DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 077 432 HE 004 254

TITLE	Proceedings of 1st Annual Conference on Higher Education Institutional Research and Planning.
INSTITUTION	Maine State Higher Education Facilities Commission, Augusta.
PUB DATE	3 Nov 71
NOTE	48p.; Conference proceedings of 1st Annual Conference on Higher Education Institutional Research and Planning, Thomas College, Waterville, Maine, November 1971
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	Conference Reports; *Educational Facilities; *Educational Planning; *Educational Research; *Higher Education; *Institutional Research

ABSTRACT

This document presents the proceedings of the 1971 Conference of Higher Education Institutional Research and Planning, sponsored by the State of Maine Higher Education Facilities Commission. The text of the main address and conference program are presented. Results of a follow-up questionnaire and a list of conference attendants are also included. (MJM)

PROCEEDINGS OF

1ST ANNUAL CONFERENCE on

HIGHER EDUCATION

INSTITUTIONAL

RESEARCH and

PLANNING

held at

Thomas College
Waterville, Maine
November 3, 1971

State of Maine
Higher Education Facilities Commission
State Department of Education Building
Augusta, Maine 04330

PROCEEDINGS OF

1ST ANNUAL CONFERENCE on

HIGHER EDUCATION

INSTITUTIONAL

RESEARCH and

PLANNING

held at

Thomas College
Waterville, Maine
November 3, 1971

State of Maine
Higher Education Facilities Commission
State Department of Education Building
Augusta, Maine 04330

THIS CONFERENCE WAS UNDERWRITTEN BY THE STATE OF MAINE

HIGHER EDUCATION FACILITIES COMMISSION

UNDER THE HIGHER EDUCATION FACILITIES COMPREHENSIVE PLANNING GRANT PROGRAM

PURSUANT TO TITLE I OF THE HIGHER EDUCATION FACILITIES ACT OF 1963

STATE COMMISSION
FOR THE
HIGHER EDUCATION FACILITIES ACT OF 1963

Christo Anton, Biddeford, Chairman

Charles F. Bragg, II, Bangor

Chester L. Dana, Bangor

Lincoln T. Fish, Gorham

Paul V. Hazelton, Topsham

Frank S. Hoy, Lewiston

Ernest C. Marriner, Waterville

Mrs. Margaret M. McIntosh, York Harbor

Charles J. O'Leary, Bangor

Carroll R. McGary, Commissioner of Education

Wayne H. Ross, Executive Secretary

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The idea of having a conference on higher educational research and planning was discussed in our office many times, by many different people, and we were all waiting for someone else to start something. Finally, Wayne Ross and I decided that we had some planning money which could be used for this purpose.

We thought we might get an organization going which could perpetuate itself and really give some direction to institutional research and planning in the State of Maine. We needed a mailing list and we also needed, we thought, an idea which would get things going with a bang. Thus was CHIRP born. We were fortunate in getting Frank Newman as our keynote speaker, and he did a terrific job keeping the audience spellbound during his talk. I regret very much that, because of time limitations, we didn't really get a chance to talk to, or question him more. His talk follows and I hope you remember that it was taken off the tape and not from a typewritten speech. Impossible to catch were the questions from the floor as they didn't come through at all.

Shortly after the conference, we sent out a questionnaire. We were pleasantly surprised at the number returned. Most of the comments were constructive and some critical. These are also listed.

I want to thank John Thomas, of Thomas College, for being such a gracious host. His beautiful new campus served as a wonderful backdrop to the conference. The facilities were comfortable and the meal was done very nicely. I'm sure everyone was satisfied.

I also want to thank the committee who gave willingly of their time and talents: Madelyn D. Alexander, Edward Y. Blewett, Bernard R. Carpenter, and Henry C. Merriam. Also deserving of thanks were Mrs. Jacqueline Foley, our faithful secretary, who also served as a receptionist, along with Mrs. Harold M. Grodinsky.

Harold M. Grodinsky
Director
Higher Education Facilities Planning

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Transcript of Address Given By
Frank Newman
Stanford University

Say, we may actually in fact be happy about the separation of space here. It's sort of an unusual program when the commissioner is sitting next to you on the platform here and, as he finished talking, comes over and picks up his small bag of tomatoes and says to you, I'm going down and sit in the first row. We may actually be delighted at the separation of space. Actually I was in Maine, I have been in Maine once before. There are a lot of people that get to this state. You may not think so, it seems remote, but I did have the delightful opportunity to spend several months here once. I'd like to, if I could, since the subject that you are dealing with is research and planning, I'd like to raise a number of questions with you - many of them perhaps reasonably embarrassing questions, but on the whole, having run a large research organization at one point in my life, I am familiar with one old axiom of research in the physical sciences which I think applies to university research as well, and that is, that the most crucial question in research is not how to go about it but what to research. So it seems to me it's worth asking ourselves, in considerable detail, just what is it, as we look ahead, we ought to be focusing on. And as I say, I'd like to raise a number of questions, not in any sense of disparagement of higher education, far from it. I am a firm believer in it, I have spent much too much of my life in it. If nothing else, I am married to a professor of anthropology at the University of California. And as you know in today's world, it's no longer possible for us guys to represent only our own opinions, so I am forced to, if only in light of the true nature of the world today, represent my wife's opinions as well. So in any criticism I make, I'd hope it would be criticism of a friend of higher education. Not that I suppose that prelude is really necessary. Any state where the inhabitants voluntarily vote an income tax has to be some sort of a state filled with realism, I would think. In California, if somebody put on the ballot the chance to abolish the income tax, it would pass. If somebody put on the ballot the chance to abolish the state, it would pass. As you know, higher education is going through a tremendous self-searching examination. We have been astonished at the response to the report. I think in some sense that response

is far beyond anything we had anticipated. I think, in part, that comes from the very unsettled conditions in higher education today. We were talking just before we started up here this morning about the nature of voter support of higher education and legislative support of higher education, and it's obvious that there is a new questioning, a mood of questioning, that hasn't been around in higher education since about 1919-1920, when there was a sort of anti-reaction for a very short period. But today's, I think, is very different from that temporary phenomena of the twenties. This strikes me as a much deeper sense of questioning of the values of higher education, maybe that is inevitable. We started out in this twenty-five year post war period with such an unrealistic perception of what higher education could be and should be. And during that 25 years, we built in the public mind a deeper and deeper image that higher education would solve almost every problem in national life, so, in a way, I suppose we ourselves are to blame for the sudden fall from grace, and I think it's going to be a lot worse before it's over. I don't mean worse in the sense that what will result will be bad, I mean worse in the sense that we are going to have to answer some very embarrassing questions. I mean that things are likely to get tougher for us intellectually before they begin to get easier.

Since we are all the way in the far corner of the country, a long way from the wild west, I feel that I can tell you the story of Big Mike if you're not familiar with that story, because out here you probably don't know much about - I know that communication is difficult up here - and probably what happens in the west doesn't drift back to this end of the country. But when one thinks about the situation of higher education, it's very much like the story of the tenderfoot who got out to the wild west. He really wanted to see what life was like in the big bad west and finally got himself in the traditional saloon, and he was standing at the bar just enjoying the atmosphere when all of a sudden some cowboy broke into the saloon and said, "Big Mike is coming." There was tremendous panic and everybody ran and pretty soon he was all alone standing with the bartender. The bartender said, "you better

get out of here." He said, "I came out here to see what was going on in the west." The bartender said, "listen, Big Mike is coming, you better get out of here." "Not me," he said, "I came to see." "Well at least get way back in the corner." So he got as far back as he could in the shadows. Sure enough pretty soon up rode a fellow on a horse - you could hear the horse coming, then you could hear this clump clump as he came up to the door, and then this huge man grabbed the two swinging doors, just ripped them off and threw them aside and came in. He came up to the bar and pounded on the bar, and the bartender put a bucket on and just poured in all the drinks. The fellow took it and just poured it down. The bartender said, "do you want another one?" He said, "hell no, I got to get out of here, Big Mike is coming." Well that's largely the boat we are in. We are standing here looking at resistance on the part of the public, looking at difficult questions that are being asked, and I would submit that we haven't begun to see the depth of the questioning that is going to come. Let me tell you some questions that we have been putting to ourselves in our task force, and that others are beginning to put.

If college is so important in our lives, what in fact does it do for the student, and how can we prove that?

If college is so crucial, what is so crucial about it? What is the thing about college that is so important?

If access and improving access to colleges is so significant, why is it that so many students leave college voluntarily?

If the most common reason that students give in the Fall Survey that the A.C.E. took for going to college is to gain a high-paying job, how can we guarantee a high-paying job for 80% of the population if we are beginning to approach access rates of 80% in certain states?

If we have too many PhD's to fill jobs that are normally filled by PhD's, what is the purpose of our continuing to expand graduate education?

If there doesn't seem to be a serious carefully made correlation between performance on the job in a bachelor's degree or an associate degree, why

do employers insist upon these credentials?

If there is a growing tendency among some of the very best students to avoid any sense of a career or achievement, why should we subsidize these students more than all the others?

If motivation is so significant in learning, why isn't motivation ever used as a requirement for college?

If the G.I. Bill has shown us that students who have some experience outside college, and who return to college after that, are more focused, more effective students, better learners and enjoy it more, why have we never capitalized on this and why do we insist that students should instead go directly from high school to college?

If most new studies show that high school students are bored by the format of learning that is used in high school, why do we insist on using the same format increasingly in all college experience?

If students are more and more diverse as access expands, why is there a steady trend toward similarity in our colleges?

If the pressures toward the accrediting and academic prestige, etc., are driving out such differing institutions as night law schools, why is it that we have never made any measurement of whether or not night law school lawyers are better or poorer lawyers?

If the pressures of economies of scales lead us to build institutions of 20, 30, or 40 thousand on a single campus, why haven't we measured whether in fact this is an economy of scale, or, as is now being suspected around the country, is it a negative economy of scale?

If there is a financial crisis in higher education, why have we resisted so firmly the question of whether or not we are using our resources efficiently, and whether there are more effective ways to teach in the classroom?

If we can ask of the rest of the world that we should be allowed to examine every facet of life and society from family structure in the ghetto to the

morality of business in our determined search for truth, in our determined search for the facts and the rigor with which we want to approach each problem, and, simultaneously, if we are going to insist that we in that process be protected by the concept of academic freedom, why should we be so recalcitrant in terms of examining ourselves and so sensitive about any self-criticism about higher education?

These things, I think, represent some very awkward questions for us. We are in my opinion in the need of a serious national debate about what we are doing in higher education. One can only have a national debate if in fact one gets very tough questions up in front and begins to argue, accept the idea that there are differences of opinion and go at it sort of hammer and tong. It's only out of that that we are going to get a new view of what higher education is to mean in the United States. I really believe the old view is dead. The old view was that every aspiring young man that could do it, when he reached the age (I say man because we obviously discriminate against women) of eighteen would be polished up by his parents and sent off to college, go four years, come out the other end with a bachelor's degree, get a high-paying job, and go on to a satisfying life. In almost every way, this point has now unraveled. First of all, most students don't go through in four years, most don't even go through. Most students in the United States do not finish college. Most students drop out in less than two years, voluntarily. Most do not get satisfying high-paying jobs for some reasons that I'd like to come back to. Most are not satisfied with their college experience. Increasingly, parents, legislators, and we ourselves, are beginning to ask about it. So I think a debate would be a very, very useful thing. And since I believe that, I would like to encourage a slight difference in the normal format. Normally, it's customary to wait until the end, and we're going to give you the opportunity of some of the discussion and debate. Both Mr. Blewett and Mr. Freeman, would it be alright with you if you, or if anybody, when you have a question you just asked it as we went along? Is it alright? They don't seem very responsive on that point. Can I ask that question

again? I'd like to ask that question again. Would it be alright with you as you got moved by a question, you just raise it as we go along? That's still a very weak response, isn't it? Was it a hard summer here? Then, I'll try it again. Would it be alright - maybe I could put the question differently. I refuse to go on unless you agree more forcefully that if you get a question you will raise it. Is that O.K.? Very good. Let me tell you, if most students responded this way we'd flunk them. Alright, you now have an obligation, keep that in mind.

Let me go back to a few of these questions. First, take the question of the purpose of college. This year's A.C.E. Survey shows that two-thirds of the students list as their reasons for going to college the desire for a high-paying job. The system we have had historically worked very well, with relatively low access rates. Europe uses the system now - very low access rates, good jobs reserved for an elite. Elite is defined as those students who graduate from college, or who have attended college, and that system works relatively well. It doesn't matter that there is not necessarily a good correlation between having a college degree and having a college education, and being able to perform on the job. It doesn't matter as long as there is a reasonable correlation and as long as the jobs are reserved for those people with the credential. If that is the case then, of course, the system will continue to work. However, look what has happened in the last several years, or last 20 or so years. There is, indeed, a shift toward more interesting jobs being available and more high-paying jobs being available. Have any of you read Toffler's book on "Future Shock?" Well, you know, Toffler and other people like that do a very American kind of a thing. They describe these grand changes that are occurring in our society. The prose carries you along with a tremendous sense of enthusiasm for what's happening. One gets the idea that if you are not a PhD in computer science, it's going to be very difficult to even write a check next year. In fact what is happening is there is a very slow glacial shift in the nature of our job market. There is a very good book out now by (well, it's been out several years now) Charles Silberman, you know the one who wrote, "Crisis in the Classroom." He wrote a book

about the myths of automation and it describes in a very careful, academic, way the nature of the makeup of the job market, and he and the other, (he's an editor o[illegible]ne") he and his co-editors have done a fairly extensive research job and what he shows is, in fact, that there is a decline in the amount of blue-collar labor, much less than has been predicted - decline as a percent of the total work force is still an absolute increase, but a decline as a percent of the total work force. There is a shift toward white collar and a shift toward professional and managerial. The professional and managerial in a decade increased about 4%. The shift to white collar is also in many ways misleading. For example, he points out a case in the computer industry, and I used to run a computer business and I really agree with it completely. As he points out, many white-collar jobs are in fact more routine, less intellectually demanding, than their blue-collar counterparts. The example he uses is the computer keypunch operator. Well, a computer keypunch operator has a less demanding, more routinized, less intellectual, job than an assembly worker in a computer plant. So, while we call it white collar, it is in fact nothing but a white-collar/blue-collar job. And yet what do we expect in terms of college experience? Well, the number of students, since 1950, that have entered college was something in the order of less than 20% of the age group in this country. Today, nationally, the figure is just over 50% enter college and in certain very high access states, it's now in excess of 60% of the age group enter college. Well, if we keep moving toward 60% of the age group entering college, which is a three times increase over 1950, in twenty years, where are we going to get a three times increase in interesting and exciting jobs? Not only that, but we've got a complicating factor. In 1950, roughly 42% of the people that entered college did not expect an interesting job because they were women, and we explained to them very clearly when they went through college that the most exciting job you can get is to be secretary to someone in the publishing business and perhaps he'll occasionally let you read a manuscript. Well, now that has all changed, but perhaps you've heard in some other states, I realize that may not be true here, but in other states,

namely the one I'm in for an example, women want to have exciting jobs. And this heretical idea is gaining such a foothold, I think we are going to have to give some ground. So instead of having, in fact, a change from 20% to 60%, what we, in fact, have is change from 12% of the population to 60% of the population wanting exciting jobs, or five times increase. Where are we going to get a five times increase in exciting jobs? We're not, but what have we told everybody? Go to college and get a good job. In fact, yesterday, we had a hassle about this in Washington - the Office of Education is continuing to advertise this on the radio occasionally. They have spot ads that tell you if you missed out on the chance to go to college, we can help you get back in and go and get an exciting high-paying job. How are we going to do it? And employers in their circumstances continue to ask for more and more credentials simply because they are flooded with employees who have minimum credentials. Let me give you an example out of the San Francisco Chronicle (you miss a great deal when you don't read that paper regularly) so let me bring you an example: here's an ad, out of the want ads, that appeared about two months ago - Wanted topless dancers, must have two years of college. Now we would all question the relativity of that point. Well listen to the last sentence, or last phrase - prefer English major or humanities. The astonishing thing about that is that all of us given the slightest imagination can think of other desciplines that would be more relevant than English or humanities. Now understand, I am not campaigning against cultured topless dancers. I mean, that seems as important to me as a lot of other things. I am only saying that we have perverted beyond all sense of reason what it is we're trying to do with college. And we have failed to examine in the most rudimentary way the relationship between what we are saying and the obvious facts in what we are doing. The net result of some of this is new senses occurring in the discussions of higher education today. As evidence, you might have seen Vice President Agnew's speech of about a year ago in which he began a new line of argument that too many people are going to college and it's time to cut this back, and I know you've had

your own difficulties here in Maine in terms of what the enrollment should be here in Maine. I have to differ with that philosophy. I do think we have got to seriously consider what college is for, but I question whether the right answer is the one to go back to the idea of an elite that matches the exciting jobs. This theory is getting more and more widespread. We did have an awkward problem with this. The National Review wrote a very favorable editorial about our report when it came out, in which they interpreted it as saying that we believed there were way too many people going to college and that someone ought to do something about cutting this back. My wife immediately, someone sent her a copy of that and she immediately confronted me with that, and she said "Look what you've done." I was sort of in the dog house for a day or so, until the next day when I got to my office my secretary handed me a copy of a review that had been printed in a radical newspaper, that appears in the Bay Area, called the "People's Advocate." The "People's Advocate" came out with a very favorable report in which they said, here's some guys that say it's time we completely changed - they got a real radical program and they want to see everybody go to college. So I took that one home and I gave it to my wife and I said, "Look, if the People's Advocate likes this and the National Review likes it, there has to be something good about us, right?" She said, well she'd see. One question I think then we've got to ask ourselves is, what is the purpose of all this? Incidently, no one has asked a question. Why hasn't anybody asked a question? That won't do. That avoids your intellectual part of the bargain. I think unless someone asks a question, we ought to stop right here. I think it's unfair that I should do all the work.

QUESTION----------

I think that's a very real question in a world of almost full access - let me say, substantial access - maybe that would be much better. What happens to the people who haven't got access? You know, in a world where 10% of the people go to college, to be in the 90% is no problem. In a world in which 80% of the high school

graduates go to college, just take high school graduates for a minute, to be in the 20% is a distinct problem. And, if anything, as we approach broader access, the pressure for even broader access accelerates. And certainly crucial among that are the people in minorities. And this raises another awkward question. When one measures the impact of college - there is now maybe half a dozen studies that have tried to measure the intellectual and other impacts of college on the students. One of the most awkward things is that it is apparent from every study that the greatest impact is not on the student who goes to Princeton or Berkeley, in fact, the greatest impact comes on the student who goes to the community college, who survives, goes through the community college and he makes the greatest intellectual gain. And there is another awkward thing about that, he does it at the lowest cost. So there is this tremendous dilemma that we have to face, that for years we have been saying that the most prestigious thing is to go to Princeton and get your bachelor's degree and we give that our priority, and we subsidize that in our society when, in fact, the student who goes to the community college, and the minority student particularly who goes to the community college at the lowest cost, makes the biggest intellectual jump. Well, then, we have to decide what it is we want. Again, this brings us back to the point - do we want reinforcement of a social structure or do we want, in fact, an intellectual advance on the part of the greatest number of people. You mentioned that college has been a force for social mobility, and it has as we've broadened access but, in facts, it has been less of a force than everyone had anticipated. What gradually happened as access broadened was that the class of students who had access earlier went on for advanced degrees, and what we've done is that sort of the whole level, everybody has sort of moved up a notch. Everybody that had a high school degree now has a college degree, and those that had a college degree now has an advanced degree, and the social structure has remained only modestly affected. It has been affected. There has indeed been, by any measure, there is a modest amount of improvement in social mobility. I think a very real question remains. What premium do we put on social mobility as opposed to ordering the social structure.

Someone the other day made, I can't remember who it was, made what I thought was a very interesting argument at a meeting I was at, in which they said the prime thing that college does is not intellectually train people, is not prepare them for a vocation, but sort them. Oh, Sandy Astin of the A.C.E., the A.C.E. Research Director. he argues that the prime thing that college does is sort people into acceptable social categories. In a way, one can see this in a new study that the University of California hasn't released yet, but it was done at the Center for Research and Development in Higher Education at the Berkeley campus and it covers all of California's higher education. And they again find that the Berkeley student makes the least jump compared to what he would have made anyway, and that the surviving community college student makes the greatest jump. Now I say surviving, and that leads us to another point. One of the things that is very awkward about higher education is that we always measure our results by surviving students. Now there is a new study out by Martin Trow, a very fine guy and an excellent scholar, in which he talks about how satisfied students are. It's one of the Carnegie reports "Satisfied With Their Education," and he measured it in a way that I disagree with, though I agree with almost everything else he's written. One of the things it does is always concentrates on the surviving student. It always reminds me when I see that situation, it inevitably reminds me of the sort of argument that you often get in terms of minority groups - the good guys, the ones that really have anything on the ball, will always survive. And those are the only guys we are worried about? We can't possibly mean that. Take for example, we had a debate the other day with some community college people in Los Angeles and the subject was, "What is the Function of the Community College?" There is a considerable debate raging in California about the role of the community college. Is it a sifter for talent for the university, or is it an educator to the students who come to it? Well, that's a crucial decision. Approximately 1 out of 7 students that enters the community colleges in California goes on at the end of two years to the university. Some of them come back later and go to the university, but about 1 out of 7 goes. Now, one of the questions you have to ask yourself is, Are

we trying to educate the 6 that don't, or are we trying to find the one that does? And in California, largely, if you look at community college structure, it is structured in favor of finding the one. Now they always get very upset when you say that, but when you look at the curriculum, in fact, it is geared to encourage the one. Well, what are the decisions that come when you start examining this? Well, take the question of comprehensiveness vs specialization. Should a community college be an equivalent of a state college (4-year college) that has courses, you know, that a student can arrange around and experiment and try things, or should it be focused with specific programs that have a fair amount of structure to them? It turns out that if you want to educate the six (6), then you'd opt in favor of much more structure. If you want to sift and find the one (1), then you'd opt in favor of the comprehensiveness on the ability of the student to wander around. Almost all community colleges in California operate on the second theory, and some of them are very large. There are at least two community colleges in Los Angeles, in the Los Angeles Community College district, which has 8 colleges that now exceed 18,000 students. The whole system has over 100,000 students just in Los Angeles, just in the community college district, which makes it the 5th largest system of higher education in the United States.

So, these aren't idle questions. So the question of access then forces us back to this question of, what is it that we want out of college? Another question that we are forced to face, I think in looking at this, is the question of, what is the pattern of college attendance? What should the pattern be? And we devoted ourselves to this in the report - some of you may remember if any of you read the Table of Contents, there is a section called, "The Academic Lockstep." And this is again something that is very typical of the United States. A friend of mine on our task force likes to say, "the idea that you go to college at age 18 is as American as violence." Why does one go to college at age 18? There are all sorts of reasons why it's logical to go then - you haven't started on your career yet, you're in the academic mood, you're ready to learn, it's a natural extension of going to high school, it's a pre-

paration for life, it should be done as early as possible. All that avoids several of the major reasons. One of the major reasons is that parents feel very strongly that their kids ought to go and they have relatively little control except at that point, age 18. That is their control point. Parents fear greatly that if their kids don't go to college at age 18, they won't go to college and they'll miss out in this quest in life. Colleges discriminate in favor of the 18 year old student. Increasingly, public colleges do not, but all the leading colleges do. Students very rapidly learn that they are not going tc get into Yale unless they go right out of high school and, consequently, the mood is set right in the high school. All of us are parties to this. When we were writing that chapter, we came to a marvelous incident in our own family. When we were right in the middle of writing that chapter, my oldest son made a suggestion that maybe he'd take a year off after high school, and without realizing what I was doing, I got deeply into the argument that the usual parent makes about - that's a cop out, you're just trying to avoid getting grades, you'd better get, damn well get to work and you're going to go to college. I was really hammering away at this and my wife stopped me and said, "who are you of anybody in the United States, who are you to make that argument?" Suddenly I realized I was deeply into this thing and I was going against everything I was saying rationally, but my sort of gut feelings were coming forth. And it's just built into us. Well, does it work? Well, for most students it works very poorly. We've had in front of us for years the G.I. bill experience, and everybody in this country believes that G.I. students are better students. Now it's interesting, since you're all worried about institutional research, one of the things that you should be aware of is that with this widespread feeling about the G.I. bill we have almost no proof about it. No one has ever seriously measured the effectiveness of G.I. bill students. We, by very diligent effort, went around and we discovered about 4 very minor studies at individual institutions where they look at a small number of students. We went to the Veterans Administration and asked them and they said, Oh yes, G.I. bill

students do very well. We said, do you have any data on it? And they said no, but they do very well. And we said, yes but have you ever made a study, and they said no, but they do very well. Then we went to the Peace Corps and they said, Oh yes, we have a lot of data on it and we can show you that almost 50 or 60%, I think it was, of students that get out of the Peace Corps go back to college. We said yes, but how do they do? They said, very well. And we said, no, no - we mean data. We went around and asked the A.C.E. and they said, Oh yes, they all do very well. And we said, do you have any data? And so on it went. I believe they do very well, I was a G.I. bill student at one point and I thought I did very well. I think most G.I. bill students that I have talked to argue that their college experience was very much enhanced by being out in the other environment. Peace Corps students say the same thing. But we haven't capitalized on that. Why have we not capitalized on it? Is there any evidence that students wouldn't do just as well if they were out working in a steel mill or in a canning factory, or out in an ecology co-op? Well, so far, the evidence, as limited as it is, seems to be that it really doesn't matter much as long as it is some completely different experience, and particularly an experience that has a difference in the mixing with other people. One of the things that is very good, for example, for elite kids that we found at Stanford, is if kids go out and are in the service, they find out that the rest of the world is not like the suburb they came from and the campus they are living on. And it's terribly difficult to tell them that - I mean that they find it out emotionally down here. Oh, they all know that there is a ghetto somewhere and several of them have driven through them on occasion, but it's very apt that we have black kids on the campus, and so on, but it's very, very, difficult to explain that there are in this world some very unachievement-oriented, unintelligent, people. Well, people are always saying mix them up on the campus. Well, you can't do that. First of all, on the campus, people segregate out again, but, secondly, one can't go around and say get 50 dumb kids and say, would you mind coming over to the campus and be our dumb kids-in-residence this week. And then, you can't say to the student body, look I want you to go down and see how dumb

these kids are - I mean, they are really dumb, and if you interact with them you will be really appreciative about how wonderful your experience has been and why you ought to get a good education. Go down there and spend a couple of hours with a dumb kid. Well, it can't work. There is no way of doing that. There is no way of saying, look if you work in a steel mill you're going to find out that there are just all sorts of other values that people have that you haven't even considered, and some of them are much better than the values you hold and you'll find that out. We can't go and get 15 steel mill workers and have them sitting around the dorms yakking with the guys. It's not the same thing. So to some degree, we have to get that kind of experience into many people's life, and it's increasingly important when so many students grow up in the suburbs and are isolated from any real sort of life experience. As society gets more affluent, as the colleges get more affluent, there is less and less of a sense of struggle that has been in anybody's life. So we gradually got around to recognizing that for some students, and maybe even most students, going to college immediately out of high school doesn't make a lot of sense. What there should be is a college system which encourages students into college when they are ready to learn, and out of college when they are not. Well, who do you have to convince? Well, some colleges are already reacting to this by this multiple year admission. You know Radcliffe, Brown, and several other schools, had multiple year admission. Of course, many public colleges have always allowed late admission, but you had to get across the idea that it's legitimate. It has to be acceptable to the American public. The hardest thing in the world is going to be when one parent sits down and the next parent says, well I see where your boy graduated from high school, where is he going to college? And have the parent feel free to say, he's not going to college, he's got an interesting thing he wants to do and if he decides to go to college, he'll go in a year and a half or two years. When we arrive at that point, then we'll have a better pattern of college attendance. Think what both these factors might do to college planning. Right now, the enrollment pattern in college depends upon the fact that most students leave. If students didn't drop out

fairly rapidly in college, enrollments would approximately double. We're facing a period as we head toward 1980, which is supposed to be the peak point at which the cohort of 18 year olds will actually begin a decline, in which everyone predicts that college enrollments will then start to fall off. But if, in fact, students really begin to enjoy college and go for a 4-year college experience and get a degree, maybe not all at one shot but at some point in their lives when they were really interested, college enrollments would rise sharply. If, in fact, students went to college when they were motivated to go to college, we would get a very different pattern of college attendance. It wouldn't be a question of 18 year olds going to college, it would be a question of motivated people going to college, and that would indeed cause a substantial shift in the nature of the college experience. I'd like to go on to the question of diversity in college, unless somebody wanted to ask a question.

QUESTION----------

Well, I think that that is a very real issue - family arrangement, job arrangements, income arrangements, etc. Can you go to college after the age 18? Of course, part of that is how far after the age 18? If, for example, take the service case, G.I. bill students have never had a real problem along this line, and yet most of them have two years' experience - so if you're talking about 2 years - the answer is no. But when you get beyond 2 years, if you're talking about people 26-27 going to college, first you ought to recognize that there are increasing numbers of them doing that. Second, it does mean we're going to have to change our idea about what college is, if we really believe what we've said for years about college being a life-long experience, you remember that phase? It's put forward on every extension pamphlet - college is a life-long experience. We don't really believe that, we just put it on the cover. We certainly don't mean - for example, let me give you an example of what college is a life-long experience means to me. You remember the fellow that ran for mayor in Los Angeles, Tom Bradley - the fellow that was such a spectacular candidate

that ran against Yorty and almost knocked him off last time? Great guy, was black, was a policeman for 19 years - the last 5 years of that he went to law school and when he came out the other end he ran for city council and got elected. And that led to the beginning of his political career. Obviously for him, going to law school after 14 years on the police force, was a terribly important life change and I would argue that the public got a great benefit from it. We can agree about that rationally. I defy you to go to a prestigious law school, including the Stanford Law School, and make that argument that, therefore, they ought to let Tom Bradleys enter. They just don't. They'll argue that that is fine for Golden Gate, sure, or perhaps he could go to a school that doesn't have any standards like University of Southern California, or some other one that we would sort of put in that category. And they'll make some deprecating remark like that, but certainly not Stanford. I mean, we know what it means to be at the pinnacle of success. We took a very interesting case, we asked three questions of graduate deans and department chairmen around the country - 50 of them. The question we put was: If there were two students who graduated from Yale with very good marks and very good graduate record exams, very good recommendations - one had just graduated and one had graduated two years earlier, in that two years he had been in the service or the Peace Corps and has come back to you (we used Yale because we didn't want to use too prestigious a school to warp the data) so we asked if those two students had come to you, which would make the best student? 100% of the graduate deans and graduate department chairmen said the student who had been out in the service would make the better student. And we said, O.K. Question No. 2, which will you admit? Now we are all academics, so we go by rational, intellectual, thought, so we all know what the answer was. The answer, of course, was 70% said we would admit the student that just got out. So we said, that does seem like a conflict, why would you admit the student who just got out? Well, there were all sorts of rationalized reasons, you know - his grade scores would be more relevant, his recommendations would be more current. But the one that always got us was the one that would come back, he'd be more dedicated to the field. Well, we restricted ourselves,

I should tell you, to the humanities and social sciences, and if you have studied the figures of graduate students in the humanities and social sciences, what you find out is that they are not at all dedicated to the field. They use - half of them, or better, get in because they don't know what else to do, they are going along and the end of the 4-year period comes and they don't really want to go out and get a job, and here they are, they are good at their work. So they go to graduate school. So then we said, O.K., there is a 3rd student whose grade scores are identical, and so on, this student says to you, look when I first graduated I didn't know what I wanted to do, so I got myself a job as a stockbroker and I've been a very good stockbroker. I made a lot of money, I've been promoted, I'm doing very well indeed, but the whole time I've been gone - the two years that I've been working as a stockbroker - I've been working at what I really want to do, now I know what I want to do. I want to be a sociologist or a historian, whatever the man's discipline was that we were talking to. How would he fair? 100% said, no chance. Now, why should we deny that man access to a graduate education in sociology? And, is he, in fact, less dedicated to his field? Well the evidence would indicate just the opposite. If one examines the statistics of who finished PhD's or any other degrees at the graduate level, one finds that the students who have been out for a year or two years, or three years, and come back are the most likely to finish and go on to a career. Why should we then refuse to examine this kind of information, and won't this, in turn, make a considerable difference in the structure of colleges? I kind of wandered away from your point of the restructuring, haven't I? Well, that's that question. There was another question over here.

QUESTION----------

Well, as to how we're doing at Stanford about bringing up change, that's kind of a dirty question, you've got to admit. Yes, I agree with your point on the..... Yes, oh Yes. The question was really a question focused on the process of change. How does one bring about change in such circumstances, and there was sort of a side question about how are we doing at Stanford. I think that's an absolutely crucial

question. We face that in a very unusual way, as you may know, at the end of the first task force. The secretary asked if we would establish a second task force to try and actually implement the changes from the Federal point of view, saying, take only one piece of this which is the Federal problem of responding, helping to bring about change. Well, it is an awful lot easier to pose the issue, and I think that's really the point of your question. It is far easier to pose the issue as to what ought to change, than to actually bring about change. It is an extraordinary difficult task. But I think there are some factors that we've tried very hard to examine in fact - at Stanford we've spent a lot of time on this. And I think there are several things that one can say about the process of change in higher education. First, we gradually concluded, we didn't understand it at first when we got into this. We were to be very frank, as naive as we could be in this subject of change, when we started this task force. One of the things we concluded was that along the way the most potent factor in bringing about change is the illumination of the problem. There is a terrible tendency, especially in Washington, to view action as coming from some direct legislative proposal or some programmatic proposal. I mean by that if we have too many students entering colleges who aren't motivated, then let's pass a Federal law requiring that all students be motivated to enter college. And when you sit in HEW, there is this sort of Potomac fever gets you and your horizons are very limited, and you sort of have the sense that everybody feels that you're controlling some levers back there, but as you know those levers work very, very, approximately. Much more important is to make something an issue. I was facetiously commenting on the women's case. Women have been discriminated against in higher education for a very long time and, indeed, some influence will come from direct Federal action, but much more influence is coming from the fact that it's now an issue in American lives. It is an issue, it is discussed endlessly in magazines of higher education. That wasn't true two years ago. So if it becomes an issue, out of higher education itself will flow answers. Let me give you some other cases - the kind of case that come forward is the question I mentioned here, how efficiently are we using resources? This is now

beginning to boil around the country. As it is boiling up and people are being asked very embarrassing questions about it, they are beginning to ask themselves questions about it. Let me give you one example - I went to testify in front of Senator Pell's committee one day and ahead of me were all the representatives of the land grant colleges, the state colleges, the community colleges, and one of the AAU institutions, I guess. And Senator Pell asked them the question - first, did they think that each of their types of institutions deserved Federal support in order to eliminate or mitigate the financial crisis? They all said, yes, yes, very important. Then he said, in each of your sets of institutions there is a financial crisis? They all said, yes, absolutely. How much does it cost for a student to get a typical undergraduate year at each one of your institutions? Then they were all, 'well' and then he said, well what? You've been in business here as associations for a very long time, you must know the answer to that question. Oh, well, that's very complex. He said, well, just in round numbers. And they kept trying to duck it and he kept pressing, and finally they all came up with figures that ranged from, 900 a year average undergraduate year costs, to, if I remember right, about $2800 were the figures that they gave. Then Senator Pell asked them, what does the student get for the difference in cost? Well, there was an enormous silence and then there was a lot of sputtering that went on - academic sputtering, you know the best kind. I was sitting there very thankful that he had asked them and not me, to be very frank. But after that, they began asking themselves that question. Senator Pell had helped escalate that, and make it a real question. Gradually now we're beginning to ask ourselves the question, what are we doing with these resources? What are people getting in return for these? Are there better ways to use these resources? Now, it's only marginal as yet, but we haven't really accepted the idea that we have to ask ourselves that question. My guess would be that, over the next couple of years, if that becomes, if there is enough debate about it, we'll begin to ask ourselves that question in earnest, and out of that will come change. So I would say that the first piece to the process of change is, in fact, making something a problem. That seems simplistic, but

I'm convinced it's right, and its implications for us have been profound. We did not intend when we first started the task force to show you how naive we were. We had no idea that a public document would even be useful.

QUESTION----------

Well, the question is, do we get - how do we get results in terms of change? How do we bring it about? How do we translate it? How do we make that transition?

QUESTION----------

Well, let me tell you our plans, and then maybe what I asked you to ask is your plan. You see, because I think that's the crucial question. There are several places where reform can come about. Reform can come about in the broad forces that the government creates, the Federal government. Let me give you one example - my own belief is, as you know, strongly that students who come back on the G.I. bill basis are more motivated and more effective. I'll go further than that, I think particularly at the more selective institutions we've got a growing problem of students who are going to college who really aren't career oriented at all. I think there is growing numbers of them. It's very hard to document, but I think that it's true. And I think it is a very serious problem. They don't really give a damn about any career. Not simply not making money, but also not saving the world or not getting rid of the pollution problem or anything else. So I am very strongly in favor of motivation becoming a vehicle for measuring who gets into college. Well, OK, you say, how do we do that? One of the proposals we're about to submit to the Secretary in the first round of recommendations is that we create a new type of student aid called a G.I. bill for community service. That there be student aid based on..... that you get accrued student aid as you work in selected community, either national, regional, or local community service types of programs - Ecology Corp, Vista Programs, Community Tutoring Programs, and that there be a HEW Board - Regional Boards that select these programs. If you work in them, that benefits like the G.I. bill, only we're proposing benefits about half as big as the G.I. bill, so if you work 15 months

you get 15 months of benefits which would give you almost two academic years of work. Well, that's a specific Federal reform that one can propose at the Federal level. But I hope that its influence will be beyond that because I don't think that one can do everything at the Federal level, but one can create a sense of what might happen. If, in fact, then motivation becomes an acceptable vehicle for selecting who goes to college, this is one avenue of doing it. We can think of others, you see. Look what have been the barriers to entry to college before. The first barrier was always wealth. You had to have money. Gradually over the period before World War II, and then particularly after, what we did was wipe out that barrier. Then the second barrier was that you had to be bright - it was OK to be poor, but you had to be bright, academically bright. Now with the rise of open admission colleges, we're gradually wiping out that barrier. Now, if you don't have to be wealthy and you don't have to be bright, what do you have to be? Well, largely, in an open admission situation, you have to be alive and there are some people who argue that that isn't a relevant criteria for going to college. That comes from people who have lectured to large numbers of big student halls filled with students who don't necessarily seem to be alive, and so maybe even that barrier will go. OK, I'd argue that the barrier - going back to the barriers of wealth or academic ability - would be wrong. Wrong indeed, but I'd also argue that having no barriers has turned out to be wrong as well. What happens in systems where there is very broad open access? Well, largely what happens is that an awfully lot of students just wander around - they wander physically and they wander intellectually. You ought to go. We made a study of the state college system in California, you really ought to see what happens in that place. For example, you view that a student comes in and goes through college, and comes out the other end with a degree. At the state college system, when they measure how many students in the graduating class had come from the freshman year directly through in 4 years, and out at the same college, it turned out that across the system the average was 13%. The highest institution was 17%, and the lowest, Long Beach State, 8% had come in as freshman and gone out 4 years later as graduates. Not only that, but when they began to

measure the transferring around, they found that something like half the students had been to 3 colleges or more, and 17% had been to 4 or more colleges. Well now everybody says that there are a lot of good reasons to transfer. Sure there are a lot of good reasons to transfer, just like there are a lot of good reasons to drop out. But we went and interviewed a whole batch of students that had transferred a lot, and what they say is, well man, you kind of go where the action is, you know, things are good at Santa Barbara, you go to Santa Barbara. Chico is good, you go to Chico. Sonoma State is red hot this year, you move to Sonoma State. That's not education in the sense we're talking about, it's a social experience of a kind that we hadn't bargained for. So, what I'm arguing is that you take away all barriers, and like anything that's free, it'll be abused and treated as worthless. So we have to have barriers, and we want barriers, and you and I perhaps can agree that we want barriers. We may even agree that we want the barrier of motivation. How do we bring about change? Well, if we propose something like the G.I. bill for community service, we're proposing one means of reforming - getting there. But more important is we've got to stimulate people's minds so they will in turn think of other vehicles for it, because there must be thousands of ways of making motivation a barrier to college. Let me give you one very simple example - Our second task force has on it a lot of very bright, very well placed, young guys in Washington, and, consequently, when we really get moved by something we often just go and do something which should not be in our lives. It should not be that. Any group has the opportunity to do this, but we did get moved about this motivational question in terms of graduate students. So when legislation was being rewritten, one of the fellows on the task force is the minority council to the House, Education, and Labor Committee, and we really got worked up about this issue, so he wrote in a new section saying that the Commissioner should give preference in the NDEA fellowships to students who had been out and demonstrated, in one or two years outside of college, extraordinary ability. Well, that's a simple motivational mechanism, but now it's gotten written into the law, at least as it is in the House version and, presumably, I hope it will be resolved that way in the

conference. But my point is - that's a very simple mechanism, but if we all get to thinking about mechanisms, we can make motivation, in fact, a very serious thing. And I think it's only this way that reform comes about. I do not think that there is any sweeping, simple way of bringing about reform. Maybe somebody differs with that.

DR. BLEWETT: Can I interrupt to ask that people who raise questions will please stand? I think everyone else in the room can hear a little better. Thank you.

QUESTION----------

That's a good question. I mean I think it really focuses on a crucial point. When one talks as you did about social mobility, who do we want, in fact, to have the great opportunity of going to college? Do we want it to be people who have grown up in the suburbs? Do we want it to be people who are likely to make a major contribution? Do we want it to be people who have a lot of money? You see, those are all very crucial questions. I would argue that the question of motivation here is an excellent sorting mechanism. It's excellent for two reasons: 1. I think we would argue that it is a traditionally American view that the people who really want to do something ought to get the benefits. Now I'm not arguing to deny anybody anything, and I'm certainly not arguing to deny people the opportunity to go to college on any grounds that they can't afford it, or that they are black or anything else. I'm only saying that if they really want to go, then it ought to be available to them. And that would be a very useful kind of motivational screening arrangement. - OK, there is a second value to motivation in this, and that is that there is an enormous difference in what people learn on the question of whether or not they are motivated, you know that from your own experience. When students are really interested, it's not a question that they'll learn 10% more, it's that they will learn 10 times more, so that one of the values of having motivation as a vehicle is that the learning process itself is grossly, grossly, accelerated. And the third thing, it's not that there is

a difference between Student A and Student B because Student A is motivated, there is that difference, but there is an even more important difference - Student A under certain circumstances is motivated, and under other circumstances is not. So we are not only discriminating solely person to person, we're discriminating in terms of time in the individual relationship. So I put these altogether and argue that there are all different kinds of motivations in this world. Some students want to get a very high paying job, some students want to do something useful in this world, some students just want to put themselves to the challenge. Any of those motivations seem to me to be excellent motivations. And I would argue that a great deal of change can take place in a college situation if, in fact, we can somehow focus much more on people who want to learn, whatever the motivation. Does that make sense from your point of view? You look very skeptical.

QUESTION----------

Oh yes, I would argue that there is among a league of students a trend of many, many, students with almost no motivation and we see them around the campus all the time. We can't get rid of them. You see, it's easy here, you have a seasonal arrangement where it comes the one season of the year all students who have no motivation and just want to hang around leave. We've got a problem in Palo Alto - that season never comes, so we have larger and larger numbers that just hang around, and this is a growing problem. And those are kids in whom there is a great deal of education invested. And as the old saying goes in California, 'I didn't raise my boy to be a candlemaker.' But there is, of course, because you know when you have $8\frac{1}{2}$ million college students, any group that large, even though they are students, almost has the characteristics of human beings. And that is, they are very diverse, and there are counter threads in there as well. In addition to the students who are unmotivated, one sees also highly socially motivated students as well. There are more socially motivated students than there have been before, in my opinion. So I don't think one can get to a single trend. There are multiple trends running, I

would argue.

QUESTION----------

Yes, of course, keep in mind that what we're talking about is what's coming when you get to a very broad access. You see, once it gets widely accepted as it is in California or New York, or Illinois, at this point, or Florida - once you get to the point that it's assumed that everybody ought to go to college - one of the things that also comes out of this is that we have now large numbers of students who feel they ought to go to graduate school forever. I mean, graduate school is not a preparation, it is a life. Now I say that, and that sounds terribly facetious, but we were astonished when we began interviewing graduate students at very elite graduate schools - how many students viewed the graduate experience as something they wanted to perpetuate. And I'm arguing that these trends are trends of the future, and that they are apparent already in high access states - and that one ought to then be thinking about the changes, how to bring about changes, because as one moves towards high access, there is no point in repeating that experience. Once you get to very high access, to then begin to introduce new barriers like motivational barriers is very difficult indeed. There are built-in assumptions in this. Students begin to assume, and the courts, for that matter, assume that anybody has got a right to go to college, and that becomes. So I'm arguing that you have got to think ahead about those barriers. There is something else you said that I wanted to respond to, now I can't remember what it is. Let me go on to just one other point about this, that bears on this, and that is the question of diversity. Our second task force has been examining the question of diversity in terms of diversity among institutions, and what we did was to examine about 150 colleges that claim that they are quite different. And one of the things that's interesting is that there are, in fact, a modest number - I say modest number because we would guess that there are probably about maybe 70 or 80 really different colleges in this country, and that's quite something. That's probably more than there are in Europe altogether, but 70 or 80 out of 2500 is not a very large number of really quite structurally different colleges. There is one group of

them that we were very fascinated with, out of the 150 or so we examined, and that is the group that considered themselves sort of experimental colleges. You know, the ones that have generally tried to free up the student from the conventional study problems and allow him a typical - I'm thinking of something like Santa Cruz or Old Westbury or Johnson College or College A at Buffalo - if you know the kind of place I mean, they have generally gotten a lot of publicity. And what they've done in these situations is very often to take away the structures that seem to be inhibitors to learning. For example, course structure - course requirements are inhibitors to learning in this view. Departments and disciplines become inhibitors to learning, etc., so gradually what they have done is sort of wipe out those and say there will be an intimate learning environment in which the student can learn as he wishes to learn. One of the interesting things about this in his drive toward freeing a student is that most of them have found the going very difficult. Bensalem at Fordham is another example one can think of - I think we found about 20 or so. What one finds is usually the results have been discouraging. They have been discouraging because the student, in fact, does not learn well in such circumstances. Very few students do. A few do, those few are remarkable students and will learn well under any circumstances. They are so self-driven and so self-motivated that we really don't need the college for them, they'll learn under any circumstances. But most students do not learn well in a non-structured situation. So one of the things I think one has to keep in mind, when you look at the question of diversity and diversity of students, is how to create structures that are relevant, new, differing, but still structured. Students argue collectively for doing away with all requirements for pass/fail grading, for elimination of course requirements, for anything that is a requirement. The collective voice of students is no structure, but individually they respond to structure. A good example is - where are students headed in largest numbers? They are headed toward law schools, and law schools are the most structured part of American higher education, structured in terms of curriculum, structured in terms of the participation and the nature of the partici-

pation. It's a very structured experience, but it's also a very exciting experience for the students. You were going to ask a question.

QUESTION----------

Yes, that's a good question, and incidentally one of the fascinating things is that there is almost no data. We can't find any on experiemental colleges or differing colleges, and we have had to go generate. We have had a couple of research teams go around the country looking at these, and the really remarkable thing is we make these massive experiments in higher education. To divert just a second from your question, another fascinating case is minority education. That must be the biggest experiment. In the last 60's, in this country - 1966-'67 - we began really a fascinating major experiment in minority education. We began sort of injecting minority students into all levels of American higher education, community colleges, the most prestigious universities, 4-year liberal arts colleges, urban colleges, remote rural colleges. There are minority students all over the place now. We've had four years of experience and we went and tried, as you notice in that chapter, and identify how well the process was going on and there is almost no data, almost nothing. And you would think that the first thing we would do, being academics, would be to evaluate the strength and breadth of that major effort. Yes, I was going to go back to your question. Go ahead.

QUESTION----------

Yes, I didn't realize that we had gone this long. Let me just answer that question. When you make a judgement on - is in fact an experimental college working? It has to be a very subjective judgement. First of all, because the data is so sketchy, but the best way we could do it is to go and examine - do students seem to be learning through intellectual achievement of some sort, some measure of it? What are they doing with themselves? I mean, physically, what are they doing with themselves? What kind of measurements can one make on the output size such as: test scores and other things like that. I would not care to make an argument that the data is very good,

but it's overwhelming in one direction. I mean, you know, all the measures are sloppy, crude measures, but they all point in the same direction. Students, by and large, at such colleges don't do much. They don't seem to, in any way that can be measured by either just observing or participating in any way, or using any kind of test score measure, do very well. Now one of the difficulties of making such a measurement is that, by and large, such experimental colleges - self-select the very brightest students. So you have the awkward problem - how much would they have achieved under ordinary circumstances? But every team we've had looking at that has come back with the same answer, and overwhelmingly with the same answer, and there are now a couple of other studies. There is a new study out by the U.C. Management on Santa Cruz which concludes the same thing. There is a study on Bensalem. Harris Wilford of Old Westbury concluded the same thing in his analysis and, in fact, several of the instances the analysis has been rigorous enough that people have shut them down and started over again. So I can't give you good measures of it, but they are awfully bad measures as a matter of fact, but since they are all unidirectional and seem to be overwhelming, that's not a bad measure. Well, why don't we turn.....

DR. BLEWETT: We won't turn Frank Newman off yet, but we'll just put him in a slightly different situation. Questions have been coming from the audience, but there are two people who were asked to be particularly concerned with questions. People were asked to react to the suggestions made by the speaker. It's my thought now that they will be given an opportunity, and there will be.....

1971

1ST ANNUAL

CONFERENCE on

HIGHER EDUCATION

INSTITUTIONAL

RESEARCH and

PLANNING

at
Thomas College
Waterville, Maine
November 3, 1971

THE IMPACT OF PENDING CURRICULUM REFORM

ON

FACILITIES PLANNING

Committee

Harold M. Grodinsky, Chairman
Madelyn D. Alexander
Edward Y. Blewett
Bernard Carpenter
Henry Merriam

Program

8:30 - 10:00
Registration and Coffee

10:00 - 12:30
Session 1

Welcome
Einar Olsen
Chairman
Higher Education Council

Remarks
Carroll R. McGary
Commissioner of Education
State of Maine

Moderator
Edward Y. Blewett
Executive Director
Higher Education Council

Keynote Speaker
Frank Newman
Stanford University

Reactors
Stanley L. Freeman, Jr.
Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs
University of Maine

Robert E. Matson
President
Ricker College

1:00 - 2:00
Lunch

2:15 - 4:30
Session 11

Moderator
Charles F. Bragg, II
Member
Maine Higher Education Facilities Commission

Speakers
Bennett D. Katz
State Senator

Robert R. Ramsey, Jr.
Director of Evaluation
Commission on Institutions of Higher Education

Wayne H. Ross
Executive Secretary
Maine Higher Education Facilities Commission

Ralph S. Williams
Administrative Vice-President
Colby College

Co-Sponsored By

Maine State Commission for
Higher Education Facilities Act

Wayne H. Ross
Executive Secretary

and

Higher Education Council

Edward Y. Blewett
Executive Director

Response to Questionnaire

83 questionnaires were sent out on November 18, 1971, and 45 were returned within one week. Below are the replies to questions 2 through 4, which were simply to be checked. On the following pages are some of the comments in reply to questions 5 and 6.

2. Do you feel the conference was worthwhile?

Yes	No
34	9

3. Did you find the format satisfactory?

Yes	No
27	13

4. Did you find the theme timely?

Yes	No
39	4

Were the speakers within framework?

Yes	No
12	22

Question No. 5 - Can you offer any suggestions for next year's conference?

1. Audience primarily from academic area rather than physical facilities.
2. Be certain that the theme is followed.
3. A little more structure. (but not absolute rigidity)
4. More and better planning. Let speakers know subject to be discussed. Tie subjects together.
5. Probably some round table or workshop sessions, more take-away material.
6. General presentations on "Institutional Research and Planning" leaving open the possibilities for action.
7. If you entertain a speaker such as Mr. Newman, extend an invitation to academic deans.
8. Framework might have been slightly more explicit.
9. Specific topics for workshop sessions such as: space utilization, teaching loads, enrollment projections, etc.
10. Federal and State subsidy of private colleges, to enable them to compete with low tuition rates of public colleges.
11. More of Senator Katz.
12. Spend afternoon session in groups to get at special problems or ideas.
13. Speaker too far from audience.
    No question and answer period for Katz.
14. Higher education policy plan for Maine barriers and accomplishments.
15. Speakers did not get to the announced topic.
16. Keep it local - Maine.
17. Try to discuss research and programming.
18. How can facilities money be used for innovative ends?
19. Smaller, cozier room.
20. Speakers stick to topic. Small group sessions.
21. Poor acoustics.
22. Panel format.
23. Follow theme.
24. Include a speaker on facilities.

25. Have the speakers address themselves to the theme of the conference.

26. A program relating physical facility needs to program requirements.

27. More information on planning.

Question No. 6 - Please indicate any ideas for a topic to be discussed.

Ideas for Topic

1. Techniques for efficient use of facilities.
2. Directed research in Maine/New England which has implications for modifying curriculum.
3. Specific problems of multi-use facilities. Buildings "without walls" etc.
4. Utilization of physical plant and resultant program changes necessary.
5. How better can coordination of higher education and other "levels" of education be achieved?
6. Public support of private colleges.
   Need for two-year programs, and sources of funding for them.
7. Workshop sessions. Space utilization, teaching loads, enrollment prediction, etc. Implementation of WICHE suggestions.
8. Community colleges - their purpose and responsibilities.
9. Economic development in Maine, and institutional research in the colleges and universities.
10. Financing of higher education.
11. Community college concept vs centralized dormitory university concept.
12. Implications of higher education legislation now going through Congress.
13. Nitty, gritty of HEGIS reports.
14. How can students be made into better decision makers.
15. Follow same topic.
16. Use of facilities, cost, operation.
17. Discussion of cooperation between public and private colleges.
18. How to plan financially, and construction for the future.
19. This year's topic was fine, but I was unable to relate the talks to it.

Attendants at 1st Annual CHIRP
held at Thomas College, November 3, 1971

Madelyn D. Alexander, CHIRP Committee
Director of Institutional Research
University of Maine
Bangor, Maine

Mr. Hayden L. V. Anderson
University of Maine Trustee
Gardiner, Maine

Mr. Joseph L. Anno, District Engineer
Department of HEW
Boston, Massachusetts

Mr. John M. Blake
Vice President for Finance & Admin.
University of Maine at Orono
Orono, Maine

Dr. Edward Y. Blewett, participant
Executive Director
Higher Education Council
Portland, Maine

Mr. Calvin Boston
Financial Aid Officer & Asst. to Treas.
Thomas College
Waterville, Maine

CWO Edgar Bowden
Public Works Officer
Maine Maritime Academy
Castine, Maine

Mrs. Merrill R. Bradford
Westbrook College Trustee
Bangor, Maine

Mr. Charles F. Bragg, II, participant
Member, Higher Education Fac. Commission
Bangor, Maine

Mr. Sumner Bravman, Program Officer
Department of HEW
Boston, Massachusetts

Dr. Kenneth T. H. Brooks
University Professor
University of Maine at Portland-Gorham
Gorham, Maine

Mr. Bernard Carpenter, CHIRP Committee
Business Manager
Bates College
Lewiston, Maine

Mr. George H. Chick
State Senator
Monmouth, Maine

Mr. Kenneth Gianchette
Unity College Trustee
Pittsfield, Maine

Mr. Robert Cloutier
Director of Placement
Thomas College
Waterville, Maine

Dr. George P. Connick
Acting Director of Academic Planning
University of Maine at Portland-Gorham
Portland, Maine

Mr. Ray A. Cook, Assistant Director
Mid-Coast Educational Devel. Center
Bath, Maine

Miss Marion Cooper, Information Officer
State Department of Education
Augusta, Maine

Dr. Melville P. Cote, Asst. to Pres.
College of the Atlantic
Bar Harbor, Maine

Mr. Keith W. Cunningham
NEPTE Coordinator
State Department of Education
Augusta, Maine

Mr. Parker G. Cushman
Director of Physical Plant
University of Maine at Orono
Orono, Maine

Dr. Ian H. Douglas, Director
Consortium of Northern New England
Brunswick, Maine

Dr. Irwin Douglass
University of Maine at Orono
Orono, Maine

Mr. Paul C. Dunham
Director of Institutional Research
University of Maine at Orono
Orono, Maine

Mrs. Gertrud E. Ebbeson
Northern Cons. of Music Trustee
Bangor, Maine

Mr. Richard A. Eustis
Asst. Director of Physical Fac.
University of Maine
Bangor, Maine

Mr. Ralph E. Fenton, Vice President
Nasson College
Springvale, Maine

Dr. Lincoln T. Fish
Member, Higher Education Fac. Commission
Gorham, Maine

Commander Robert H. Flenner
Development Officer
Maine Maritime Academy
Castine, Maine

Mr. Herbert L. Fowle, Jr.
Vice Chancellor for Business & Fin. Affairs
University of Maine
Bangor, Maine

Dr. Stanley L. Freeman, Jr., participant
Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs
University of Maine
Bangor, Maine

Mr. Earsel E. Goode
Director of Space & Scheduling
University of Maine at Orono
Orono, Maine

Mr. Alan Goodwin
State Planning Office
Augusta, Maine

Father James Gower
College of the Atlantic Trustee
Bar Harbor, Maine

Mr. Ford A. Grant, Treasurer
Thomas College
Waterville, Maine

Dr. John S. Greer, Director
Southern Maine Voc.-Tech. Inst.
South Portland, Maine

Mr. Harold M. Grodinsky, CHIRP Chairman
Director, Higher Educ. Fac. Planning
State Department of Education
Augusta, Maine

Mr. Dennis W. Haggerty
Bursar
Unity College
Unity, Maine

Mr. Albert Hall, Jr., Executive Secretary
New Hampshire Higher Ed. Fac. Commission
Manchester, New Hampshire

Mr. Floyd M. Haskell
State Representative
Houlton, Maine

Mr. George Hayes
University of Maine
Bangor, Maine

Mrs. Dorothy M. Healy
Director of Development
Westbrook College
Portland, Maine

Dr. Paul G. Jenson
Dean of Faculty
Colby College
Waterville, Maine

Mr. Stephen Johansson
Asst. to the President
Bates College
Lewiston, Maine

Mr. Bennett D. Katz, participant
State Senator
Augusta, Maine

Commander James A. Lyle
Public Works Officer
Maine Maritime Academy
Castine, Maine

Dr. William J. MacLeod
Vice President for Academic Affairs
University of Maine at Portland-Gorham
Portland, Maine

Director William R. Mague
Northern Conservatory of Music
Bangor, Maine

Mr. Harold L. Mailman, Director
Northern Maine Voc.-Tech. Inst.
Presque Isle, Maine

Mr. John Marion, Review Engineer
Department of HEW
Boston, Massachusetts

Dean Ernest C. Marriner
Member, Higher Education Fac. Commission
Waterville, Maine

Mr. Robert E. Matson, participant
President of Ricker College
Houlton, Maine

Dr. Carroll R. McGary, participant
Commissioner of Education
State Department of Education
Augusta, Maine

Dr. Aims C. McGuinness, Jr.
Executive Asst. to the Chancellor
University of Maine
Portland, Maine

Mr. Francis McGuire
Director of Physical Facilities
University of Maine
Bangor, Maine

Mr. Henry Merriam, CHIRP Committee
Business Manager
Nasson College
Springvale, Maine

Miss Phyllis Mixer
Asst. to the Treasurer
Bates College
Lewiston, Maine

Mrs. Ruth R. Mraz
Director, University Relations
University of Maine at Presque Isle
Presque Isle, Maine

Dr. Frank Newman, participant
Stanford University
Palo Alto, California

Dr. Einar A. Olsen, participant
President of University of Maine at Farmington
Farmington, Maine

Mrs. Mildred Peabody
Ricker College Trustee
Houlton, Maine

Mrs. Leonard A. Pierce
Unity College Trustee
Carmel, Maine

Mr. Robert R. Ramsey, Jr., participant
Director of Evaluation
Commission on Institutions of Higher Education
Burlington, Massachusetts

Mrs. Mary E. Randall
Registrar and Director of Institutional Res.
University of Maine at Augusta
Augusta, Maine

Dr. Rodney M. Redding, Academic Dean
Thomas College
Waterville, Maine

Mr. Dick Rice
University of Maine at Farmington
Farmington, Maine

Mrs. Chauncey Robbins
Ricker College Trustee
Augusta, Maine

Mr. William E. Robinson
Dean of Adult Education & Community Services
University of Maine at Augusta
Augusta, Maine

Mr. Wayne H. Ross, participant
Executive Secretary, Higher Education Fac. Comm.
State Department of Education
Augusta, Maine

Dr. Stanley F. Salwak, President
University of Maine at Presque Isle
Presque Isle, Maine

Dr. Peter V. Sampo, Dean
St. Francis College
Biddeford, Maine

Mrs. Jean Sampson
University of Maine Trustee
Lewiston, Maine

Mr. Samuel Sezak
University of Maine at Orono
Orono, Maine

Mr. Stephen Simonds
University of Maine at Portland-Gorham
Portland, Maine

Dr. F. Seth Singleton
Director, Physical Facilities Planning Grant
University of Maine at Portland-Gorham
Portland, Maine

Dr. Richard J. Spath, President
University of Maine at Fort Kent
Fort Kent, Maine

Mr. Roger G. Spear, Business Manager
University of Maine at Farmington
Farmington, Maine

Mr. Francis B. Sprague, Director
Eastern Maine Voc.-Tech. Inst.
Bangor, Maine

Mrs. Mollie Stern
Unity College Trustee
Bangor, Maine

Mr. Larry Stinchcomb
Director, Educational Fac. Planning Project
Auburn, Maine

Dr. Carl B. Straub, Asst. Dean of Faculty
Bates College
Lewiston, Maine

Mr. James J. Sullivan, Regional Engineer
Department of HEW
Boston, Massachusetts

Mr. William A. Sutton, Dean of Students
St. Francis College
Biddeford, Maine

Mr. Ernest R. Therrien, President
St. Francis College
Biddeford, Maine

Mr. Raymond L. Thibodeau, Dean of Students
Eastern Maine Voc.-Tech. Inst.
Bangor, Maine

Mr. John L. Thomas, Jr., President
Thomas College
Waterville, Maine

Mrs. Mary R. Thompson
Westbrook College Trustee
South Portland, Maine

Mr. Stanford I. Trask, Principal
Waterville High School
Waterville, Maine

Mr. William L. Vassar
Assistant Director
Central Maine Voc.-Tech. Inst.
Auburn, Maine

Mr. Clifford H. West, Jr.
Director of Administrative Services
University of Maine at Augusta
Augusta, Maine

Mr. James Weston
Asst. Business Manager
Bates College
Lewiston, Maine

Dr. A. Perry Whitmore
Dean of Instruction
University of Maine at Presque Isle
Presque Isle, Maine

Mr. John Wolf
Business Manager
Westbrook College
Portland, Maine