DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 169 459 CG 013 421

AUTHOR	Tilley, David C.; And Others
TITLE	The Student Affairs Dean and the President: Trends in Higher Education.
INSTITUTION	ERIC Clearinghouse on Counseling and Personnel Services, Ann Arbor, Mich.; National Association of Student Personnel Administrators, Detroit, Mich.
SPONS AGENCY	National Inst. of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	79
NOTE	90p.
AVAILABLE FROM	ERIC/CAPS, School of Education, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, MI 48109 ($4.95)
EDRS PRICE	MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS	Academic Enrichment; *Administrative Policy; *College Deans; Colleges; *Futures (of Society); *Role Perception; *Student Personnel Services
IDENTIFIERS	Information Analysis Products

ABSTRACT

This collection of three papers with introductory material examines the role of the Student Affairs Dean. Particular emphasis is placed upon the dean's historic relationship as assistant to the college president and the need for student affairs deans to develop ways to help their presidents prepare for the future. It also emphasizes the relevance of social and educational trends towards management accountability and economic pressures. Additional considerations include the challenge for student affairs to not only supplement teaching, but also contribute to the improvement of teaching and the student's academic learning environment through collaborative efforts with the faculty. (LJS)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED169459

HARD COPY NOT AVAILABLE

THE STUDENT AFFAIRS DEAN AND THE PRESIDENT: TRENDS IN HIGHER EDUCATION

by

David C. Tilley, Louis T. Benezet, Joseph Katz, and William Shanteau

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Eric / Caps

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

Developed by
ERIC Counseling and Personnel Services Clearinghouse
in collaboration with the
National Association of Student Personnel Administrators

CG013421

This publication was prepared pursuant to a contract with the national institute of education, United States Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Contractors undertaking such projects under Government sponsorship are encouraged to express freely their judgment in professional and technical matters. Points of view or opinions do not, therefore, necessarily represent National Institute of Education position or policy.

ERIC COUNSELING AND PERSONNEL SERVICES CLEARINGHOUSE
School of Education
The University of Michigan
Ann Arbor, Michigan 48109

Published by ERIC/CAPS
1979

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

Foreword, *Garry R. Walz and Libby Benjamin* ii

Introduction, *David C. Tilley* 1

Future College Students and the Growth of College Management Systems, *Louis T. Benezet* 11

Collaboration of Academic Faculty and Student Affairs Professionals for Student Development, *Joseph Katz* 33

A Discussion of Current Trends Impacting Student Affairs, *David C. Tilley and William Shanteau* 55

Partially Annotated Bibliography 66

FOREWORD

Changing times are leading to changing professional roles. Deans once secure in the institutional role which they had defined (or which had been defined for them) now discover their institutions in the ethos of significant and multi-directed change. No newcomers to change, still deans are experiencing increasing pressure to know what to change and how to change it. Should their focus be on institutional and organizational change? Should they be in the vanguard of experimentation with innovations in learning climates and teacher-student interaction modes? Or should change be directed inward, toward updating their perceptions of student and institutional needs and of ways they can respond?

Knowing what questions to ask is probably one of the most important tasks confronting the contemporary dean. An insightful Washington higher education bureaucrat, now turned professor, once remarked to us, "Why is it that deans have attached so little importance to examining their relationship with the college president?" This person was suggesting that the nature of the relationship between the dean of student services and the president was a critical area of inquiry and a question that was infrequently/inadequately raised. His remark piqued our interest. Was the relationship between the dean and the president a subject that was being given attention in the literature? A review of the ERIC data base showed that it was not. This started the flow of our creative juices. How could we stimulate thinking and discussion on the topic? We turned to NASPA.

Working collaboratively on a project with NASPA had long been one of our major goals. The presence of Alice Manicur, then President-Elect of NASPA, on our Advisory Commission gave us the opportunity to pursue it further. Discussions held initially with Alice and with Art Sandeen, a later President-Elect who also served on our Commission, excited us and confirmed the need and desirability of a joint effort. Creating a publication that broke new ground, encompassed the best thinking of NASPA leaders, and built upon the resources of ERIC/CAPS was mutually determined to be the route to take. Dave Tilley was the agreed-upon choice to spearhead the publication, and this volume is the result. Exercising his broad and insightful knowledge of the field, he provided the impetus for capturing the cogent thinking of the major authors, Louis T. Benezet and Joseph Katz, and his co-author, William Shanteau.

In a style which we hope is perceived by readers as both compelling and predictable for a CAPS publication, the present volume jolts the reader, raises questions, and stimulates thinking, rather than provides answers. We hope that a thoughtful perusal of the ideas contained herein will lead to questioning and reflection, and then to action. We expect few deans of student affairs will be the same for having read this book.

Another outcome high on our hope list is that this publication will lead readers to avail themselves more regularly of the plethora of resources in ERIC on topics of major interest to deans of student services. ERIC exists as a dynamic body of materials. Its growth in both numbers and topics reflects the needs and interests of student services specialists. As readers gain stimulation through publications such as this one or are confronted with perplexing questions of their own, we urge that they use ERIC as a follow-through system for obtaining the information and resources they need.

One of the most important things we wish to express is our pleasure in working on this venture with NASPA. Hopefully, this will be the beginning of an extended publication marriage rather than a brief romantic fling. We especially wish to convey our thanks to Presidents Manicur and Sandeen for their vision and interest in the publication, and to Channing Briggs, Executive Director of NASPA, for his support of and faith in the project. We are pleased with this, our first collaborative publication effort, and hope you are too. After reading the book, it would be much appreciated if you would share your feelings with us and with NASPA.

Garry R. Walz and Libby Benjamin

THE STUDENT AFFAIRS DEAN AND THE PRESIDENT: TRENDS IN HIGHER EDUCATION

INTRODUCTION

Planning for this series of papers began during a chance, informal conversation among several student affairs deans--one of those talks that tend to be the high point of most professional gatherings. Talk that day focused on the kinds of communications typically exchanged with institutional presidents. The anecdotes of that session are lost to memory--or prudently forgotten--but not the questions nor the intensity of feelings expressed. Most such discussions are remembered primarily for the good feelings of being with old friends and new acquaintances. But in this case the substance and intensity of the issue became a force motivating us to examine more closely what student affairs deans should discuss with the campus president and others influential in policy making. The following papers address that question from the perspective of the college president, the faculty, the influence of socioeconomic trends emphasized in the recent literature, and the practical experience of student affairs deans.

The background papers depict the complex environment within which the student affairs dean approaches interaction with institutional policy and policy makers. Louis Benezet has been a college president for more than twenty-five years. His leadership experiences range from small private colleges to a large public university, and from coast to coast with stops in between. Eloquently and, one suspects, with some misgiving, he describes the growing pressure from external sources for accountability in higher education.

Those who fund higher education are increasingly questioning both product and productivity. Sophisticated management technology is now common in the private corporate sector and in many federal and state agencies. This leads trustees, regents, and legislatures to expect similar practices in colleges and universities.

Demands for more precision in planning, more efficiency in operation, and more evidence of outcomes that justify support levels obviously place a difficult burden on student affairs deans managing programs with such individualized impacts and effects. The demand on presidents for improved management means that student affairs deans, who are typically trained in human development and helping services, find themselves expected to function in unfamiliar and often alien technologies. Too often these models are hasty and imperfect translations from business, industry, or the military which fail to comprehend the special character of a college, especially its nonacademic dimensions. This is the challenge poignantly given by President Benezet: How may student affairs deans today best assist their presidents in facing the future?

Dr. Joseph Katz, for many years a noted researcher and writer on student and faculty development, presents another challenge. His is perhaps a more serendipitous vision: He sees student affairs deans as contributors to the improvement of teaching and the students' academic learning environment. The two roles, when combined, illustrate the enormous range of service proposed for deans in the contemporary college. My own paper, last in the series, attempts to summarize some ideas from the previous ones and relate them to current literature.

The concept of student affairs deans contributing to the academic mission is not new. In fact, the impetus for the development of student affairs programs after World War II coincided with the development of testing technologies to help select and guide students in their learning and subsequent career choices. What is new is the shift in attention from offering services to the learner to helping faculty understand and adapt to student learning styles. The veil that for years has set the classroom apart as the instructor's castle has begun to lift. Student affairs deans skilled in working with students now are invited in to help enhance classroom communication and to improve the fit between learning and teaching styles.

Already the early success of this effort has initiated further study. Methods for classifying teaching preferences and student personality characteristics are being examined to determine the results of matching up students and faculty. It is expected that matching will improve the quality of student learning, as well as increase teacher satisfaction.

Obviously, this approach to the organization of teaching and learning increases the importance of research on students and the significance to deans of systematically gathering data on student characteristics. Comprehensive baseline data, combined with ongoing planning to adjust institutional environments and improve the quality of campus life, represent a promising prospect for increased professional service by student affairs deans. Deans can anticipate contributing to a systematic approach to student-institutional planning that moves beyond traditional prescriptions and results in a realistic consideration of how students and institutions interact.

Traditionally, faculty and curricula have been organized around academic disciplines, intellectual themes, and professional applications of knowledge. While faculty members often identify strongly with their fields, most agree that the interaction of ideas and perspectives represented by varied disciplines is needed for a truly vital intellectual community. A good mix seems to stimulate all.

So the twofold mission of higher education becomes clear. It must both train the intellectually talented needed to fill the professional ranks in society, and provide a source of lifetime learning for those who seek simply to satisfy their curiosity. As more institutions adopt this view, it will be more evident to faculty that the special training, talent, and experience of student affairs deans adds yet another dimension to the academic program.

The two domains of service to management/accountability and the improvement of the teaching-learning environment occur in the distinctive context of each dean's institution. They reflect the way each institution is affected by the larger social, political, and economic issues unfolding in the local regions and in the nation.

Our view is that ecomomic pressure generally is causing the public to reexamine its longstanding willingness to support large public and private investments in higher education. This value adjustment, combined with a reduced birthrate and an altered international economic balance, places a severe strain on the availability of resources for higher education. The search for resources tends to make both public and private institutions compete for public monies. Extensive use of public funding, however, together with questions about the capacity of educators, introduces serious questions about the independence of educational institutions and who will govern. A not-inconsiderable force in this issue is the growing power of student consumers to secure both accountability from institutions and a voice in decision making. The fact that 18-year-olds now vote makes the government much more attentive to their opinions. Similarly, employees on many campuses, including faculty, are now organized into collective bargaining units. The struggle for limited resources threatens to affect college government and campus life in ways one shudders to imagine.

Many components of the social forces at work relate to student affairs. Some of the more obvious are employment, both un- and under-; access for the disadvantaged, underrepresented minorities, women and the handicapped; financial aid; and enrollment and retention. The student affairs dean, more than any other campus officer except the president, needs to have a sophisticated grasp of the large social forces at play. The dean must be able to relate these to the institution and its mission, and work with the campus in designing strategies to respond to the many communities seeking the institution's services.

Clearly, in defining and carrying out our plan for this manuscript we have made choices that not everyone will share. Our purpose, however, is not to convince anyone that our answers or visions are correct. Rather, we hope that what we have to say will encourage others to examine the questions for themselves, and to persist in the effort to make the rich resources of student affairs deans available to their institutions.

The issues presented in these papers are some of the topics student affairs deans need to discuss with their presidents. The institution, its mission, and its special concerns obviously will occupy many meeting agendas. The sad reality for most of us is that such urgent matters inevitably tend to crowd out opportunities to address the important ones we raise here.

In preparing to draft this paper I spoke to and corresponded with many student affairs colleagues. I asked, "What do you talk about when you meet with your president?" The specific answers varied, but in general it is safe to say that most dealt with management topics. Deans report that they brief the president on current issues, advise on program priorities and budgets, and assist in analyzing special problems. Many deans indicate that a high priority for them in managing their presidential agendas is to preserve decision-making authority as much as possible within their own divisions. In order to accomplish this, messages to the president are carefully selected and prepared to avoid pre-emptive presidential action.

Almost all agree that there are few opportunities to exchange ideas openly on matters of educational or social philosophy. The short time available tends to require that immediate, largely functional matters be the focus of conversation. One dean's list of the past semester's topics included advising the president about how to respond to a parent's complaint; planning for future campus housing needs; the feasibility of a student dental care program; ways to involve faculty in summer orientation; how to tell the student body president that he is wrong on a particular issue; ways to shorten lines at registration and in financial aid; ways the institution can achieve greater autonomy from state bureaucracy; how best to provide legislators with information that would convince them to vote in a favorable way; and assorted specific requests for presidential action to appoint committees, accept or decline invitations from student groups, and write letters on legislative matters (e.g., financial aid, commending student leaders). Agendas such as this made it clear to us that there are additional equally important matters which we should be discussing with our presidents.

It is useful to remember that student affairs deans trace their formal origin in this country to the appointment of Le Baron Briggs at Harvard College in 1890. Dean Briggs was appointed to serve as the president's alter ego in matters involving nonacademic student life--although this definition did not exclude academic advising and the implementation of rules governing academic standing and honesty. The point is that the student affairs dean began as an agent of the president. In 1890 that included moral supervision of students and responsibility for socializing students to the accepted standards of the time.

Until the end of World War II that role changed little, except that new knowledge introduced new techniques such as testing. After World War II, however, the GI Bill, the baby boom (which became the student tidal wave), the labor movement, civil rights legislation, and other significant changes in the public consciousness regarding individuality, all resulted in a rapid shift from a socially hierarchical nation to a conciously pluralistic democratic people. Higher education changed accordingly, with in loco parentis an early loser.

All presidents, however, have not recognized that the student deanship has become professional. The dean no longer controls students, but attempts instead to manage crises, resolve conflicts, adjudicate differences, describe reality, and provide environments for growth--and balance the budget. Student affairs deans need to reflect on these changes, how they feel about what has been gained and lost, and about how their actions now will produce desirable changes in the future. In doing this, however, deans should remember their origin. Student affairs deans were--to use the latest terminology--cloned from the President's role to attend to students' needs for guidance and assistance in their personal growth. To develop agendas in isolation from the president, or in contradiction to presidential purpose or style, may on occasion seem to be necessary; but it inevitably is a signal of a serious institutional or student affairs schism occurring at the very point in the organization from which student affairs derives meaning and purpose.

Dean and president must consciously seek to know each other as persons. Most of the deans reported that their relationships with their presidents are functional, professional, and, when social, almost always role-based. If we as student affairs deans are truly to come to grips with the value contents of our perceptions and message, and if we are to develop the ability to anticipate behaviors and create a basis for trust, then we need a firm base of personal understanding.

Deans and presidents typically represent very different backgrounds and experiences. It is not enough merely to recognize that the differences exist; we must get in touch with their meanings. Listening to another person with attention to the individual's expressed "felt" meaning is a very different affair from merely attending to another's words. Sometimes an individual's implicit meaning and his/her explicit, expressed meaning do not match up. Awareness of mismatching, plus accrued knowledge concerning the consequential meanings of various kinds of mismatching, enables an aware, knowledgeable person to move through interpersonal situations more effectively and with greater enjoyment. Attention to "felt meanings" is essential if individuals are to develop intimate sharing relationships with others.

Initially such a discussion between dean and president may not be easy. One dean remarked, "The real question is, 'What will the president let you talk about?'" By and large, however, presidents are curious and attracted by novel approaches. It should be possible to capture the president's interest in sharing experiences by explaining the purpose briefly for instance, pointing out that such sharing will help the dean to anticipate the president better and to perform more confidently. It might also help to present the president with two documents: a brief autobiography of the dean, and a brief biography of the president himself, prepared from available documents, observations, and interviews with resource people. The dean might suggest that the president respond to the biography. As he does so, the dean relates the president's experiences to the development of current values and style. At an appropriate time the process can be reversed and the president becomes the interviewer exploring the dean's biography until it is possible for them to identify commonalities and to understand differences. It is possible that this process might from time to time be aided by a trained facilitator who could assist at critical moments and also summarize observations when appropriate. By presenting themselves as persons and by attending to each other's individuality, the dean and the president establish a common ground for defining their reality and the possibilities for future action.

Possible future conversations between dean and president are limited only by circumstance and imagination. We can only suggest several briefly and leave elaboration of the scripts to the participants. High on our list are questions designed to probe personal and educational values. A good example is, "What is quality?" The term is used frequently, but seldom defined. Quality in teaching, curriculum, and student life is much discussed, often alleged, and rarely demonstrated. It is usually assumed on the basis of approved behaviors believed to be related, such as successful student performance in subsequent schooling or occupations.

Another value issue follows from the question, "How wise is conventional wisdom?" Do we create our institutions and programs freshly from their own circumstances and our best visions? Or are our programs imitative, derivative--as banal as the pop culture that a higher education supposedly helps distinguish from more enduring expressions? Do we have the wit to seek the best way and the courage, when needed, to choose a fresh path? Can we, as an academic cynic remarked recently, risk disapproval of the conventional miseducators?

A stunning issue was raised not long ago by a president seeking advice on the development of student life programs from a group of student affairs deans. He asked, "How much is enough?" It is, of course, the classic bargainer's quandary. Put in the context of an educational management question, it gathers considerable power. How much is effective? How much is efficient? How much is fair? Where do our insufficiencies lie--in goods, in services, and in caring? Is the existing distribution of resources the one we intend? This question serves to link values and resources, justice and practicality. The Bakke case posed the same questions to the Supreme Court. How much affirmative action is enough to remedy the damage of discrimination in access to medical school, or to any other education one's capability and motivation permit?

A fourth question presents a different issue: What do we really know about the students at our institution? What have they experienced in their lives? What do these experiences represent as preparation for college? How have their varied experiences shaped the attitudes and values students bring with them to the campus? In the past decade, research on students has increased greatly. Still, few institutions are systematic in their collection of information, or even in the analysis of routinely available data. Most information gathered by campuses on students is relatively simple and rarely followed up to observe individual or sub-group changes.

The promise of improved institutional functioning resulting from expanded and improved methods of studying students, however, is one of the most positive aspects of the student affairs future. A detailed description (available in the ERIC system) prepared by Dr. James Bess, Associate Professor of Higher Education at Teachers College, Columbia University, shows one way that colleges might use currently available information sources about students in improving teaching and management. Data on incoming freshmen were collected using a number of different formal and informal assessment instruments, and made available in useful form to faculty and student services specialists.

A fifth possible question for deans and presidents to discuss looks toward the future: Is the education we are offering going to serve the student for a lifetime? This is another way of putting the liberal education versus vocational education issue. It is also connected to each of the previous questions. An alumnus of the University of California at Santa Cruz, in defending the value of the broad liberal education experienced there, answered the question with a question. "Who was wiser," he asked, "the man who studied the philosophers of Greece and Rome, or the one who knew all the latest alchemy and flat-earth theory?"

The final suggested question--which is too often the first topic deans feel they must discuss--is, "What does student affairs add to the institution? Is it a necessary, useful, cost-effective program?" It is a rare dean who has not been confronted by questions about the legitimacy of student affairs as a field or profession. Deans must also deal with those who characterize student affairs as ancillary or of lower importance than other institutional activities such as instruction, football, and parking. In a sense we have ourselves to blame. We have been vague about our origins, accepting of subordinate roles, slow to assert political power, careless in the development of staff and programs, and delinquent in establishing sound bases for programs and policy planning. In short, we haven't always had our act together. This vagueness has hurt us as a profession and confused those who try to understand us. It has made it hard for new professionals to plug in and to be comfortable. It has even encouraged some of the more able professional prospects to select other fields (such as social work) or more defined functions (such as counseling).

The reality is that student affairs is not an intellectual/academic field. Student affairs is an administrative label used to describe a grouping of functions. These functions vary from institution to institution on the basis of organizational needs and not on the basis of a clear common principle. Studies of student affairs organizations show a great diversity of patterns. Even the term "nonacademic services" is inadequate to define the broad outline within which student affairs falls. Many programs today include academic services--even the delivery of credit-bearing instruction.

We need not be defensive about this diversity. "Student affairs," like "academic affairs," is an organizational term given specific meaning by its local use. The activities performed by a typical student affairs division, however, begin to identify substantive areas of professional expertise. A wide range of areas includes applied sciences such as administration, the management of information systems, and the development and control of budgets; technical services such as financial aid; and more defined professional activities such as counseling and health services. Each of these activities relates to a rich body of knowledge. We need apologize only if we fail to recognize the fields that inform our actions and to become expert in their use.

Excluding some of the exotic things that find their way into our domain, student affairs essentially has two major divisions: administration (activities designed to serve institutional accountability) and helping (this means faculty and staff, not just students). These activities are essential and central to the healthy functioning of any college or university.

If we have developed our conversation well, the final question need not be asked. The defense may rest safe in the knowledge that the institution and the president understand that student affairs is a necessary part of their wholeness. To ask, then, "Is student affairs necessary?" becomes no less silly than to ask, "Are students and faculty necessary?"

David C. Tilley

ABOUT THE AUTHOR

Louis T. Benezet is Professor of Human Development and Educational Policy at State University of New York, Stony Brook. His extensive administrative experience includes being president of several colleges. He was a member of the Founding Committee, Council on Post Secondary Education, and has published numerous works on various aspects of higher education administration.

FUTURE COLLEGE STUDENTS AND THE GROWTH OF COLLEGE MANAGEMENT SYSTEMS

Louis T. Benezet

Growth of the Corporation for Education

The largest personal change one might predict for American college students during the last of this century is that they will become more and more like clients of a corporation and less and less like members of a community of learners. It is a safe prediction because to a considerable extent it has already happened. Future historians of the 20th century may tell us that the change started after World War II when the G.I. Bill of Rights made it possible for nearly 3,000,000 veterans, most of whom had not entertained college hopes, to obtain degrees and go on to upper-level careers. Even while this was happening many predicted that it could not be so.

The dangers of predictions for society, as Harold Orlans has observed (1977), are that a group of experts can project a future society only to find next month that their underpinnings have been removed by a single national incident. He quotes Charles Beard as of 1929:

> Nobody would foretell in October 1928 whether Mr. Smith or Mr. Hoover would be elected President, and yet we are asked to project the social trajectory of the United States until the end of the century. . . . All such prognostications (have) the chances of perhaps a thousand to one against correctness. (p. 32)

Still it seems unlikely that American higher education at its present size can go in any direction other than that of the system-managed corporation. It will be engaged in the business of training people both to start in a specific career and to cope in an increasingly threatening world of four billion mostly have-not human beings.

It also seems natural to predict that our country will continue to demand more and more education for its citizens. The following statement by a national observer of the day is typical:

1. There are not jobs enough to take care of the youth who need them and want them.

2. Our educational system is not adequate in size or character to prepare multitudes of youth for the work opportunities that are available.

3. Nationally speaking, there is not equal opportunity for education. Vast areas of the United States have inadequate educational systems. (p. ix)

This contemporary-sounding statement was written by Betty and Ernest K. Lindley in 1938.

The rise in college access since World War II is part of the triumph story of American higher education. It climaxed in the decade of the 1960's when total enrollments more than doubled, from 3,582,726 to 7,920,149 (Grant, 1976). To a large extent our higher education has been a victim of its own success, because we find it costs very much to educate so many students as well as we should. As yet we have not suffered the overcrowding and plummeting of faculty-student ratios, or the abandonment of planning, let alone ethics, to gain entrance on any terms that are said to be afflicting Italy and Japan. Instead the United States since 1945 has (with perhaps traditional engineering zeal) converted a scattered pattern of institutions large and small, rather informally run on the whole, into a nationwide complex of state systems. This includes even private institutions, which find themselves increasingly caught up in coordinating councils, legislative committees and governors' budget offices. Undergirding the system, if "system" can be used to describe the education by 3,000 institutions of 11,000,000 persons, are 1,003 two-year community colleges. These have done wonders for student access, not only because of their very low cost but also because of their essentially open-door admissions policies and their curriculums mixing vocational with academic subjects.

It seems needless to point out that the enormous increase in number and variety of students since mid-century has changed the idea of what it is like to "go to college." If one attempts to forecast what students of the future will be like, one might do well to remember that most college student bodies already bear little resemblance to their counterparts in the early 1900's. At that time a few hundred thousand students attended highly selective, four-year residential colleges which turned out graduates for the choice professions and upper stations in life. Strangely enough, many people still hold that image as typical of the student who goes to college. A college education is considered a sort of reward either of wealth or unusual drive, and not to be made available to just anybody.

Folklore in any topic has its advantages. To think of college as a place where a young man or woman of 18 can spend four years living on a familial campus studying the liberal arts with master teachers and becoming socialized by a governing principle of "cognitive rationality" as Parsons and Platt have described it (1973) keeps alive a standard of pride--slightly stuffy, to be sure--as well as a warning against easy expectations of success. This writer can remember a seminar held thirty years ago on an upstate New York campus at which a visiting president from one of the neighboring liberal arts colleges said, "I have always considered that the purpose of higher education was to prepare for the magistracy." There were no grins or frowns about the table at this, even though several colleges represented--including the speaker's own--were producing graduates who could expect a far more modest future.

Whether or not the American college student of the past was somebody privileged to prepare for the magistracy or its equivalent, there is small reason to speak about such lofty career patterns now as the universal purpose of higher education in America. Elite colleges do remain, and within all colleges there are some who will be outstanding in various elite fields. The question which concerns us more is what the process does for the person: whether or not the great swelling of enrollments and the management systems which have been brought in to handle them permit us to think of college students as active and personal participants in their own educative process. When the growth of the higher education industry has become a matter of 11,000,000 students served by an overall staff of more than 2,000,000, and when the total budget for operating United States colleges and universities has risen to $30,000,000,000 a year for educational and general expenditures alone (Council for Financial Aid to Education, 1977) plus the expense of financial aid, capital construction and auxiliary enterprises, we are looking at a giant industry. Perhaps most students who are part of that industry keep hope alive that they will have some personal role to play as they proceed through their courses. Yet even in the smallest campuses of America the complications of administering a degree program make it increasingly likely that the personal side of education, if it succeeds at all, does so in spite of present circumstances rather than because of them.

Looking from Past to Present

A book widely circulated just ten years ago made hopeful predictions about preserving individuality in college. Alvin Eurich's edited volume (1968), containing chapters contributed by a veritable "Who's Who" of American educators, was optimistic about the chances of the individual both to find identity and to assert individual options in the process. Nevitt Sanford, one of its most sanguine authors, states of the purpose of education in the future:

> By 1980 educators will see much more clearly . . . that the major aim of college education is the fullest possible development of the individual personality, and that the only basis for planning an educational environment is knowledge of how students actually develop. (p. 182)

In another chapter ("The American Campus--1980") Harold Gores, president of the Educational Facilities Laboratories (Ford Foundation), carries on Sanford's idea of an environment built around individual student development. He predicts that the physical campus will be planned as "mostly library and living room" for the enrollees:

> The living rooms, nee classrooms, will provide the arena where the student . . . hammers out the values, the meaning of it all. In this arrangement, where faculties deal less with the dispensing of information than with the imbuing of values, the teacher can return to his ancient trade--philosophy. If this be true, it behooves every institution to be imprecise in its physical planning, to stay loose, to build no wall or roof or fence which cannot, another day, serve another purpose. (p. 198)

Eurich's book presented an optimistic picture of college in the next decade as a place for personal growth. Although it was written at the very onset of student unrest and demonstrations, it contains no predictions about the new demographic populations just then pouring into the institutions. There is no hint of the difficulties these people would have acculturating themselves in strongly WASP colleges. The problems of blacks, Chicanos, Puerto Ricans and women over finding identity or gratification in their campus experience are not mentioned. A great deal is said about the vast institutional growth needed to take care of the expanding numbers, which are predicted with fair accuracy. But the various contributors agree with almost no dissent that such growth of systematization bids fair to contribute to the involvement of faculty, students and administrators in a closer relationship between higher education and the ongoing needs of society. Efficiency and effectiveness are seen as quite compatible if not complementary.

Eurich's ambitious compendium for colleges and universities in the 1980's was drawn from its various authors just ahead of the full outbreak of student unrest, although the book was published four years after the first major demonstration at Berkeley. Only Sanford's chapter spends time on the meaning or possible future of student activism. He sees it as a wholesome, constructive sign. Within a year after the issue of Eurich's book a flood of books and pamphlets began sounding the alarm about student protest over everything from government to grading policies. The target was by no means limited to Vietnam. As the Berkeley Muscatine Report (Select Committee on Education, 1968) eventually made clear, students, particularly on the research university campuses, were equally turned off by the neglect of undergraduate teaching by professors still enjoying the largess of federal research grants which had been stimulated by Sputnik in 1957. As for minority students, the struggles over Black Studies, studies for the various Hispanic cultures and women's studies had become major issues on dozens of campuses.

After the ebb of the Vietnam debacle climaxed by the Kent State and Jackson State killings, for a time there were diverse upsurges of activism calling for programs in such areas as urban blight and environmental pollution. Among those writers urging such measures as giving the students "a greater measure of real control over their own lives and the things which affect their lives--in their words 'a piece of the action'" was our present Secretary of HEW, Joseph A. Califano, Jr., then Assistant to former President Johnson (Califano, 1970, p. 71), who also suggested that students "could have a voice at the highest level of federal government which sets educational policy" (p. 75).

The decade of the 1970's has given educators a chance to observe students in a different climate. The public view is generally expressed that after the Vietnam period and the recession resulting in part from the OPEC nations' quadrupling of oil prices, students have sobered down and are dutifully turning to their studies, letting world and national events take their own course. There is wide belief that liberal education has been given up in favor of career-oriented courses and that only the most affluent and selective colleges are able to hold onto a so-called pure academic curriculum. Actually, almost all colleges, whether rich or modest, give a mixture of basic and applied courses.

Having begun with Eurich's book, which after all could see no further than the time in which it was written, we have our own assignment to predict where students in the next decade will be going. We have already before us in the late 1970's the major facts of growing financial constraints and the leveling off of enrollments. Most dramatic is the drop in total enrollments expected during the 1980's. Since 1969 a smaller percentage of high school graduates have been choosing to go directly on to college, even though total enrollments, largely representing part-time students, continue to inch upward. Significant numbers are choosing the open university experience which has made its sensational growth in Bletchley, England, and which is seen in the United States in various forms of the "university without walls." Both private and public colleges are now conceding the fact of unused student spaces on their campuses. Recruitment tactics have reached levels comparable to the early days of World War II when admissions staffs went to ingenious lengths to enroll a boy either below draft age or 4-F, while attracting girl students with assurances that the male element on campus would still be preserved.

Assumptions for the 1980's

Let us begin with some assumptions of our own for the decade of the 1980's.

1. Demand for higher education in the United States will remain high despite a decline of 15 to 20% in the 18-to-24 age group.

2. College facilities and personnel workers are sufficiently numerous to suggest that competition to maintain enrollments will increase, especially among four-year private colleges whose programs and resources compete with those of nearby state and community colleges.

3. Competition for federal and state funding, both for students and for institutional costs of education, will increase among private and public colleges alike (except for a small group of private colleges which have officially opted against acceptance of state or federal funds).

4. As students pay larger proportions of the tuition cost, social benefits and responsibilities of higher education will become downgraded and individual benefits such as come from purchasing any personal commodity will increase (Bowen, 1974, 1977).

5. Liberal arts in the established disciplines will remain the core of the curriculum in comprehensive colleges and universities as well as those more exclusively committed to the basic academic program.

6. In terms of educational purpose, students' top priority will continue to be their own personal development. Faculty will interpret that student development as a growth in systematic knowledge and cognitive skills, chiefly reflected in the established arts and sciences curriculum. The general public will continue to uphold the purpose of preparing for high-level employment and career success.

7. Administrators will find their more explicitly managerial roles increasing under the economic pressures from all sides, the competition for public funds by other agencies (chiefly defense and social welfare), and the increase of state university system controls and state executive budgetary constraints. Management roles will also grow from the fulfillment of faculty and classified employee union contracts.

8. All these forces will tend to widen the cleavages on campus between the separate constituencies of students, faculty and administrators.

9. Barring disasters such as energy depletion or a major war, the economy of the United States will remain strong enough to support higher education of undiminished resources and variety for all who truly desire part- or full-time college study.

Indications for Student Life

Among the nine assumptions that have been proposed for the state of affairs in the 1980's, numbers 1, 2 and 5 offer no significant change from matters as they are or as they have been for the past half decade. Number 9 is an opinion which will be interpreted variously according to what priority taxpayers hold on how their money should be spent for education beyond high school. During idle moments educators sometimes try to imagine another Sputnik episode in order to electrify the nation into appropriating additional sums to improve the quality of college teaching and research; but the prospect appears unlikely.

Assumption 3 projects an increase in degree, not in kind. Its effect, however, could be a dangerous rise of cost pressures upon the least affluent private and public colleges. The effect of that in turn would likely be either a greater number of college closings among that group or a further lowering of academic standards, with educational programs of such dubious quality as to render them colleges of last resort for students who find nothing more challenging to do with their time.

Assumptions 4, 6, 7 and 8, then, remain as areas where we might gain some inkling about how students will react if these factors develop.

Paying the Piper and Calling the Tune (Assumption 4)

Students who have come across this fact in medieval history have been delighted to discover that in the early universities at Bologna and Salerno professors were paid individually by students in the free-enterprise style, and therefore were to an extent at the mercy of their appraising public (Rashdall, 1936). Nowhere was it said, however, that students of that day told the master what the curriculum should be. Studies were fixed solidly in the trivium and quadrivium, relieved gradually by a rediscovery of the Greek and Roman classics as the Renaissance proceeded.

During the student unrest of the late 1960's and early 70's, nothing provoked professors more than the thought that students were remaking the curriculum through political pressures. True enough, since those days the growing financial constraints upon colleges, the retrenchment of faculty positions and the limitation upon wide course offerings have cooled the climate for students to press for new subject matter.

Sometimes it is forgotten that valuable changes in the curriculum resulted from student leaders' enthusiasm during the activist years of 1967-72. Urban studies, environmental sciences, interdisciplinary studies of many sorts, ventures into ethnic history and cultural backgrounds all owe much to that period.

More likely than the prospect of an increasing student intervention into curriculum change is the continued student appraisal of college teaching. This is a subject as old as teaching itself. Student activity has ebbed since 1970, partly because of faculty union contracts which contain clauses dealing with tenure and promotion as an exclusive concern of faculty. Departmental requirements for closer appraisal of the question of tenure are doing more than student pressure itself to monitor performance, although professorial and student priorities are rarely the same. More direct forms of intervention were practiced during the student turbulence period of the late 1960's. They occasionally still occur in the direct confrontation by students of deans and presidents in behalf of some young professor who has been rejected for academic tenure but who, in the students' opinion, is among the best classroom teachers in a school or department. In 1973 a young man at the head of a delegation of students in my office said in a serious, noninsolent tone, "You know, sir, we regard ourselves as your employers in this matter."

With the expected increase of older students during the 1980's, now already under active recruitment especially in metropolitan regions, such direct approaches probably will decrease. What may remain is a more immediate factor in the classroom that most professors will concede: The older and more mature the student, the more careful the teacher tends to be in his preparation, delivery and evaluation. Unfortunately, this excludes some extension teaching.

In Washington the defense of student interests has entered the general area of consumerism, in part because of the Newman Report of 1971. A Washington bureau organization known as the Federal Interagency Committee on Education actively pursues such matters.

With due respect to the Washington spirit of defending its citizens, it thus far appears more likely that student organizations within universities and state systems may become more directly effective in representing the student constituency in institutional policy. Growing trends to place students either as voting members or as vocal observers on boards of trustees, alumni, administrative and faculty councils, have continued even during the 1970's period of so-called quietism. To be sure, many students label this as tokenism rather than representative governance. Still it is logical to predict that the next decade, with its pressures to maintain enrollments, will bring a more active and critical student voice. Increasing pressure in this direction comes from continuing recommendations, such as those of the Committee for Economic Development (Research and Policy Committee, 1973), that a higher student share in the cost of education become nationwide policy.

Future Trends in Educational Purpose (Assumption 6)

Continuing division of belief regarding the chief educational purposes of college may or may not be reflected in student attitudes during the decade ahead. The general belief that students have given up liberal arts has not been broadly documented. One study on two varied campuses (Benezet, 1976), in one case a high-cost private college, in the other a state college, indicated that students in both agreed that "a good liberal education" should remain the main purpose of the curriculum.

What students object to more than staying in liberal arts as a major is academic specialism under the name of liberality. There are professors who cannot resist the belief that the more closely the student identifies with the professor's own specialty, the more liberal will his education become.

As for the public's attitude, skyrocketing salaries now being paid to nonacademic workers all the way from sanitation truckers to professional athletes have helped diminish the emphasis which used to be placed upon the difference in income to be expected between a high school and a college graduate.* Today's occupations mingle technical, practical and artistic expertise so thoroughly with academic training that the financial distinctions of a standard college degree no longer mean what they once did. Being a college graduate is by now the province of more than 15% of young adults in our country.

---

*Howard Bowen (1977) converts this more meaningfully into cumulative or capital value. He finds the difference still significant in favor of the college person (p. 439).

Realities of Managerial Life in the University (Assumptions 7 and 8)

In a special report several years ago the Chronicle of Higher Education (Magarrell, 1974) made an analysis of campus systems developments. The title was, "The New Managers on Campus," and the subtitle was, "Are their 'systems' changing the character and control of higher education?" The reporter, Jack Magarrell, began, "Sophisticated corporate style management systems are rapidly becoming standard equipment on the American campus." The report of several pages traced the causes of this development, noted as "pressures . . . which are demanding more specific, more standardized information about colleges and universities as a basis for decisions on the allocation of scarce funds." It also gave reactions to it among academic administrators, such as that of Richard M. Millard, Director of Higher Education Services for the Educational Commission of the States in Denver: "There is the possibility that decision making will take place at levels progressively remote from where the educational process actually takes place, to the detriment of the freedom necessary for effective education" (p. 9). The Chronicle report listed 14 different national agencies engaged in the business of servicing institutions and systems with software in the areas of Program, Planning and Budget Systems (PPBS), Management by Objectives (MBO), and other symbols of management reform in the college world. The number of these agencies has since multiplied; the most versatile and widely used is currently the National Center for Higher Education Management Systems (NCHEMS), located in Boulder, Colorado.

Among the myriad issues raised by such managerial developments are questions that have been around campuses for a considerable time, although often under heavy academic wraps: how to appraise the cost-benefit balance of widely differentiated academic departments and professional schools; how to compute full cost per student and what items legitimately to call "educational and general"; how to teach educators to control the system instead of having it control them; how to decide on the distribution of academic personnel and student representatives in management control; and the ultimate question, how to devise better ways of measuring the outcomes of the educational experience.

Our own question must remain: Will the student emerge from college with a sense of a shared human experience in growth, or will he have experienced a well-tooled program of training under impersonal management methods?

The Chronicle report was a natural follow-up to five years of economists' studies which in turn followed the downward trend in federal allocations to colleges after 1967. These allocations had peaked after the passage of the Higher Education Act of 1965; since then the abandonment of the attempt to have both guns and butter, plus Nixon's cooling ardor towards universities, resulted in less government money for university construction, research and instruction. M. M. Chambers (1976) continues to document the annually growing size of state allocations to higher education; the trend is nevertheless towards aid to the student rather than to institutions. Universities have thus struggled progressively with the problem of soaring expense for personnel and equipment amidst a still-burgeoning enrollment. Pressures for budgetary constraint were increased not only by outside management system centers but also by surveys conducted by educators themselves. Earl Cheit's The New Depression in Higher Education (1971) was followed by a series of economic analyses documenting the same trends and urging greater attention to management efficiency and information systems. These studies came from within the academic world itself rather than from outside management agencies. In varying ways they described the growing financial trouble of institutions not only because of soaring costs and spreading programs but also, for not a few colleges, because of an unexpected plateauing and even decrease in enrollments some five years before demographic predictions had said it would happen.

History again may misrecord that scientific management did not hit the American campuses until 1970, after the ebb tide of government allocations to colleges produced by the attitudes of the late Nixon years. It will even be claimed that stiffer management controls were a direct businessman's response to the years of student rebellion of the late '60's and the flaccid institutional response. Hayakawa's tam-o-shanter will be memorialized. Even now reports are heard that colleges are in trouble partly because alumni abandoned them in disgust during the days of student political activism. A simple corrective for such ideas can be found in the Annual Report of the Council for Financial Aid to Education (1977). Total voluntary support for higher education, both private and public, almost exactly doubled between 1964-65 and 1975-76; this includes all categories of givers, non-alumni individuals as well as alumni and business corporations. In no case did the curve turn downward except on a one-year basis for certain colleges during times of economic recession, such as 1970-71 and 1974-75. In terms of alumni giving, the upward trend, although slower than one would wish, shows no clear relationship to years when students were most demonstrative on campus.

The idea that a university should be expected to use scientific or business methods to run its affairs has been eloquently opposed by faculty for at least 60 years, dating to the redoubtable Thorstein Veblen. As many historians have followed the course, nevertheless, there has been a progression throughout the 20th century toward using businesslike methods to run anything as financially complex as universities and even small liberal arts colleges have become. Francis Rourke and Glen Brooks reviewed the movement (1966). Since tracing the history of management trends is not the purpose of our discussion, it need only be said here that the development has been steady and more or less inexorable, though by no means unopposed within the profession itself. Perhaps the strongest area for criticism is the fact that students have had so little opportunity to either participate in the discussion of events or share in contributing to improvements (Astin, 1976).

Rourke and Brooks underscored the potential negative impact of computers, which a decade ago were coming into full flower, on relations between the university and students of the future:

> The evidence thus far available suggests that the introduction of computers frequently influences the distribution of authority and the shape of policy within an academic institution. . . . Critically important side effects may appear in the form of student alienation, faculty unrest, or intra-administrative struggles. If these side effects are not anticipated or remedied, they may negate many of the expected gains to be made. (p. 19)

Late in the study the authors characterize the conflict of administrative versus faculty power in government as one of the scenes of battle spurred on by the growth of management systems. One suggested antidote is better faculty organization to represent constructively its own interests--"a development of its own academic civil service, which will reflect faculty rather than administrative points of view in the management of the university" (p. 129).

It may be part of the reluctant story of university trends toward organizational methods of business that in the Rourke-Brooks study of a dozen years ago there is scarcely a mention of faculty unionization. In the late 1970's studies of faculty unionism are everywhere, reflecting national growth of the movement. Private colleges are proving slower to go to collective bargaining; yet the trend is clear in both sectors. Reports such as Unions on Campus (Kemerer and Baldridge, 1975) suggest that the faculty union movement is here to stay. The authors, like Millard (above), are cautious in pointing out that lower echelons of faculty responsibility tend to lose as a result of collective bargaining: "Contract negotiation . . . is a highly centralized process, and the result may be a shift of decision-making power upward to those who ultimately have the final say" (p. 201).

Regarding the effect of faculty unionization on students the authors are more categorical: "Unfortunately under collective bargaining students now appear to be the most likely losers" (p. 201). That comment brings us to the final section of this discussion of student trends for the future in the American university and college.

Student Power in the Years to Come

After the turbulent years of 1967-72 trustee boards and the general public heaved sighs of relief, noting that students had again been shown their true place and were getting back to work, well aware that jobs were no longer so easy to get on the basis of a college diploma. Sober assessment, however, continues to show that students are acquiring greater access to the councils of policy making. We are well past the day when student power was limited to deciding whether or not the activity fees should be used to bring a big band for the Spring Prom. We are at a time when students are being given relatively complete freedom over their social lives both on and off campus.

The remaining questions involving roles students will play in deciding the definition and forms of their instructional program will distinguish between real student participation in college governance and consultation either before or after the fact with administrative and faculty contacts.

Perhaps students should no longer be thought of as isolated family dependents but as part of an entire national culture with both economic and, since the passage of the 26th Amendment, political powers (Coleman, 1974). Some predict that they can become as much a force in the shaping of the American university as they decide, together, that they wish to be. Few writers outside of the committed left wing would agree. A more balanced prediction is that they will become, in varying degree and in different places, a more active, separate constituency on the university campus, for once again this trend is already strongly evident. How greatly that constituency may intervene in matters such as faculty evaluation, appointment, tenure and promotion, or in specific programs of new study, can only be matters of speculation.

One can rest reasonably assured that in most universities faculty conservatism will hold the center. Some seasoned academic administrators, such as Peter Vukasin (Note 1), see signs of a widespread counter-move among the faculty to take back as many as possible of the concessions made to students during the years of turbulence. Other writers on campus politics and decision making (Baldridge, 1971; Epstein, 1974) believe that students will in one way or another form unions which, while perhaps not having the legal status of their faculty counterparts, will act in much the same manner. European university student bodies are ahead of the United States in this area. Sweden has a 104,000-member National Union of Students whose current trend happens to be more conservative than liberal. The University of British Columbia for several years experimented with student unions which established parallel committees to those of the faculty on each item of important academic policy (Duckenfield, 1977).

Forecasting developments from the standpoint of trends toward wider democracy and sharing, James Perkins (1973) sees the future American university as becoming "representative of the various internal constituencies" and suggests that the official boards of governance will be "reduced to ratifying institutional decisions rather than making them" (p. 259). At the same time Perkins predicts from his own years on campuses that the actual impact of student influence on university affairs will vary from campus to campus and from year to year depending upon how persistent the student interest in following through on administrative detail remains on a given campus.

Conclusion

The university and college of present-day America has inevitably become a corporation run increasingly according to management systems and business principles. It could not handle the processing of education for millions of students at a cost of many billions of dollars and do otherwise. The result of the huge growth in universities from 1950 has meant that they have become places of city management--a city of a very special kind and constituency, to be sure, but still a city which demands system and regulation.

The effect of the managerial imperatives that this has inevitably brought makes higher education for the student less a sharing of knowledge with a community of learners and more a client contract with a corporation. Going off to college as a freshman in the fall will continue for thousands of young people to be the exciting adventure it has always been. The family will pile everything into the car that the new college arrival can possibly imagine using in a place of such glittering new freedom and excitement. As they lug furnishings and books up to their children's dormitory rooms, parents will think nostalgically of their own good times in residence. Still, to the discerning college officer, only surface features remain the same. Many college futurists foresee the effective end of officially-provided university residences in twenty years.

It is easy to forget that the present population of college students, especially in states like California, Florida, New York and Illinois, is by now a large segment of the total population of young America. This is true not only in numbers but in the range of intellectual, social, economic, and ethnic backgrounds, thanks to the huge growth in college access and college student space since 1960. The student body that confronts us is thus not only a large slice of the youth population; it is a vocal part of that separate generation that since World War II has helped to revolutionize much of American social custom. It has been more places, seen more people and events (many, to be sure, via television), and earned and spent more money than previous youth could ever have imagined. For all but a few elite institutions the socialization of youth no longer approaches introduction to a life governed by cognitive rationality as described by Talcott Parsons, whose observations inevitably had been shaped by his years at Harvard. We come instead to a contest of counter-socializations. We see on campus a loosely-consolidated corporation of scholars and teacher-administrators who are committed to serve youth, yet not prepared to deal with youth on abject terms. This is especially true in the matter of deciding "whatsoever things are true or of good report"--in other words, worth spending time and thought upon.

Added to the counter-impact of the youth generation against the impact of the university is the predictable likelihood that future students will increasingly attend college on a part-time basis, usually as members of older age groups. Their academic zeal will be balanced by responsibilities to people outside the campus and to practical livelihoods already underway. Lastly, the tardy absorption into higher education of minority-ethnic and low-income groups means that campuses, both residential and nonresidential, will more closely approach the cities of America themselves in decorum and life-styles. In the University of Paris in the 1200's townies and students distinguished each other only by the gown, which must have simplified the line-ups for tavern brawls. American universities, following the Oxbridge pattern, sought suburban retreat instead. In the late 1960's several French universities were moved outside of town under the edict of the then Education Minister, Marcel Debre. The professors roundly denounced it; it made moonlighting more difficult and reminded them that the European professor is more of an urban than a campus citizen. In the same spirit, American trends away from secluded campuses bid fair to continue.

Students of the future will interpret higher education in ways more subject to their idiom than ever before. Higher education is a business, an immense and important business. It should be our effort not to interpret this more literally than need be. The business before all higher learning is to turn out products that, whatever else they say or do, may be identified as people--thinking and estimable human beings. It should be possible to pursue that goal, despite the managerial imperatives upon us, if certain humanistic priorities are sustained by the management.

At present a realist would be bound to say that it is a toss-up whether or not this pledge to human priorities will be preserved by our burgeoning state systems. It could thus be up to the future students themselves to be someday, as they were a decade ago, the ones who will demand a higher education that for all its efficiency places the study of humanity itself as its first goal.

REFERENCES

Astin, A. W. Student-oriented management information systems. Los Angeles: Higher Education Research Institution, UCLA, 1976.

Baldridge, J. V. Academic governance. Berkeley: McCutcheon Publishing Corp., 1971.

Benezet, L. T. College organization and student impact. Washington, D.C.: Association of American Colleges, 1976.

Bowen, H. Financing higher education: The current state of the debate. Washington, D.C.: Association of American Colleges, 1974.

Bowen, H. Investment in learning. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1977.

Califano, J. A., Jr. The student revolution. New York: W. W. Norton and Company, 1970.

Chambers, M. M. A record of progress. Danville, IL: Interstate Printers and Publishers, 1976.

Cheit, E. The new depression in higher education. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1971.

Coleman, J. S. Youth: Transition to adulthood. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1974.

Council for Financial Aid to Education. Voluntary support of education 1975-76. Washington, D.C.: Council for Advancement and Support of Education, 1977.

Duckenfield, M. Sweden's student unions: Young conservatives in command. The Chronicle of Higher Education, 1977, 14(17), 8.

Epstein, L. D. Governing the university. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1974.

Eurich, A. C. (Ed.). Campus 1980. New York: Delacorte Press, 1968.

Grant, W. V., & Lind, C. G. Digest of education statistics. Washington, D.C.: United States Department of Health, Education and Welfare, 1976.

Kemerer, F. R., & Baldridge, J. V. Unions on campus. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1975.

Lindley, E. K., & Lindley, B. A new deal for youth. New York: Viking Press, 1938.

Magarrell, J. The new managers on campus. The Chronicle of Higher Education, 1974, 3(26), 9-10.

Newman, F. Report on higher education. Washington, D.C.: United States Office of Education, 1971.

Orlans, H. Remembrances of things future. Change, 1977, 9(4), 30-36.

Parsons, T., & Platt, G. M. The American university. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1973.

Perkins, J. A. (Ed.). The university as an organization. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1973.

Rashdall, H. The universities of the middle ages. London: Oxford University Press, 1936.

Research and Policy Committee. The management and financing of colleges. New York: Committee for Economic Development, 1973.

Rourke, F. E., & Brooks, G. The managerial revolution in higher education. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press, 1966.

Select Committee on Education. Education at Berkeley. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1968.

REFERENCE NOTES

1. Personal conversation with the author on State University of New York at New Paltz campus, May, 1976.

ABOUT THE AUTHOR

Joseph Katz is Professor of Human Development and Director of Research for Human Development and Educational Policy, State University of New York, Stony Brook. He is also a consultant for the Undergraduate Assessment Program Council of the Educational Testing Service, Princeton, N.J. He holds a Guggenheim Fellowship for 1978-79, and has written extensively on student affairs topics.

COLLABORATION OF ACADEMIC FACULTY AND STUDENT AFFAIRS PROFESSIONALS FOR STUDENT DEVELOPMENT

Joseph Katz

Neglected Students

The 1970's have been largely a time of student quietude in American higher education. Few political, social, or curricular causes have brought students out en masse. Many students study quietly or even desperately, hoping to gain some advantage in the competition for jobs. Others regard college as an oasis within a troubled world. Still others are apathetic and do not set their aims very high.

All indications are that student attitudes have not changed considerably since the days of student activism in the 60's. Students still have the same preferences for a world that is more just and more generous in promoting the growth of individuals of all classes and nationalities. But they no longer translate these ideas into some attempt at action. Students were a force to be reckoned with in the late 60's. Now they can be often disregarded. Consultation with students and inviting students to serve on relevant committees seems to have become less frequent. It is one of the ironies of higher education that student interests and needs were most considered when students were actively demonstrating. Even educators seem to need political prods in order to do more adequately what one would think is one of their central functions: to serve student development.

There are many reasons for viewing the present disregard of students as dangerous. First, there is the obvious utilitarian problem of declining enrollments. This is in part a function of the birth rate. But the demographic fact might be counterbalanced if going to college were a more attractive experience.

Second, there is the question of morale. As the occupational incentives for obtaining higher-level jobs through a college education diminish, compensation could come from the treatment that students receive in college. It will be remembered that one of the slogans of the Berkeley demonstrations in 1964 was the desire not to be treated like an IBM card. But disregard of the individuality of the student has continued in spite of the student activism of the 60's--with the exception of a few successful educational ventures in which the greatest single factor accounting for the success seems to have been the special attention given to the student as an individual (Suczek, 1972). (Treating students more like individuals also seems to account in part for the higher morale in many smaller private institutions.)

Third is the fact that the present quietude may not be lasting. Certainly the conditions for unrest are as strong now as they were in the 60's, even though the issues of the draft and the war no longer exist. Here and there an issue has continued to lead to activities reminiscent of the 60's, as in the drawn-out protests at Kent Sate against the building of a gymnasium on the site of the 1970 shootings. It should also be remembered that student demonstrations in many European countries are vigorous and attracting large masses of students (Levin, 1976; Patterson, 1976). These protests are about the diminished occupational and social prospects of attending an institution of higher education--certainly issues that are just as relevant in the United States.

Attempts at Remediation

There have been, even in the present climate, some calls for improved education. Some of these have been at a very specific level, such as calls for the improvement of the ability to write and express oneself effectively in English. Other people have been making more sweeping demands, such as the recent move towards a revival of general education, core programs, integrative courses, and the like. Some educators are uneasy about the student's sense of values and would like the colleges to motivate and equip students to be more responsible members of society.

There is often naivete about the ways in which such objectives are to be implemented. Often the measures called for seem overly simple: an added course or two in writing, a senior seminar in values, making a civilization course a requirement--as if requirements had not failed again and again to lead to general cultivation. These approaches disregard the lessons of 20 years of research on the psychological development of students. It has been shown that much more radical and sophisticated procedures are needed, including drastically altered behavior on the part of those who are the student's adult mentors: faculty and other staff.

The Role of Student Affairs

It is ironical that the student services (student affairs, counseling, etc.) have traditionally taken a more holistic view of students than the faculty has. They have been aware of the multitude of activities, much beyond traditional classroom procedures, that would have to be fostered to bring about student development. But student affairs officers have had limited influence even in the best of times, and in recent years, under budgetary pressures, their services have been given even lower priority.

At all times, greater power has been in the hands of the academic faculty. This is largely a function of the faculty's numbers and entrenched traditional prerogatives. But there also is an ideological element, since the concept of student development is more recent, while concepts of the transmission of knowledge (whether such transmission is accomplished or not) date back to the medieval universities and before. Unless there is conceptual clarification and acceptance of the notion that student development is central, not peripheral, student affairs departments are not likely to prosper as much as they ought.

A further reason for the subdued state of student affairs departments has been the fact that their staff members have often not been as well trained or have not had the same degree credentials as academic faculty (Tilley, 1973). Upgrading of the training of student affairs professionals seems very desirable. Some universities could make a more sustained effort towards training their own student affairs professionals. In turn, student culture, dormitory life, and other facets of student affairs provide a rather unused "laboratory" for social scientists and other scholars, as demonstrated in a special program at the University of Florida (Barger & Lynch, 1973).

There is still another reason for the recent decline in the role of student services. Until not so long ago many of their functions were custodial rather than oriented towards student development. Since the early 60's the student culture has become much more independent. (The lowering of the age of majority has been both cause and effect.) Parietal and other rules have waned in many institutions to the point of nonexistence. The student culture has not only shown itself to be more able to resist pressures from older adults, but has been in many ways a trend setter. For instance, styles of sexual behavior and of living together were pioneered in the college residences and from there moved into the older population.

Many college officials were happy to be rid of the burden and responsibility of supervising the private lives of their students. There is much to be said for letting young people of college age find their own ways of living with themselves and with others. Students have often shown themselves inventive and responsible, and thus have given to their own generation a chance to define themselves afresh and to society a chance to be redefined through the efforts of young people. So the waning of the custodial era leaves little to be regretted. It has in fact created opportunities for student affairs staff to define new roles and activities--opportunities which often have not been seized with sufficient imagination. For instance, there is now little attempt to regulate students' sexual lives through rules and penalties. But there is much need for advising and environmental facilitation to help students cope with anxieties generated by the intense relationships born of sexual liberalism.

The Concept of Student Development

Even though the concept of student development is rather unfamiliar, if not strange, to many academicians, the accomplishment of cognitive goals is very much dependent on understanding the psychological and social conditions of student learning. An education that takes hold depends on enlisting the willing cooperation of the student. This requires detailed consideration of the motivation, interests, and aptitudes of the student and of the structures of the collegiate environment. It also means testing in some detail the effects of education. This can be done by examining what students effectively carry into their professional and personal lives five or ten or twenty years after graduation (see, for instance, Heath, 1977; Astin, 1977; Bowen, 1977; Feldman & Newcomb, 1969). Even though going to college enables many people to hold more informed opinions and think in more complex ways about social and political issues (Hyman, 1975), we are far from realizing more ambitious intellectual objectives, in part because of our neglect of the psychosocial conditions of learning.

But the affective life is more than an instrument towards securing the growth of intellect. There are intrinsic values in a life that is not dominated by many poorly controlled emotions, nor so fearful that consciousness and action are narrowed and inhibited. There are intrinsic values in the fostering of relationships with other people that entail a developed capacity for understanding, empathy, and expressions of caring. The simultaneous cultivation of mind and feeling would considerably enlarge our students' capacity to enjoy the enormous richness stored up in our long heritage of science and art. Much of that heritage remains a closed book in spite of the billions we put into higher education each year and despite the very long period--longer than any in history--that so large a part of our population spends in schools.

Faculty in an Enlarged Service Role

How can one translate ideas about student development into practice? Given the current organization of the university, faculty tend to represent the interests of their professional disciplines and to be almost necessarily concerned with their own status and advancement; service to students often plays a lesser role. Student affairs staff tend to be more identified with furthering the cognitive-affective development of students, though in many instances their interest too is segmented into specific aspects of the student's college career, e.g., financial aid, housing, or record keeping. Presidents and other chief administrators are deeply embroiled in the increasingly cumbersome tasks of management. Nevertheless, their position at the top inclines them to a more holistic view, and they often make valiant efforts to move their faculty towards enlarged concern for student learning. Much of the fate of student development hinges upon enlisting substantially enlarged cooperation by the academic faculty. This is so, if only because of the sheer numbers of faculty. Only they have the requisite mass to do the job--or to thwart it. The first question for the more enterprising administrator, whether she/he be a president or a student affairs administrator, is how to enlist faculty help.

The traditional pattern for attempting reform in an American educational institution is the sequence of committee investigation, committee report, and debate by the faculty at large. That sequence usually ends up not very far from the status quo. Faculty as collective bodies are not very different from any parliament; compromise means very slow progress. The change-oriented administrator will need to take a more indirect route. Such a route involves identifying faculty who share at least in some fashion the objective of student development and who are open to experiment. These faculty will need to take political and executive initiative, lest projects get tagged as being imposed from above, as "the administration's idea," and thus bring forth the "natural" opposition of faculty. In this grassroots process faculty enlist other faculty, and after sometimes painfully long deliberations--after all, faculty are intellectuals--new ideas may be given a chance of being tried out, usually in a smaller format at first. Eventually, through success, imitation, and propagation they can find more widespread adoption.

Administrators can help by using the powers inherent in their office. They have the possibilities of budgetary facilitation: extra compensation such as summer salaries, secretarial services and travel funds. Too much emphasis is often placed on material rewards. At times they make it difficult to know how much of the enthusiasm for a new project is due to the expected remuneration. Projects then disintegrate when the funding source has dried up. We tend to underestimate the incentive that is provided by encouragement from peers and administrators. Faculty members who try to do more than pursue the traditional ways of disciplinary scholarship often feel relatively alone and somewhat out on a limb. The fact that others whom they respect appreciate the objectives and think them important makes a considerable difference. A new approach is greatly helped by the endorsement of faculty colleagues who are well regarded. If a president or other high-placed administrator supports new ideas, even if somewhat on the sly, the effect of the prestige of the office is not to be minimized. Such support constitutes something of a parental sanction, and the continued need for parental approval even in adults is one of the psychological facts of life.

The approach here suggested opens up new ways of collaboration between student affairs professionals and the academic faculty. Student affairs professionals usually are more highly expert in student attitudes, motivations and behavior than academic faculty, and as the latter move into the area of student development they will appreciate that expertise more fully. The forms of cooperation could be many. They might be provided through consultation, or by student affairs officers providing leadership in seminars in which faculty discuss such problems as advising or, more daringly, the dynamics of student-faculty interaction in the classroom. More daringly still, one could think of joint association of student affairs staff and faculty in teaching. In a jointly taught course, the student affairs person could provide the faculty member with interesting opportunities for learning about student dynamics, while the faculty member could provide deepened knowledge of the subject matter.

Still another area of cooperation could be in the area of research. We know very little about our students even when the institution has engaged in some data-gathering efforts. Usually we know some basic demographic and actuarial facts, such as parental background, student major, career objectives, and grade performance, and we know a few things about attitudes. More finely tuned studies are needed, and collaboration between faculty and student affairs staff could assemble the requisite expertise and personpower. (One example is the University of Maryland at College Park, where the office of Student Affairs, under the direction of Vice Chancellor William L. Thomas, Jr., recently undertook a detailed study of the students. Five members of the research team held joint associate staff and faculty appointments. In other institutions, faculty-student affairs collaboration can be more informal and temporary. To work overtime with many different faculty members is very desirable.)

Such investigations would also have the effect of enlisting the research expertise of faculty members for studying, as they rarely do, their own institutions. In pursuit of such studies, faculty members might also devise courses in which students learned research methods by collecting data about their own institution. This would not only provide training for students and expand knowledge about higher education, but would have the further effect of making the students helpers in the efforts to improve the academic and nonacademic life of their institution. Students and faculty alike often get inspired to do something about the problems they themselves find in their own institutions.

In these days when there is much talk about the virtues of interdisciplinary work, the potential of working across the professions and merging the knowledge and expertise of student affairs staff and faculty has rarely been mentioned. (Perhaps one should call this interprofessional rather than interdisciplinary work.)

To turn to some further areas of collaboration, among traditional activities, advising is one that constitutes both an overlap between faculty and student affairs and an opportunity for mutual learning. Advising is a perennial problem. There are forever calls to have faculty do more advising, and forever complaints about the lack of time and attention that faculty give to it. Part of the problem is not that faculty are unwilling, but that they are unable. They are venturing into territory in which they do not have the requisite training, and often they do not feel very safe. Even when faculty are advising strictly about academic matters, they may not be able to disentangle imposing their own preferences for recruiting students to their field from considering what is in the best interest of the student. Many faculty also do not know how to use their time appropriately with students, and some of them are at the mercy of the student "nudge" who monopolizes faculty time without commensurate benefit to the student or the faculty member. Well-planned advising of students in groups can be both time-saving and more effective (Katz, 1973).

There probably is no strictly academic advising that does not have implications for the student's emotional growth, certainly for his or her self-image. Academic advising imperceptibly slips into personal advising, since school problems often relate to the student's personal struggles, which are frequently intense and preoccupying. Faculty need help to become more aware of the intricate nature of the process and to develop more skills to respond appropriately, including knowing where and when to keep silent. A chief problem is that faculty are, by training, "intellectualizers." This gift stands them well in their profession, but can be an obstacle in relations with students and particularly in advising.

Another area of student concern that has been curiously neglected is occupational choice. Faculty have been largely inattentive to the issue. But for students, however deeply motivated they may be toward their studies, the question of making a living has a way of intruding.

One might begin by raising faculty awareness of occupations and the labor market. The president or academic vice president, in consultation with department chairmen or others, might appoint one or two members of each department to ascertain the occupational prospects and problems of their majors. Their efforts--aided by the available career and placement professionals--could begin with such fact-finding inquiries as what occupations graduates enter. They could then proceed to a greater acquaintance with the nature of the occupations they enter, including prospects of available jobs within the next five to ten years. One would expect that the selected faculty members would share their knowledge with colleagues in their department so that it could spread formally and informally to the students. One obvious outcome would be greater sophistication among students about occupational possibilities. This should be augmented by exposure of students to prospective occupations through visits, interviews, reading and particularly summer and school-year employment.

Another effect that may be expected from faculty members' greater knowledge of student occupational needs and prospects is that it would further help to enlarge their perspective on and sympathies for students, and move them towards adopting concerns other than those of teaching subject matter alone. One of the points here, as elsewhere in this chapter, is to suggest means for the gradual education of faculty, facilitated by the exposure to fresh experiences, in the direction of understanding and implementing the goals of student development. Like all education, it takes time.

Enlarged Conception of the Classroom

A few pages back I suggested that ideas about student development might be carried into the classroom itself. Until very recently this would have been an almost hopeless objective. Faculty tended to regard the classroom as sacrosanct and unexaminable. By tradition and tacit consent they defined the classroom as primarily serving cognitive purposes: transmission of knowledge and the cultivation of critical thinking and research skills. However, recent events have opened up fresh possibilities. There has been an influx of students who previously did not attend college and the traditional approaches to enabling these students to write, to think, even to memorize have proven highly inadequate; fresh pedagogical skills are obviously needed. Students older than the traditional 17 to 22 have been entering colleges and the different needs and different orientations of these students have led people to reexamine traditional assumptions. In fact, enthusiasm for learning shown by current adult students, somewhat reminiscent of the veterans after World War II, has given some faculty a taste of better student-faculty communication.

Further, both the student movement of the 60's and recent student apathy, a more indirect rebellion against authority, have led to a morale problem among faculty, increasing the incentive for a fresh look at teaching processes and planning of course content. Finally, the "faculty development" idea has spread rapidly since 1974. It has given rise, on the negative side, to official evaluations and faculty fears of such evaluations and, on the positive side, to an ideology which takes the teaching role more seriously and holds that pedagogical concerns are quite compatible with being a scholar or scientist.

There are no easy shortcuts to learning the art of good teaching. Here and there in graduate school a special course is devoted to the teaching process. There may be some occasional seminars or discussions among college and university faculty. But the art of teaching, like the art of medical care, requires long and sustained attention. It is a lifelong task. Given the richness, complexity, and variety of human beings, almost every student and every class contain a fresh challenge. No matter how good a teacher becomes, there is always more for him to learn (Katz, 1962).

Professors will need to know a lot more. They will need more knowledge--of the sort that Perry (1970) has provided--about cognitive and other forms of development. They will need to gain a first-hand sense of students. To do so they may wish to acquire skills of interviewing and observing them. (At first, they should preferably not interview students from their own classes.) They will need to acquire greater awareness of the learning and interpersonal processes in the classroom. Here a variety of means are at hand, such as observing others in the classroom, having other people observe oneself, or using videotape. This last means permits classroom behavior to be recollected in tranquility--by oneself alone or, preferably, with student members of the class and with the help of a more expert observer.

There is now a rather rich literature that describes a variety of methods and approaches to teaching and learning, differently suited to the styles of different faculty members (Gaff, 1977). There also are qualified consultants available who could help an inexperienced institution get started. Here, too, a beginning can be made by finding a few people who are willing to serve as initiators and experimenters and who will gradually involve a larger number of colleagues. For instance, in a recent project I asked six colleagues to pick, practically at random, colleagues in other departments. They requested them to allow us to visit their classrooms once a week, observe them, and immediately afterwards discuss what we had observed (supplemented by student observations which we obtained in separate interviews). Some of the faculty we worked with subsequently joined us as colleagues in an expanding endeavor.

In undertaking such tasks as those just described, academic faculty may discover that some of their colleagues in student affairs offices can render valuable help because procedures of interviewing students or of observing group processes have been part of the experience and training of these professionals. Depending on the institution, one also can envisage some student affairs staff taking initiative in enlisting faculty, maybe first turning to those with whom they have some personal acquaintance on or off the job. There is sometimes too much timidity on the part of student affairs staff--as if they had accepted the faculty's definition of them as auxiliary. Organizational boundaries and status fears are to be reckoned with, but informally the boundaries are much thinner. Many faculty in important corners of their minds are aware of unfulfilled potential in regard to their own personal and even intellectual growth. Once one taps into that concern, more fruitful collaboration can come forth.

Beyond the Classroom

A still wider world opens when one considers sources of learning beyond the classroom. Practitioners in all fields agree that what they learned on the job differs considerably from what they learned and anticipated in the classroom. (Even professors will say how much more deeply they understood their subject matter once they were teaching it.) It should be obvious that the possibilities of learning about child development, for instance, are considerably enhanced by observing and working with children; that political science becomes much more vivid through a city hall internship; that one's anticipations of a future career become more realistic through some period of working in a setting in which it is practiced. Yet we have never adequately heeded the lesson of that almost universal experience.

The notion of field work has been around for a long time, but it usually has been reduced to subsidiary status. More recently the expansion of study abroad programs and of study sites away from campus, as in geology or oceanography, has given more status to the idea of using the larger world as a laboratory. But there are still many more possibilities. Businesses, communities, political bodies, schools, families--all of these provide precious opportunities for observation and for making classroom concepts easier to grasp and refine.

Even more challenging is the notion of going beyond observation to service. For it is one thing to observe children, another thing to work with them on some learning task. By seeing people (or things) in action or motion, requiring some unfolding of their potential, we usually learn more than from mere passive watching, which does little to affect the person or object under observation.

Typically colleges do little towards serving the civic and work lives of their surrounding communities. Through its Action Research Liaison office, with the help of student affairs staff, Stanford University has recently undertaken to work with community action organizations and social service agencies. Edith Eddy and Bill Leland are the directors of a project supported by the Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education which aims at the furtherance of action research. The goal is to develop research projects of policy formulation, data analysis, or program evaluation in such areas as education, minority rights, alternative energy sources, transportation, conservation, mental health, alcoholism and criminal justice. Faculty and students work together in these projects. Current plans include having a significant number of faculty teach courses in areas of action-oriented research, thus having many students work on a community project at some stage of their college careers. For such work beyond the classroom, student affairs professionals again have experience that should prove very useful. Both they and the academic faculty will learn many new things.

An exciting possibility in the ideas here presented is that they could lead to a redefinition of roles such that some traditional conceptions of both faculty and student affairs staff would become obsolete. In an ideal future that portion of student affairs that is not concerned with administrative matters would be staffed by people with special expertise in such areas as personality development or group and community processes, and they would have full faculty status. As things are now, the expertise of student affairs staff is an important complement to the rather one-sided, nonpersonal, heavily intellectualized training and attitudes of faculty. A wise administrator will take a hard look at how the potential of student affairs staff might be better utilized.

Traditional Student Affairs Domains

Having discussed a number of new areas of possible faculty-student affairs collaboration, I return to areas in which student affairs personnel have traditionally had the major role. There is, first of all, the area of counseling and psychotherapy. Under the recent conditions of budgetary stringencies there has been a tendency to diminish services that provide individual psychotherapy for students. All depends on whether individual counseling and psychotherapy are regarded as a "fringe" activity or whether they are considered central. Some psychological problems prove themselves much more tractable on a one-to-one basis. But beyond that, as the example of some very good psychiatric services show (Arnstein, 1973; Glasscote, et al., 1973) the cumulative effects of individual counseling can have an important impact upon student morale and on more effective classroom learning. There also can be such "side" effects as those reported by one university service: the virtual elimination of unwanted pregnancies and venereal disease (Sarrel & Sarrel, 1971).

Another benefit of individual counseling or psychotherapy is that it demonstrates, by deed as well as word, the institution's commitment to individual worth. Times of budgetary scarcity often go together with an undervaluation of the individual. Less caring, less service, even less courtesy, coupled with the great increase in the number of students, have increasingly made the students part of a mass. This turning of students into a passive mass of people, bereft of a sufficient sense of individuality, may become one of the most ominous effects of higher education.

Professional counseling or psychotherapy merits a larger place than it now often has. There are other ways to give more attention to the individual. One is peer counseling. Much of the effectiveness of peer counseling depends upon adequate training of the peer counselors, including an awareness of the limits of their role. At Stony Brook a few years ago we pioneered a program in which academic faculty and student affairs professionals worked together on a course designed to equip students to be peer counselors. Lectures, seminars, and service experience were three equal ingredients in the program.

Dormitory life has traditionally been the domain of student affairs. But the potential of dormitories for education is vastly underutilized. The dormitory in many ways constitutes a replica of society, with all the multiplicity of interpersonal emotions and tensions, cooperative and disruptive behavior, political control and bureaucratic organization.

Never again in their lives will students be thrown together with so many people, often very different from themselves, and face the opportunity of moving beyond coexistence. Much could be done to make dormitories more effective communities and equip people for cooperative living that entails not just responsibility to each other but mutual enjoyment. Riker and Barger at the University of Florida have developed a program in which dormitories are used as laboratories for learning about social organization and social process (Barger & Lynch, 1973).

Many years ago Edmund Williamson at the University of Minnesota developed the concept of the extracurriculum showing the opportunities for education that reside in activities outside of the classroom. Anybody who has watched a truly eventful university, such as the University of California at Berkeley, has realized that one could get a good education there without ever going to a single class. Berkeley provides education through its out-of-class musical offerings, plays, lectures, film archives, museums and other exhibits, and above all through its many informal groups of people who get together, among them more or less accomplished poets, philosophers, writers, artists, and reformers.

As recent research has indicated, on-campus residential living enhances the effects of going to college (Chickering, 1974; Astin, 1977). Students grow both as persons and as scholars through these arrangements. Some of these effects may be due to the 24-hour proximity to learning facilities, but probably much is due to the fact that residential living provides opportunities for informal exchange of ideas and other ways of mutual learning. This advantage of residential arrangements constitutes a special challenge for those colleges which have few or no residential facilities. They might look for alternatives that would facilitate productive interactions among members of the school community. In a recent study, David Tilley (1976) examined an informal counseling center at a community college. It was initiated to improve the academic performance of students, but it turned out, by facilitating student-faculty and student-student interactions, to have other effects as well. Not only did academic performance improve, but also students increased their self-esteem and social functioning. They gave and received more help from fellow students. The open access to the Center during school hours, the provision of physical space, and, above all, the presence of a dedicated professional staff all contributed to the success.

Exiting Students

Another kind of problem in need of attention is that of the student leaving the institution. We have offices of admissions but we do not have offices of exit. Yet attrition is a problem in many schools, and students often leave their institutions uncertain and fumbling about the next step. Leaving a college, either by going to another one or by dropping out temporarily or permanently, may be a positive step in a person's life. But it may not be. It may be a result of cumulative frustration, isolation, and a low sense of worth. We usually do not know, and we do not provide opportunities for the exiting students to find out, how dropping out may be turned into a constructive experience. We also need to reach the student who is seriously considering dropping out. The students, whether they leave or stay, would benefit; and the institution would learn much about itself from the experience of its "misfits."

Colleges might also enlarge their services to alumni. Some institutions, particularly private ones, have pioneered in extending services to alumni--there is of course a monetary incentive. I envisage services to the alumni which would enable them to remain in touch with the intellectual life of the institutions through publications, reading lists from courses taught at the college, traveling seminars, correspondence courses and other means. This would help to raise and maintain the general cultural level of our postgraduates, whose intellectual life often shrinks for lack of support. (Perhaps such services could be rendered as part of a tax-exempt membership in an alumni organization; tax-exempt contribution towards one's self-improvement may have a certain attractiveness.)

Why Student Development?

In the end one might raise questions about why all this emphasis is put upon human development. Does it not considerably extend the function of undergraduate education beyond the comfortable limits implied in the traditional concept of classroom instruction? The answer to that question can be given along two dimensions: What are the increased benefits? And can it be done? Clearly the benefits that we have in mind are the achievement of intellectuality and emotional and esthetic sensitivity considerably beyond what is achieved by college education today. A long list of studies shows insufficient connections between college grades and creativity or success in life, professional or personal (Hoyt, 1965; Heist, 1968; Heath, 1977). There also is little evidence--though not much investigation has been done--that an amount of usable thought commensurate with the institutional effort remains from the vast array of ideas that students are exposed to. As I have stressed, attention to the cognitive alone tends to be self-defeating as far as student learning is concerned. Some students will learn under any circumstances, but many others need improved settings and teaching, in and out of the classroom, in order truly to assimilate what they are exposed to and make it a functional part of their personalities.

I have described a number of strategies that may convince the reader that what I have proposed can be done. The research evidence indicates that some institutions and some programs have a much larger impact than others (Jacob, 1957; Stern, 1970; Astin, 1977). I suggest they have this greater impact because their educational arrangements further cognitive individuality, and active rather than passive learning, and because their faculty show greater respect for and expect more from their students. Past experience thus shows that differential effects are possible. But the differences between what has been attempted and what is possible are quite big.

Suggestions for Administrators

Finally, a list of suggestions for an enterprising administrator might be helpful. It sums up some of the points I have made.

1. Identify people who are interested in student development and who give some indication that they might be willing to work for it. These people can come from all segments of the campus: faculty, administration, services.

2. Pinpoint some people of special ability who also have the respect of their peers to serve as initiators.

3. Meet with one or two of these people informally. Give them an indication of other people you have identified and what you know about existing successful programs either at your institution or elsewhere.

4. Keep a low profile.

5. Encourage the people you have singled out as initiators to meet with others to develop some tentative plans.

6. Make some means available, such as secretarial help, release time, or some funds for amenities, to give moral encouragement to the enterprise.

7. New programs and procedures ought to be limited to a small size at first. Have growth occur gradually as programs and procedures prove themselves and, even more important, as contagion and imitation lead to more general acceptance.

Side by side with the above activities:

8. Assemble what is known about students, teaching, and student development on your campus. Often much is "known" already but molders in unused files. There may be institutional studies such as the annual freshman survey undertaken by the American Council on Education. Some professors might have undertaken studies as part of the training of their students or for their own research purposes. Different offices may have kept records or engaged in studies. These studies may exist in rudimentary form, perhaps typed or dittoed. Yet in the aggregate they all may considerably enlarge the picture.

9. Bring together a group of people to whom you suggest an extension of available data and studies. Sometimes an external occasion, such as a forthcoming accreditation visit, may provide an extra incentive. Be sure to enlist people who will ask searching questions and who eventually may do something about the facts they are finding. At first keep the thought of action in the background, but as data accumulate, keep asking what is going to be done about them and who is going to do it. The person who raises these questions and chairs the fact-finding groups may be a top administrator. If a suitable member of the faculty can be found, however, it is usually preferable to have him or her do it.

10. Always keep in mind the greater effect of experience as opposed to didacticism. Help as many people as possible to be exposed to the experiences of student learning in and out of the classroom.

11. Though it has become less fashionable to do so, involve as many students as possible. Their ideas are often good and reflect their experience, usually not easily accessible to administrators and faculty. Moreover, through their participation, a model is generated of the appropriate roles of teachers and students in the learning process.

REFERENCES

Arnstein, R. L. Psychiatric services on campus. In J. Katz (Ed.), Services for students. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1973.

Astin, A. Four critical years: Effects of college on beliefs, attitudes and knowledge. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1977.

Barger, B., & Lynch, A. Q. University housing: A healthy learning laboratory. In J. Katz (Ed.), Services for students. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1973.

Bowen, H. R. Investment in learning: The individual and social value of American higher education. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1977.

Chickering, A. Commuting vs. resident students. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1974.

Feldman, K. A., & Newcomb, T. M. The impact of college on students. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1969.

Gaff, S. S., Festa, C., & Gaff, J. Professional development: A guide to resources. New Rochelle, NY: Change Magazine Press, 1978.

Glasscote, R. M., et al. Mental health on the campus: A field study. Washington, D.C.: Joint Information Service of the American Psychiatric Association and National Association for Mental Health, 1973.

Heath, D. Academic predictors of adult maturity and competence. Journal of Higher Education, 1977, 48(6), 613-632.

Heist, P. (Ed.). The creative college student: An unmet challenge. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1968.

Hoyt, D. P. The relationship between college grades and adult achievement. A review of the literature. Research Report No. 7. Iowa City: American College Testing Program, 1965.

Hyman, H. H., et al. The enduring effects of education. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1975.

Jacob, P. E. Changing values in college: An exploratory study of the impact of college teaching. New York: Harper, 1957.

Katz, J. A new conception of service. In J. Katz (Ed.), Services for students. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1973.

Katz, J. Personality and interpersonal relations in the college classroom. In N. Sanford (Ed.), The American college. New York: Wiley, 1962.

Levin, H. M. Educational opportunity and social inequality in western Europe. Social Problems, 1976, 24(2), 148-172.

Patterson, M. Governmental policy and equality in higher education. The junior collegization of the French university. Social Problems, 1976, 24(2), 173-183.

Perry, W. G. Forms of intellectual and ethical development in the college years. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1970.

Sarrel, P. M., & Sarrel, L. J. A sex counseling service for college students. American Journal of Public Health, 1971, 61(7), 1341-1347.

Stern, G. C. People in context, measuring person-environment congruence in education and industry. New York: Wiley, 1970.

Suczek, F. F. The best laid plans. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1972.

Tilley, D. C. Report no. 3. Stony Brook, NY: Research Group for Human Development and Educational Policy, 1973.

Tilley, D. C. Meeting student development deficiency needs: An evaluation of the impact of the people center on the personal development of academic high risk students. Stony Brook, NY: Research Group for Human Development and Educational Policy, 1976.

ABOUT THE AUTHORS

David C. Tilley is Vice-Chancellor of Student Affairs at the University of California, Santa Cruz.

William Shanteau is a graduate student, also at the University of California, Santa Cruz.

A DISCUSSION OF CURRENT TRENDS IMPACTING STUDENT AFFAIRS

David C. Tilley and William Shanteau

There appear to be several salient dimensions of the current crisis in higher education which education researchers have identified and discussed: the projections and implications of low or no-growth rates between now and the beginning of the 1990's; the implications of recent state and federal policies to stop direct institutional subsidization and instead focus on direct student loans and grants; and a growing tension between the ideals of higher education and the social needs of an increasingly egalitarian (as opposed to an elite) cultural movement. Faced with the limitations of a fixed resource base, and a growing societal dissatisfaction with the benefits of higher education, administrators are forced to, in Trow's terminology, "plan in the context of uncertainty" (1976, p. 389).

The forces creating this context are wide and varied: a slowdown in population growth, the effects of recession and inflation, a saturated labor market, competing social priorities, and a growing disenchantment with the role of education in preparing students for transition into the world of work. The problems associated with these forces become more complicated by the increasing pressure being exerted on higher education by federal and state policy-makers, who, to put it bluntly, "want the most for their bucks." This creates an increasing tendency to want measures which can show cost savings, improve program efficiency, and undertake steps to reallocate precious public monies.

Responses to these forces are equally varied. Some argue that higher education must assume the characteristics of the competitive marketplace, where choice mechanisms create higher levels of efficiency in achieving social goals such as equal opportunity (Hiroak, 1975; Windham, 1976; Witkowski, 1975). This appears to be the dominant approach being taken by federal and state legislators, as indicated by the passage of the Educational Amendment Act of 1972, and recent emphasis on student (as opposed to institutional) funding. On the other hand, most educators seem to feel that these policies are endangering the institution of higher education, and that market theories are inappropriate models upon which to base federal educational policy (Fincher, 1975; Herman, 1976; Leslie, 1974a; Riesman, 1975).

However, all would seem to agree that higher education must do something if it is to survive the period of the last three decades of the 20th century. Most seem to feel that the most effective mechanism educational administrators could have is increased participation in both federal and state policy-making processes, as well as the implementation of effective and efficient planning mechanisms. As Glenny put it (1975a), the existence of a planning vacuum invites the creation of external forces affecting internal policy matters. Historically, higher education has not been noted for its great planning ability. This deficiency increases external pressure on it by legislators and market theorists to "clean up its act." Lack of adequate knowledge and models, however, limits the ability to deal conceptually with planning, as well as creates false assumptions about the relationship between models and reality (Dresch, 1975a, b; Hoos, 1975). Planning is further limited by the growing tendency to create a number of separate planning agencies at both state and federal levels. The result is a clear lack of consensus about the role of planning, as well as about the ability to coordinate the activities of the various agencies.

The most radical approaches being forwarded all center around the relationship of education to occupations. O'Toole (1975) argues that the structure of industrialized society creates nonmeaningful jobs, leading to the concept of what he calls the "underemployed self." Of what use is a college education if there are not appropriate occupational openings in which that education can be applied? However, instead of attacking education, he sees the problem as being that of the larger society as a whole. Herman (1976) agrees with him on this, and both seem to be calling for the reorganization of the structure of work. Herman goes one step further and states that one cannot blame education for the failure to meet the social expectations of the 1960's. Rather, it is the overall environment of which education is but a part that is responsible for many of today's self-perceived social ills. In response to those who argue for the implementation of the market mechanism, he points out that the market has historically been unable to cure these ills, and the application of that model is completely inappropriate. Joining a host of others who are becoming more and more convinced of the need of a "learning society," both authors argue that education must not be viewed as an investment in human capital, but rather an investment in human growth and potential. Thus the need to restructure the nature of work.

Another theme that has emerged is that of viewing liberal education as a necessity in a time of change. This is concomitant to the belief that education, and educational institutions in particular, can become agents of change, and that rationality and understanding can lead to the design of alternative futures, as opposed to the passive observation of the events and forces of time. Along with this philosophy comes an attack on recent tendencies to increase vocational training, de-emphasizing liberal education. In response, O'Toole states that vocational training is subverting education and making it a servant to the labor market. Instead of training people for jobs, he argues that the adaptive skills of liberal arts education are the best preparation for a largely unknowable future. In addition, it is becoming increasingly clear that education cannot be sold as a "guarantee" to good jobs; rather, it can only help one to adapt and survive in a constantly changing environment. However, a more positive step is offered in recent developments of "experiential learning," or the combination of learning and practice in such programs as Cooperative Education.

In terms of research, most of the work has been done on enrollment projections, predicting student demands on programs, and effectiveness of current student aid policies. The latter has perhaps the deepest implications, especially in light of the studies of Leslie (1974b) and Jackson (1975), who have found that the assumed redistributive effects of student aid do affect student choice, but that choice is not only directly expensive (in terms of overall educational costs), but redirects public monies away from community and large state universities and colleges. (It should be added that many of the more vocal contributors strongly criticize this current policy: Herman and O'Toole especially have both argued for the implementation of what could be called "negative income tax," or credit distributed by the government which could be used to replace both student subsidies and current programs of social welfare.)

Needless to say, all of this raises the question of how best to effect future policies, and plan in the context of both internal and external pressures for efficiency. Dresch (1975a) offers the most comprehensive analysis of planning models, noting that the gap between theory and reality is still too large to give much credence to such models as PEFM and NCHEMS. Instead, he argues that researchers must work in incremental levels, slowly developing both the framework and the models themselves. Cantlon (1974), meanwhile, cautions against too hasty an embrace of efficiency-oriented analytic tools (Hoos, 1975), but nevertheless agrees that certain measures must be taken. Leister (1976) offers a tool developed in advertising (metamarketing), which had originated in attitude research in psychology. Through it, he argues, institutions can gain a better sense of their position relative to the "competition," and can design strategies for implementation which will effectively increase enrollments through user preference.

Despite these attempts to create rational means to the solution, or at least an understanding of the forces responsible for the situation today, many people seem to feel that an overquantification of educational management will distort and blur the qualitative aspects of the impact of higher education on both students and the society at large. Personally, this author would argue that quantitative measures are necessary, but so is the development of qualitative ones, particularly in relation to the assumed benefits of liberal education, and as a means to conduct institutional assessment of program effectiveness. Thus, the area of educational planning and development of planning tools could potentially be the most important aspect of any attempt to reestablish the relationships between education and society, as well as documenting in its own right our conceptual ability to deal with and plan for the future.

Now the question must be asked as to what extent student affairs administrators will be able to effect change, participate in these broader issues, and help create an environment supportive of the educational enterprise. To begin with, the first step is the recognition of these metapolicy issues, supported by a firm commitment to the institution of higher education, and a high degree of concern for students, past, present, and future, all of whom will in some way be affected by whatever policies are established now. The apparent rejection by students of the values of a liberal education need not mean that administrators should give their all to vocational training; rather, it is just a symptom of a much larger problem, that is, the relationship between education and occupations. Such programs as Cooperative Education represent the most beneficial way in which education and business can develop new work patterns and modes of organization. As well as giving students actual work experiences, and an opportunity to expose themselves to potential employers, programs such as these allow the benefits of liberal education to become much more apparent and visible. Correctly handled, these programs can do more to reestablish faith in education than can any pedagogical rhetoric about the social "benefits" of liberal education, an approach which, as we have seen, has not exactly drawn rave reviews of current educational practices. In addition, these programs could potentially work in reverse; that is, enrollments could be increased by creating inducements for career employees to continue their education (as in lifelong learning or the learning society), thus reversing the traditional pattern and, instead of learning to work, working to learn.

In terms of internal policy, obviously the biggest step would be the active involvement of student affairs personnel in various planning processes and the initiation of institutional self-analysis. The goal here would be to know more about the institution than some external agency does (Glenny, 1975a) thereby being in a far more powerful position as well as gaining a better perspective on just exactly "what's going on out there." Staff development concepts such as those forwarded by Clark (1971) and Richardson (1975), and studies such as Lewis' (1976) indicate just two of the ways in which administrators can work toward improving staff efficiency, not only in terms of productivity, but also in the qualitative aspects of being part of the institution. A constant self-critical attitude is the best measure of "quality" that we have.

A topic which dominated university dialogue a while back, but has since receded into the background, is the participation of students in the governance of institutions. The Pollay (1976) and Hawes (1974) studies both show that much more work must be done in order to create the reality which the idealists fought so hard for during the 1960's. This is not a moot question, for now, of all times, is the time to work toward increased participation and "community," especially by finding ways to make liberal education a more effective force in current society. The students who inherit tomorrow would no doubt like some say about it. Programs such as the Administrative Intern program at the University of California at Santa Cruz certainly indicate just one aspect of the potential resource each campus has in the form of its student body. It would seem a shame to let such a large and varied resource go to waste.

Related to this area is the question of faculty effectiveness and assumptions regarding the learning process. If there will be any trend at all toward nontraditional education (and this is not yet clear), then further work must be done to determine which are the most effective alternative delivery systems. Concepts such as the Open University are still too new to evaluate adequately in comparison to traditional systems [although there have been attempts--see Hanle (1976) and Mackenzie (1975)]. Faculty development programs are similarly important in an institutional context, especially when it comes to policies such as Glenny and Warren propose, where the idea of tenure becomes subject to attack, because of its tendency to inhibit effective reallocation and to encourage maintenance of the status quo.

Another area, which saw much work during the late 1950's and early 1960's but has since receded, is the concept of measuring the impact of the collegiate culture on student values and perceptions. This area bears specific emphasis for student affairs administrators, who, through such studies, can gain a much better perspective on the comparison of values of student cultures. This is all the more relevant in the face of such questions as, "Why should a student come to this particular school?" "How will the student benefit?" "What alternatives are there?"

To sum up the arguments, both personal and those based on the work presented here, the following perceptions seem to be indicative of the current context of higher education:

1. There appears to be a general loss of faith on the part of the public in the value of college education, a loss which makes itself felt both in state and federal policies, and in student demands for liberal education.
2. There is a growing tendency to want cost-efficient methods of education, which some educators feel threaten the autonomy and intrinsic values of higher education.
3. Educators need to face this growing conflict between academic and social purposes honestly and openly, and especially need to seek ways to make liberal education a better investment.
4. There is a need to develop planning tools which can more accurately portray the environment which they purport to model.
5. There are specific steps which administrators and educators alike can take, not only to become involved in the decision-making processes at the federal and state levels, but also to participate in the reformulation of "social purposes" to achieve the goal of a learning society.

REFERENCES

Adams, C. R., et al. Decision-making and information systems in colleges: An exploratory study. Journal of Higher Education, 1976, 47(1), 33-49.

Cantlon, J. E. The threat of efficiency. Planning for Higher Education, 1974, 3(5), 3-5.

Clark, B. R. Belief and loyalty in college organization. Journal of Higher Education, 1971, 42(6), 499-520.

Dresch, S. P. A critique of planning models for postsecondary education. Journal of Higher Education, 1975a, 46(3), 245-286.

Dresch, S. P. Educational Saturation: A demographic-economic model. American Association of University Professors Bulletin, 1975b, 61(3), 239-247.

Fincher, C. On the national solution of dominant issues in higher education. Journal of Higher Education, 1975, 46(5), 491-505.

Glenny, L. A. The illusions of steady state: Nine myths, nine realities. Change, 1974, 6(10), 24-28.

Glenny, L. A. Coordination and planning despite competition and confusion. New Directions for Institutional Research, 1975a, 2(2), 13-22.

Glenny, L. A. The unsteady state: Personnel impact. College and University Personnel Association Journal, 1975b, 26(1), 1-7.

Hanle, R. V. Adult learners and traditional students: A comparison of values, attitudes, and aspirations. Paper presented to Association for Institutional Research in May 1976. Available from Elizabeth College, Elizabethtown, PA. 18p.

Hawes, L., et al. Student participation in the university decision-making process. Journal of Higher Education, 1974, 45(2), 123-134.

Herman, W. R. The university as a national resource. Change, 1976, 8(5), 31-37.

Hiroak, L. S. Reorganization--prescription for higher education. Education, 1975, 95(4), 368-372.

Hoos, I. R. The costs of efficiency: Implications of educational technology. Journal of Higher Education, 1975, 46(2), 141-159.

Jackson, G. A. Individual demand for higher education: A review and analysis of recent empirical studies. Journal of Higher Education, 1975, 46(6), 623-652.

Leister, D. V. Identifying institutional clientele: Applied metamarketing in higher education administration. *Journal of Higher Education*, 1975, *46*(4), 381-398.

Leister, D. V. Assessing the community college transfer market: A metamarketing application. *Journal of Higher Education*, 1976, *47*(6), 661-680.

Leslie, L. L., et al. The market model and higher education. *Journal of Higher Education*, 1974a, *45*(1), 1-20.

Leslie, L. L. The college student grant study: The enrollment and attendance impacts of student grant and scholarship programs. *Journal of Higher Education*, 1974b, *45*(9), 651-671.

Lewis, D., et al. Time management in higher education administration: A case study. *Higher Education*, 1976, *5*, 49-66.

Mackenzie, N., et al. *Open learning: Systems and problems in postsecondary education*. New York: United Nations Economic and Social Council, 1975.

O'Toole, J. The reserve army of the underemployed: The role of education, parts one and two. *Change*, 1975, *7*(5), 26-33, 60-63.

Pollay, R., et al. A model for horizontal power sharing and participation in university decision-making. *Journal of Higher Education*, 1976, *47*(2), 141-157.

Richardson, R. C. Staff development: A conceptual framework. *Journal of Higher Education*, 1975, *46*(3), 303-311.

Riesman, D. The future of diversity in a time of retrenchment. *Higher Education*, 1975, *4*(4), 461-482.

Trow, M. Notes on American higher education: "Planning" for universal access in the context of uncertainty. *Higher Education*, 1975a, *4*(1), 1-11.

Trow, M. The public and private lives of higher education. *Daedulus*, 1975b, *104*(1), 113-127.

Trow, M. The implications of low growth rates for higher education. *Higher Education*, 1976, *5*(1), 377-396.

Warren, J. The match between higher education and occupations. *New Directions for Institutional Research*, 1975, *2*(3), 47-60.

Windham, D. Social benefits and the subsidization of higher education: A critique. *Higher Education*, 1976, *5*, 237-252.

Witkowski, E. The economy and the university: Economic aspects of declining enrollments. Journal of Higher Education, 1975, 45(1), 48-60.

PARTIALLY ANNOTATED BIBLIOGRAPHY

Adams, C. R., et al. Decision-making and information systems in colleges: An exploratory study. Journal of Higher Education, 1976, 47(1), 33-49.

Explores parameters of decision-making processes through case study of 10 small- to medium-size colleges, surveying administrators to determine how decisions are made and what information bases are used in those decisions. States that little work has been done on the various aspects of administrative systems, reviews what work has been done (34). Outlines method of study, description of major decision processes (35): academic program review (APR), faculty position allocation (FPA), institutional goal setting (IGS), faculty performance evaluation (FPE), and budgeting (Btg). Overall findings (37-41): APR: only very limited mechanisms established, lack of guidance for decisions, need for improved information, organization; FPA: lack of new additions to faculty, decisions made mostly by faculty involved, specific but unwritten guidance re deadlines etc., and felt need for improved work load criteria and standards; IGS: three of ten schools never conducted evaluation or formal review, implication that formal planning systems are less relevant to small campuses, need to set up mechanism without annual task, need to develop measurable goals; FPE: faculty evaluation seen as very difficult to develop, need for improved techniques and measurement, agreement on methods; Btg: all schools use budget to control expenditures, lack of large budgeting models (i.e., NCHEMS) used due to overcomprehensiveness, need to simplify process, cost analyses. Found that information available was underutilized; suggests specific areas needing more information bases (44). Creates 7 specific hypotheses related to information use (45-7). (Brief bibliography)

Bayer, A. E. Faculty composition, institutional structure, and students' college environment. Journal of Higher Education, 1975, 46(5), 549-565.

Discusses studies of institutional environment, student perceptions, influence of faculty characteristics on students' perceptions of overall environment. Briefly reviews work by Astin (1961, 1966, 1968, 1969, 1971), Pace and Stern (1958, 1960, 1963), Centra (1968, 1971). Presents method and analysis of present study (552-61). Found that faculty have little influence on perceptions of "care," that institutional size is best determinant of institutional environment, perceptions (561-2). Supports Gallant and Prothero's hypotheses that growth beyond optimal size results in decline of "community" (562). States three general conclusions: (1) tools such as this one may be valid for determining intrinsic attributes of college environment; (2) faculty attributes have little to do with dimension of "care" as perceived by students; (3) size is most important determinant of environmental perceptions (563). (Extensive bibliography)

Beatty, G., Jr., et al. A simplified approach to interinstitutional cost comparison. Planning for Higher Education, 1974, 3(6), 5-6.

Boulding, K. E. The management of decline. Change (Viewpoint), 1975, 64(7:6), 8-9.

States that biggest problem facing higher education will be managing lower enrollments. Stresses need for change in leadership styles, skills, orientation. Calls for organizational reform, search for new input. Describes higher education as linked historically to biggest growth sectors (i.e., space-tech, etc.); says we need to reassociate with present growth sectors (service, etc.). Emphasizes need to search for better economic distribution (opportunity bank--Riesman), provide more opportunities for low-income students, foster greater communication between institutions, administrators.

Bowen, W. G. Higher education and the national economy. Planning for Higher Education, 1975, 4(3), 1-5.

Discusses effects of inflation on higher education, use of Higher Education Price Index (HEPI) to measure costs. States that while general costs (as indicated by Consumer Price Index, GNP Deflator) have risen 50% over the last decade, HEPI has risen 75%. Says effect is made worse by lack of public support for institutions, need to make ends meet, widening cost differential between public and private institutions. Sees private philanthropy similarly struck by inflation. Says we must work toward renewed commitment by everyone concerned to the reestablishment of higher education as social benefit (qualitative benefits). Calls for development of shared sense of educational goals.

Buss, A. R. Systems theory, generation theory, and the university: Some predictions. Higher Education, 1975, 4, 429-445.

Argues that unless steps are taken, the university will suffer from a lack of young academicians coming in to renew and refresh the academic heritage. Context: growing alienation of students from academia, diminishing needs, no market for new PhD's. Discusses concept of university as system (input/output), relation to supra-system (society), subsystems (university departments) (433ff). Overviews recent developments in higher education (i.e., education as investment, bigger is better); suggests that failure to meet societal goals reason for nonsubsidization, low priority (431). Describes tension between society and education, alienation of society from higher education (431) [illegible] system hierarchies of values, conflict between what was and what should have been; dysfunctional relation between parts (436). Calls for increased information flow between society and institutions, goals of education (437). Uses generation theory to discuss decline of new academicians, implications. Views culture as changing through generational reinterpretation: necessary for cultural adaptation, change (438); otherwise, stagnation and

decay of values, further schims between real and academic worlds. Stresses need for fresh input (439), otherwise there will be reenforcement of status quo.

Butkovich, P. M. Higher education institutions as bounded systems: The structure of admissions. *College and University*, 1976, *52*(1), 28-41.

Cantlon, J. E. The threat of efficiency. *Planning for Higher Education*, 1974, *3*(5), 3-5.

Discusses need for efficiency in planning for higher education in context of current pressures; calls for caution in determining what measures, policies to use. States we must not resort to overly simplistic outcome measures (i.e., increasing SCH/FTE ratios = increasing efficiency, etc.); short-term responses versus long-range planning; insistence on institutional uniformity. Suggests implications for large universities: sheer size of budgets encouraging indiscriminate cuts; differential effects of single budget policy; redundancy in program offerings; ineffective use of resources; increased demands on staff/faculty time; differing student needs. Presents 14 different ways to cope with change: internal and external resource studies; centralized view of course offerings and resource requirements; interinstitutional exchange of cost analyses; conversion of budgeting processes into effective management information systems; resensitizing the incentives for improving faculty productivity; tougher policies on tenure, with emphases on early retirement; position control at higher levels than department; enrollment forecasting for individual departments; use of training workshops for administrative leadership; reexamination of academic governance and grievance procedures; cultivation of relationships with public, policy-makers; indoctrination of faculty into administrative problems; opening boundaries between disciplines to encourage cross-utilization of resources, offerings. Calls for commitment to meet educational, societal goals.

Carnegie Commission on Higher Education. *Toward a learning society: Alternative channels to life, work, and service*. Hightstown, NJ: McGraw Hill, 1973.

Centre for Educational Research and Innovation. *The use of cost-effectiveness and cost-benefit techniques in planning courses of study for new higher educational institutions: A progress report*. Paris, France: Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, 1974.

Chidambaram, T. S. *Enrollment forecasting in an open admissions environment*. Washington, D.C.: Office of Institutional Research, 1974.

Clark, B. R. Belief and loyalty in college organization. *Journal of Higher Education*, 1971, *42*(6), 499-520.

Presents argument for the development of institutional self-perception, organizational efficiency, motivation. Discusses types of **social** bonding (normative, structural). Suggests that the best **way to increase** quality of institutional perception is through "re-norming" or changing basic beliefs about institutional purposes, **goals,** personal involvement. Discusses idea of "sanga," institutional history, participants involvement, identification with organization. States that larger organizations defy "community" (502); if "community" does not exist, organization decays. Presents notions of alternative futures, "social design"; various components of saga (506). States that involvement, community, lead to better organizational efficiency, productivity (*quality*, *not quantity*); offers new directions for institutional goals. Comment by Richardson at end.

Craven, E. C. Information systems in higher education. *Journal of Higher Education*, 1971, *42*(6), 499-520.

Argues that effective information systems are needed for efficient administration of times ahead. Briefly reviews forces on higher education, implications of fixed resource bases (125-6). Provides conceptual outline of design, function, and use of information systems (127-8). Argues that different decision-making activities within institutions require different information bases (129). Presents model of input/output, diagrammatic representation (130-1), outline of model and uses (131-5). States that evaluation mechanisms *necessary* for maintaining program excellence, improvement, renewal (135). (Brief bibliography on management information systems.)

Crean, J. F. The income redistributive effects of public spending on higher education. *Journal of Human Resources*, 1975, *10*(1), 116-123.

Doi, J. I. *College and university fiscal administration in the 1970's: The emergence of a new frame of reference*. Washington, D.C.: National Association of College and University Business Offices, 1970.

Dresch, S. P. A critique of planning models for postsecondary education. *Journal of Higher Education*, 1975a, *46*(3), 245-286.

Presents major review of current research and planning policies, emphases. Argues that too much effort on quantitative measures, ad hoc requisites of practice, obscures basic theoretical questions of policy analysis; too little effort given to understanding consequences of public policy (246). Describes tendency for public policy-makers to want immediate measures for perceived problems, which may or may not be most important issues at time (248); use of analytic measures only provides illusion of rationality (problems with methods, theories, models, etc., 248). Argues that comprehensive models are inaccurate, perhaps more damaging than productive (249); stresses need to work in incremental units, advancing both framework and tools one step at a time; not to put all eggs (efforts) into one basket (model)--diversity of approaches yields better payoffs (249-50). Provides overview of needs for models to portray conditions correctly; criticizes recent comprehensive models of PEFM and NCHEMS (254-283). Discusses recent forces, studies (256-9); past research based on assumption that "future will replicate a particular past" (259); specific need to consider various enrollment parameters, patterns of institutional and student behavior (260-2). Says tools should be developed in context of research, not application (265); student-institution interdependence characterized by partial list of dimensions (266-9); large number of variables to be dealt with defy attempts to be incorporated into large-scale computer models (269-70). Describes inadequacy of PEFM and NCHEMS to meet criteria outlined above; inaccurate assessment, inclusion of various data, behaviors (271-283). Summarizes by stating that models lack grounding in clear conceptual bases and cause confusion (283). (Extensive bibliography)

Dresch, S. P. Educational saturation: A demographic-economic model. American Association of University Professors Bulletin, 1975b, 61(3), 239-247.

Discusses implications of "saturation" of labor market in relation to enrollment forecasts; briefly reviews other models, which only state ratio of enrollment to population (including Carnegie and NCES). Argues that these other models are limited, inasmuch as they explicitly ignore (a) the capacity of larger system (i.e., economy) to absorb college-educated, and (b) the effects of the supply of college-educated on the labor market. Briefly discusses sources of growth between 1930 to 1970 (240), including enrollment forecasts from models above (Table 1, 240). States that any model must take into account the relation between education and the labor market; argues that past behavior is based on oversupply of educated (lack of planning, foresight, knowledge). Presents model of "educational adaptation," not designed to predict future, but rather to understand processes whereby future evolves out of past and present (242). Presents projections based on model (243); predicts during decade 1970-1980 40% cumulative increase in degree credit enrollment (roughly the same as CC and NCES), with sharp drop back to 1967 levels by the end of 1980's (40% contraction, in contrast to CC contraction of 8%, and NCES increase of 26%) (244). States that high inflow of newly trained PhD's will be curtailed in next two or three decades (245, cf. Buss); egalitarian ideal is shattering age-dependency, affecting both family and education (245). Says there is growing tendency toward technologically rationalized society (245); liberal arts is becoming consumptive activity; projects that there will be vast expansion of nonvocational, age-dependent enrollments in alternative educational systems (246). Predicts that

distinction between ages will become far less important; functions of postsecondary education increasingly less sought, more dissipated (247); decline in high school graduates. Stresses need to adapt to changing student, societal needs; redefine postsecondary education.

Dressel, P. Approaches to resource allocation. New Directions for Institutional Research, 1976, 11, 17-25.

Dressel, P. Impact of federal support of science on the publicly supported universities and four-year colleges in Michigan. Washington, D.C.: National Science Foundation, 1969.

Dunham, R. B. Achievement motivation as predictive of academic performance: A multivariate analysis. Journal of Educational Research, 1973, 67(2), 70-2.

EDUCOM. We can implement cost-effective information systems now. Princeton, NJ: Interuniversity Communications Council, 1976.

Fincher, C. On the national solution of dominant issues in higher education. Journal of Higher Education, 1975, 46(5), 491-505.

States that dominant issues facing higher education are legal, economic, and technological, stemming out of practices of last 25 years, and involving different modes of rationality; issues themselves shaped by prevailing mode, providing only partial answers to dominant questions, each presenting a threat to institutional autonomy. Says there is too much emphasis on knowledge as commodity (498), technology as best way to deal with change (499). Stresses need to understand relation between whole and parts; to engage in dialogue concerning primary purposes of education (503); to utilize integrated, interdisciplinary approach that will take into account other facets of higher education, allow interplay between discrete forces and establishment of rationality for academe.

Frantzreb, A. C. Evaluating a development program. Arlington, VA: Frantzreb, Pray, Fenner, and Thompson, Inc., 1975.

Froomkin, J. Study of supply response to oversupply of college places. Washington, D.C.: Froomkin, Inc., 1975.

Froomkin, J. The productivity and screening effects of educational attainment. Washington, D.C.: Froomkin, Inc., 1976.

Fuller, B. A framework for academic planning. Journal of Higher Education, 1976, 47(1), 65-77.

Argues for need for long-range social planning, design of alternative futures. Outlines components of planning processes, goals. Historical forces: quantitative--enrollment trends, demos, etc., (67); qualitative--disagreement about internal/external purposes of education, competition with other social priorities, increasing diversity in values. States that inability to resolve internal issues quickly leads to external pressure, with such issues becoming matters of public policy (69). Says that dialogue is the first step to planning. Goals of Planning: (1) assessment of values, understanding of implicit assumptions of learning process; (2) establishment of institutional objectives; (3) data collection, research, use of tools to inform policy; (4) determination of priorities and strategies to affect public policy, avoid external pressures; (5) development of open and continuous environment for adaptation to change (70-5). Says that planning, dialogue represent ways to meet, cope with, design future--not be shaped by the future (76).

Glenny, L. A. The illusions of steady state: Nine myths, nine realities. Change, 1974, 6(10), 24-8.

States that "to generate rational solutions to real problems, we must clearly understand the conditions creating the problem, its dimensions, and alternative ways we may approach it" (24). Argues that misinterpretation of "steady state" will cause educators to base policy on false assumptions regarding future. Outlines 9 conceptions and compares assumptions/realities: (1) numbers of college-age youths actually increasing throughout 1970's; (2) college-going rates distorted by decrease in college attendance of men, large variations in patterns, decrease in high school graduates going straight to college; (3) variance in enrollment patterns, both regionally and statewide, depending upon particular characteristics of institutions involved, increases in part-time students; increase in community college enrollments; (4) need for shift in resources, ability to cope with change; (5) need to reassess ability to meet new demands, lower enrollment rates for traditional-type students; (6) higher education no longer number one public priority; increase in emphasis on community colleges detracting from state universities; (7) technological innovations in management not a solution--rather, emphasis on developing relationships with public policy makers, social import of higher education; (8) past successes no guarantee of safe sailing in waters ahead; adult education not the means of solving enrollment problems; (9) current program not causing increasing attendance from low-income families; biggest increase in above-median family-types ($15,000+); decrease in middle income groups. Says these facts show that "steady state" does not exist; must focus instead on critical self-examination, students' behavior, adaptability in face of change. Watchword: commitment.

Glenny, L. A. Coordination and planning despite competition and confusion. New Directions for Institutional Research, 1975a, 2(2), 13-22.

Discusses implications of shift from federal to state funding of higher education, establishment of 1202 commissions. Notes recent proliferation of state agencies concerned with higher education. Says this causes problems of communication, confusion, conflict of interests; increases complexity in dealing with specific policies; causes questions of funding to become political, social issues, that technological efficiency cannot handle. Argues that lack of long-range academic planning creates too many demands on administrators, institutions, thereby increasing influence of legislators who are more short-term, self-oriented (19). Says there is need to centralize planning efforts on all fronts; that institutions must take lead to prevent self-interests from destroying institutional autonomy. Key to planning: rationality and participation (21). Need for institutions to: develop new perspectives; carry out meaningful evaluations and assessments; create strong data bases; develop adequate models for forecasting student demands, enrollments; understand faculty impact on students. Suggests guidelines for institutional research (21). Says existence of planning vacuum invites external pressure; need to know more about self than state--otherwise, indicative of bad environment, lack of planning ability.

Glenny, L. A. The unsteady state: Personnel impact. College and University Personnel Association Journal, 1975b, 26(1), 1-7.

Discusses basic forces impacting on higher education: (1) less federal money; (2) less state money; (3) increases in community college enrollments, part-time students; (4) increasingly older students; (5) economic impacts of 3, 4 above; (6) state universities losing more than privates (result of BEOG, etc.); (7) BEOG discrimination against low income, nontuition supported schools; (8) no major federal monies available in quantities planned for (lack of adequate backing for federal programs); (9) decreasing enrollment rates, birth rates. Implications: must respond to local demands, reorganize to reduce institutional fat.

Gustafson, B. K. & Hample, S. R. Enrollment projections model. Annapolis: Maryland Council for Higher Education, 1976.

Hamilton, I. B. The third century: Postsecondary planning for the nontraditional learner. Princeton, NJ: Educational Testing Services, 1976.

Hanson, W. L., & Weisbrod, B. A. On the distribution of costs and benefits of public higher education: Reply. Madison, WI: Institute for Research on Poverty, 1971.

Hawes, L., et al. Student participation in the university decision-making process. Journal of Higher Education, 1974, 45(2), 123-134.

Argues that governance roles are poorly defined, result of intense growth during 60's, alienation in large institutions (123). Discusses trend to include students on faculty, administrative committees; presents arguments by Clark (1968), Ikenberry (1966), Follet (1969), Munston (1970), Hubbel (1970), Eckert (1970); stresses need to assess impact of policies, effectiveness of participation (124-5). Describes various dimensions of committees: symbolic, information processing and decision-making, feedback channels, educational, and delay of action (126). Outlines use of survey tool, multi-method design (127). Discusses results: symbolic--agreement that participation changes perceptions in positive directions; decision--students felt to have equal participation, but committees tend to be influenced by discussers; representational--overall awareness of constituencies very low, with faculty having more than students; feedback--student interest greatest in decisions to be made (not reports of ones already done), and in knowing more about "rules of game" (127-133). Concludes that biggest problems are nondefined constituencies, student unawareness of power integration methanisms, lack of clearly defined issues. Stresses need to work on total participation, representation of students.

Herman, W. R. The university as a national resource. Change, 1976, 8(5), 31-37.

Argues for the recognition of higher education as a national resource, endangered by current policies of student subsidies, loans. Examines past history of views of higher education as "income maximization, human capital development" (32). Questions use of current policies to achieve societal goals, continuation of view of education as "capital investment." States that one cannot attack failure of higher education to respond to societal goals without also attacking prevailing cultural standards, industrial practices--other institutions equally if not more responsible for present dilemma (33). Says use of market model only creates pressure for uniformity, lack of measures of excellence. States that historically, the market has been unable to deal with societal ills; how can one expect social equality in a mechanism which cannot create? (34). Presents system of "negative income tax" to replace both social welfare and student subsidy programs--perhaps far more cost-effective, practical, beneficial (36-7). Criticizes emphasis on vocational training--jobs won't exist; suggests that we need flexible, responsive, adaptive modes for change.

Hight, J. E. The demand for higher education in the United States, 1927-1972: The public and private institutions. Journal of Human Resources, 1975, 10(4), 512-20.

Hiroak, L. S. Reorganization--prescription for higher education. Education, 1975, 95(4), 368-372.

Argues that part of problem facing higher education is with organizational structures, characteristics (i.e., "professionalism," bureaucracy); lack of adequate planning goals. Says there is need for efficient reorganization, priorities, evaluation methanisms. States that business-like methods might be best way to achieve internal reform, efficiency. Provides normative set of objectives for institutional planning (371). Discusses need for participatory environment, use of "change agents" (organizational development specialists) to facilitate reorganization. Argues for unified perception of need for change (faculty, staff involvement).

Hodgkinson, H. L. Planning and management in the face of the changing demographic picture. Boulder, CO: National Center for Higher Education Management Systems, 1976.

Hollander, T. E. Planning for changing demographic trends in public and private institutions. New Directions for Institutional Research, 1975, 2(2), 1-12.

Discusses implications of declining enrollments; briefly summarizes recent trends (3). Discusses prospects for future graduates, lowering differential between college/no-college jobs (cf. O'Toole, etc.). Stresses need for new strategies to cope with change; illustrates with example from New York, attempt to balance difference between public/private tuitions (cf. Bonner). Stresses need to reexamine basic assumptions about postsecondary delivery systems.

Hoos, I. R. The costs of efficiency: Implications of educational technology. Journal of Higher Education, 1975, 46(2), 141-159.

Presents argument against industrial-style efficiency, that it may be more harmful than helpful in higher education. Discusses trends in higher education within past 50 years (i.e., elite/mass, screening for jobs, social mobility, etc.). Says that throughout, there has been an increasing tendency to utilize technology in education--objective standardized tests are one illustration; that its use produces reading deficiencies, alienation from learning process, too much emphasis on productivity. States that preoccupation with model inhibits accurate perception of reality (151). Argues that use of system analysis as means to managerial efficiency is not necessarily appropriate for models of social planning (i.e., "biggest bang for buck") (152-3). Says use of cost/output models turns higher education into factory, too much emphasis on quantitative measures obscures educational purposes and objectives (158).

Jackson, G. A. Individual demand for higher education: A review and analysis of recent empirical studies. *Journal of Higher Education*, 1975, *46*(6), 623-652.

Reviews recent research on impact of student grants, low tuition policies in light of historical forces for egalitarian ideal (623). Specific studies reviewed: Campbell and Siegal (1967); Hoenack (1967); Hoenack, Weiler, and Orvis (1969); Corrazzini, Dugan, and Grabowski (1972); Radner and Miller (1970); Kohn, Manski, and Mundel (1972); Barnes, Erikson, Hill, and Winokur (1972). All studies concerned with attempting to isolate factors most responsible for student choice in higher education, price responsiveness of students' demand. Attempts to determine general fluctuations in demands (643-6). Found that demand was related to price, but magnitude of effect was generally extremely small; also that price differences affected demand more in lower income groups than higher ones. States, however, that evidence is insufficient to analyze the differential impact of specific types of financial aid--further, that the cost incurred through student loan programs may be far more than realized: for every $100 of loans, $4100 of costs are incurred by enrolling that particular student. States that considerable research is necessary before undertaking unqualified support of current federal policies (649-50).

Keeton, M. *An approach to a theory of quality assurance: Remarks to the conference on quality control in nontraditional education.* Columbia, MD: Antioch College, 1974.

Kenny, P. Reflections on educational capitalism. *College and University*, 1975, *51*(1), 44-8.

Presents argument that institutions are too much based on "educational capitalism" (i.e., economic vs. educational or philosophical bases for evaluation); that schools respond too much to market, not enough to needs of students, philosophy of school (45). Says competition is harmful, that survival of the fittest is an inappropriate measure of benefits, needs, that small institutions are losing out to big ones (46). Says there is too much stress on quantitative measures, not enough on qualitative, that business methods are inappropriate, lack of diversity will strangle American higher education. Stresses need to support education through involvement in political, media processes.

Kintzer, F. C. *Updating statewide articulation practices.* Gainesville: University of Florida, Institute of Higher Education, 1975.

King, M. C., et al. *Contemporary issues in postsecondary education: With emphasis on the community/junior college.* Cocoa, FL: Brevard Community College, 1976.

Legg, K. Comparative studies in costs and resource requirements for universities. Paris: Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development, 1971.

Leister, D. V. Assessing the community college transfer market: A metamarketing application. Journal of Higher Education, 1976, 47(6), 661-680.

Shows application of metamarketing technique in assessing potential transfer market of community college students. Out of analysis, makes concrete policy recommendations regarding transfer market (676), new marketing plan (677). Notes that biggest problem to be encountered will be institutional inertia against attitude changes viewed as necessary for correct marketing position (679).

Leister, D. V. Identifying institutional clientele: Applied metamarketing in higher education administration. Journal of Higher Education, 1975, 46(4), 381-398.

Presents view of higher education as competitive marketplace, allowing application of metamarketing theory to enable institutions to perceive their position relative to competition, identifying potential clientele, program emphases. Briefly reviews current forces on higher education, need for effective management techniques (382-3). Reviews development of current market thought, use of multidimensional scaling techniques, originally developed in psychology for measuring attitudinal responses (383-6). Describes the three-stage process: (1) assessment of current positions held by products; (2) determination of salient characteristics responsible for each product's position in relation to all others measured; and (3) selection of new position based on data, uniqueness. Shows use in identifying clientele for small denominational college in western Washington; applicability to policy formation, program implementation; contrast in marketing strategy to increase enrollments from students who might otherwise choose a different institution. Concludes by stating that this method allows greater flexibility in institutional planning, provides clues to complex behavior in competitive marketplace.

Leslie, L. L., et al. The market model and higher education. Journal of Higher Education, 1974a, 45(1), 1-20.

Discusses growing tendency of public policy-makers to view higher education as "market," with "products" and "consumers." Argues that market model is inappropriate to higher education; that both misunderstanding of theory and institutional characteristics acting as functional and structural limitations limit applicability of model. Discusses the implication that if model is inappropriate and federal/state policies are based on model, policy becomes subject to serious questioning, and there is need for reanalysis of effects of student subsidization of higher education, purposes for implementing market mechanisms (3-4): equalization of educational opportunity,

Lewis, D., et al. Time management in higher education administration: A case study. Higher Education, 1976, 5, 49-66.

Discusses method of assessing time use, efficiency in organizations. Reviews literature (50). Outlines method, tools, objectives (50-1); describes codes used, dimensions involved (52-5). Found that administrators (1) had incorrect picture of how time was spent (55), that the most effective reallocation would be reduction of meeting time (57); (2) spent little time on institutional research or student affairs (58), mostly responded to initiative of others; needed to develop delegation ability for more efficiency (59). Found stress related to job dissatisfaciton; need to reduce meetings (most stress producing because of frustration, time spent, etc.) (61); reduced stress associated with long work week (i.e., unhurried about business) (63). States that employee-initiated changes are more effective than fiat from above; that potential for conflict is reduced in environment of communication, shared experiences, motivation (64). Outlines method to enable administrators, staff to examine work patterns, understand relationships, ways to improve.

Lyell, E. H., et al. Student flow modeling and enrollment forecasting. New York: Society for College and University Planning, 1975.

Mangelson, W., et al. Projecting college and university enrollments: Analyzing the past and focusing the future. Ann Arbor, MI: Center for the Study of Higher Education, 1973.

Mayville, W. Contract learning. ERIC Higher Education Research Currents, 1973.

Michigan State Board of Education. Planning for student financial assistance. Lansing, MI: Author, 1974.

Millet, J. D. Creative management in a time of economic decline. New Orleans, LA: State Higher Education Executive Officers Association Conference, 1975.

Mills, G. H. Competition for public funds as aid increases to private education. Denver, CO: Clinic 4, Education Commission of The States, 1972.

Newton, R. D. Assessing the impacts of future student demand: An application of a demographically-differentiated projection model. Association for Institutional Research, 1976.

Norris, D. M. Enrollment projection strategies in an uncertain environment. Austin, TX: Office of Institutional Studies, University of Texas, 1976.

redistribution of monies, response to current financial crises. States that market is viewed as the most "efficient" means to justify public spending on higher education. Explains basic premises of market (5-9); shows how market, education do not fit together because of lack of adequate theory, predictive context of model (9). Discusses recent studies that show geographic location primary determinant of student choice (13). Says that if education = market, then commodity sold is enrollment space, not education (14), that actual conditions of higher education do not fit into market theory (14-5). Says there is little probability that student grants will do what is expected, that they only create marginal influences on demand for higher education (17). Sees evidence of potential conflict between view of education as investment, economic rationality (i.e., efficiency, productivity vs. quality, growth--cf. Hoos, 18); discusses primary purposes of education in nonquantitative terms (Carnegie Commission, 18); sees market approach as seriously inhibiting higher education's ability to meet societal goals (19).

Leslie, L. L. The college student grant study: The enrollment and attendance impacts of student grant and scholarship programs. Journal of Higher Education, 1974b, 45(9), 651-671.

Examines effects of student loan, scholarship program in five states, with eye to redistributive effects of six major federal and state programs for student aid. Briefly discusses role of price and income functions in student choice to attend particular colleges (654), price differentials between public and private institutions, justifications for student aid programs (655). States that if assumptions about student choice are true, then aid programs should indeed create different patterns of distribution. Through specific study, shows relationship existing between income (aid) and college attendance, although not particularly strong (659). Presents evidence that aid groups have a tendency to go to smaller institutions (i.e., privates vs. states) (664); says that in general, privates gain more than do publics (667), community colleges lost to both (667). Concludes generally that aid causes an average 41% increase in enrollments; however, calls for further research to determine just how much the public institutions are losing to the privates, as well as detrimental effects on community colleges. Calls for aid to be based on total need, not just tuition (i.e., tuition is free at most community colleges, therefore students are ineligible for aid). Stresses need to develop programs for part-time students, and to assess overall impact of programs (670).

Leuba, R. J. Individualized instruction and the letter grade system. Atlanta, GA: National Conference on Behavior Research and Technology in Higher Education, 1974.

O'Toole, J. The reserve army of the underemployed: The role of education, parts one and two. *Change*, 1975, 7(5), 26-33, 60-63.

Discusses growing societal concern with education as social opportunity (i.e., greater access), contradiction that occurs when lack of jobs negates advantage of college education, trap of viewing education as work-preparation. Says that mismatch between education and career opportunities is part of price paid for industrialization and increasing expectations of advanced standards of living. States that the answer is not revolution but rather redesign of jobs, education, and training, all geared toward developing and engaging the "unemployed self" (i.e., alienation from industrial jobs). Stresses need to erase completely the notion that credentials equal or guarantee good jobs. Says vocational training is not the right way to ease inequalities--need is for adaptive skills of liberal education. States that career is more than a series of jobs--it is a course of events that constitue life; that human growth is the essential goal of higher education (30-1). Stresses need to integrate work *experience* with *learning* (not occupation, but *education*) (32). Discusses concept of Mastery Learning as key to satisfaction, change from dependent to independent modes, democratization of workplace. Calls for redesign of jobs to increase personal satisfaction, learning opportunities, quality of productivity. Contrasts western work modes with Japanese, where managers and workers alike are constantly engaged in learning new skills (60). Says relating theory to practice will increase motivation and institutional loyalty; calls for education as training in idealism, not as way "to get by" (62).

Paola, E. G., et al. *Program effectiveness and related costs (PERC): An overview*. Saratoga Springs, NY: State University of New York, 1975.

Park, Y. A conceptual basis for nontraditional study. *Community and Junior College Journal*, 1976, 46(6), 29-31.

Pechman, J., & Sharkansky, I. The distributional effects of public higher education in California. *Journal of Human Resources*, 1970, 5(3), 361-70.

Phillips, J., et al. *DHEW/USDE task force on management of student assistance programs: Preliminary report to the deputy commissioner for higher education*. Washington, D.C.: Office of Education, DHEW, 1973.

Pitman, J. C., et al. *Institutional support package for comprehensive planning and staff training for community college personnel (state and local level) for the state of North Carolina*. Durham, NC: National Laboratory for Higher Education, 1971.

Pollay, R., et al. A model for horizontal power sharing and participation in university decision-making. Journal of Higher Education, 1976, 47(2), 141-157.

Discusses need for participatory processes in university governance, lack of appropriate mechanism. Develops 5-stage model to generate faculty opinion of role of new dean (147-9). Examines current limitations on decision-processes; discusses two popular modes of analysis: input-output, disjointed incrementalism (143). Criticizes input-output as being based on linear relationships between subsystems; says latter has ability to allow for fragmentation and disorder. Urges that we weigh relative consequences of policies at micro level, develop alternatives (144). Defines participation as a means to reduce conflict, create consensus, democratize institutions. Says most research is centered on vertical, that horizontal represents way to integrate varied interests and resolve differences, and is necessary for self-renewal. Describes case study (149-154); indicates costs not insignificant (154). States that model represents best way to generate consensus, feeling of participation, as well as useful data about administrative perceptions, procedures. (Extensive bibliography)

Richardson, R. C. Staff development: A conceptual framework. Journal of Higher Education, 1975, 46(3), 303-311.

Presents framework for analysis and implementation of staff development concepts. States that future change will be by substitution, contraction, not growth (303). Says best way to change organizational practices is to alter participants' view of organization, position, beliefs (cf. Clark). States that leadership sets direction for future development; that management by crisis creates ineffective organization, environment (305). Calls for leaders who understand process of development to establish conditions of growth (306). Outlines stages of process (307-9): (1) individual and small group learning experiences; (2) learning experiences applied on job; (3) analysis and revision of administrative and governance structure; (4) establishment of goals and priorities; (5) setting of goals by individuals; (6) evaluation and feedback. Says all are stages interrelated and growth-conducive. Briefly discusses management by objectives (MBO), a process that establishes cycle of growth vs. decay, allows for greater institutional flexibility in times ahead.

Roueche, T. E., & Mink, O. G. Impact of instruction and counseling on high risk youth: Final report. Austin, TX: Department of Education, NIMH/DHEW R01MH25590.

Sheehan, B. S., et al. The fundamental cost model. New Directions in Institutional Research, 1976, 3(9), 53-74.

Presents analytic tool (instructional cost index) based on common cost models, useful for comparison of data within and between institutions, with ability to estimate actual costs for specific programs. States that administrators need some simple tool to estimate costs so as not to get bogged down in analysis. Suggests fundamental cost model as pragmatic management tool, way to understand the complexities of policy variables affecting costs (72). (Extensive bibliography, unit cost studies, etc.)

Southern Regional Education Board. *The academic common market*. Atlanta, GA: Author, 1974.

Toft, R. J. *College IV: Individualized instruction for an entire college*. Atlanta, GA: Research and Technology in College and University Teaching, Second National Conference, 1974.

Van Alstyne, C. The economic costs of federally mandated social programs in higher education. *College and University Personnel Association Journal*, 1976, *27*(2), 16-22.

Discusses impact of federally mandated social programs on higher education. Stresses need to understand three components of economy, not just two: public, private, and nonprofit. Discusses differential effects of social policy through a case study of six different institutions, impacts of twelve federal programs (Affirmative Action, Fair Labor, etc.). Found increased cost in administration, inability to recover costs as can private industry, that biggest expenditure was for social security taxes. Says we must reconfirm commitment to higher social purposes, search for alternative means to meet that commitment. States that biggest potential for action is in increased participation in political processes, expansion of boundaries of concern, development of balance between educational and societal goals. Emphasizes need for cooperation within and between institutions.

Warren, J. The match between higher education and occupations. *New Directions for Institutional Research*, 1975, *2*(3), 47-60.

Discusses differences between viewing higher education as training (means) and as intellectual development (ends). States that views do not necessarily reject each other, but rather focus on different applications and emphases. Discusses history of education as training (48). Examines patterns in work force, demographic changes, indicating that professional/technical areas are the only areas that utilize college-associated skills (49ff). Thinks perceptions by students of utility are likely to change institutional objectives, that the path of least resistance is experiential (field) learning (52). States that current graduates are finding career opportunities mismatched to skills gained in college, that decreasing numbers are employed in their field of choice. Advocates need to understand and reinforce other nonoccupational aspects of education, work toward uniting theory with practice (59-60).

Weinstein, W. L. Social purposes in search of higher education, or higher education in search of social purposes? Higher Education, 1975, 4, 409-428.

Discusses difficulty of formulating coherent social policies, intrinsic goals of higher education. Notes tension between intrinsic values in higher education, extrinsic social purposes (tension between ends/means), difficulty of identifying benefits of higher education (414). Discusses history of elitism (415-6) to mass education, vocationalism (417ff). Views education as moral development (423), ethics of responsibility, dependency on morality (relation between institutions and society: academic values = democracy --425). Stresses need for balance between social, academic goals: "the more academics have to consider the social effects of their activities qua academics, the more they also have to become involved in the active determination of society's purposes" (426). At the same time, sees too close a social involvement making education useless, argues for academic detachment, objectivity.

Windham, D. Social benefits and the subsidization of higher education: A critique. Higher Education, 1976, 5, 237-252.

Examines justifications for subsidization of higher education. Discusses past patterns of behavior, view of higher education as national resource. Questions subsidy in light of failure of educational opportunities to cause substantial change in demos, relative opportunities for "social advancement." Presents basic dialogue between opponents, justification of expenditure of federal/national monies on basis of "manpower needs," "social mobility" (239). Raises questions of efficiency of institutional subsidies, failures to achieve goals; criticizes existence of so-called "social benefits" (242). States that these are hard to show, let alone act as justification for subsidies. Argues that student support is a much better vehicle for meeting societal, institutional needs (economic efficiency, social opportunities, choice mechanisms).

Witkowski, E. The economy and the university: Economic aspects of declining enrollments. Journal of Higher Education, 1975, 45(1), 48-60.

Discusses current crisis in higher education in relation to different aspects of declining enrollment, increasing demands for new and varied services. Sees reduction in staff, funds available, diminished ability to innovate, public vs. private, all creating environment of competition, not cooperation (49). Discusses both short-term and long-term effects. Short term: reduced enrollment = reduced income; inability of students to obtain funds for increased costs and less federal income tax = less federal subsidy; government attempts to fight inflation = cuts in federal spending; confusion about education = job opportunities (50-2). Long Term: perceived lower rate of return for investment in higher education, increased tuitions requiring higher differential in incomes before students invest, recruiting marginal students "lowering" quality of standards, screening effect diminished, and increased competition for both college and noncollege jobs (52-5). Makes policy recommendations on basis of two "alternatives"--increase product attractiveness, or go under (56). Sees most productive effort being increase of lobby for federal, state dollars, and convincing lending institutions that education increases personal productivity (therefore human capital investment). Stresses need to adopt image as industry to increase investment aspects, enrollments (56). Says costs savings can be made in decreasing duplication, cutting marginal programs (57); that this must be done to increase efficiency. Advocates working toward increasing income differential for college graduates to make education better investment; working with industry to prepare students more accurately for work; increasing screening potential to make higher education pay off (59). Asserts that if we do not do these things, people will not view education as wise investment, which in turn could lead to the decay of higher education as a social institution (59-60).

Winsborough, H. H. & Sweet, J. A. Life cycles, educational attainment, and labor markets. Madison, WI: Institute for Research on Poverty, 1976.