DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 104 245 HE 006 367

AUTHOR Johnson, Elizabeth H.
TITLE Evaluating and Terminating Existing Instructional Programs: The Controversial Role of Statewide Coordinating/Governing Agencies.
PUB DATE 24 Mar 75
NOTE 13p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Association for Higher Education (30th, Chicago, Illinois, March 24, 1975); Not available in hard copy due to marginal legibility of original

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.76 HC Not Available from EDRS..PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS Agency Role; *Educational Coordination; *Governing Boards; *Higher Education; *Program Coordination; Speeches; State Agencies; *Statewide Planning

ABSTRACT

Structures for governing and coordinating higher education are changing. However, the primary responsibility for education rests with the state. The coordinating agency, which occupies the middle-ground between the institutions and the political decision-makers, should have 5 minimum abilities: (1) to engage in continuous planning, both long-range and short; (2) to acquire information from all postsecondary institutions and agencies through the establishment of statewide management and data systems; (3) to review and approve new and existing programs, new campuses, and substantial state aid; (4) to review and make recommendations on all facets of both operating and capital budgets; (5) to administer grant programs and all state-administered federal grant and aid programs. Coordinating efforts would engage the faculties and administrators in their own best efforts to find ways to improve their offerings, management, and operations. If institutions choose to join the effort in working with coordinating boards, they will have taken an important step forward in regaining public confidence and support. (Author/PG)

Concurrent General Session I
Monday, March 24

EVALUATING AND TERMINATING EXISTING INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAMS: THE CONTROVERSIAL ROLE OF STATEWIDE COORDINATING/GOVERNING AGENCIES*

Elizabeth H. Johnson
Member
Board of Higher Education in Oregon

In the education circles in which I move these days, one seldom hears funny stories. In fact, the grimness sometimes is all-pervasive. However, there is this story which somewhat fits my situation here today.

A traveler was walking across the frozen tundra in the far north. The temperature was below zero; it was snowing hard. He was huddled in his parka and was just plodding along, head down, bent against the icy wind.

Through his frost-hung eye lashes he glimpsed a small bird, almost frozen, lying against a clump of stiff grass. Thinking the bird might revive and provide companionship, he picked it up and tucked it gently inside his parka. Suddenly a large musk ox lumbered across the traveler's path, and as it passed by, it dropped behind a generous pile of warm, brown, steaming manure. The traveler stooped down, placed the nearly frozen bird in the midst of the warm pile, and watched in fascination as it moved feebly, opened its eyes, shook its wings, chirped and finally broke into welcome, glorious song.

Whereupon, a fierce timber wolf suddenly arrived from nowhere, rushed over to the bird and before the traveler could head him off, grabbed the feathered friend, and ate him.

...And the moral to this story, so it is told, is that
(a) He who puts you in it is not necessarily your enemy
(b) He who takes you out of it is not necessarily your friend
(c) And if you find yourself in the middle of it, the least you can do is keep your mouth shut.

I've pondered the wisdom of that last line ever since accepting this assignment, but no one came to my rescue.

Perhaps, at the outset, I should do the obvious: broaden the title of these remarks to read: "Program Review, Evaluation and Termination: The Controversial Role of the Controversial Statewide Governing and Coordinating Boards." Even a short overview of the matter of program review almost has to include some reference to the responsibilities and powers of these controversial state-wide boards themselves. These boards, which were almost invisible only a few years ago, have appeared on the scene at first as vehicles for voluntary coordination and the flow-through of federal funds and various Titles. Then as the voluntary became regulatory and the role of the coordinating groups more "threatening" to traditional institutions and segments, often the

*Address presented at Concurrent General Session I of the 30th National Conference on Higher Education, sponsored by the American Association for Higher Education, Monday morning, March 24, 1975, Chicago.

legislatures made them statewide governing boards - or strengthened their regulatory powers. Most of them have also been named the states' "1202 Commissions" for statewide planning, under the federal Higher Education Amendments of 1972. They are the "new kid on the block."

Structures for governing and coordinating higher education are changing. Actions by the governor of Maine, in asking for the resignation of all the members of the University of Maine Board in order "to make the university more accountable to the taxpayers and the students and accomplish the fresh start that is needed and expected by the people of Maine" is one example of change. The proposed dissolution of the Board of Regents in Ohio by Governor Rhodes, who created the Regents originally, is another. It is safe to say that in almost every state that hasn't recently changed its governing and/or coordinating structure, the traditional organizations are in trouble.

Just rearranging the tables of organization or abolishing one structure and creating another won't solve the problems or "accomplish the fresh start." The fact that the political leaders have been taking the initiative and leadership role, though, is of great significance. It calls for the education leaders to do more than criticize and raise the rallying cry of "academic freedom" and "institutional autonomy" to get the wagons in a ring and protect the status quo. If we believe in the necessity of continuous planning, both short and long-range; if we believe in diversity of options for students and for society; if we believe in accountability for the use of the funds available, then we have to recognize that a plan, like a budget, is a mechanism of control. By that much, then, an individual institution is restricted in its "autonomy" or its authorization to go its own way.

That being the case, the assumption that there must be tension and conflict between the planners and the educational establishment may be unavoidable. I join those who believe that any scheme of governance depends upon the willingness of persons of good will and broad understanding to stand back and see what it is that must be accomplished - and examine the alternatives. If the planning is done cooperatively, and if the planners are not trying at the same time to "govern" or to administer and operate, then I think confrontation is avoidable.

The primary responsibility for education rests with the state. In the end, the final decision may have to be a political one. The Congress and the State Legislatures hold the purse strings. Personalities are bound to be a strong influence, but the wise administrator and the wise planner and the wise political leader will recognize the realities. Most importantly, the people who pay for the education, kindergarten through graduate school, the employers, the practitioners and the consumers, need to be an important part of the planning process.

D. Kent Halstead takes a look at central control in the form of a centralized coordinating and planning board, and says,

> "The debate regarding centralized versus decentralized authority in higher education (postsecondary) has progressed beyond arguing the relative advantages and disadvantages of each. Discussion of the pros and cons of both central coordination and institutional autonomy has resulted in considerable agreement among educators about the relative merits of both practices. The evidence also reveals - and herein lies the crux of the

controversy - that winning combination is a yet unidentified balance which would retain most of the advantages of central control with a minimal sacrifice of institutional sovereignty...The balance sought is delicate and equilibrium may exist only in theory.

"No effective planning agency can expect to fulfill all of the hopes and aspirations of each institution. No institution is likely to endorse all the coordination measures proposed by a state-level agency. Consequently, it is realistic to expect that some form of power struggle will always be inevitable - maybe a healthy sign...It is likely that no two states will weigh the values of autonomy and coordination in exactly the same manner."

That having said, how much power or authority should the planning and coordinating agency have? Here I have to turn to the best minds in the research and development field. I have to draw on my experience, and on the trends in the separate states and at the federal level. By every indicator, I am persuaded that the coordinating agency, which occupies a kind of middle-ground between the institutions and the political decision-makers should have at least the five minimum powers named by Glenny, Berdahl, Palola and Platridge, and those listed in the Education Commission of the States' report, "Coordination or Chaos." These include the power -

1. "to engage in continuous planning, both long-range and short-range;

2. "to acquire information from all postsecondary institutions and agencies through the establishment of statewide management and data systems;

3. "to review and approve new and existing programs, new campuses, extension centers, departments and centers of all public institutions, and, where substantial state aid is given, of all private institutions;

4. "to review and make recommendations on any and all facets of both operating and capital budgets; and when requested by state authorities, present a consolidated budget for the whole system. and

5. "to administer directly, or have under its coordinative powers all state scholarship and grant programs to students, grant programs to non-public institutions and all state-administered federal grant and aid programs."

Many oppose granting any of these powers to a coordinating board; others might oppose certain ones; but my reading of the current scene, state by state, indicates that program review and budget review are the most important and sensitive areas. There is no one "best" arrangement or delineation of powers because no two states have the same demographic patterns, traditions and existing structures.

The policy-makers in state government, however, have the same needs: They need to know that continuous planning is going on, and that budget requests are linked to realistic goals, missions and objectives of both institutions and state government. They need to know that the public interest has been represented in the planning,,along with institutional and student interests. They need balanced, comparable, unbiased, analyzed data on which to base the policy decisions that they must make in appropriating funds.

Programs are at the heart of the whole enterprise. They are the reasons institutions exist and buildings are constructed and students are served. Programs should be tailored and planned to fit institutional missions. Legislators want to know that there is a mechanism for controlling duplication and proliferation and haphazard responses to what may be transitory interests or intra-institutions policies. A single institution cannot successfully try to be all things to all people in these times.

Budgets need to reflect the match between realistic institutional missions and programs. Since available funds for all of education will be limited and costs will continue to rise, some agency has to stand back and take a look at the needs of all levels - and then make recommendations. Those recommendations should be based on educational needs and the state's and the institution's ability to finance strong programs.

Scholarship and financial assistance grants, loans and work-study programs cut across all postsecondary institutions - public, private and proprietary. Their distribution needs to be integrated with need, with ability to fund and related to the goals of access and opportunity.

Actually, it is often true that if the powers granted are clear and considerable, they will not need to be used. Time that might be spent on arguing over jurisdiction or authority can be spent more constructively. If the rights and responsibilities of all the actors are known, voluntary cooperation often comes more easily and forthrightly.

It seems increasingly clear to me that the conclusions reached by many experts in the field are stated clearly by Glenny et al.:

> "The choice today is not between strengthening the coordinating board or retaining the status quo. Rather, the choice is between creating an effective coordinating board or of seeing postsecondary education ingested into the executive branch of state government."-- I would add 'or, under control of the ligislative branch'-- "Strengthened coordination seems the best way to protect the public interest in education with minimum impairment of institutional autonomy...whatever the number and variety or substructures subject to coordinating board jurisdiction, the board and its staff should exercise power over institutions only through the official channels of the particular institution or subsystem."

The key jurisdictional issue between the coordinating board and the institutional or segmental policy (governing) boards is where to draw the dividing line between their respective powers and responsibilities and to make clear the areas of institutional or system-wide governance that the coordinating board should not get into.

These are all very sensitive matters. As someone has aptly put it: "The idea that 'outsiders,' state bureaucrats or representatives of a political environment might meddle in academic affairs probably transcends all of the other administrative and coordinative issues relating to statewide coordination of postsecondary education."

Despite the legitimate and traditional reservations about the roles of statewide coordinating boards, the numbers of these boards and their powers have increased in recent years. Section 1202 of the Higher Education Amendments of 1972 has given impetus to either creating new planning or coordinating agencies or to naming existing agencies as the states' 1202 Commissions. Increasingly, too, the function of program review and approval has become commonplace - but is in the beginning stages of the art.

A recent survey by the Education Commission of the State shows that of the 45 states having coordinating agencies with statutory authority to review and approve or

recommend programs, 37 have the responsibility to review and approve programs. Eight state-wide coordinating agencies, including the Oregon Educational Coordinating Council have statutory responsibility to review and recommend only. In five states the responsibility to review and recommend is a matter of policy, not of statute. As the role of these agencies has evolved from "voluntary" to "advisory" responsibilities, to regulatory powers, and in a few more recent cases, to governing authority, the function of program review has become commonplace.

So that there will not be misunderstanding of what is meant by the use of the broad term "program," I am referring to those organized educational activities, excluding individual courses and course content, which lead to some terminal objective: a degree, diploma, certificate or license. Under the umbrella of "program," I include departments, divisions, schools, colleges, institutes, learning centers, branches or any unit not presently included in the program of the institution. It usually does not include "reasonable and moderate" extensions of existing curricula, research or public service programs, except where they may overlap and compete unreasonably with those of nearby institutions, public and private.

The purposes of state level review of programs, broadly stated are (1) to conserve resources; (2) to avoid unnecessary and unwise duplication and proliferation; (3) to assure quality programs; and (4) to assess the state's needs for a given program. In the case of high-cost specialized professional programs, such as veterinary medicine, health professions, oceanography, etc , there must be regional planning and needs assessment to increase access to high-quality programs and conserve resources. Consortia and regional efforts are presently underway, and they, too, must be encouraged.

That these functions should fall on non-administrative coordinating agencies is based on conclusions apparently reached in many states, "that neither the organs of state government nor the institutions of higher education are capable of conducting finely balanced assessments involved in program review - the government agencies because the issues are too complex for non-professionals to handle, and the institutions because their own self-interest often inhibits their objectivity." (R. O. Berdahl, Statewide Coordination of Higher Education, 1971).

To expect an institution to act as its own physician, diagnosing the weak programs, especially in times of financial stress, and then getting out the instruments and performing surgery where indicated is asking too much.

Where financial exigencies have required reduction or elimination of a program at an institution, both the process and the results have been traumatic to internal and external constituencies. In some cases the press, under the requirements of "open meeting" laws, has demanded the right to attend and report deliberations, which must, of necessity, involve persons and effectiveness. In some cases, the announced program reductions have been more publicized than real. In others, even a small improvement in either the financial or enrollment situation has put a damper on enthusiasm for program reduction. Most institutions, though they may agree on the principle of state-level review and recommendation, would dissent from the specific processes and choose voluntary compliance, or if forced, across-the-board reductions rather than termination or shelving programs.

In any event, if conservation of resources is a goal of program reduction, the termination of a program will not, in and of itself reduce expenditure outlays, unless faculty is reduced. If a degree is dropped, but the courses and the instructors to teach them are retained and shifted into some other programs, no savings result.

If the degree is no longer offered, but the courses remain, there may be a decline in enrollment in those courses, thus increasing the unit costs. If the courses and the degree are eliminated, but the tenured faculty who taught them are transferred to some other teaching or administrative post, there are likewise no sizeable savings.

If the question is one of the need to improve quality and the program is recommended for retention with improvement, the costs are increased. As Dr. Glenny puts it:

> "Whatever the economics of steady state and the politics of tenure, the analyses of program elimination must consider a reduction in faculty - or no great savings in dollars will result."

I am aware that the words "Master Plan" raise all kinds of questions - and mistrust. I know the validity of the warnings that a Master Plan must not become the Master Plan, cast in concrete. However, I believe that before any state-wide governing or coordinating board can consider change or program review, it has to ask searching and perhaps uncomfortable questions about the state of the planning at the present time. Whether we like it or not, there has to be some kind of overall plan, some thoroughly considered statements of educational goals for the state, the system, the individual institutions and the "programs" that are realistic. Policy boards at the institution or segmented level have an obligation to assure themselves that their institutions have valid, objective, studied Master Plans, continually up-dated.

Too often statements of guidelines or goals have been cast in such "global" and idealistic terms that they are relatively meaningless - or they have been stated in the kind of educational jargon that makes them less-than-clear, even to the educators. Obfuscating language just asks the lay citizen to be skeptical, if not disbelieving.

Where compromise and equivocation to reach "consensus" have reduced statements of goals to a kind of lowest common denominator there must be a fresh start. The examination of goals should involve as many informed lay persons, practitioners, employers, consumers - and taxpayers as possible, along with administrators, faculty and students.

Without getting caught up in the details of how a broad-based planning group ought to organize itself to come up with findings and recommendations that will give guidance to institutions and coordinating boards in the matter of program review, let me simply suggest the kinds of questions that I believe ought to be raised:

1. Does the state have a "Master Plan" that includes the missions of all the institutions, public, private and proprietary? Are these missions realistically laid out so they can serve as guidelines for planning and evaluation?

2. Does it define the roles and responsibilities of the existing governing or coordinating boards and individual institutional boards?

3. Is there an up-to-date inventory of all the programs presently available - and where are they?

4. Has a study been made of unmet needs?

5. What is the current statutory or policy provision for reviewing and approving programs? By what agencies? Which agencies are to be reviewed?

6. What kind of provision for planning and coordination would best serve the state, with its own traditions, its existing structures for governance and policy-making, and its unique political climate?

If, based on its findings, the state-wide planning group recommends a strong state-level agency to resolve issues that individual institutions or system-wide or segmental policy boards and state governments cannot resolve, then it seems to me the matters of program review and recommendation and the effectiveness of education programs at all levels become a top priority agenda item of the coordinating body. A non-administering board can raise the kinds of questions and call for the kind of planning, decision-making and management which will produce change, promote cooperative efforts, and anticipate issues and problems.

The coordinating board must develop its own guidelines and operating procedures, again fitted to the situation state by state. One key to any system of evaluating what is being done, what ought or might be done, and what outcomes may be expected, is the specificity and the clarity of the goals statements for the state, for the segments, for the institutions. In 1947, President Truman's Commission on Higher Education offered this advice:

> "What America needs today is a schooling better aware of its aims. Our colleges need to see clearly what it is they are trying to accomplish and they need ways of measuring their effectiveness in meeting those aims."

That quotation is even more relevant today. With more than 50 percent of the college-age group going on to postsecondary education of some kind, it is crucial that the education missions of an institution be clear, visible and understood by students, the public, and by the elected and appointed persons who are responsible for seeing to it that schools are operated to serve those missions effectively and efficiently.

In looking at programs, proposed and existing, the state-level board will have to concern itself with three broad aspects, as identified and described by Glenny, Berdahl, et al.:

1. The programs to be reviewed
2. The criteria to be used in judging
3. The mechanism review

Obviously, the programs to be reviewed will depend upon the legal authority of the coordinating or governing board. The case has been made, I believe, that the most effective process of review is one that considers not only the approval of new programs, but also the deletion, merger, reallocation and suspension of existing programs.

The board's membership, I believe, should be made up of knowledgeable, experienced lay persons not connected directly with, or employed by public institutions or agencies. They need time, interest and energy to devote to the task. They should assure themselves that they have a director or commissioner of stature and a staff with expertise in the areas of board responsibility.

The staff may be relatively small if it utilizes the planning and information-gathering capabilities available at the institution and segmental level.

With the aid of the staff, then, the state-wide board should go about the task of setting out the criteria for program review. In general, these criteria should call for the use of common guidelines and procedures.

Our State Board of Higher Education in Oregon has had considerable experience with reviewing and authorizing requests for new programs or repackaging existing courses into new options. It has, on very rare occasions, recommended disapproval or referral back to the institution for further study. (The Board of Higher Education also has had to provide for implementing legislative decisions to make an urban state college into a state university, or add or phase out a department within an institution.) We now are embarking on a "review and recommend" process for existing programs, commencing with those of high-cost and low-enrollment at the graduate level.

The criteria followed by the central office in making recommendations to the Academic Affairs Committee of the Board are made up of the seven major components commonly included in program review procedures of coordinating and governing boards. They include a description of the program; a setting out of the program's purposes and objectives; an analysis of need for the program; a cost analysis that includes direct and indirect funding sources; an estimation of the resources required (faculty, staff, library, physical facilities); an indication of the prospects for accreditation; and a description of possible relationships to future developments at the institution and within the state.

Our statutory responsibility extends only to the three state universities, the three regional state colleges, a technical institute and a health sciences center. Our system has functioned as both governing and coordinating since 1931, but with the addition of 13 publicly supported community colleges, which fall under the loose coordination of the Board of Education, and are governed by a locally-elected board, our system lacks the state wide perspective it should have. Under the present State Board of Higher Education's jurisdiction, the programs of the private and independent schools are not included in the program review, except by reference at times. Our Oregon situation is further complicated by the fact that some of the four-year institutions award Associate Degrees, normally the province of the community or junior colleges, and the community colleges serve state-wide needs, have their lower division college courses transferable credit for up to 108 quarter-hours out of 185, and serve students of the area education district, the state as a whole, and non-resident students. Three-tier tuition levels reflect these in-state and out-of-state services, at the lower-division level. The four-year institutions receive about 75 percent of their funds from state general fund appropriations. Their tuitions pay for roughly 25 percent of the cost of instruction. The community colleges, on the other hand, receive roughly 50 percent of their support from the general fund, 33 percent from local property taxes, and only 17 percent from tuition.

Overlooked in the present planning is the fact that "out there" - in many non-educational enterprises - are people as well or better qualified to teach, equipment more sophisticated, and resources for real-life experiences more effective than we have in formal education. Aren't we short-sighted and remiss if we do not take those resources into consideration in our planning processes?

As you can readily see, ours is a fragmented kind of situation over which the Educational Coordinating Council attempts to exercise a measure of planning on an

advisory, coordinative, research and forecasting basis. Educational coordinating matters are complicated even further by the fact that the appointed Chancellor of Higher Education and the elected State Superintendent of Public Instruction are voting members of the Coordinating Council Board. The Council has not been very effective in its overall planning and coordinating role for many reasons, which certainly include the make up of the Council Board.

On the central issue in program review, that of the mechanism and the process of review, I want to get away from the details and the alternate processes because they are almost limitless. Generally, they need to be responsive to some of the following:

1. They must take into consideration the jurisdiction and powers of existing boards, systems and substructures.
2. They should utilize common guidelines and procedures so that all institutions are responding to the same requests and requirements.
3. They should involve the individual institutions and their faculties, administrators and students in developing the plans and guidelines.
4. They should contain no unnecessary and cumbersome features.
5. They should expedite change, if recommended.
6. They should require state-wide compliance with the state-level process of program review.
7. They should provide that decisions about individual courses and course content stay at the institutional level.
8. They should deal with the matter of building up de facto programs which operate without formal approval.
9. They should provide for standing and ad hoc advisory committees which may or may not include coordinating board members, but which may utilize coordinating board staff assistance.
10. Program review by a state-level board should provide for the use of outside consultants, for on-site visitations by consultants from inside and outside the state; the board and staff of the coordinating agency should work closely with the institution and segmental boards and staffs in developing recommendations.
11. Finally, individual institutions or the segments should be required to respond to questions concerning their goals, their educational relevancy, and their cost-effectiveness.

The recent past indicates that much of the impetus for change and diversity has come from the outside, from student demand, and from the political world. Some of the responses have been outstandingly good. We have moved from higher education for a relatively few to mass postsecondary education, which, more and more, attracts new learners. In the process, we may, however, be lowering standards and accepting mediocre performance which, in turn, debases the worth of the credentials. It is imperative that a state-level board provide leadership in assessing the performance, in forecasting "futures," in providing opportunities for examining economic, social, and demographic forces, issues and trends as these apply to education in the state. Such a coordinating board would be responsible, then, for acting as a bridge between institutions and the decision-makers in state government.

Because of the rapid growth of postsecondary education in the last two decades, and the lack of time for careful planning and "taking stock," many inequalities have developed. We have to answer simple but difficult questions: Who should pay? For what? Where? How much? For how long?

I also believe it will be increasingly necessary for all boards to assess periodically and even harshly, their own performances in the light of their changing roles. Because the state-level board's planning, information-gathering, coordinative and evaluative functions are different from those of policy-making boards (and they are relative late-comers), state boards will have to be especially diligent in performance and assessment. Robert O. Berdahl, Senior Fellow of the Carnegie Foundation Council on Policy Studies in Higher Education, is currently developing criteria and information for evaluating state-wide boards of postsecondary education. There are many problems. He says, "Personalities are sometimes more important than the structure. The structure itself is affected by the interpl of many other elements." James Miller put it this way:

> "Some agencies have more power than their enabling legislation suggests because they are heavy on informal power, influence, and 'credibility' with state officials and the public. Other agencies have less power than the statutes suggest because their credibility is low and their recommendations are ignored. The web of informal relationships, communication and respect among legislators and the state agency is extremely important and is often overlooked."

The situation in New York State, described by Karen Winkler in the January 27 Chronicle of Higher Education in an article entitled "Statewide Planning Versus Institutional Autonomy," points to the gap that exists between theory and the actual "review and approve" process. The Commissioners of Education and the Regents, who are appointed by the Legislature and must "register" (approve) all programs in both public and private colleges and universities, have undertaken to review, recommend continuance, termination, phaseout or improvement of all doctoral programs in the state. Their recommendations have been intensely questioned by the Chancellor and Regents of the State University and by individual presidents.

Everyone admits that the two criteria used - "need" and "quality" - are difficult to come to grips with. It has been customary to link "quality" with dollars expended, faculty degrees and salary levels, space utilized, library holdings, etc. There may be studies to show direct relationships between dollars and effectiveness of outcomes; I don't know of any, though there are obvious relationships between resources available and choices that may then be made. Policy boards have "non-transferable responsibilities for determining, as objectively as it is humanly possible, the degree of wisdom by which existing resources are managed" as Arthur Frantzreb told the Association of Governing Boards in October. He is not sure, nor am I, that policy boards are equipped or have the ability to do this - as they are presently organized. Some are isolated from the realities of present or future dangers; some, as he said, are apathetic enough to let the president or someone else worry about the major issues and what may be growing academic deficits and poor management practices. In some cases, the problems are too diffused and too big for part-time lay persons to grasp, and they need to retain specialists to help them.

The use of "need" as an evaluative criterion - whether in reference to the needs of society for trained manpower, or the "needs" of students - runs counter to the long-held tradition that any student ought to be able to enroll in any program he wishes and for which he is qualified, whether or not there will be an employment outlet for his training and talents. This - and certain well-established status requirements - have led institutions to try to offer a vast smorgasbord of studies. The rapid expansion has generated an overall growth rate large enough to justify most programs, even in not very popular fields. Duplication of most undergraduate programs and departmental majors at state colleges and universities has been the rule. The federal government has poured money into a variety of programs, thus compounding the proliferation.

However, at these crossroads in the long history of the development and financing of higher education - before collective bargaining with its focus on job security, forces program decisions which may be more rigid; before able young instructors must be denied appointment and untenured faculty let go; and before hard-pressed small liberal arts institutions are forced to close their doors or reduce their programs to the point of diminishing returns - all of us should see that it may be to the state's and the institution's advantage to concentrate in fewer institutions' programs for which there is decreased demand - or disproportionate costs. The powers of program termination or reallocation have been used but slightly up to now. Ralph Dungan, Chancellor of Higher Education in New Jersey is quoted in a recent Chronicle article as saying that some institutions have developed "a Brinks-truck mentality: you dump the dough once a year and you don't come back and see us again until next year." This article raises the question of what will happen when a strong state coordinating agency comes up against a strong statewide faculty union.

College presidents are predictably upset by the prospects, as are faculties. They see the whole process of state-level program review and recommendation as an infringement upon their traditional autonomy and responsibility to chart their own courses. Though some of them publicly denounce the specifics of the review process while endorsing the general principles, privately some of them will admit that the state-level reviews may give them more latitude and power to eliminate the weak programs that sap the funds which should more properly go to the strong. Viewed this way, the review process could improve the institution's "image," credibility, and drawing power. Students will choose strong programs, given adequate information and counseling.

Dr. Glenny, in his paper, "The Volatile Steady State," says:

> "At the state level, concern must be focused toward flexibility, zero-base planning, clearly defined, realistic goals and objectives for each institution, adherence to long-range plans through such goals and an operationally responsive planning and budgeting process."

In my view, these are proper concerns for a state-level agency with some of the functions and powers we have discussed. The Executive Director of the agency should be a stimulator to his board: he should educate his board members objectively and persistently about present and future issues in realistic terms. If there are academic deficits, he should stimulate planning to alleviate them.

Somebody has to do it. Internally, the faculties find it extremely difficult to reach these kinds of decisions. They lack the state-wide perspective, and their self-interests blur vision. Externally, it is more appropriate that program review and approval be done by a state-wide coordinating board which includes all levels of education than by a governor's staff or a legislative staff. Most legislators don't want to serve as education board members, and they resent being cast in the role of academic "meddlers," or of being niggardly if they don't fund budget requests at a level near the asking.

Legislators will continue to review budgets as a part of their proper role in appropriating funds. They will thus influence educational policy. But they need to be assured that their budgetary decisions are based on reliable data.

To those who would advise against the creation or strengthening of coordinating boards and ask, "But isn't this an invasion of academic freedom?" the reply has to be that nothing that has been recommended would preclude an institution from engaging in self-evaluation and priority-setting. All of these coordinating efforts would engage the

faculties and administrators in their own best efforts to find ways to improve their offerings, management, and operations. If institutions choose to buck the current trends and fight the legislatures or the state-wide coordinating boards, they will lose. On the other hand, if they choose to join the effort, they will have taken an important step forward in regaining public confidence and support.