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This study is an analysis of the goals of independent senior colleges and universities in Texas as perceived by persons in positions of leadership in these institutions.

The purposes of this study were (1) to identify the major goals of independent senior colleges and universities in Texas, (2) to survey the opinions of persons in positions of leadership in independent senior colleges and universities in Texas with respect to existing and preferred goals, (3) to determine if there are significant differences of opinion among these persons, and (4) to develop projections of the probably priorities for goals of independent senior colleges and universities in Texas, based upon the expressed opinions of these persons in positions of leadership.

The first chapter includes the introduction, statement of the problem, purposes of the study, questions for the study, background and significance of the study, definitions, basic assumptions, limitations, delimitations, description of the instrument, and procedures for collection and analysis of data.
The second chapter consists of a review of books, articles, reports, and other studies which pertain to the goals of higher education and to independent higher education in particular.

The third chapter consists of a description of the population utilized to provide specific data, a description of the development of the questionnaire, procedures for collection of data, and the methods used in analyzing data.

The fourth chapter is a report of the analysis and discussion of specific findings regarding questions for the study.

The fifth chapter presents a summary of the study, findings obtained from the analysis, conclusions obtained from the findings, implications for the future, and recommendations concerning goals of independent senior colleges and universities in Texas.

Two groups of subjects were utilized to obtain the desired data. Seven judges, who were selected on the basis of their experience and expertise in independent higher education, were utilized to verify the appropriateness of the goals to be included in the questionnaire and to ensure the inclusion of major goals which are appropriate for independent higher education. In addition, opinions were obtained from presidents, academic deans, and faculty chairmen of independent senior colleges
and universities in Texas with respect to the status of current goals and the probable priority of major goals for the next decade.

Considerable agreement existed among the institutional leaders concerning goals. There was little discrepancy concerning goals among institutions of different size and those offering different levels of degrees.

According to the opinions of institutional leaders, the major goals pertain to quality faculty and academic freedom, to areas which are directly related to the personal, social, and intellectual development of students, and to the continuance of quality academic programs.

Based on the opinions of these groups, plans and decisions in independent higher education in Texas over the next decade will be influenced more by financial matters than by any other factor. Other goals which will be important include continued development of strong academic programs, spiritual and moral growth of students, stabilization of enrollment, and development and retention of quality faculty.

It was recommended that during the next decade, independent higher education in Texas place major emphasis upon the development of financial resources and effective management.

It was further recommended that studies of institutional goals for all independent higher education in Texas be
conducted by an appropriate agency on a scheduled basis and include trustees and student body presidents.
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Research reports concerning goals and purposes of higher education completed within the last decade have emphasized the university, in most cases the public doctoral degree-granting institution. New and changed conditions in the economy and other areas of national life have caused many leaders in higher education to rethink institutional objectives (8, p. xi). Profound changes in society are increasingly requiring institutions to respond in new ways to human needs (11).

Since institutional objectives set the framework for governance and the criteria for educational decisions, the role and function of higher education is ultimately influenced by the operative goals and purposes. If colleges and universities are to survive in the midst of the multitude of changes occurring in society, adjustments may have to be made in purposes as well as programs. In recent years private institutions over the nation have joined together for financial efforts, research studies, and other endeavors. The formulation of groups such as the Independent Colleges and Universities of Texas, Inc. (34) has resulted in cohesive efforts to assist and advertise the programs and
opportunities at private institutions. An investigation of the goals and purposes of such institutions perhaps would assist in identifying more definitively their goals and, thereby, enhance the combined efforts of this group.

The mission of higher education has traditionally been reported as being threefold: teaching, research, and public service, otherwise described as the transmission, expansion, and application of knowledge (8, p. 1). Other researchers have expanded these also to include the facets of a multitude of programs, seeking to encompass the ultimate ends of higher education.

Formulation of goals has been mainly by students, faculty, administration, trustees, and public officials. The question "Whose goals?" becomes obvious when one considers the distinct groups from which perceptions of goals has been obtained (8, p. 1). Different sets of goals may arise; consequently, there may exist another division of goals: (1) "Goals that are" and (2) "Goals that ought to be" (13, p. 3). In particular, there exists a need for examination of goals in relation not only to what goals now exist but also to what goals various academicians prefer.

Although all colleges and universities collectively share functions in the attainment of the goals of higher education, a separate institution may pursue only those goals which are suitable to its needs, abilities, and requirements (8, p. 2). Coherence and unity of purpose to
this end have become increasingly difficult. In many colleges the processes of higher education have come to the forefront, and questions of goals and purposes rarely surface (6, p. 158). It is important, then, that clear and consistent objectives be realized and utilized as a starting point for discussions and a criteria for institutional decision-making (33).

Purposes of the Study

The purposes of this study were (1) to identify the major goals of independent senior colleges and universities in Texas, (2) to survey the opinions of persons in positions of leadership in independent senior colleges and universities in Texas with respect to existing and preferred goals, (3) to determine if there are significant differences of opinion among these persons within and among those institutions, and (4) to develop projections of the probable priorities for goals of independent senior colleges and universities in Texas, based upon the expressed opinions of these persons in positions of leadership.

Questions for the Study

To achieve the purposes of this study, the following questions were formulated:

1. What are the major goals of the independent senior colleges and universities in Texas as established by the panel of judges?
2. What is the level of agreement of the chief administrative leaders of the independent senior colleges and universities in Texas with respect to the stated goals?

3. What is the level of agreement of academic administrators with respect to the stated goals?

4. What is the level of agreement of faculty leaders with respect to the stated goals?

5. What is the level of agreement between the leaders' perceptions of what each goal is compared to what they prefer each goal to be?

6. Are there goals which are presently not being served that should be added or others which should be deleted?

7. Are there significant differences in level of agreement concerning goals (a) among persons in similar positions of leadership, (b) among institutions of similar size and level, and (c) for the total sample?

8. Basing judgment upon responses of persons in leadership positions, what are the probable priorities of goals of the independent senior colleges and universities in Texas over the next ten years?

Background and Significance

For centuries educational institutions have engaged more than most elements of society in communication of scholarship and ideas. The whole of centers of learning has been pivotal,
playing a leading part in the American sense of mission (32). It is clear that higher education has dealt with new and changed conditions which it has attempted to control and ameliorate. Society, behavior, values, and institutions of years ago have been intensively modified (8, pp. xi, 2). However, Mayhew suggests that goals have frequently lagged behind cultural needs, with alternating periods of responsiveness and unresponsiveness (9, p. 179).

Although the study of goals for higher education may seem remote from an institution's daily activities, modern concepts of management stress the need for clarifying objectives (31, p. 1). According to Gross, even though it is generally agreed that the university is among the most important institutions in our society, there exists no consensus of opinion relative to its role and purposes (13, p. v). Smith emphasized that in order for educators adequately to define its aims and clarify its methods, it must become "aware not only of what it consciously intends but also of what it unconsciously assumes" (28, p. 6). Harmon has stated, "The basic issue for education is the choice of goals; all else follows this" (14, p. 44). Lee stated the problem encompasses more than true purpose, involving preferences among priorities, means, and the form of governance by which goals are considered, articulated, and adopted (8, p. 2).

Continuing conflicts over purposes in higher education affect both internal conduct of institutions and external
relations to society. Disagreement takes place within the context of social relationships surrounding actual purposes served and functions performed. The history of higher education records a proliferation of purposes. One purpose has added to another—personal development, economic growth, political health, service to society. Thus, purposes have become more complex and more contested (5, p. 62). These purposes, as affected by doctrinal views from within and public attitudes from without, will increasingly become the objects of future conflict. The three basic goals set forth by Lee—to transmit, to extend, and to apply knowledge—may be accomplished through the missions of teaching, research, and public service. These are related to a multitude of programs, intermediate goals, and functions, as identified by the five primary constituents of higher education (8, p. 1). Trivett portrayed the growth and complexity of goals through his review of goal statements of the recent past, including presidential commissions, state goal statements, and other "name" committee reports (31, p. 2). One Carnegie Commission enumerated the goals of higher education as follows:

(1) The education of the individual student and the provision of a constructive environment for developmental growth,
(2) advancing human capability in society at large,
(3) educational justice for the post secondary age group,
(4) pure learning—supporting intellectual and artistic creativity, and
(5) evaluation of society for self-renewal--through individual thought and persuasion (5, p. 1).
In a study by Gross and Grambsch, consideration was given not only to conceptions of what the goals are, but also to what the goals ought to be (13, p. 27). Emphasis was placed upon correspondence among intentions, activity, and output with respect to the goals. A total of forty-seven goals were identified and classified either as output goals--reflecting some product, service, skill, or orientation which affect society, or support goals--those reflecting some internal or environmental maintenance type activity (13, pp. 13-16). Chickering alluded to the need for recognizing existing as well as preferred goals, stating that clear and consistent objectives make a difference in student development and that they are the starting point for discussion and the criteria for decisions (6, p. 159).

Lee stated that higher education must address itself to a comprehensive reassessment of its aim and missions (8, p. 2). He indicated that creating coherence and unity of purpose within academic institutions, while made difficult by the degree of individualism and decentralization which characterizes institutions, should be the primary task of higher education today. "Education for what?" was the question emphasized by Thompson as being critical in a world which is unmistakably new (18, p. 27). He further proposed a continuation of constructive change in the interest of maintaining a free society and in the interest of subsequently needed revisions and changes. It was indicated by both Caffrey and
Gross that the primary constituents of higher education have more in common among themselves than with any other major social institution and, perhaps, more than has previously been supposed (3, p. 3; 13, p. 115).

In *Education and Identity* Chickering proposed that institutional objectives set the framework for governance and the criteria for educational decisions, thus necessitating investigation of the role and function of higher education (6, p. 159). Furthermore, many educators point out that changes must be initiated from studies based upon systematic knowledge and research methods (11, 10). A common process of investigations of this type is the intuitive method, utilizing opinions both from persons considered to be knowledgeable in a specific area and persons who are functioning in specific positions (16). At a time when one Carnegie report suggested that there is an opportunity for higher education to become a dominant force in changing and influencing society, a study of the primary bases of institutions is critical if colleges and universities are to survive in the midst of these changes (22).

Definitions

For the purposes of this study, the following definitions were developed:

**Goals and purposes**.--The intentions and aspirations of an institution, the end objectives it pursues (31, p. 3).
Objectives and functions.--The specific acts performed in the course of fulfilling the goals and purposes of an institution (31, p. 3).

Higher education.--The educational programs of two-year institutions which grant associate degrees and four-year institutions which grant bachelor's degrees, master's degrees, and doctor's degrees.

Independent college.--An institution of higher education not directly associated with the state legislature, accredited by the appropriate regional accrediting agency, and receiving the majority of its income from tuition and fees and sources other than state or federal appropriations.

Senior college.--An institution of higher education offering four-year courses of study in liberal arts and sciences.

University.--A multilevel institution of higher education consisting of liberal arts, sciences, and professional schools and offering graduate study.

Chief administrative leader.--The primary administrator who is responsible for the total institutional program--the president or chancellor.

Academic leader.--An administrator primarily responsible for the academic program--the academic dean or vice president.

Faculty leader.--The faculty member generally designated as chairman or spokesman for the faculty--the faculty senate chairman.
Basic Assumptions

It was assumed that the respondents were objective in their reactions and that their judgments were based upon their understanding and knowledge of changes and developments in higher education as well as within their own institutions. It was further assumed that the consensus expressed by the respondents would further increase the value of relative or corresponding data obtained from the literature and other studies utilized.

Limitations

The results of this study were limited by the subjectivity of the expressed opinions of the respondents; therefore, the degree of probability or desirability of a goal is subject to the degree of validity of the opinions given. The study was further limited by the small number of independent senior colleges and universities in Texas.

Delimitations

The boundaries of the study included an analysis of goals and purposes of higher education which relate directly or indirectly to the independent senior colleges and universities of Texas. The survey was delimited to those independent senior colleges and universities of Texas which are reported as being members of the Independent Colleges and Universities of Texas, Inc. (34).
Description of the Instrument

From a survey of literature, the primary goals of higher education were identified to encompass a number of major categories. Trivett, in *Goals for Higher Education: Definitions and Directions* (31), reviewed goals beginning with the report *Higher Education for American Democracy* (1947), through the Newman "Report on Higher Education" (1972), and the Carnegie report *The Purposes and the Performances of Higher Education in the United States* (1973). Careful consideration of the forty-seven goal intentions formulated by Gross and Grambsch (1968), although not readily recognized in the order outlined by these previous reports, revealed this survey to be inclusive of those primary goals thought to represent the several major categories of goals of higher education.

Although the Gross and Grambsch questionnaire (see Appendix A) was last utilized in 1971, it was surmised that these goals, having been previously put to the test, so to speak, properly conformed to the intent of the purpose and function of this study. Additional goals, which were considered to be appropriate for this purpose, were solicited from the panel of judges and from the institutional leaders included in the study in an attempt to overcome this limitation. Caffrey indicated, however, that Gross and Grambsch had performed a valuable service in illustrating the depth and breadth of detail possible in defining goals and
providing a set of goal statements which exhibits a commendable level of detailing modeling (45, p. vii). Other pertinent information was obtained through the use of a brief survey which solicited general background information.

The following panel of judges was utilized in establishing the appropriateness of the goal statements in the questionnaire: John Hitt, Associate Dean of the University, Texas Christian University, Norman Hackerman, President of Rice University; Theodore Hesburgh, President of University of Notre Dame, Willis Tate, Chancellor of Southern Methodist University; Joe Mitchell, former Chairman of the Division of Education and Psychology, Texas Wesleyan College, William Jones, Provost and Administrative Vice President of Southwestern University; and Roy McClung, President of Wayland Baptist College. The judges were selected on the basis of their experience and expertise in private higher education in Texas (see Appendix G). An out-of-state judge was selected to insure the inclusion of other goals appropriate to private higher education. The panel included judges from senior colleges, senior colleges with graduate programs, and colleges of different sizes. Judges were selected from various administrative and faculty positions. The judges indicated whether the goal statements were appropriate goals for independent higher education or not (see Appendix B). If five of the seven judges agreed that a goal was representative, it was included. The judges, in addition, were afforded
the opportunity to suggest additional goals: (1) which are current and (2) which will be important over the next ten years. If five of the seven judges agreed in suggesting an additional goal, it was added to the list of goal intentions.

Each person responding to the final questionnaire indicated an opinion concerning the various goal statements as to (1) what is the current attitude relative to the goal and (2) what is preferred concerning the goal. A scale of values from one to five corresponding to various degrees of percentages was utilized to indicate the degree of existence and degree of desirability of the goal. The respondents were also requested to list in order of priority the goals which they felt would be the most important over the next ten years. The resulting questionnaire was utilized to obtain the opinions of chief administrative leaders, academic administrative leaders, and faculty leaders of independent senior colleges and universities in Texas, with respect to the existing goals and the preferred goals in independent education in Texas (see Appendix D).

Procedure for Collection of Data

First, the independent senior colleges and universities were identified based upon the listing of the Independent Colleges and Universities of Texas, Inc. (34). The names and addresses of the chief administrative leaders, academic administrative leaders, and faculty leaders were obtained
through correspondence with the Independent Colleges and Universities of Texas, Inc. and the respective institutional presidents (see Appendix C).

Following the establishment of the goal statements by the panel of judges and the securing of permission from each institution to utilize it in the study (see Appendix C) the questionnaire was mailed to the respondents (see Appendix D). Later, a follow-up letter was utilized to encourage a higher rate of return (see Appendix E). A return of approximately 66 per cent of the sample was considered desirable to provide the information necessary to achieve the purposes of the study (27, p. 215).

Procedures for Analysis of Data

The sample utilized for the study consisted of the respondents from the population of chief administrative leaders, academic administrative leaders, and faculty leaders of the independent senior colleges and universities in Texas. The data was compiled and reported in the form of tables in order to facilitate the presentation and discussion.

Means and rank order distributions were calculated for each of the three groups relative to exiting and preferred goals (4, p. 23). Significant differences in the numerical ratings of each goal on both scales among persons in similar positions of leadership, across institutions of similar size and level (undergraduate, graduate) and for the total sample.
were determined by a comparison of the rank orders (9, p. 343).

Conclusions were drawn regarding the probable priorities of goals of the independent senior colleges and universities in Texas in the future, according to the responses which were made by both the judges and questionnaire respondents concerning the list of the most important goals for independent higher education institutions over the next ten years.

Organization of the Study

The second chapter, "Related Literature," consists of a review of books, articles, reports, other studies, and other documents which pertain to the goals and purposes of higher education in general and the area of independent higher education in particular.

The third chapter consists of a description of the population utilized to provide specific data for the study, a description of the development of the questionnaire, procedures for collection of data, and the methods used in analyzing the data.

The fourth chapter is a report of the analysis and discussion of the specific findings regarding the questions for the study.

The fifth chapter presents a summary of the study, findings obtained from the analysis, conclusions obtained
from the findings, implications for the future, and recommendations concerning the goals of independent senior colleges and universities in Texas.
CHAPTER BIBLIOGRAPHY


15. Havighurst, Robert J., American Higher Education in the 1960's, Columbus, Ohio, Ohio State University Press, 1960, p. 52.


CHAPTER II

RELATED LITERATURE

Review of Related Literature

Two basic approaches were utilized in conducting an extensive review of contemporary literature. The first was a search for recent studies whose major topic concerned goals and purposes of higher education and more specifically, independent higher education. The second approach was an extensive search of contemporary literature for books, articles, reports, or other documents which discussed the goals and purposes of higher education. In addition, an ERIC search was conducted through the Lockheed Retrieval Services utilizing the descriptors of "private colleges," "objectives," and "educational objectives." Specific goals or purposes were listed; the latter two descriptions, however, contained this basic topical area. It must be noted that, in the literature reviewed, the terms "goals," "aims," "purposes," and "objectives" were not clearly delineated. In many cases these terms referred basically to the primary ends to which an institution aspires.

This chapter is organized into the following sections which present an overview of the topic: (1) Introduction; (2) Institutional Purpose; (3) Relevant National Reports;
(4) Relevant State Reports; (5) Other Relevant Studies and Literature; (6) Relevant Statements Concerning Private Higher Education; (7) Important Texas Agencies; (8) Recommendations and Concerns for the Future; and (9) Summary.

Introduction

It is clear that higher education is dealing with new and changed conditions which control it and which it, in turn, attempts to control and ameliorate. The essential task, according to Sullivan, then is to make "colleges and universities strong centers of teaching and of learning, strong centers of scholarship and discovery, responsive and responsible, free, truthful, and unafraid" (111, p. 205). Mayhew, however, stated that what is noticeably lacking is a careful reassessment of the very nature of higher education and how it is being expressed in the current institutional forms. He stated further that the difficulties with which higher education is currently beset will not be overcome until the difference is recognized between "what it is" and "what it tells the world it is" (74, p. 15).

Richman and Farmer most recently stated that experience now suggests that colleges and universities will have only a few more years without solutions being imposed from the outside. He further stated that the best and most meaningful method to get at what to do is to utilize goal system analysis (101, p. 95). Mayhew suggested that the
application of systems analysis would leave considerable relevance for investigating "(1) where, when, with what, and with whom (2) you must accomplish (3) what, for whom, and where" (75, p. 14). The purpose of this kind of analysis is to provide clues and suggestions which lead to modification or redesign.

According to Bolin, planning is taking a higher priority, institutions having begun to look for ways to utilize the resources at their disposal. He stated that goals must be feasible and purposeful targets towards which the institution must direct itself, insuring that each operational activity--administrative, instructional, or otherwise--is included (12, p. 245). Goals, then, are basic to institutional strategy planning.

Winstead stated that "a clear statement of goals, measureable objectives derived from these goals, and an administrative style that emphasizes management to attain these objectives" can provide the necessary focus and direction for an institution to decide what it should do, wants to do, can do, and how it will go about doing it (129, pp. 669-670). To function effectively, the goals and objectives must be clearly articulated and receive institutional support. The systematic clarification of goals and perceptive planning and decision-making has become increasingly important in answering these expectations.
Examination of pursued goals and their related priorities reveals much about the problems which plague institutions. Where objectives, goals, and purposes are not just mere statements but are seriously considered, Chickering reported institutional impact is strengthened in three ways: (1) policies, programs, and practices tend toward greater internal consistency, (2) clear objectives help students make more explicit their purposes, and (3) clear objectives lend themselves toward a better awareness of their strong value commitments (29, p. 289). Finally, Chickering continued by stating:

As institutional objectives remain salient and are clearly expressed, a distinctive atmosphere develops. It develops not only out of the conscious effort of those who stay with the institution for some time—more importantly, it develops because prospective students and prospective faculty who resonate with the objectives and their modes of implementation, are accepted and remain. Through this process a community of shared values, which sustains its members and influences those who join, comes into being. Institutional objectives are thus of primary importance. Not only do they influence the emphasis given to one vector relative to another— for one college competence is most important, for another integrity, for a third autonomy and purpose. But their clarity and the internal consistency with which they are implemented largely determines whether any substantial development will be fostered or whether the student, subject of opposing forces, remains fixed or changes only in response to other outside pressures (29, p. 146).

Institutional Purpose

Seiber reported that the term "institutional purpose" is used in at least five ways in the literature on higher
education: (1) the activities of the institution, such as research, (2) the products and impacts of these activities, for example, new knowledge, (3) the motives which attract participation in the institution, for example, to be certified for a job, (4) the goals professed by the participants, for example, to get a degree, and (5) the desired ends which are incorporated into the institution's formal statements (106, p. 159). The formally stated goals must reflect the avowed ends of all the subcultures represented within the institution, as well as other external forces.

Lee indicated that insight must be gained into how to resolve the differences centered around the following specific issues: (1) ultimate goals, (2) priorities among goals, (3) criteria for determining the relevance of intermediate to ultimate goals, (4) the best means for achieving goals, and (5) the persons or groups responsible for decision-making (34, p. 2). Richman and Farmer stated that in considering goal systems and evaluation and measurement of institutional purpose, one must ask what the institution is trying to achieve, what its outcomes are projected to be, how this can be determined, and for what purposes management operates. The process of determining institutional purpose must involve operationalizing, evaluating, measuring, and verifying goal systems and priorities (101, p. 90).

Richman and Farmer set forth in a similar manner some basic questions which should be considered in investigating
the institution's goal system and priorities. These include: Who should we try to educate, in what fields, for what purposes, and in what ways? How much emphasis should we place on research? What kinds of public and community service should we pursue and emphasize? How important are other goals, such as athletics, cultural and religious assimilation, to the success of the institution? They further stated, "The institution's goal system should be in dynamic, not static, equilibrium" (101, p. 316). Priorities may have to be shifted in response to changing conditions.

J. W. Gardner, in Agenda for the College and University--Higher Education in the Innovative Society, enumerated the major problems and challenges facing higher education relative to institutional purpose. First, there must be a restoration of the status of teaching. Second, institutions must involve themselves in a thorough-going reform of the undergraduate curriculum. Third, the small, independent liberal arts college must be brought back into the mainstream of higher education. Fourth, more thought must be given to the purposes related to continuing education and off-campus instruction. Fifth, more pride must be taken in service to the larger community. Finally, among the other problems and challenges listed, was the improvement of the internal health of colleges and universities as functioning communities themselves. Gardner also stated that attention must be given to
morale, internal coherence, and adaptiveness of institutions of higher education (39, pp. 1-13).

In *Educational Planning and Program Management*, Miller stated that purposing, the determination of goals, encompasses four basic characteristics, indicating that a goal is (1) built upon historical precedent and philosophic premises, (2) worthy, (3) attainable, and (4) compatible with specifically stated objectives to be accomplished. He stated the purposing rationale is needed in determining the realness, trueness, and bestness of goals among the philosophic and ideational conflicts, since a purposeful goal system must be clearly defined and stated (83, p. 23).

Melton discussed a process which is important in determining institutional purpose--needs assessment. He stated that needs assessment must begin with the determination of "what should be." Following this, the next process Melton reported in needs assessment is to determine "what is." This involves a critical examination of how well the institution is performing in relationship to its institutional purposes concerning its specific goals and objectives. The needs may be determined by investigating the discrepancies between "what is" and "what should be" (81).

The Carnegie Commission on Higher Education discussed three major doctrinal views about institutional purpose. First, it should be concerned with a search for and socialization of values, a view which was supreme in the United
States prior to the Civil War. Second, it should serve the cause of the continuing evolution of knowledge and of skill development within society, which has been the dominant view for the past century. Finally, it should help prepare the way for and assist in the perpetuation of some designated type of society, the view which now stands out as the main challenge to the still dominant approach (25, p. 3). The following presentation and discussion of reports, surveys, studies, and other articles attempts to relate chronologically the points of interest about goals and purposes which are relative to this study.

Relevant National Reports

In 1938 the Educational Policies Commission stated that education is important for the kind of society in which we live. The democratic way of life establishes the purpose of American education. As the democratic way of life is being challenged at home and abroad, the achievement of democracy through education has become the most urgent and intensely practical problem facing education today. The Commission stated the following objectives for education: (1) self-realization, an educated person, (2) human relationships, an educated member of the family and community, (3) economic efficiency, an educated producer and consumer, and (4) civic responsibility, an educated citizen (114, p. 47).
In 1946 the United States President's Commission on Higher Education was established by Truman. Its subsequent report in 1947 expressed throughout, the basic theme of access to higher education, which must be expanded and democratized. The role of the federal government must increase to extend support to people and programs. Its three prime goals were "education for a fuller realization of democracy in every phase of living. . . for international understanding and cooperation. . . (and) for the application of creative imagination and trained intelligence to the solution of social problems and to the administration of public affairs" (121, p. 8). These goals were to be accomplished through the development of better individuals and the creation of conditions whereby education would permit individuals the full realization of educational rights in a democracy.

A decade later the National Education Association's Educational Policies Commission enunciated five purposes for higher education:

(1) to provide opportunity for individual development of able people, (2) to transmit the cultural heritage, (3) to add to existing knowledge through research and creative activity, (4) to help translate learning into equipment for living and social advance, (5) to serve the public interest directly (89, p. 10).

The Commission concerned itself primarily with the following questions about the future of higher education in American society:

For whom will college education be provided? How will higher education be financed? How
will it be organized? What are the desirable relations of higher education to the state? Is academic freedom in the public interest? What curriculums can best meet the hopes of talented youth and the needs of our times? What do Americans expect higher education to contribute to the future of America? (89, pp. x-xi).

The Commission further noted the desirability to maintain diversity in American higher education, stating that an "effective national enterprise is far more likely to result from many centers of initiative than from a tightly organized system of control" (89, p. 20). During the same year, the United States President's Committee on Education Beyond High School reported six propositions concerning the next ten to fifteen years as being important goals established by the Committee:

1. If the United States is to become increasingly a society of teachers.
2. The quantity of students and the quality of education cannot rise together unless basic educational resources also rise with sufficient speed.
3. The choice between quality and quantity is not mandatory. The Nation needs more of both, and it can have more of both if it decides to do so. The decision rests much more with the public than with the educators, and the public's decision must be expressed in terms of greatly increased financial support for colleges and universities.
4. Teachers must be enabled to increase their effectiveness, and buildings and all other educational resources must be used more efficiently, through improved management and more effective academic procedures.
5. It is of the highest importance that priorities be wisely established and firmly adhered to, that careful and comprehensive planning be done, with a high degree of lay participation, and that the efforts of neighboring institutions be better coordinated than ever before.
6. The coming years will require greater public understanding and support, a strong and sustained effort to enlarge and improve higher education, a burst of imaginative experimentation and many changes in our conventional educational practices. . . (122, pp. 4-5).

This Committee established its priorities in the following order: (1) teachers, (2) expanded educational opportunity, (3) cautious expansion of facilities, (4) financial assistance from all sources, including federal assistance, and (5) a residual federal role in higher education (122, p. 6).

In 1970 a Presidential task force chaired by Hester reported that the assessment of the "primary federal objectives in higher education should be: (1) to make appropriate educational opportunities available to all those who were qualified, and (2) to sustain high-quality centers of academic excellence throughout America" (123, p. vi). Three immediate priorities were suggested: first, to provide access to higher education for disadvantaged students of all races; second, federal support for health care professional education was recommended; and third, expansion of tax incentives was sought so that more private funds would be given to private higher education (123, pp. iv-v). The task force also asked institutions to improve the quality of the curriculum and methods of teaching and learning, to make more efficient use of their resources, and to clarify the method of institutional governance (123, p. vi).

One year later, in 1971, the Assembly on University Goals and Governance issued a statement of eighty-five goals
which were compressed into nine themes. The nine themes are as follows: (1) "Learning: the Central Mission;" (2) "Knowledge as a Basis for Educational Reform," which includes the need for self-scrutiny by institutions of higher education; (3) "Admissions and Attendance: Extending Choice;" (4) "Experimentation and Flexibility in Undergraduate and Graduate Education;" (5) "Diversification and Differentiation;" (6) "Preserving the Private and Public Systems;" (7) "Enhancing the Professoriate;" (8) "The Presidency: Governance by Delegation and Accountability;" (9) "Self-Help," which explains what institutions can do for their own survival (4, pp. 6-10). The Assembly called for a rethinking of academic goals and made a number of recommendations. Learning should be emphasized as the goal to which governance should be directed. The University is not a place where total participation is possible. Strong, accountable, and experienced institutional leadership is needed and should be exercised in a manner which takes into account opinions and values of the whole university community (105).

In 1972 the Newman "Report on Higher Education" was published under the aegis of the United States Office of Education. The report indicated some of the concerns that led them to define new types of goals. They found "disturbing trends toward uniformity . . . growing bureaucracy, over-emphasis on academic credentials, isolation of students and faculty from the world--a growing rigidity and uniformity of
structure that makes higher education reflect less and less the interests of society" (91, p. 28). The antidote to the trends would be more diversity and responsiveness in the system, based on a broader concept of "what a student is, what a college is, and how one gets an education" (91, p. 28). The committee has resolved to ask different types of questions, such as Was the lockstep (high school--college--career) necessary? Was growth good? Why weren't the other sources of education (proprietary, military, business) recognized by the academics?" (91, pp. 28-30). Questions were raised concerning the "paradox of access," the "credentials monopoly," and "unfinished business in minority education," and the community college.

In 1973 the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education published The Purposes and Performances of Higher Education in the United States: Approaching the Year 2000. This evaluative report set forth purposes for the whole system of higher education, stating neither the purposes as envisioned or the performances related to them apply equally to all institutions. The main purposes for today and the prospective future were enumerated by the Commission:

1. The provision of opportunities for the intellectual, aesthetic, ethical, and skill development of individual students, and the provision of campus environments which can constructively assist students in their more general developmental growth,
2. The advancement of human capability in society at large,
3. The enlargement of educational justice for the post-secondary age group,
4. The transmission and advancement of learning and wisdom,
5. The critical evaluation of society--through individual thought and persuasion--for the sake of society's self-renewal (25, p. 1).

Purpose one was defined as: "The campus has a basic responsibility to provide good educational opportunities for its students (1) to develop an understanding of society, (2) to obtain academic and technical competence in selected fields, (3) to fulfill appropriate standards of academic conduct, and (4) to explore cultural interests and enhance cultural skills" (25, p. 19). Purpose two was defined as: higher education has a great responsibility for (1) developing and making available new ideas and new technology, (2) finding and training talent and guiding it to greater usefulness, and (3) generally enhancing the information, the understanding, and the cultural appreciation and opportunities of the public at large" (25, p. 23). Purpose three was defined as: "Higher education has an obligation to join with and to assist other institutions in society in providing educational opportunities for persons who seek them beyond the secondary level" (25, p. 36). Purpose four was defined as

Higher education has a fundamental obligation to preserve, transmit, and illuminate the wisdom of the past, to provide an environment for research and intellectual creativity in the present, and assure the future of the trained minds and the continuing interest so that the store of human knowledge may keep on expanding--all this beyond reference to any current practical applications.
We include here basic research in science and social science, humanistic scholarship, creative artistic activity, and speculative social thought (25, p. 40).

Purpose five was defined as: "Faculty members and students, as an integral part of their yearly activities, should have both the freedom and the opportunity to engage in the evaluation of society through individual thought and persuasion (25, p. 50).

As the Commission stated, purposes accumulate and grow in complexity as the trained intellect becomes more essential to the effective conduct of society. The four "historic" purposes were translated by the Commission into the five current and future purposes:

1. Personal development can be translated into the education of the individual student and the provision of an environment for developmental growth,
2. Economic advancement, into aspects of advancing human capability in society at large,
3. Political health, in part, into educational justice and into evaluation of society,
4. Service to society, into aspects of advancing human capability,
5. Pure scholarship has come along more as a companion of these four historical purposes than as a consciously chosen purpose by American society. We believe, however, that it should now be set forth formally as a central purpose, as we have done above (25, p. 63).

The Commission referred in its report to educational development, rather than socialization of students, utilizing the term "academic socialization." Academic socialization includes inculcation of the virtues of hard work, of postponed gratification, of the integrity of one's personal
performance, of respect for the facts, of cognitive rationality, of independence of mind, of the "recognition of differential achievement," and of the "acceptance of functionally necessary authority" (25, p. 19). All these are values of high importance in a successful academic life. They may also be characteristics of worth in many other endeavors.

Finally, the National Commission on the Financing of Postsecondary Education established in 1973 a preliminary set of objectives--"learning opportunities (access, choice, relevancy, completion, and employability) and learning operations (cooperative independence, pluralistic support, and managerial responsibility)" (119). The Commission stated that, although the study of past or contemporary goals for higher education may seem remote from the daily struggle of keeping an institution alive, modern concepts of management stress the necessity for investigation and delineation of objectives. The end of growth, new societal values, and different expectations for higher education all heighten the need for leaders in higher education to know what education has aimed for in the past and what the primary targets are in the near future.

Relevant State Reports

Trivett, in his review of several state goal statements, indicated that, while state documents include the usual inherent abstract language of goal statements, they also include specific objectives for the particular state and an
awareness of the political necessities and immediate priority needs of the state. These statements have included provision for access, appropriate institutional function, and regulation of growth; and the levels have included social, cultural, economic, and humanistic, psychological objectives. He stated that the state goal statements demonstrated the integral relationship of goals to evaluation and planning. The various statements have shown an awareness of contemporary movements in higher education: lifelong learning, post-secondary education, and the effects of no growth (119).

The University of South Florida in Tampa stated its goals in 1959. Prospective students of higher education in Florida were to be afforded the opportunity for personal development in eight basic areas. The institution must foster (1) skills in writing, speaking, reading, and listening, (2) self-reliance and clear thinking, (3) understanding oneself in relation to others, (4) understanding and appreciating our heritage, (5) intelligent approaches to problems, (6) understanding language, (7) professional competence, and (8) healthful development of the body (1, p. 35).

Hobbs acknowledged in the Oklahoma statement that one purpose for the elaboration of goals was to remind institutions of the purposes for which they were created by society. After studying the Goals for Oklahoma Higher Education, 1966, Hobbs published the statement in a planning format in 1970. Within Hobbs' statement, the Oklahoma goals were divided into
four types: "those related to individual needs; those related to societal needs; those related to the nature of higher education; and those related to effectiveness and support" (53, p. 19).

Two items of importance may be noted from the New Jersey Board of Higher Education volume, Goals for Higher Education. First is a clear statement of the relation of goals to current society and to planning:

The establishment of goals requires understanding and judgment. Goals must be based on a broad conception of the trends and developments taking place in society. Goals necessarily reflect values and are therefore difficult to formulate. Nevertheless, the establishment of goals is the crucial step in the planning process, and it is in the effort to reach the goals that all planning decisions are made (90, p. 3).

Second, although many of the state goals hint at the need for the preservation or encouragement of academic as a goal, the eighth New Jersey goal is simply "to sustain academic freedom" (90, p. 14).

The New York Regents in 1971 detailed the interrelationships of goals and planning as: "the establishing of goals; the execution of research; . . .; and the making of decisions based upon value judgments" (97, p. 221). This statement combined individual and state educational needs and represented a statement which is fairly typical of state goal statements. The statement included equality of access to all citizens over time and over level, a comprehensive system, both diverse and flexible, excellence where scholarship
is recognized, meeting educational needs of society by combining career objectives and manpower needs, and community needs (97). As seen in other state goals, many of these goals are interlocking and interdependent. The statement also listed "concerns" which attempted to link goals to immediate problems.

In 1972, the South Carolina Commission of Higher Education considered goals and objectives for the entire spectrum of postsecondary education in South Carolina for the decade of the 1970's. The Commission was concerned with higher education structure, programs, financial aspects, building needs, and the relationship between public and private institutions of higher education. The Commission stated these goals:

(1) to provide the opportunity for learning beyond the secondary school level for all who seek it, (2) to reduce the socioeconomic barriers to higher education, (3) to improve the efficiency of higher education, (4) to improve the quality of higher education, (5) to encourage research and creativity within higher education, (6) to better utilize the resources of higher education in public service, (7) to sustain among the citizens of the State an appreciation and an understanding of its commitment to improve the quality of life, and (8) to preserve a strong nonpublic sector of higher education (109, p. 4).

It should be pointed out that, in addition to the usual state goals, the Commission included the goal of preserving the nonpublic sector, "recognizing the vital contribution made by the state's private institutions and the adverse impact on the state if the load carried by them is significantly reduced" (109, p. 5). Also unusual was the goal
of sustaining the appreciation of the state's citizens for what higher education does (109, p. 4).

The California Coordinating Council's Select Committee suggested in 1972 that the purpose of goals is to "inspire" the public to support a system of higher education (20, p. x). It stated that goals were necessary both for future planning and for evaluation of previous efforts. Reasons cited concerning the planning effort were increased enrollments, uncontrolled local aspirations, fear of segmental competition, and a "plethora" of questions from the political arena (20, pp. i-ii).

Peterson's study in 1973 of the goals of 116 institutions of higher education in California focused on twenty institutional goals, thirteen which were referred to as output goals, and seven as process goals. Many of these goals were similar to those dealt with by Gross and Grambsch and Bladridge, which are reported in the following section. For each goal statement the respondents, using a five-point scale, gave two judgments: (1) how important is the goal, presently, at the institution; and (2) how important should the goal be (96).

Among the most significant discrepancies revealed by Peterson's study were the following: (1) students between individual personal and academic development, (2) the faculty between accountability and efficiency (they generally thought there should be substantially less); however, they attached
high importance to the creation of a better intellectual and aesthetic environment; (3) community people between vocational preparation (except for the junior colleges) and individual personal development (they wanted significantly more emphasis); however, they felt that there should be significantly less emphasis on freedom, including off-campus political activities by faculty and students, faculty presentation of unpopular or controversial ideas in the classroom, faculty and student life styles, and talks by highly controversial speakers on campus; (4) administrators about freedom (they felt there should be more) (96).

The only perfect correlation in the survey involved community college presidents and other administrators who gave identical "should be" rank orderings for the twenty goals. The correlations were generally higher among the private institution constituencies than they were in the state college system. Most significant discrepancies at the private schools were found to involve trustees and students. Greatest diversity regarding goal systems was found in the private institutions, as is to be expected. While accountability and efficiency ranked relatively low as a "should be" goal by both faculty and students in all groups, it ranked higher in the private sector than at the state college campuses. Students desired considerably more emphasis on vocational preparation at the private schools and state colleges, which suggested why so many of these
institutions, especially the higher cost private schools, are having trouble attracting enough students.

The Peterson study indicated that getting from "is" to "should be" is far easier in theory than in practice. If the relatively high consensus "should be" goals are to be pursued in an effective and efficient manner, they have to be operationalized, evaluated, measured, and verified in concrete ways . . .; restructuring and operationalizing goal systems and priorities, and getting from perceived goals to "should be" goals, requires truly effective, creative, and often courageous institutional leadership and management" (101, p. 99).

All campus personnel must be made to realize that reordering certain priorities, operationalizing the goal system, and pursuing some new kinds of goals is in both their own and the institution's best interest. Finally, the Peterson study revealed that various off-campus groups are clearly out of sympathy with what they perceive many campuses are doing. Freedom, participation, and other related aspects of campus life were seriously questioned. Peterson contended that lay people can understand and will accept institutional goals if campus officials will communicate these goals. He further stated that

off-campus constituencies, individuals, and actual potential financial supporters will be much more likely to accept and support an institution with enthusiasm if they see its goals and priorities are sufficiently operational, reasonably clear and verifiable, adequately meaningful to them, and also in substantial part (if not entirely) relevant to them (96, p. 33).
Other Relevant Studies

In 1960 Havighurt's *American Higher Education in the 1960's* was published. He listed the goals for the next decade as being educational opportunity, social mobility, investment in human resources, education as a consumption good, and general liberal education. He clarified that general liberal education must incorporate the personal growth of an individual and must be public in the sense that self-fulfillment has to include making a contribution to society (48, p. 52).

In their publication concerning American higher education in 1965, the purposes of higher education were summarized by Brown and Mayhew as:

1. Higher education is the method by which people are selected, screened, trained, and placed in the more desirable and more influential positions in society.

2. Higher education provides a custodial function for young people whom the labor market is not yet ready to absorb. Particularly in residential colleges, it provides a place where late adolescents can be away from home, yet subject to some greater supervision than they would receive in the full adult role.

3. Higher education is a device used to help young people search and find their own personal identities and to understand the identities of others.

4. Higher education is one of the devices by which research and intellectually related services are provided to the society. Through research, scholarship, extension services, museums, libraries, and the sponsorship of lectures and cultural events, higher education is intended to provide a leadership functions (15, p. 11).

In 1968 Lee stated that the basic functions of higher education are teaching and learning. He identified other
functions as being research and public service. Research is to enhance and strengthen teaching or public service and may differ from institution to institution or even department to department. Lee believed that public service is obviously more common with the community than teaching and research. He indicated that contemporary America is dependent upon the university for socially beneficial research and innovation, as well as the development of manpower.

A survey of college and university administrators conducted by Nash and Sieber in 1968 revealed the goals which are espoused by institutional authorities. In most cases the response was from the academic dean. The goals stressed by more than half of the administrators were those that concern socialization of students and those concerning organizational maintenance and expansion. The socialization goals most frequently endorsed the following: to improve the quality of instruction; to provide a basic liberal education and appreciation of ideas; to induce students to develop all of their human potential--intellectual, emotional, social, aesthetic, and moral; to develop moral capacities, ethical standards, and values; and to provide professional training, teaching skills, and other techniques directly applicable to a career. Goals of organizational maintenance and expansion most frequently mentioned were: to increase the number of books in the library; to increase the institution's resources in general; to develop better public relations in
order to increase recognition in the community, state, or region in which the institution is located; to add new physical units—for example, a new library or gymnasium; and to increase the utilization of present facilities (88). The results indicated that expressive socialization or basic liberal education, development of all human potential is subscribed to more often than instrumental socialization or professional training and the like.

Research was among the goals least often emphasized; teaching or socialization of students being far more important to the administrators as a whole. Also infrequently emphasized were goals concerning student freedom and participation in governance. Neither the most nor the least frequently endorsed goals entail service to community or to society at large (88).

According to Nash and Sieber then, in the higher education system as a whole, the rank-order of administrative goals may be reported as follows: (1) teaching and socialization, (2) organizational maintenance and expansion, (3) service, and (4) research. The study also revealed private colleges and universities are most desirous of providing a basic liberal education and an appreciation of values. The private schools are also most often concerned with attracting students of high academic aptitude (88).

Gross and Grambsch in 1968 and Gross in 1971 did major studies on perceived and preferred goals in the mid 1960's
and an additional study focusing on the 1967-1971 period. The questionnaire was sent to administrators and a sampling of faculty at the same universities. The questionnaire contained a list of forty-seven goals, including four categories of output goals and four categories of support goals. Each respondent was asked to state the relative degree to which each goal was important and the relative degree to which a goal should be important--perceived and preferred (101, p. 96).

In the 1967 survey, protecting academic freedom distinctly ranked as the first perceived and preferred goal. Only one directly student-related goal ranked in the top seven as both a perceived and preferred goal, "train students for scholarship, research, or both." The relatively low ranking of almost all student-related goals clearly suggests at least one reason for the amount of student unrest and discontent during these years. Even more important, preferred goals involving students did not differ markedly in most cases from the perceived goal rankings, and often ranked lower (101, p. 97). The 1967 study was not encouraging with regard to the preferences and interests of external constituencies, especially actual and potential financial contributors. It is not surprising, considering the results, that so many outsiders have become disenchanted with universities. And, if faculty and administrators' attitudes toward goals and priorities do not change significantly,
many academic institutions are probably due for increased problems and conflicts with external groups and constituencies.

Gross and Grambsch's 1964 study clearly suggested why so many private universities and colleges in particular are in serious trouble today. They found that private schools emphasize preserving institutional character, conducting pure research, protecting academic freedom, providing faculty with maximum opportunity to pursue their careers in a manner satisfactory to them, gaining institutional prestige, accommodating only students of high potential, and other elitist goals more than public universities do.

This study indicated the top seven perceived goals of American universities in order:

1. Protect the faculty's right to academic freedom.
2. Increase or maintain the prestige of the university.
3. Maintain top quality in those programs felt to be especially important.
4. Ensure the continued confidence and hence support those who contribute substantially to the finances and other material resource needs of the university.
5. Keep up to date and responsive.
6. Train students in methods of scholarship and/or scientific research and/or creative endeavor.
7. Carry on pure research (45, p. 29).

Only one of the goals (6) was concerned in any way with students. Five of the seven goals were support goals, and the remaining goal (7) was an output goal. Three of the top
five support goals had to do with maintaining the university's position in relation to other universities.

The four lowest ranked perceived goals (from the bottom up) were:

1. Make a good consumer of the student—a person who is elevated culturally, has good taste, and can make good consumer choices.
2. Keep the university from becoming something different from what it is now; that is, preserve its peculiar emphases and point of view, its "character."
3. Involve students in the government of the university.
4. Emphasize undergraduate instruction even at the expense of the graduate program.

Using the same procedure as was used for perceived goals, Gross and Grambsch identified nine top preferred goals:

1. Protect the faculty's right to academic freedom.
2. Train students in methods of scholarship and/or scientific research and/or endeavor.
3. Produce a student who has had his intellect cultivated to the maximum.
4. Maintain top quality in all programs engaged in.
5. Serve as a center for the dissemination of new ideas.
6. Keep up to date and responsive.
7. Maintain top quality in those programs felt to be especially important.
8. Assist students to develop objectivity about themselves and their beliefs and hence examine those beliefs critically.
9. Make sure the university is run by those selected according to their ability to attain the goals of the university in the most efficient manner possible (45, p. 32).

Here the actual seems in accord with the ideal, as the goal of protecting academic freedom headed the list. Students
fared better on the preferred list; preparing the student for scholarship and research, number 2, (also on the top perceived list) and two other goals number 3 and 8, are student-related goals.

The three lowest-ranked preferred goals (counting from the bottom up) were:

1. Keep the institution from becoming something different from what it is now; that is, preserve its peculiar emphases and point of view, its "character."
2. Involve students in the government of the university.
3. Make a good consumer of the student—a person who is elevated culturally, has good taste, and can make good consumer choices (45, p. 32).

The three lowest-ranked perceived goals were also among the lowest-ranked preferred goals; here, then, the ideal was congruent with the actual. In addition, four of the seven goals rated as those most emphasized were also those regarded worthy of emphasis:

- protecting academic freedom; maintaining top quality in programs felt to be especially important; keeping up to date and responsive; and training students in methods of scholarship, scientific research, and creative endeavor. On the whole, these correspondences are impressive evidence that, at least at the extremes, things are as they should be, in the eyes of administrators and faculty members (45, p. 34).

Gross and Grambsch indicated, in summary, that students as a group were not felt to be particularly important when respondents were asked about goals. Responses to this study indicated more attention should be paid to educating the
student and protecting the student's right of inquiry--cultivating his intellect, developing his objectivity, developing character and citizenship abilities, and producing a well-rounded student. More attention, as well, should be placed upon goals which encourage competent professors to remain with the university (45, p. 109). They reported that agreement was high concerning preferred goals, and, where disagreement did exist, it was slight. The study clearly indicated considerable congruence between the ideal and actual (45, p. 33). Gross and Grambsch stressed "that the few differences that exist in the values and attitudes of administrators and faculty, as revealed in their ratings of preferred goals, are too slight to warrant any inference of deep-seated conflict"--that administrators and faculty see eye to eye to a much greater extent than is commonly supposed (45, p. 115). They indicated the greater power of the administrators should not be regarded as inimical to the faculty or inconsistent with the role and purpose of the university.

Concerning their perceptions and attitudes, as revealed by the study, in only a few cases did faculty members disagree with administrators on what goals were emphasized, and the degree of disagreement was slight. More importantly, the same was true for preferred goals. Moreover, the same findings were obtained for administrators by rank. Higher ranking administrators tended to agree with faculty quite as
much as lower ranking administrators. It was found that faculty members had generally the same values as administrators and would, therefore, not change the direction of the university, even if faculty had greater power (45, p. 59).

Gross and Grambsch found that the larger universities pursued essentially the same goals as the smaller ones. The region in which the university was located was another negligible characteristic, insofar as goal emphasis and preference were concerned (45, p. 111).

Concerning private institutions, the patterns indicated emphasis upon the student's intellect, motivations related to faculty well-being, and position goals relating to the quality and prestige of the institution--educating those students with the utmost academic potential. As was also indicated in the Nash and Sieber study (88), private colleges and universities were found by Gross and Grambsch to be interested in providing a basic liberal education and an appreciation of values as well as attracting high aptitude students (45, p. 33). Private institutions placed a high value on output goals associated with the preservation, expansion, and dissemination of knowledge and with support goals associated with the well-being and satisfaction of faculty and with professional interests (45, p. 33).

Richman and Farmer reported that, in comparing aspects of Gross and Grambsch's 1971 goal rankings with their 1964
findings, not much overall change in the goal rank orders were discovered. A trend toward congruence within the universities on perceived and preferred goals was indicated; however, top goals continue to relate primarily to faculty interests (101, p. 98). Protecting academic freedom remained in first place in both categories. Private universities, already differing from public universities in 1964, were more distinctive in goals in 1971. Private universities had also been surrendering some of their functions to other higher educational institutions. A de-emphasis on research and graduate work was reported, as well as reduced emphasis on faculty interests and concerns. Although the 1971 survey indicated administrators and faculty tended to "see eye to eye" even more than in 1964, Richman and Farmer indicated that given the increased financial problems, and therefore, increased power conflicts, differences in goal preferences between them have likely increased considerably in many cases since the 1971 study (101, p. 99).

Swarr, in his 1971 dissertation concerning the goals of American colleges and universities, questioned what both faculty and administrators think goals "are" and "should be." He indicated there is general dissatisfaction with the attention goals are receiving. As in the case of Gross and Grambsch (45, 44), Swarr reported that faculty and administration do not so much disagree on emphasis placed on goals as has been assumed. He also indicated faculty and administration have similar goal and power structures (112).
In 1971 Baldridge focused on New York University, as well as presented and analyzed the results of a 1969 faculty senate survey on that university's goals. The survey asked faculty to rank the importance of nine university goals. In this survey little attention was given to the students' intellectual or personal development or preparing students for useful careers; little attention was given to the desires, needs, or interests of financial supporters; and no attention was given to university governance or management (7, pp. 118-123). The goal rankings were as follows: (1) teaching graduate students; (2) teaching undergraduate students; (3) research; (4) maintenance of university conditions attractive to excellent scholars; (5) enhancement of the reputation of the university; (6) maintenance of a scholarly atmosphere; (7) preservation of the cultural heritage; (8) application of knowledge to life situations; and (9) solution of problems of great national and international concern (7).

Baldridge and others analyzed some of the above goals and the faculty subcultures that grow up around them. There is a split between teaching and research. Teaching splits into working with graduates or undergraduates, in professional or vocational programs or in liberal arts or other units, with fulltime students or parttime adult education, and so forth. There is a rift between pure and applied research, which can involve an endless array of topics, fields, methodologies, projects, and approaches. And, there are
rifts involving the humanistic versus the deterministic emphases. Disciplinary and other specializations also promote the growth of subcultures with regard to goal systems (7). Baldridge stated that truly effective management and leadership is required to develop and implement programs that are beneficial to both the institution's viability and success and to its external market potential.

Brown, in *Student Development in Tomorrow's Higher Education--A Return to the Academy*, 1972, reported that little discussion or debate about what is to happen to students as a result of their exposure to higher education is taking place. As he stated in his monograph, most college goal statements include intentions to promote in students independence of thought along with critical thinking, to make students better citizens as well as to make them more knowledgeable about their cultural heritage, and to help students understand themselves and relate better to others, as well as to prepare them for a profession. In simpler terms, higher education has sought to make its students better persons. This goal needs critical scrutiny. "If higher education is to have an impact on student development, changes will have to be made in the academic arena that are consistent with this goal (16, p. 44). Although Brown indicated the resultant need to reorganize the student personnel staff, the recommendation also would necessitate a change in what is taught and how it is taught."
Brown indicated acceptance of student development as a major goal means bringing it into reality with new students and in new settings. He indicated a need to reaffirm and testify to the validity of this as a goal, as well as securing an institutional commitment to create an environment for student development (16).

Spalding, in "Policies for Higher Education," 1973, indicated simply that the traditional purposes of higher education are distinct but related. He related the purposes to functions: (1) to discover knowledge-research, (2) to teach knowledge-instruction, (3) to disseminate knowledge-public service, and (4) to preserve knowledge-preservation of society (110, pp. 135-144).

Bok, the president of Harvard, defined the goals of undergraduate education in "Going Beyond Goals," 1973. He described the goals as follows: (1) help students acquire knowledge and information by acquainting them with facts, theories, generalizations, principles, and the like; (2) train the intellect of the students through mastery of various disciplines or modes of conceptual inquiry, (3) develop intellectual skills and qualities of the mind, and (4) engender broad intellectual and aesthetic interests that will survive and grow after graduation (11, p. 3). The intellectual skills which are necessary include the ability to communicate orally and in writing with clarity and style and the capacity to analyze problems by gathering relevant
data. The qualities of intellect Bok set forth include respect for other points of view, presence of commitment, taste for learning, sensitivity to ethical considerations, and capacity to make discriminating moral and value choices (11, p. 4).

In "Challenges to Universities Through Year 2000," 1974, Sabin redefined the functions, responsibilities, and modus operandi of institutions of higher learning in light of the critical problems which will beset the world through the year 2000. The primary purposes and needs of higher education, according to Sabin, were as follows: (1) self-fulfillment and dignity, (2) change of universities to true institutions of higher learning and transfer of broad liberal education to postsecondary schools, (3) self-preservation and justice, (4) immunization of the spirit through enrichening and broadening experiences, (5) public service through development of leaders, securing of new understanding and knowledge, and analysis of problems, and (6) the uniting of nations and peoples through understanding and mutual acceptance (102, pp. 200-203).

Also in 1974, Metzger reported the results of a study which required responses to what "is" and what "should be" important concerning the goals listed on the Institutional Goals Inventory. Those goals that were perceived to actually be important were academic freedom, accountability/efficiency, democratic governance, and communications. Those goals which
he determined should be more important were communications, individual personal development, intellectual orientation, intellectual/aesthetic environment, and academic development (82).

Finally, Hetenyi reported the role of the American university during the same year as being a place for weighing fundamental thoughts--seeking to know and understand man and the universe, disseminating knowledge, and educating and training people--enabling them to become contributors to knowledge. He stated the university should expand the frontiers of human knowledge and understanding, disseminate its findings without proprietary restraints, and provide the highest level of formal preparation for all those who are capable of engaging in the enterprise of higher education (52, pp. 337-339).

Relevant Statements Concerning Private Higher Education

In 1965 Patillo and MacKenzie asserted that the principle assets of the church colleges are freedom to experiment and to serve special purposes, concern for progress of the individual student, and the espousal of humane values. They pointed out, however that these church colleges were insufficient in scholarly attainment of faculty, financial support, selection of students in relation to purposes, curriculum design, and other problem areas (94, p. 50).
Chamberlain and Shilling reported in 1967 concerning the desired outcomes of the educational programs of private liberal arts colleges. These outcomes were expressed as the acquisition and utilization of knowledge, and development of certain intellectual capacities, and the cultivation of certain attitudes, values, and appreciations which are considered in America to be the mark of a cultured man. The end result would be a knowledgeable, sensitive, and concerned individual, free from the limitations of a narrow, restrictive environment (27, p. 26).

Angel, in 1972, set "Some Considerations Regarding Goals for Church-Related Colleges," which are important to consider in discussing independent higher education and its goals. Angel stated the human as well as physical resources of many church-related colleges do not meet standards set by some more affluent public institutions. He indicated that private colleges, which have become more secular in practice, if not in purpose, must draw students on other grounds that specific "Christian" intent. Private church-related institutions have not been found to be consistent with the times. Angel stated self-study was called for concerning the following questions: (1) Who are we "as a community?" (2) What is our place in society? (3) How can we reconstruct our guiding philosophy and basic framework? (4) What are our plans to project a renewed, more up-to-date institutional self-image? (5) How can we incorporate
self-study and evaluation in the process of answering these questions and meeting the challenge of change? (3, pp. 340-346).

Locklin reported in 1973 on the Perceptions of Desired and Actual Goals and Influence Structure at a Small Private Liberal Arts College. The Goals Conference Survey sampled four groups in the college community: trustees, faculty, administrators, and students. Each group rated the current and ideal level of importance of twenty-nine goal statements. While the groups were more alike than unlike in their ratings, students and faculty had the highest level of agreement. Trustees had the least strong agreement with other groups. Generally, there was less agreement on what the relative importance of what goals should be than on how important goals actually are (68).

Lyman, the president of an independent university, asked why, in the face of a decline in the private educational sector in the United States, this sector could not be left unmonitored but well supported in order to make its contribution to American society. His answer, or argument, was twofold. First, the tide appears to be running against the private sector in American life generally. There is concern not for equality of opportunity, but for equality of results; there is a new-found passion for rationalizing the allocation and use of resources throughout our society. Secondly, the case for survival and support is subtle and difficult to make.
His defense argued from the overall advantages of pluralism to society and from the viewpoint that the contribution of independent schools derives from the variety and individual uniqueness. The suggested course of action begins with making the best possible case for pluralism. A second and related point is to improve understanding of other institutions and individuals involved with independent schools. Next, it must be demonstrated that the claims of excellence and individuality have been lived up to. Lastly, those in independent educational institutions must retain their capacity both to innovate and, where it is important to do so, to resist innovation (69).

Geier wrote that the church is in higher education because it believes in seeing human beings and their culture in an eternal perspective. The church bears witness in church-related colleges in that it believes that religion is the foundation of education and that without faith humanity cannot truly live. He stated further the church supports colleges today because in them men and women are engaged in the search for the meaning of the person, resisting the devaluation of the individual, and developing the gifts of the individual toward the attainment of wisdom and social responsibility. These are values and traditions worth preserving for humanity. Finally, in higher education, the church bears witness to the belief in an honest and unfettered search for truth. Geier indicated the commitment to
these purposes means more, not less, freedom for the scholar
(40, p. 9).

In a special report from the President, Walsh set
forth the goals and purposes of St. Edward's University
of Austin, Texas. The goal statement identified broad
purposes and specific goals:

I. Identification of the Institution in Terms
of Broad Purposes--St. Edward's University
is an independent, Christian, co-educational
university endeavoring to provide liberal
education and dedicated to:
1. creating an atmosphere which helps
student:
   -to develop operative values which
      integrate the person with needs and
      realities outside the self
   -to cultivate their powers of indepen-
      dent and balanced thought and action
   -to develop their capacities of dis-
      crimination and critical expression
      through exploration, experimentation,
      and concentration
   -to acquire a positive and realistic
      concept of their own abilities
   -to relate their experiences to the
      quality of their lives and to the de-
      cisions they must reach
   -to become competent, constructive, and
      creative members of an interdependent
      society
2. provide and environment which enables the
   faculty and staff:
   -to creatively explore and develop new
     processes for promoting learning
   -to grow within their respective fields
   -to share their competence with the wider
     community
3. participating in the wider community in
   order that the University and its members
   be able:
   -to respond to the obligations and rights
     of living in society
   -to fulfill the obligation of service

II. Specific Goals to Facilitate Fulfillment of the
Purposes
We aim to provide:
- a value orientation education
  by operating in a framework of the Christian values
  by integrating value considerations into the curriculum
  by offering opportunities to confront the value-dimensions of current problems
- in a person-oriented atmosphere
  by providing opportunities for responsible exercise of free choice
  by designing administrative and operational procedures which make maximum possible provision for individual differences and needs
  by offering widest possible scope for participation of students and faculty in institutional decision-making
- with a service-oriented focus
  by conducting research on the needs of the University and the wider community
  by initiating policy and programs in response to these needs
  by making resources available for the use of the wider community
  by increasing two-way awareness between members of the University and the wider community (124, pp. 1-2).

Finally, at the 1975 Workshop of the Independent Colleges and Universities of Texas, Incorporated, Muller, President of Johns Hopkins University, addressed the participants concerning "Is the Private Sector of American Higher Education Worth Preserving?" (87). Muller stated the fundamental purposes to which the private colleges and universities are committed. First and most important, independent colleges and universities are a crucial counterweight to public governance of public institutions of higher education. The second reason lies in the fact that many of the component colleges and universities are church related. To deny the choice of higher education in a denominationa...
context is to deny individual liberty, he stated. The third reason for the preservation of private higher education is the preservation of student choice. Finally, Muller highlighted the single aspect of diversity as being important to the survival of private colleges and universities, as well as to the American system (87, pp. 1-4).

**Important Texas Agencies**

A select Governor's Committee on Education Beyond the High School, having made a year-long study of the Texas system of higher education and identified its strengths and weaknesses, recommended solutions to the pressing educational problems of Texas. The Commissioner of Higher Education, Bevington Reed, had stated that, of the three options concerning the future of higher education--"confusion and chaos, coordination, or control"--which were brought about by the problems of "size, cost, and complexity," the most amenable of these is undoubtedly coordination (84, p. 1). The Committee recommended in 1965 to the Texas Legislature the creation of the Coordinating Board, Texas College and University System.

The Coordinating Board responsibilities include efficient planning on a state-wide level in the areas of financial planning, program development, services to students, and campus planning. However, the individual institutions retain the responsibility for planning and administration of
their own particular needs. The Board, being in the position of "facilitator and promotional agency..." must be concerned, in a positive, constructive manner with a broad spectrum of policies, issues, and questions whose resolutions must be achieved in a statewide context, rather than with individual institutions (84, p. 4).

Although it is generally assumed the Coordinating Board is concerned solely with governmental colleges and universities, it involves to a considerable extent the independent institutions in Texas. The following specifies the types of responsibilities of the Coordinating Board:

1. Coordinating the various state and local government-sponsored colleges and universities by supervision of programs and institutional authorizations and providing the usual budget and other services to the Governor and the Legislature.

2. Developing a statewide master plan for the orderly growth of the Texas system of higher education, with the cooperation of the independent colleges and universities and taking into account the programs they offer.

3. Encouraging cooperation wherever possible and legally permissible and entering into cooperative arrangements on a shared-cost basis; and

4. Administering certain programs for both government and independent institutions as the responsible agency for the state. Examples are the federal facilities grants program and the Texas Opportunity Plan loan program.

Three out of the four functions listed involve the independent sector directly, and the other activities involve it indirectly (65, p. 15).

It may be further observed that the statute creating the Coordinating Board also recognized the past and potential contributions of the independent institutions by providing:
The Board shall enlist the cooperation of private colleges and universities in developing a state-wide plan for the orderly growth of the Texas system of higher education, shall encourage cooperation between public and private institutions of higher education wherever possible, may enter into cooperative undertakings with such institutions on a shared-cost basis as permitted by law, shall consider the availability of degree and certificate programs in private institutions of higher education and shall cooperate with such private institutions, within statutory and constitutional limitations, to achieve the purposes of this act (65, pp. 4-5).

The Coordinating Board and its officers are concerned for the total Texas higher education enterprise, both government-sponsored and independently-sponsored, "in the development of a master plan and in other broad areas of responsibility and concern implied by the last three listed [above] responsibilities" (65, p. 15).

The independent sector of higher education consists of a diversified group of institutions. These institutions operate together as the Independent Colleges and Universities of Texas, ICUT. The ICUT currently is comprised of forty-two independent institutions which are fully accredited colleges and universities in Texas. In addition to operating the independent system, ICUT works in association with the Coordinating Board and the independent institutions in administering the Tuition Equalization Grant Program (67). The work of ICUT is accomplished through an Executive Council, the Executive Vice President, the Office of Planning and Research, the Office of Public Information, and the "efforts
of a dedicated core of trustees, alumni, students, faculty, [friends], and administrators" (67).

Since the position and status of the independent sector within the total system of Texas higher education are increasingly matters of public policy, in 1967 the Coordinating Board appointed a Liaison Committee on Texas Private Colleges and Universities, composed of seven college presidents. This body was charged to provide "a statement by the independent colleges and universities explaining what they consider their proper place in a state system of education, now and for the next two decades" (66). In 1968 the Committee concluded its task and submitted a study entitled Pluralism and Partnership: The Case for the Dual System of Higher Education, as its expression of position and recommendations. Upon recommendation of the Liaison Committee, the Independent Colleges and Universities of Texas, Incorporated was recognized as the official representative of private higher education (65, p. 19; 66). The Coordinating Board created an advisory committee on private universities and colleges, composed of the membership of the Executive Council of ICUT, Inc., which body has worked with the members and staff of the Coordinating Board in many areas relating to higher education in Texas. The Liaison Committee considered ICUT to be the best vehicle since its membership included the accredited independent institutions, as well as some of the unaccredited colleges which hold
affiliate memberships. ICUT voted to respond positively to the recommendation if requested to do so (65, p. 20).

The Liaison Committee indicated the stated purpose of ICUT makes it ideally suited to fill this role:

It shall be the purpose of this organization to promote and advance the interests of the Texas system of higher education, including both public-supported and independent colleges and universities, with special concern for the dual nature of the system, its quality, freedom and responsibility to serve the educational and cultural needs of the state, nation and world.

It shall further be the purpose of this organization to speak for the member independent colleges and universities as they serve and promote the purposes of the total Texas higher education system and accept responsibility for their share of the educational function.

It shall further be the purpose of this organization to assist in cooperative endeavors with state supported institutions and agencies in performing the educational tasks and meeting the educational needs of Texas.

It shall further be the purpose of this organization to represent the interests and to protect and promote the general welfare of the non-profit, tax-exempt independent colleges and universities located in the State of Texas (65, p. 20).

The Liaison Committee further classified its recommendations:

We believe it is essential that the independent colleges and universities have a new, vigorous, aggressive leadership, first within their own ranks in facing their present and future problems together, and second, with the public in general and with the government sector and agencies to promote a favorable climate in which the private institutions can fulfill their responsibilities and opportunities in higher education--and, indeed, survive. In all fairness, and because of the administrative considerations involved, we are cognizant of the
necessity for initiative, planning, and contracting craftsmanship to be developed by the private sector.

Third, the Liaison Committee finds that the greatest problems and the greatest potential for creative and effective cooperation and contracts for utilization of independent and government resources are at the local level in the metropolitan areas, and we recommend that federations of independent colleges and universities be organized to cooperate and contract for programs and services through a compact type of working arrangement, sharing responsibility in meeting the higher education needs of various metropolitan areas more fully and efficiently (65, p. 20).

Recommendations and Concerns for the Future

Higher Education for American Democracy (1947) and the 1971 Report on Higher Education (Newman Committee) represent benchmarks in the evolution of goals for higher education from past to present. A central theme since 1947 has been the goal of extending access or equality of opportunity for higher education. These tentative phases are equality of access through expansion, through openness, and now through equity for access. Universal access is defined less now as access for minorities and more as opportunity for success. Trivett indicated there have been changes in the relationship of the institution to students, involving a contracted, more specific set of expectations, with greater emphasis on the role of the learner as selector among alternate routes. This now broadens the meaning of access and is signified by the use of the term postsecondary education. He stated no-growth,
new social conditions, or the conscious selection and pursuit of new values by society may alter the goals proclaimed in future goal statements (119, p. 2). Most of the subgoals enunciated over the years can be interpreted in view of the access goal. Trivett stated this goal remained a unifying goal in 1973, but under different meanings. The character of the institutions to which one has access has changed. Diversity, flexibility, "lateral and vertical mobility," and delineation of institutional role are now more important to access for diverse students than is the expansion of facilities. In addition, an emphasis on the necessity, desirability and availability of recurrent, lifelong learning represents an attempt to broaden access throughout the lifetime of the population, replacing a stratified "adult education" (119, pp. 54-55).

Downey presented the major goal trends observable on the contemporary scene, which reflected divergence in views regarding educational aims. Attempts are being made to derive from the nature of knowledge itself appropriate aims, substance, methods, and outcomes of education. Attempts are being made to find in various modes of inquiry the appropriate aims, substance, and methods. Appropriate guides to educational objectives are being sought in the various types and levels of cognitive processes. Finally, attempts to consider the affective dimensions of learning are being made (35, p. 157). Massive
infusion of federal funds has helped firmly establish research in the interests of increasing knowledge as a commonly accepted and basic purpose of education (35, p. 167). Downey proposed the following goals: (1) The overarching goal of education in the future ought to be to educate for the survival of the individual, a tolerable physical and cultural environment, and some form of social order. (2) Another goal should be the counteraim to educate for a leisure-oriented society in which what work there is will take the form of service to society. (3) Renewed attention should be paid to the self-development aim of education. (4) Education should adopt the survival aim of educating for the development of a social conscience, to desire the preservation and improvement of man and his environment (35, p. 157).

Richman and Farmer indicated that, since goal systems at numerous institutions are going to change, systematic consideration of goal problems could be the most important thing that an administrator or academic manager should be doing now (101, p. 335). An institution should have a good, realistic idea of what it is and what it is doing before it decides where it is heading. This requires meaningful assessment of capabilities and limitations, strengths and weaknesses, potential advantages and resources. If the fundamental problem of goal system operationalization, verification, and restructuring is not handled
carefully and effectively during the rest of the 1970's and in the 1980's, much of the vitality, originality, and delight of the modern American higher educational institution may well be destroyed (101, p. 334).

Based upon the empirical research of other scholars and their own experience, Richman and Farmer presented the following as the future pursued goals of American universities, in rank order:

1. Protect the faculty
2. Undergraduate education
3. Financial support and resources
4. Faculty benefits and privileges
5. Graduate education
6. Research
7. Income, prerequisites, prestige, and job protection for administrators
8. Outside validation of programs
9. High institutional prestige and pride, good facilities, and healthy climate
10. Top quality in most important programs
11. Student scholarship, scientific research, and/or creative endeavor
12. Student intellectual development
13. Admission of students of high potential
14. Faculty governance
15. Student personal development
16. Truth
17. Athletics
18. Cultural and religious assimilation
19. Student activities and rights
20. Democratic governance
21. Innovation
22. Preparation of students for useful careers, jobs, and status in society
23. Public service
24. Social egalitarianism
25. Provision of culture and information to community
26. Part-time and continuing education
27. Accountability and goal-attainment verification
28. High quality in all program in a balanced way
29. Social criticism and activism
30. Operating efficiency
31. Effective and efficient staffing of management and support positions (101, pp. 119-120).

In Table I the suggested goal rankings for different types of universities and colleges are presented as indicated by Richman and Farmer concerning institutions considered by this present study (101, p. 122).

**TABLE I**

**SUGGESTED GOAL RANKINGS FOR DIFFERENT TYPES OF COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>High Prestige Private Schools</th>
<th>Less Prestigious Private Schools</th>
<th>Religion-Sponsored and Affiliated Schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Examination of the preceding table, taken from Rich-
man and Farmer, showed that protecting the faculty (12)
ranked first for all but one category of institutions
(101, p. 121). Faculty benefits (14) ranked relatively
high in all cases, and benefits for administrators (23)
ranked fairly high in most cases. It may seem unkind or
cynical, because professionals typically did not admit
that they were trying to optimize for themselves, even
when they really were. But realistic observations of
academic institutions, as well as other kinds of organi-
zations, suggest that when priority problems arise, the
personal angles come out first. Various influential and
possibly powerful off-campus constituents and outsiders
may care very much about such goals as job preparation
for students (8), part-time education (3), community
service (27), social egalitarianism (17), public service
(26), operating efficiency (25), effective and efficient
staffing of managerial and service jobs (22), and account-
ability with regard to goal attainment (31). These goals,
however, were generally ranked quite low (101, p. 121).
Table I also suggested some of the reasons why so many
students, particularly undergraduates, are at least some-
what disenchanted at many schools, even though undergrad-
uate education (2), at least in terms of quantity of students,
was often a relatively important goal. At many institu-
tions, students were not really considered very important
by the faculty, the administration, or the institution.
Some of the other student impact goals also were not ranked very high in Table I. Student activities and student rights (10), for example, did not rank very high, although they were somewhat higher in some of the sectors than others. Many schools did put teaching ahead of research (4). Religious schools, state colleges, and less prestigious private schools often placed considerable emphasis on the student's personal development (9), but frequently did not achieve this goal very effectively, or in a very broad or durable way. The same was often true of the student's intellectual development (6) and student scholarship, scientific research and creativity (7), even at quite a few institutions in the other sectors (101, p. 123).

According to McMurrin, long range goals, the large purposes of education, can be defined in reference to the culture, the society, and the individual. He stated the task of education is not simply the conversation of established values and institutions. In a society which is marked by social conscience and scientific intelligence, the schools and colleges are instruments of criticism and analysis. Goals enable people to generate a critical consciousness of themselves and examine and appraise themselves, their inheritances, and their creations. Institutions, then, "provide the means by which people achieve competence in knowledge and the arts and the
capability of judgment and action which are essential to the continuous restructuring and strengthening of the social institutions and to the building of creative vitality into the culture" (80, p. 148).

Blackwell reported on the policy statement of the Commission Goals for Higher Education in the South (in the next 20 years). The Commission stated that a number of commitments and changes were necessary. Higher education institutions in the South must be committed to the principle that every individual should have the opportunity to progress as far as interest and capability will allow. Universities and strong liberal arts colleges should abdicate their lower division responsibilities to community colleges. Quality may be increased by putting more finances into higher education in the South. Planning and coordinating agencies will be allocating finances and programs based on manpower supply and demand, student enrollments, and the cost effects in instructional goals. The characteristics of the current student generation, which include serious purpose, activism, intense desire to improve society, must be channeled into constructive activity.

According to Blackwell, goal-setting in operational terms is sometimes neglected. Too frequently, the mission of the institution is unclear, the catalogue statement, merely a series of platitudes. Trustees, faculty, and
administration should collaborate in formulating a statement which is subject to clear interpretation. The goals must be carefully determined so as to reflect for the particular institution a proper balance between teaching at the several levels, research, and service to the larger community (9).

According to Thompson, courses or programs that either now constitute or should constitute part of the general educational curriculum are to be established in a manner which accords to the them priority, instructional forms, scope, sequence, and relationships derived from persistent and changing human needs and from changes in knowledge and its uses (118, p. 247). In considering these program needs, Haywood indicated colleges and universities are becoming more involved in the problems of the community, state, and nation. Greater efforts are being made to apply research, consultation, and teaching skills toward the solutions of these problems by establishing programs aimed toward involving education in the solution process (49). Orlans indicated that in order for society to receive full benefit of expertise, the functions of a college or university should reach into various other institutions, such as research institutes, libraries, museums, theatres, and industrial laboratories (92).

McGrath reported information in defense of the small colleges, stating that in the future, the small college
(here denoting an institution of 1200 or fewer students) can offer clarity and singleness of purpose by placing limitations on its objectives, faculty, curriculum, and students. The primary aim for most small colleges should be education of students for a fuller personal life and sensitive participation in a democracy. A broad general education, unavailable elsewhere, can be offered and emphasis placed on good teaching in the undergraduate disciplines. The experience of small colleges indicates that the small college can attract dedicated teachers chosen on the basis of their commitment to teaching, to broad interdisciplinary units, and to the belief that specialization in the liberal arts college can be achieved by offering a few basic subjects well taught. Small colleges should adopt liberal admissions policies admitting students of a considerable range in ability. With its potential for close personal relationships and the cultivation of values, the small college should be uniquely concerned for the modern students' efforts to find meaning to their lives (79).

Jencks and Riesman argued that the public and private sectors have increasingly similar objectives and methods, and that the major differences between them today reflected differences between the students who chose one sector rather than the other. They qualified this generalization by suggesting that the public sector is unable
to support independent university colleges and has great difficulty supporting colleges with small homogeneous student bodies. These forms of distinctiveness are not important to most students, but it does seem that they should be preserved for those who value them. Jencks and Riesman stated, furthermore, that if public subsidies were equally available to all sorts of institutions, those under private control might well be able to do a better job than public ones in achieving conventional objectives, such as mass education at moderate cost. According to Jencks and Riesman, it would be unfortunate if America were to abandon its open system for a closed one in which nobody could establish or maintain a college unless he was either directly sponsored and controlled by the state, or else began with the enormous private resources needed to compete with top state institutions in terms of academic reputation (60, p. 290).

Finally, Elliot Richardson stated, in looking toward "Directions in Higher Education," the worst thing a college or university could do would be to try to adopt all recommended goals--or adopt any without questioning them (100, p. 295). He cited various national reports in indicating that flexibility and diversity should be the mainstays of higher education institutions. No institution should stop with one self-study, but it should create some mechanism for continuous introspection into its goals and purposes.
Summary

Throughout the literature, a number of major goal themes persist. First, the provision of opportunities for development of individual students through enriching and broadening experiences has been indicated to be of primary importance. Opportunities for reaching self-fulfillment and for increasing human dignity have become necessary parts of higher education. Second, there have been a number of faculty concerns which are of increased importance: (1) academic freedom, (2) salaries and benefits, (3) faculty development, and (4) increased institutional loyalty. Third, the development of quality programs and provisions for individual academic development for staff and faculty, as well as students, have been reported as being critical. Fourth, institutional financial efficiency and better utilization of resources have become more important. Methods of increasing confidence and financial support have become essential to institutional survival. Fifth, a number of important goals have bearing upon society, its positive growth, and self-renewal possibilities. Increased communication to bring about appreciation for and acceptance of higher education and to develop mutual understanding has been and continues to be increasingly important. The enlargement of educational justice and increased development of social conscience have been emphasized in the literature. Sixth, the employment and development of quality staff and leaders
in management and support positions to maintain effective and efficient institutional operation have received increased support and emphasis. Finally, more emphasis has been indicated for critical evaluation of higher education concerning accountability and goal attainment. Higher education leaders have recognized the various areas of conflict concerning goals and have seemingly emphasized responsible evaluation as a means for resolving differences. In attempting to become more accountable, higher education has placed emphasis upon resolving some of the various conflicts concerning goals between society's expectations and those of higher education.

In considering the broad categories of goals, the goal priorities derived from the literature were: (1) teaching and personal development through socialization, (2) efficient and effective institutional operation and management, (3) public service, and (4) research—the latter two emphasizing preservation of man and his environment. Much emphasis also has been expressed in the literature concerning the preservation of a pluralistic system of higher education. The continuing development of diversity in higher education through the survival of the nonpublic sector has become increasingly important. Specifically, the goals of higher education are: (1) protect the faculty and ensure academic freedom, (2) teach and develop students academically and personally,
(3) increase financial support and resources, (4) develop quality programs, (5) continue research, and (6) ensure sufficient and economical management of higher education.

Finally, increased emphasis has been indicated concerning the importance of systematic evaluation of institutional goals and the related problems. Meaningful assessment of goals and institutional capability are essential prerequisites to effective assessment of higher education programs. The process of systematic evaluation of institutional goals, programs, and personnel has been indicated as being critical to the survival of American higher education.
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CHAPTER III

PROCEDURES OF THE STUDY

This chapter describes the population of the study, development of the instrument, and the procedures utilized in gathering the data. In this chapter, except as otherwise noted, the data, procedures, and comments pertain to the independent senior colleges and universities in Texas. These procedures were planned in order to obtain the data necessary to fulfill the purposes of this study. First, an extensive review of related contemporary literature was conducted, utilizing both a manual search and a computer search of the literature for the purpose of compiling a list of major goals. Secondly, the opinions of selected leaders in independent higher education about goals were obtained in the process of validating the instrument. Thirdly, the opinions of persons currently in leadership positions about goals were obtained.

Description of the Population

Seven leaders in independent higher education, all of whom have broad expertise, are well-respected, and have made significant contributions to the field, were selected and asked to express their opinions concerning the appropriateness of the goals listed in the selected questionnaire (see
Appendix G). These leaders were also requested to prescribe what they considered to be the most significant goals over the next ten years.

In addition, persons who occupied positions of leadership and who had the capability of influencing the direction and goals of the colleges and universities were asked to express their opinions concerning the goals listed. The persons selected were the chief administrative leaders (presidents), the academic administrators (academic deans), and the faculty senate or council chairmen.

Development of the Instrument

The survey of literature resulted in the identification of a number of major goals in higher education. It was determined that these major goals were included in the questionnaire by Gross and Grambsh in their 1964 study concerning goals of institutions of higher learning (3, pp. 13-16). The goals were listed in the form of a questionnaire. A scale of values from one to five was utilized to indicate the respondent's judgment of the degree of appropriateness of the goals. Responses were to indicate judgment of:

1. how important each goal is at the institution and
2. how important each goal should be at the institution.

The list of goals was sent to the selected group of seven leaders in independent higher education to obtain their opinions as to the appropriateness of the goals and their opinions concerning the priority goals of independent higher
education over the next ten years. Accompanying the list of goals was a letter requesting their assistance, a general background information sheet, and instructions for responding (see Appendix B). In addition, a copy of the dissertation proposal was included providing an explanation of the purpose of the study, the procedures to be utilized in it, and an explanation of the respondents' role.

All seven of the judges responded, providing the responses requested. In addition to evaluating each goal listed, the judges were requested to make corrections, additions, or deletions.

A number of suggestions were offered pertaining to the phrasing of the goals listed. Additional goals were suggested, and several of the goals listed were rejected on the basis of the panel's responses.

Upon receiving the list of goals from the respondents of the panel of judges, the suggested corrections, based upon the condition set in Chapter I, were incorporated into the questionnaire (see Appendix D).

Procedures for Collection of Data

First, the independent senior colleges and universities in Texas were identified (4) (see Appendix F). Secondly, the names and addresses of the presidents of these institutions were obtained in order to seek permission for the institution to be utilized in the study and as a source to
obtain the names and addresses of the other institutional leaders to be surveyed (see Appendix C). Twenty-five of the thirty-four independent senior colleges and universities in Texas granted permission to be utilized in this study.

Of the institutions which responded, nine have an enrollment of less than 1000 students, ten have 1000-3000 students, and six have more than 3000 students. Fifteen of these institutions offer only the Bachelor's Degree, seven have offerings through the Master's Degree, and three have programs which lead to the doctorate. The makeup of the nine institutions which did not respond was similar to that of the responding institutions. Of those institutions which did not respond, four have an enrollment of less than 1000 students, four have 1000-3000 students, and one has above 3000 students. Four of these institutions offer only the Bachelor's Degree, four have offerings through the Master's Degree, and one has programs which lead to the doctorate. The similarity of these two groups seems to indicate that, if the other nine institutions had responded, the results would likely have not been different.

An envelope which contained a letter of introduction, a general background information sheet, a questionnaire (see Appendix D), and a stamped, self-addressed envelope for return of the questionnaire was mailed to each respondent. Ten days after the requested return date had passed,
a follow-up letter was mailed to each respondent who had not returned the questionnaire (see Appendix E). Table II shows the total number of persons in each group and the percentage of returns for each group and the total populations.

TABLE II

NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE OF RETURNS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Number Who Returned Questionnaire</th>
<th>Per Cent Returned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Presidents</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>76.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Deans</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>76.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Chairmen</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>81.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>77.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Since each college or university had three possible respondents, the number of respondents in the groups varied. It should be noted that four institutions did not have a faculty senate or council chairman. The group having the largest percentage of returns was the chairmen of faculty senates or councils. Academic deans and presidents had the same percentage of returns. The per cent of return specified in Chapter I was surpassed.
Procedure for Treatment of Data

Data from the returned questionnaires was compiled and classified according to the three basic groups--chief administrative leaders (presidents), the academic administrators (academic deans), and the faculty senate or council chairmen. The data was also compiled into subgroups based upon the primary group, the size of the institution, and the level of highest degree offered by the institution. The data was tabulated manually and then punched into cards for automatic processing at the North Texas State University Computer Center.

Means and rank order distributions were computed for each of the three groups relative to existing and preferred goals in order to rank each goal (1, p. 23). Based upon a comparison of means, no significant differences were obtained in the numerical ratings of each goal on both scales among persons in similar positions of leadership, across institutions of similar size and level, and for the total sample (2, p. 343). Data was compiled and reported concerning the general background information. In addition the future goals, as reported by the panel of judges and by the respondents, were detailed and discussed.

The data was compiled and reported in the form of tables to better illustrate the comparisons of each group's opinions concerning the goals.
Summary

The population for the study was identified and a questionnaire was selected and modified. The final questionnaire was utilized to gain further information pertaining to the opinions of institutional leaders concerning the goals of independent senior colleges and universities in Texas, current and projected over the next ten years.

The questionnaire was distributed to the chief administrative leaders (presidents), chief academic administrators (academic deans), and the faculty senate or council chairmen in the institutions from which permission had been obtained for it to be utilized in the study.

The procedures for the treatment of the data were identified and discussed in this chapter.
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CHAPTER IV

PRESENTATION OF DATA

To carry out the purposes of this study, questions were developed to be utilized in obtaining information concerning institutional goals. The specific questions are restated, and the relative findings with regard to each question are presented with discussion and analysis of the results.

Substantive Questions in the Study

Question 1

What are the major goals of the independent senior colleges and universities in Texas as established by the panel of judges?

Table III presents the number of positive responses to the goals listed. A positive response from five or more of the judges was necessary in order to warrant the inclusion of the goal in the questionnaire (see Appendix D). The major goals, as identified from the initial questionnaire (see Appendix A) by the panel of selected judges as being appropriate, are listed in the questionnaire.

From an examination of Table III it can be seen that the goal, 34, "Make sure that on all important issues (not
only curriculum), the will of the full-time faculty shall prevail," received no positive votes from the panel of judges. This is consistent with results reported in the 1971 findings of Gross and Grambsch of de-emphasis upon

TABLE III
NUMBER OF POSITIVE RESPONSES
BY PANEL OF JUDGES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

faculty interests and concerns. The goal, 47, "Keep this place from becoming something different from what it is now. . . .," received only one positive vote. Other goals receiving a significantly low number of positive votes were
11 and 12, which involve research, 21, which involves selection of only high quality students, 36, which has to do with faculty satisfaction based on faculty criteria, and 44, which involves maintaining an across-the-board quality of programs. The omission of these goals is consistent with findings concerning research goals and faculty interests as stated by Nash and Sieber and Gross and Grambsch; however, they are somewhat different from the suggested goal priorities of Richman and Farmer. It is important to note that several of the goals eliminated by the panel directly affect faculty--24, 30, 34, and 36. In addition, several of the goals eliminated by the panel directly affect students--7, 9, 20, 21, and 22. Finally, it is interesting to note that a support goal which is generally considered to be of vital interest to independent colleges--18, "Ensure the continued confidence and hence support of those who contribute substantially (other than students and recipients of services) to the finances and other material resource needs of the university," was eliminated.

Although the number of judges to recommend additional goals was not sufficient to add them, the following recommended additional goals were supported by two or three judges:

1. Work to increase the racial and social harmony of American society,
2. Strive to maintain alternate modes of instruction and opportunities for learning, and
3. Maintain a viable posture in relation to increasing costs, enrollment, and regulation problems.
Question 2

What is the level of agreement of the chief administrative leaders of the independent senior colleges and universities of Texas with respect to the stated goals?

The five point scale utilized in the questionnaire by the respondents is presented in Table IV.

TABLE IV

FIVE POINT SCALE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Importance Level</th>
<th>Scale Grade</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Of absolute importance</td>
<td>.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Of great importance</td>
<td>.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Of medium importance</td>
<td>.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Of little importance</td>
<td>.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Of least importance</td>
<td>.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table V presents the number of questions for which responses did not vary more than one scale gradation. From an examination of Table V it can be seen that over 70 per cent of the responses by presidents varied no more than one scale gradation in twenty-eight of the thirty-one questions. For twenty-three of the questions, responses by over 75 per cent of the presidents varied no more than one scale gradation.
### TABLE V

NUMBER OF QUESTIONS FOR WHICH RESPONSES DID NOT VARY MORE THAN ONE SCALE GRADATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Per Cent of Responses</th>
<th>Presidents</th>
<th>Deans</th>
<th>Faculty Chairmen</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>28*</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHOULD BE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Number of questions

Table VI presents the number of questions in which agreement of 60 per cent with one scale gradation was indicated.

### TABLE VI

NUMBER OF QUESTIONS WITH 60 PER CENT AGREEMENT ON ONE SCALE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Presidents</th>
<th>Deans</th>
<th>Faculty Chairmen</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IS</td>
<td>4*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHOULD BE</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Number of questions
Examination of Table V reveals that in four of the thirty-one questions for *is* responses (7, 21, 22, 31), over 60 per cent of the presidents agreed on the rating. Based upon the scale presented in Table IV, agreement of 70 per cent or more for *is* responses was expressed within one scale gradation for these groups: fourteen questions within scales 3-4, and five questions within scales 4-5.

Examination of Table V reveals that for the *should be* responses, over 70 per cent of the presidents agreed within one scale gradation in twenty-six of the thirty-one questions. In nineteen of these, agreement was indicated by over 75 per cent. Examination of Table VI reveals that in six of the thirty-one questions (1, 2, 4, 5, 11, 23), over 60 per cent of the presidents agreed on the rating for *should be* responses. Based upon the scale presented in Table VI, agreement of over 70 per cent for the *should be* responses was expressed within one scale gradation for these groups: ten questions with scales 3-4 and sixteen questions with scales 4-5.

Table VII presents the per cent of questions within which agreement was found to be over 70 per cent within two adjacent scale gradations for *is* and *should be* responses.
TABLE VII

PER CENT OF QUESTIONS WITH 70 PER CENT OF PERSONS IN AGREEMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Per Cent of Questions for:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Presidents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IS</td>
<td>90*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHOULD BE</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Per cent of questions

Question 3

What is the level of agreement of academic administrators with respect to the stated goals?

Examination of Table V reveals that for IS responses, over 70 per cent of the academic deans agreed within one scale gradation in eighteen of the thirty-one questions. In fourteen of these agreement was indicated by over 75 per cent. Examination of Table VI reveals that for the IS responses, in one of the questions (21) over 60 per cent of the academic deans agreed on the rating. Based upon the scale presented in Table IV, agreement of 70 per cent or more of the academic deans for the IS responses was expressed within one scale gradation for these groups: fourteen within scales 3-4 and four within scales 4-5.

Examination of Table V reveals that for SHOULD BE responses, over 70 per cent of the academic deans agreed
within one scale gradation in twenty-two of the thirty-one questions. In eighteen of these agreement was indicated by over 75 per cent. Examination of Table VI reveals that for the should be responses, in three of the thirty-one questions (2, 5, 8) over 60 per cent of the academic deans agreed on the rating. Based upon the scale presented in Table IV, agreement of 70 per cent or more of the academic deans for the should be responses was indicated for these groups: five questions within scales 3-4 and seventeen questions within scales 4-5.

Examination of Table VII reveals that the amount of agreement indicated by the academic deans' responses is less than that indicated by faculty chairmen and substantially less than the presidents' level of agreement. Agreement of 70 per cent within one scale gradation is indicated in over 58 per cent of the thirty-one questions for the is responses and in 71 per cent for the should be responses. As in the case of responses by presidents, responses by academic deans were generally at a higher level for the should be responses than the is responses.

**Question 4**

What is the level of agreement of faculty leaders with respect to the stated goals?

Examination of Table V reveals that for the is responses, over 70 per cent of the faculty chairmen agreed
within one scale gradation in twenty-two of the thirty-one questions. In thirteen of these agreement was indicated by over 75 per cent. Examination of Table VI reveals that for the *is* responses, in one of the questions (17) over 60 per cent of the faculty chairmen agreed on the rating. Based upon the scale presented in Table IV, agreement of 70 per cent or more of the faculty chairmen for the *is* responses was expressed within one scale gradation for these groups: two questions within scales 2-3, eighteen questions within scales 3-4, and two questions within scales 4-5.

Examination of Table V reveals that for the *should be* responses, over 70 per cent of the faculty chairmen agreed within one scale gradation in twenty-six of the thirty-one questions. In twenty-four of these agreement was indicated by over 75 per cent. Examination of Table VI reveals that for *should be* responses, in four of the questions (2, 4, 14, 24) over 60 per cent of the faculty chairmen agreed on the rating. Based upon the scale presented in Table IV, agreement of 70 per cent or more of the faculty chairmen for the *should be* responses was indicated for these groups: eight questions within scales 3-4 and eighteen within scales 4-5.

Examination of Table VII reveals that the amount of agreement indicated by faculty leaders was slightly greater
than that indicated by academic deans, but less than that indicated by presidents. Agreement of 70 per cent within one scale gradation is indicated in 71 per cent of the thirty-one questions for the is responses and in eighty-four per cent for the should be responses. As in the cases of the other two groups of institutional leaders, the faculty leaders' responses are generally somewhat higher for the should be responses than for the is responses.

**Question 5**

What is the level of agreement between the leaders' perceptions of what each goal is as compared to what they prefer them to be?

Table VIII presents the number of questions within which agreement was found to be over 70 or 75 per cent within one scale gradation, and the number of questions in which agreement of 60 per cent was indicated for the rating.

**TABLE VIII**

NUMBER OF QUESTIONS FOR TOTAL RESPONSE FOR WHICH AGREEMENT WAS INDICATED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>One Scale Gradation</th>
<th>Two Adjacent Scale Gradations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>is</td>
<td>2*</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>should be</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Number of questions
Examination of Table VIII reveals that for the is responses, over 70 per cent agreed within one scale gradation in twenty-two of the thirty-one questions. In twelve of these agreement was indicated at over 75 per cent. In two of the questions (21, 22) over 60 per cent agreed on the rating. Based upon the scale presented in Table IV, agreement of 70 per cent or more was expressed within one scale gradation for these groups: two questions within scales 2-3, seventeen questions within scales 3-4, and three questions within scales 4-5.

Examination of Table VIII reveals that for the should be responses, over 70 per cent agreed within one scale gradation in twenty-five of the thirty-one questions. In eighteen of these agreement was indicated at over 75 per cent. In three of the questions (2, 4, 5) sixty per cent agreed on the rating. Based upon the scale presented in Table IV, agreement of 70 per cent or more was expressed within one scale gradation for these groups: nine questions within scales 3-4 and sixteen questions within scales 4-5.

Further examination of Table VIII reveals that agreement of 70 per cent within one scale gradation was indicated in 71 per cent of the thirty-one questions for the is responses and in 80 per cent for the should be responses. This seems to indicate that, although the per cent for the should be responses is 9 per cent higher, the level of agreement is reasonably consistent and substantially high.
### Table IX

**Rank Order Based on Leaders**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>IS Presidents</th>
<th>IS Academic Deans</th>
<th>IS Faculty Chairmen</th>
<th>SHOULD BE Presidents</th>
<th>SHOULD BE Academic Deans</th>
<th>SHOULD BE Faculty Chairmen</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>*2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>*4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>*29</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>*29</td>
<td>*30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>*4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>*1</td>
<td>*23</td>
<td>*1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>*8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>*1</td>
<td>*23</td>
<td>*23</td>
<td>*22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>*22</td>
<td>*1</td>
<td>*30</td>
<td>*6</td>
<td>*4</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>*6</td>
<td>*6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>*6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>*6</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>*22</td>
<td>*3</td>
<td>*16</td>
<td>*5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>*24</td>
<td>*8</td>
<td>*15</td>
<td>*29</td>
<td>*31</td>
<td>*8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>*29</td>
<td>*22</td>
<td>*23</td>
<td>*22</td>
<td><strong>25</strong></td>
<td><em>8</em>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>*25</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>*24</td>
<td>7**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>*28</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>*24</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>*17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>*28</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>*24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>*16</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>*15</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>*8</td>
<td>*24</td>
<td>*3</td>
<td>7**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>*30</td>
<td>*15</td>
<td>*25</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>*3</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>*29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>*27</td>
<td>*16</td>
<td>*13</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>*16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>*17</td>
<td>*17</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>*27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>*19</td>
<td>*18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>*7</td>
<td>*20</td>
<td>*21</td>
<td>*11</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>*15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>*18</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>*13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>*21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>*14</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>*21</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>*11</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>*13</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>*11</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>*14</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>*18</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>*14</td>
<td>9**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>*14</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>*10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>*10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Tied Ranks*
Again, although the level of agreement is similar for both sets of responses, the level of the responses based upon the scale presented in Table X is somewhat higher for the should be responses. This may indicate institutional leaders feel that their respective institutions are not performing with quite as much emphasis upon particular goal as is deemed necessary by these institutional leaders. Agreement on the goals is consistent with the similarities of goals and objectives found by Jencks and Riesman in 1968, and Gross and Grambsch in 1964 and 1974, Swarr in 1971, and Locklin in 1973.

**Question 6**

Are there goals which are presently not being served that should be added or others which should be deleted?

The goals which were eliminated, by the panel of judges, from the initial questionnaire (see Appendix A) were reported in the prior discussion about Question 1 of this study. Also, several additional goals were suggested by the judges, but not to such a substantial number so as to be added.

Based upon the responses received from the institutional leaders, there were no suggestions for the addition of goals which were not presently being served. Three of the respondents indicated that goals 14 and 30 were not clear. Although this is not a substantial number, perhaps greater clarity is needed concerning these two goals.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Presidents</th>
<th>Academic Deans</th>
<th>Faculty Chairmen</th>
<th>Presidents</th>
<th>Academic Deans</th>
<th>Faculty Chairmen</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>*23</td>
<td>*5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>*29</td>
<td>*4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>*23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>*6</td>
<td>*1</td>
<td>*2</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>*8</td>
<td>*4</td>
<td>*5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>*5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>*28</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>*24</td>
<td>*6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>*5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>*22</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>*30</td>
<td>*22</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>*22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>*23</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>*31</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>*24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>*31</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>*4</td>
<td>*15</td>
<td>*22</td>
<td>*27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>*15</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>*28</td>
<td>*16</td>
<td>*29</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>*29</td>
<td>*17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>*23</td>
<td>*30</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>*1</td>
<td>*22</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>*29</td>
<td>*31</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>*30</td>
<td>*15</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>*8</td>
<td>*7</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>*31</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>*24</td>
<td>*24</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>*17</td>
<td>*7</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>*16</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>*24</td>
<td>*19</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>*25</td>
<td>*25</td>
<td>*8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>*25</td>
<td>*25</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>*3</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>*25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>*3</td>
<td>*28</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>*7</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>*14</td>
<td>*30</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>*27</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>*16</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>*11</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>*17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>*29</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>*17</td>
<td>*13</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>*12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>*7</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>*26</td>
<td>*19</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>*19</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>*21</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>*13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>*7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>*21</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>*26</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>*19</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>*12</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>*14</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>*14</td>
<td>*9</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>*9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>*10</td>
<td>*12</td>
<td>*14</td>
<td>*10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>*10</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Tied Ranks
Question 7

Are there significant differences in level of agreement concerning goals (a) among persons in similar positions of leadership, (b) among institutions of similar size and level, and (c) for the total sample?

Based upon the responses given to the thirty-one questions (see Appendix C), Tables IX through XII present the rank order of questions for the should responses and the responses. Tables XIII through XVI present the Spearman Rank Order Correlation RHO and the F Test results.

Examination of Table IX reveals that, for persons in similar positions and concerning the is responses, goals 2, 5, 23, 4, 1, and 6 received the highest responses. It is important to note that, with the exception of 23 (protect academic freedom), all these top goals were directly related to the student. Although the faculty chairmen included academic freedom, it is interesting that they did not rank it as high as the presidents or academic deans. Responses for the should be category were similar concerning the highest ranked goals. The rankings concerning the top goals, specifically including academic freedom, student personal and scholastic growth, and the academic program, are consistent with the findings of Nash and Sieber in 1968, Gross and Grambsch in 1964 and 1971, Baldridge in 1971, Metzger in 1974, and the suggested goal priorities of Richman and Farmer in 1974.
**TABLE XI**

**RANK ORDER BASED ON DEGREE OFFERED**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Presidents</th>
<th>Academic Deans</th>
<th>Faculty Chairmen</th>
<th>Presidents</th>
<th>Academic Deans</th>
<th>Faculty Chairmen</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>*23</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>*29</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>*4</td>
<td>*2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>*4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>*30</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>*29</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>*29</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>*6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>*8</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>*31</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>*22</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>*8</td>
<td>*8</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>*29</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>*30</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>*3</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>*15</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>*25</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>*28</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>*27</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>*8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>*28</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>*13</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>*17</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>*30</td>
<td>*15</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>*24</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>*6</td>
<td>*24</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>*24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>*15</td>
<td>*11</td>
<td>*7</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>*31</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>*25</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>*27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>*3</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>*27</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>*7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>*11</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>*16</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>*11</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>*13</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>*26</td>
<td>*26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>*21</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>*18</td>
<td>*21</td>
<td>*20</td>
<td>*12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>*12</td>
<td>*20</td>
<td>*12</td>
<td>*18</td>
<td>*10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>*26</td>
<td>*14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>*10</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>*14</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>*10</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Tied Ranks
TABLE XII
RANK ORDER BASED ON TOTALS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Is</th>
<th>Should Be</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>*6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>*29</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>*22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>*29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>*7</td>
<td>*15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>*19</td>
<td>*17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>*13</td>
<td>*11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>*21</td>
<td>*21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>*18</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>*14</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>*14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>*10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Tied Ranks

Based upon the is responses by persons in similar positions, the lowest ranked goals included 10, 12, and 9. These lowest goals were basically community related,
including education for parttime adult students. Based upon the should be responses by persons in similar positions, goals 10, 9, and 14 were the lowest ranked goals. Goal 14 concerned the favorable appraisal of those who validate the quality of the programs. Similar to the findings of Gross and Grambsch concerning low priority goals, these goals are unrelated to those goals which have received high priority rankings.

Examination of Tables XIII and XIV shows that, for persons in similar positions and concerning the overall responses, no significant differences in level of agreement

| TABLE XIII |
| SPEARMAN RANK ORDER CORRELATION (RHO) AND F TEST FOR IS RESPONSES |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>RHO</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leaders</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presidents with Deans</td>
<td>0.9198</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>159.2526</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presidents with Faculty</td>
<td>0.7875</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>47.5472</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deans with Faculty</td>
<td>0.8363</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>67.4678</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 with 2</td>
<td>0.8400</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>69.5168</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 with 3</td>
<td>0.8084</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>54.6837</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 with 3</td>
<td>0.7748</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>197.4329</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelors to Masters</td>
<td>0.9047</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>130.8242</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelors to Doctors</td>
<td>0.7511</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>37.5389</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters to Doctors</td>
<td>0.8455</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>72.6862</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*1 less than 1000
2 1000 to 3000
3 3000 or more
were revealed. The Spearman Rank Order Correlation RHO ranged from 0.7875 (presidents to faculty chairmen) to 0.9198 (presidents with deans) for the responses and from 0.8291 (deans with faculty chairman) to 0.9234 (presidents with deans). All subsequent F Test results were significant to the 0.0001 level. These findings are similar to the findings of the studies reported in the previous discussion concerning top priority goal rankings.

**TABLE XIV**

SPEARMAN RANK ORDER CORRELATION (RHO) AND F TEST FOR SHOULD BE RESPONSES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>RHO</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Leaders</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presidents with Deans</td>
<td>0.9234</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>167.8019</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presidents with Faculty</td>
<td>0.8793</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>98.8826</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deans with Faculty</td>
<td>0.8291</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>63.7886</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Size</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 with 2</td>
<td>0.8199</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>59.4601</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 with 3</td>
<td>0.8213</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>60.0895</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 with 3</td>
<td>0.8588</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>81.4704</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Degree</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelors with Masters</td>
<td>0.8523</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>77.0123</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelors with Doctors</td>
<td>0.8099</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>55.2788</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters with Doctors</td>
<td>0.8643</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>85.6425</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*1 less than 1000
2 1000 to 3000
3 3000 or more

Examination of Tables XIII and XIV shows that no significant differences of opinion were revealed based upon
institutional size and concerning the overall responses. The Spearman Rank Order Correlation RHO ranged from 0.7748 to 0.8400 for the *is* responses and from 0.8199 to 0.8588 for the *should be* responses. All subsequent F Test results were significant to the 0.0001 level. Similar results were obtained by Gross and Grambsch, in that both size and geographic region were found to be negligible characteristics.

Examination of Table X reveals that, based upon institutional size and concerning the *is* responses, goals 2, 5, 23, and 4 received the highest responses. Concerning the *should be* responses, the results were similar. Again the lowest ranked goals based upon the *is* responses were 10, 9, and 12; whereas the lowest ranked goals based upon the *should be* responses were 10, 9, and 14.

Examination of Tables XIII and XIV also shows that no significant differences of opinion were revealed based upon the level of degree offered by the institutions. The Spearman Rank Order Correlation RHO ranged from 0.7511 (Bachelors to Doctors) to 0.9047 (Bachelors to Masters) for the *is* responses and from 0.8099 (Bachelors to Doctors) to 0.8643 (Masters to Doctors) for the *should be* responses. All subsequent F Test results were significant to the 0.0001 level.

Examination of Table XI shows that, based upon the level of degree offered, the highest goals indicated by
the is responses included 2, 5, 23, and 4. For the should be responses, the highest goal included 2, 4, 23, and 1. The lowest goals indicated by the is responses were 9 and 10. For the should be responses, the lowest goals were 10 and 14.

Examination of Tables XIII and XIV reveals that, based upon the total responses and concerning the overall responses, no significant differences in level of agreement were revealed. Agreement found here is also consistent with findings reported in the studies previously cited in the discussion concerning top priority goal rankings. The lowest Spearman Rank Order Correlation RHO was 0.7511 (Bachelors to Doctors), and the highest was 0.9234 (presidents with deans). The results of correlating the responses of various subgroups to the total revealed only four of the eighteen correlations computed to be less than 0.9000. It should be noted that, since the subgroups were component parts of the total, spuriously high correlations may have been obtained.

Since the rank order comparison revealed no overall differences in level of agreement, an analysis of variance was computed on each goal. The results indicated for the is responses among institutional leaders differences existed within question 16 at the 0.05 level and questions 19 and 23 at the 0.01 level. For the should be responses differences existed for question 16 at the 0.05 level.
Results indicated for the is responses based on institutional size revealed that differences existed at the 0.05 level for questions 7, 11, 29, 30, and 31 and at the 0.01 level for questions 22 and 28. Based on size, differences for the should be responses existed for questions 10, 13, 14, 16, 17, and 29 at the 0.05 level and for questions 15, 28, 30, and 31 at the 0.01 level. The results also indicated interaction between institutional leaders and institutional size at the 0.05 level for questions 21, 23, 25, and 28 for the is responses and questions 15, 16, 24, and 29 for the should be responses. Interaction for the same groups existed at the 0.01 level for questions 20, 29, and 30 for the is responses and for question 30 for the should be responses.

Table XII presents the rank order of goals based upon the total response. The top priority goals, listed in order of preference, as revealed by the is responses (perceived goals), were as follows:

1. Produce a well rounded student, that is, one whose physical, social, moral, intellectual, and aesthetic potential have all been cultivated.

2. Develop the inner character of students so that they can make sound, correct moral choices.

3. Protect the faculty's right to academic freedom.

4. Assist students to develop objectivity about themselves and their beliefs and hence examine those beliefs critically.
5. Produce a student who has had his intellect cultivated to the maximum.

6. Provide students with a broad educational basis for useful careers.

7. Maintain top quality in those programs we feel to be especially important (other programs being, of course, up to acceptable standards).

Again, these top priority perceived goals correspond to those top goals reported by Nash and Sieber in 1968, Baldridge in 1971, Metzger in 1974, and the suggested goal rankings of Richman and Farmer in 1974. Specifically, the goals concerning academic freedom, top quality programs, and student development were also among the top priority perceived goals reported by Gross and Grambsch in 1964 and 1971.

The lowest ranked perceived goals (listed from least up) were as follows:

1. Assist citizens directly through extension programs, advice, consultation and the provision of useful or needed facilities and services other than teaching.

2. Serve as a center for the dissemination of new ideas, whether those ideas are in science, literature, the arts or politics.

3. Provide special training for part-time adult students.

4. Protect and facilitate the student's right to advocate direct action of a political or social kind and
any legal attempt on their part to organize efforts to attain political or social goals, consistent with a rational, open and free society.

TABLE XV
SPEARMAN RANK ORDER CORRELATION (RHO) AND F TEST FOR IS RESPONSES FOR TOTALS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>RHO</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leaders to Totals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presidents</td>
<td>0.9491</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>263.2705</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deans</td>
<td>0.9760</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>582.7085</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Chairmen</td>
<td>0.9048</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>130.9851</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size to Totals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 1000</td>
<td>0.9338</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>197.4329</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1000 to 3000</td>
<td>0.9451</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>242.3811</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3000 to more</td>
<td>0.8955</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>117.3577</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree to Totals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelors</td>
<td>0.9724</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>503.3147</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>0.9672</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>420.9553</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctors</td>
<td>0.8321</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>65.2531</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The top priority goals, listed in order of preference, as revealed by the should be responses (preferred goals), were as follows:

1. Produce a well rounded student, that is, one whose physical, social, moral, intellectual, and aesthetic potentialities have all been cultivated.

2. Develop the inner character of students so that they can make sound, correct moral choices.

3. Assist students to develop objectivity about themselves and their beliefs and hence examine those beliefs critically.
4. Produce a student who has had his intellect cultivated to the maximum.

5. Protect the faculty's right to academic freedom.

6. Provide students with a broad educational basis for useful careers.

7. Produce a student who is able to perform his citizenship responsibilities effectively.

8. Make sure the institution is run by those selected according to their ability to attain the goals of the institution in the most efficient manner possible.

9. Maintain top quality in those programs we feel to be especially important (other programs being, of course, up to acceptable standards).

These top priority goals correspond to those top goals of the previously cited studies reported in the discussion concerning the top priority perceived goals. The greatest amount of correspondence among goals exists between this preferred goal ranking and the ranking of preferred goals reported by Gross and Grambsch in 1964. Goals 3, 4, 5, 8, and 9 were among the top nine goals reported by Gross and Grambsch. The other four goals are also related to the remaining top goals reported by Gross and Grambsch.

The lowest ranked preferred goals (listed from least up) were as follows:

1. Assist citizens directly through extension programs, advice, consultation and the provision of useful
or needed facilities and services other than teaching.

2. Ensure the favorable appraisal of those who validate the quality of the programs offered.

3. Provide special training for part-time adult students.

4. Protect and facilitate the student's right to advocate direct action of a political or social kind and any legal attempt on their part to organize efforts to attain political or social goals, consistent with a rational, open and free society.

TABLE XVI

SPEARMAN RANK ORDER CORRELATION (RHO) AND F TEST FOR SHOULD BE RESPONSES FOR TOTALS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>Rho</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Presidents</td>
<td>0.9789</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>666.5569</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deans</td>
<td>0.9569</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>314.4841</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Chairmen</td>
<td>0.9259</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>171.8657</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size to Totals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 1000</td>
<td>0.8980</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>120.7741</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1000 to 3000</td>
<td>0.9711</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>479.5408</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3000 or more</td>
<td>0.9259</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>174.2297</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree to Totals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelors</td>
<td>0.9547</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>298.7739</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>0.9592</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>333.5615</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctors</td>
<td>0.8799</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>99.4855</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The high correlation between the actual and ideal goals indicates, by inference, that a high degree of satisfaction exists among institutional leaders that goals are
receiving the proper emphasis. For goals which are ranked high on the actual list, there is a commensurate tendency to give them a high ranking on the preferred list. This is specifically in agreement with the findings of Gross and Grambsch.

**Question 8**

Based upon responses of persons in leadership positions, what are the probable priorities of goals of the independent senior colleges and universities in Texas over the next ten years?

The panel of judges were requested to indicate what they felt the goals for independent senior colleges and universities in Texas would be over the next ten years. These goals are presented in order of priority:

1. Institutional survival concerning financial needs to support a pluralistic system.
2. Preservation of spiritual, rational, and moral values of society.
3. Increase and improve the institutional program which is presented in as individualized manner as possible.
4. Become the pacesetter in American higher education through the fostering of new ideas and unique approaches.
5. Search for new understandings and integrations to benefit American society.
6. Preservation and enhancement of institutional character and integrity.
7. Clarify and improve the educational goals and processes of higher education.

8. Increase teaching salaries and insure that they reflect faculty worth.

9. Attract and retain quality faculty and staff.

The panel of judges, although not ranking them as highly, also included the following goals:

10. Selection of faculty and staff who are in sympathy with and capable of achieving selected institutional goals.

11. Negotiate a more reasonable relationship with state and federal government.

12. Add to the revitalization of the world and make it more habitable.

With the exception of specific inclusions of goals related to spiritual development and the negotiation of a more reasonable relationship between private institutions and state or federal governments, the priority goals for the next decade listed by the panel of judges directly relate to the priority goals reported in studies by Gross and Grambsch, Baldridge, Metzger, and Richman and Farmer. These goals also relate to the general categories of goals reported by Nash and Sieber, Spalding, Sabin, and the Carnegie Commission, as well as the reports published by the various Presidential and state commissions.

The institutional leaders were requested to list, in order of priority, those goals which they considered the
most important goals of their institutions over the next ten years. The following unranked list presents the goals which were reported to be important:

1. Continued development of a strong academic program.

2. Continued development of moral and spiritual character of students.

3. Continued enlistment and development of quality faculty.

4. Increased and continued development of a sound financial program, utilizing assured financial resources.

5. Development and maintenance of adequate facilities.

6. Continued operation and study of a broad-based curriculum.

7. Development of a viable recruitment program in order to stabilize enrollment.

8. Increased service and cooperation to the surrounding community, including the offering of off-campus programs.

9. Maintenance of high academic standards and scholarship.

10. Establishment of long-range goals and planning, followed by efficient management.

11. Increased salaries.

12. Improved services to students, including increased counseling and advisement.
Table XVII presents the order of priority of goals for the next ten years, indicated by presidents, academic deans, and faculty chairmen and the priority indicated by the total group.

**TABLE XVII**

**GOAL PRIORITIES FOR NEXT DECADE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Presidents</th>
<th>Academic Deans</th>
<th>Faculty Chairmen</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>4*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Question number

Lines have been drawn within Table XVII to indicate significant levels of drop in the per cent of inclusion of the goals listed by the particular group or total. For presidents the major goals reported were the first four, with the remaining five also receiving support. For both the categories of academic deans and the totals, there were
five major goals. It should be noted that, within the categories of faculty chairmen, the primary, major goals were the first two listed. The next group of goals in this category received moderate support, with the remaining four also receiving support.

The goals receiving the highest priority rankings were primarily the increased and continued development of a sound financial program and, secondarily, the continued development of a strong academic program. Two goals receiving somewhat lesser rankings were the continued development of moral and spiritual character and the development of a viable recruitment program. The final major goal reported by institutional leaders was the continued enlistment and development of quality faculty, which confirms the findings of Gross and Grambsch that more emphasis must be placed upon goals which encourage the retention of competent professors. It should be noted, also, that all three categories of institutional leaders indicated the most significant major goals for the next decade concern the financial program and the academic program.

It is important to note here that the first three major goals for the next decade reported by the panel of judges (institutional survival concerning financial needs, preservation of spiritual, rational, and moral values, and increase and improve the instructional program) corresponded greatly with the major goals reported by the
major institutional leaders surveyed (increased and continued development of a sound financial program, continued development of a strong academic program, and continued development of moral and spiritual character). In comparing the goal (should be) responses indicated by the institutional leaders on the thirty-one questions to the goals the same persons responded as being the major goals for the next decade, it was evident agreement existed concerning continued development of (spiritual and) moral character and continued development of a strong academic program. The top priority goal of increased and continued development of a sound financial program was not included (as a support goal) within the questionnaire; therefore, it was not found within the ranking of top (should be) preferred goals. It is interesting that this goal received the top priority ranking, but was not suggested as an additional goal by the respondents at all and was suggested by only two of the panel judges.

With the exception of goals relating to spiritual character, which are attributed more often to private institutions, and, in only a few cases, goals related to financial development, the goal priorities for the next decade reported by institutional leaders in Table XVII are consistent with the goal priorities reported in the studies previously cited in the discussion concerning top priority goals reported by the panel of judges. In addition, the
major goals derived concerning the next decade parallel Trivett's findings in his survey of the literature con-
cerning the goals of higher education, which specifically included financial support, managerial responsibility, academic excellence, institutional quality, and increased emphasis upon the learner.

General Background Information Questions

A number of additional questions were formulated to ascertain the developmental process of goal setting. These questions were utilized in an investigation of the general background information which might have had an influence on the responses. The general background questions are restated with discussions of the relative findings.

**Question 1**

Should an institution have a goal statement?

All respondents indicated an institution should have a goal statement. It was further indicated by a number of the respondents that a goal statement was necessary to provide purpose and direction to the institution.

**Question 2**

Does your institution have a goal statement?

All respondents indicated their institutions do have goal statements. Fifty per cent of these further reported having evaluated this goal statement at some time during
the current academic year. This is consistent with numerous statements in the literature concerning the importance of goals and their regular evaluation.

Question 3

How did your institution determine its goals?

Table XVIII indicates the per cent of persons or groups reported as being responsible for determining goals.

**TABLE XVIII**

**INDIVIDUALS OR GROUPS RESPONSIBLE FOR DETERMINING GOALS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Individual or Group</th>
<th>Per Cent Reported</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Representative Group</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other: Students included</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Off-campus persons</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Multiple responses were received

An examination of Table XVIII reveals that 75 per cent of the respondents reported that a representative task force was utilized in determining institutional goals. Only 12 per cent indicated students were involved in the process of determining goals. Sixteen per cent indicated administration determined goals. Only one institution
responded that off-campus persons other than board members were included in the process of determining goals. Over twice as many faculty chairmen as presidents and academic deans reported that faculty were involved in the process of determining goals. This seems to indicate some lack of communication in the process, as well as some question concerning exactly who is responsible for and involved in determining goal.

**Question 4**

Did the faculty, at any point, review or approve the goals?

None of the academic deans reported that faculty were not involved in the process of determining goals, whereas 8 per cent of the presidents and 16 per cent of the faculty chairmen indicated faculty nonparticipation. This further serves to point out the possible lack of communication indicated by Question 3, as well as the question of who is responsible for and involved in determining goals.

**Question 5**

When was the last time your institutional goals were reviewed?

Table XIX reports the year in which the institutions last reviewed their goals.

An examination of Table XIX reveals that all institutions responding, except one, reported having evaluated
their institutional goals during 1972 or since that year. One institution last evaluated its goals in 1970. Sixty-eight per cent of the institutions responding indicated

TABLE XIX

YEAR IN WHICH INSTITUTION LAST REVIEWED GOALS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Per Cent of Institutions Reporting</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1973</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1974</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Their goals were evaluated at some time during 1975 or 1976. This further confirms responses to Questions 1 and 2 that goal statements are of primary importance to institutional leaders.

**Question 6**

From where did the impetus come to review the goals?

Table XX reports the sources from which impetus was received toward reviewing goals.

An examination of Table XX reveals that in forty-four per cent of the institutions' impetus for reviewing the goals
came from accrediting agencies. Also, 40 per cent indicated that the source of influence for reviewing goals came from the administration. In 16 per cent of the institutions, it was reported that the faculty had an influence in bringing about review of the goals. In 12 per cent of the cases,

TABLE XX

WHERE IMPETUS CAME FROM TO REVIEW GOALS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Per Cent Reported*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accrediting Agency</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church Board</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordinating Board</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other: Self-study</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Multiple responses were received.

institutions received impetus toward reviewing goals from their boards. A self-study process was reported as being involved in 12 per cent of the institutions. Only one institution reported that students had any influence toward the decision to review institutional goals.
Question 7

In what manner was the review carried out?

Table XXI reports the groups which carried out the goal evaluation process.

TABLE XXI

GROUPS WHICH REVIEWED GOALS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Per Cent Reported*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Representative Task Force</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other: Self-study</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board</td>
<td>(one)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Multiple responses were received.

An examination of Table XXI reveals that in 75 per cent of the institutions which responded, the goals were evaluated by a representative task force. In many of these cases respective groups of the campus carried out the study, then their representatives came together as a task force. Twelve per cent was reported for both the categories of administration and faculty. Again, 12 per cent of the institutions indicated this involved a self-study report. One institution reported the board was responsible for reviewing the goals.
Question 8
Did the goals appear adequate?

There was agreement among the three groups surveyed concerning the adequacy of goals. Twelve per cent of the institutions reported indicated their goals were inadequate.

Question 9
If not, what changes were made?

Fifty-six per cent of the reporting institutions indicated that minor changes, classification, or up-dating of their goals took place. One institution included the initiation of a coeducational program. One institution indicated goals were added including (1) a vocation oriented goal, (2) more prominence to fine arts, and (3) more prominence to the professions, and emphasis upon off-campus programs. Two institutions reported inclusion of the following goals of student recruitment and improvement of instruction. Goals included by one institution were de-emphasizing graduate study, emphasis on continuing education, and emphasis on efforts concerning reducing the attrition rate. Finally, one institution predicted the future elimination of the doctoral program.
CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS, IMPLICATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary of the Study

This study was an investigation of the goals of independent senior colleges and universities in Texas. The purposes of this study were: (1) to identify the major goals of independent senior colleges and universities in Texas, (2) to survey the opinions of persons in positions of leadership in independent senior colleges and universities in Texas with respect to existing and preferred goals, (3) to determine if there are significant differences of opinion among these institutions, and (4) to develop projections of the probable positions of goals of independent senior colleges and universities in Texas, based upon the expressed opinions of those persons in positions of leadership.

The subjects selected for the study were persons in leadership positions in independent senior colleges and universities in Texas—the chief administrative leaders (presidents), the academic administrative leaders (academic deans), and the faculty senate or council chairmen—from which permission was received for the institution to be utilized in the study.
The list of goals, which was inclusive of those primary goals identified in the literature as representing the several major categories of goals for higher education, was selected and submitted to a panel of judges composed of institutional leaders in private higher education. All of the judges submitted responses. The amended list of goals was then utilized to constitute a questionnaire for the purpose of obtaining the opinions of the chief administrative leaders, the academic administrative leaders, and the faculty senate or council chairmen with respect to the goals as related to their particular institution. The respondents indicated how important each goal is and how important each goal should be at the institution, based upon a five point scale ranging from one to five.

The responses from the questionnaire were compiled for automatic data processing and processed at the North Texas State University Computer Center. Means and rank order distributions (based on the Spearman Rank Order Correlation) were computed for the responses to the listed goals concerning how important each goal is and how important it should be. An Analysis of Variance was used to determine within each question if there were significant differences of opinion among the institutional leaders with respect to their responses. Findings were presented in the form of tables and findings.
Findings

The following findings were derived from the analysis and interpretation of the data gathered in this study.

**Findings Relative to the Substantive Questions in the Study**

1. As expressed in the literature, there exists much less disagreement among institutional leaders concerning goals than is commonly supposed.

2. Appendix D lists the major goals of independent senior colleges and universities in Texas, as reported by the panel of judges.

3. Goals involving research were not included, due to a low response from the judges.

4. Several goals which directly affect faculty were excluded--24, 30, 34, and 36 (see Appendix A).

5. Several goals which directly affect students were excluded--7, 9, 20, 21, and 22 (see Appendix A).

6. In addition, the goal of ensuring the confidence of contributors was deleted.

7. Over 70 per cent of the presidents agreed within two levels of response on twenty-eight of the thirty-one goals for the is responses; over 75 per cent agreed on twenty-six goals.

8. Over 70 per cent of the presidents agreed within two levels of response on twenty-three of the thirty-one goals for the should be responses; over 75 per cent agreed on nineteen goals.
9. Over 60 per cent of the presidents agreed on one level of response on four of the thirty-one goals for the is responses and on six goals for the should be responses.

10. Concerning is responses, 70 per cent of the presidents agreed on 90 per cent of the thirty-one goals; concerning should be responses, 70 per cent of the presidents agreed on 84 per cent of the goals.

11. Over 70 per cent of the academic deans agreed within two levels of response on eighteen of the thirty-one goals for the is responses; over 75 per cent agreed on fourteen goals.

12. Over 70 per cent of the academic deans agreed within two levels of response on twenty-two of the thirty-one goals for the should be responses; over 75 per cent agreed on eighteen goals.

13. Over 60 per cent of the academic deans agreed on one level of response on one of the thirty-one goals for the is responses and on three goals for the should be responses.

14. Concerning is responses, 70 per cent of the academic deans agreed on 58 per cent of the thirty-one goals; concerning should be responses, 70 per cent of the academic deans agreed on 71 per cent of the goals.

15. Over 70 per cent of the faculty chairmen agreed within two levels of response on twenty-two of the thirty-one questions for the is responses; over 75 per cent agreed on thirteen question.
16. Over 70 per cent of the faculty chairmen agreed within two levels of response on twenty-six of the thirty-one questions for the **should be** responses; over 75 per cent agreed on twenty-four questions.

17. Over 60 per cent of the faculty chairmen agreed on one level of response on one of the thirty-one questions for the **is** responses and on four questions for the **should be** responses.

18. Concerning **is** responses, 70 per cent of the faculty chairmen agreed on 71 per cent of the thirty-one goals; concerning **should be** responses, 70 per cent of the faculty chairmen agreed on 84 per cent of the goals.

19. Agreement of 70 per cent of the institutional leaders was indicated on 71 per cent of the thirty-one goals for the **is** responses and on 80 per cent for the **should be** responses.

20. Agreement was found on 9 per cent more of the goals for the **should be** responses than the **is** responses.

21. Although the rank order comparison revealed no overall differences in level of agreement, some differences in level of opinion were found for some of the goals by the Analysis of Variance. Some interaction was discovered between institutional leaders and institutional size for a few goals.

22. No suggestions for additional goals were received from the institutional leaders, and suggestions
by the panel of judges were not substantial enough to warrant their inclusion.

23. Goals 14 and 30 were found to be unclear; the widest spread of responses was for goal 16.

24. Spearman Rank Order Correlation coefficients for the institutional leaders ranged from 0.7875 to 0.9198 for the is responses and from 0.8291 to 0.9234 for the should be responses.

25. All F Test results for institutional leaders were significant to the 0.0001 level.

26. Spearman Rank Order Correlation coefficients concerning institutional size ranged from 0.7748 to 0.8400 for the is responses and from 0.8199 to 0.8588 for the should be responses.

27. All F Test results concerning institutional size were significant to the 0.0001 level.

28. Spearman Rank Order Correlation coefficients concerning the level of degree offered by the institutions ranged from 0.7511 to 0.9047 for the is responses and from 0.8099 to 0.8643 for the should be responses.

29. All F Test results concerning level of degree offered were significant to the 0.0001 level.

30. The lowest coefficient was 0.7511, and the highest was 0.9234; for the comparison of rank orders of the groups to the total, the lowest was 0.8321, and the highest was 0.9789.
31. Concerning the thirty-one goals listed, the top nine goals include 2, 5, 4, 1, 23, 6, 8, 22, and 29 (see Appendix D).

32. Six of the top goals relate directly to the growth and development of the student, one to faculty academic freedom, one to institutional management, and one to the quality of the academic program.

33. Concerning the thirty-one goals listed, the least important goals include 10, 12, 14, 9, and 26 (see Appendix D).

34. Three of the least important goals concern part-time education and community service, one concerns program validation, and one concerns students' rights.

35. The top goals expected to receive priority attention during the next decade (see Table XVII) include 4, 1, 2, 7 and 3--from the priority goals reported by the institutional leaders.

36. These priority goals include areas concerning finances, academic programs, student moral and spiritual character, student recruitment, and quality faculty.

37. The presidents were primarily concerned with the financial situation and the moral and spiritual development of the students.

38. Faculty chairmen and academic deans were primarily concerned with the financial situation and the continued development of a strong academic program.
Findings Relative to the General Background Questions

1. All respondents indicated a goal statement is necessary for an institution.
2. Each institution from which responses were received had a goal statement.
3. In 75 per cent of the responding institutions, institutional goals were determined by a representative task force.
4. Students were involved in the goal determining process in only 12 per cent of these institutions.
5. In 16 per cent of the institutions, administrators were responsible for determining goals.
6. Some faculty nonparticipation in the process of determining goals was indicated by presidents and faculty chairmen, but not by the academic deans.
7. All but one institution had reviewed its goals since 1972.
8. Sixty-eight per cent of the institutions responding indicated their goals were evaluated during 1975 or 1976.

Conclusions

1. Institutional leaders agreed with the selected panel of judges on the institutional goals.
2. The results of this study, as well as what is expressed in the literature, indicated there exists much
less disagreement among institutional leaders concerning goals than is commonly supposed by institutional leaders. (Gross and Grambsch, Swarr, and Locklin obtained similar results.)

3. Presidents agreed on institutional goals to a greater extent than academic deans and faculty chairmen.

4. Faculty chairmen agreed on institutional goals to a greater extent than academic deans.

5. Academic deans agreed on institutional goals although to a lesser extent than presidents and faculty chairmen.

6. Considerable agreement existed among the institutional leaders concerning goals.

7. Whereas disagreement was discovered within particular questions, agreement based on the overall responses was considerable concerning the listed goals.

8. There was very little discrepancy concerning goals among institutions which offer only Bachelor's Degrees, institutions which have offerings through the Master's Degree, and institutions which have offerings through the Doctor's Degree.

9. There was very little discrepancy concerning goals among institutions of differing size.

10. Institutional leaders agreed that slightly more emphasis should be placed on certain goals than was indicated concerning the current level of emphasis.
11. More emphasis is being placed upon goals directly related to students than to other goals, and more than is commonly supposed by institutional leaders. (Gross and Grambsch and Richman and Farmer obtained similar results concerning private institutions, which Trivett also confirmed in his survey of goals.)

12. Less emphasis is being placed in independent senior colleges and universities on goals related to the part-time student and to community service-related enterprises than is being placed on other goals. (These goals were ranked in a similar level in studies by Peterson, Gross and Grambasch, and Richman and Farmer.)

13. Quality faculty and academic freedom are also important to institutional leaders.

14. Plans and decisions concerning the goals of independent higher education in Texas over the next decade will be influenced more by the financial situation than by any other factor.

15. Other goals which will significantly affect the plans and decisions of institutional leaders in independent higher education during the next decade include the spiritual, moral, and academic growth of students, the stabilization of enrollment, the continued development of a strong academic program, and the development and retention of quality faculty.

16. Half of the institutions from which responses
were received had evaluated the goal statement at some time during the academic year.

17. The major sources of influence for reviewing goals were accrediting agencies and the administration.

18. Twelve per cent of the institutions responding indicated the involvement of the self study process in evaluating goals.

19. Eighty-eight per cent indicated that, upon reviewing their goals, they found them to be adequate.

20. Over half of the reporting institutions indicated that minor changes or updating of goals were made.

21. Institutional goals and their continued evaluations were considered by the institutional leaders to be important in providing purpose and direction in institutional planning.

22. Most all groups of the campus community were utilized in goal evaluation, since a representative task force is the most commonly used method for evaluating goals.

23. Evaluation of institutional goals will continue to be important in the process of planning for institutional priorities.

Implications

With the emphasis placed on goals in the literature and with the corresponding findings of the importance of goals and their evaluation reported in the general background
information, the time seems ripe for effective, qualitative change to be brought about in the goals of independent higher education. Because administrators, faculty leaders, and other institutional leaders value and work toward essentially the same goals, regardless of position in the institution or level or size of the institution, the processes of selecting, supporting, and evaluating these goals should be relatively free of any significant conflict. The basic problems concerning goals generally exist within the institution; therefore, the questions asked and the process of self-examination itself may be more constructive than the results which are finally obtained.

The primary responsibility for goals and their incorporation into the institutional programs is internal and consideration must be given to influential forces outside the institution. Therefore, pressures because of changes in societal values and increased public pressures because of funding and policies from external agencies. While an institution serves the cause of knowledge by protecting the freedom of its own independence, it must respond with consideration for the needs of society. Where higher education places its emphases and how it resolves its problems related to purpose and function are of concern to society and ultimately relate to it. Having some definite commonality of purpose and of institutional needs,
independent higher education must continue to draw together through the primary source of Independent Colleges and Universities of Texas, Inc., to ensure proper and sufficient representation and influence in matters which affect higher education in Texas, particularly to independent higher education.

Several specific goals found to be of top priority in this study are of importance to all who are influenced by higher education. Their inclusion in the major goals of independent higher education in Texas serves to reinforce the previous emphasis upon them in the literature. Financial solidarity is, of necessity, a primary goal of independent higher education. To this end, effective and efficient management should receive increased emphasis during the next decade. Relative to this, an upgrading of the student recruitment program must be experienced in independent institutions of higher education. The purpose of the recruitment program should be to inform the public of what independent higher education has to offer, as well as to sufficiently ensure the continuance of independent higher education in the total system of higher education.

Attention to the education of the student and the protection of his rights must continue to receive emphasis in independent higher education. Emphasis upon values and the development of moral and spiritual character, as well
as emphasis upon academic and intellectual growth, seems to be the most acceptable course to follow in the future. Relative to financial solvency and student personal growth, an increase in satisfied consumers and equally satisfied employers would ultimately be helpful to independent higher education. To this end, equality of access and successful attendance of those students who enroll should continue to be important to these institutions.

Emphasis upon academic excellence by providing quality programs must continue to be of major importance. In relation to these goals, the development and retention of quality faculty through providing for their needs and personal and professional growth is equally important. Faculty and staff who are willing to work for the good of the institution, as well as for the advancement of themselves and their own professions by participating more fully in institutional affairs should be actively recruited and encouraged to remain. Such an attitude may be more fully developed through providing a high level of academic freedom on the campus and more proper remuneration for services rendered.

The importance of institutional goals and their regular evaluation must continue to be emphasized. Provisions should be made for the effective measurement of goal attainment. Examination of goals in the institutional as well as societal context by a representative
group is important. In addition, personnel and program directors should be held accountable for the various areas of responsibility. Needed changes, which are made evident by studies of institutional goals, must subsequently be incorporated into the mainstream of the institutional community.

Finally, it is important to encourage the continuation of the diversity provided by a differentiation of functions and styles in the institutions of independent higher education in Texas. Although considerable agreement exists among the leaders of these institutions concerning goals, clearly a difference in style and make-up exists. Even though a competitive spirit pervades these institutions, each continues to attract and hold persons whose values are in accord with its purposes. The continued protection and development of this diversity of style and differentiation of objectives seems to be in the best interest of independent higher education in Texas.

Recommendations

The following recommendations are made concerning the future of independent higher education in Texas relative to goals.

1. It is recommended that a study of institutional goals be utilized in any planning and decision-making processes concerning independent higher education institutions.
2. It is recommended that, with the possible limitations in scope and considering the period of development of the initial questionnaire utilized in this study, a new instrument be developed which is inclusive of goals which are appropriate for independent higher education and which reflects changes relative to passage of time and other influences.

3. It is recommended that independent higher education institutions in Texas place major emphasis upon the financial resources and the effective and efficient management of these financial resources.

4. It is recommended that emphasis also be placed upon the improvement of student recruitment programs, the increase of programs which enhance academic growth and the development of student moral and spiritual character of students, the development of quality academic programs, and the development and retention of quality faculty in independent higher education in Texas.

5. It is recommended that, since institutional leaders agree on goals more than is commonly supposed, the evaluation of institutional goals continue to be carried out by a task force which is representative of the campus community.

6. It is recommended that a follow-up study be conducted in 1986 to determine the accuracy of the predicted goal priorities reported in this study for the next decade.
7. It is recommended that studies of institutional goals for independent higher education in Texas be conducted by an appropriate agency on a scheduled basis, possibly also including trustees and student body presidents, which should encompass all the independent colleges and universities in Texas.
APPENDIX
APPENDIX A

The following information will be utilized in determining the goals and purposes of independent senior colleges and universities of Texas and the probable priorities concerning these goals. Your responses to the following general questions and the questionnaire will be kept in strictest confidence, thereby preserving both individual and institutional anonymity.

GENERAL BACKGROUND INFORMATION

1. Should an institution have a goal statement? ____

2. Does your institution currently have a goal statement?

3. How did your institution determine its goals?
   Administrator prepared ______
   Faculty prepared ______
   Representative task force ______
   Other (specify) ______

4. Did the faculty at any point review or approve the goals? ______

5. When was the last time your institutional goals were reviewed? ______

6. From where did the impetus come to review the goals?
   Accrediting Agency ______
   Faculty ______
   Administration ______
   Students ______
   Board ______
   Church Board ______
   Coordinating Board ______
   Other (specify) ______
7. In what manner was the review carried out?
   Administration
   Faculty
   Representative Task Force
   Other (specify)

8. Did the goals appear adequate? _____

9. If not, what changes were made?

GOAL STATEMENTS

Please react to each of the following goal statements utilizing the 5-point scale listed. React first to all statements with respect to how important each goal actually is at your institution. Then react to all statements with respect to how important you feel each goal should be at your institution.

Of utmost importance 5
Of great importance 4
Of average importance 3
Of little importance 2
Of least importance 1

1. Produce a student who, whatever else may be done to him, has had his intellect cultivated to the maximum.

2. Produce a well-rounded student, that is, whose physical, social, moral, intellectual and aesthetic potentialities have all been cultivated.

3. Make sure the student is permanently affected (in mind and spirit) by the great ideas of the great minds of history.

4. Assist students to develop objectivity about themselves and their beliefs and hence examine those beliefs critically.

5. Develop the inner character of students so that they can make sound, correct moral choices.
6. Prepare students specifically for useful careers.

7. Provide the student with skills, attitudes, contacts, and experiences which maximize the likelihood of his occupying a high status in life and a position of leadership in society.

8. Train students in methods of scholarship and/or scientific research and/or creative endeavor.

9. Make a good consumer of the student—a person who is elevated culturally, has good taste, and can make good consumer choices.

10. Produce a student who is able to perform his citizenship responsibilities effectively.

11. Carry on pure research.

12. Carry on applied research.

13. Provide special training for part-time adult students, through extension courses, special short courses, correspondence courses, etc.

14. Assist citizens directly through extension programs, advice, consultation, and the provision of useful or needed facilities and services other than teaching.

15. Provide cultural leadership for the community through university sponsored programs in the arts, public lectures by distinguished persons, athletic events, and other performances, displays, or celebrations which present the best of culture, popular or not.

16. Serve as a center for the dissemination of new ideas that will change the society whether those ideas are in science, literature, the arts, or politics.

17. Serve as a center for the preservation of the cultural heritage.

18. Ensure the continued confidence and hence support of those who contribute substantially (other than students and recipients of services) to the finances and other material resource needs of the university.
19. Ensure the favorable appraisal of those who validate the quality of the program we offer (validating groups include accrediting bodies, professional societies, scholarly peers at other universities, and respected persons in intellectual or artistic circles).

20. Educate to his utmost capacities every high school graduate who meets basic legal requirements for admission.

21. Accommodate only students of high potential in terms of the specific strengths and emphases of this university.

22. Orient ourselves to the satisfaction of the special needs and problems of the immediate geographical region.

23. Keep costs down as low as possible, through more efficient utilization of time and space, reduction of course duplication, etc.

24. Hold our staff in the face of inducements offered by other universities.

25. Make sure that salaries, teaching assignments, prerequisites, and privileges always reflect the contribution that the person involved is making to his own profession or discipline.

26. Involve faculty in the government of the university.

27. Involve students in the government of the university.

28. Make sure the university is run democratically insofar as that is feasible.

29. Keep harmony between departments or divisions of the university when such departments or divisions do not see eye to eye on important matters.

30. Make sure that salaries, teaching assignments, prerequisites, and privileges always reflect the contribution that the person involved is making to the functioning of this university.
IS

31. Emphasize undergraduate instruction even at the expense of the graduate program.

32. Encourage students to go into graduate work.

33. Make sure the university is run by those selected according to their ability to attain the goals of the university in the most efficient manner possible.

34. Make sure that on all important issues (not only curriculum), the will of the full-time faculty shall prevail.

35. Protect the faculty's right to academic freedom.

36. Make this a place in which faculty have maximum opportunity to pursue their careers in a manner satisfactory to them by their own criteria.

37. Provide a full round of student activities.

38. Protect and facilitate the students' right to inquire into, investigate, and examine critically any idea or program that they might get interested in.

39. Protect and facilitate the students' right to advocate direct action of a political or social kind and any attempts on their part to organize efforts to attain political or social goals.

40. Develop loyalty on the part of the faculty and staff to the university, rather than only to their own jobs or professional concerns.

41. Develop greater pride on the part of the faculty, staff, and students in their university and the things it stands for.

42. Maintain top quality in all programs we engage in.

43. Maintain top quality in those programs we feel to be especially important (other programs being, of course, up to acceptable standards).

SHOULD BE

40. Emphasize undergraduate instruction even at the expense of the graduate program.

41. Encourage students to go into graduate work.

42. Make sure the university is run by those selected according to their ability to attain the goals of the university in the most efficient manner possible.

43. Make sure that on all important issues (not only curriculum), the will of the full-time faculty shall prevail.

44. Protect the faculty's right to academic freedom.

45. Make this a place in which faculty have maximum opportunity to pursue their careers in a manner satisfactory to them by their own criteria.

46. Provide a full round of student activities.

47. Protect and facilitate the students' right to inquire into, investigate, and examine critically any idea or program that they might get interested in.

48. Protect and facilitate the students' right to advocate direct action of a political or social kind and any attempts on their part to organize efforts to attain political or social goals.

49. Develop loyalty on the part of the faculty and staff to the university, rather than only to their own jobs or professional concerns.

50. Develop greater pride on the part of the faculty, staff, and students in their university and the things it stands for.

51. Maintain top quality in all programs we engage in.

52. Maintain top quality in those programs we feel to be especially important (other programs being, of course, up to acceptable standards).
IS

44. Maintain a balanced level of quality across the whole range of programs we engage in.

45. Keep up to date and responsive.

46. Increase the prestige of the university or, if you believe it is already extremely high, ensure the maintenance of that prestige.

47. Keep this place from becoming something different from what it is now; that is, preserve its peculiar emphases and point of view, its "character."

Please list below, in order of priority, those goals which you consider will be the most important goals of your institution over the next ten years.

1.

2.

3.

4.

5.

6.

7.

8.

9.

10.
Dear

My doctoral dissertation topic at North Texas State University is related to the goals and purposes of independent senior colleges and universities of Texas. I propose to utilize a panel of judges who have expertise in the field of private higher education to affirm and modify the instrument to be utilized in the survey and to list the goals which will be most important over the next ten years.

Through deliberation with my committee and its chairman, Dr. W. A. Miller, Jr., you have been selected to serve as a member of the panel of judges. Since my colleagues and myself feel this to be a significant area for research, I would sincerely appreciate a brief amount of your time in responding to the stated questions. For your information I am including a copy of my dissertation proposal.

If you are unable to participate, I would appreciate your returning the survey so that I may select another appropriate judge. Please feel free to call me collect should you have any questions. I greatly appreciate your interest, assistance, and cooperation.

Sincerely,

Jerry Bawcom

Office: 817-534-0251
Home: 817-534-4750
The following goal statements were utilized in a survey of both public and private universities which was conducted by Edward Gross and Paul Grambsch and published in 1968. Please respond (yes or no) to each goal statement as to whether or not each is an appropriate goal for independent or private higher education (in Texas). Please feel free to rewrite any goal statement in order to make it more appropriate to your institutional setting. On page five you will be provided the opportunity to add other current goal statements.

_____ 1. Produce a student who, whatever else may be done to him, has had his intellect cultivated to the maximum.

_____ 2. Produce a well-rounded student, that is, one whose physical, social, moral, intellectual, and esthetic potentialities have all been cultivated.

_____ 3. Make sure the student is permanently affected (in mind and spirit) by the great ideas of the great minds of history.

_____ 4. Assist students to develop objectivity about themselves and their beliefs and hence examine those beliefs critically.

_____ 5. Develop the inner character of students so that they can make sound, correct moral choices.

_____ 6. Prepare students specifically for useful careers.

_____ 7. Provide the student with skills, attitudes, contacts, and experiences which maximize the likelihood of his occupying a high status in life and a position of leadership in society.

_____ 8. Train students in methods of scholarship and/or scientific research and/or creative endeavor.

_____ 9. Make a good consumer of the student—a person who is elevated culturally, has good taste, and can make good consumer choices.

_____ 10. Produce a student who is able to perform his citizenship responsibilities effectively.

_____ 11. Carry on pure research.

_____ 12. Carry on applied research.

_____ 13. Provide special training for part-time adult students, through extension courses, special short courses, correspondence courses, etc.
14. Assist citizens directly through extension programs, advice, consultation, and the provision of useful or needed facilities and services other than teaching.

15. Provide cultural leadership for the community through university sponsored programs in the arts, public lectures by distinguished persons, athletic events, and other performances, displays, or celebrations which present the best of culture, popular or not.

16. Serve as a center for the dissemination of new ideas that will change the society, whether those ideas are in science, literature, the arts, or politics.

17. Serve as a center for the preservation of the cultural heritage.

18. Ensure the continued confidence and hence support of those who contribute substantially (other than students and recipients of services) of the finances and other material resource needs of the university.

19. Ensure the favorable appraisal of those who validate the quality of the programs we offer (validating groups include accrediting bodies, professional societies, scholarly peers at other universities, and respected persons in intellectual or artistic circles).

20. Educate to his utmost capacities every high school graduate who meets basic legal requirements for admission.

21. Accommodate only students of high potential in terms of the specific strengths and emphases of this university.

22. Orient ourselves to the satisfaction of the special needs and problems of the immediate geographical region.

23. Keep costs down as low as possible, through more efficient utilization of time and space, reduction of course duplication, etc.

24. Hold our staff in the face of inducements offered by other universities.
25. Make sure that salaries, teaching assignments, prerequisites and privileges always reflect the contribution that the person involved is making to his own profession or discipline.

26. Involve faculty in the government of the university.

27. Involve students in the government of the university.

28. Make sure the university is run democratically insofar as that is feasible.

29. Keep harmony between departments or divisions of the university when such departments or divisions do not see eye to eye on important matters.

30. Make sure that salaries, teaching assignments, prerequisites, and privileges always reflect the contribution that the person involved is making to the functioning of this university.

31. Emphasize undergraduate instruction even at the expense of the graduate program.

32. Encourage students to go into graduate work.

33. Make sure the university is run by those selected according to their ability to attain the goals of the university in the most efficient manner possible.

34. Make sure that on all important issues (not only curriculum) the will of the full-time faculty shall prevail.

35. Protect the faculty's right to academic freedom.

36. Make this a place in which faculty have maximum opportunity to pursue their careers in a manner satisfactory to them by their own criteria.

37. Provide a full round of student activities.

38. Protect and facilitate the students' right to inquire into, investigate, and examine critically any idea or program that they might get interested in.
39. Protect and facilitate the students' right to advocate direct action of a political or social kind and any attempts on their part to organize efforts to attain political or social goals.

40. Develop loyalty on the part of the faculty and staff to the university, rather than only to their own jobs or professional concerns.

41. Develop greater pride on the part of the faculty, staff, and students in their university and the things it stands for.

42. Maintain top quality in all programs we engage in.

43. Maintain top quality in those programs we feel to be especially important (other programs being, of course, up to acceptable standards).

44. Maintain a balanced level of quality across the whole range of programs we engage in.

45. Keep up to date and responsible.

46. Increase the prestige of the university or, if you believe it is already extremely high, ensure the maintenance of that prestige.

47. Keep this place from becoming something different from what it is now; that is, preserve its peculiar emphases and point of view, its "character."
Please add any current goal statements which you feel should be included in the survey.

1.

2.

3.

4.

5.

6.

7.

8.

9.

10.
Finally, please list in order of priority your opinion of what goals for independent higher education will be over the next ten years (up to ten goals).

1.

2.

3.

4.

5.

6.

7.

8.

9.

10.
Dear

May I request permission to utilize your institution in a study for my doctoral dissertation? The topic concerns the goals and purposes of independent senior colleges and universities of Texas. This study involves the securing of responses from ICUT member institutions to a questionnaire concerning goals. Responses would be requested from the President, the chief academic administrator, and chairman of the Faculty Senate or Council. Hopefully, after being modified by the panel of judges, the questionnaire will only be of moderate length and involve only a brief amount of time.

I have received some assistance from Dr. Robert Hunter at the ICUT office. Would you please return the enclosed card, indicating your response, and if indicating willingness to participate, supply the names needed.

I would greatly appreciate your assistance in this matter and pledge a sincere effort in maintaining anonymity and confidentiality. I would be happy to share the results of the study with you.

Sincerely,

Jerry Bawcom
Dear

Permission has been obtained from the President of your institution for it to be utilized in a study for my doctoral dissertation. The topic concerns the goals and purposes of independent senior colleges and universities of Texas. The study involves the securing of responses from participating TCUT member institutions to a questionnaire concerning goals. Responses have been requested from the President, the Chief Academic Administrator, and the Chairman of the Faculty Senate or Council.

I am requesting that you take a few minutes from your busy schedule to assist in this study by completing the attached questionnaire. I greatly appreciate your cooperation and pledge a sincere effort in maintaining anonymity and confidentiality. I would be happy to share the results of the study with you.

I would appreciate your returning the survey in the enclosed self-addressed envelope by Friday, February 6, 1976. Please feel free to contact me if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

Jerry Bawcom
Dean of Student Affairs

Enclosure
The following information will be utilized in determining the goals and purposes of independent senior colleges and universities of Texas and the probable priorities concerning these goals. Your responses to the following general questions and the questionnaire will be kept in strictest confidence, thereby preserving both individual and institutional anonymity.

GENERAL BACKGROUND INFORMATION

1. Should an institution have a goal statement? ______________

2. Does your institution currently have a goal statement? ___

3. How did your institution determine its goals:
   Administrator prepared? _____
   Faculty prepared? _____
   Representative task force? _____
   Other (specify)? ________________________

4. Did the faculty at any point review or approve the goals? ______________

5. When was the last time your institutional goals were reviewed? ______

6. From where did the impetus come to review the goals:
   Accrediting Agency? _____
   Faculty? _____
   Administration? _____
   Students? _____
   Board? _____
   Church Board? _____
   Coordinating Board? _____
   Other (specify)? _____

7. In what manner was the review carried out:
   Administration? _____
   Faculty? _____
   Representative task force? _____
   Other (specify)? _____

8. Did the goals appear adequate? __________
GOAL STATEMENTS

Please react to each of the following goal statements utilizing the 5-point scale listed. React first to all statements with respect to how important each goal actually is at your institution; then, react to all statements with respect to how important you feel each goal should be at your institution.

- Of utmost importance 5
- Of great importance 4
- Of average importance 3
- Of little importance 2
- Of least importance 1

1. Produce a student who has had his intellect cultivated to the maximum.

2. Produce a well rounded student, that is one whose physical, social, moral, intellectual and esthetic potentialities have all been cultivated.

3. Make sure the student is confronted with (in mind and spirit) the great ideas of the great minds of history.

4. Assist students to develop objectivity about themselves and their beliefs and hence examine those beliefs critically.

5. Develop the inner character of students so that they can make sound, correct moral choices.

6. Provide students with a broad educational for useful careers.

7. Train students in methods of scholarship and/or scientific research and/or creative endeavors.

8. Produce a student who is able to perform his citizenship responsibilities effectively.
9. Provide special training for part-time adult students.

10. Assist citizens direction through extension programs, advice, consultation and the provision of useful or needed facilities and service other than teaching.

11. Provide cultural leadership for the community through institution-sponsored programs in the arts, public lectures by distinguished persons, athletic events and other performances, displays or celebrations which present the best of culture, popular or not.

12. Serve as a center for the dissemination of new ideas, whether those ideas are in science, literature, the arts or politics.

13. Serve as a center for the preservation of the cultural heritage.

14. Ensure the favorable appraisal of those who validate the quality of the programs we offer.

15. Keep costs down as low as possible, through more efficient utilization of time and space, reduction of course duplication, etc.

16. Make sure the salaries, teaching assignments, prerequisites, and privileges always reflect the contribution that the person involved is making to his own profession or discipline and the institution.

17. Involve faculty in the government of the institution.

18. Involve students in the government of the institution.

19. Make sure the institution is run democratically insofar as that is feasible.

20. Keep harmony between departments or divisions of the institution when such departments or divisions do not see eye to eye on important matters.

21. Encourage students to go into graduate work.
**IS**

22. Make sure the institution is run by those selected according to their ability to attain the goals of the institution in the most efficient manner possible.

23. Protect the faculty's right to academic freedom.

24. Provide a reasonable program of student activities.

25. Protect and facilitate the student's right to inquire into, investigate and examine critically any idea or program that they might be interested in.

26. Protect and facilitate the student's right to advocate direct action of a political or social kind and any legal attempt on their part to organize efforts to attain political or social goals, consistent with a rational, open and free society.

27. Develop loyalty on the part of the faculty and staff to the institution rather than only to their own jobs or professional concerns.

28. Attempt to develop greater pride on the part of the faculty, staff and students in their institution and the things it stands for.

29. Maintain top quality in those programs we feel to be especially important (other programs being, of course, up to acceptable standards.

30. Keep up to date and responsive.

31. Increase the prestige of the institution, or if you believe it is already extremely high, ensure the maintenance of that prestige.
Please list below, in order of priority, those goals which you consider will be the most important goals of your institution over the next ten years.

1.

2.

3.

4.

5.

6.

7.

8.

9.

10.
February 16, 1976

Recently you received a letter soliciting a response to a questionnaire concerning the goals and purposes of independent senior colleges and universities in Texas. Permission had been obtained from the President of your institution for it to be utilized in the study.

To date the questionnaire has not been received. I would sincerely appreciate your taking time to assist me in the study by returning the survey as soon as possible in the enclosed, self-addressed envelope.

Thank you for your interest and cooperation.

Sincerely,

Jerry Bawcom
List of Independent Senior Colleges and Universities in Texas.

1. Abilene Christian College
2. American Technological University
3. Austin College
4. Baylor University
5. Bishop College
6. Dallas Baptist College
7. East Texas Baptist College
8. Hardin-Simmons University
9. Houston Baptist University
10. Howard Payne University
11. Huston-Tillotson College
12. Incarnate Word College
13. Jarvis Christian College
14. LeTourneau College
15. Lubbock Christian College
16. Mary Hardin-Baylor College
17. McMurray College
18. Our Lady of the Lake College
19. Paul Quinn College
20. Rice University
21. St. Edward's University
22. St. Mary's University
23. Southern Methodist University
24. Southwestern Union College
25. Southwestern University
26. Texas Christian University
27. Texas College
28. Texas Lutheran College
29. Texas Wesleyan College
30. Trinity University
31. University of Dallas
32. University of St. Thomas
33. Wayland Baptist College
34. Wiley College
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RELATED INFORMATION ABOUT PANEL OF JUDGES

Panel of Judges

1. John C. Hitt
2. Norman Hackerman
3. Theodore M. Hesburgh
4. William M. Tate
5. Joe C. Mitchell
6. William B. Jones
7. Roy S. McClung
JOHN C. HITT

Education:
1962 A. B. cum Laude Austin College, Sherman, Texas
1964 M. S. Tulane University
1966 Ph.D. Tulane University

Academic Honors:
Alpha Chi, 1960
Danforth Graduate Fellow, 1962-1966
National Science Foundation Graduate Fellow, 1962-1966
Sigma Xi, 1965
Psi Chi, 1966

Professional Organizations:
American Psychological Association
Society for Neuroscience
Southern Society for Philosophy and Psychology
Southwestern Psychological Association
Midwestern Psychological Association
American Association for the Advancement of Science
American Association for Higher Education

Professional Background and Experience:
1963-64 Tulane University, Research Assistant
1964-66 Tulane University, Part-time Instructor
1966-69 Tulane University, Assistant Professor
1969 Tulane University, Elected to Graduate Faculty
1969-present Texas Christian University, Associate Professor
1972-present Texas Christian University, Associate Dean of the University
1974-present Texas Christian University, Vice President, TCU Research Foundation

Publications:
Numerous articles and manuscripts concerning physiological psychology, motivation general psychology, and psychopharmacology
Extensive reporting of research grant experience

Related Professional Activities:
Elected Chairman, TCU Faculty Senate, 1972
Representative, North Texas Study of Higher Education, 1972-73
Chairman, Committee on Social Sciences, Austin College Commission, 1973-present
TCU Representative to Leadership Fort Worth, 1973-74
Chairman, Affirmative Action Committee, 1973-present
Member, Board of Co-Editors, Psychological Research, 1973-present
Member, Forum Fort Worth, 1974-present
Planning Committee, 30th Annual Summer Conference of Academic Deans, Oklahoma State University, 1975
NORMAN HACKERMAN

Education:
1932 A.B. Johns Hopkins University
1935 Ph.D. Johns Hopkins University

Academic Honors:
Honorary Degrees:
1972 LLD St. Edwards University
1975 D.Sc. Austin College
Whitney Award of National Association of Corrosion Engineers 1956
Joseph L. Mattiello Award 1964
Palladium Medalist of the Electrochemical Society 1965
Southwest Regional Award of the American Chemical Society 1965
Honors Scroll, Texas Institute of Chemists 1975
Alpha Chi Sigma
Phi Kappa Phi
Phi Lambda Upsilon
Sigma Xi

Professional Organizations:
American Philosophical Society
National Academy of Sciences
Electrochemical Society
American Chemical Society
American Association for the Advancement of Science
International Society of Electrochemistry
Board on Energy Studies of National Academy of Sciences/National Research Council; Chairman 1974-
National Board on Graduate Education 1971-75
National Science Board, 1968 chairman 1974-
Who's Who in America; Board of Advisors 1975-

Professional Background and Experience:
1935-39 Loyola College, Assistant Professor of Chemistry
1936-40 Colloid Corporation, Research Chemist
1939-41 United States Coast Guard, Assistant Chemist
1941-43 Virginia Polytechnic Institute, Assistant Professor of Chemistry
1944-45 Kellex Corporation, Research Chemist
1945-46 The University of Texas at Austin, Assistant Professor of Chemistry
1946-50 UT, Associate Professor of Chemistry
1948-61 UT, Director of Corrosion Research Laboratory
1952-61 UT, Chairman of Chemistry Department
1960-71 UT, Dean of Research and Sponsored Programs
1961-63 UT, Vice President and Provost
1963-67 UT, Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs
1967-70 UT, President
Hackerman (continued)

1970-present Rice University, Professor of Chemistry
1970-present RU, President

Publications:
Numerous articles on chemistry and electrochemistry
Author and co-author of more than 170 publications

Related Professional Activities:
Universities Research Association (Council of Presidents); chairman, 1973
Environmental Pollution Panel, the President's Science Advisory Committee, 1965-66
Industry Consultant to the Metal Surface Treatment Equipment Show, Stockholm Trade Center, for U. S Department of Commerce, 1967
Association of Universities for Research in Astronomy, Inc. (Consultant, 1964- )
Editorial Board, Catalysis Reviews, 1968-73
Advisory Editorial Board, Corrosion Science, 1965-
Oak Ridge Associated Universities; Board of Directors, 1975-
Argonne National Laboratory (Chemical Engineering Division Review Committee, 1963-69; chairman, Board of Trustees, 1969-73)
Review Committee, 1963-69; chairman, Board of Trustees (1969-73)
Gordon Research Conferences (chairman, Conference on Corrosion, 1950; chairman, Conference on Chemistry at Interfaces, 1959; member, Board of Trustees, 1970-73).
THEODORE M. HESBURGH

Education:

1934-37 University of Notre Dame, Indiana
1937-40 Ph.B. Gregorian University, Rome, Italy
1940-43 S.T.L. Holy Cross College, Washington, D. C.
1943-45 S.T.D. Catholic University of America, Washington, D. C.

Academic Honors:

Fifty-one honorary doctorates, including honorary doctorates from Dartmouth College, Columbia University, Princeton University, Yale University, Syracuse University, and Harvard University
Fellow, American Academy of Arts and Sciences
United States Navy's Distinguished Public Service Award 1959
Medal of Freedom 1964
Antarctic Service Medal 1968
Gold Medal, National Institute of Social Sciences 1969
Meiklejohn Award, American Association of University Professors 1970
Charles Evans Hughes Award, National Conference of Christians and Jews 1970
National Catholic Educational Association Merit Award 1971
American Liberties Medallion, American Jewish Committee 1971
Liberty Bell Award, Indiana State Bar Association 1971
Clergyman of the Year Award, Religious Heritage of America, Inc. 1972
National Football Foundation and Hall of Fame's Distinguished American Award 1975

Professional Organizations:

Rockerfeller Foundation, Board of Trustees
Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, Board of Trustees
American Philosophical Society
National Academy of Education
Carnegie Council on Policy Studies in Higher Education
Association of American Colleges, Past President
American Council on Education, Board of Directors
Institute of International Education, Board of Trustees

Professional Background and Experience:

1934 Entered the Order of the Congregation of Holy Cross, Notre Dame, Indiana
1943 Ordained to priesthood
1943-44 Chaplain for the National Training School for Boys, Washington, D. C.
1945-47 Chaplain to Veterans, University of Notre Dame
1948-49 Assistant Professor of Religion, University of Notre Dame
1948-49 Head, Department of Religion, University of Notre Dame
1949-52 Executive Vice President, University of Notre Dame
1952 Appointed President, University of Notre Dame

Publications:
Numerous articles and eight books including *Patterns for Educational Growth*

Related Professional Activities:
Chairman, Academic Council, Ecumenical Institute for Advanced Theological Studies in Jerusalem
Board of Trustees, University of Jordan
Board of Directors, Chase Manhattan Bank
Board of Trustees, United Negro College Fund, Inc.
Council on Foreign Relations
Commission on United States-Latin American Relations
American Committee on United States Soviet Relations
Committee on International Science, National Science Board
International Federation of Catholic Universities, President, 1963-70
Administrative Board, International Association of Universities
Special Studies Group, Rockefeller Brothers Fund
Select Committee on the Future of Private and Independent Higher Education in New York State
Board of Consultants, National War College
Board of Trustees, Woodrow Wilson National Fellowship Foundation
Council of Presidents, Universities Research Association
WILLIS M. TATE

Education:
1932  B. A.  Southern Methodist University
1935  M. A.  Southern Methodist University

Additional Graduate Work:
University of Texas at Austin
University of Chicago

Academic Honors:
Honorary Degrees from:
Texas Wesleyan College
Centenary College
University of Denver
Oklahoma City University
University of Tulsa
Albright College
Fellow of American Sociological Associations

Professional Organizations:
Numerous social and professional organization memberships
Council of Protestant Colleges and Universities
Past Chairman of Board of Directors, Association of American Colleges
Board of Directors, American Council on Education
Past President of Philosophical Society of Texas
Past President of Texas Association of Colleges and Universities

Professional Background and Experience:
1935-42  San Antonio Public Schools, Texas
        Teaching, Elementary School Principal
        Junior High School Principal
1943-44  The First Methodist Church, Houston, Texas
        Executive Assistant to Pastor
1945-47  Southern Methodist University, Assistant
        Dean of Students
1948-49  SMU, Dean of Students
1950-53  SMU, Vice President of Development and
        Public Relations
1954-present  SMU, President

Publications:
Various articles
Co-author of Human Behavior in Industry

Related Professional Activities:
Vice Chairman of Association of Graduate Education and
Research of Texas
Chairman of Inter-University Council of North Texas
Program Commission of Independent Colleges and Universities of Texas
Former Member of Governor's Committee on Education Beyond the High Schools
Past President to Southern University Conference
Planning Committee, Goals for Dallas Board of Consultants to the National War College
Executive Committee on the Methodist World Council
Rotary Club of Dallas
JOE C. MITCHELL

Education:

Attended:
Lee Junior College
Westminster College
Southwestern University

1950 B. S. The University of Texas at Austin
1960 M. A. The University of Texas at Austin
1961 Ph.D. The University of Texas at Austin

Academic Honors:
Alpha Chi
Phi Delta Kappa
Visiting Lecturer, University of Texas 1955
Kellogg Foundation Fellow 1957
Piper Professor Nominee 1973

Professional Organizations:
Texas Education Association
National Education Association
Texas State Teachers Association
American Association of University Professors
Texas Association of School Administrators
American Association of School Administrators
Sponsor, Student Education Association
Sponsor, Alpha Chi

Professional Background and Experience:
1951-53 Pleasanton Public Schools, TX, teacher
1954-55 Pleasanton PS, Assistant Principal
1956-57 Pleasanton PS, Counselor
1958-59 Pleasanton PS, Principal
1959-60 Pleasanton PS, Superintendent
1956 The University of Texas at Austin, Visiting Lecturer, Education
1957-58 UT, Kellogg Foundation Fellow
1960-present Texas Wesleyan College, Professor of Education
1962-64 TWC, Dean of Men
1965-71 TWC, Chairman of Division of Education and Psychology and Director of Teacher Education

Publications:
Articles in Texas Outlook and Texas School Board Journal
Article in Phi Delta Kappan concerning Teacher Education Evaluation

Related Professional Activities:
Southern Association Accreditation Teams for Public Schools and Colleges
Texas Education Association Accrediting Teams for Public Schools and State Study Commission
Accreditation Teams for National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education Programs in Colleges
National Foreign Policy Conference for Educators, 1966
Consultant to Tarrant County Human Relations Commission
Chairman, Education Commission Administration Board,
United Methodist Church Council, Fort Worth, Texas
Tarrant County Inservice Training for Teachers
Chairman, Texas Wesleyan College Faculty Council
Academic Council, Texas Wesleyan College
Former Secretary/Treasurer of Texas Council of Deans
of Education
Board of Directors, White Lake School, Fort Worth, Texas
WILLIAM B. JONES

Education:

1950 B. A. magna cum laude Millsap College
1953 B. D. summa cum laude Emory University
1965 Ph.D. Vanderbilt University

Academic Honors:

President of Millsap College Student Body
Numerous scholastic awards
Rockerfeller Doctoral Fellow, 1961-63

Professional Organizations:

American Historical Association
American Society of Church History
Southwestern Conference on Latin American Studies
European History Section of Southern Historical Association
Conference on Latin American History
American Association of University Professors

Professional Background and Experience:

1953-58 Director Training School for Christian Workers, Santiago, Chile, with the Methodist Board of Missions
1958-63 Graduate School and part-time work
1963-65 Baker University, Assistant Professor of History and Acting Chairman, Department of History, Baldwin, Kansas
1965-75 Southwestern University, Lucy King Brown Professor of History and Chairman of the Department of History and Government
1975-present Southwestern University, Administrative Vice-President and Provost

Publications:

Numerous articles, book reviews, and lectures concerning philosophy and Spanish-American studies

Related Professional Activities:

Graz Center, Graz, Austria, Summer, 1970. Courses in Eastern European Society and Comparative Educational Systems of Europe
Sabbatical leave, Spring, 1972. Research in major European Libraries (Portugal, Spain, Vatican City, Italy, Switzerland, France, Netherlands, England)
Chairman Stonehaven Community Center for Senior Citizens, 1972
Member Citizens' Advisory Committee to local school board, 1972
Member and Chairman of Williamson-Burnett County Community Action Agency, 1971-75
Vice-Chairman Capitol Area Human Resources Agency, 1974-75
Director of Workshop for Coordinated Vocational-Academic Education, Austin, Texas, 1970
Author of American History examination for use by TEA in statewide teacher accreditation, 1968
Member Texas Educational Agency Accreditation Teams for Colleges, 1967-present
ROY C. McCLUNG

Education:

1941  B.S.  Oklahoma Baptist University
1944  Th.M.  Southern Baptist Theological Seminary
1948  Th.D.  Southern Baptist Theological Seminary

Academic Honors:
Who's Who in America
Who's Who in the Southwest
Who's Who in American Colleges and Universities
Community Leaders of America
Personalities of the South
Who's Who in the South and Southwest
Who's Who in Religion

Professional Background and Experience:
Pastorates in Oklahoma, Kentucky, and Indiana during college and seminary years
1947-54  Pastor, Ninth and O Baptist Church
           Louisville, Kentucky
1954-58  Pastor, First Baptist Church, Ada, Oklahoma
1958-63  Pastor, First Baptist Church, Plainview, Texas
1960-63  Trustee, Wayland Baptist College
1963-present  President, Wayland Baptist College

Publications:
Not submitted

Related Professional Activities and Organizations:
First Baptist Church, Plainview
Plainview Lions Club
Masonic Lodge
Plainview Chamber of Commerce
President, Texas Baptist School Administrators Association
Board of Directors, Western Information Network, Inc.
Haynes District Council of Boy Scouts
Independent Colleges and Universities of Texas, Inc.
Association of American Colleges
Association of Southern Baptist Colleges and Schools
Association of Texas Colleges and Universities
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