DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 021 524

JC 680 262

COORDINATION AND DEVELOPMENT IN HIGHER EDUCATION, MAJOR ADDRESSES AT THE ANNUAL CONFERENCE OF THE ASSOCIATION FO HIGHER EDUCATION, (3RD, SEATTLE, DECEMBER 2-3, 1966).

Washington Education Association, Seattle. Association for Higher Education.
Pub Date Dec 66
Note- 49p.
EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$2.04
Descriptors- CONFERENCE REPORTS, *EDUCATIONAL COORDINATION, EDUCATIONAL PROBLEMS, GOVERNANCE, *GOVERNING BOARDS, *HIGHER EDUCATION, *INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH, *JUNIOR COLLEGES, PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT, STATE PROGRAMS

Three major papers pertaining to the strengths and weaknesses of voluntary and more formal forms of institutional coordination (and other related issues) were presented to Washington's Association for Higher Education: (1) Warren Deem, in treating with the question of how the state's total higher education efforts might be more effectively coordinated in order to ensure the sound development of the state's educational resources, recommended (a) that planners should view their policy goals as "moving targets" rather than as some sort of stable condition, and (b) that an investigation should begin with a careful identification of the educational problems and needs for which more coordinated action is required. (2) Logan Wilson maintained that higher education has become too crucial to the general welfare for its development to be left entirely in local hands, and he therefore endorsed the trend toward statewide coordination. Observing that there has been a shift from voluntary to legislated coordination, he traced the historical development of state coordinating agencies. (3) Thomas B. Merson summarized the conference proceedings, cited conference gaps, and considered the question of whether a separate governing board for junior colleges in Washington should be created. Regarding the latter, he urged primarily that such a board not reduce local control and autonomy. (DG)

COORDINATION AND DEVELOPMENT IN HIGHER EDUCATION

Major Addresses at the Third Annual Conference

of the

ASSOCIATION FOR HIGHER EDUCATION

A Department of the Washington Education Association

December 2 and 3, 1966

Benjamin Franklin Hotel Seattle

ASSOCIATION FOR HIGHER EDUCATION
of the
Washington Education Association

"COORDINATION AND DEVELOPMENT IN HIGHER EDUCATION"

CONFERENCE PLANNING COMMITTEE

Larry Easter, Chairman
AHE President-elect
Clark College

Dr. George Kabat, AHE President
Eastern Washington State College

George Douglas
Shoreline Community College

James Newbill
Yakima Valley College

Dr. Clifford Foster
University of Washington

Dr. William H. Crawford
Washington State University

Dr. Harvey Gelder
Western Washington State College

Dr. Alvin Quall
Whitworth College

Dr. Kenneth Halwas
Eastern Washington State College

Floyd Young
Peninsula College

Dr. James Ford
Skagit Valley College

Dr. Frederic Giles
University of Washington

Ernest G. Kramer
Office of the State Superintendent
of Public Instruction

Staff Consultant: Dr. C. Wayne Hall,
Director of College and University Relations
Washington Education Association
910 Fifth Avenue
Seattle, Washington 98104

040767

"COORDINATION AND DEVELOPMENT IN HIGHER EDUCATION"

Benjamin Franklin Hotel, Seattle, Washington

December 2-3, 1966

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION AND ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

COORDINATION: VOLUNTARY OR FORMAL? AHE CONFERENCE EXAMINES PATTERNS

High on the agenda of unresolved issues in higher education is the matter of coordination of this sector of education within and among the various states. Although the literature on this highly controversial subject is not voluminous, increasing attention has been devoted to this topic since the late 1950s.

The unprecedented demand for expanded and broader forms of educational opportunities beyond high school has created serious concern for the financial commitments involved in satisfactorily meeting these demands.

Government officials and authorities in the field of higher education are vitally concerned not only with the costs involved but with educational purpose as well. Forms of coordination and its corollary, long-range planning on a statewide basis, are increasingly being viewed as a means for dealing effectively with the matter of economy as well as educational opportunity and purpose in higher education.

The controversy centers on voluntary forms of coordination vs. more formal forms of coordination. Proponents of the voluntary type of coordination among the institutions of higher education are basically concerned with preserving institutional autonomy in fulfilling the purposes of higher education. Proponents of formal coordination are primarily concerned about the ability of the state to meet statewide and even regional needs in the higher educational process.

The strengths and weaknesses of these forms of coordination, and other related issues, were examined in the recent statewide conference of the Association for Higher Education of the Washington Education Association. The Association for Higher Education was pleased to obtain the services of outstanding individuals to aid in the investigation of the issues.

Major conference addresses were delivered by Dr. Logan Wilson, president, American Council on Education; Dr. Thomas B. Merson, director of research, California Association of Junior Colleges, and Warren Deem, study director of the management firm of Arthur D. Little, Inc.

WEA-AHE also is indebted to the individuals who composed two panels that brought much insight to the basic issues involved. The first panel, "Society's Concern for Coordination in Higher Education," was moderated by State Senator Gordon Sandison. Members of the panel were State Senator Marshall A. Neill; State Representative Frank B. Brouillet; J. R. (Bob) Mitchell, assistant vice-president, Pacific Northwest Bell Telephone Co.; John L. King, chairman, board of regents, University of Washington, and W. Phillip Strawn, executive secretary, Washington State Research Council.

The second panel, "The Profession Views Coordination in Higher Education," was moderated by Dr. Frederic Giles, professor of higher education, University of Washington. Members of the panel were Dr. Robert Mortvedt, president, Pacific Lutheran University; Ernest G. Kramer, assistant superintendent, Division of Vocational Education, Office of the State Superintendent of Public Instruction; Dr. Kenneth Halwas, president, Washington American Association of University Professors; Dr. Frederick P. Thieme, vice-president, University of Washington; Mrs. Elizabeth McPherson, head of the English department, Clark College, and Dr. William E. Steward, president, Wenatchee Valley College.

The statewide planning committee for the AHE conference and the chairman (Larry Easter, AHE president-elect) are to be commended for their success in focusing attention on this significant issue in higher education.

C. WAYNE HALL, WEA director of college
and university relations.

041267
jjj

THE COORDINATION OF HIGHER EDUCATION IN WASHINGTON STATE:

PROBLEMS WHICH DEFINE THE TASK

by

Warren H. Deem

Management Services Division
Arthur D. Little, Inc.
San Francisco, California

A Speech Delivered to the Third Statewide Conference of the Association for Higher Education, Seattle, Washington
December 2, 1966

INTRODUCTION

The more effective coordination of education is regarded as one of the most important unresolved public policy issues confronting educators, laymen and public officials concerned with education in Washington State. During our recent study of the State's community college system, the Arthur D. Little, Inc. study team found repeated evidence of concern throughout the State with the general question of how the State's total education efforts might be more effectively coordinated so as to ensure the sound development of the State's educational resources.

It is reassuring, therefore, that the Association for Higher Education has chosen the issue of coordination for its annual conference topic. I interpret this as meaning that the members of AHE and AHE as a group intend to initiate by means of this conference a serious study of this issue and that you intend to exercise leadership in the process of shaping essential public policy in the State with regard to it.

I find this reassuring because experience elsewhere in the nation suggests that professional educators have not always taken such initiative. Logan Wilson, for example, has observed that:

> "... the initiative behind mandatory coordination in most states comes from outside rather than from inside academic circles. In view of the entrenched tradition of institutional sovereignty, this is understandable, but the unfortunate aspect of it is that resistance to change often places educators in the role of passive observers rather than active

participants in shaping the larger destinies of their institutions."[1]

If the views and activities of AHE and its members with respect to community college policy questions are any guide, I think our Arthur D. Little, Inc. study team would forecast that you will be anything but passive in pursuing study and action in regard to the issue of coordination.

A MANAGEMENT CONSULTANT'S APPROACH

My purpose today is not to try to suggest how greater coordination should be structured or achieved, because such recommendations must be grounded in research and study of the type which you intend to initiate and pursue. Instead, I have been asked to view the issue of coordination from the standpoint of a management consultant and in this role, as a student of organization, to try to assist you in doing two things:

1. define some of the issues which might be examined in your study of this matter; and,
2. suggest how you might structure your enquiry.

Now every observer has perceptual biases which reflect the conditioning of his experience and his occupational role. Perhaps the much-maligned term of management consultant provides no basis for generalization in these matters, but I think it only fair to confess my own biases merely as one student.

One of these biases takes the form of an observation with which those of you who worked with us on the community college study are now familiar. It is that in matters of institutional structure and administrative procedure, there is seldom any "one best way" to organize and implement a complex policy or program. In other words, the choice of organizational means to achieve any significant policy and program end usually involves a complex decision-making process which requires sensitivity and, in the end, judgment informed by research.

---

1. Logan Wilson, Emerging Patterns in American Higher Education, American Council on Education, Washington, 1965, p. 33.

I might also add the observation that this process of choice has seemed to be most successful in those instances in which the planning is "adaptive" in intent and in method. By this I mean to suggest that whether the task be establishing new organizational structures or modifying old ones, the most successful results have been obtained by the planners who have not viewed the future as some sort of fixed-end state to be realized through a unitary set of means. Instead, they have viewed their policy goals as "moving targets", and therefore they have created programs, organizations and processes which have been designed to function with a high degree of sensitivity and adaptability to complex and changing variables.

Since it is my own, I commend this bias to you as you begin your study of educational coordination. I do so, in particular, because as an outsider it has always seemed to me that professional educators never feel quite comfortable in beginning an undertaking such as yours without first searching for (or imputing) something called "principles", as in "the principles of state-wide coordination".

Now principles, of course, are extremely valuable possessions and, insofar as they are clear, detailed, statements of policy (as contrasted with vague endorsements of motherhood) they are essential to sound planning. The risk, as I have observed it, however, is to expect that the principles contain within them a single set of organizational or institutional means or that such can readily be deduced from them.

My warning, therefore, is that while goals may rule out from consideration certain organizational means:

1. they usually admit a wide range, and often a changing set of organizational means from among which choices must be made; and,
2. such choices must be informed by empirical research and not merely philosophical speculation of the Platonic sort.

In short, if you undertake your study of this conference topic with a healthy skepticism about the likelihood of your finding any single set of organizational mechanisms for achieving improved coordination, your inquiry is likely to be wide ranging, and my hunch

is that your final choices are likely to be rather more sound.

A second bias of mine might be summed up by suggesting that the dictum of the great American architect, Louis Sullivan, ought to be followed by designers of organizations, as well as by designers of buildings and cities. Sullivan's dictum is that "form follows function."

This second bias is one which may have some utility to you as you begin your consideration of the problem of educational coordination, because it suggests how you might structure your enquiry.

This advise might be summed up by the admonitory warning that much of the speculation already current in the State about the relative merits of "voluntary" and "mandatory" coordination may be premature. For example, during our discussion with you about how State-level guidance of the community college system ought to be organized, our study team heard a number of proposals for various types of State-level "super boards" of education. Others suggested specific mechanisms for voluntary coordination of the community college and the higher educational systems. While all of these specific proposals were interesting and many of them warrant subsequent study, it seemed to us that most of them were not directly addressed to specific and well-defined problems.

The risk, as I see it, is that you may begin by taking a series of existing institutional models for coordination, ones which have been tried or are being tried in other states, and impose them on present and future educational needs in Washington State. In saying this, I do not mean merely to repeat the cliche' that Washington's problems are "unique" or "different", however true, in fact, this may prove to be. Instead, I want to suggest that your enquiry should begin by a very careful identification of the educational problems and needs for which more coordinated action is required. Not until you have done this admittedly difficult and probably controversial part of the enquiry can you:

1. define the policies, programs, and functions which require greater coordination; and,

2. begin the job of designing the procedures and institutional mechanisms for ensuring more effective coordination.

If you structure your study of coordination in this sequence of steps, however, I believe you are likely to discover two things. First, you may develop an extremely useful basis for comparing the relevance of the problems and the answers which are being tried out elsewhere in the nation with the situation here in Washington. And, there is the possibility (and not necessarily such a remote one) that you may come up with some answers which are innovative not only with respect to Washington's needs, but to those of other states.

EXISTING PATTERNS OF COORDINATION: VOLUNTARY AND MANDATORY

I suggest this sequencing of your enquiry because a review of the published literature on the coordination of higher education suggests that much of it is addressed to a discussion of the relative experience and merits with three general types of coordination mechanisms. These are:

1. The so-called voluntary arrangements in which public and sometimes private institutions voluntarily associate to coordinate varying aspects of their operations; and,
2. Another class which generally have been given the mandatory force of law; which have resulted in the creation of official public coordination agencies; and which often seem to have been imposed upon public institutions of higher education; and,
3. A small class of agencies which achieve coordination by virtue of their powers to exercise unified line operating control over all public institutions.

Among this literature, some of the books which I have found most interesting and suggestive are Logan Wilson's Emerging Patterns in American Higher Education, Lyman Glenny's Autonomy of Public Colleges, and T. R. McConnell's A General Pattern for American Higher Education. Let me also commend to you an extremely thoughtful

article by Dr. Algo Henderson in the fall issue of the Educational Record of the American Council on Education.

From this literature, it is apparent that thoughtful and informed professional educators like Wilson, Glenny, McConnell, Henderson and Medsker are of the opinion that: 1. no single set of existing institutional devices provides anything more than a short-term general answer to the need for coordination; and, 2. no single state has yet found a set of devices which are completely satisfying in terms of its specific problems and needs. Many students, such as McConnell, observe that some form of coordination is "inescapable,"[1] and some have concluded, rather reluctantly it would appear, that most of the existing forms of purely voluntary coordination between heads of institutions have proved, or are proving, unsatisfactory, notably to state legislatures.

Beyond these general conclusions, one gains two other impressions. The first is that coordination of higher education, whether voluntary or mandatory, is of fairly recent origin and that it is in a highly fluid and evolutionary state of development. The second and, to me at least, perhaps more troubling impression is that there is no great unanimity among professional educators or students of higher education about: a) the specific ends for which coordination is required; and b) the detailed processes by which coordination should be achieved.

If these impressions are correct, then I think they suggest several observations about the structure and aims of your enquiry. The first I have already suggested; namely, that you ought to view the experience and organizational "models" available in other states with some skepticism or, at least, in an extremely pragmatic and

---

1. T. R. McConnell, A General Pattern for American Higher Education, McGraw Hill Book Company, Inc. 1962

enquiring frame of mind. Second, and more important, however, I believe that your enquiry must begin by a very careful identification and analysis of the educational problems and needs in terms of which the coordination function is to be structured.

For whatever assistance it may be to you, I would like to devote the remainder of my remarks to discussing a few of the problems and needs which are likely to be included in your discussions during this conference and your subsequent study of coordination. My purpose is to suggest problem areas which are illustrative of the problem and goal definition task. Also, I want to indicate something about the approach which I think you might take to this first, and perhaps most difficult portion of your study.

I make no pretense that this discussion is in any way inclusive, or even very systematic. We have not made any study of the coordination problem in Washington, nor have we conducted any sort of broad enquiry into the problems, resources and needs of higher education in the State. What follows is a series of observations and questions which have been suggested by our recent study of the State's community college system. As a consequence, the way in which the problems are stated reflects rather directly this somewhat limited vantage point.

COORDINATED PLANNING

Your discussion might begin by looking at the problem of educational planning.

Most of the literature on coordination, for example, suggests a general agreement that "planning" comprises one of the educational functions which increasingly require coordination in most states. Many of the examples cited in published studies suggest that the term "planning", as one might suspect, is susceptible currently to widely differing definitions. It seems to include a diverse collection of functions. These range from the identification and specification of new institutional locations and facilities all the way to rather detailed statement of educational goals, programs and even curricula.

I suspect that there is no good reason to suppose that the term "educational planning" (if we mean by it a collection of discrete goals and processes rather than a condition of abstract virtue) need comprise the same processes and procedures in every state or even mean the same thing at successive stages in the development of a complex set of educational systems within any one state. Nor does it seem to me that "comprehensive" or "master plans", whether in educational or in urban planning, for example, must automatically indicate one document, a standard table of contents, or even a single agency of authorship.

To affirm, therefore, that Washington lacks an educational "master plan" is not likely to take us very far in defining what the goals and techniques of the educational planning processes should be. Nor is any general agreement about the desirability of "master planning" likely to indicate, ipso facto, what kind of agency should author such a plan, or even that such a plan or planning process must be the sole responsibility of a single agency.

Among most educators, many laymen, and some public officials in the State of Washington today, I believe there is a growing consensus that educational development at all levels in the State is likely to be furthered by better educational planning and more effective coordination of plans and planning processes. If our interviews during the community college study are indicative, for example, there seems to be a growing concern on the part of many legislators that current planning procedures do not identify and relate the separate and distinct needs and resources which must be devoted to each of the State's major educational systems -- colleges and universities, community colleges and common schools. In passing, let me add the observation that this concern was voiced to our Arthur D. Little, Inc. study team by many legislators who are enthusiastic supporters of educational appropriations in the Legislature. Most of them, moreover, define planning to mean a procedure for securing a more effective and coordinated allocation of financial resources devoted to education and not merely as a means of reducing the amount or rate of tax dollars expended on education. In brief, it is

education's friends and legislative advocates who are calling for more effective and more coordinated planning and not just the traditional opponents of increased public expenditures.

What troubles me, however, is that as yet no one seems to have gotten down to tackling the admittedly difficult job of giving detailed definition to the goals, contents and methods of the plans and planning processes required. If planning merely means that the State ought to try in some orderly fashion to anticipate its educational needs and identify the "what", "when" and "where" of the resources which will be necessary to meet them, then almost everyone can endorse the idea that planning is a good thing. Indeed, at this level of generalization, it's not too difficult to go on to support more and better plans and better and more coordinated planning! Regretably, however, such endorsements provide little concrete direction to an educational administrator or to a legislative bill drafter.

At this point, I think you might reasonably object that I am merely confounding, not enlightening, and that after all the job of the consultant is not to compound problems, but to solve them! This is a reasonable observation, but since I have not done the research you propose to initiate, the best I can do is to suggest, somewhat gratuitously, no doubt, how you might go about your study. Let me suggest, therefore, that you begin by merely cataloguing all of the defects and inadequacies which you see in current educational planning in the State.

If our recent discussions with you over the last months are a good sample, I think that you may be amazed at how long and interesting that list will be and how quickly you can do that job. Reviewing merely a few of our interview notes in preparation for this meeting, I was impressed at the really extensive and on the whole thoughtful catalogue of problems which we collected through the interviews with you which we conducted in our community college study. I can scarcely begin even to list the many planning problems and issues which you suggested to us. But in case you have forgotten what you told us, let me list only several of them. First is the matter of numbers.

You seem to believe that good planning must begin with 1. good forecasts about how many and what type of people will be seeking education in the State during the years ahead; and 2. with forecasts about what types of education and educational institutions they will be seeking. I would also judge that you are almost unanimous in your view that the existing stock of forecast data that you have to work with is not adequate in quality and type.

One item I think you will find on your list, therefore, will be the need for better logistical data about the extent and character of the demand for education in the State in the years ahead. A closely related item doubtless will be the need for improved coordination of these forecasts and the forecasting processes so that planning for college and university enrollments, community college populations, and common school enrollments will be based upon the similar assumptions about what's ahead for the population and economy of this State.

Going to a very different and rather more complex issue, let me suggest that you also add to your list the planning problems and needs which can be identified through case studies of recent educational planning decisions. In looking at these recent examples of educational planning decisions, you ought to ask, not how good a job was done, or was the decision the right one, but rather:

1. how the specific planning decision impacts other sectors of the educational system;
2. how effectively were these other impacts identified and considered in the planning process; and
3. could organizational and procedural changes have ensured a greater sensitivity to such issues in the planning process?

Let me illustrate what I mean by citing the example of what I personally regard as a very successful planning decision. I refer to the work of the Temporary Advisory Council on Public Higher Education in selecting a location for the State's

next four-year baccalaureate institution. I indicate my own endorsement of the Council's decision merely as a means of suggesting to you that your case study research ought to extend to some of the planning decisions which you endorse and not merely to those you regret. The "right" decisions viewed as case studies can sometimes be more instructive than a study of those we regard as "wrong" because in putting under the microscope what we endorse, we have the chance to examine our own motives and limitations in action, rather than the more easily observable defects of those with whom we disagree.

While I believe that the Council used sound procedures to arrive at a sensible locational decision, I think your study of this case in planning may raise some useful questions.

- Isn't Washington going to need a number of new institutions of higher education over the next decade or so, and should these planning decisions be the work of a temporary group or a permanent one?
- Was there any available plan for the development of community colleges which provided the data necessary for the Temporary Council to determine how its alternative sites would affect existing or future community college enrollments?
- When you plan for a new four-year college, who determines what it ought to do and who it ought to serve? Should colleges serve geographical areas and should all colleges provide a standard educational offering to a certain population group; or should they be planned to serve certain types of educational demands? How is the service area of a new institution to be delineated in each instance? What do you need to know to make these choices? Who should make them?
- What data is required to define and decide the question of the educational mission, role, or "market" of a new institution of higher

learning? Who should make these decisions? The institution itself; all of the existing institutions of higher education; a State Board of some sort, and if so, who should sit on it?

If some of these questions sound editorial in tone, the message is quite intentional! In my view, when we talk of planning, we are talking of matters of value and choice, and we are squarely in the decision-making process, no matter how much we may want to rationalize or complain that planning is merely a staff and not a line function.

I believe that the Temporary Council made the right decision. I doubt, however, that they felt that they had the data necessary to make all of the decisions they confronted. And, I am not sure that all of the parties-in-interest, the people who will be impacted by the new college, were in there with definitive advice or were even "coordinating" with the Council during the planning process.

INSTITUTIONAL MISSIONS: DEFINING THE DIVISION OF LABOR IN HIGHER EDUCATION

A case study like this is likely to suggest and anticipate a lot of the questions which a more logical outline would identify in a different order or treat in a different dimension. Among the host of questions about how to plan which are likely to emerge from any case study like the one I have just suggested, however, are questions about educational and institutional goals.

Stated in its most obvious form, this problem can best be summarized in a series of questions:

1. What are the distinctive educational missions of the State of Washington's five existing institutions of higher learning?
2. What definable educational needs or "markets" do they serve? What evidence do we have to define the educational "markets" they should serve in the future? What measures can be applied to determine their effectiveness in serving existing "markets"?

3. Who should determine what institutions play what roles and what evidence will be required to make such decisions?

I believe that with more time than I have had, you will be able to formulate a series of logical and thoughtful ways of arranging some meaningful answers to the question of how the missions, "markets", and roles of the institutions of higher education should be defined. In the role of a layman, however, I want to assure you that these questions do indeed pose a number of imponderables.

If your Chairman had allowed you a question period after my remarks, I am sure that you would have every reason to ask me:

. Do you, as a management consultant, know any way of answering in neat, tidy, and quantifiable fashion, the question of what should each of the Washington State's institutions of higher education teach, and what "markets" they should serve?

But because your Chairman knows me so well, he knows that I will not give you any satisfying answers to these questions because as an organizational consultant, I cannot. Let me explain why. My belief is that these, in part at least, are questions of value and choice, not merely questions of fact and quantification. Devising educational goals and coordinating educational efforts involve matters of values. This requires making difficult choices between competing goals and alternatives. If this is the case, then it seems to me that those best prepared to take the lead in identifying the alternative goals and values are you -- the professional educators, the administrators, and teachers in Washington's system of higher education.

You, who are most intimately and continuously involved in the educational enterprise, it seems to me, must take the initiative in defining what coordination must do, how it must operate, and how the imponderables I've referred to earlier, must be resolved.

However, I think that you might reasonably reply that these decisions are impossible and since they are, getting them will take more time. Let me end, therefore, on an apocalyptic note. Earlier I have suggested that the published literature is not likely to suggest many conclusive definitions of what you ought to do in coordination of higher education or how you ought to do it. But what the literature does suggest to me, as I hope it has suggested to you, is that something must be done. As T. R. McConnell has suggested, coordination is "inescapable". Your review of Legislative opinion in this state is likely to validate our view that the matter of coordination in Washington today is not one of "if", but of "when" and "how".

While I am willing to concede as a layman that many of these issues of what should be taught, "when", "where", and "how", and at what cost, and by whom, strike me as difficult to define and to quantify, I think that the demand to define answers to them is inescapable; particularly in view of the experience in other states. The challenge of coordination, therefore, is whether you will be "passive observers" or "active participants" in the job of confronting and getting working definitions of these imponderables.

My own view is that educators, rather than laymen, must take the lead in defining the issues and finding the answers to the values and problems posed by coordination. If you shrink from this task, however, let me assure you that others will do the organizational carpentry, whether that requires cutting timber or the patient.

In suggesting this, I certainly do not mean to suggest that your leadership in this matter will ensure that your remedies will be accepted without serious question or contest. For example, the literature suggests that when educators, particularly the heads of colleges and universities, have decided to adopt more effective voluntary coordination merely as a tactical defense against imposed remedies, neither the rationale of their actions nor the results have proved widely persuasive.

Today in Washington, giving definition to the task and the means by which coordination should be structured and accomplished, requires confronting some tough questions. In these remarks, I have touched upon only a few of these questions. Others exist, and I merely mention a few of them to indicate the dimensions of the task which confronts you:

1. How should State financial support for higher education be budgeted and allocated? How can legislators and the public be assured that budget requests represent anything more than a tactical agreement arrived at between competing institutions?
2. Can political competition between individual educational institutions and institutional systems in the state colleges and universities, community colleges, and common schools, be avoided through some "super board", or are supervisory and consultative rather than regulatory agencies a better solution to competitive power struggles?
3. How can supervision, coordination and control be structured so as to avoid the manifest problems of lock-step uniformity, over-regulation, and bureaucratic timidity? Should a system of coordination be aimed more toward saving money, preventing mistakes and avoiding waste, or toward encouraging experimentation and stimulating innovation?
4. What are the functional interrelationships -- actual and desirable -- which should unite common schools, community colleges, and colleges and universities? In what particular respects and at what specific points are these systems interdependent and in need of coordination and articulation? Can you define "coordination" and "articulation" in terms which will be intelligible to those who are not professional educators? Can you assign economic values of cost and effectiveness to the results of improved "coordination"?

CONCLUSION

There are countless other questions which will appear on your list and which should constitute the basic point of departure of your study of coordination. I would not define them here today even if I had the time, because, as I have indicated earlier in my remarks, I think the matter of problem definition is an integral part, not merely of the research task, but also of the leadership function which you must perform in confronting the coordination issue.

I hope today that I have been able to suggest to you not merely what a difficult and complex task lies before you, but also to suggest something about the mode and approach which your study of this complex problem might take. While your Chairman charged me to raise many problems and settle none, I think you ought not to be discouraged as you undertake this task. While the experience in other states may not provide any very useful models for the solutions you will be called upon to construct, this very situation suggests the considerable promise which can result from your work. Because these models are not very satisfactory, I think Washington has a great opportunity to make a substantial contribution, not merely to the solution of its own problems, but to the resolution of this continuing problem in other states.

Having gotten to know you as we have through the course of our community college study, I have come to place a high estimate on your capacity for confronting difficult problems and finding innovative solutions to them. The climate of public opinion with respect to higher education in Washington seems to me to be positive and indeed enthusiastic. With this great resource and with your own willingness to innovate and experiment, I think the outlook for improved and effective coordination of higher education in Washington during the next decade is extremely promising.

011067

STATE COORDINATION OF HIGHER EDUCATION

Association for Higher Education
Washington Education Association
Seattle, Washington
December 2, 1966

Logan Wilson
President
American Council on Education

Although it would be comforting to attribute the independence enjoyed historically by most American colleges and universities to a popular appreciation of the virtues of institutional autonomy, we may as well acknowledge that this independence has been in part a reflection of public indifference to higher education. At the turn of the century, few persons went to college (about four percent of the college-age group), and until the last decade many campuses were ivy-covered enclaves of the surrounding society. Wide latitude was permitted in the establishment, support and control of institutions; local independence in decision-making was the rule. Academic matters seldom became political issues, and usually institutions were left relatively free to determine their own role and scope.

As a result of academic conservatism, the average college or university changed very slowly in character and grew mainly by gradual accretion. Nobody thought much about coordinating the efforts of different institutions, and long-range planning was virtually unknown. The diversification, decentralization, and institutional autonomy achieved under these circumstances are now widely held to be unique strengths of American higher education.

Recently we have become more aware of the weaknesses that exist alongside the strengths; unplanned diversification is being called into question as a model for further developments. As higher education becomes more complicated and expensive, pressures for expansion and improvement are often attended by demands for improved efficiency and effectiveness. Although we still pride ourselves on the cultural pluralism of our free society and on the autonomy of our intellectual institutions, the growing importance, cost, and interdependence of educational agencies are forces that compel changes in the tradition.

Higher education, in brief, has become too crucial to the general welfare for its development to be left entirely in local hands. Many of the urgent issues and problems cannot be dealt with adequately by individual institutions acting unilaterally, and piecemeal approaches do not yield satisfactory patterns. With the growing collectivism of modern life, more and more decisions and actions affecting the present and future of higher education are being transferred from the private to the public arena, and from the local to the state or national level.

One evidence of this trend has been the widespread formation in recent years of state-wide boards, commissions, or councils designed to give policy direction to public higher education. In our kind of society, the emergence of such agencies has been inevitable and in many respects desirable, but we should not blink the fact that such agencies often reduce the authority of the boards, administrators, and faculties of individual institutions. Considering the tendency of many academics to resist the centralization of educational authority, and to scrutinize relentlessly the actions of institutional trustees and administrators, it is indeed astonishing how quiet they have been about this drastic reorganization that has taken place in the governance of public higher education since World War II.

The trend toward state-wide coordination has been gaining momentum since the early 1950's, but when the American Council on Education chose "Autonomy and Interdependence: Emerging Systems in Higher Education" as the theme of its 1964 annual meeting, we were hard put to identify more than a handful of individuals who had systematically examined this important subject. As some of you know, Moos, Rourke, Glenny, Brumbaugh, Chambers, McConnell, and a few other writers were the only commentators who had paid much attention to the movement. One outcome of the Council's 1964 meeting, I might add, was the book I edited, Emerging Patterns in American Higher Education, and I shall have more to say later about other studies.

Although the drive for coordination has only recently become widespread, a framework for the state-wide regulation of higher education was established by New York State in 1784; moreover, consolidated governing boards have long been in existence: Nevada, Montana, and South Dakota each had a state governing board before the turn of the century. Similarly eleven states established the single governing board arrangement between 1900 and 1945. Since 1951, however, the trend has been entirely toward unified coordination rather than unified direct governance.

The flux of change, confusions of definition, and other factors make it difficult to describe precisely the present status of coordination in American higher education, and it is hazardous to be too categorical, but, according to the best information available, the following statements appear to be correct. Since Wyoming, Alaska, and Hawaii have only a single senior-grade public institution within their borders, they presumably have no problem of coordination. States which are reported to have no single agency for coordinating or directing higher education are Alabama, Delaware, Louisiana, Maine, Nebraska, New Jersey, Tennessee, and Vermont, but I know that in several of these states the matter is under consideration.

Although state coordination of higher education had not been the subject of much inquiry prior to 1964, the deficiency is being remedied. The Public Affairs Research Council of Louisiana recently published a comprehensive survey, Coordination and Planning, that is mostly descriptive in nature. The American Council on Education is currently making a study that has analytical and evaluative emphasis, under the direction of a California political scientist, Dr. Robert Berdahl. Our inquiry employs a fivefold classification of existing arrangements. It categorizes the New York scheme, which is unique, as a governing-coordinating board. According to Berdahl's findings, the second category -- the single governing board arrangement -- exists in the following states: Arizona, Florida, Georgia, Idaho, Iowa, Kansas, Mississippi, Montana, Nevada, New Hampshire, North Dakota, Oregon, Rhode Island, and South Dakota. A division within the State Board of Education has some responsibilities for higher education in Michigan and Pennsylvania. There is now some form of coordinating

council, board, or commission, as they are variously designated, in effect in these states: Arkansas, California, Colorado, Connecticut, Illinois, Kentucky, Maryland, Massachusetts, Minnesota, Missouri, Ohio, Oklahoma, New Mexico, North Carolina, South Carolina, Texas, Utah, Virginia, and Wisconsin. Only three states now have voluntary associations performing coordinating functions: Indiana, West Virginia, and -- as all of you know -- your own State of Washington.

In another survey of the subject, J. G. Paltridge, of the Berkeley Center for Research and Development in Higher Education, has noted three main trends in recent years. First, voluntary coordination is giving way to legally established agencies, as exemplified in such states as Colorado, Ohio, and Michigan. Second, coordinating agencies which had only limited regulatory powers are being given broader authority, as may be seen in New Mexico and Texas; those groups which hitherto were largely advisory, as in Wisconsin, are becoming more regulatory. Third, organizations whose controlling boards have been composed of institutional representatives are being transformed (for example, in Kentucky and Maryland) into boards composed of lay members representing the general public; a variation of this trend consists of adding more noninstitutional representatives and placing institutional members in nonvoting roles.

From what I have read and heard about the Council of Presidents here in the State of Washington, I judge that it has performed the coordinating function well enough to forestall pressures to establish a more formal mechanism with legislatively specified authority, but the trend throughout most of the nation is clearly in another direction. Moreover, to quote from a brochure which your Council issued in 1964, "The State of Washington, in terms of the present distribution of types of public institutions for post-high school education, has a happier inheritance than many states." I also understand from President Odegaard's recent annual report that considerable agreement exists about the need to establish a fourth state college and to have "a separate system of community colleges organized within 20 districts so defined geographically as to bring community college educational opportunities within a

convenient distance of the population in all parts of the state." In passing, I would comment that you Washingtonians seem to be able to achieve through cooperation and voluntary association what is accomplished only under political mandate in many other states!

As the Pliner survey for the Public Affairs Research Council of Louisiana points out, most states with coordinating agencies have aegis over all public colleges and universities, though some have separate jurisdictions for junior colleges, and a few draw private institutions into planning and other special activities. A number of states are still undecided about how to draw community colleges and private institutions into unified planning and coordination. It should be noted, however, that the Federal Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963 requires every state to have a single agency to determine building construction priorities among all eligible institutions, private as well as public.

In most states, the coordinating boards for public higher education are appointed by the governor, with the consent of the senate, and are intended to represent the general public rather than individual institutions. Such boards range in size from seven to eighteen members, who serve staggered terms of office varying from four to fifteen years, and who typically meet once a month. They usually elect their own officers, name their committees, and employ their own professional staffs. These staffs range in size from one to twenty.

In the study which the American Council on Education has under way, we shall inquire into the qualifications of board members, their power and prestige in comparison with those of board members for individual institutions, the problems they encounter in staff recruitment, the professional backgrounds of staff members, and many other matters relating to the functioning of these agencies.

The functions of commissions or coordinating boards characteristically involve analysis of institituional budgets for construction, operational cost studies, the development of accounting codes and of uniform policies and procedures, and similar matters. In recent years, these agencies have engaged more intensively in master

planning. Such planning entails giving attention to the role and scope of existing institutions, developing criteria for the establishment of new branches and new institutions, and furthering the more efficient use of staff and facilities. Many of the boards not only set priorities for new buildings but also must approve all construction plans. In addition, they review budget requests, and make recommendations to the governor and the legislature. Some have devised formula approaches which all institutions must adhere to in their presentations to the legislature.

As to programs, virtually all of the boards have authority to approve requests for new programs and to recommend elimination in cases of unnecessary duplications among existing programs. In fact, I know of one state where the commission even has the authority to veto individual course offerings. In most places, however, the programmatic focus is not on the details of a particular curriculum, but on high-cost areas such as graduate and professional work where an undue proliferation of programs results in both waste and mediocrity. Some of the commissions or boards also make recommendations about policies regarding faculty and students.

These coordinating agencies, I want to observe, have negative as well as positive reasons for being. Some years ago I was a university president in a large state which had eighteen or twenty degree-granting public colleges and universities. The programmatic duplication among them and the competition for increased funds had become so acute that the legislature placed a ban on all new academic programs. True, there had been a Council of State College Presidents for some years, but their main purpose was to uphold a tacit agreement not to cut one another's throats in institutional hearings before legislative appropriations committees. Seldom if ever did they discuss a voluntary approach to a more sensible division of academic labor among their institutions. To make a long story short, the legislature established a Commission on Higher Education to do for the institutions what they were either unable or unwilling to do for themselves.

This episode, I suspect, illustrates the negative side of the story in a number of other states. Prior to the development of systematic coordination, most states simply

had congeries of institutions, some of which were indiscriminately established, inadequately maintained, and poorly directed insofar as serving the best public interest was concerned. With institutional rivalry rather than careful attention to real needs behind some of the seemingly endless vertical and horizontal expansion of local endeavors, it is no wonder that the rich diversity of the education enterprise was often displaced by a poor divisiveness. Institutional autonomy run rampant not only increased unnecessarily the price of public higher education but also reduced its overall effectiveness. When rapid population growth and other factors added to the spiral of rising costs, it became obvious in many states that a coordinating mechanism had to be developed. Moreover, governors and legislatures increasingly felt the need for a buffer between themselves and the pressures generated by junior colleges wanting to become four-year institutions, of senior colleges wanting to change into universities, and of universities wanting to expand ad infinitum.

But this is by no means the whole story; fortunately, there are many positive reasons for the growth of coordinating agencies. On all sides there has been increased awareness of the need to distribute funds equitably among existing institutions, and to have an orderly plan for their expansion and for the establishment of new institutions. An agency that reviews programs and budgets can be viewed constructively as a means for implementing goals rather than as a device for keeping costs down. The less affluent as well as the more affluent states are now sold on the importance of education as an investment and on the advantages of central planning. Boards or councils specifically charged with responsibility for public higher education can usually do a better job of dealing with complex problems than can governors and legislatures, who must cope with the whole spectrum of public problems.

There is no single type of agency, of course, which is equally well suited to the needs of all fifty states. The scheme which works effectively in a state with just a few public colleges and universities might be inappropriate, even harmful to a state with dozens of institutions. Traditions as well as present circumstances must be considered. Although T. R. McConnell has concluded that the voluntary or informal

arrangement has lost its viability almost everywhere, it still seems to function successfully here in Washington. Certain states, as I have mentioned, have successively tried different arrangements, and as yet are not satisfied. The California scheme, widely regarded as a carefully worked-out prototype, is now under fire within the state itself.

In the fall issue of the Council's journal, The Educational Record, Algo D. Henderson, in a critique of state planning and coordination points out that central coordination is one thing and central operation another. The real test of coordination, he contends, is effectiveness in achieving goals rather than economy in using funds. Conformity and mediocrity often go hand in hand, and the first public concern should be not with distributing limited funds but with assuring that there be adequate funds to achieve those goals on which high values are placed.

Moos and Rourke, in their book The Campus and the State, pointed out in 1959 that colleges and universities are not analogous in most respects to other state agencies. There is an efficiency in allowing freedom to professional workers and other engaged in the higher learning, and permissiveness rather than authoritarianism is the appropriate scheme of governance. It should be remembered, furthermore, that educators themselves have developed regulatory mechanisms and coordinating devices through voluntary associations of individuals and institutions, accrediting agencies, consortia, and various other means.

We need look only at the rebuffs encountered occasionally by the organized medical profession as well as by trade unions to realize, however, that our society's tolerance for syndicalism is limited. In a political democracy it is inevitable that basic problems having to do with the support and control of public higher education -- and, increasingly, of private also -- should become political issues. Over-all state needs necessarily must have priority over the needs and desires of individual institutions. Some of the most critical problems today are inter- rather than intra-institutional, and politically appointed or elected officials need objective as well as expert advice in the search for solutions. The periodic budgetary requests from

individual institutions no longer constitute adequate guidelines for higher education to expand and improve over the next year or two, much less the next decade or two. The long view must be substituted for the annual and the biennial view.

For these and other reasons it is clear why the power structure of higher education has been changing rapidly in most states. A unified view of state-wide needs and plans to meet these needs are essential. With greatly increased funding demands, it is unrealistic to maintain that institutions of higher education should somehow be exempt from the tests of efficiency and effectiveness applied to other human enterprises. It is unrealistic also for professional educators to expect that intensified public interest in higher education will not be accompanied by a desire to participate at least indirectly in the critical decisions about its present and future. This groping for new forms of public agencies reflects, it seems to me, a healthy awareness of what is at stake. Before we rigidify existing arrangements or too hastily create new ones, however, I think we educators and the general public need to ask and answer some basic questions. I have mentioned some of them on other occasions, and I shall repeat a few here:

First, within a state, a region, or the nation, what kinds of decisions are best made by local authority and what kinds by central authority? What are the gains and losses each way? How much of our traditional autonomy must we discard to become more efficient and effective?

Second, to what extent does enlarged public control of higher education inevitably entail more political and less academic participation in planning and conducting the total enterprise?

Third, will the increased use of state-wide governing and coordinating bodies result in a more rational approach to the growing problems of support and control? What are the undesirable effects on individual institutions? How can they be minimized? What are the desirable effects? Are trends tending to politicize decisions which ought to be made by professionals? Should the executive officers of these state-wide agencies function as chancellors of systems or as secretaries of the agencies appointing them?

What role should private colleges and universities play in developing state-wide plans and policies and in achieving common educational goals? What role should community colleges play?

Fourth, what can be done to strengthen the leadership of professional educators? Granting that fundamental questions of educational policy are now being answered with little objective information, what kinds of objective knowledge do we need to correct this deficiency?

I do not claim to have the answers to all these questions, nor do I think anybody else has, and I would be the first to acknowledge that we cannot delay further action until we know precisely where we want to go and how to get there in American higher education. Even so, I would emphasize that we should not plunge heedlessly into the frenetic activity of developing state-wide systems and state schemes to allocate Federal funds, implementing the recommendations of anonymous task forces or bolstering interstate compacts and a multitude of other arrangements which, superimposed on those we already have, may confuse rather than clarify the decision-making process in higher education. I firmly believe that institutional independence must necessarily give way to new forms of interdependence but as we devise these new forms I think it is a serious mistake to bypass and undermine the recognized leadership of American higher education.

I am concerned about any move which in effect displaces the most experienced institutional leaders (including those on the faculty) and relegates them to the role of mere observers in public policy formation. Issues in higher education are too vital a concern of the public at large to be settled by professional educators alone, of course; yet it would be the height of folly to remove front-line leaders from the foreground of decision making and replace them with politically constituted committees, commissions, and other agencies remote from the real scenes of action. Moreover, I think we need to be cautious about the possibilities of developing central bureaucracies -- in either our state capitals or the national capital -- that would be prone to claim superior wisdom about what ought to be done to and for our colleges and universities.

With regard to these concerns, I refer again to the study of state-wide systems which the American Council on Education is now undertaking. In our inquiry we expect to go into a selected group of states and we hope to gather firsthand evidence on such matters as: the adequacy of enabling legislation; the quality of planning; the quality and adequacy of agency staff; the ability of states to increase their support for higher education; institutions' flexibility and openness to experimentation; the reactions of administrators, faculties, and students; the degree of insulation from political intervention; effectiveness in increasing accessibility and improving quality of programs. We are giving Dr. Berdahl and those working with him complete freedom to get at the facts, analyze them objectively, and evaluate them candidly. We are well aware in advance, of course, that since one man's meat may be another man's poison, the reactions we shall encounter will be diverse. We hope to have the study completed by the end of 1967.

In conclusion, let me say that I am pleased that you invited me from the other side of the United States to discuss with you an important subject, and one which you rather than I chose. Your choice was a timely one, and I hope that my remarks have thrown light on some issues which should be of vital concern to everybody who cares about the present and future of higher education. It is fortunate that your educational leaders here in the State of Washington have already done a lot of thinking about coordination and are now at work on plans for further development in this forward-looking state. You are to be congratulated for your past accomplishments and for your progressive outlook.

010667

COORDINATION OF HIGHER EDUCATION

Association for Higher Education
Washington Education Association
Seattle, Washington
December 3, 1966

Dr. Thomas B. Merson
Director of Research
California Junior College Association

Introduction

My assignment in concluding this Conference is threefold: (1) to note implications of the highlights of conference addresses and discussions, (2) to indicate important issues not covered by other sessions, and (3) to present points considered important to junior college coordination. Within the limited time of this session, the task seems nearly impossible.

Conference Summary

If I had to summarize in a telegram what we've said in two days, it would be: "Washington is different. Voluntary coordination works wonderfully here. We are happy. Go away and let us forget about coordination."

As I perceive it, we've had a stimulating academic discussion without really coming to grips with the critical issues. I'm not sure that I know, or that you know, what your position is, or may become, on any of the major issues of coordination.

A consultant soon learns that he sees and hears only those things his client wants him to see and hear. So consultants learn to sniff. As I sniffed around in all your sessions, I asked myself, "If all is working so well in Washington under voluntary coordination, why is a statewide conference needed on the topic of coordination in higher education?" I concluded that in spite of your line of chatter, you know vaguely that you have a problem. You hope the problem will go away. At least you hope you won't have to take any action until the problem reaches more critical proportions.

In his keynote address, Warren Deem gave you excellent advice when he told you to define the issues of coordination as they apply to Washington and then to structure your study accordingly. He emphasized that you will be unable to find a single solution to coordination because you always will be shooting at a moving target. Consequently, no matter how ably you decide now what you want to do, you'll find five years from now that your problems have changed. You must plan to be adaptable.

Mr. Deem further advised you not to select an existing model as a solution to your problems without first measuring its fit to the solutions you seek. He urged you to begin by categorizing defects which you want to correct, and to ask in each case if coordination could correct them.

"The cooperative action solution is not one that will work forever," Deem warned. He offered the opinion that involved questions of choice which will come to a coordinating agency are better handled by members of the profession. Deem closed by asserting that the climate of public opinion regarding issues in higher education is positive. I thought he inferred that this was a wholesome sign.

In the panel session moderated by Senator Sandison, we heard the views of leaders outside the profession. Mr. Strawn said, "With or without coordination, costs of higher education will be high." He emphasized that everyone sees the need for coordination, but opinions differ with respect to who should coordinate what, and how. He emphasized that coordination won't solve the cost problem, and said, "Let's be cautious about a superboard."

Senator Neill placed the issue squarely before us when he said, "The solution we seek is how to get more service for less cost." He warned that we can't afford duplication, but he urged us not to embark on forced coordination before we'd given voluntary coordination a better trial.

Representative Brouillet cautioned us that federal programs were creating a need for coordination. Mr. Mitchell then urged the formation of a strong regulatory agency because it could save millions of dollars. Mr. King, in delightful style, noted that "As we centralize, we deprive ourselves of the opportunity for involvement," and he advised us about the complexity of cost determination.

The panel represented a good cross-section of the views now held about coordination. They underscored Mr. Deem's earlier remarks when he observed, "Education's friends are calling for planning, if not for coordination." The panel made it clear that we must not ask "if," but "when" and "how."

Next I observed an example of coordination failure in the Conference. Let me briefly interject a report on this case study. Following good coordination procedure, Wayne Hall had carefully distributed discussion questions to each group. However, I found none of the groups using Dr. Hall's questions because everyone had been carried away by Warren Deem's advice to formulate questions of their own. If Mr. Deem can be that convincing in an hour's address, what will be the effect of Dr. Odegaard's persuasion when he gets a chance to influence your views?

After a delightfully humorous introduction of banquet guests by Dr. Joe Chandler, Dr. Logan Wilson gave his address in which he stated, "Higher Education has become too crucial to the general welfare for its development to be left entirely in local hands." Dr. Wilson noted that there has been a shift from voluntary to legislated coordination, and from liaison to regulation. Dr. Wilson listed the regulatory powers of master boards. These powers have frightening implications. He also listed many reasons for coordination, stated that we cannot wait until we know what to do, but cautioned us against developing unnecessary bureaucracy. Dr. Wilson concluded by reviewing the current ACE study of the effectiveness of existing boards.

A new day started with Dr. Giles' late-train panel. President Mortvedt underscored the need for coordination and pleaded for scholarships for students attending private colleges. Mr. Kramer told us a lot about vocational education, emphasizing that the real differences between vocational and other education are not basic. He stated his belief that the major issue was the press toward fragmentation, and he pleaded for more "togetherness."

Dr. Halwas reminded us of the meaning of "co" in "coordination." He noted that participation among equals is important, listing faculty, trustees, administrators and legislators as essential cooperating groups. Vice-President Thieme then told us that the league in which the University played was a national league, and that much of the activity of the University lies outside the scope of review of a state-level coordinating agency. Dr. Thieme pointed out that he would rather see the highway program reviewed than the higher education program.

Mrs. McPherson identified transferability of courses and teacher load as examples of topics appropriate for review by a superboard. She pointed out, however, that such topics as assistance with the unique teaching problems associated with terminal students is better provided through interdisciplinary conferences. Dr. Steward concluded the panel with a statement of his belief that, "Our present way is the best way to meet the challenges ahead."

Activity in the morning discussion groups had changed direction overnight. Discussion was moving ahead full-throttle, perhaps to make up for time lost by Dr. Giles' late train. The groups had stopped making lists for Mr. Deem and were talking about how a superboard might find solutions to major problems. Several delegates requested opportunity for instructor exchanges among the segments of higher education, and others pleaded for opportunity for inter- and intra-disciplinary discussion among representatives of all segments of higher education. This observation is being passed on to

the Directors of AHE with the comment that there is an important role for the Association whether or not Washington adopts a superboard. Several groups asserted that the University does not have the right to set policy independently of other segments. A number of examples were cited to illustrate that University policy change may create hardships for other institutions. In general, the groups acknowledged the difficulty of a superboard being able to reduce "irritant cases," and seemed to agree that before anyone could decide wisely whether he favored coordination by a superboard, we would need a clear definition of the proposed board's responsibility and role.

In concluding this brief review of conference proceedings, I would observe that more understanding will probably be carried home from the discussion groups than from the speakers and panels. There was a very active participation in the discussion groups, and the conference organizers are to be complimented on making these arrangements. I believe participants are leaving the conference with clearer views of the issues than they had when they arrived.

Conference Gaps

The second portion of my assignment is to identify gaps in what has been discussed during the Conference, and to add additional points for consideration.

For someone from another state to try to guess in advance of the Conference what needs to be said is hazardous. After Mr. Deem's keynote address, I discarded my checklist because he had presented the major issues vividly. I would like to enlarge on only three points.

Let me first call your attention to the matter of definitions. I thought the Conference at different times talked about coordination in different settings and at different levels almost interchangeably without always identifying the setting or the level of reference. I believe it is appropriate to coordinate some things at one level, but inappropriate to coordinate these same things at another level. There

are three common levels of coordination. Each appropriately has some distinct responsibilities, but each also overlaps the other to a confusing degree. The levels are: (1) a statewide superboard or coordinating council at the top, clearly separated from the statewide boards which govern the several segments of higher education; (2) separate statewide boards for the governance of each segment of higher education: junior colleges, state colleges and universities; and (3) local boards or advisory committees, one for each institution of higher education in the state.

I would judge that many conference participants were trying to project their knowledge about local board operation to the other two categories. Such projection will not accommodate the significant differences which exist between the responsibilities and operation of local boards and the responsibilities and operation of statewide boards. I sense that conference delegates felt comfortable in discussing local board responsibilities, they were ready to discuss separate statewide boards for each segment of higher education, but they were fearful of a superboard. As Washington's system of higher education grows in complexity, some control organized at all three levels seems almost inevitable. To clarify this view, my next remarks will deal primarily with the superboard. What I will say about this board will in many ways differ from what I would say if I were talking about the proposed new statewide junior college board.

California has a statewide Coordinating Council for Higher Education, now almost ten years old. I judge it to be effective. True, its first few years were hectic, but more recently it has demonstrated a willingness to tackle problems which are beyond solution by any one segment of higher education alone. The research being conducted by the Council is creditable. Before you close your mind to the merits of a statewide superboard, I would urge you to study carefully the progress and accomplishments of the California Council, and to ask yourselves in what other way these responsibilities of coordination could be better handled.

With reference to a superboard, then, my first remark would be an assertion that increased state-level coordination and/or control of higher education is inevitable as systems of higher education increase in number and size.

This bald assertion may come as a shock to you, following as it does some of my earlier commentary on the remarks of other speakers. I think Mr. Deem's address pointed to a similar conclusion. Please note that I said "coordination and/or control." Later I'm going to urge coordination rather than control, perhaps more hopefully than realistically.

Let me summarize briefly the logic which leads to my assertion that increased statewide coordination is inevitable. It is axiomatic that increased enrollments in higher education are assured. Increased costs automatically follow enrollment increases. Superimposed upon these two factors is a rapidly-changing society requiring and demanding diversified educational programs and <u>diverse educational institutions to provide these programs</u>. Expansion of numbers and kinds of institutions cannot be left to chance or to political manipulation.

Legislation or a superboard mandate, or both, will be required to obtain equal access to higher education for all segments of our society. A single kind of institution cannot carry the full load of educational responsibility. When different kinds of institutions are established, competition follows. In your Conference, you spoke approvingly of the way you decided upon the location of a new state college. But under your present organization, could you have decided equally well upon the question had it involved establishing a dozen or more new institutions -- what kinds, which first, when and where? It was such a circumstance that lead to establishing the Coordinating Council in California. In that state, bills for the establishment of many new institutions were introduced in one session of the legislature. A state masterplan which had established priorities did not yet exist. Legislators agreed, "If you vote

for my college, I'll vote for yours." Higher education was on the verge of chaos. The point I'm trying to make is that advanced, impartial, objective planning is essential for the orderly development of a differentiated system of higher education.

The clinching argument is that federal legislation is making a superboard imperative. Lacking a superboard, each state will be required to create a new agency each time new federal legislation is enacted. The competition for federal funds is vicious and only an impartial super-agency can distribute these funds so they will bring maximum benefit to the state as a whole. One must wonder if even a super-agency can accomplish this.

I will introduce the second reference to superboards by a question: Can a superboard remain sensitive to the interests and welfare of individual colleges and simultaneously control its statewide component systems?

If we could answer this question affirmatively, our fears would be markedly reduced. The question is not unlike the primary question which faced the founders of our nation almost 200 years ago. In that case, they were trying to work out a plan which would promote the orderly development of each state as an integral and contributing part of the nation. From that experience we can derive hope. But our situation is also not unlike the one which produced the United Nations. The experiences encountered by that body are less encouraging. You can readily see the fallacy of arguing from analogy.

It seems to me that the preservation of the autonomy and the diversity of individual institutions is paramount if innovations are to flourish and if institutions are to remain sensitive and responsive to changing societal needs. A central agency can promote diversity, innovation and responsiveness in spite of inescapable and ever-present pressures for uniformity which continuously force it to apply control. Yet

control seems to result in spite of good intentions. If efforts are made to curtail an agency's power of control, the agency usually becomes ineffective. It is rare to find a central agency which achieves desirable levels of control through leading rather than driving, through giving aid rather than demanding subservience, through inspiring rather than legislating. You can see I'm suggesting that if you create a superboard in Washington, you should seek to have it achieve control through service and leadership.

Legislative pressure is the most pervasive force which influences a super-agency toward excessive and unwanted control. To state the point directly, the legislature is likely to say, "If you professional folk don't take the responsibility for the orderly growth of higher education, we will." All of us would choose self-governance.

Competition for fiscal support is another force which promotes excessive control. Other state agencies compete with education for limited available funds. Almost automatically, state government requires every agency to adopt controls on salaries, space utilization, budget reviews, central purchasing, building authorization and personnel policies as a condition for financial support. If an educational agency doesn't comply, it simplifies fund allocation. Most states would rather build highways than colleges.

Other speakers have advised you that a superboard must have its responsibilities clearly defined at the time it is created, and its personnel must be selected with care. I want to underscore the idea that competent personnel are perhaps the most critical to an agency's effective operation.

The third issue I'd like to raise is: "Can any agency gain both the freedom and the support which are necessary for all higher education to reach maximum effectiveness?" The answer is probably "no." Here is where we face our dilemma. We can

expect an agency to do some things well. We cannot hope it will solve all our problems. Let's be reasonable in our expectations.

I believe, however, that a state with a superboard has a better chance of obtaining a positive answer to the question than one without such a board. Factors beyond a board's control or influence which adversely affect its operation include: (1) the low value our citizenry collectively gives to higher education as a top priority social service; (2) the preference of state governments to operate by rules and regulations when they become large and complex; (3) the preferential treatment of other important social services which have direct personal appeal; and (4) the cherished right of the legislature to make decisions, hence its reluctance to grant discretionary powers to an agency.

Creating a superboard alone will not guarantee all the improvements we might hope for. More than an agency is needed. The few states which have made marked progress in coordinating higher education have all had vigorous support from the governor and the legislature. Education must court political support. We can solve our minor internal professional problems with relative ease, but without substantial legislative and gubernatorial support, overall gains will be minimal.

In concluding this section, let me quickly review with you steps you might take if you do decide to establish a superboard of higher education. Action would start with a resolution by the state legislature authorizing a comprehensive study and the subsequent development of a masterplan for higher education. I believe you are ready for these steps now. I hope you won't postpone this initial action until a crisis forces you into hurried planning. Constructing a masterplan would require: (1) defining the systems and segments of higher education, and the respective roles and responsibilities of each; (2) identifying the problems which require coordination --

this is what you were doing in your discussion sessions at this Conference; (3) stipulating the nature and functions of the coordinating agency, relating these points to the problems you created the agency to solve; (4) formulating a plan of financial support under which all segments could flourish; and (5) providing means for periodic adjustments of the masterplan.

Let me try to make these points more meaningful by presenting questions you would have to answer as you prepared your masterplan.

What form would you select for your total system of higher education? Would you adopt California's tripartite plan of a university system, a state college system and a junior college system? Would you then give each segment equal representation on the superboard? And would there be other representation on the superboard?

The answer to the first question seems easy until you begin to assign non-overlapping roles to each segment. When you reach this point, every field presents a host of thorny problems. For example, as you divide responsibility for engineering education, you can readily assign preparation of design engineers to the university and preparation of engineering technicians to the junior college. Then who should prepare the applied engineers? If this is assigned to the state colleges, what shall be the limits of the program both upward and downward? Or you may ask, which institutions should offer doctoral programs? An answer comes readily -- "The universities, of course, because they have the research training capabilities." But then you might ask if the state colleges could retain competent professors without a research inducement? Moving to consideration of the role of the junior college, you'd readily agree on their responsibility for technical programs, but how technical? Nursing will illustrate this quandry. It is easy to differentiate between a two-year and a

four-year R.N. program. But because these programs have little similarity of organization, will there be any reciprocity between them? And shall licensure limitations be imposed on either program?

Questions of admission restrictions are as difficult as any. Will you adopt a plan of differential admissions as California did and restrict enrollment of the upper one-eighth of high school graduates to the university, the upper one-third to the state colleges, and hold the junior colleges to an open door policy? In all your discussion sessions, you talked about the problems of students transferring from junior college to senior college. This problem could be eliminated by assigning all lower division work to the junior colleges. Why not try this? Or would such a move create more problems than it solves?

Let's now consider the forms of governance you might want to adopt. Should there be a separate state board for each system -- university, state college and junior college? California has a separate board for the universities and another for the state colleges, but junior colleges are controlled by the board which also has jurisdiction over elementary and secondary education. This places junior colleges at a disadvantage in bargaining. Before Washington adopts a tripartite system with each system controlled by an independent board, you have some other questions to answer. For example, could the University of Washington and Washington State University be happy together under a common board? It is a tough question to answer now, and it will get tougher as time goes on. There won't always be only two universities in the state. Which will be the first to develop a branch campus? Once this process starts, it could get out of hand quickly. It is at this point that a superboard's advantages become most obvious.

Let's stop with one more major problem. What reaction would the universities and the state colleges have to the state alloting funds on the basis of enrollment

if three-fourths of the students are enrolled in the junior colleges? That is exactly the problem we face in California. California's junior colleges now enroll over a half-million students. This number is more than twice the combined enrollment of all the state colleges and branches of the university. At the last election, bonds valued at over one hundred million dollars were approved for higher education, and nothing was allocated for junior college support! Such inequity cannot persist. In Washington you can expect a similar struggle for equitable allocation of funds. Workable answers to such questions don't come easily. I'll close this section with two more questions. How effective can a superboard be in reaching solutions to such questions? Can you think of a better way to objectively adjudicate such matters?

Junior College Coordination

For the third portion of my remarks, I'd like to shift emphasis from a superboard to a state level governing board for junior colleges. Mr. Deem has given us a splendid reference base for considering the question, "Should you create a separate governing board for junior colleges in Washington?"

In future deliberations of this question, I would urge you to:

1. Make every effort to insure that a new state-level board will not reduce local control and local autonomy. At the time the new board is formed, unless you are vigilant, the powers given to the board could impose a degree of uniformity on all colleges to the point where individual colleges could not be responsive to local needs.

2. Ensure that the junior college board and its staff are so constituted that they can speak authoritatively for all the junior colleges of the state.

3. Strive to have the board become respected to the degree that it can compete favorably with other agencies of government, in order that it may secure adequate, equitable and proportional financial support for junior colleges.

4. Impose on the board no limitations as to the scope of programs for youth and adults. Charge the board with responsibility for encouraging the

development of programs which are appropriate for the societal, political and economic education of all youth and adults.

5. Seek to free the board from impediments to creativity. Future junior college development will call for this institution to serve society in many ways we cannot foresee today.

Community colleges represent the new frontier of higher education. They already carry the major enrollment burden. Other institutions must become accustomed to their secondary though important role. "Junior" has grown up; he's now ready for full partnership. The day has almost arrived when nearly all high school graduates will choose to enroll in community colleges, and nearly all adults will require the services of these institutions to maintain their employability and citizenship competence.

Gratifying as the present achievements of this institution appear to be, they are dwarfed by its future potential. What are the theoretical limits of enrollment? Clearly they are represented by enrollment of all high school graduates and all adults. These numbers are staggering. Yet we know junior colleges can profitably serve this full range now. A realistic, yet conservative, estimate would be that by the turn of the century, nearly all high school graduates will attend junior college, and nearly every employed adult will enroll part-time at least every four or five years. Stated another way, we can expect within a very few years to be called upon to educate a ten-fold increase in regular day students and a hundred-fold increase in adults. What kind of agency is going to be able to guide the junior college through such a phenomenal period of growth? Don't you agree the challenge promises to be one unmatched in the history of educational development? Don't you agree it merits priority consideration?

When I learned of my assignment at this Conference, I asked Dr. William Crawford to give me questions which represented your prime concerns. Dr. Crawford

was the chief coordinator of the recent study of junior colleges conducted by the Arthur D. Little staff. I will try to briefly answer Dr. Crawford's questions in the hope that the questions and their answers may influence future study which may follow this Conference.

Question 1. Should vocational-technical education, adult education and education of all types beyond high school come under the direct control of the community college system? The answer is "yes," except of course for upper division, baccalaureate and graduate education. The complete job of a comprehensive community college cannot be accomplished unless it embraces all of these functions.

Question 2. Should there be a community college system both outside and independent of the state superintendent of public instruction? The answer is "yes," the anticipated future growth of community colleges warrants separate administration. We have learned that independent separate local boards govern junior colleges more effectively than boards with responsibility divided among several segments of education. It seems logical that this principle would apply equally at the state level.

Question 3. Should there be a state board for vocational-technical education exclusively for community colleges, acting independently of the assistant state superintendent in charge of vocational-technical education for the state? The answer is "no." Vocational education is still important in high schools. Clearly the major responsibility should, and in the future will reside in the community colleges. But recognizing that historically the roots of vocational education have grown in high school programs, and in view of the character of federal legislation, at the present time a "straddle board"seems advisable. Vigorous and direct effort should be made to encourage the straddle board to move responsibility for occupational education to the community colleges.

Question 4. Should the state board for community colleges in vocational-technical education be appointed by the governor or be elected by the electors? I prefer appointment.

Question 5. Should existing vocational-technical institutions which are now part of the common school districts become part of the community college system? "Yes." The trend toward requiring more education for employment is clear.

Question 6. What should be the relationship of multicampuses in community college districts? I believe we will have multicampuses in most of our districts in future years. Population growth in Washington is rapid. Multicampus districts are becoming common in other states with heavy population increases. Organizational principles are now pretty well established. Each college in a multicampus district should have as much autonomy as possible with central staff limited to those needed to efficiently handle tasks common to the operation of all campuses in the district.

Question 7. What is the best approach for statewide cooperation between institutions of higher learning: the state colleges, the universities and the junior colleges? I believe the best solution lies in a coordinating council and separate state boards for each segment. I believe the poorest arrangement would be a single board for all of higher education.

Question 8. Should there be a state advisory committee, advisory to the state junior college system, and would this be elected or appointed? In general, I favor advisory committees. However, if the state junior college board has the proper composition and representation, an advisory committee may be unnecessary. I believe, in the long run, you will find an advisory council to be advantageous. We must insure that the board is sensitive to important issues. The junior colleges should fashion direct pipelines to and from the board which will provide the board with information, support and direction whenever it is needed.

Question 9. What would be the comparative cost of administration of the state system within the present structure of the state superintendent's office as compared with a separate office for community colleges? Cost will vary with service. Your present state service is inadequate. You need additional service now. As the number of junior colleges increase and enrollment grows, additional services will be required and costs will correspondingly increase. In spite of some evidence to the contrary, real costs should not vary substantially because you provide the services through one agency or another. The separate agency, however, is more likely to provide the services you need.

Conclusion

I realize the Conference has covered many points superficially. You will want to hold other conferences to deal with these and other questions in greater depth. At least this conference has alerted you to the major questions and started your planning for their solution. Some questions will require decisions soon, others can be postponed. Thank you for the chance to share in this stimulating meeting.