DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 380 047 HE 028 201

AUTHOR Shires, Michael A.
TITLE The Role of History in Developing the Missions of California's Public Higher Education Systems. Draft.
INSTITUTION Rand Corp., Santa Monica, CA. Inst. for Education and Training.
REPORT NO RAND-DRU-395-IET
PUB DATE Mar 94
NOTE 27p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Community Colleges; Educational Change; *Educational History; Educational Policy; Equal Education; Financial Support; Higher Education; *Institutional Mission; Institutional Role; Liberal Arts; *Master Plans; Public Colleges; Remedial Programs; Research Universities; Sciences; Social Influences; *State Colleges; *State Universities; Statewide Planning
IDENTIFIERS *California

ABSTRACT

The California Master Plan of 1960 defined relevant student populations and differentiated the missions of the University of California (UC), the California State Universities and Colleges (CSU), and the community colleges. Modern social forces are now complicating those missions. As the demand for high-quality instruction in the liberal arts and sciences has grown, the ability of UC to meet this demand has fallen behind, and CSU has graduated an increasing share of the baccalaureate students in these areas. The CSU's ability to attract high quality faculty has resulted in a much more research-oriented faculty, blurring the distinction between the CSU's and the UC's research missions. Concurrently, an increase in the pressures on institutions to meet access and equity objectives, coupled with the overall decline in the quality of secondary students entering the CSU and the UC and the increased participation of nontraditional student populations, have led to an increased need for these institutions to provide extensive remediation services, a role which was reserved for the community colleges under the Master Plan. Finally, the declining resource base within the state has caused all three of the public systems to reconsider their roles and missions. (Contains 11 references.) (JDD)

RAND

The Role of History in Developing the Missions of California's Public Higher Education Systems

Michael A. Shires

DRU-395-IET

March 1994

Prepared for the Institute on Education and Training

Center for Higher Education Reform

PREFACE

Originally, this RAND Paper was completed as a course requirement for the RAND Graduate School Seminar or the "Uses of History" during the winter quarter of the 1991-1992 academic year. The class, lead by *Los Angeles Times* Research Director Molly Selvin, emphasized the use of historical analysis and the historical when framing and analyzing important policy issues. Subsequently, it was updated and revised as part of an on-going effort in the RAND Center for Higher Education Reform to assess and participate in the reform process under way in California's higher education sector today.

The paper analyzes the ways in which the history of California's major postsecondary institutions contributes to their current missions under the California Master Plan of 1960. California's explicitly formulated higher education model was a critical contribution to higher education in America and this paper traces the history of one of the model's most important dimensions—the differentiation of the missions of each of the sector's constituent systems.

It will be of particular interest to those interested in the state's higher education sector and the way in which its component systems have adopted the roles that they have. This paper may be of particular interest to higher education policy makers at all levels, as well as legislators, sectoral participants, and anyone interested in the history of higher education in America.

Support for this effort was provided by the RAND Institute on Education and Training. This paper represents the opinions and efforts of the author only, and does not in any way reflect the opinions and positions of RAND, the RAND Center for Higher Education Reform, or the RAND Institute on Education and Training.

CONTENTS

SUMMARY

Education serves a unique and important role in society. Not only is an educated populace perceived as essential to the continued existence of democracy,[1] but it has also been recently framed as the crucial key to American competitiveness in increasingly global markets. Higher education serves many other important social roles as well. For this reason, the people of the state of California have expended considerable resources to create what is considered one of the pre-eminent higher education sectors in America.

But that sector is in crisis. The recent California recession, coupled with federally and constitutionally mandated spending requirements, has placed tremendous pressures on all institutions funded in the discretionary portion of the public budget,[2] and especially higher education. Public support for both of California's public four-year systems, the California State University system and the University of California, has declined significantly in the past several years.

This scope, scale, varied character, and abruptness of many of these changes has brought about a renewed and widespread call within and across the state's many institutions and systems for a systematic way of initiating and implementing strategic reform and change within the sector. One of the first steps in any such reform effort is to execute an environmental scan of the forces impacting the higher education institutions—an environmental scan. This paper represents a first step in such an environmental scan as it surveys the histories that have lead up to the systems' current missions under the California Master Plan of

[1]James Madison, for example, wrote in a letter to W. T. Barry on August 4, 1822, "Learned institutions ought to be favorite objects with every free people. They throw that light over the public mind which is the best security against crafty and dangerous encroachments on the public liberty."

[2]Many major categories of the state's annual spending are controlled either by federal mandate, such as AFDC, SSI, and Medi-Cal, or by the state constitution, such as K-12 education, which is controlled by Propositions 98 and 111. Total mandated spending is commonly estimated to be in excess of two-thirds of all state spending.

1960 and identifies some of the more recent social trends that have confused the distinctions between the systems' specific missions.

MISSIONS AND HISTORIES

The University of California (UC) was California's original land grant college. As such, its mission was and is to provide high quality research and instruction to the state's brightest and best students. It is the primary public institution to provide doctoral training and professional training in medicine, law, veterinary science, and dentistry.

The California State University (CSU) system evolved from the state's "normal schools" of the past. These institutions were established primarily to train teachers for California's primary and secondary education systems. Similarly, the CSU system today is the primary producer of primary and secondary school teachers in the state. It also provides undergraduate degrees to the largest share of the state population that can benefit from such training and graduate education in predominantly applied fields such as business administration, public administration, nursing, and other health areas.

Finally, the California Community Colleges (CCC) evolved from the state's early "junior college" programs. These programs were typically two-year extensions of high school education which were housed on high school campuses. Their goals were to provide additional vocational training to students and to allow college-bound students to take additional preparation for college, often receiving credit. These missions remained essentially unchanged in today's modern community colleges.

SOCIAL COMPLICATORS

A wide range of emerging social trends have complicated the ability of the sector's systems to maintain the mission differentiation that was envisioned in the California Master Plan of 1960. As the demands for high-quality instruction in the liberal arts and sciences have grown, the ability of the UC to meet this demand has fallen behind and the CSU has graduated an increasing share of the baccalaureate students in these

areas. Furthermore, the CSU's ability to attract high quality faculty has resulted in a much more research-oriented faculty, blurring the distinction between the CSU's and the UC's research missions.

Concurrently, an increase in the pressures on institutions to meet access and equity objectives, coupled with the overall decline in the quality of secondary students entering the CSU and the UC, and the increased participation of non-traditional student populations, have lead to an increased need for these institutions to provide extensive remediation services. Remediation is a role that was reserved for the California Community Colleges under the California Master Plan of 1960.

Finally, the declining resource base within the state has caused all three of the public systems to significantly reconsider their roles and missions. This has brought about an extended dialogue at high levels within on eliminating the mission distinctions between the systems.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The author would like to thank RAND colleagues Molly Selvin and Steve Carroll for their assistance in the development and publication of this paper. Their critiques and comments were invaluable in the formulation and exposition of the analysis included herein. The provision of funding and support by the RAND Center for Higher Education Reform aand the RAND Institute on Education and Training is also gratefully acknowledged.

1. INTRODUCTION

Education serves a unique and important role in society. Not only is an educated populace perceived as essential to the continued existence of democracy,[3] but it has also been recently framed as the crucial key to American competitiveness in increasingly global markets. It is also touted as a key mechanism for societal change. For example, pursuing higher education is considered one of the best mechanisms for social mobility between classes in our society and is also perceived as one of the principal devices for reconciling the historical inequities between ethnic groups.

As such an important component of our postindustrial society, the educational institutions we have established are critical to our future. In education, as in all of the public sectors of our modern society, there has been increased demands placed on its institutions. Modern schools are called upon not only to provide historical levels of training, but also to serve the broad social roles above, as well as to respond quickly and effectively to the new technologies and requirements of the information age. This has brought about widespread calls for reform and restructuring within all of these education institutions.

Concurrent with the increasing demands on our public institutions has been increased pressure on the availability of resources to those institutions. Nationally, these pressures have been brought about by an increased emphasis on deficit reduction coupled with burgeoning and growing demands on the nation's social support infrastructure. This has brought about a growing interest in reform and restructuring in these public institutions as they strive to respond and do more with less.

California has been particularly hard hit by these pressures as the end of the Cold War fueled a long recession in the state. Although there are no available direct measures of state domestic product, wage

---

[3]James Madison, for example, wrote in a letter to W. T. Barry on August 4, 1822, "Learned institutions ought to be favorite objects with every free people. They throw that light over the public mind which is the best security against crafty and dangerous encroachments on the public liberty."

and salary employment have declined every year since 1990 and are not expected to experience positive growth until calendar 1995.[4] Overall General Fund revenues, which represent the pool of resources available for public uses, have declined by 2.6 percent and 4.2 percent in the 1992-93 and 1993-94 fiscal years, respectively, and are expected to remain flat for the 1994-95 fiscal year.

This economic crisis, coupled with federally and constitutionally mandated spending requirements, has placed tremendous pressures on all institutions funded in the discretionary portion of the public budget,[5] and especially higher education. Public support of both of California's public four-year systems, the California State University system and the University of California, has declined significantly in the past several years. These declines have resulted in increased tuitions, decreased staffing, and a plethora of campus-specific changes—including the elimination of schools and academic programs, the discharge of all part-time faculty, and elimination of library acquisitions and other administrative budget items.

This scope, scale, varied character, and abruptness of many of these changes has brought about a renewed and widespread call within and across the state's many institutions and systems for a systematic way of initiating and implementing strategic reform and change within the sector.

In order for strategic change to occur, the sector must first consider where it is today and where it is headed. This assessment is generally recognized as an "environmental scan." A successful environmental scan must answer two questions: 1) how does the institution interact with and how is it affected by its external environment; and 2) how is that environment changing. An important, and

---

[4]California Commission on State Finance, *California Budget Outlook-February 1994*, pp. 7-8.

[5]Many major categories of the state's annual spending are controlled either by federal mandate, such as AFDC, SSI, and Medi-Cal, or by the state constitution, such as K-12 education, which is controlled by Propositions 98 and 111. Total mandated spending is commonly estimated to be in excess of two-thirds of all state spending.

often overlooked part of that process is to understand how that environment in the past has shaped and formed institution's present.

This paper represents a first step in an environmental scan of California's higher education sector. It looks closely at a very important aspect of the sector—the missions of the three public systems.[6] It specifically addresses how the history of the state's three public systems shaped their modern missions and how modern social forces are complicating those missions.

ORGANIZATION OF THIS PAPER

The paper begins, in Chapter Two, with brief descriptions of the individual systems. It then moves on in Chapter Three to a description of how the histories of the systems lead to the California model for higher education as formally described in the California Master Plan of 1960. Chapter Four then turns to a discussion of several recent social trends that have shaped many of the current debates regarding the future structure and roles of these systems. Finally, Chapter Five will discuss some of the implications of the history of the systems' missions for their futures.

---

[6]These systems are the University of California, the California State University system, and the California Community Colleges.

2. THE HISTORIES OF THE INSTITUTIONS

Each of the individual component institutions has a unique history of development. Intrinsic in these histories are the roles and missions that inspired their founding. In the following sections these histories will be briefly reviewed.

THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

The current University of California system, which is composed of nine campuses,[7] has a long history dating back to the early 1850s. The concept of a state college was actually initiated by California legislators in 1851, when the legislature appropriated $20,000 to investigate the opening of a university. In 1855, the College of California was founded using some state monies. In 1862, the federal Morrill Act (Land Grant Act) appropriated 30,000 acres of public land per representative to each state to be used exclusively for the establishment of institutions of higher learning. After much planning and discussion, the College of California was liquidated into the University of California in 1868. At this time, the University was committed to the liberal arts and professional areas such as law, medicine, and dentistry. The University continued to grow in stature and reputation and in 1879 the Hastings College of Law formally affiliated with the University.

Private endowments and donations contributed to the rapid expansion of the facilities and especially the faculty. The result was a faculty that rivaled even the elite Ivy League in standing. As Joseph Le Conte, then a professor, stated, "the University has become now an institution in which the professor is no longer a teacher merely, but also a maker of science and philosophy; and the relation is no longer one of teacher

[7]The University of California currently has campuses in Berkeley, Davis, Irvine, Los Angeles, Riverside, San Francisco (medical campus only), San Diego, Santa Barbara, and Santa Cruz. There are also advanced discussions regarding the opening of a tenth campus, proposed for the Fresno area, although the state's current fiscal crisis has slowed the prospects for its actual opening.

and learner, but also of coworker in the field of thought."[8] The University soon expanded its course areas into the sciences and engineering.

The hiring of Benjamin Ida Wheeler as President in 1899 changed the character of the University significantly. He would only accept on the condition that he become the sole contact point between the Board of Regents and the University. He also argued for more independence in the management of finances on the campus. His actions ended years of internal conflict that was triggered by . politics of direct regent intervention and facilitated the University's later growth, both in eminence and size.

The University continued to grow in international stature during the next sixty years. While some expansion[9] had occurred before Gordon Sproul became President in 1930, he was chiefly responsible for its explosion into the nine-campus system we see today. During his tenure, the "Southern Campus" became UCLA, the Davis farm and agriculture program had widely expanded into new areas, and new campuses had opened in Santa Barbara and Riverside. The growth did not stop with him, however, as the University added campuses in Irvine, San Diego, and Santa Cruz during the 1960s.

Throughout its entire history, the University has been committed to advancing the three products of its existence: teaching, research and service to its constituent community—the citizens of the state of California. The campus has focused its resources on attracting and retaining the highest caliber of faculty. This tradition of research and academic orientation has become imbedded in its very core and structure.

---

[8]William W. Ferrier, *Ninety Years of Education in California* (Berkeley: Sather Gate Book Shop, 1937), p. 319.

[9]There were several research stations outside Berkeley including the "Southern Branch" in 1919 and an agriculture school in Davis.

THE CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITIES AND COLLEGES

The California State Universities and College (CSU) system[10] has a different history and development. The system traces its start to the "Normal Schools" of the 19th century. The normal schools were founded to provide the state with well-trained teachers for elementary and secondary schools. The first Normal School opened in San Francisco in 1862. This school was moved to San Jose in 1871 and branches opened in Los Angeles (1881) and Chico (1887). A separate school was opened in San Diego in 1897. During this time, each of the schools was governed by a local school board. In 1899, normal schools were placed under the auspices of the State Board of Education, but each retained a separate local board to guide curricula. Separate schools were subsequently opened in San Francisco (1899), Santa Barbara (1909), Fresno (1911), and Arcata [Humboldt State] (1913).

In an effort to standardize the programs, local governing boards were abolished in 1920 and control given to the State Board of Education. In 1921, the names of the schools were changed from normal schools to Teachers' Colleges and a statewide accreditation system was implemented. Curricula at the various campuses continued to diversify and the scope of the courses offered broadened until 1935.

In 1935, sweeping changes were made in the state's teachers' colleges. The names were changed to the "State Colleges." The focus was further diversified and, for the first time, schools were allowed to offer degree programs in other areas than education. A complementary change was made eliminating the education courses as a requirement for

[10]The California State Universities and Colleges system is currently comprised of 20 campuses including: California Polytechnic University Pomona, California State University San Luis Obispo, California State University Bakersfield, California State University Chico, California State University Dominguez Hills, California State University Fullerton, California State University Hayward, California State University Northridge, California State University Sacramento, California State University San Bernardino, California State University Stanislaus, Fresno State University, Humboldt State University [Arcata], California State University Long Beach, California State University Los Angeles, California State University San Marcos, San Diego State University, San Francisco State University, San Jose State University, and Sonoma State University.

graduation. In 1962, the name of the institutions was changed to the "California State Universities and Colleges System."

Throughout this time, the system continued to grow and expand. The focus has always been on teacher preparation and even when the name was changed to "State Colleges" (from teachers' colleges), a clause was included mandating that the primary purpose of the system was to "prepare teachers."

COMMUNITY COLLEGES

The first junior college[11] was developed in Illinois in the early 1900s. The concept was that these institutions would provide the same classes as a student would take during their first two years of college at a four-year institution—the so-called general education classes. In 1907, the California Legislature authorized the development of junior colleges in California. Even so, the first junior college[12] was not formed until 1910 at Fresno High School. In 1911 another junior college was founded in Santa Barbara High School and another in 1913 at Fullerton High School.

During this same time, junior colleges also beg. . to add vocational and technical training classes to their curricula. This trend got a substantial boost by the Smith-Hughes Act of 1917. This federal legislation provided extensive federal funding to schools for the provision of these classes, as well as for offering part-time programs and night and weekend classes. Attaching college classes to high schools grew rapidly and eventually lead to the development of separate two-year institutions. By 1921, there were two independent institutions and 21 junior colleges attached to high schools throughout the state. By 1930, these numbers had exploded to 16 and 18 respectively, with more

---

[11]The term "junior college" arises from a pilot program at the University of Chicago. The undergraduate programs were divided into two-year groups, the "junior college" and the "senior college". The junior college was comprised of freshmen and sophomores while the senior college was comprised of juniors and seniors.

[12]The terms "junior college" and "community" college are used interchangeably throughout this document.

than 10,000 students. One report published by the state in 1930 summarizes the various roles and missions of the junior college well:

- "to fit one group of students to enter the junior class of standard four-year institutions;
- to fit a second group of its students for no particular occupation, but merely to enable them to gain at moderate expense one or two years more of general education than they would otherwise be able to afford;
- to fit a third group of its students, immediately upon the completion of their course, to secure employment in some semiprofessional capacity, e.g., as dental and medical assistants; and
- to fit a fourth group of its students to earn a livelihood at some skilled or semiskilled trade or occupation, e.g., as machinists, electricians, horticulturists, automobile mechanics, poultry raisers."[13]

Many of these roles remain the same even today, as we shall see below.

---

[13]*Report of the California Commission for the Study of Educational Problems, 1930, Volume I*, Sacramento, p. 62.

3. THE CALIFORNIA MASTER PLAN OF 1960

The California Master Plan of 1960 is the institutional blueprint for the current structure of the California higher education. In fact, it is also the blueprint for higher education in several other states across the nation and countries around the world. Few documents have had as much of an impact on postsecondary education. In this section, we will discuss this special document and point out some of its highlights.

THE HISTORY OF THE CALIFORNIA MASTER PLAN

The California Master Plan emerged from a very tempestuous time in the history of California higher education. The lack of a cohesive overall plan for postsecondary education created an era of intense instability in its governance.[14] In the 1959 legislative session alone, a wave of no less than two constitutional amendments, three resolutions, and twenty-three bills were introduced, each addressing an aspect of higher education. This situation lead to the establishment of the Assembly Concurrent Resolution 88, which called for a liaison committee comprised of members of the University of California's regents and members of the State Board of Education.[15] Their charter was to

---

[14]Concern regarding the structure of higher education had built over time and was a reflection of the competitive pressures of having three public college systems competing for the same students. As Irving Hendrick points out in *California Education: A Brief History*,

> "By 1959, it had become apparent that the growth of higher education had to be managed intelligently. Concern over duplication of facilities and cost had been expressed earlier. In 1933 the Suzzalo Report of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching had recommended that all public higher education in California be placed under the authority of the University of California regents. Two subsequent studies, the Strayer Report of 1938 and the McConnell Report of 1955, also emphasized the need for coordination and planning." (p. 62).

[15]The members of the committee were as follows: **State Board of Education:** William Blair, Raymond Daba, Mabel Kinney, Wilber Simons, and Roy Simpson; **Regents of the University of California:** Gerald Hagar, Cornelius Haggerty, Clark Kerr, Donald McLaughlin, and Jesse Steinhart; **The Master Plan Survey Team:** Arthur Coons (Chairman), Arthur Browne,

"prepare a master plan for the development, expansion, and integration of the facilities, curriculum, and standards of higher education."[16]

The committee's report, which was endorsed by the leadership of all of the major postsecondary institutions in the state, was released in late 1959. The Plan was subsequently passed in a special legislative session as Senate Bill 33. The Plan addressed many of the issues set forth in the preceding reports, as we shall see below.

HIGHLIGHTS OF THE PLAN

The Master Plan addressed a wide range of issues. Among these was the definition of relevant student populations for each set of institutions and a formalization and differentiation of the missions of each set of institutions. The definition of student populations was in response to the sometimes messy competition between the various public institutions for the high caliber students. The Plan resulted in the University of California admitting only the top one-eighth of the high school population. The California State Universities and Colleges system is to admit students from the top one-third of the high school population and junior colleges (now called community colleges) from the entire high school population. The driving force behind the plan was that ALL Californians should have access to postsecondary education, irrespective of their level of preparation while balancing the different needs of the postsecondary institutions for high quality students.

The Plan also differentiated between the missions of the three groups of institutions. Each was allocated a specific set of roles within the overall objective to provide a postsecondary educational opportunity to all Californians. Each of these roles is a reflection of the institution's history, as well as the student population to which it is targeted.[17] The role of each of the institutions is discussed in further detail below.

Howard Campion, Glenn Dumke, Thomas Holy, Dean McHenry, Henry Tyler, Robert Wert, and Keith Sexton.

[16]Irving G. Hendrick, *California Education: A Brief History*, (San Francisco: Boyd & Fraser Publishing Company, 1980), p. 63.

[17]This relationship actually goes both ways, inasmuch as we pointed out above that the Plan balanced the needs of the institutions

Community Colleges

Junior colleges were assigned a variety of roles in the Master Plan. There were three basic components to their new role, each of which can be traced, at least in part, to the history of the junior college as an institution. Let us now examine these three roles in greater detail. The junior colleges shall "offer instruction but not beyond the fourteenth grade level, including, but not limited to the following:"[18]

Standard courses for transfer to higher institutions. The junior college is chartered to provide classes for individuals who will eventually transfer to other four-year institutions of higher learning. Historically, the junior college was an offshoot of high schools (with which they had their initial affiliations) and were modeled to provide the courses typically encountered in the first two years of college.

Vocational-technical courses in fields leading to employment. Vocational courses have long been a component of junior college programs, dating back to 1917 and the Smith-Hughes Act of 1917. The formalization of the junior college's exclusive role in providing this training was important, however, inasmuch as it established a specialization within the postsecondary educational framework.

General or liberal arts courses. This category of courses exemplifies California's commitment to provide access to postsecondary education to ALL Californians. This particular category of courses allows individuals to pursue general courses in academic areas without having to make a long-term commitment to a full-fledged degree program. Incorporated with this role was the introduction of the Associate in Arts and Associate in Sciences degrees.

The local governance aspect of the community college system also brought the community college and its curriculum decisions much closer to the market it served. This allows local communities to establish their own priorities for programs of local community interest.

(including their student population they required) against the access objective.

[18]California State Department of Education, *A Master Plan for Higher Education in California, 1960-1975*, (Sacramento, 1960), p. 2.

State Colleges

The role of the State College System also was also revised and expanded in the Master Plan. To quote the Plan,

> "The state colleges shall have as their primary function the provision of instruction in the liberal arts and sciences and in professions and applied fields which require more than two years of collegiate education and teacher education, both for undergraduate students and graduate students through the master's degree. The doctoral degree may be awarded jointly with the University of California, as hereinafter provided. Faculty research, using facilities provided for and consistent with the primary functions of the state colleges, is authorized."[19]

Reviewing the history of the schools found in the state college system recall that these institutions started as "normal schools" (committed exclusively to training elementary and secondary teachers), this charter reflects both their origins in teacher preparation and the trend toward expansion and liberalization of their curricula. The expansion of the professional degrees to be offered reflected, in part, the changing demographics of a state undergoing massive population growth. We will discuss these demographics more in the next section.

The University of California

Similarly, the mission of the University of California is explicitly defined in the Master Plan. The relevant text reads as follows:

> "The University shall provide instruction in the liberal arts and sciences, and in the professions, including teacher education, and shall have exclusive jurisdiction over training for the professions (including but not by way of limitation), dentistry, law, medicine, veterinary medicine, and graduate architecture. The University shall have the sole authority in public education to award the doctor's degree in all fields of learning, *except that* it may agree with the state colleges to award joint doctor's degrees in selected fields. The University shall be the primary state-supported academic agency for research, and the Regents shall make reasonable provision for the use of its library and research facilities

[19] *ibid.*, p. 2.

> by qualified members of the faculties of other higher educational institutions, public and private."[20]

This text almost exactly echoes the mission statements that go back to the University's inception as a land grant university in the nineteenth century.

The unique aspect about the California Master Plan of 1960 was not the specific missions that was assigned to each of the institutions in the structure, for each mission was in part a function of pre-existing standards for the missions of each institution. Instead, the uniqueness of the California Master Plan arose from the integration of the diverse functions of the three previously independent systems into a single, intentional framework for meeting the needs and objectives of the people of California while simultaneously matching the needs of the institutions for high quality students. It was the departmentalization and formalization of the diverse roles of the constituent institutions that made the Master Plan unique, coupled with the overarching objective of providing access to postsecondary education to ALL Californians.

---

[20]*Ibid.*, pp. 2-3.

4. EMERGING SOCIAL COMPLICATORS

Despite the success of the institutional framework of the California Master Plan in terms of providing educational opportunity to all Californians, there have recently been a series of social trends that have complicated the continued existence of the California Master Plan.[21] This discussione will focus on three of these trends: the recent trends toward a blurring of the distinctions between the institutions and missions as implemented; the complexities associated with remediation; and the declining resource environment of modern California.

BLURRING THE INSTITUTIONAL MISSIONS

One component of the post-1975 era has been a social context where the demands on the University, state college, and junior college systems have expanded greatly. Over the course of the past several years, for example, there have been increasing demands on the system in terms of the quality and quantity of students graduating from postsecondary institutions. While the role of the CSU system, as specified ir the Master Plan, called for some liberal arts and sciences education, the primary responsibility for advanced academic training in these areas was relegated to the University of California. Yet, in the course of the past twenty years, demand for the provision of high-quality education in these areas has far outstripped the University of California's limited capacity. In response to this phenomenon, programs in the CSU system have been under pressure to and have responded to pressure increase the level at which their training in these areas is offered—to the extent that the CSU system now produces a substantial proportion of the undergraduate degrees awarded in these fields.

---

[21]It is interesting to note that the original plan was only intended for a fifteen year period spanning 1960-1975. While the Plan continues to be the centerpiece of the California image of postsecondary education even today, some 19 years beyond its original scope, many of the social trends referred to in this section actually began to have an impact in the mid-1970s.

Another component that has driven the blurring in the distinction between the University of California and the California State College system has been the retention of highly qualified faculty by the state college system. With limited opportunities for employment in the University of California, many eminent faculty are attracted to the California State College campuses. This has the result of staffing these campuses with a more motivated and active faculty population—a group of individuals that is pushing the limits of what was intended by the statement, "Faculty research, using facilities provided for and consistent with the primary functions of the state colleges."[22] With an increasingly qualified and restless faculty population, the California State College system has grown more and more liberal in its interpretation of this constraint, allowing faculty to undertake more and more of what could be considered "primary research" within their disciplines. While this has had the result of increasing the stature of many of the CSU campuses, it also produces a blurring in the differentiation of missions provided in the Master Plan.

REMEDIATION AS A MISSION COMPLICATOR

Another area of where differentiation between the institutions is breaking down is student remediation. Student remediation includes policies and programs that are designed to bring under-prepared students up to a level where they can compete in the University or College environment. The need for this process is the result of two phenomena: the decline in quality of students produced in the elementary and secondary school programs and the requirement of Colleges and Universities to actively pursue affirmative action programs. Both of these factors produce a pool of entering students in the University of California and California State College systems who, too often, are not adequately prepared to perform at the level of other students in the system. In order to address this problem, campuses in both systems have

[22]This is generally interpreted by analysts of the California Master Plan to impute to the faculty the opportunity to perform research in relation specifically to the instruction of the subjects being taught and to not authorize primary academic research in those fields.

expended considerable resources in remediation programs, such as special tutors and training seminars.

The complication arises when assessing the intent of the original California Master Plan. The authors made it clear that the University of California was to accept students only from the top one-eighth of graduating high school students. The California State University system, similarly, was only to recruit students from the top one-third of graduating high school students. All other students were to be funneled into the junior college system. It was here that remediation was supposed to be concentrated. After receiving their remedial training in the junior college, under-prepared students were expected to transfer into four-year institutions. The social changes and pressures on the state's two public four-year systems, have resulted the transfer of a significant portion of the remediation role from the commuity colleges to the two public four-year systems.

THE DECLINING RESOURCE BASE

Another feature of social change that has emerged in the past several years has been the decline in public resources in general, and consequently those available to the postsecondary institutions. While expenditures on higher education grew more rapidly than enrollments in the seventies and continued to grow in the early eighties, the fiscal crises of the late eighties and early nineties have brought about a rapid reassessment of the missions and structure of postsecondary education in California. Rising tuition costs and declining faculty sizes have raised extensive concerns regarding the viability of the California Master Plan in its current form. Soaring tuition and fee levels, oupled with declining financial aid resources, have brought into question whether a postsecondary education is truly a viable possibility to *most*, let alone all, California residents. This has brought about a revival of whether this universal access ***should*** be an objective of the postsecondary educational system and, if so, how to best implement it.

5. DISCUSSION AND IMPLICATIONS

The emergence of the social complicators discussed in the section above, as well as many others, have revitalized the debate about what the country's most populous state should do to and with its postsecondary institutions. Inherent in this debate is the reconciliation of current reality with the individual and distinct histories of the various institutions and the cumulative effect of these histories as they are embodied in the California Master Plan. In considering the policy alternatives, it is important to remember that it is very difficult to reverse and/or to redirect more than a century's worth of institutional momentum and tradition.

One set of solutions, for example, proposed by in a report authored by Assemblyman Tom Hayden, Chair of the Subcommittee on Higher Education, envisions a "triad" of higher educational institutions (as opposed to the current hierarchical, pyramid structure) as the key.[23] In this approach, the differentiation of the missions would be essentially eliminated and each institution would fill all of the missions it could find the resources to meet.[24] This approach fails to recognize the very historical context presented in this paper. There is the further complication that, even if the formal differentiation of missions between the California State University system and the University of California was eliminated, the California State College system may not be able to overcome the history that has provided its current structure and distribution of resources in order to implement and adopt the new missions.

As the example above demonstrates, **it is critical**; when considering policy alternatives for the future of postsecondary education in California, to seriously consider the history that has moved it where it is today. From a policy making perspective, it is even more unclear

---

[23]See *Beyond the Master Plan: A New Vision for Higher Education in California*, March 1986.

[24]While the community college would enjoy a greatly increased status relative to the other two sets of institutions in terms of resources and stature, it would remain a two-year institution.

whether the current differentiation of missions, which represents the cumulative product of the histories of the individual institutions and the impact of broad social trends, does in fact work. It is less clear whether that mission differentiation should be weakened or strengthened.

What is clear is that, in the course of developing new strategic visions for the sector, the three public systems, and their constituent institutions, the missions and their individual and collective histories must be considered. They represent powerful forces in the framing of future options for the implementations of new strategies for each and all of the entities.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

California Commission for the Study of Educational Problems, *Report of the California Commission for the Study of Educational Problems, 1930: Volume I*, (Sacramento: 1931), 203 pp.

California Commission for the Study of Educational Problems, *Report of the California Commission for the Study of Educational Problems, 1930: Volume II*, (Sacramento: 1931), 197 pp.

Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, *More Effective Use of Resources*, (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1972), 201 pp.

Committee on the Conduct of the Study, a committee of the Liaison Committee of the Regents of the University of California and the State Board of Education, *Needs of California in Higher Education*, (Sacramento: 1948), 132 pp.

Hayden, Tom, *Beyond the Master Plan: A New Vision for Higher Education in California*, (Sacramento: 1986), 38 pp.

Hendrick, Irving G., *California Education: A Brief History*, (San Francisco: Boyd & Fraser Publishing Company, 1980), 97 pp.

Kerr, Clark, *The Great Transformation in Higher Education: 1960-1980*, (New York: State University of New York Press, 1991), 383 pp.

Lee, Eugene C. and Frank M. Bowen, *The Multicampus University*, (New York: McGraw Hill, 1971), 481 pp.

Liaison Committee of the State Board of Education and The Regents of University of California, *A Master Plan for Higher Education in California, 1960-1975*, (Sacramento: California State Board of Education, 1960), 230 pp.

Liaison Committee of the State Board of Education and The Regents of University of California, *A Restudy of the Needs of California in Higher Education*, (Sacramento: California State Board of Education, 1955), 473 pp.

Stone, James C., *California's Commitment to Public Education*, (New York: Thomas Crowell Company, 1961), 193 pp.