.

Lawrence and Service (50) attempt to assess and describe the current status of the complex approaches and techniques that fall under the heading of "quantitative" approaches to higher-education management. They provide a brief history of the origins of quantitative approaches, the assistance that quantitative approaches can provide, and the limitations and complexities.

Quantitative approaches to planning and management are relatively new, even more so to higher-education planning. There is still considerable opposition to and reservation about their use in a field where most of the variables are qualitative. The higher-education planner who seeks to apply quantitative approaches must first determine if quantitative approaches will help in making any particular planning decision, if the necessary information is available, and if there is an acceptable technique that will analyze the available information so that it will illustrate the particular decision-making issue.

Master Plans

Continued concern with the growth, development, coordination, and control of higher education has led to the development of a body of literature that provides a
state-of-the-art discussion on statewide planning and coordination of higher education. Never before has the support for statewide coordination of education been so widespread.

Currently, statewide planning is being regarded by many as the vehicle that can effect better institutional management and enhance public opinion of higher education (36, p. vi). During the last ten to fifteen years, much emphasis has been placed on master development plans for statewide expansion of higher education, and state after state has set up a state agency to coordinate, and in a sense, control, the institutions of higher education in the states.

Paralleling recent events in the development of state systems of coordination, and largely a product of centralized planning, has been the steady growth and evolution of state studies and surveys of higher education (40, p. 9). The earliest such surveys were conducted in 1921 by North Dakota, Pennsylvania, and Virginia, and by 1936, fifty-one such surveys had been recorded (40, p. 13). Gradually, however, there was a transition from such state surveys to the more comprehensive master plan.

The first true master plan was contained in the well-known "Strayer Report," produced by the state of California in 1948 (73). Halstead says that the distinction between a survey and a master plan is principally that of scope and emphasis (40, p. 11). He says that (1) the survey focuses
primarily on inspection and fact gathering, while the mas-
ter plan (in addition to inspection and fact gathering) 
incorporates recommendations and a blueprint for action;
(2) surveys are primarily descriptive, while master plans 
are action-oriented; (3) both surveys and master plans in-
clude analysis of facts, but an interpretation of trends 
and their application to future policies are usually asso-
ciated only with master plans; and (4) the survey is usually 
limited in scope, but the master plan is comprehensive.
Glenny (32) identifies the distinguishing characteristics 
as

. . . the volume of data collected; the depth of 
analysis, 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.

Furthermore, what clearly distinguishes a master plan from 
the state survey (of needs) or a special study is its unique 
combination of multiple elements, each functionally distinc-
tive, yet mutually supporting (40, p. 21).

Halstead (40) identifies the following as some common 
features of master plans, even though, he admits, "under 
certain supporting circumstances, practically any component 
of higher education could be seriously considered a legiti-
mate topic for master planning":

1. Immediate and long-range post-secondary educational goals of the state;
2. Socioeconomic conditions of the state and implications of these conditions for higher education;
3. Analysis of a wide variety of topic areas;
4. Supporting statistics and advisory studies;
5. Integrated recommendations;
6. Plans for implementation and simultaneous review of progress.

The Strayer Report (73) contains, among other things:

(1) an evaluation of the current and future needs of the state of California for education beyond twelfth grade;
(2) an analysis of the needs of each geographic area of the state; (3) an analysis of the needs of the different types of publicly-supported higher education; (4) desirable changes in the education system; and (5) examination of the manner of support of public higher education in the state.

In 1966, the master plan was evaluated by the California Coordinating Council for Higher Education to assess the extent to which the recommendations had been implemented. The document, entitled "The Master Plan Five Years Later," indicated that sixty out of the sixty-seven recommendations had been implemented (22).

In the 1960s master plans came into their own; twenty-three states had completed master plans, eight had plans in the process, and seven others planned to develop such a
plan (38, p. 10). Many states that previously had conducted only surveys and special studies began to extend the studies and develop them into full master plans. In 1977, the state of Louisiana approved what knowledgeable educators think is a very laudable master plan.

Scholars do not completely agree on the topics to include in a total-system framework or those that are appropriate for institutional planning. However, in discussing control versus autonomy, the consensus is that there is danger in over-centralized planning. The central agency should decide if a topic warrants central or institutional study. Browne (11), however, states,

. . . compared with institutional plans, generally the system plan discriminates more of its variables quantitatively than qualitatively; utilizes comprehensive data to measure perimeters of the system; emphasizes educational opportunities, differential functions and programs, faculty demand and supply, relations with state government, procedures for equitable distribution of funds, etc. (11, p. 41).

The consensus of the literature is that while institutions should retain autonomy within certain limits, the present and future pressures and complexities of higher education require a coordinated and unified higher education system for states and nations.

Admissions

The admissions issue is a sticky one for educational planners because so many factors impede standardization; where there is no standardization, coordination is
difficult. Extensive literature exists that covers the research on the misunderstandings, obstacles, and barriers inherent in the admissions techniques currently used in many systems.

Bailey (4) discusses many problems that are associated with minorities. The arguments on both sides of the Bakke case are reviewed by the author, and some admission guidelines are provided that are in accordance with the Bakke decision.

The Carnegie Council on Policy Studies in Higher Education, in their report, "Selective Admissions in Higher Education" (16), addresses the issue of special admission for disadvantaged students. It presents recommendations for public as well as academic policies regarding special admissions. The report also offers valuable statistical and descriptive information on selective admissions and preferential treatment for ethnic minorities.

Ernest Beals (6) conducted a statewide admissions study of 20,000 transfer students. He attempted to ascertain where the students came from and in what numbers, where they applied to enroll, where they were accepted or rejected, their previous and current academic characteristics, and their aspirations.

On the issue of student retention, Pantages and Creedon (61) studied the characteristics of college drop-outs and the affecting variables; they concluded that this
attrition is the result of an extremely intricate interplay among a multitude of variables. In a follow-up study on over 100,000 students who entered college in 1968, it was concluded that such variables as financial aid, employment, place of residence, and campus environment affect a student's inclination to stay or drop out. Cope and Hannah (23), after a substantial review of research on attrition retention, presented a series of case studies of students and institutions to demonstrate the multifaceted problems associated with the revolving-door syndrome. They conclude that "stopping out," delayed entrance, transferring, and even "dropping out" are not harmful to either student or institution.

The most prevalent theme of this literature is a belief in the need for educational planners to adapt to a changing environment and to the new breed of students. They will then be able to modify state and federal policy so that the variety of new learners can move smoothly in and out of the institutions.

Finance

Most of the literature on financing higher education focuses on how to provide for the cost of higher education. This cost is met by financial support from different levels of government, from private sources, through contributions and bequests, and from student tuition and fees.
The National Commission on Post-Secondary Education (58) describes the different financing patterns and evaluates their successes. The Carnegie Commission on Policy Studies in Higher Education (14), in a study of the federal government's responsibility to higher education, suggests the following: (1) the establishment of a National Student Loan Bank to reduce student difficulties with some loan programs; (2) a matching program with states to assist private institutions; and (3) a program of support for major research libraries, as a way of fulfilling government obligation to higher education.

The Carnegie Commission on Higher Education (13) carefully documents and discusses the sources of educational revenue and the distribution of the benefits of higher education. On the basis of that analysis, it recommends a gradual shift in the payment burden to bring distribution of costs in line with benefits. It recommends (1) a redistribution of student aids and subsidies from higher- to lower-income groups by a gradual increase in tuition charges to those able to pay, and (2) a modest and gradual rise in public school tuition, through increases in the number of public four-year colleges and universities, until tuition is roughly equal to one-third of the educational costs.

Garms (34) also discusses the financing of community colleges and argues that all financing systems could be classified as either market models, planned-economy models,
or hybrids of these two. He feels that most of the funding for community colleges should come from the state but that there should also be increased tuition for community colleges, especially to those who are able to pay.

The consensus in the literature, therefore, is that there is an increasing federal and state role in higher-education finance, and that this is desirable in order to ensure quality education and to reduce the financial burden on students and their families. Further, the financial condition of some private institutions is not improving, and remedial action is needed if they are to continue to play the vital role they are currently playing.

Role and Mission of Institutions

It has been long recognized that individual colleges and universities serve different ends, although the differences are sometimes hard to distinguish, and administrators in their competitions often help to complicate or blunt these differences. The most important distinction is usually in the programs offered; in the United States the major purpose--such as the research university, the comprehensive university, the liberal arts college, the institute of technology, the specialized professional school, and the junior college--also serves as a distinguishing factor.

The Carnegie Council on Policy Studies (15) groups institutions by mission, namely, doctoral-granting universities,
comprehensive universities, liberal arts colleges, and two-year institutions. The planning process for the role and mission of an institution will necessarily begin with a consideration of these classifications.

In a guide for planning two-year and four-year institutions, Harris and Grede (44) argue that the distinction between "education for employment" and "education for living" can no longer be made. They argue that the new objective is "career education," and they discuss the planning, financing, management, and governance of career education.

The Carnegie Commission (14) asserts the "great worth" of the two-year community colleges to American society and urges that they be located within commuting distance of the communities. The Commission favors the model of a comprehensive community college that offers general- as well as technical-education programs and advocates open access as the basis for admission.

In a study of university planning in the U.S.S.R., the United States, the German Democratic Republic, Australia, and Belgium (60), it was found that higher-education planning in the U.S.S.R. and the G.D.R. is part of a national economic plan. The institutional role, therefore, is determined mainly by political forces. In the other three countries, planning for higher education occurs in the context of some degree of "social pluralism and liberal democracy."
Elizabeth Johnson (48) in a discussion of the authority of the California State Board of Education, considers especially the role of such boards in reviewing academic programs. The justification for such review, the author asserts, is to (1) conserve resources, (2) assure quality programs, (3) avoid unnecessary duplication and proliferation, and (4) assess the need for a given program. Administrators and faculty members consider such program review an infringement of traditional autonomy, while board members claim to act from the vantage point of having a statewide perspective.

This literary trend-of-thought is that planning, whether governmental or non-governmental, must be concerned with the determination of roles and missions for each particular college and university within the system.

Faculty

The review of the literature revealed that much attention has been given to the position of faculty in educational planning. Most of the literature deals with the status, the role, and the measurement of performance of faculty.

In a 1976 survey, Atelsek (3) found that the proportion of "young" faculty (those who received doctorates during the past seven years) has decreased and is expected to continue to decline. To increase this proportion, the authors suggest early retirement, increased funding, research
support, post-doctoral research-associate positions, sabbaticals, and changing of the tenure system.

After an investigative study, the Commission on Academic Tenure in Higher Education (20) concluded that (1) tenure policies are not uniform among institutions, (2) almost 50 per cent of all faculty are tenured, thus reducing the opportunity for advancement of young faculty, (3) a need for reform in the system exists, and (4) the success of the alternative contract system is difficult to establish. They concluded, however, that tenure is extremely valuable in maintaining both academic freedom and quality of faculty.

On governance and the impact of unionization, Angell and Kelley (2) attempt to prove that collective bargaining can be a constructive and useful force in a university. In 1976, Riley and Balridge (66) studied the trends in higher education and noted (1) the increasing significance of "external forces," (2) the increase in state control, (3) the growth in faculty unionism, and (4) the end of student revolutionism. The authors probe many of the new problems within academe, and they are not very optimistic about the positive effects of increased control and loss of institutional autonomy.

Centra (17) studied the types and extent of programs designed for faculty development and found four major approaches: (1) seminars, (2) assessment procedures,
(3) media technology and course development, and (4) institution-wide policies and practices such as sabbaticals and annual teaching awards. He discusses the effectiveness of each approach and the faculty members who would receive the greatest benefit from each. Similarly, Gaff’s study of faculty renewal (33) confirms a trend by institutions to improve faculty from within as opposed to the addition of new faculty.

Summary

A review of the literature related to planning for higher education leads one to the conclusion that educational planning is a relatively new and rapidly-evolving field. So new is the field that most of the literature has only recently been published in book form; so rapidly are the statements changing that by the time most are published, they have been rendered obsolete by the flow of seminar papers, articles, research reports, and monographs that constitute the cutting edge of new knowledge in this field. Coombs (21) says that one of his troubles was that "by the time I came to the last paragraph of any draft, I found that the first paragraph and the approach I had adopted became unsatisfying." Of course, scholars like Coombs, together with the aggressiveness of such organizations as the International Institute for Educational Planning, are in no small measure responsible for the rapid changes in
the field of higher-education planning. Be that as it may, a large and increasing volume of literature exists. ERIC Clearing House, the Institute of Higher Education, and the International Institute for Educational Planning are beginning to provide a collection of abstracts and bibliographies that will further aid the growth in the field. In addition, Halstead has recently published a bibliographic handbook (40). This handbook is not only a useful reference book but it will help planners keep abreast of developments in the field through its short reviews of each entry.

This review of the literature suggests that development economists have been somewhat more active than educators in discussing, researching, and reporting on integrated educational planning. In the area of educational planning of techniques and procedures, the available materials are prepared largely by economists (especially in developing nations) but increasingly by educators, and the material deals mainly with the establishment of goals to identify needs. Less attention is paid to the establishment of positive programs, and there is much less concern for quality.

Master plans that involve the implementation of recommendations are new and are found almost exclusively in the United States. Outside of the United States, the literature is weighted toward the manpower aspects of planning with little emphasis on educational planning for social development. Therefore, the general state-of-the-art, as
revealed by this survey of the literature, is that much progress has been made during the short span in which educational planning has been popularized, but that deficiencies still exist; economists and educators have much research yet to do to fill these gaps of knowledge in this field.
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CHAPTER III

PROCEDURES FOR THE COLLECTION

AND TREATMENT OF DATA

The purpose of this study was to establish a model for use in developing long-range planning for higher education, and to utilize the developed model to assess the current planning efforts in Nigeria. This chapter presents a description of the steps taken in the preparation of the instrument which was used to collect the data for determining the necessary elements of a master plan: the utilization of the data-collecting instrument is also described. A detailed discussion of the treatment of the data is also included.

The information in this chapter is organized and presented in three main sections that correspond with the three main phases of the study. The first section discusses the development and validation of the instrument that is used in evaluating long-range planning in higher education. The second section discusses the utilization of the instrument in Nigeria to collect the factual material that was used as a basis for this study. The third section of this chapter discusses the treatment of the data.
Development of the Instrument

Review of Literature

A thorough review of the literature pertaining to educational planning was conducted in order to identify the major components of long-range plans. Particular attention was given to the components that were considered important by three or more different sources. Reports of past efforts on the development of comprehensive-planning documents were also carefully reviewed.

Those elements identified in the literature and representative planning documents as meeting the criteria were compiled into a list. The list was arranged in groups, as follows: (1) purpose and value of educational planning, (2) theoretical considerations in educational planning, (3) methods and statistical techniques in educational planning, and (4) techniques of developing master plans. This arrangement provided a tentative format for the initial data-collecting instrument (see Figure 1).

From this format, a list of the major categories in long-range planning in higher education was prepared. These topics are (1) organizing for planning, (2) the planning premises, (3) the planning process, (4) master plan contents, (5) goals and assumptions of master plans, (6) governance and coordination of higher education in the system, (7) programs for action, (8) staff and faculty,
space or facility management, (10) financing, (11) inputs and/or participation, (12) time frame, and (13) evaluation mechanism.

These major categories were then compared with those contained in three established long-range plans. The categories were discussed with three professionals who had participated in some phase of state-wide master planning; they were also discussed with two professors of higher education at North Texas State University who have an interest in higher-education planning and have published on related topics. Mini-seminars and group discussions were held with graduate students of higher educational administration at North Texas State University to obtain further input and suggestions.

The previously-listed categories were selected because of their repeated occurrence in the literature, their existence in several master plans, and their verification by graduate students in higher education administration, professors in higher education, educational planners, and officers of the Nigerian National Universities Commission. These categories then were used to shape the major areas of the data-collecting instrument. Policy statements and decision-making assumptions were made concerning each of the categories in the major areas. These statements became the tentative criteria for evaluating a master plan for higher education. The final validation of the criteria was
done by a panel of experts in long-range planning in higher education. Quality would be determined by the degree to which each of these elements is present in the plan being evaluated.

**Resource Person**

Prior to the validation, the criteria and the procedures for actually validating the criteria were discussed in a personal interview with Ms. Sharon Beard, the Deputy Commissioner for Higher Education, Louisiana State Board of Regents. This interview was important because the Louisiana master plan for higher education was developed under the guidance and direction of the Deputy Commissioner. The Deputy Commissioner reviewed the criteria of this study, evaluated the procedures, and assisted in identifying a group of experts who would further validate the criteria.

**Validation of the Criteria**

A panel of ten experts in higher education were contacted by mail; panel members were selected from a list of names compiled with the assistance of the Deputy Commissioner, Louisiana State Board of Regents, and two professors of higher education at North Texas State University. Seven of the ten agreed to participate.

Selection of the panel was based on each individual's current professional activities (such as service as a planning consultant), publication of articles or books on
planning, and teaching or being employed in higher education planning. A list of the participants and a brief biography of each is in Appendix D.

Each participant was sent a list of the criterion statements with a cover letter and directions (see Appendices A and B). Participants were asked to validate the criterion statements by reacting to each statement. The reaction was to agree, to disagree, or to modify. To agree meant that the jury member believed that the statement should be used to judge a state or national plan for higher education. To disagree meant that the statement should not be used to judge a state or national plan for higher education. To modify meant that the statement could be used as modified by the jury member, in which case the member should write in the suggested modification. Participants were also asked to suggest additional criterion statements if it was felt that an area had been omitted.

Criterion statements were retained for the final instrument if four of the panel members agreed that the statement should be used to judge a state or national long-range plan for higher education. Statements receiving fewer than four agreements, or with which three or more panel members disagreed, were excluded from the final instrument. Statements were included in the final instrument with the suggested modification.
Fifty-six criterion statements were mailed to the jury. Fifty-one of these statements were included in the final instrument. Of the fifty-one validated statements, thirty-nine were agreed upon, as submitted, by all jury members; twelve were modified slightly, as suggested by the jury members, and were retained. Five statements of the initial fifty-six were omitted from the final instrument because three or more of the jury members disagreed. The five statements omitted are, as follows,

1. Program content should be centrally planned on the basis of state or national needs.

2. A systematic planning of new facilities and controlled utilization of existing space is one of the responsibilities of the central planning unit.

3. To ensure quality of student intake, uniformity of standards, and equal opportunity, a plan should develop policies that determine admission, retention, transfer, and graduation standards/requirements for the system.

4. Despite the close relationships between financial support and legal control of institutions these topics should be discussed separately and adequately.

5. For those variables whose future influence a change direction cannot be anticipated, it should be assumed that the status quo will be maintained.
Collection of the Data

Sources of Data

Data for the study were collected from various sources—public documents and government publications, through questionnaires and from personal interviews. The public documents included the Federal Republic of Nigeria, Third National Development Plan, 1975-80 (5), the Federal Republic of Nigeria National Policy on Education (6), the Reimbursable Aid Program: National Universities Commission, Nigeria (10), Operating Expenditures of a Nigerian University (8), Summary Budget of the Nigerian Universities Commission (9), National Universities Commission Analysis of Estimates of Requested Recurrent Expenditures, 1979-80 (7), and Supplement to the Official Gazette of the Federal Military Government of Nigeria (4). These documents were obtained from the National Universities Commission, Lagos, Nigeria, and from the University of Lagos Library, Lagos, Nigeria, and they describe the state of higher education in Nigeria and yielded the data needed to evaluate the current planning efforts.

Other documents used were The Virginia Plans for Higher Education (11), The Master Plan for Higher Education in Louisiana (1), Texas Higher Education, 1968-1980 (3), and the Master Plan for Higher Education in Connecticut, 1974-79 (2). These documents were obtained from the North
Texas State University Library and by writing to the Education Resources Information Center (ERIC) document reproduction service in Arlington, Virginia. These representative documents yielded the data utilized in formulating criterion statements and developing the model.

The Nigerian Embassy in Washington, D. C., was visited and the proposed study discussed with the Education Attache, Mr. Femi George. The Washington representation of the National Universities Commission, Mr. Bunni O. Rofimi, also was personally interviewed for pertinent information relating to the current planning efforts in Nigeria. He provided some background information, addresses, and a list of officers of the National Universities Commission in Lagos, Nigeria, to be contacted for more information.

**Personal Interviews**

The researcher made a trip to the Lagos, Nigeria, office of the National Universities Commission. On appointment, Dr. Abel Guabadia, the Executive Secretary of the N.U.C., Dr. B. Briggs, the Chief Planning Officer, Academics, and Mrs. A. Olagunji, Senior Planning Officer, were interviewed. About forty-five minutes was spent with each officer and a prepared interview schedule (see Appendix E) was utilized. The responses were recorded in writing.

The questions of the interview schedule were devised to provide the pertinent information on higher-education
planning in Nigeria, to point out the differences and the similarities between this study's model and the Nigerian planning experience, and also to shed more light on this study's research questions five through seven. Specifically, the interviews were designed to

1. Clarify the organizational structure of the planning unit in Nigeria;
2. Identify the planning documents, and the policies and programs of action related to higher education in Nigeria;
3. Identify, examine, and clarify the values inherent in the plans, policies, and programs;
4. Clarify the objectives, goals, and purposes of the plan and programs;
5. Ascertain the criteria for measuring the success of the plan;
6. Obtain and analyze the data on each of the elements in the plan;
7. Obtain suggestions and recommendations for changes in any undesirable features of the present plan.

A second meeting was arranged with Dr. Griggs, the Chief Planning Officer for Academics, in which he made available some copies of the N.U.C. planning documents and expanded on the history of higher education planning in Nigeria. Mrs. G. M. U. Adyemo, the Secretary to the Federal Scholarship Board, was also interviewed for specific
information on student financing and the role of the Federal Scholarship Board. Mrs. Awta, the Director of Higher Education, Federal Ministry of Education, also provided specific information on the attitude of the federal government toward higher education.

**Supplementary Questionnaire**

In order to determine whether there exists a basic agreement among the Nigeria citizens, and representatives of government, and the higher education community with respect to the goals of higher education in Nigeria, a written questionnaire involving goals was prepared and administered during the visit to Nigeria. The questionnaire (see Appendix F) was mailed with instructions to five student leaders, five government officials of executive rank, five community leaders in five different states (who have demonstrated interest in educational affairs, such as by serving on school boards), and five university and Teacher Training College professors, for a total of twenty respondents.

Each respondent was asked to indicate whether he considered each item of the questionnaire "appropriate" or "inappropriate" as related to goals of higher education in Nigeria. Additionally, each respondent was requested to rank the goals by order of priority. A 60 per cent vote (twelve or more out of twenty) was accepted as a basis that
an item was an appropriate goal; the item that received the greatest number of "Is" was considered as the goal with the highest priority.

Treatment of the Data

The responses of the jury members were grouped and tabulated. A list of the responses was compiled for each group, and from this list the final form of the instrument was drawn with the validated and modified criterion statements (see Appendix B). The rejected criterion statements were eliminated from this final instrument. This final instrument was used as the model to evaluate planning in higher education in Nigeria.

The transcripts of the personal interviews were reviewed and grouped according to amount or extent of agreement. They were compiled and analyzed in an attempt to add to the overall picture of the planning efforts in Nigerian higher education in accordance with the planning model. The results of this analysis was used to develop the summary, conclusions, and recommendations stated in Chapter V.
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CHAPTER IV
PRESENTATION, ANALYSIS, AND
EVALUATION OF FINDINGS

Introduction

This chapter presents the findings as related to the research questions that were developed to guide the procedures used in the study. The findings are presented in two main sections. The first section discusses the findings related to research questions one through four (the development of the model). The second section presents the findings for research questions five through seven (the assessment of the current planning efforts for higher education in Nigeria), together with the recommendations for modifications in the Nigerian plan that were made to the Nigerian Ministry of Education.

Characteristics of a Model Plan

A review of the literature dealing with long-range planning and the development of master plans reveals that the dimensions of planning can be categorized under the following three primary headings: (1) the parties and participants, (2) the process, and (3) the product. The parties and participants that constitute two elements of our model are the group (or unit) that is responsible for
developing the plan and the participants who supply the inputs. The process, which constitutes the third element of the model, involves the methods and procedures adopted in the formulation of the plan. The product, which constitutes the fourth and fifth elements of the model, involves the major content (or components) and the underlying premises (or guiding principles) that form the basis of the plan. Therefore, the following five elements emerge:

1. The organizers who develop, arrange, and direct the writing and publication of the plan;
2. The participants who debate the issues, suggest the solutions, and supply the necessary input that is required to arrive at the recommendations that appear in the final document;
3. The process of formulation of the plan;
4. The actual content or issues addressed in the plan;
5. The premises on which the planning exercise is based.

The latter part of this section presents the specific findings related to the characteristics of a long-range plan as indicated in research questions one through four.

Literature relating to long-range planning in higher education, the opinions of the jury of experts in higher-education planning, and the results of the personal interviews conducted in this study reveal that the major
elements of a long-range plan for higher education are the following:

1. The organizers who set up the time tables, coordinate activities, organize meetings, record minutes and resolutions, accept suggestions, proposals and position papers, memos, drafts and other relevant materials utilized in the course of the planning exercise, and publish the findings and conclusions. In most instances this is a "Commission for Higher Education" or a similar group with staff members.

2. The participants who supply the input. These include the members of the task forces, the resource groups, special committee members, and other interested parties or individual citizens whose responses are relevant to the preparation of the final plan.

3. The process involves the method and the steps by which recommendations evolve. This involves the decision-making approach; whether it depends on (1) a large number of people contributing ideas with the utilization of a system or mechanism to delegate and disperse responsibility, or (2) whether the chairman or leader developed a plan and dictatorially imposed it on the group.
4. The content involves the topics and the subject matters that are discussed in the plan. This includes the goals to be resolved, from which short-range objectives can be derived, the specific courses of action to be taken, the resources to be utilized, and other such matters to which the plan must address itself.

5. The planning premises are the guiding principles that form the basis of the planning exercise. This includes the axiomatic presuppositions, the self-evident truths, and the ethical demands that establish not only the objectives of post-secondary education but also the pattern and depth of the planning exercise.

The major planning premises that generally serve as a basis for establishing higher-education objectives and planning patterns are, as follows:

A. There are many benefits that accrue to society from an improved educational system. As a social endeavor, post-secondary education is important to the individual as a member of society and is beneficial to society in general;

B. The needs of society for self-renewal are enhanced by a well-developed public higher education system;

C. The manpower needs of the government are met through an improved system of higher education.
The increasing complexity of society requires a wide variety of human skills and many levels of achievement that only a well-developed educational system can supply;

D. The needs of the individual citizens in terms of opportunities for an improved livelihood and self-fulfillment are provided through higher education;

E. Available resources, both human and financial, will influence the depth and pattern of planning. With careful planning, the available resources will cover the greatest number of needs;

F. The state or national program of higher education depends on the quality of programs and services offered by individual institutions; therefore, state planning, coordination, and control should be aimed at encouraging individual institutions to attain optimum strength;

G. Careful planning and coordination will enhance the autonomy of the institutions within the system in the making of essential decisions that affect institutional operations;

H. Planning and coordination aids an educational system through strength and effectiveness. The presence of one or more well-performing institutions will not necessarily insure an effective
state or national program of higher education. All institutions in the system need to be sound;

I. The needs of society, individual citizens, the educational system, and individual educational institutions are enhanced by effective planning and coordination.

Responses of Panel to Criteria Statements for Assessing Long-Range Planning

The generally-accepted characteristics of planning involve the integration of many diverse perceptual viewpoints as to what should be done and when, where, why, by whom, and how. In this study, the above elements were utilized to develop a set of criterion statements to which a jury of experts in higher-educational planning were asked to respond. The criterion statements were grouped under three major headings and nine subheadings (see Appendix B), and they were submitted for validation to the panel of seven experts identified in Chapter III. These responses are grouped and analyzed in Tables I and II. The responses of the experts, which in effect determined the characteristics of a model long-range plan for higher education, are reported in this section.

**Statements Accepted**

Thirty-eight statements were validated by the jury members who agreed with the statements as presented without
### TABLE I

**RESPONSES OF EXPERTS IN HIGHER EDUCATION PLANNING TO CRITERIA STATEMENTS REGARDING LONG-RANGE PLANNING IN HIGHER EDUCATION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subheading and Criterion Statement*</th>
<th>Brown</th>
<th>Halstead</th>
<th>Glenny</th>
<th>Rotimi</th>
<th>Beard</th>
<th>Hill</th>
<th>Folger</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A-Organizers of the Planning Exercise</td>
<td>*1 **A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-Organizers of the Planning Exercise</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-Organizers of the Planning Exercise</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-The Planning Process</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-The Planning Process</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-The Planning Process</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-The Planning Process</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-Master-Plan Content</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-Master-Plan Content</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-Master-Plan Content</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-Master-Plan Content</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-Master-Plan Content</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-Master-Plan Content</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-Master-Plan Content</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-Master-Plan Content</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-Master-Plan Content</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-Master-Plan Content</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D-Goals and Assumptions</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D-Goals and Assumptions</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D-Goals and Assumptions</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-Governance and Coordination</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-Governance and Coordination</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subheading and Criterion Statement</td>
<td>Brown</td>
<td>Halstead</td>
<td>Glenny</td>
<td>Rotimi</td>
<td>Beard</td>
<td>Hill</td>
<td>Folger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-Continued</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F-Programs</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G-Staff and Faculty</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>A(M)</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A(M)</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H-Space Management</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Facilities)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-Financing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J-Inputs and Participation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K-Time Span</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A(M)</td>
<td>A(M)</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(See following page for footnotes.)
TABLE I--Continued

* Numbers following each subheading refer to the corresponding criteria statement in the questionnaire; thus, 3 under "Inputs and Participation" refers to Criterion Statement 3 that "A state or national plan requires the concurrence of the legislature and governor."

** Letters under the name of an expert refer to the expert's response to the relevant criterion statement, as follows:

- **A** = The expert agreed with the statement.
- **M** = The expert modified the statement.
- **D** = The expert disagreed with the statement.

Thus, Folger modified criterion statement 2 under the heading "Organizers of the Planning Exercise:" or that the experts were unanimous in their agreement with statement 1 under "The Planning Steps and Processes" that an acceptable step in effective planning would include "Determine the goals of higher education by using some type of needs assessment."
### TABLE II

**ANALYSIS AND SUMMARY OF THE RESPONSES OF EXPERTS IN TABLE I**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subheading and Criterion Statement</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Modify</th>
<th>No Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>A-Organizers</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B-Planning Process</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C-Master-Plan Content</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>D-Goals and Assumptions</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>E-Governance and Coordination</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>F-Programs</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>G-Staff and Faculty</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>H-Space Management</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
* This table indicates the number of experts that agreed, disagreed or requested modification to each of the criterion statements. Thus, four experts agreed with Criterion Statement No. 3-D (Goals and Assumptions) that a plan should be flexible and provide for contingencies; three members requested some modification, and none disagreed.
any modifications. Twelve statements were slightly modified as suggested by at least three of the panelists (see Appendix B).

Following are the original twelve statements as submitted to the experts; the modified forms appear on the final instrument in Appendix E.

Criterion Statements:

A-2. Long-range planning must be continuous, therefore the planning unit should be permanently engaged in collecting data pertaining to higher education in the nation.

A-3. The staff of the planning unit should be separate from the staff of the educational institutions and the government ministry.

B-5. An acceptable method or steps to effective planning would be as follows—selection and justification of a specific solution.

D-4. The following are adequate components and suitable topics for a central master plan—admission, graduation, and transfer policies of higher-educational institutions in the state.

D-6. Faculty and staff recruitment, development, retention, and dismissal in higher-education institutions.
D-7. Space management including libraries and laboratories.

D-3/#2. A plan should discuss the person or persons responsible for the policy, development, and planning necessary to guide the individual institutions to their stated objectives.

D-3/#4. A plan should discuss means of removing barriers to access of citizens of the state.

D-8/#2. Programs should be planned on the basis of national economic trends, need, and enrollment projections.

D-6/#1. It is important that a plan considers how to attract and retain staff for the system.

D-8/#1. A plan should identify the main sources of income to the institutions and discuss the mechanism to ensure equitable allocation of appropriations.

D-3/#. The involvement of students, faculty, parents, businessmen as well as government officials is important to the preparation of a plan.

Statements Rejected

Five criterion statements were rejected and eliminated from the original list since three of the experts "disagreed"
with them. The experts disagreed with the following statements:

1. For efficiency and economy, programs and offerings should be centrally planned and definite criteria for addition of new curriculum set.

2. A controlled utilization of existing spaces in the university is the responsibility of the central planning unit.

3. For those variables whose future influence or change direction cannot be anticipated, it should be assumed that the status quo will be maintained.

4. Despite the close relationship between financial support and legal control of institutions, these should be discussed separately.

5. Despite a commitment to democracy in the planning process, the last word, legally belongs to the coordinating board or Commission, which agency represents the highest authority in the state or nation in matters of higher education.

The final set of criterion statements is found in Appendix A. In essence, these elements and validated statements form a model plan for higher education. A description of the application of this model to Nigerian education follows.
Review of Higher Education in Nigeria

As a background for the assessment of higher-education planning in Nigeria, a brief overview of the current status of higher education is provided. This is followed by a brief history of Nigerian-university development from 1948 to the present.

The present university system in Nigeria is a combination of six universities that opened before 1970, and seven new ones, as follows:

**Old Universities**

- University of Ibadan, opened in 1948
- University of Nsukka, opened in 1960
- University of Lagos, opened in 1962
- Ahmadu Bello University, opened in 1962
- University of Ife, opened in 1962
- University of Benin, opened in 1970

**New Universities**

- University of Calabar, opened in 1973
- University of Karo, opened in 1973
- University of Port Harcourt, opened in 1973
- University of Jos, opened in 1975
- University of Ilorin, opened in 1975
- University of Sokoto, opened in 1975
- University of Maiduguri, opened in 1976

(See Figure 1 for locations.)
Fig. 2--Map of Nigeria showing the geographic locations of the Universities, October, 1979.
The National Universities Commission projects the total university enrollment to be 53,460 students, of which about 44,000 are in the three-year undergraduate programs. About 5,000 are post-graduate students, and the rest are pre-university students in some type of readiness preparation, diploma and sub-degree programs as shown in Table III.

The academic disciplines include arts, social sciences, natural sciences, education, engineering, environmental design, human medicine, veterinary medicine, pharmacy, agriculture administration, law, and Islamic studies. Table IV shows the actual student enrollment in these disciplines by universities, as of January, 1979.

All Nigerian universities are "generalized institutions"; the specialized university concept is not very popular in Nigeria. However, the National Universities Commission indicated that the government has asked for the development of a specialized "Center of Excellence." All the universities, except for a few of the new ones, have organized research units that are funded by the N.U.C.

At present, only the Universities of Lagos, Ibadan, Nsukka, Zaria, Ife, and Benin have computer centers. The N.U.C. plans, however, to have computer centers on all thirteen campuses by 1980, using the centers as a management tool, for library research, and as teaching aids. One staff member at the University of Lagos described this as "an overzealous plan."
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No. of Institutions</td>
<td>Enrollment</td>
<td>No. of Institutions</td>
<td>Enrollment</td>
<td>No. of Institutions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ahmadu Bello University</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>719</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Lagos</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>558</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Ibadan</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,136</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2,284</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Nigeria</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2,499</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Ife</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>659</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Benin</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 New Universities</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,395</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6,719</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Disciplines</th>
<th>Ibadan</th>
<th>Lagos</th>
<th>Mmakka</th>
<th>Zaria</th>
<th>Ife</th>
<th>Benin</th>
<th>Jos</th>
<th>Calabar</th>
<th>Kano</th>
<th>Maiduguri</th>
<th>Sokoto</th>
<th>Ilorin</th>
<th>Port Harcourt</th>
<th>All Universities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arts</td>
<td>1,100</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>650</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>425</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>440</td>
<td>660</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>6,215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Sciences</td>
<td>1,400</td>
<td>1,350</td>
<td>720</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>850</td>
<td>660</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>6,620</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sciences</td>
<td>1,400</td>
<td>780</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>1,050</td>
<td>675</td>
<td>362</td>
<td>580</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>8,024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>1,750</td>
<td>1,085</td>
<td>1,050</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>560</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>530</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>9,405</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering &amp; Technology</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>850</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>375</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3,705</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Design</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,250</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Medicine</td>
<td>1,750</td>
<td>950</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5,452</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veterinary Medicine</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>850</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pharmacy</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>880</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2,565</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>770</td>
<td>480</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2,320</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Islamic Studies &amp; Others</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>1,680</td>
<td>53,466</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
<td>DIRECT TEACHING UNITS</td>
<td>OTHER ACADEMIC STAFF</td>
<td>ALL STAFF: ADMINISTRATIVE</td>
<td>ALL STAFF: TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>Senior Techs &amp; Admin. Staff</td>
<td>Junior Staff</td>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>Senior Techs &amp; Admin. Staff</td>
<td>Junior Staff</td>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>Senior Techs &amp; Admin. Staff</td>
<td>Junior Staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ibadan</td>
<td>845</td>
<td>378</td>
<td>1,736</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>2,843</td>
<td>1,659</td>
<td>4,852</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lagos</td>
<td>650</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>744</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>2,732</td>
<td>1,290</td>
<td>3,550</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nasukka</td>
<td>702</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>1,465</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>341</td>
<td>4,471</td>
<td>1,476</td>
<td>6,083</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zaria</td>
<td>910</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>1,319</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>342</td>
<td>4,955</td>
<td>1,521</td>
<td>6,516</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ife**</td>
<td>691</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>1,146</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>2,739</td>
<td>1,175</td>
<td>3,800</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benin</td>
<td>395</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>387</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>1,034</td>
<td>696</td>
<td>1,460</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jos</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>693</td>
<td>347</td>
<td>955</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calabar</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>307</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>812</td>
<td>338</td>
<td>1,150</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kano</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>1,002</td>
<td>356</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maiduguri**</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>602</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>800</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* * *
**TABLE V--Continued**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University</th>
<th>DIRECT TEACHING UNITS</th>
<th>OTHER ACADEMIC STAFF</th>
<th>ALL STAFF: ADMINISTRATIVE</th>
<th>ALL UNITS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>Senior Techs &amp; Adminis. Staff</td>
<td>Junior Staff</td>
<td>Senior Teachers &amp; Adminis. Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sokoto</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>20 (50) (4) (17)</td>
<td>84 (2) (2) (14)</td>
<td>37 (37) (279) (95)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ilorin</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>46 (140) (29) (74)</td>
<td>92 (5) (3) (27)</td>
<td>58 (57) (373) (235)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Port Harcourt</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>30 (72) (11) (88)</td>
<td>109 (5) (2) (24)</td>
<td>40 (45) (256) (130)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Universities</td>
<td>5,296 (4,579) (1,379) (7,233)</td>
<td>1,853 (352) (243) (2,117)</td>
<td>7,983 (1,055) (2,138) (20,515)</td>
<td>9,832 (8,748) (29,865)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Entries in parentheses are actual figures as of January, 1978.

** In the University of Ife, Direct Teaching Units, the actual numbers of junior staff, as of January, 1978, include those in Adeyami College, Institutes of Education and of Continuing Education.

*** As of January, 1978, Maiduguri University had 355 daily-paid junior workers in addition to those shown in parentheses.
The university system currently employs about 5,296 teachers, 9,832 senior staff, and 31,626 junior staff. Table V indicates a breakdown of the National University Commission's actual and recommended staff positions. A majority of the professors in Nigerian universities are expatriates; the N.U.C. and individual universities have developed plans to replace these non-permanent recruits to some extent by encouraging qualified Nigerians to teach in the universities.

The student-teacher ratio for the 1978-79 academic year was 10:3 for the University of Ibadan, 10:5 for the University of Lagos, and 11:5 for the Universities of Nigeria, Nsukka, and Zaria. It is expected that the ratios for the new universities will increase as their buildings are completed and student enrollment increases.

The National Universities Commission emphasizes that all the universities are engaged in teaching, research, and service to the community. Faculty members debate the mix of teaching and research, but that policy remains the prerogative of the individual institution.

Attitude and Philosophy of the Federal Government on Higher Education

Education in Nigeria is no longer a private enterprise; it is a huge government venture that has witnessed a progressive evolution of government's complete and dynamic intervention and active participation. The federal military
government favors university expansion to remove geographic educational imbalances, to foster national unity, and to train high-level manpower. The National Policy on Education describes the federal government's plans to achieve part of its national objectives by using education as a tool, and the policy states that education is adopted as "an instrument par excellence for effecting National Development."

The policy states that Nigeria's philosophy of education is based on the development of the individual into a sound and effective citizen with the provision of equal educational opportunities for all citizens of the nation at the primary, secondary, and tertiary levels, both inside and outside the formal school system.

Higher education is now on the Exclusive Legislative List of the federal government which means that all Nigerian universities are under federal control and funding. Also, the Third National Development Plan (1975-80) gives specific impetus to higher education for high-level manpower training and economic development. Among other things, the plan states,

Government commitment, however, is to the creation in the country of an educational system capable of ensuring that every citizen is given the full opportunity to develop his intellectual and working capabilities for his own benefit and that of his community (3, p. 245).
University Development in Nigeria, 1948-1960

Prior to 1948 many eminent intellectuals of African descent tried unsuccessfully to establish university education in West Africa. In 1896 an attempt to establish the Lagos Training College and the Industrial Institute failed. Yaba College (1930-1947) came the closest to a university in Nigeria; it served as the local source of teachers, medical assistants, agriculture officers, forestry officers, surveyors, and administrators in the colonial days.

In January, 1948, when Nigeria was still a British Colony, University College, Ibadan, admitted its first group of students. This is an example of the British policy of extending higher education to its colonies. A crucial part of this policy was that each of these overseas university colleges had to be affiliated with the University of London, which retained the power to grant its degrees to students of these colleges as external degrees. The University of Ibadan severed its relationship with the University of London in October, 1962, and turned out the first graduates holding Ibadan (rather than London) degrees in July, 1965.

University Development in Nigeria Since 1960

The University of Nigeria, Nsukka, was opened on October 7, 1960, as part of the week-long celebration marking Nigeria's independence from Britain. The University, established by the government of the Eastern Region of
Nigeria was fully autonomous, with the power to grant its own degrees. It has been argued that Nsukka was, therefore, the first fully-fledged university in Nigeria since at that time Ibadan was still a University College, affiliated with London and granting London degrees.

In 1960 the report was released of the Commission on the Post-School Certificate and Higher Education in Nigeria (popularly known as the Ashby Commission Report). It recommended, among other things, the establishment of three universities in addition to Ibadan. These were to be located in Lagos, in the Northern Region, and in the Eastern Region of Nigeria. As a result of this report, the Ahmadu Bello University, Zaria, was officially opened in October, 1962, by the government of the Northern Region of Nigeria, and the government of Western Nigeria established the University of Ife also in October, 1962.

In the same year, following the report of the UNESCO Advisory Commission for the Establishment of the University of Lagos, the federal government established the University of Lagos as the second federal university after Ibadan. Ife and Ahmadu Bello, as was Nsukka, were Regional Universities and received only a part of their support from the federal government.

Thus, within two years of political independence, Nigeria established four autonomous universities with power to grant degrees. In 1970 the government of Mid-Western
Nigeria established the Midwest Institute of Technology, which was accorded full university status by the federal government in 1972. The name was then changed to University of Benin.

Post-War Universities

Following the Nigerian Civil War (1967-70) and the creation of the first twelve states in the Federation, seven new universities were established. This was done so that each state would have its own university.

The University of Calabar began in 1973 as a campus of the University of Nigeria, Nsukka, but it became a separate university in the Cross River State on October 1, 1975. At present the student population is 1,336 and there are six faculties. Massive expansion is underway, and the Faculty of Medicine will begin this year.

The school at Jos was chartered as the University of Jos in 1975. It was built upon the school of basic studies that was developed by the University of Ibadan in 1971. It has a student population of 1,339 and is located in Plateau State.

The University of Sokoto, founded in 1975, differs from other new universities in that it has no base in a prior institution. It is located in the town of Sokoto in Sokoto State and has a student population of 194 students. It started off with faculties of Islamic Studies, Social
Sciences, Administration, Education, Extension Services, Law, Science, Medicine, and Agriculture.

The University of Ilorin was established in 1975 as a University College of the University of Ibadan. It was elevated to a full university status in 1976 and operates at the site of the Kwara State College of Technology. The University has a current student population of 472 students. A new teaching Hospital and Medical School has been added to the University. It serves the State of Kwara.

The University of Maiduguri was created in March, 1976, and is located in the buildings which housed the North Eastern College of Arts and Sciences. The student population is 1,184 and the University is located in Borno State.

The Abdullahi Bayero University, Kano, was founded in 1963 as a Department of Islamic Studies of the Ahmadu Bello University. It was elevated to university status in October, 1977, and now has faculties of Education, Humanities, Natural Science, Social Science, and Business Studies, with faculties of Engineering, Law, and Medicine to be added in due course. The student enrollment for the 1978 academic year was 1,851.

The University of Port Harcourt also started as a college campus of the University of Nigeria, Nsukka, but was elevated to full university status in October, 1977, to serve the Rivers State. The population is only 385 students, but the University is heavily involved in planning
and beginning a variety of construction projects. When completed, it will specialize in such fields as mathematics, pre-clinical medicine, public health, community education, and educational technology.

Development of Planning Efforts in Nigeria

Nigeria's planning experience dates back to 1946 when the government accepted systematic economic planning as an instrument for effective management of the national economy. Since independence, the country has formulated two comprehensive five-year development plans. Before the reconstitution of the National Universities Commission, educational planning was formulated and executed as part of the total National Development Plan. Education was planned by the Federal Ministry of Economic Development. It received, however, a high priority over other projects in each of the Economic Development Plans, as judged by the magnitude of financial resource allocation.

The planning function then passed from the Central Planning Office of the Ministry of Economic Development to the National Universities Commission, following the promulgation of Decree No. 1 in 1974. The Decree sets up the N.U.C. as a body-corporate charged with the responsibility of advising the federal government on all aspects of university education and the general development of universities in Nigeria. The Commission is also charged with
drawing up periodic master plans touching on, among other things, the expansion of existing universities and the establishment of new ones, as well as the channeling of funds from the government to the universities.

Planning is carried out at two levels in the N.U.C. Academic planning is handled by the Academic Planning Division, and physical planning by the Buildings Division. The Buildings Division engages architects, engineers, surveyors, and other related professionals to plan and set standards for the facilities, including libraries and laboratories.

Assessment of Higher-Education Planning in Nigeria

Utilizing the model and its criterion statements that were developed as a part of this study, an assessment of current planning efforts in higher education in Nigeria was conducted. The findings which follow provide the data for research question five of this study.

Research question five is composed of three parts. They are (1) a comparison of the Nigerian planning document with criteria, (2) development of the Nigerian planning document, and (3) frequency of revision.

Development of Planning Document in Nigeria

Work on the planning document was started in 1973 by a seminar of educational experts under the chairmanship of Chief Simeon Adebo, the chairman of the Nigerian Universities
Commission. The experts were drawn from a wide range that included representatives of both Christian and Islamic religious organizations, the universities, the National Universities Commission, and Ministries of Health, Education, Economic Development, and Finance. Also participating were representatives of the National Council for Education, the Joint Consultative Committee on Education, and the National Educational Research Council. But conspicuously absent was a representation of students as an interested group.

The staff of the National Universities Commission originated the drafts, and invited briefs and position papers from the public and interested groups; it organized these papers for use as terms of reference by the ad hoc planning groups. The ad hoc groups consisted of people from different walks of life, including university professors, professional people, expatriates, and businessmen.

In 1977, the final draft was compiled by the N.U.C. and circulated for more input before submission to the federal government. The final document was published in 1977 in the form of a White Paper, having been modified in its passage through the various organs of government, as well as by the passage of time which had made some recommendations either obsolete (having been overtaken by events) or no longer acceptable in the light of changed circumstances. The thirty-five-page document was published and
circulated by the Federal Ministry of Information, Lagos, at the end of 1977.

Goals of Higher Education in Nigeria

The responses to the supplementary questionnaire, that checked the validity of the goals of education in Nigeria, were grouped and analyzed. Four per cent of the respondents ranked as "1" the goal of accountability, eight per cent ranked it as "2," and 38 per cent ranked it as "3." Seventy-six per cent of the respondents ranked as "1" the goal of accessibility, 16 per cent ranked it as "2," and eight per cent ranked it as "3." Twenty per cent of the respondents ranked as "1" the goal of excellence, 76 per cent ranked it as "2," and four per cent ranked it as "3" (see Table VI).

The Nigerian Planning Document

The data presented in the following sections are the comparisons of the Nigerian document to the model plan developed for this study. Each element is identified and the data collected is then presented.

A. Organizers of the Planning Exercise

A-1. Planning should be carried out by an official formal planning unit, with clearly defined functions and adequate staff. The official planning unit in Nigeria is the National Universities Commission (N.U.C.), established by Decree No. 1
TABLE VI
DEVELOPING GOALS FOR HIGHER EDUCATION IN NIGERIA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Per Cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>40.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>28.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>32.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>48.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>44.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>68.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>44.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>28.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>24.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>80.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>28.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>64.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>56.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>28.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>76.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>24.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>68.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>24.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>68.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variable</td>
<td>Characteristic</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Per Cent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>28.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>60.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>56.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>40.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>28.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>48.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>28.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>40.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>24.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>32.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>32.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>28.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>68.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>24.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>48.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>28.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>36.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>36.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variable</td>
<td>Characteristic</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Per Cent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>40.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>52.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>88.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>76.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>76.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
of 1974. The decree states thirteen specific functions of the Commission, among which is
to prepare, after consultation with all the State governments, the Universities, the National Manpower Board and other such bodies as it considers appropriate, periodic master plans for balanced and coordinated development of Universities in Nigeria, and such plans shall include: (1) The general programs to be pursued by the Universities in order to ensure that they are fully adequate to national needs and objectives . . . (1)

A-2. Long-range planning must be continuous; therefore, the planning unit should be permanently engaged in collecting, evaluating and interpreting data pertaining to higher education in the state or nation for which planning occurs.

The decree states that the National Universities Commission "shall be a body-corporate with perpetual succession and a common seal . . . ." A staff of the N.U.C. admitted, on interview, that the Commission is only now beginning to accumulate and preserve pertinent data. One of the great handicaps to planning in Nigeria is that recorded data are scarce, and for the most part planning in Nigeria has been based on guesses—often described as "planning without facts."

A-3. The staff of the planning unit should be separate from the staff of the educational institution and should be a part of the
state agency with coordinating or governing responsibility.

The staff of the National Commission is separate from the staff of the Universities; it is a part of the Federal Ministry of Education. The Executive Secretary, who is the chief executive of the Commission, is appointed to a five-year term by the head of State. Other officers and staff of the Commission may be appointed by way of transfer, or secondment from any of the other public services in the Federation. Figure 2 shows the staff structure of the National Universities Commission.

B. Inputs and Participation

B-1. The involvement of students, faculty, parents of students, businessmen and women as well as government representatives is important in the preparation of a long-range plan for higher education.

It was revealed that a significant group—the students—who are the direct beneficiaries of higher education, were not represented at any stage of the Nigerian planning exercise. The chairman and members of the National Commission are appointed by the Head of Federal Military Government for a period of three years. Membership of the Commission consists of the following:

1. The chairman of the N.U.C.
Fig. 3—The National Universities Commission; Staff Chart
2. Thirteen members, one from each of the Universities in Nigeria who are chosen in such a way that different academic disciplines are represented.


4. Six members appointed on individual merit, on a nationwide basis, to represent commercial, industrial, and professional interests.

5. The Executive Secretary of the N.U.C., who is an ex-officio member of the Commission but who has no voting rights at meetings.

B-2. Drafts of various sections of the master plan should be circulated for constructive criticism and revision.

Work started in 1973 on the "National Policy on Education" and ended in 1977 under the chairmanship of Chief Adebo. In those four years, the staff of the U.N.C. revealed that various sections and stages of the draft had been circulated, but mostly among the universities.

B-3. A state or national plan requires the concurrence of the legislature and governor.

The National Policy on Education was accepted in 1977 by the Head of State and the Federal Military Government of Nigeria.
B-4. A plan should be a compromise of views, everyone's contribution and no one's brain-child.

This criterion was met in the Nigerian planning exercise; the plan came out of a series of meetings, seminars, and discussions among the participants.

B-5. A plan should not be the lowest and most general common denominator on which everyone agrees.

There were some disagreements over certain recommendations of the plan before and after publication. West Africa (6) reports that

Some of the document's recommendations were so far-reaching that it may take years before they can be put into effect, and others were highly controversial; the government however accepted it and declared that it intends the recommendations to start to transform all aspects of the nation's life without delay (5, p. 873).

C. The Planning Steps or Process and Procedures in Formulating the Plan

C-1. An acceptable method or steps to effective planning would be as follows (not necessarily in any order):

1. Determining the goals of higher education (using some type of assessment);
2. Identifying the possibilities, problems, and constraints.
(3) Analyzing and interpreting relevant data to diagnose problems in institutions of higher education;

(4) Recognizing possible alternative solutions to problems in higher education;

(5) Presentation of alternative solutions and selection and justification of one "best" solution.

No evidence exists that this criterion was met or how it was met. The staff of the N.U.C. indicated that one of the first tasks of the seminar that produced the National Policy on Education was to develop a set of goals and objectives, as stated in the Second National Development Plan. However, how the final recommendations evolved and the steps or methods utilized was not revealed. Evidence does not exist that any type of needs-assessment was conducted prior to developing the goals and objectives.

D. Master Plan Content

While there are many topics in higher education that are best suited for institutional planning, there are a few topics demanding uniformity and coordination, sufficiently universal in nature to make them inherently and ideally suited for central planning. The following are adequate components and suitable topics for a Central Master Plan:
(1) Goals and basic assumptions.

(2) Review of past and present status of education in the state or nation.

(3) Coordination and governance of higher educational institutions in the state or nation.

(4) General guidelines regarding admission, graduation, and transfer policies of higher educational institutions in the nation.

(5) Programs and services to meet the diversified needs of the state and citizens regarding higher education.

(6) General guidance regarding faculty and staff recruitment, development, retention, and dismissal in higher education institutions.

(7) Standards for space management and projection, all physical facilities including libraries and laboratories.

(8) Financing of higher education in the state or nation.

(9) Role and scope of each institution (or type of institution) in the system.

(10) Future agenda.

The Nigerian plan contains definite goals and objectives. Such goals are mentioned in the National Policy on Education, Section 5, No. 32. However, the document contains no review of the past or present status of education
in the nation. Administration and governance are discussed in Section 11, page thirty-one. The White Paper also discusses admission, matriculation, and graduation policies in Section 5, No. 37, No. 43, and Section 11, No. 101, No. 102. Programs are discussed in Section 5, Nos. 34 through 36, and staff and faculty matters are discussed in Section 10, pages twenty-five to twenty-eight. No evidence exists on standards for space management or for facilities such as libraries and laboratories. The policy discusses the financing of education in Section 12, Nos. 106 through 110. Evidence does not exist that any of the thirteen universities are provided with a role or mission statement. There is no future agenda in the Nigerian plans, and, contrary to what the model suggests, items that could not receive priority attention, and items needing further studies, are not specified for future planning sessions.

D. **Criteria Statements Regarding Specific Plan Contents**

D-1. The Goals and Assumptions:

(1) To provide the necessary direction and purpose, general statements of intent and/or expected achievements should be included in a plan.
The government's White Paper on National Education Policy states that one of the main factors that led to the planning exercise was the government's realization that,

For the benefit of all citizens of Nigeria the country's educational goals in terms of its relevance to the needs of the individual as well as in terms of the kind of society desired in relation to the environment and the realities of the modern world and rapid social changes should be clearly set out (2).

The Nigerian National Policy on Education contains general statements which indicate the philosophy of Nigerian education. These statements are linked to Nigeria's national objectives as set forth in the Second National Development Plan and apply to all three levels of education. In Section 5, No. 32, the policy specifies the goals of higher education, as follows:

A. The acquisition, development, and inculcation of the proper value-orientation for the survival of the individual and society.

B. The development of the intellectual capacities of individuals to understand and appreciate their environments.

C. The acquisition of both physical and intellectual skills which will enable individuals to develop into useful members of the community.

D. The acquisition of an objective view of the local and external environments . . . (2, p. 14).

(2) Since goals must change with times and circumstances, a plan should allow for anticipated (or assumed) changes in
economic conditions, political and military situations, college entrance rates, and other such variables.

This criterion is covered by the statement on page three of the policy that "since education is a dynamic instrument of change, this policy will need to be constantly reviewed and updated to ensure its adequacy and continued relevance to national needs and objectives."

(3) A plan should be flexible and provide for contingencies.

Though no specific contingencies are provided for in the plan, the language of the plan indicates flexibility. A top official of the N.U.C. also observed in the interview that the plan contains a "built-in flexibility."

D-2. Governance and Coordination:

(1) At the state of national level, the primary responsibility for coordination should rest with a specified agency, which agency should represent the highest authority in the state of nation in matters of public higher education.

This criterion is taken care of by the provisions of Section 11, No. 86 (b), which places responsibility for coordination in the hands of the Ministry Department or Directorate of Education. In the case of higher education, the Federal Ministry of Education is responsible for the
governance and coordination of the universities, a function that is performed in cooperation with the National Universities Commission.

(2) A plan should identify the person charged with responsibility for policy development and planning necessary to guide the individual institutions to their stated objectives.

The National Policy on Education states that "the internal organization and administration of each university will be left to that university" (2). However, the personal interviews revealed that institutional policy development and planning are the responsibilities of the university's councils.

(3) The functions and responsibilities of the several types of higher education institutions should be specified, and the role, scope, and mission of each individual institution in the system discussed.

No evidence exists to show that this criterion is met in Nigeria's planning effort. Role and scope for the individual institutions is not specified for the purpose of planning and none of the thirteen institutions has a mission statement or statement of philosophy on record with the National Universities Commission.
(4) A plan should recommend means of removing identifiable barriers to access and of providing meaningful choices between institutions and programs for citizens of the state or nation.

Section 5, No. 40, of the National Policy discusses the various means by which the government will attempt to remove obvious barriers to higher education and increase access to those who want to benefit from it. Financial barriers will be eliminated through scholarships and loans, and ultimately through elimination of fees. Geographic barriers will be eliminated by the establishment of more universities and campuses, correspondence courses, or open universities, or part-time and work-study programs.

(5) (a) The coordinating agency should develop policies that regulate admission, retention standards, and transfer of students in institutions comprising the state or national system of higher education.

(b) Specific admission and retention standards should be adopted by each individual institution in accordance with stated guidelines.

(c) Uniformity of programs in institutions is neither expected nor
desirable, yet a plan should discuss policies and guidelines covering transfer students to enhance mobility between institutions.

Following the publication of the National Policy on Education (2), a Joint Admission and Matriculation Board (JAMB) was established. This Board has final responsibility for admissions into all first-degree and sub-degree courses in Nigerian universities.

There is controversy in the academic community over the establishment of JAMB. However, the individual institutions set their own retention standards, and any student placed by JAMB who does not meet those standards is dropped.

Current practice among Nigerian universities is in violation of the above criterion in regard to transfer among institutions. However, Section 11, No. 102, states, as follows,

A credit system which is transferable among universities and institutions of higher learning on a reciprocal basis will be initiated. This is to enable a student who may be compelled to change his residence before completing his course to finish it in another institution (2).

D-5. Programs:

(1) Definite criteria for addition of new institutions should be specified in a plan.
The current Nigerian planning document does not address itself to this criterion. However, it refers to the functions of the National Universities Commission, one of which is "to advise the Head of the Federal Military Government, through the Commissioner, on the creation of new universities and other degree granting institutions in Nigeria."

(2) Curriculum should be planned at the institutional level, but new programs may be submitted to the Central Planning Unit for evaluation and approval to ensure relevance.

Section 5, No. 42 (iv), of the National Policy states that universities are guaranteed the freedom to determine the content of courses, so long as these are consonant with national objectives. But No. 38 (ii) specifies that "curriculum will be geared towards producing practical persons and the course contents will reflect national needs, not just a hypothetical standard." The plan also empowers the National Universities Commission to set up "working parties" in engineering and agriculture to advise on the restructuring of courses in all universities to make them relevant to the needs of the Nigerian economy. Compulsory courses in social organizations, customs, and the culture and history of Nigeria are required for graduation from any institution. Section 5, No. 34, also sets up an Academic
Planning Committee within the N.U.C. to carry out academic planning for the new universities (3).

(3) Procedures for evaluation of existing programs should be specified in a plan.

Evidence does not exist that this criterion is met in the Nigerian planning effort. Personal interviews did not reveal that existing programs and curriculums are ever evaluated.

(4) Programs should be planned with a knowledge of national economic trends, and on the basis of manpower needs, enrollment projections, student interests, and available resources.

The planning exercise in Nigeria calls for the N.U.C. to prepare, after consultation with all the state governments, the National Manpower Board and such other bodies as it considers appropriate, periodic master plans for the balanced and coordinated development of universities in Nigeria. Such plans shall include the general programs to be pursued by universities in order to ensure that they are fully adequate to national needs and objectives.

Such a wide consultation as described above, and the presence of the Permanent Secretaries of the Federal Ministries of Health, Education, Economic Development, and Finance on the Commission, ensures that the above criterion is met. However, the absence of students (or representatives of student interests) should be noted.
(1) It is important that a plan recommends how to attract and retain qualified staff and competent staff for the system. No evidence exists that this criterion is met in the current planning exercise in Nigeria. However, the Planning Officer indicated at the interview that the N.U.C. often serves as a liaison for universities during overseas staff recruitments.

(2) Faculty salaries, tenure, overload, teaching and research facilities are important elements that a long-range plan should discuss.

This criterion is not met in the current planning effort. The National Policy on Education is silent about staff and faculty issues except for Section 5, No. 42, which states that the internal administration of each university will be left to that university. However, our criterion assumes that certain staff issues are universal enough to justify central planning.

(3) An appropriate measure of autonomy to protect academic freedom should be considered as well as measures to ensure faculty and administrators' accountability.
This criterion is met in the Nigerian planning document which states, as follows:

Government is aware that the traditional areas of academic freedom for universities are (i) to select their students, (ii) to appoint their staff, (iii) to teach, select areas of research, and disseminate the results of such research, and (iv) to determine the content of courses. As long as these are consonant with national objectives, they will be guaranteed to universities (2).

D-7. Space and Facilities Management:

(1) A systematic planning of new facilities is a responsibility of the central planning body.

The Secretary revealed on interview that a Buildings Division is responsible for physical and facilities planning for the universities.

(2) A plan should provide guidelines and discuss standards for utilization of existing space.

The Buildings Division has developed standards for new facilities, but there is no indication that anything will be done about the existing facilities on Nigerian campuses.

(3) A plan should project immediate and future space needs.

The current document is silent about space projection, but the officers of the N.U.C. felt that this criterion and others related to facilities are adequately met by the
establishment of a Buildings Division to plan facilities as a part of the overall planning exercise.

(4) The library and laboratory facilities should be considered as part of the planning effort.

There is no evidence to indicate that laboratory and library facilities are considered a part of the planning effort in Nigeria.

D-8. Financing:

(1) A plan should identify the main sources of income to institutions of higher education and recommend the mechanism to ensure equitable allocation of appropriations.

Section 12, Nos. 106 through 110, of the National Policy on Education meets this criterion. The current plan calls for the establishment of the National Universities Commission Fund for the purpose of making grants to universities. Thus, one of the functions of the N.U.C. is "to receive block grants from the Federal Military Government and allocate them to universities in accordance with such formula as may be laid down by the Federal Executive Council." All the universities are financed by the federal government.

(2) A state or national plan should project economic and financial trends and
interpret the possible implications for higher education funding.

There is no evidence to show that this criterion is met in the current planning effort in Nigeria.

(3) The projected financial needs of higher education should be discussed in the plan.

This criterion is not met in the Nigerian planning effort.

(4) A plan should discuss who will pay for higher education and in what proportion—specifically, what proportion of total educational costs will be borne directly by the students and his or her family and what proportion by society.

The planning document for Nigeria states, as follows:

Government's ultimate objective is to make education free at all levels; but meanwhile government and local communities will continue to share responsibility for financing education. The traditional sources of revenue for education levies or rates and sometimes donations will continue, but fees will no longer apply in the case of primary education. However, participation at local levels for specific projects will be encouraged (2).

D-9. Time Span:

(1) To cope with the rapidity of change, a plan should encompass a span of about five years.
The planning document in Nigeria makes no mention of time span.

(2) An annual or biennial review and updating is necessary to keep a plan from becoming obsolete.

No evidence exists to show that this criterion is satisfied in the Nigerian planning effort.

D-10. Future Agenda:

(1) A plan should include a future agenda of items to be considered at the next planning session.

This criterion has not been satisfied in the Nigerian planning effort.

**Frequency of Review of Document**

There is no evidence that this document has been reviewed since publication. There are no provisions in the document for such a periodic review. However, on December 19, 1978, the National Education Policy Implementation Task Force, a committee under the chairmanship of Professor Sanya Onabamiro, submitted a report to the federal government that calls for a review of the document (5, p. 873).

**Evaluation of Nigerian Planning in Higher Education Strengths and Weaknesses**

Using our model, and utilizing the data presented in this chapter, the evaluation of the Nigerian planning effort
reveals certain strengths and weaknesses. The strengths are considered to be those elements of the Nigerian plan that clearly meet the criteria of the model plan. The weaknesses are those elements of Nigerian planning that do not meet the criteria. These strengths and weaknesses are listed below.

**Strengths**

1. There is a permanent, well-organized, and well-staffed planning unit. The National Universities Commission has a set of well-defined functions, and it is vested with sufficient authority and support from the government to effectively perform those functions.
2. The staff of the planning unit is not part of any of the Nigerian institutions of higher education.
3. The staff of the N.U.C. are now collecting and recording data pertaining to higher education for use in future planning efforts.
4. The planners have demonstrated a commitment to democracy by involving many different groups of citizens in the planning exercise, and in the circulation of the drafts of various sections of the plan for review and future inputs. The utilization of seminars, committees, and task forces insures that many different viewpoints were sought and
considered, and that the recommendations reflect, to a very large extent, the wishes of the people.

5. The plan received the concurrence of the military government and the approval of the Nigerian head of state before implementation. According to the staff, the final document was definitely a compromise of views.

6. The broad range of topics considered in the plan shows comprehensiveness and indicates the ability of the plan to deal with various inevitable changes in society that affect higher education. Components present in the Nigerian plan are goals and objectives of higher education in the nation, coordination and governance of institutions, admission and matriculation standards, space and facilities management, educational services, and financing of education.

7. The goals and objectives to be achieved by higher education and by the planning exercise are clearly stated.

8. The evaluation reveals the development of a strong and effective system of governance and coordination of institutions in the system. The plan identifies the coordinating agency responsible for policy development, planning, decision-making, and the
securing of effective interrelationships between institutions and their recognition of common goals.

9. The Nigerian plan discusses the means of removing certain artificial barriers to access, i.e., sex, state or ethnic origin, economic status, or religious affiliation.

10. Definite programs of action are proposed that are intended to meet the manpower needs of the nation and to assist national development. The plan specifies that these programs be coordinated to avoid duplication, wherever necessary.

11. The plan shows evidence of appropriate measures of autonomy for institutions, and it guarantees to protect academic freedom.

12. Evidence of appropriate measures to deal with space utilization, space and facilities management, and space projections are found in the planning effort.

13. The plan identifies the main source of income to the institutions and discusses the mechanism to be used to ensure an equitable allocation of appropriations.

14. The plan specifies the approximate proportions of the educational costs that are to be borne directly by students and by society.

15. The planners recognize the need for monitoring the implementation of the plan, hence the recommendation
and establishment of a special task force, the National Education Policy Implementation Task Force.

Weaknesses

The evaluation also reveals certain elements of the Nigerian planning effort that do not meet our criteria adequately. Such discrepancies are considered weaknesses and are enumerated, as follows:

1. There is a lack of evidence as to the methods used to determine needs.

2. No satisfactory evidence exists that the decisions and the final recommendations evolved from step-by-step procedures that included the identification and consideration of constraints, interpretation of data, and recognition of alternative solutions; nor is there a justification of the final solutions that were adopted.

3. The exclusion of students as a significant group, and the failure to seek and consider their views and suggestions along with those of other participants, does not meet the criteria.

4. The Nigerian plan does not provide guidelines for attracting staff and faculty to the system, nor does it mention increasing salaries or expanding fringe benefits as a measure to aid institutions in attracting and retaining faculty members.
5. The absence of recorded information and reliable statistics covering the important variables pertaining to higher education makes the Nigerian planning exercise and the recommendations less reliable. The concept of "planning without facts" is not fully acceptable.

6. The failure to describe or prescribe a role and mission for each institution in the system is a serious planning weakness. Experts agree that such a description of role and purpose is an essential part of higher-education planning that may be considered an appropriate response to the diversity of social expectations and public interests.

7. The plan does not discuss the accountability of faculty, of administrators, or of the planning agency itself.

8. The Nigerian planning document does not include a "future agenda" section.

9. The Nigerian National Policy on Education does not state clearly the time span that it is intended to cover.

10. "Frequency of review" of the Nigerian plan is not included.
Recommendations for Nigeria

1. A master plan for higher education should be developed that is separate and distinct from the present plan. This new plan should focus attention exclusively on Nigerian higher education because the present plan covers all three levels of education in the country.

2. Student input should be sought, and student leaders should be involved in most of the seminars and deliberations.

3. A "needs assessment" should be made to determine the discrepancy between "what is" and "what should be" in the system.

4. A National Center for Education Statistics should be established to develop, record, and publish selected data on higher education. Such a center should also collect, record, and publish other economic variables, and it should attempt to explain the essential phenomena and trends that affect higher education. The center should issue reports that give meaning and relevance to the exercise beyond a mere accumulation of sterile numbers. Such informative statistics would provide planners with the necessary perspective and insight into the current educational practices. It would also eliminate heuristic projections that are
5. Each of the Nigerian institutions should be given a separate role and mission statement; this should be an essential component of the Nigerian plan. Each institution's statement should contain comparable information, such as (a) the history, geographic setting, degrees offered, and other general information; (b) the type of institution, academic areas, the future plan (institutional), and the extent to which it is to involve itself in the functions of instruction, research (departmental, organized, or sponsored), and public service; and (c) projected enrollments, plans or pledges to admit the recommended number of students from the National Universities Commission, and such other information as would help the planning commission to know what each institution will contribute toward the overall goal.

6. The master plan should be for a minimum of five years with provisions for review every two years.

7. The plan should include an agenda for action that specifies who will be responsible for implementing each action (e.g., the Ministry of Education, the National Universities Commission, an individual institution and/or any other agency that is charged
with the responsibility for carrying out the recommended action).

8. Goals relating to accessibility should receive priority over all other goals in subsequent planning exercises.

Summary

A model plan for higher education should contain information pertaining to (1) the organizers who develop and publish the plan, (2) the participants who supply the necessary input, (3) the process by which the plan is developed, (4) the contents of the plan, and (5) the planning premise. There are nine generally-accepted planning premises indicating that individual citizens, institutions of higher learning, and society derive many benefits from improved systems of higher education. In Nigeria, long-range planning for higher education is the responsibility of the National Universities Commission which was established by Decree No. 1 of 1974. The Commission published in 1977 a comprehensive plan for education, the National Policy on Education.

When the Nigerian plan was compared to the model plan, a number of strengths and weaknesses were revealed. Strengths included (1) the existence of a permanent, well-organized and well-staffed planning and coordinating unit, (2) a commitment to the democratic process by the planning unit and the hundreds of people, with wide interests, who
participated, (3) the consideration of a broad range of important topics that affect higher education, and the resolution of those issues which is sure to bring about significant changes in the system.

The significant weaknesses that were revealed included (1) the exclusion of students from the exercise, (2) planning without facts and pertinent statistics, (3) the failure to describe the role of each institution in the system to avoid unnecessary duplications, and (4) the lack of a specified time span along with arrangements for periodic review of the plan.

The goals, in their order of priority therefore became accessibility, excellence, and accountability. Based on the above findings, a set of recommendations are presented in Chapter V that would improve higher-education planning in Nigeria.
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CHAPTER V

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FURTHER STUDY

The problem of this study was to establish a model for long-range planning in higher education and to utilize such a model in assessing the current planning efforts in Nigeria. This chapter presents a summary of the methods and procedures used in the collection and treatment of data, a review of the major findings as they relate to the research questions, and the conclusions, implications, and recommendations for further studies.

Summary of Method of Collecting and Treating Data

A review of the literature pertaining to educational planning and past efforts in developing comprehensive planning documents was conducted in order to identify the major elements of an educational plan. These elements were grouped into four main categories and eleven sub-categories to provide a tentative format for the data-collecting instrument. Policy statements and decision-making assumptions were made for each area of educational planning and for the elements in the instrument. A panel of seven experts in higher-education planning was selected to validate the
instrument by agreeing, disagreeing, or modifying the criterion statements.

The validated instrument was then used to assess the planning efforts in higher education in Nigeria. In the assessment, those elements of the Nigerian plan that clearly met the criteria of the model were considered strengths, and those elements of the Nigerian plan that did not meet the criteria were considered weaknesses.

As an additional phase of the assessment, personal interviews were held in Nigeria with officials of the Nigerian Ministry of Education and the National Universities Commission to obtain additional information that was not available in the documents. Some clarification was secured concerning certain aspects of the Nigerian planning exercise. A supplementary questionnaire on the goals of higher education in Nigeria was also distributed to a cross-section of Nigerian citizens, and the responses were analyzed to further verify the results of the assessment.

Summary of the Findings

Model Plan

This study reveals that a long-range plan for higher education should encompass the following: (1) the organizers of the planning activities, (2) the participants who supply the input, (3) the process and steps by which the plan is formulated, (4) the actual content or issues
addressed in the plan, and (5) the guiding principles or premises on which the planning exercise is based.

Premises

The development of the model plan resulted in a set of generally-accepted premises that serve as the basis for establishing higher-educational objectives. These are, as follows:

1. Many benefits accrue to society and individuals from an improved system of higher education;
2. The needs of society for self-renewal are enhanced by a well-developed system of higher education;
3. The manpower needs of government are met through an improved system of higher education;
4. The needs of individual citizens in terms of opportunities for self-fulfillment and means of livelihood are provided through higher education;
5. Careful planning enables the available human and material resources to cover greater ground;
6. Careful planning and coordination enhances the autonomy of individual institutions for making decisions that affect institutional goals and operations;
7. Planning and coordination strengthens the educational system's effectiveness in every respect.
The model also indicates that state or national long-range planning for higher education should be carried out by an official, formal planning unit which has clearly-defined functions and adequate staff. Citizen participation should be encouraged at every stage of the planning exercise. The involvement of students, parents of students, taxpayers, representatives of the institutions, and the government is essential to the preparation of any acceptable master plan for higher education.

**Strengths**

When the Nigerian plan was compared to the model plan in the second part of the study, a number of strengths and weaknesses were revealed. They are, as follows: (1) the existence of a well-organized and well-staffed planning unit, the National Universities Commission; (2) citizens' participation was encouraged and hundreds of citizens' responses were considered during preparation of the final document; (3) a wide range of important issues that affect higher education in Nigeria were discussed.

**Weaknesses**

Significant weaknesses in the Nigerian plan included (1) the exclusion of students, hence failure to get a total picture of the needs of the clientele and their assessment of the present system's successes and failures; (2) failure to conduct a "needs assessment" as one of the necessary
steps in the planning process; (3) planning without facts and pertinent statistics on which to base projections; (4) failure to describe institutional roles and missions; (5) lack of a specified time span with provision for periodic evaluations and update of the plan; (6) developing plans for all three levels of education in one exercise and publishing the recommendations for the three levels in one document.

Conclusions

The findings of this study appear to warrant the following conclusions:

1. State or national plans for higher education generally contain similar elements, have underlying assumptions, and identify the individuals responsible for, as well as those involved in, the preparation.

2. Long-range planning documents can be evaluated by using established criteria.

3. Nigerian planning for higher education generally meets the criteria, with a few exceptions.

4. Nigerian planning for higher education has been somewhat systematic but lacks thoroughness.

5. Nigerian planning for higher education can be strengthened if future planning activities more closely meet the criteria, especially in the areas
of contextual analysis, students' participation, and evaluation mechanisms.

Recommendations for Nigeria

On the basis of the findings and conclusions of this study, the following recommendations are made for the improvement of higher-education planning in Nigeria:

1. A separate master plan for higher education should be developed, distinct from the existing plan and from the plans for other levels of education;
2. A formal process of "needs assessment," as a component of a step-by-step problem solving method, must be a starting point for the planning exercise.
3. To increase interest and support for the plan and to obtain a total picture of the needs of the clientele to be served, student participation should be encouraged;
4. A national center for educational statistics should be established to develop, record, and publish comprehensive data on higher education;
5. Each of the Nigerian institutions of higher learning should prepare, as part of the planning exercise, a role and mission statement to reflect its purposes and contribution toward the common goals and policies;
6. The master plan should be for a minimum of five and a maximum of ten years, with provisions for review and update every two years;

7. The plan should include an "agenda for future action" that includes recommendations on problems to be resolved in the future, on revisions of the master plan, and on delegating those responsible for carrying out the recommended actions;

8. Programs to attract faculty to the system should be increased; a greater effort should be made to divert a larger portion of college graduates into graduate training that is preparatory for teaching careers in colleges and universities; the methods used could include stepped-up counselling and guidance services, increased financial support for teaching internships, scholarships, loans, and fellowships; the National Universities Commission staff should also conduct further research into the faculty demand-and-supply situation; specific studies of faculty-recruitment patterns and market conditions are recommended;

9. Goals relating to accessibility should be given appropriate priorities, so that more opportunity is available to Nigerian citizens to pursue the type of higher education that is appropriate to their interests and abilities;
10. Further studies should be conducted to identify other essential elements and criteria necessary for effective long-range planning in higher education in Nigeria.

Recommendations for Further Studies

Based on the findings and conclusions of this study, the following recommendations for further studies are proposed:

1. Similar studies should be carried out for another state on national long-range plans for higher education to help improve quality and effectiveness;

2. Similar studies should be carried out on other types of master plans such as system-wide plans, individual college or university plans, separate campus plans, and departmental and special-program plans;

3. Studies should be conducted to develop (and utilize) other instruments that could be used to judge the quality of educational plans;

4. Further studies should be conducted to identify other elements and priority criteria that are necessary for effective master planning in higher education;

5. Further studies should be conducted to assess educational performance within a system and to
determine the level of improvement in performance attributable to planning;

6. Studies should be conducted to determine the most promising means of implementing master plans.

Implications

The findings and conclusions of this study provide the basis for several implications regarding the Nigerian planning effort.

1. This study was based on the premise that higher education in Nigeria needs a planned evolution, rather than a revolution, to keep pace with the pressures and rapid changes in demographic, economic, political, and technological conditions that are taking place (or are likely to take place) in the next few years, and improved planning would most likely ensure this orderly evolution;

2. Recent disturbances in Nigerian universities (resulting in the death of a number of students and in the destruction of much property), the shortage of funds and staff in all Nigerian universities, admission irregularities, and the many other problems facing Nigerian higher education indicate that plans need to be revised and updated regularly
because the temporary measures now in effect will not hold indefinitely;

3. If students are not included in future planning, the accomplishment of specific goals may be hindered by their lack of cooperation or even resistance;

4. The swift expansion in education that has occurred in Nigeria may lead to a lowering of standards if higher education continues underfinanced and understaffed; controlled expansion will result from the adoption of the "future agenda" category for some programs;

5. Increased programs of teacher training will guarantee that teachers will be available to the system and that the expansion will not lead to a lowering of standards due to staff overload;

6. Improved national planning and priority of accessibility would lessen the tension in the so-called disadvantaged states and improve the political climate in the country;

7. The separation of higher-education planning from the planning for other levels of education will enable the planners to concentrate on fewer "needs" and result in higher-quality decisions;

8. The lack of statistics and reliable information regarding some important variables makes it
difficult to project accurately; estimates and projections based on guesses are unreliable and add to the lack of thoroughness in the planning effort;

9. The low enrollment in some universities and the large number of applicants implies underutilization of resources;

10. In view of the serious financial problems of the universities, the decision of the government to make higher education free could be criticized as premature;

11. It could be argued that in this stage of Nigerian higher education, all conventional sources of revenue must be tapped;

12. The goal of accessibility could be enhanced through the establishment of private institutions; whatever may be said against private higher education, the experience of most developed countries indicates that private universities can bridge the gap to a large extent.
APPENDICES
Dear ____________:

I am a doctoral candidate in the College of Education at North Texas State University, Denton, Texas. My dissertation study is the development of a model master plan for higher education in Nigeria. A part of the study calls for the development of a set of criteria statements that could be used to judge the quality and content of a State or National long-range plan for higher education. This instrument must be validated by people who are knowledgeable and are considered authorities in the field of Educational Planning.

Ms. Sharon Beard, Deputy Commissioner of Higher Education in Louisiana, who is serving as a resource person for the study has identified you as an outstanding authority whose informed opinion is highly respected. Would you please assist in validating these criteria statements by agreeing with, disagreeing with, or modifying each statement presented. Directions are provided.

Thank you so much for your assistance. A stamped self-addressed envelope is enclosed for your convenience.

Sincerely,

Joe Ibiok
APPENDIX B

CRITERIA STATEMENTS

Directions

On the following pages please find a list of statements pertaining to the topics that an official planning group should consider in developing an adequate and effective state or national master plan for higher education. Please respond as follows:

If you agree that this criteria statement should be used to judge a state or national plan for higher education, place an X under A in the response column.

If you disagree that this criteria statement should be used to judge a state or national plan for higher education, place an X under D in the response column.

If you suggest a modification before the statement could be used to judge a state or national plan for higher education, place an X under M in the response column and write your suggestion under the statement. Use additional sheets where necessary and indicate the statement number to which you are referring.
EXAMPLE:

2. (i) A plan should ignore all other points of view and accommodate only those of the planning staff.

(ii) At every stage of the plan, citizen participation should be encouraged.

(iii) Regardless of the planning unit's commitment to democracy, the last word belongs to the Board (or State Commission) for Higher Education.

* Regardless of the planning unit's commitment to democracy someone outside the academic community must give the final blessing to everything that gets included in the plan, but that group must depend upon the Staff work and academic people's guidance.

*Please use L, M, N, O, etc. for additional criteria statements that you may suggest.
CRITERIA STATEMENTS

A. Organizers of the Planning Exercise

1. Planning should be carried out by an official formal planning unit, with clearly defined functions and adequate staff.

2. Long-range planning must be continuous, therefore, the planning unit should be permanently engaged in collecting, evaluating, and interpreting data pertaining to higher education in the nation, and in the state (or other subdivision) for which planning occurs.

3. The staff of the planning unit should be separate from the staff of the educational institutions and should be a part of the state agency with coordinating or governing responsibility.

B. Inputs and Participation

1. The involvement of students, faculty, parents of students, businessmen and women as well as government representatives is important in the preparation of a long-range plan.

2. Drafts of various sections of the master plan should be circulated for constructive criticism and revision.

3. A state or national plan requires the concurrence of the legislature and governor.

4. A plan should be a compromise of views--everyone's contributions and no one brainchild.

5. A plan should not be the lowest and most general common denominator on which everyone agrees.
C. **The Planning Steps and Process**

An acceptable method or steps to effective planning would be as follows (not necessarily in that order):

1. Determining the goals of higher education (using some type of needs assessment).

2. Identifying the possibilities, problems, and constraints.

3. Analyzing and interpreting relevant data to diagnose problems in institutions of higher education.

4. Recognizing possible alternative solutions to problems in higher education.

5. Presentation of alternative solutions and selection and justification of one "best" solution.

D. **Master Plan Content**

While there are many topics in higher education that are best-suited for institutional planning, there are a few topics demanding uniformity and coordination, "sufficiently universal in nature" to make them inherently and ideally suited for central planning.

The following are adequate components and suitable topics for a central master plan.

1. Goals and basic assumptions.

2. Review of past and present status of education in the state or nation.

3. Coordination and governance of higher educational institutions in the state or nation.

4. General guidance regarding admission, graduation and transfer policies of higher educational institutions in the state or nation.
5. Programs and services to meet the diversified needs of the state and citizens regarding higher education.

6. General guidance regarding faculty and staff recruitment, development, retention and dismissal in higher educational institutions.

7. Standards for space management and projection (physical facilities) including libraries and laboratories.

8. Financing of higher education in the state or nation.

9. Role and scope of each institution (or type of institution) in the system.

10. Future agenda.

D-1. The Goals and Assumptions:

1. To provide the necessary direction and purpose, general statements of intent and/or expected achievements should be included in a plan.

2. Since goals must change with times and circumstances, a plan should allow for anticipated (or assumed) changes in economic conditions, political and military situations, college entrance rates and other such variables.

3. A plan should be flexible and provide for contingencies.

D-3. Governance and Coordination:

1. At the state or national level the primary responsibility for coordination should rest with a specified agency, which agency should represent the highest authority in the state or nation in matters of public higher education.
2. A plan should identify the person charged with responsibility for policy, development, and planning necessary to guide the individual institutions to their stated objectives.

3. The functions and responsibilities of the several types of higher education institutions should be specified, and the role, scope, and mission of each individual institution in the system discussed.

4. A plan should recommend means of removing identifiable barriers to access and of providing meaningful choices between institutions and programs for citizens of the state or nation.

5. (a) The coordinating agency should develop policies that regulate admission and retention standards in institutions comprising the state or national system of higher education.

   (b) Specific admission and retention standards should be adopted by each individual institution in accordance with state guidelines.

   (c) Uniformity of programs in institutions is neither expected nor desirable, yet a plan should discuss policies and guidelines covering transfer students to enhance mobility between institutions.

D-5. Programs:

1. Definite criteria for addition of new institutions should be specified.

2. Curriculum should be planned at the institutional level but may be submitted to the planning unit for evaluation and approval to ensure relevance.

3. Procedures for evaluation of existing programs should be specified in a plan.
4. Programs should be planned with a knowledge of national economic trends, and on the basis of manpower needs, enrollment projections, student interests, and available resources.

D-6. Staff and Faculty:

1. It is important that a plan recommends how to attract and retain qualified and competent staff for the system.

2. Faculty salaries, tenure, overload, teaching, and research facilities are important elements that a long-range plan should discuss.

3. An appropriate measure of autonomy to protect academic freedom should be considered as well as measures to ensure faculty and administrators' accountability.

D-7. Space (Facilities) Management:

1. A systematic planning of new facilities is a responsibility of the central planning body.

2. A plan should provide guidelines and discuss standards for utilization of existing space.

3. A plan should project immediate and future space needs.

4. The library and laboratory facilities should be considered as part of the planning effort.

D-8. Financing:

1. A plan should identify the main sources of income to institutions of higher education and recommend the mechanism to ensure equitable allocation of appropriations.
2. A state or national plan should project economic and financial trends and interpret the possible implications for higher education funding.

3. The projected financial needs of higher education should be discussed in the plan.

4. A plan should discuss who will pay for higher education and in what proportion—specifically, what proportion of total educational costs will be borne directly by the students and his or her family and what proportions by society.

D-9. Time Span:

1. To cope with the rapidity of change, a plan should encompass a span of about five years.

2. An annual or biennial review and updating is necessary to keep a plan from becoming obsolete.

D-10. Future Agenda:

1. A plan should include a future agenda of items to be considered at next planning session.
KEY TO RESPONSES

A = Agree that this criteria statement should be used to judge a state or national plan for higher education.

D = Disagree that this criteria statement should be used to judge a state or national plan for higher education.

M = The criteria statement should be modified before being used to judge a state or national plan for higher education. (Please make the necessary modification below the criteria statement on the space provided. Use additional sheets where needed and indicate statement to which you are referring.)
Dear ________________:

Thank you for your assistance in validating my instrument for use in the evaluation of a state or national plan for higher education. Since I have included your name in my panel of experts, it is necessary to include a brief statement about your professional career in my study. Please send me a brief vita for inclusion in the final report of my study.

Your time and assistance in this matter is highly appreciated.

Sincerely,

Joe F. Ibiok
APPENDIX D

INFORMATION ON PANEL MEMBERS

Sharon Beard

Sharon Beard is the Deputy Commissioner, Louisiana Board of Regents. She holds a degree in education from Louisiana State University and has had considerable teaching experience. Additionally she has served as the Assistant Executive Director, Louisiana Coordinating Council for Higher Education; Research Statistician Louisiana Coordinating Council for Higher Education; Manuscript Editor; and Executive Secretary to the President, Duke University, Durham, North Carolina.

Mrs. Beard is a member of the Association for Institutional Research; Society for College and University Planning; Southern Regional Education Board, Women's Political Caucus and the American Association for Higher Education. She is on the Advisory Committee, Institute for Higher Education Opportunity, Southern Regional Education Board, and has played an active role in the development of the Louisiana Master Plan for Higher Education that was recently adopted.
Robert O. Berdahl

Robert O. Berdahl is a Professor of Higher Education and Chairman of the Department at the State University of New York at Buffalo. He received a B.A. (1949) and M.Sc. (Economics) (1957) from the London School of Economics and M.A. and Ph.D. from the University of California at Berkeley (1954 and 1958)--all in Political Science. He taught at San Francisco State College between 1958 and 1968. During this time he also worked for the Commonwealth Fund in London, 1960-1962; for a Ford Foundation project on Canadian university government, 1965; and for the American Council on Education in Washington, 1967. He received a Marshall Scholarship, 1955-1957 and a Guggenheim award, 1972-1974; as first Chairman of the Eastern Regional Council of the AAHE, 1972-1973; as European representative of the International Council for Educational Development, 1973; and as Senior Fellow of the Carnegie Council on Policy Studies for Higher Education, 1974-1976. He has consulted for statewide boards of higher education in twelve states and has delivered papers on state planning and coordination to some eight national conferences. He has authored the following books and monographs:

- British Universities and the State (1959)
- Statewide Coordination of Higher Education (1971)
- with James Duff, University Government in Canada (1966)
- with T. R. McConnell and Margaret Fay, From Elite to Mass to Universal Higher Education (1973)

William C. Brown

William C. Brown is the Director of the Institute for Higher Education Opportunity, Southern Regional Education Board. He holds a degree in Psychology and Education from Allen University in Columbia, South Carolina and a Doctorate degree in Education from New York University, New York. He was for several years Chairman of the Department of Health and Physical Education, South Carolina State College; Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs and Professor of Education, Fayetteville State University and Interim President of Barber Scotia College in 1971. He is a member of several professional organizations including National Association of College Deans and Registrar, National Education Association, Southern Academic Deans Association, American School Health Association and many others. He is listed in *Who's Who in American Education* (1965-1966 edition), *Community Leaders of America* (1968 edition), and *Leaders in Education* (1971 edition).


Dr. Brown has served as a consultant to several State agencies for higher education on a variety of matters.

Lyman A. Glenny

Lyman A. Glenny is a Professor of Higher Education and the Director, Center for Research and Development in Higher Education, University of California, Berkeley. He holds a Ph.D. in Political Science from the University of Iowa and has a wide teaching experience in the areas of political theory, Constitutional Law Economics, Juris Prudence Organization Theory, Financing of Higher Education and the European Perspective Coordination of Higher Education.

He has consulted for twenty-six of the State governments on planning, financing and coordination of Higher Education. He has also consulted for the International Council on Educational Development (ICED) and the Sloan Foundation "Commission on Government Intervention in Higher Education."

His publications include The Autonomy of Public Colleges: The Challenge of Coordination, 1959; Public Universities, State Agencies and the Law: Constitutional Anatomy
in Decline (with Thomas Dalglish), 1973; Coordinating Higher Education for the 70's, 1971; and Issues in Funding Higher Education: A Six Nation Analysis, 1974.

Author of one, and co-author of six of the 1976-1977 Center for Research and Development in Higher Education's series of books on State Budgeting for Higher Education, Dr. Glenny is regarded as an authority in state and government relationships to colleges and universities, with emphasis on planning, financing, and coordination.

Warren G. Hill

Warren G. Hill is the Executive Director, Education Commission of the States. He holds a B.S. degree from Gorham State Teachers College, Ed.M. from Boston University and Ed.D. from Columbia University.

Dr. Hill has had several years extensive teaching and administrative experience at the elementary, secondary and university levels. He has served as Project Director, Inservice Education Program, Post-Secondary Education Department, Education Commission of the States; Chancellor of Higher Education, State of Connecticut; President, Trenton, State College and State Education Commissioner, State of Maine.

He has been Chairman, CATALYST in Education; Chairman, National Commission on Teacher Education and Professional Standards; Chairman, Defense Advisory Committee on Education,
Vice-Chairman, Education Commission of the States; President, State Higher Education Executive Officers Association; Consultant, National Education Association Reorganization Study; and member of several professional bodies.

D. Kent Halstead

Dr. D. Kent Halstead is a Research Economist with the National Institute for Education, United States Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.


B. O. Rotimi

Mr. B. O. Rotimi is the Director of the Washington office of the Nigerian National Universities Commission. He has served as a teacher in the former Western Nigerian Ministry of Education for several years before joining the National Universities Commission.
APPENDIX E

INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

1. Self-introduction, purpose of interview and explanation of possible use of the study findings.
2. Inquire name, educational qualifications, position, and responsibilities of interviewee.
3. Can you identify for me some of the documents that constitute Nigeria's plans for higher education, i.e., Does Nigeria have a plan for higher education?
4. How was this plan (or were these plans) developed?
5. Who, in your opinion, should be responsible for developing a long-range planning document for Nigeria?
6. To what extent do you support the goals and objectives of this plan?
7. What is your criteria for measuring or determining the attainment of each of the goals?
8. To what extent and in what ways are you guided by the stipulations of these planning documents in the daily performance of your duties?
9. How is the planning unit organized? To whom is the planning unit accountable?
10. What would you recommend for alteration, addition, discontinuation or specific change in the present plans?
11. What is your reaction to the present organizational structure of the central planning office?

12. What is your reaction to the planning process or approach adopted by the N.U.C.?

13. Who are the major participants in the Nigerian Planning Exercise?

14. Do you agree that a model master plan should be composed of the organizers, the participants, the planning process, the plan content and the planning premise, with the following topics addressed: goals, review of past status, coordination and governance, general admissions standards, staff recruitment development and performance standards, general space and facilities standards, financing methods, future agenda?

15. What are some of the guiding principles on which the Nigerian higher education objectives are based?

16. What is the major problem facing higher education planning in Nigeria at present?

17. What other information statistics, documents, or data pertaining to educational planning in Nigeria do you think would be useful in this study?
APPENDIX F

DEVELOPING GOALS FOR HIGHER EDUCATION IN NIGERIA

Dear Sir/Madam,

As part of a dissertation study, you are being asked to assist in identifying what should be the appropriate goals of higher education in Nigeria. The attached questionnaire contains some goal statements that could provide the necessary direction, purpose and parameters to the systematic planning of post secondary education in Nigeria.

After each goal statement, mark an X under the column that, in your opinion, indicates the degree of appropriateness of this statement as an objective toward which efforts and resources should be directed in Nigerian higher education. Also, rank the three categories in an order of priority.

The results of this study will be used in improving the planning efforts in Nigerian higher education. Your assistance is very highly appreciated.

Sincerely,

Joe Ibiok
A. GOALS RELATING TO ACCOUNTABILITY:

1. To assure most effective and efficient use of all resources provided to higher education in Nigeria.

2. To bring about both the intellectual and personal development of individual students and to prepare the student for productive participation in society.

3. To contribute to the well-being of Nigeria and the component communities by assisting to bring human and material resources of higher education to bear upon the solution or abatement of State and National problems.

4. To ensure institutional and system-wide accountability through coordination and cooperation among all components of the nation's higher education system, and between higher education and all other levels of education.

B. GOALS RELATING TO ACCESSIBILITY:

5. To identify and encourage all capable Nigerian youths to continue their education beyond the secondary level.

6. To provide each Nigerian citizen, insofar as practicable, EQUAL access to the form of higher education most appropriate to his/her interests and abilities.
7. To open higher education to an even wider constituency, particularly females and those above the usual college age (teens and twenties) who cannot or will not fit into the usual regimen of campus learning.

8. To ensure that financial conditions, geographic accessibility, age, sex, and tribal origin are not a barrier to qualified Nigerians who may seek and will benefit from higher education.

9. To provide opportunities for responding to state and national needs for trained manpower for economic, social, cultural, and educational developments.

C. GOALS RELATING TO EXCELLENCE:

10. To foster continued growth and maintain excellence in teaching, research, and public service activities that meet local, state, and national needs.

11. To encourage an increased commitment to quality higher education by the Nigerian institutions of higher learning.

12. To protect and enhance institutional diversity, flexibility, and autonomy.

13. To observe as much as possible the need for differential functions by institutions and to avoid unnecessary duplication of programs.
14. To protect and sustain academic freedom in all institutions.

15. To foster appropriate innovative modes of instruction.

16. To foster flexibility in institutional policies, structures, and programs that will allow the nation's system of higher education to respond adequately to changes in the economy, in worldwide technology, and in student needs and interests.

17. To maintain sufficient faculty, facilities and budgetary support to meet the nation's total higher education needs qualitatively and quantitatively.

18. To protect faculty rights and privileges.

19. To provide for orderly growth of higher education in the nation.

20. To provide for continuous planning, supportive research, and effective communication between state agencies (MOE, NUC) and individual institutions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GOAL PRIORITY OR IMPORTANCE:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No. 1: Goal relating to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. 2: Goal relating to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. 3: Goal relating to</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Analysis of Responses to Questionnaire Regarding the

Goals of Higher Education in Nigeria
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