

INFORMATION TO USERS

This was produced from a copy of a document sent to us for microfilming. While the most advanced technological means to photograph and reproduce this document have been used, the quality is heavily dependent upon the quality of the material submitted.

The following explanation of techniques is provided to help you understand markings or notations which may appear on this reproduction.

1. The sign or "target" for pages apparently lacking from the document photographed is "Missing Page(s)". If it was possible to obtain the missing page(s) or section, they are spliced into the film along with adjacent pages. This may have necessitated cutting through an image and duplicating adjacent pages to assure you of complete continuity.
2. When an image on the film is obliterated with a round black mark it is an indication that the film inspector noticed either blurred copy because of movement during exposure, or duplicate copy. Unless we meant to delete copyrighted materials that should not have been filmed, you will find a good image of the page in the adjacent frame.
3. When a map, drawing or chart, etc., is part of the material being photographed the photographer has followed a definite method in "sectioning" the material. It is customary to begin filming at the upper left hand corner of a large sheet and to continue from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps. If necessary, sectioning is continued again—beginning below the first row and continuing on until complete.
4. For any illustrations that cannot be reproduced satisfactorily by xerography, photographic prints can be purchased at additional cost and tipped into your xerographic copy. Requests can be made to our Dissertations Customer Services Department.
5. Some pages in any document may have indistinct print. In all cases we have filmed the best available copy.

University
Microfilms
International

300 N. ZEEB ROAD, ANN ARBOR, MI 48106
18 BEDFORD ROW, LONDON WC1R 4EJ, ENGLAND

NETTLES, MICHAEL TERRAEL

THE DEVELOPMENT AND VALIDATION OF CRITERIA AND METHOD
FOR EVALUATING STATEWIDE PLANNING FOR HIGHER EDUCATION

Iowa State University

PH.D.

1980

University
Microfilms
International 300 N. Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, MI 48106

PLEASE NOTE:

In all cases this material has been filmed in the best possible way from the available copy. Problems encountered with this document have been identified here with a check mark ✓.

1. Glossy photographs _____
2. Colored illustrations _____
3. Photographs with dark background _____
4. Illustrations are poor copy _____
5. Print shows through as there is text on both sides of page _____
6. Indistinct, broken or small print on several pages ✓
7. Tightly bound copy with print lost in spine _____
8. Computer printout pages with indistinct print _____
9. Page(s) _____ lacking when material received, and not available from school or author
10. Page(s) _____ seem to be missing in numbering only as text follows
11. Poor carbon copy _____
12. Not original copy, several pages with blurred type _____
13. Appendix pages are poor copy _____
14. Original copy with light type _____
15. Curling and wrinkled pages _____
16. Other _____

The development and validation of criteria and method for
evaluating statewide planning for higher education

by

Michael Terrael Nettles

A Dissertation Submitted to the
Graduate Faculty in Partial Fulfillment of the
Requirements for the Degree of
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Department: Professional Studies in Education
Major: Education (Higher Education)

Approved:

Signature was redacted for privacy.

In Charge of Major Work

Signature was redacted for privacy.

For the Major Department

Signature was redacted for privacy.

For the Graduate College

Iowa State University
Ames, Iowa

1980

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
CHAPTER I. INTRODUCTION	1
Problem Statement and Rationale	1
Study Procedures	8
Evaluation Method and Design	10
Study Hypothesis and Data Analysis	12
Purpose of the Study	12
Assumptions	13
Delimiters	14
Definition of Key Terms	14
CHAPTER II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE	16
The Origin and Function of State Level Planning for Higher Education	16
CHAPTER III. ESTABLISHING CRITERIA FOR EVALUATING MASTER PLANNING	33
A Review of Past Evaluations	34
Purposes	43
Processes	47
Outcomes	54
Product	63
CHAPTER IV. METHODOLOGY AND RESULTS OF THE CRITERIA EVALUATION	68
Subjects	69
Task	72
Analysis	73
Response Rate	74

	Page
Purposes	76
Processes	90
Products	130
Outcomes	142
Summary	157
CHAPTER V. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	161
Goal Setting	162
Funding	165
Role and Mission	167
Planning Process	168
Criteria Evaluation	170
Evaluating State Level Plans	173
BIBLIOGRAPHY	175
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	182
APPENDIX A	183
APPENDIX B	188
APPENDIX C	199
APPENDIX D	203

CHAPTER I. INTRODUCTION

Problem Statement and Rationale

By definition and in purpose, a statewide higher education master plan is a guide for the systematic development of academic programs, fiscal patterns, and capital and physical facilities. Master planning is cyclical in that it is constructed for a specified time period (usually 5 to 10 years) the end of which marks the time to repeat the process in developing a new plan. At some point during the planning cycle, there is a need to evaluate the effectiveness of the planning process, product and impact and a need to examine the focus of the master plan.

It appears that most evaluations of statewide higher education plans now occur as a coincidence during the development of a new plan. This means that evaluations are usually confined to the primary planners who decide to do some things differently because of lessons learned from previous planning experience. Such a method gives no assurance of a thorough assessment in which all problems have been considered.

Master planning evaluations have been advised by many planning experts and scholars, but few formal attempts have been made. John Millett encouraged planners to establish steps for evaluating plans because "the effectiveness of new plans will depend upon the evaluation of old plans, upon the quantity and quality of feedback about experience" (Millett, 1976, p. 495). In 1973, the Education Commission of the States (ECS) task force recommended that master plan evaluations occur every five to eight years in order to "validate the process and context of the plan to fit the changing conditions in which it exists" (State-wide Comprehensive Planning for Postsecondary Education, 1973,

p. 11). Robert Berdahl, who encouraged the evaluation of all the functions and operations of coordinating agencies, viewed the evaluation of master planning as "necessary to avoid excessive rigidity." Berdahl explained:

One way to get the losers in a particular planning dispute to accept an adverse recommendation and to acknowledge the fairness of the planning procedure is to assure them that they will, in the not-too-distant future, be given another opportunity to raise the issue and to present additional supporting evidence for their point of view (Berdahl, 1971, p. 78).

Although the idea of master planning evaluation is now very popular, it has not always been viewed so desirable. A few scholars of master planning completely ignore evaluation while others think of it as not being complementary to the planning process. Kent Halstead, for example, criticized master planning evaluation in considering alternative solutions in the planning process:

Creativity is often stymied by premature attention to evaluation criteria, an activity which can prevent identification of valid but unlikely approaches (Halstead, 1974, p. 19).

This can be viewed as a necessary warning to remind planners and evaluators not to establish ironclad rules in their planning and evaluation activities. On the other hand, planning evaluation is as necessary as the act of planning itself. A discussion of two important reasons that evaluation must be considered as a major part of the planning process will now be presented.

First, evaluation is a mechanism used to display accountability. Patrick Callan reminds that education resides in the age of accountability in which "the public and its representatives are now looking

frequently and critically at higher education and demanding evidence of performance and effectiveness (Callan, 1975, p. 15). One of the central purposes for developing coordination and centralization was to bring about accountability in higher education. Although college and university campuses were the initial targets of public concern, accrediting associations have been more recent targets, and it is reasonable to expect that state boards will be called upon more frequently to substantiate their functions. About accountability as related to evaluation, Don Gardner said:

The accountability crisis has had profound effects on the implementation of evaluative studies in higher education. In the not too distant past, decisions affecting all phases of university operations were routinely made on the basis of unchallenged assumptions regarding benefits (the assumed good) or the unquestioned judgment of key administrators. Today those same administrators are often constrained to produce evaluative data to support even the most basic kinds of decisions--to the extent that the cost of collecting the required information is often suspected of rivaling the cost of the course of action ultimately chosen (Gardner, 1977, p. 571).

Second, evaluation is a feedback mechanism used to improve administrative and management effectiveness, and to provide renewal for planners. Callan asserted that "periodic reevaluations and structural overhauls are essential to the health of all organizations; state systems and boards of higher education are not exceptions" (Callan, 1975, p. 16). While the implementation of the master plan goals are dependent upon the leadership of the planner, it is also dependent upon the participation and cooperation of college and university personnel and various government officials. The master plan functions in a social and political

environment that is constantly changing. Therefore, it is necessary periodically to monitor the temperature and examine the pulse of the master planning constituency. Now, observe the types of master planning evaluation activities which have been attempted.

Don Gardner recently defined five types of evaluations that are commonly used in higher education: (1) evaluation as a professional judgment, (2) evaluation as measurement, (3) evaluation as the assessment of congruence between performance and objectives (or standards of performance), (4) decision-oriented evaluation, and (5) goal-free/responsive evaluation. The master planning evaluations up to this time have been of the first type--evaluation as a professional judgment (Gardner, 1977).

The first such evaluation was conducted by Lyman Glenny in 1959. Glenny examined the entire functions and operations of six state centralized agencies. Master planning was one of the functions evaluated. Glenny interviewed several persons in each state (government officials, and higher education officials) and he examined the work produced by each agency. Glenny's method of evaluation was the use of his professional experience and background to draw conclusions and to make recommendations. His major conclusion was that master planning was the most important yet most neglected function of state-wide coordination in higher education (Glenny, 1959, pp. 78-82).

In 1969, Lewis Mayhew published the results of his study of planning in fifty states with more detailed study of planning in the four states

of Colorado, Illinois, Ohio, and New York. Mayhew concluded that master planning was necessary but was in need of improvement and continued development. Mayhew found that planning in all the states concentrated on the same issues of funding, program allocation, and facilities planning but with varying degrees of authority and influence. Mayhew's evaluation consisted of surveys of all fifty states and personal interviews and observation of the four target states. He recommended that the master planning become more authoritative and influential on higher education development.

In 1970, Palola, Lehmann, and Blischke evaluated statewide planning in four states believed to have the longest experience in master planning: California, Florida, Illinois, and New York. The authors used a case study approach, treating each state separately, to judge the impact master planning had on colleges and universities in each state. Like Glenny, they interviewed government officials and higher education officials in all four states and relied on their intuitive judgment. The authors concluded by recommending a model that in their judgment would be an ideal guide for master planning (Palola et al., 1970).

A year later, Robert Berdahl concluded a study of coordinating agencies in thirteen states. Like the previous studies, Berdahl used his professional judgment based on personal assessments in the selected states. He concluded his treatment of planning by indicating that planning had improved vastly since Glenny's evaluation in 1959, and he further recommended the necessary ingredients for good planning (Berdahl, 1971, pp. 73-96). These studies will be discussed further in Chapter III.

Formal evaluations of coordination functions and operations have been conducted in Alabama (Alabama's Challenge, 1979) and South Carolina (The State of South Carolina General Assembly Legislative Audit Council Management and Operational Review of the South Carolina Commission on Higher Education, 1978). The former has a statutory requirement to undergo an evaluation in the final year of each Governor's term, while the latter was evaluated as a result of an order by the South Carolina General Assembly. The primary evaluators of both agencies were experts in higher education and the results again were based upon the experience and professional knowledge of the consulting team.

These studies represent valuable contributions to evaluation of coordination and planning, and each one has contributed to the development of higher education coordination. Many persons believe that the Alabama statute and the South Carolina mandate are only the beginning of the demand for accountability and development of state boards and commissions of higher education. Therefore, the development of evaluation criteria and processes are necessary for continuous progress in master planning at the state level.

The reason current evaluations are not conducted at the state level is due to the lack of consensus on the criteria to use in evaluating the functions of coordination. Berdahl explained:

There are no guiding principles for the coordination of higher education, and decisions about coordinating procedures continue to be handled in an ad hoc manner. In absence of objective criteria, each writer must perforce fall back on his own private assessments (Berdahl, 1971, p. 255).

The development of criteria for evaluation is not being posed as a substitute for outside peer evaluation. In fact, peer evaluations have provided priceless services to higher education in the form of accreditation, which has become acceptable to the general public and to government officials. Through accreditation, peer evaluations have also provided renewal and development for professional educators and academic departments. However, in addition to relying upon professional judgment, accrediting associations have also established standards and criteria to use as a basis for decision-making. The lack of criteria for evaluating master planning prohibits the all important exercise of self-study that is very important to organization development and is germane to accreditation processes.

Attempts to develop criteria for evaluating state board functions have encountered many problems. The most recognizable deterrent has been the inability to gain a consensus on criteria. However, there is continuous effort toward developing such criteria. Berdahl recommended:

Another approach to the problem of complete subjectivity in evaluations is to turn to the relative safety of "pluralistic subjectivity"--that is, to seek to incorporate a variety of subjective viewpoints, knowing that they will probably not agree (Berdahl, 1971, p. 12).

This viewpoint of Berdahl is the heart of this current study--the development and validation of planning criteria for evaluating master planning by determining what should be the purposes, processes, product components, and outcomes of planning and who should participate in the process.

Study Procedures

The initial stage of this study is a review of literature on statewide planning in higher education, its origin, development, and functions (Chapter II).

Next is a continuation of literature review with emphasis on identifying the purposes for statewide planning and establishing criteria for evaluating statewide planning process, product, and outcomes. The criteria identified in the literature will constitute Chapter III.

Then, the criteria are reviewed by a group of 75 legislators, executive branch staff, public higher education lay board and commission members, public college presidents, private college administrators, public college administrators and faculty in the state of Tennessee and some out-of-state experts who are known to be familiar with statewide planning (the names of members of the criteria-group are shown in Appendix A). The analysis and interpretation of these criteria groups constitute Chapter IV. (An illustration is provided in Figure 1.)

Following the advisory-groups' evaluation of the criteria, a questionnaire will be constructed to include the planning criteria divided into four parts: (1) master planning purposes, (2) master planning processes, (3) master planning product, and (4) master planning outcomes. The questionnaire will be designed to be administered to constituents of state plans for their subjective evaluation. The analysis and conclusions of the criteria evaluation constitute Chapter V.

	What are the major purposes of master planning?	What are the planning processes and who should be the partici- pants in each of these processes?	What criteria should be used to evaluate master planning product and outcomes?
	<u>Purposes</u>	<u>Process</u>	<u>Product (Master Plan Document)</u>
Executive Branch			
Legislators			
Lay Board & Commission Members			
Public College Presidents			
Public College Administrators			
Private College Administrators			
College Faculty			
Higher Education Experts			

Figure 1. Structure for developing evaluation criteria

Evaluation Method and Design

Worthen and Sanders have defined evaluation as the determination of the worth of a program or project (Worthen and Sanders, 1973, p. 19).

In the Phi Delta Kappa book on educational evaluation, evaluation is defined as the process of delineating, obtaining, and providing useful information for judging decision alternatives (Stufflebeam, 1971).

Both of these definitions are prevalent in the evaluation of master planning criteria. After the criteria have been taken from the literature the advisors will determine its worth, and also distinguish between what are the most important criteria from what are not.

The first step in evaluation is to determine what the goals of the evaluation are. In evaluating master planning criteria, the primary goal is to develop a method and criteria for evaluating master planning in order to ultimately provide feedback for improving master planning. This goal may be realized in terms of the following objectives:

- Purpose -- To determine the purposes master planning has for planners as well as for the planning constituents..
- Process -- To determine the steps of the planning process and the extent of participation constituent groups should have in each process.
- Product -- To determine the desirable content and style of the plan (document).
- Outcome -- To determine what should happen to government and higher education as a result of master planning.

Now to observe the specific procedures to be followed in carrying out the evaluation of master criteria.

Following the literature review on statewide master planning and the identification of criteria from the literature, the advisory group will assess the planning criteria. Each advisor will be given a list of planning purposes, planning processes, planning product, and outcomes and asked to:

1. Rate the importance of the criteria on a five-point scale for the purposes, products and outcomes.
2. Rank-order the purposes, products, and outcomes.
3. Indicate the extent of participation each of the constituent groups should have in the planning process.
4. Add any additional criteria which should be included.

The planning criteria evaluation instrument and a cover letter to be mailed to each, are illustrated in Appendix B.

After the criteria have been established and synthesized, a questionnaire will be developed for the use by state boards and commissions to evaluate their plans. The questionnaire will be constructed to solicit judgments about a particular state plan as it relates to the criteria. In other words, the constituents of the plan would be asked to judge the master planning process, product, outcomes, and to indicate if the plan served its necessary purposes. For example, if one criterion for master planning process is:

The inclusion of private college administrators as primary leaders in the goal setting process.

An appropriate question may be:

Have private college administrators been sufficiently included as leaders in the planning process of goal setting?

The questions will be specifically structured to reflect the evaluation criteria.

Study Hypothesis and Data Analysis

The data collected from the criteria groups (75 persons) will be analyzed to determine if there is agreement among the planning constituency on criteria for master planning. The major hypothesis then is:

H_{01} : There is no significant difference among the eight criteria groups' ratings of criteria for evaluating master planning purposes, processes, product, and outcomes.

This hypothesis will be tested using analysis of variance (ANOVA) at the .05 level of significance to determine differences among the groups on the five-point scale responses. Then, multiple range tests will be used to determine which groups are significantly different when the ANOVA results are significant. Kendall's W coefficient of concordance will be used to determine if there is a high correlation in the groups rankings of the criteria, and it will indicate the average rank of each group on each criterion ranked. This hypothesis is an attempt to test the theory that there is no consensus on criteria for evaluating master planning.

Purpose of the Study

Evaluation is an integral part of the master planning process, yet the lack of acceptable criteria for evaluation has made it an uncertain and often neglected task. This study will contribute to the evaluation of

master planning by developing both a method for establishing criteria and the actual establishment of criteria for use in evaluations by statewide boards and commissions of higher education. A questionnaire will also be developed for the use of planners who are interested in subjective constituent assessments of long-range plans.

Assumptions

This study is based on the following assumptions:

1. Statewide planning for postsecondary education has become increasingly important and more common in the United States, and the practice will become increasingly common in the future.
2. Statewide planning serves colleges and universities, government officials, and society by setting goals for the orderly development of higher education.
3. The public relies on statewide planning to provide leadership in academic program distribution and economic decision making in higher education.
4. Statewide planning has an impact on individual higher education institutions.
5. The evaluation of statewide planning can result in improved planning processes.
6. The statutory purposes of master planning are constantly expanded to include other functions in higher education. An evaluation of master planning can help to identify new purposes.
7. An evaluation framework and criteria are necessary for the further development of master planning.

Delimiters

Although there are different levels of planning in higher education, this study will focus primarily on state level master planning for higher education. The evaluation of master planning criteria, while it may apply to other states, will be biased toward the state of Tennessee because the large majority of the advisors are Tennesseans. The criteria for evaluation will be developed by a nonrandomly selected advisory group.

Definition of Key Terms

1. Statewide Planning or Master Planning (these two terms will be used interchangeably in this study). The following definition provides a description of its usage in this study.

Statewide planning refers to those activities which:
1) represent a statewide effort to suggest solutions to the existing problems and the future needs for higher education; 2) provide significant guidelines in assigning priorities for the allocation of scarce resources (programs, land, facilities, finances); and
3) have altered or have the potential to alter the form and function of existing institutions and the overall pattern of higher education within a state (Palola et al., 1970).

2. Evaluation. The determination of the worth of a program or project (in this study master planning).
3. Evaluation Criteria. Characteristics and standards upon which judgments are based. For this evaluation the components or characteristics for judging master planning purposes, processes, outcome, and product will be established by a review of literature and by an advisory group.

4. Planning Purposes. The reasons (either statutory or goal oriented) for planning for postsecondary education.
5. Planning Processes. The action of developing, implementing, and evaluating a statewide plan for higher education.
6. Planning Products. The document (the written plan) which is published at the end of the planning process.
7. Planning Outcomes. The occurrences in higher education and government which are caused by master planning.

CHAPTER II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE

The Origin and Function of State Level
Planning for Higher Education

The major development of state-level master plans for higher education has occurred in the United States over the last two decades. Prior to the 1960s, there was very little activity in statewide comprehensive planning for higher education. The action to develop master plans was initiated by state governors and legislators that were concerned about the increase in the demand for college education and the rapid increase in state government funding.

Higher education enrollments grew from approximately two million in 1946 to seven million in 1967 (O'Neil, 1971, p. 8) and up to over eleven million in 1978 (Anderson, 1977). It took over three hundred years from the beginning of Harvard University in 1636 to enroll the first two million students in 1947, but only twenty years (1967) to enroll the next five million. In 1978, just twelve years later, an additional four million had been added (O'Neil, 1971, p. 11).

There has also been a major change in the ratio distribution of students between public and private institutions. In 1947, the public-private ratio was 52:48 (O'Neil, 1971, p. 11). By 1967, the ratio was 70:30 and in 1978 the ratio was 78:22 public over private (Anderson, 1977).

Contributing to the growth in higher education has been the emergence and expansion of the community college. In 1919, community colleges in the United States enrolled 8,100 students. By 1950, the

community college enrollment was 244,000, and 1,331,000 students in 1967. In 1978, there were over 4,000,000 community college students of which 96% were enrolled in public institutions (Anderson, 1977).

Another major growth in higher education has been in the amount of state expenditures. The total state appropriations for public colleges and universities in 1947 was about three hundred fifty million dollars (Biennial Survey of Education in the United States 1946-48, 1948). By 1967, the total state appropriations was four billion five hundred million dollars, and in 1978 state appropriations exceeded fifteen billion dollars (SREB, 1978).

Since the end of World War II, higher education has increased its academic program offerings, has expanded its role in public service and research, and many new college campuses have been constructed. These, coupled with the growth in enrollment and state appropriations, have prompted economy and efficiency minded state governors and legislators to establish centralized lay coordinating and governing boards. One of the intended roles for such boards and their professional staffs is to provide expert appraisals of the need for growth and expansion of higher education (Glenny, 1959, p. 22). Before centralization, state institutions lobbied in competition with one another for as much of the state funds as possible. Institutions rivaled for enrollment, expansion of function, and overall growth (Kelly and McNeely, 1933, p. 199).

American higher education consists of a broad range of institutions from two-year community colleges to four-year and graduate colleges; from colleges of music and art to technical vocational schools; and the list goes on.

The diversity that exists in today's college and university systems evolved during the first three hundred years of American higher education. Although the diversity is recognized as being important, the unplanned and uncontrolled method of individual institutional autonomy in policy-making is no longer acceptable to government officials.

"Issues relating to size, governance, programs, facilities, faculty and staff personnel, student clientele, and budgets are less and less matters left to internal institutional resolution" (Wilson, 1968, p. 134). While serving as president of the American Council of Education, Logan Wilson expressed the urgent need to support state-wide planning and shared governance. In his words:

. . . higher education has become too crucial to the general welfare for its developments to be left entirely to local hands. Many urgent problems cannot be adequately dealt with by individual institutions acting unilaterally, and piecemeal approaches do not yield satisfactory patterns. The development of statewide boards may thus be interpreted as a logical response to the functional need for more centralized policy direction (Wilson, 1968, p. 138).

Often, many centralized governing and coordinating boards have been viewed as a government arm only to oversee funding. However, John Millett noted that "government officials have been not only interested in finances for higher education, but equally or more interested in what these sizable appropriations are providing" (Millett, 1967, p. 3). Millett illustrated the typical questions of legislators:

- What are the state goals and objectives in higher education?
- How well is the state meeting these goals?
- What are the major deficiencies in higher education?
- Where is the state government heading in the field of higher education and where should it be going?

Without coordination and centralization, the responses to these questions from individual institutions in the past have represented the ambitions of each institution, the sum total of which represented the state plan (Millett, 1967, p. 3). The dissatisfaction of state government officials with the absence of means for formulating and implementing a statewide point of view about public higher education has caused the movement for statewide planning.

The development of centralized coordination and planning is the newest form of governance in American higher education where there have been only a few other forms of governance. Emogene Pliner divides higher education governance into four periods (Pliner, 1966).

1. Complete institutional autonomy lasting from colonial days to the late 19th century;
2. Creation of single statewide governing boards beginning in the late 19th century, reaching a peak in the first two decades of this century, currently undergoing a slight revival;
3. Creation of voluntary coordination from the 1940's and 1950's; and
4. Creation of statewide coordinating boards beginning in the 1950's and still continuing.

Each form of governance is indicative of the time period and the stage of development of higher education. During the first period, institutions adopted lay governing boards that protected the institutional autonomy and at the same time represented the public interest. Halstead justified the period of institutional autonomy by the nature of independence by which institutions were created and supported:

Autonomy persisted largely because of the simple nature of the early American colleges. Statewide coordination was of little concern and probably of little need to sparsely scattered institutions that offered only a few programs to a small minority of the population. Geographical distances, coupled with parochial viewpoints and professional jealousies, provided little incentive for common effort. Each college pursued its own goals and generally disregarded its counterparts, despite the fact that an almost identical classical curriculum was offered (Halstead, 1974, p. 6).

In the latter years of the nineteenth century and early years of the twentieth, many new colleges were built and state governments became more directly involved in higher education. Glenny claimed that "colleges were being created to satisfy the ambitions of politicians who proved their merits to their constituents by bringing home a college" (Glenny, 1959, p. 13). This was done without much regard for the cost to or needs of the state. During this time, the institutional lay governing boards that existed for so long were becoming more and more ambitious for the growth of their institution. Glenny described the growth and expansion trend of this time:

With increasing urbanization and expansion of population, the task of higher education became more varied. Universities began extensive research programs in the physical and biological sciences; provided new services for farmers, industries, and other special interest groups; added professional schools in new areas such as social work, public administration, industrial relations, and municipal management; further specialized in agriculture, medicine, and dentistry; and increased course offerings in almost all previously existing fields. Land-grant colleges began to extend their programs into academic professional disciplines which had traditionally been offered only by the state university (Glenny, 1959, p. 13).

This resulted in the development of governing boards (beginning in Florida in 1905 and Iowa in 1909) as a method of establishing

coordination (Halstead, 1974, p. 6). By 1945, fifteen governing boards had been established. Although many other states considered adopting such an arrangement, problems were encountered in gaining political support for abolishing already existing institutional governing boards.

In some states where the individual institutional governing boards continued to exist in the 1940s and 1950s, Pliner's third form (voluntary coordination) of governance began. While the colleges and universities were feeling the pressures from state government for more coordination and accountability, they were interested in maintaining autonomy. Thus, institutions developed informal communication and agreements among themselves to coordinate their functions. However, these voluntary arrangements were short lived because of societal changes which encouraged institutions to grow in similar directions. The technological developments in the Sputnik era and the increase in federal support for scientific research along with the increase in demand for education (veterans and children of the baby boom) are often cited as incentives for colleges and universities to establish certain functions to attract both funds and students. The lack of binding commitment among individual institutions and long-term plans doomed voluntary coordination (Brumbaugh, 1963, p. 9).

Kentucky pioneered the development of statutory coordinating boards in 1934 followed by Oklahoma in 1941 (Halstead, 1974, p. 8). The 1950s and 1960s, however, marked the period in which most of the coordinating boards were established primarily to "remove the burdens of higher education policy-making from state offices and elected

officials" (Palola et al., 1970, p. 60).

Prior to 1945, only fifteen states had governing boards and only two had coordinating boards (Carnegie Commission, 1971). By 1978, every state had either a centralized governing board or a coordinating commission with the statutory responsibility for statewide planning for higher education (State Postsecondary Education Profiles Handbook, 1978). Although some states have both governing and coordinating boards, only one is designated in each state to conduct the long-range planning. Several methods for planning and coordination exist and it is necessary for each state to establish a method that will best serve its needs.

Discussions concerning purpose, type and consequence of coordination have been persistent over the last two decades. "College and university administrators, professional educators, and state officials have differed greatly about the educational value and practical effectiveness of coordination efforts" (Palola et al., 1970, p. 55). M. M. Chambers, like many early opponents of centralization, believed that competition among state higher education institutions provided incentives for creativity, experimentation and initiative that would be destroyed by centralization (Chambers, 1960, p. 46). Chambers spoke the words of many when he said:

Fortunate are those principal universities (i.e., Michigan, Minnesota, and California) whose state constitutions give the university governing boards full control, and protect them from outside meddling in their internal affairs by non-educational administrative functionaries (Chambers, 1960, p. 45).

These educators thought that statutory coordination and planning would standardize their operations and produce educational mediocrity. They

believed that the diversity achieved by institutional independence outweighed the benefits to be received by coordination. There were many who also believed that government intervention into the affairs of academia would cause destruction of academic freedom. Many educators support the concept that planning and governance should be left to faculty and administrators on the college campus (Brown, 1975, p. 33).

The rebuttal to the above arguments came from other educators, government, and tax payers who were concerned about the uncontrolled spread of new educational institutions, the proliferation of programs and the increase in averaging of funds that were not growing rapidly. To these educators, coordination was a means for developing higher education while at the same time preserving institutional autonomy (Palola et al., 1970, p. 56).

Several principles have been found which explain the development of coordination and planning for higher education in recent years. Three of these will now be discussed. First, to promote diversity. Institutional competition for funds and students became greater, smaller state colleges began to model after larger more prestigious institutions as a means of assuring existence and bettering their position among other state institutions. Two-year colleges wanted to become four-year colleges, four-year colleges began changing to universities with graduate and research ambitions (Statewide Comprehensive Planning for Postsecondary Education, 1973, p. 34). Diversity began to diminish under the pressures of competition. Coordination and planning became necessary to establish a design by which to

maintain and enhance the diversity in types of institutions as well as geographical location (Glenny, 1959, p. 207).

Second, coordination would bring about equity in the treatment of the functions of each institution in a system. The "principal institutions" recognized by Chambers had advantages that were becoming more the envy of other state institutions in funding and instructional programs. Coordination is necessary to assure representation of the unique problems of small as well as large institutions in a state system. The remedies may be found through special accommodations to smaller colleges through the funding process. In setting priorities, coordinating and governing boards must take care not to overlook special concerns of small institutions that appear minute to the state system but very important to the institutions.

Third, concerning academic freedom and autonomy, Robert Berdahl argued that while the two are somewhat related, they should be viewed separately. Berdahl agrees that institutional autonomy no longer exists as in the early years of higher education, rather higher education now has shared governance which also includes government and citizens (tax-payers) (Berdahl, 1971, p. 7). Higher education is best served by an office that specifically represents it rather than being incorporated into the state budget office or some other agency that does not represent higher education as a special interest. However, he insisted that academic freedom still exists. Berdahl identified institutional autonomy as the power to start new programs and colleges without outside interference, and academic freedom as the liberty to research and

teach and learn (Berdahl, 1971, p. 7). Coordinating boards serve to protect the academic freedom while representing the public interest in allocating resources.

Then the question often arises; should a state have a centralized governing board or a centralized coordinating board with individual institutional governing boards? The most appropriate form of coordination and governance for any state depends upon the tasks to be performed. Generally, it is widely proclaimed that for states with eight or fewer institutions a governing board is encouraged because of the simplicity in establishing unity among college presidents in a small system. For larger systems, a combination of governing boards and a coordinating board should be considered (Glenny, 1959, p. 225).

Both governing and coordinating boards are currently involved in the task of master planning in the United States. According to the 1978 ECS publication, State Postsecondary Education Profiles Handbook, twenty-three states had coordinating boards with the responsibility for planning, twenty-four states had centralized governing boards responsible for master planning, and in three states planning was the responsibility of the institutional governing board (State Postsecondary Education Profiles Handbook, 1978). The same publication indicated that twenty-six states had completed at least one master plan before 1978, of which fifteen were produced by coordinating boards and ten were the product of a governing board (Table 1). Several states are currently in the process of preparing their first plan. Although a detailed description of these two types of organizations is not necessary for this study, a brief

Table 1. State responsibilities for long-range planning^a

State	Statutory provision for long-range planning	Long range planning is conducted by institutional governing bd.	Long range planning is conducted by state level governing bd.	Planning is conducted by coordinating board	Has developed a master plan by 1978
Alabama	X			X	X
Alaska	X			X	
Arizona	X	X	X		
Arkansas	X			X	X
California	X			X	X
Colorado	X			X	X
Connecticut	X			X	X
Delaware	X			X	
Florida	X		X		
Georgia	X		X		
Hawaii	X		X		
Idaho	X		X		
Illinois	X		X		X
Indiana	X			X	X
Iowa	X		X		
Kansas	X		X		
Kentucky	X			X	X
Louisiana	X		X		X
Maine	X		X		
Maryland	X		X		X
Massachusetts	X			X	
Michigan	X		X		
Minnesota	X			X	X
Mississippi	X	X			
Missouri	X			X	
Montana	X		X		
Nebraska	X			X	
Nevada	X		X		

^aState Postsecondary Education Profiles Handbook, 1978 Edition.

Table 1 (Continued)

State	Statutory provision for long-range planning	Long range planning is conducted by institutional governing bd.	Long range planning is conducted by state level governing bd.	Planning is conducted by coordinating board	Has developed a master plan by 1978
New Hampshire	X			X	X
New Jersey	X			X	X
New Mexico	X			X	
New York	X		X		X
North Carolina	X		X		X
North Dakota	X		X		
Ohio	X		X		X
Oklahoma	X			X	X
Oregon	X			X	
Pennsylvania	X		X		X
Rhode Island	X				X
South Carolina	X		X		X
South Dakota	X		X		X
Tennessee	X			X	X
Texas	X			X	X
Utah	X		X		X
Vermont					
Virginia	X			X	X
Washington	X			X	X
West Virginia	X		X		
Wisconsin	X		X		
Wyoming	X			X	

description of their strengths and limitations as related to master planning and coordination is appropriate.

The central governing board is the oldest form of centralization. It generally has the legal authority to establish policies and compel the institutions under its jurisdiction to enforce those policies. Such authority should assure the implementation of planning and coordination (Glenny, 1959, p. 132). Coordinating boards on the other hand, have been easy to develop by legislative stature without abolishing existing governing boards. Coordinating boards concentrate more on advising and planning and development than on institutional policy-making. Coordinating agencies have been credited for balance representation of both the public interest and the interest of higher education (Glenny and Hurst, 1971, p. 23).

In the early years of the twentieth century, the trend was toward establishing single governing boards as a means of controlling and managing higher education. In many states where there are single governing boards, there have been attempts to establish, in addition, a planning agency because of the lack of emphasis governing boards give to planning. But the governing boards through their political power have disallowed such development (Glenny et al., 1971, p. 23). Georgia, Florida, Iowa, and Wisconsin are good examples of states with long existing single boards (Carnegie Council on Higher Education, 1971).

While some states continue to establish single governing boards, the most pronounced recent trend is toward coordinating lay boards with

professional staffs to conduct planning. Tennessee's 85th Congress of 1967 is a good example of state governments across the country, establishing planning and coordinating boards. This Congress created the Tennessee Higher Education Commission with one of its statutory responsibilities:

. . . to develop a master plan for the future development of public higher education in Tennessee, taking into account the programs and functions of each of its existing institutions to the governing boards of the various institutions and to the Governor and the General Assembly for the implementation of the plan (Public Acts of Tennessee, 1967, p. 448).

The federal government has also supported the development of coordinating and planning commissions. In 1973, the U.S. Congress passed a bill which provides for federal grants to states who establish or designate a centralized agency to conduct long-range planning for higher education. The Section 1202 of Title X of the U.S. Higher Education Act includes the following provision for state long-range planning:

The Commissioner (HEW) is authorized to make grants to any State Commission established pursuant to section 1202 to enable it to expand the scope of studies required through the comprehensive inventories of, and studies with respect to, all public and private postsecondary educational resources in the state including planning necessary for such resources to be better coordinated, improved, expanded or altered so that all persons within the state who desire, and who can benefit from, post-secondary education may do so (Federal Register, 1972, p. 325).

Forty-seven states now receive federal funds for long-range planning, and have properly designated an agency in accordance with the legislation. These agencies are known as 1202 Commissions (State Postsecondary Education Profiles Handbook, 1978).

Most scholars of higher education agree that state government actions creating coordinating agencies is the appropriate way to centralize the planning function. A 1971 ECS task force consisting of notable authorities in higher education and state government met specifically to discuss the subject of long-range planning (Statewide Comprehensive Planning for Postsecondary Education, 1973). Two recommendations were:

1. That each state recognize the overriding importance of comprehensive statewide planning for postsecondary education by making continuous and identifiable financial commitment to it, allocating such funds to the agency legally responsible for coordinating postsecondary education. If no agency exists, one should be created.
2. That this agency consider comprehensive planning its primary function, attempting insofar as possible to keep a separate focus on planning as distinct from its operating activities.

The 1971 Carnegie Council stated that long-range planning is one function that needed to be performed by a state advisory (nonregulatory) coordinating agency because of administrative operation of institutional affairs (Carnegie Council on Higher Education, 1971, p. 35). Glenny and Hurst reinforced this point citing research which showed that single boards were no more effective in coordination, conserving resources, and controlling programs, than coordinating boards. They also stated that "single governing boards have proven to be less capable of developing and effecting long-range master planning policies than coordinating boards" (Glenny et al., 1971, p. 23). These findings can be attributed to: 1) the low priority governing boards have given to planning and, 2) the statutory responsibility of coordinating boards to master plan.

Planning is considered to be the most important function of a coordinating agency, yet as research by Glenny indicates, it is the most neglected (Glenny, 1959, p. 78). Fred Harclerod asserted that:

Comprehensive statewide planning is the first and basic necessity for effective operation of any statewide board or commission for postsecondary education. Of all the tasks assigned to such a statewide agency, the most important has to be the development of long-term master plans for program development and capital expenditure (Harclerod, 1973, p. 4).

In their book, Coordinating Higher Education for the 70's, Glenny, Berdahl, Palola and Paltridge wrote:

Planning is the most important function of coordination, for it provides the operational base and guidelines for which all other functions constitute implementing instruments (Glenny et al., 1971, p. 25).

The authors refer to master planning, like Fred Harclerod, as being a prerequisite to successfully performing such functions as academic program review and funding recommendations.

Other proponents of master planning think it is the key to effective coordination. Planning is endorsed as the means for anticipating and confronting problems caused by changes in student enrollment and economic conditions (Statewide Comprehensive Planning for Postsecondary Education, 1973, p. 34).

In this chapter it has been demonstrated that the growth and complexity of higher education and the need for public accountability have been the major causes for statewide higher education planning. Although there have been disagreements among higher education authorities about the need and/or desire for state-level planning, it appears that it will continue and even expand its focus. Now that the background

for master planning has been established, Chapter III will focus on an examination of effective planning criteria.

CHAPTER III. ESTABLISHING CRITERIA FOR EVALUATING MASTER PLANNING

In recent years, evaluation has been receiving greater attention in higher education. However, statewide planning and coordination is one area in which evaluation is still in the developmental stages. The philosophies of higher education scholars and the views of state planners represent diverse theories and ideas on the subject of master planning. The only point of overall agreement is that some provision should be made for planning the future of state systems of higher education. Outside of that, no consensus has been reached on the standards required for effective planning or the practical utility a master plan should have.

This chapter will focus on developing criteria for evaluating statewide master planning. The criteria is developed in a two-step process: First (in this chapter), by reviewing the theories and experiences of scholars and planners, and second, by having seventy-five expert advisors review and make recommendations regarding master planning. The advisory group consists of the Governor's staff, state legislators, lay higher education governing board and commission members, college presidents and administrators, campus faculty in Tennessee, and higher education experts from outside the state of Tennessee. (Advisory Group Identified in Appendix A.)

The selection of criteria serves as a very important phase of this study, as it will be the basis for which judgments will be made concerning the effectiveness of master planning in Tennessee. The criteria

focuses on evaluating four features of master planning: 1) The purpose served by the Tennessee master plan; 2) the strengths and limitations of the master planning process, 3) the impact of Tennessee master planning on higher education and government, and 4) the strengths and limitations of the product (the master plan document).

Two approaches will be used to obtain the criteria from the literature. First, a review of reports on the scope and objectives of past evaluations of statewide boards in which planning was included, and second, a review of the principal guidelines for what scholars and practitioners believe constitutes good planning for higher education. Then, there will be a development of a general set of criteria that the advisory group will react to and suggest additional standards for the actual evaluation. A chronological discussion of three evaluations of higher education governance and master planning that occurred between the years of 1959 to 1972 will be reviewed. These evaluations were conducted by Lyman Glenny (1959), Lewis Mayhew (1969), and Ernest Palola, et al. (1970).

A Review of Past Evaluations

In his evaluation of centralized governance and coordination, Lyman Glenny devoted some attention to the evaluation of master planning. Glenny described planning as "a method of approaching problems; it is preparing for action to follow" (Glenny, 1959, p. 62). Glenny evaluated twelve state agencies' functions and their planning activities. He

found that planning consisted of two steps:

First, to conduct research, which for a system of higher education, requires the systematic collection and analysis of all available information, including the analysis of past trends. Second, the formulation of immediate and long-range objectives and the methods by which to achieve them (Glenny, 1959, p. 62).

As a precondition to sound planning, Glenny recognized a need for planners to have a mastery of facts about their higher education system and knowledge about their state institutions, college-age youth, the economy, the social forces, and the programs needed for future promotion of educational opportunity. This often requires that special studies pertaining to these issues and others be conducted prior to the production of a master planning document. Glenny found that important information gathering was done insufficiently at the time of his 1959 study (Glenny, 1959, p. 74). Glenny noticed that

. . . agencies had acquired data on class size, student faculty ratios, faculty quality, faculty loads or even faculty salaries. All, though, have attempted to estimate student enrollment for some years ahead. Here a chief weakness is that in several states the institutions predict for themselves. If a system is to be maintained, no college can adequately do this task for itself. A wide range of assumptions and variations in computations of projected enrollments leads to widely disparate results and therefore to a difference in the plans based on these data (Glenny, 1959, p. 74).

Glenny's statement supports the idea that planning is both cyclical and continuous. Although major master planning documents are produced in cycles of five to ten years, the preparation for the major product requires continuous research to obtain information relative to planning issues. Glenny concluded his evaluation of planning, noting that planning

up to that point by central governing and coordinating agencies was inadequate. Much of the problem he found was caused by the "lack of significant program studies, need studies, utilization data and other such objective studies" (Glenny, 1959, p. 78). Glenny observed that some studies were initiated by the central agency but many surveys and studies were the result of legislative action brought about because of poor planning by central agencies, the ineffectiveness of some operating procedures, and the unwillingness of the agency to study and propose solutions to more controversial problems (Glenny, 1959, p. 78). Another reason for poor planning was that many agencies were fearful of being accused of interference into the operation of institutions or so unsure of their own functions that they did not even attempt the necessary collection of data.

Glenny discovered that much of the poor planning was due to their use of the "negotiated method" in which each institution presents information and reports representing its own interests, which is followed by compromise and negotiation between the central agency and the institution. This procedure appeared to serve the institution and the fulfillment of the agency's responsibility to plan, but did not serve in the best interest of the general public. Glenny asserted that planning for higher education by the central agency should provide objectivity and leadership which is not found in the negotiated method of planning.

Plans supported by an array of relevant data and directed toward sound objectives become more acceptable to those

with whom coordinating agencies deal than all the arguing, cajoling, and public relations techniques. Nothing wins like foresight in planning, assurance of position, and vigorous pursuit of goals. Indifference and apathy, too often excused as doing things the democratic way, preclude the leadership that higher education so desperately needs (Glenny, 1959, p. 79).

Another problem in master planning perceived by Glenny concerned the impact of planning on the relationship between public and private higher education institutions. Private colleges and universities have often opposed the planning for public development of higher education as it may overshadow their own operation and growth. Glenny noted that "public and private institutions have avoided open conflict but have never made a collective attempt to face the educational problems in their state (Glenny, 1959, p. 80). The challenge for planners is to plan in the best interest of the state considering all available resources and assessing the need for additional resources. Thus, Glenny's primary concerns for statewide planning was that leadership be provided and that master planning be based on factual identification of problems and established methods of resolving those problems.

In 1969, Lewis Mayhew reported the findings of his survey analysis of each states' planning activities and more detailed analyses of four states--Colorado, Illinois, Ohio, and New York. Mayhew viewed long-range planning as a necessity, stating that "once the premise is established that higher education is complex and costly, it is inevitable that some form of coordination is essential (Mayhew, 1969, p. 22). He believed that master planning was typically initiated as a

result of "political desires for greater efficiency in higher education, social desires to extend its opportunities and economic desires to produce the skilled workers needed for technological society" (Mayhew, 1969, p. 102).

Mayhew recognized that there were desirable differences in coordination and planning in each of the fifty states but at least four features were common among all: concentration on budget, review of new programs, setting standards for building and space utilization, and obtaining data and conducting continuous studies of higher education within the state (Mayhew, 1969, p. 24). Other subjects Mayhew found to be common in master planning were as follows (Mayhew, 1969, p. 89).

All have provisions for differentiation of function according to institutional type.

All have provisions for some form of coordination.

All assume that students of differing academic abilities will attend different sorts of institutions.

All advocate providing access of higher education to citizens within driving distance.

All plans indicate the status of change in tuition and taxes.

All plans make projections about enrollment (how many will be attending college).

All plans discuss decisions or need for decisions on program distribution and standards.

All plans indicate need for establishing admission requirements.

All plans discuss the specific need for state support in financing higher education.

All plans make program assumptions regarding labor market demands for graduates.

Mayhew also recognized several problems with master planning much of which was related to creativity and leadership. One such problem was that "master plans did not seriously mention the possibility that college attendance may not be the only means of meeting the needs of college age youth" (Mayhew, 1969, p. 82). Another problem was that the duties and responsibilities of faculties are often not specified. Mayhew also believed that there was a need for greater specificity about curriculum to be included in master planning (Mayhew, 1969, p. 83).

Mayhew noted a weakness in the articulation between state-level master planning and institutional master planning. He believed that statewide master planning should have an impact on institutional planning and both should have similar goals. However, he found that although the intent of most master planning was to encourage coordination between and among systems, as well as among individual institutions, statewide plans have little influence on institutional plans (Mayhew, 1969). He made a clear distinction between statewide master plans and institutional plans which indicates that they could be coherent and directly related if goals were agreed upon.

In effect, institutional master plans are operational statements on which institutions propose to take action while regental (sic) plans reflect broad policy statements (Mayhew, 1969).

Thus, in summary, Lewis Mayhew saw the need for much improvement in master planning by state systems of higher education. Mayhew believed that master plans tended to "codify popular attitudes rather than seeking to transcend them." Mayhew also saw the need for planners to

improve writing with assertive leadership and creativity (Mayhew, 1969, p. 103).

It is claimed that master plans are an effective device for communicating with the society at large about the nature and needs of education. If this is so, the public must have an amazing tolerance for arid prose, overgeneralization and indigestible statistics. Few master plans are written in a way that could excite the public, or for that matter, the professionals in education and government. Perhaps this is because they all partake of the quality of government documents which should probably retain a certain neutrality of tone. But if education is as crucial as the plans claim it to be, one can hope for a little more drama.

The 1970 study of higher education governance and planning by Palola, Lehmann, and Blischke was centered around the activities in four states: California, Florida, Illinois, and New York. The study was aimed at determining the types of statewide planning in each of the states and to analyze the impact of statewide planning on the operation and development of colleges and universities within each of the states (Palola, 1970, pp. vii-3). The authors point out three types of critical decisions of long-range planning that impact upon the autonomy of public higher education institutions. They are: 1) the setting of goals and the development of programs to meet those goals; 2) the educational integration of the system; and 3) the allocation of resources in the network (Palola et al., 1970, pp. vii-3). These three critical decision types are important to consider as criteria for evaluation in the current study, therefore each one will now be discussed.

The setting of goals and the development of programs to meet those goals: Palola explains that "to set goals is to make certain value commitments which define future relationships between the organization

(higher education institution) and its environment. Once defined, goals can provide guidelines for making day-to-day decisions which ultimately determine the survival and/or success of the organization." (The distinction is made between "official goals" as those written for public consumption, and "operative goals" as those which show the actual operating policies of the organization.) The authors note that planning documents frequently serve a variety of audiences which hold different, and sometimes conflicting views of college campuses. Therefore, abstract and bland statements are often written to avert possible tension and conflict and to allow the institution maximum maneuverability (Palola et al., 1970, p. 14). The authors go on to point out the four major subjects with which goals may be concerned.

1. Social/cultural goals - The concern for contemporary social problems, the democratization of educational opportunities, and the promotion of cultural interests and activities and standards for excellence in education.
2. Economic goals - The supply and demand of economic resources, trained manpower and the development of trained resources.
3. Political goals - The form, function, and process of government, and an appreciation of and concern about governmental affairs by an informed citizenry.
4. Humanistic/psychological goals - The recognition and building of educational programs which cater to the individual needs of students and encourage students to search for values and strive for self-awareness.

Like Mayhew, Palola et al. realized a need for segmental goals which illustrate the types of institutions necessary to fulfill the statewide goals, and institutional goals which define each institution's role within each segment. The challenge for statewide planning is to first,

clearly establish the segments needed in a state system, and then to make sure that each institution has a distinct role and mission.

Goals should be perceived as clearly defined and tangible, and should be widely acceptable resulting from broad participation in formulating and defining goals (Palola et al., 1970).

The educational integration of the system: Palola et al. refer to the integration of academic programs within higher education systems. In the study of planning in the four selected states, they examined the cooperation between colleges and universities in sharing human and material resources. State planning can impact on the development of systems by encouraging sharing of faculty, facilitation of programs at community colleges that are easily transferable to four-year institutions, and the limiting of program duplication. These serve as criteria for assessing impact of planning (Palola et al., 1970). Plans should provide for both differentiation and integration resulting from coordination and cooperation. Master plans should emphasize the division and integration of function between institutions within each segment.

Institutions need not be trapped in the familiar pattern of offering such a wide range of programs that resources become spread dangerously thin. Participating institutions can combine their limited resources to create strong and well-supported programs. Finally, through the exchange of information and ideas, interinstitutional cooperation can foster self-examination about the effectiveness of various existing programs and the possibility of developing new ones (Palola et al., 1970, p. 20).

This final critical decision follows.

Resource allocation: A very important function of statewide long-range planning is to determine how to allocate financial, and programmatic resources. Palola et al. discuss the coordination of the critical decision of resource allocation with goal setting and integration:

Once a set of goals, purposes, and functions has been defined by and for the various segments and institutions within the statewide network, important decisions must be made about the distribution of resources for the accomplishment of these goals. To put it a slightly different way, the allocation of resources is the process by which means (i.e. students, faculty, administrators, facilities, equipment, etc.) are deployed in order to achieve organizational ends (Palola et al., 1970, p. 21).

A master plan should indicate long-term expectation for fiscal and programmatic distribution.

Palola points to another criterion for evaluating impact--educational autonomy. Master planning should include the clear distinctions of the authority distribution of various aspects of higher education. The plan should "define the dimensions of educational autonomy at the institutional level, and also should identify conditions in the larger organizational environment that are significantly related to different levels of educational autonomy (Palola et al., 1970, p. 27). This is especially important with the development of centralization and shared governance, as institutions realize less autonomy at the campus level on operational matters. It needs to be clear who has final authority on such matters as institutional mission and role; programs and curricula; methods and forms of instruction; recruitment, selection, promotion, and

general welfare of the faculty, including academic freedom; admissions criteria, academic standards, and student affairs; and finances and facilities (Palola et al., 1970, p. 28).

Attention will now be devoted to the views of other scholars and practitioners on the subject of planning purposes, processes, outcomes, and product. Although these will not include evaluations of state planning as those previously discussed, they will be used in establishing criteria for evaluation. It begins with a discussion of established purposes for master planning and proceeds with process, outcomes, and product.

Purposes

Purposes for statewide long-range planning have commonly been given as statutory provisions for coordinating and governing boards as they are established. These statutory purposes for planning are most often broad and general statements designed to grant authority. For example, the portion of the 1971 North Carolina statute which pertains to planning reads:

In order to foster the development of a well-planned and coordinated system of higher education, to improve the quality of education, to extend its benefits and to encourage an economical use of the state's resources (North Carolina Government Statute, Sec. 116, 1971).

Or the Tennessee statute which reads:

To develop a master plan for the future development of public higher education in Tennessee, taking into account the programs and functions of each of the existing institutions, and to make recommendations to the governing boards of the various institutions and to the General Assembly

for the implementation of the plan (Tennessee Code Annotated. 49-4203, Sec. 1, 1967).

And more specific is the California statute:

The California Postsecondary Education Commission shall prepare a five-year state plan for postsecondary education which shall consider at least the following factors: (a) the need for and location of new facilities; (b) the range and kinds of programs appropriate to each institution or system; (c) the budgetary priorities of the institutions and systems of postsecondary education; (d) the impact of various types and levels of student charges on students and on postsecondary educational programs and institutions; (e) appropriate levels of state-funded student financial aid; (f) access and admissions of students to postsecondary education; (g) the educational programs and resources of private postsecondary institutions; and (h) the provisions of this division differentiating the functions of the public systems of higher education (California Education Code, Sec. 22712, 1961).

It is evident in these definitions that state master planning purposes vary in specificity and in scope. Of course, much differentiation of the planning functions results from the differences in the powers and function of coordinating and governing boards in each state. The primary concerns of planning purposes in this evaluation are: (1) to determine if master planning is serving the statutory purpose which it was given, and (2) to determine if the State of Tennessee is receiving the optimum benefit from master planning under the statutory purposes. The second statement requires a comparison of the Tennessee master planning definition with those of other states and the purposes given in the literature. The literature of master planning purposes as written by scholars and practitioners will now be explored.

Master planning is often explained as being only a response to increasing enrollment in the 1960s and most of the 1970s. This

explanation is not so critical until we realize that enrollments in the late seventies were not increasing as rapidly as the sixties and in fact will decline in the eighties; yet master planning is not ceasing but rather gaining momentum. States that have been involved in long-range planning for many years are concentrating on refining their planning techniques and states that have no history of master planning are beginning to get involved. Some explain the continuity of the master planning movement by the declining enrollments projected for the next decade, suggesting that determining funding mechanisms, facilities utilization, and program distribution and discontinuance, may be more sensitive in the times of declining growth as they were in times of expansion.

Although few will doubt that master planning was given impetus by the problems of increasing enrollments, there must be some realization that master planning serves purposes that exceed the provisions of most state statutes. Master planning involves qualitative as well as quantitative issues.

Louis Bender describes the early purposes of master planning:

During any rapid growth period, whenever demand outstrips supply, institutions tend to be satisfied with straight line projections of input requirements while giving little consideration to the complexities and implications of output requirements. The major challenge of planning (and the major indices of success in the eyes of legislators as well as planners) is then quantification in numbers with particular focus upon the accuracy of numbers prediction. Planners of the 1960's, both at the institutional and the state level, took great pride in their predictions being within one or two percent of actual numbers whether in terms of students or dollar requirements (Bender, 1974, p. 63).

Bender realized that many mistakes were made in the numbers planning that resulted not only, in some cases, inaccurate projections but also in compromise in the quality of instruction.

In addition to planning for growth and expansion, early planning was viewed as a mechanism for achieving coordination among institutions. This was expressed in the recommendation by the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education.

Master plans should give attention to (1) access to post-secondary education; (2) functions or roles of institutions; (3) provision for orderly growth (by type of institution, institutional size, new institutions, etc.); and (4) provision for articulation among the various elements of post-secondary education (Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, 1971).

While Chancellor of the State University of New York, Ernest Boyer viewed master planning as a mechanism to encourage change and innovation to meet the changing needs and conditions of our society. Boyer wrote of the necessity of curriculum changes to suit the demands and requirements of changing student clienteles (Boyer, 1973, p. 35). In this context, master planning is seen as a change instrument. This involves making provisions for nontraditional students as well as external course offerings.

More recently, master planning has been closely linked to academic development. Declining enrollments require long-range planners to concentrate on new formulas for funding, the scaling down of physical plant utilization and development, and the assurance of academic quality.

In a 1979 address to State Higher Education Executive Officers, John Millett began his talk by pointing out the changing focus of state level planning.

State boards of higher education and statewide governing boards are going to hear a great deal about quality in the next several years. We have talked about quality in public higher education in the past, but I believe it is fair to say that at the level of state government our necessary preoccupation in the 1960's and 1970's was with quantity rather than quality. Now that the problem of quantity is one of too little rather than too much, state governments will be told that it is time to give renewed attention to the quality of our higher educational endeavors (Millett, 1979a, p. 1),

Millett spoke of the higher education community setting standards for improved quality in instruction, quality in research, quality in creative expression, quality in public service, quality in educational justice, and in constructive criticism (Millett, 1979a).

Processes

The master planning process is a continuous cycle. The process is the most important part of master planning, because it includes development of the plan, implementation of the planning recommendations and the evaluation for improved future planning. The master planning process was described by Glenney et al. (1971, p. 30) as:

. . . the identification of key problems, the accumulation of accurate data about those problems, the analysis of their inter-relationships, the extrapolation of future alternatives that might emerge out of present conditions, the assessment of probable consequences of introducing new variables, the choice of the most desirable modified alternatives as the basic goals, a sequential plan for implementing the desired goals, and a feedback system for periodic reevaluating the goals selected and the means used to achieve them.

Kent Halstead (1974) discussed a planning strategy consisting of six steps: (1) determining goals, (2) identifying problems, (3) diagnosing problems, (4) establishing premises, (5) searching for possible solutions, and (6) selecting a solution (p. 17). Robert

Kratz listed nine important steps in the planning process: (1) pre-planning, (2) establishing goals and objectives, (3) establishing assumptions and premises, (4) organizing for planning, (5) obtaining data, (6) evaluating data, (7) selecting a course of action, (8) control, (9) approval and implementation (Kratz, 1971).

In 1971, the ECS task force on long-range planning stated that the master planning process consisted of strategic and tactical planning, both of which were essential. Strategic planning was described as that portion which "provides a framework within which tactical planning is developed and implemented". Strategic planning is the identification of "fundamental assumptions a state and its citizens have about postsecondary education and it should establish the frame of reference, fundamental premises, value judgments, philosophies, and purposes for which tactical planning develops means of achievement."

Tactical planning was described by the task force as that which took place within the parameters of strategic planning. It includes short and intermediate-range goals, developmental time-frames, and step-by-step means of achieving strategic goals (Statewide Comprehensive Planning for Postsecondary Education, 1973, p. 9). Tactical planning is usually concerned with finding methods to confront or resolve problems, such as: establishing articulation between vocational-technical institutes and community colleges, reducing some duplicative academic programs, construction of new campuses, extension of programs and courses, budget formulas student aid, and research and public service functions. An evaluation of master planning processes must assess the degree of fulfillment of

the strategic and tactical functions.

Palola et al. recognized comprehensive state-wide master planning processes in terms of six dimensions--scope, priority, research, participants, implementation, and time span. The three authors defined these six categories as follows: (Palola et al., 1970, p. 10).

SCOPE--All major policies about statewide functions and activities for higher education are examined. In general, this includes education, facilities, and fiscal policies. More specifically, in the education category, this involves the definition of goals in regard to the socio-cultural, economic, political, and psychological or humanistic aims of higher education. Also, the numbers and types of different institutions are established to meet the various educational goals identified.

PRIORITY--The statewide goals for higher education receive first priority, followed by decisions about facilities and finances. In other words, issues about public and educational policy are the first order of business.

RESEARCH--A continuous process of research occurs which goes beyond the routine studies normally conducted by institutional research offices and focuses on the key issues facing the state (e.g., manpower needs, economic resources, geographic distribution of campuses, lifelong learning, individualized education, new technologies, and institutional size).

PARTICIPANTS--Students, faculty, administrators, statewide coordinators, legislators, and governors all share responsibility for planning in higher education. Each group has a unique perspective, type of expertise, and particular contribution to make toward statewide planning. A variety of roles--initiator, reviewer, recommender, decision-maker, implementor, and evaluator--are played by the above groups at different times in the planning process.

IMPLEMENTATION--A timetable and general strategy are specified by which proposals will be put into action. Such a strategy considers vested interests within various parts of the statewide network.

TIME-SPAN--Statewide plans contain proposals for three time periods: short-range (1-4 years); intermediate-range (5-25 years), and extended long-range (26-50 years); Planning which concentrates solely on one- or two-year periods overlooks important long-term questions. Similarly, planning focused on intermediate or extended long-range goals ignores more immediate and pressing needs.

These six dimensions can be used as criteria in evaluating master planning processes.

One aspect of the planning process which has received broad support concerns the level and degree of participation in the planning process. "Participants" was mentioned above as one of Palola et al. six dimensions of comprehensive planning (Palola et al., 1970, p. 10). Following his evaluation, Lyman Glenny supported broad participation in the planning process.

The amount and quality of participation by presidents and faculty in planning and policy making largely determines the degree of unity and support from within the system for effecting policies (Glenny, 1959).

Several years ago, Cameron Fincher viewed the planning process as requiring leadership from a staff of fully committed planners, but recognized the necessity of including a diversity of interests in order for the plan to represent the broad interests of society. Fincher established the following statement as one of his guiding principles of planning:

It is well to recognize, that higher education is unlikely to benefit from "a planning elite." The goals and objectives of higher education must be determined in "an open market-place of ideas" and not be dictated by a clique of specialists (Fincher, 1966, p. 12).

Two years later, however, James Theodore called for "more sophisticated,

less folksy planning that is refined and technologically oriented" (Theodore, 1968, p. 28).

Glenny and Hurst (1971) recall the early years of master planning in which the central staffs of state agencies, with the help of a few consultants, generated the ideas, attitudes, goals, and the means for achieving the goals. The authors note the change in the planning process with emphasis on its increased participation.

More and more, the central staffs provide the data bases and information systems which become the factual elements used by a broad range of technical task forces and advisory committees charged with initiating recommendations to solve the diverse higher education problems. Such groups are composed of experts on the particular subject under consideration--faculty and administrators from public and non-public colleges and universities and leading citizens and special-interest representatives.

The central staff composing the final recommendations to go before the statewide board may then draw heavily on the planning documents prepared by these groups. Additionally, public hearings are often held on a preliminary draft of a plan before the board takes final action. As a result, both new ideas and broad consensus for the plan are developed, allowing the legislature and governor to avoid much of the acrimonious contention which arises out of major changes in goals and means for their fulfillment. The plan becomes more acceptable to these political leaders and eases passage of those elements requiring legislation or new funding (Glenny and Hurst, 1971, p. 29).

Much of the reason for the early lack of participation mentioned by Glenny and Hurst was due to the resistance which statutory coordination and centralization received in the 1940s, 1950s, and early 1960s. The number of such agencies nationwide and the expanded powers over programs and budgets brought about a growing realization that the centralization of higher education was here to stay; therefore,

participation is one means for accomplishing institutional and state-wide goals. Participation also should bring about the cooperative spirit hoped for but never accomplished by voluntary coordination. Robert Berdahl pointed out the advantage of a planning process that consisted of widespread participation by faculty and administrators:

. . . it promotes confrontation and dialogue between persons who would not otherwise hear each other's point of view and thus often leads to mutual enlightenment and catharsis (Berdahl, 1971, p. 74).

This is not to suggest that state planning is not in need of identified leadership, but rather as Beeby stated, "The essence of a good administrator at the top level is that he rarely acts alone. He is surrounded by officials and advisors, and whether or not he follows their advice, he would be foolish to act before hearing it" (Beeby, 1967, p. 290).

Charles Odegaard reinforced broad participation by pointing out that "process may in the long run be more important than substance, and that voluntary coordination by institutions themselves must remain open after the establishment of formal and even mandatory coordination under a statewide agency" (Odegaard, 1975, p. 87).

Brian Scott listed five tasks for planning participants to consider in the planning process (Scott, 1965).

1. Establishing Objectives
2. Establishing Planning Assumptions
3. Seeking the Facts Regarding Possible Courses of Action
4. Evaluating Alternatives
5. Selecting a Course or Courses of Action

Thus, we see the principal advantages of broad participation in the planning process are the recognition of diverse interests, the contribution toward coordination, the achievement of acceptable planning document and substance, and the gaining of a commitment for implementation. Statewide master planning process as described above fits in the context of a systems approach. Churchman described the system approach as being:

. . . made up of sets of components that work together for the overall objectives of the whole. The systems approach is simply a way of thinking about the total systems and their components (Churchman, 1968, p. 11).

Stephen Knezevich presents six concepts by which to view the systems approach (Knezevich, 1969, p. 64).

1. Systems Orientation--Whole is greater than the sum of the parts. (One statewide plan is superior to a group of segmental plans.)
2. Heavy reliance on facts and data.
3. Focus on Future--Heavy reliance on long-range planning; seeks to reduce negative impact of uncertainty about the future.
4. Teams of specialists frequently involved.
5. Simulation and use of models involved.
6. Creativity required.

Now the criteria for evaluating planning outcomes will be examined.

Outcomes

Criteria for evaluating master planning outcomes will focus on answering two questions: 1) What difference has master planning made in higher education?, and 2) Have master planning goals been appropriate and are they measurable?

The first question addresses the general universal achievements to be claimed as a result of conducting master planning, and the second question addresses the accomplishments of certain goals established by an individual state (in this case Tennessee).

In regard to general effects of planning, several authors have suggested the positive results of statewide master planning and some others have suggested shortcomings. Among the supporters, Lyman Glenny suggests seven advantages of master planning (Glenny, 1959, p. 204).

1. Lessens or eliminates tensions and conflicts among institutions.
2. Focuses attention of the public on the whole system of higher education rather than on one or two of the larger institutions.
3. Helps to create among legislators and state executive officers a more favorable attitude toward educators and higher education.
4. Provides a relative increase in support for smaller colleges, which, thanks to central agencies, are said to be better off than before coordination.
5. Affords, through assigning and enforcing differential functions, some protection of the traditional functions of the University and land-grant college against encroachment by teachers colleges and state colleges, and obtains for them financial support equivalent to, or greater than, that before coordination.

6. Provides, in a number of states, long-range capital-construction programs and schedules which, it is hoped, the legislature will agree to support.
7. Enriches program offerings throughout the public system by increasing support and preventing unnecessary overlap and duplication.

The seven points made by Lyman Glenny are reinforced by other experts.

E. T. Dunlap insisted that master planning should result in a "rational division of labor" by clearly defining roles for public and private two-year and four-year institutions to serve (Dunlap, 1972, p. 11).

A universal expectation of master planning is that it will limit or alleviate duplication of function and program offerings, giving state system institutions unique identities and missions. Frederick E.

Balderston also reviewed mission identification as a beneficial effect of master planning and he described the ingredients:

Each public institution can expect to derive a well-defined role assignment from statewide planning. This is generally stated in terms of degree-level of programs and the attributes of students who, by the admissions policies laid down in the plan, are expected to attend. The stipulated role assignment fortifies leadership of the public institution in resisting external constituency pressure to do something else (Balderston, 1971, p. 106).

Balderston mentioned another major benefit of master planning: enrollment projections. He saw the statewide enrollment projections as providing warnings of the future outlook which prepare individual institutions for their own destiny:

There are two possible benefits from projections of future enrollments for the individual institution. One is the increased degree of validation of its own growth plan and of its consequent resource needs. When stipulated amounts of enrollment growth are validated in the statewide plan,

resource needs for this growth can be more easily defended, provided that there are capital and operating budget standards. The other is that each institution may benefit internally by improving the coherence of its academic plans when its long-range enrollment expectations are firmly based on state-wide enrollment forecasts (Balderston, 1971, p. 107).

Balderston's point centers around enrollment growth, but the same point can be used in periods of no-growth in which new standards are needed to assure appropriate capital and operating budgets. This brings us to another major potential impact of master planning--greater assurance of budgetary support. Balderston suggested that whether individual institutions received greater assurance of adequate budgetary support depended upon two things:

First, will the comprehensive design the higher education system of a state lead to greater willingness on the part of political authorities to underwrite the resource requirements of that system than they would have in the absence of a comprehensive plan?

Second, will the individual institution tend to fare better in detailed dealings with an educational planning agency for validation of its plans and review of its budgets than it would through direct negotiation with the executive and legislative decision makers?

Balderston asserted that:

The individual public institution will perceive net benefit only if the statewide planning and coordinating agency having budgetary responsibility employs expertise and adequate procedural review in budget analysis, and if it is effective in presenting and defending the overall resource needs of the public higher education system (Balderston, 1971, p. 107).

Alvin Eurich and Sidney Ticton (1975) recommended that long-range planning was a necessity in higher education budgeting just as in corporate budgeting. Eurich and Ticton warned higher education against

some of the problems of decision-making which higher education confronted in earlier days.

Many major decisions were being made on the basis of incomplete, frequently irrelevant data. Trustees responsible for setting policy were absolutely ignorant of the facts. Using the only data available, they, in fact, could not know the extent to which they were committing their institutions for years ahead. They have survived until now in many cases mainly on good luck. During the late 1950's and 1960's the upswing in business and the increased public support of higher education enabled the trustees of many institutions to bury mistakes (Eurich and Ticton, 1975, p. 3).

Eurich and Ticton believe that as a result of long-range planning, governing boards should be able to make decisions based on more complete data and envision the long-term effects of current decisions. This is especially necessary when deciding how many faculty to hire or the number of buildings to construct, in view of the projected enrollment declines in the next five to ten years.

Another anticipated impact of planning and coordination is the establishment of guidelines for decisions affecting higher education.

Robert Berdahl explained:

The coordinating agency should be in a position to see that important substantive decisions are based on adequate information. The institutions, weighing net gains and losses, should recognize that if they cooperate in the creation of coordinating agency with a strong staff membership, and powers, these substantive decisions will be better than those arrived at by normal state political processes (Berdahl, 1971).

Through the planning and coordination, higher education should be assured of its future. Decisions made by elected officials and higher

education leaders can be made with more complete information and some awareness of long-term consequences.

In addition to the intended effects, planning can also have serendipity effects that should be recognized. Edward Wrapp noted that there were "several by-products that can be derived from planning."

1. Executive thinking is crystallized by writing recommendations and plans.
2. Committee investigation and deliberation enhances communication, particularly at the top level.
3. A planning group may locate blind spots or potential problem areas otherwise missed.
4. Planning group may be sounding board for potential innovations (Wrapp, 1964, p. 16).

Planning should also have an impact on society as well as societal changes should cause some changes in higher education. In this case, educational planning may be viewed as a way of integrating education with other sectors of society.

Just as there were anticipated beneficial effects resulting from statewide planning, there was also fear of unpleasant outcomes of master planning. Many believe that planning and coordinating agencies would seriously impair the initiative, flexibility, and diversity of public institutions. It was also anticipated by many that statewide planning would result in a loss of autonomy and interfere with the decision-making process at the institutional level. Many private institutions feared that the result of statewide planning would be a threat to their operations, thinking they would have to face a united public sector. These private institutions felt that coordinating and planning agencies

would be representative of only public institutions in funding and program considerations, not considering the need of the private support.

Much of this apprehension lingered on, and some still continues despite the findings of James Paltridge, in a study of coordination and planning in which he concluded that "the authority structure inherent in a scheme of statutory coordination can serve as a protector rather than an adversary of the substantive autonomy of institutions (Paltridge, 1973). Or, the conclusions of Palola et al. (1970), that because of the great expansion of higher education "colleges and universities have been able to maintain their educational autonomy and expand and develop their educational programs in directions they desired even though substantial decision-making power had been legally centralized at the statewide level. Agencies have served a vital function in helping to define and promote a more balanced and orderly pattern of growth, while continuing to promote educational autonomy of institutions" (Palola et al., 1970, p. 541).

Robert Berdahl pointed out that the choice was not whether to have an agency for planning and coordination, rather the choice was between having a coordinating agency or being "ingested into the executive branch of state government" (Berdahl, 1971, p. 249). In regard to the relationship between the public and private sector, Berdahl recommended the establishment of statewide councils of independent universities and colleges to maintain lateral communication, cooperation, and political articulation. Berdahl also stated that as planning became more sophisticated, the private sector institutions would have more participation (Berdahl, 1971, p. 249).

Even in the attempt to establish orderly growth in higher education through the designation of roles of institutions, unfavorable impacts are possible. Balderston explained that a master plan "may require a role for an institution which frustrates internal constituencies; for example, many comprehensive state colleges want to move toward offering doctoral degrees and advanced professional degrees even when it is not permitted in their current role assignments" (Balderston, 1971, p. 106). Balderston pointed out that one benefit of planning to both the public and private institutions was that the "functions and missions of their competing and complementary institutions are defined, which may permit better forecasting of inter-institutional relationships, both competitively and articulatively" (pp. 106-107).

Finally, on the subject of outcomes Palola et al. reached eleven major findings concerning the effects of statewide planning. These are:

1. Statewide planning has controlled for the expansion of new campuses and new educational programs.
2. Statewide planning has served to initiate and/or stimulate the widespread development of institutional planning.
3. Statewide planning has served to extend educational opportunities and to meet new educational and social needs.
4. Statewide planning has served to justify the increasing operating and capital budgets of the higher education enterprise.
5. Statewide planning has made efforts to promote institutional differentiation.
6. Statewide planning has been unable to define and eliminate unnecessary duplication of programs, nor has it been successful in discontinuing obsolete, inadequate, or expired programs.

7. Statewide planning has failed to integrate the private sector with the public sector in the orderly development of higher education.
8. Statewide planning has failed to promote cooperative efforts between institutions on a large scale.
9. Statewide planning has given insufficient direct attention to the issues of quality, excellence, and substance in higher education.
10. Statewide planning activities have served to unify the higher education network in some states, but fragment it in others.
11. On the whole, educational autonomy and the level of performance of colleges and universities have improved as a result of statewide planning and coordination during the period of massive expansion in higher education (Palola et al., 1970, p. 552).

Finally, in evaluating the impact of master planning, the general goals of the plan should be judged to determine the degree of progress toward fulfillment, and the flexibility of those goals to meet changing conditions. This part of the evaluation should include all plans, past and present, because many goals are set with the knowledge that it may take longer than the five-to ten-year time period for goals to be achieved. Also, because of the continuous nature of planning, previous planning goals should be either accepted, adjusted, or recognized as accomplished by the most recent plan. The 1973 Tennessee master plan, for example, established eight major goals that were later updated in 1978. These goals should be evaluated to determine to what extent they have been accomplished. The 1973 planning goals are as follows:

1. Tennessee should provide educational opportunity for all citizens who have ability and interest to attend college.
2. Tennessee should provide a system of public institutions offering the programs by its citizens.

3. The state should assist in maintaining strong private colleges.
4. Tennessee should provide advanced graduate and professional programs for an expanding and more complex society.
5. Tennessee should support higher education at a level to insure quality instructional programs.
6. Institutions should place high priority on meeting accreditation standards for existing programs before initiating new programs.
7. Efficient and responsible operation.
8. Educational change will require institutional flexibility and adjustment to new needs.

The goals for the 1978 master plan are:

Accessibility	Provide educational opportunities for all citizens who have the ability and interest to attend college.
Excellence	Develop and maintain quality programs in instruction, research and service.
Diversity	Promote differences in public institutional mission and recognize the role of the state's private institutions.
Responsiveness	Provide those programs that are responsive to current needs and plan for future program and service needs.
Responsibility	Maintain and demonstrate integrity of purpose and practice and effectively apply resources. (Higher Education in Tennessee, A Statewide Master Plan, 1979, p. 58).

Product

The evaluation of the product is the evaluation of the master planning document. This portion of the evaluation will focus on the structure and the utility of a state master plan. The evaluation of the master plan document will concentrate on two factors (1) assessing the structural design of the master plan; and (2) assessing the component parts of the plan.

The 1971 Carnegie Commission developed a checklist of planning consideration components which can be used in evaluating a master plan. This check list is listed below: (Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, 1971).

Statement of Goals

- Educational
- Social
- Economic
- Individual

Quantification of the Goals to the Extent Possible

Analysis in Terms of Enrollment, Resources, and Programs of Present Postsecondary Education in the State, Including

- Public and Private Colleges and Universities
- Public and Private Trade and Technical Schools
- Present Extent of Use of New Educational Technologies
- Opportunities for Adult Training and Education
- Geographic Availability of Institutions in the State

Projections for at Least the Short Run (2 to 5 Years) and the Intermediate Period (5 to 15 Years) Including

- Enrollment Trends Categorized by Institutional Type and Broadly Defined Programs
- State Manpower Needs

Resource Requirements--Including Faculty (area and level), Physical Facilities and Equipment, Libraries, and Funding Levels for Operating and Capital Expenses

Consideration of present and Potential Arrangements with Other States to Maximize use of State Resources

Extent of Differentiation of Function Among Types of Institutions, and Plans for Bringing About Desired Changes in the Pattern of Differentiation

Analysis of the Quality of Existing Programs and Proposals for Improvement

Analysis of the Present Degree of Efficiency in use of Educational Resources and Proposals for Increasing Efficiency

Definition of Relation to Provide Education, Including Descriptions of Present and Projected State Aid to Private Education, If Any

Analysis of Existing Requirements for Admission and Recommendations for any Modification if Deemed Advisable

Review of Tuition Levels at Public Institutions and, if any Increases are Project, an Analysis of the Impacts of Increased Tuition on Student Financial Aid Requirements and Enrollments at Various Types of Institutions

Attention to the Articulation of Postsecondary Education with Secondary Education, Including Consideration of Advanced Placement

Concern with the Potential Adaptability to Changing Educational Needs of the System and the Units Within It

Evaluation of the Adequacy of Counseling for Careers, and for Postsecondary Education Sufficiently Early in a Student's Life to be Effective and Proposals for Improving the Program if Necessary

Identification of Any Other Agencies Outside Postsecondary Education Which Have Major Impacts on the Way Postsecondary Education is Able to Function and Suggestions for Improving the Interaction with these Agencies

In their book entitled Planning Theory, Preston LeBreton and

Dale Henning wrote about corporate planning. The authors describe a plan

(document) as being "a unit complete within itself with a definite beginning

and end." LeBreton and Henning then describe thirteen dimensions of a plan. Each one is listed and briefly defined below:

1. Complexity - A plan ranges in complexity depending upon the number of parts to be considered in the plan, the number of alternatives to consider for each component, the extent to which the plan is or is not guided by already existing policy (more complex if plan serves as a policy statement), the technical requirements and the amount of available technical assistance, and the extent to which the total plan can be divided into logical sub-units.
2. Significance - The relevance or attention of the plan to the major issues that will yield benefit making the plan worth its cost. The focus being on the contribution the plan makes to the overall system.
3. Comprehensiveness - A plan that compasses the entire enterprise or system.
4. Time - A plan consisting of adequate preparation lead time for beginning work on major portions, time for full implementation of those parts, and appropriate time-frame for future (5 yrs.) in Tennessee.
5. Specificity - Such elements of the plan as time for the beginning and end of various parts of the plan, quantity and quality of components to be produced, and the assignment of direct responsibility for the implementation, coordination and control of the plan and all its component parts. (A plan does not have to be specific in areas where established policies would automatically state the parameters of operation.
6. Completeness - "A complete plan would be one which includes all necessary components for proper judgment to be passed on its adoption or rejection and for its expeditious implementation."
7. Flexibility - Certain components of the plan must be changeable if conditions warrant a change. The plan should not be written presupposing static conditions.

8. Frequency - Higher education planning is continuous and it is written carrying the tone that the completion of one generates the need for beginning another. Some of the planning components, however, will be relevant to current planning but not so in the future, while others will be recurring.
9. Confidential Nature - A public plan should not include information that would responsibly be shared with authorized personnel.
10. Formality - Refers to planning process. Consists of five parts: (1) authorization of the study, (2) preparation of the plan, (3) approval of the plan, (4) implementation of the plan, and (5) control of the plan.
11. Authorization - Plan should show official initial authority for preparation, and approval of the prepared plan and its contents by a body that can affect implementation.
12. Ease of Implementation - "Once a plan has received official approval, it must be put into practice." The implementation of a plan is dependent upon its contents as well as the process by which it was prepared. The best plan is one that is easily understood and consists of the appropriate information for its user. The contents should also reflect the results of the process. "Plan should be in simple terms and should contain sufficient directness to enable each participant to perform his role with minimum verbal direction from others.
13. Ease of Control - Provisions for measuring accomplishment.

Koontz and O'Donnell described a plan as a bridge from where we are to where we want to be (Koontz and O'Donnell, 1968, p. 81). They cited five limitations of planning:

1. Difficulty in Basing It on Accurate Premises
2. Problems of Rapid Change
3. Internal Inflexibility

4. External Inflexibility

5. Time and Experience (LeBreton and Henning, 1961, p. 22).

Now that the planning purposes and criteria for evaluating processes, product and outcomes have been identified, the advisory groups' validation of the criteria is next in order. A questionnaire has been developed and is listed in Appendix B. The questionnaire contains the criteria identified in this chapter but redefined to encompass their relevancy to state level planning as well as to reflect the variations in the descriptions given by the writers of the literature reviewed in this chapter.

CHAPTER IV. METHODOLOGY AND RESULTS OF THE CRITERIA EVALUATION

In the previous chapter, the review of literature provided a complete list of purposes for state-level master planning along with a set of criteria for planning process, product, and outcomes. These purposes and criteria have been synthesized and compiled and are listed in Appendix B.

Throughout the literature discussed in the first three chapters, it has been shown that there are varied and diverse opinions on master planning and that a major deterrent to the evaluation of planning is that there is no consensus or agreement on the criteria for such an evaluation. In other words, there is no universal agreement on the purposes to be served by a state-level plan for higher education; the process to be used in developing such a plan; what the product or the planning document should consist of; nor the desired educational and political outcomes resulting from state-level planning.

This chapter focuses on the evaluation of master planning purposes and the criteria for master planning process, product, and outcomes. The evaluation of these purposes, processes, products, and outcomes by seventy-five advisors is examined in this chapter to determine if a consensus was reached among a broad group of people on a clearly defined and comprehensive set of criteria. The evaluation was also used to determine the importance of each of the planning purposes and criteria.

Subjects

Seventy-five persons were selected to represent eight groups in evaluating the master planning purposes, and the criteria for process, product, and outcomes. The eight groups and the number represented from each are listed in Table 2. (The names of all the evaluators and the group and institution they represent are provided in Appendix A.)

Each in-state group was selected because they were considered to be constituents or users of the master plan. The executive and legislative branches of government utilize long-range plans when enacting laws affecting higher education. Higher education lay board and commission members were chosen because of their statutory responsibility for authorizing the plan and because they represent the voice of the public on matters of higher education. College presidents and public higher education administrators were selected because of their involvement in formulating the plan and because the plan ultimately has impact upon policies made by both presidents and administrators. Private college administrators were chosen because of a need to clarify and define their role in major public higher education activities, such as long-range planning. Faculty were also chosen because of the need to define their role in master planning, and also because they too are affected by recommendations in the plan. Finally, a group of out-of-state advisors was chosen in order to provide some professional objectivity and to compare with in-state (Tennessee) evaluators. Although students can be viewed as constituents of master planning, they were excluded from this study because of the rapid turnover

Table 2. Selected advisory groups involved in the evaluation of planning criteria

Group	Number of Persons
College presidents	10
Executive branch (Governors office)	2
Faculty	13
Lay board and Commission members	8
Legislature	10
Out-of-state professionals	9
Private higher education administrators	8
Public higher education administrators	15

in student populations.

Each person chosen in each of the eight groups was selected on a nonrandomized basis in which his or her participation in higher education activities at the state-level served as the principle criterion for their selection. All participants were recommended by high ranking officials at the Tennessee Higher Education Commission and the two Governing boards in Tennessee. The executive branch representatives were the governor's only two staff advisors on matters pertaining to higher education. The legislators selected were those on the higher education sub-committee and other members of the legislature who were known to be aware of and most interested in current issues in higher education. The lay board members were those who hold leadership positions on their

respective boards and those who had served on the boards the longest having the most experience in master planning. The college presidents and public higher education administrators and faculty were chosen because of their knowledge and/or involvement in state-level planning or related activities. The out-of-state advisors were chosen because of their involvement in advising states on the subject of master planning or because of their writing and publishing on state coordination and planning in higher education.

Special attention was given to obtaining a demographically diverse group of evaluators in terms of race, sex, geographical location of residence, and in the case of higher education administrators and faculty, difference in type of institution (i.e., community college, university, graduate and professional schools). As a result, 15 of the evaluators were women and 15 were black. Of the in-state evaluators 45% live in middle Tennessee, 29% in East Tennessee, and 28% in West Tennessee. The out-of-state evaluators were from different parts of the country--three from the Eastern United States, one from the South, three from the Midwest, one from the Southwest, and one from the West.

Of the public higher education presidents and administrators, eleven were from universities, seven from community colleges, seven from governing and coordinating board staffs, and one each from a post-secondary technical institute and a medical school. There were also eight evaluators who were private college or university administrators.

The faculty included eight persons from public universities, three

from public community colleges, and two from private universities. The administrators were selected from among chief academic and fiscal officers. The faculty evaluators also represented several different academic disciplines including education, sociology, engineering, English chemistry, mathematics, and political science.

Task

All subjects were provided with identical questionnaires and asked to rate the master planning purposes, products, and outcomes. Each subject rated the criteria on the following five-point scale of importance: (1) no importance, (2) of little importance, (3) of average importance, (4) very important, and (5) undecided. Then, the evaluators were asked to rank the ten purposes, the fourteen products, and the thirteen outcomes in order of importance with 1 being most important and the highest number in each category representing least important.

For the master planning process, the evaluators were asked to indicate the degree of involvement nine constituent groups should have in each of the seven planning processes. The evaluators were asked to indicate whether each group should have no participation, limited participation, continuous advisory participation, or primary leadership in each of the seven processes. A choice of undecided was also available.

All subjects were treated equally by receiving questionnaires through the mail and given 15 days to return the completed questionnaire in a self-addressed prepaid postage envelope.

Analysis

The point of the evaluation is to determine if there can be agreement on a broad set of criteria by all groups involved or affected by the plan. The major hypothesis is as follows:

Ho. There is no significant difference among the eight criteria evaluation groups ratings of criteria for evaluating master planning purposes, processes, product, and outcomes.

The hypothesis has been tested statistically using one-way analysis of variances (ANOVA) for each planning purpose, process, product, and outcome for each group involved in the evaluation. This amounted to a total of 100 one-way ANOVAS--10 for the rating scale analysis of 10 purposes; 63 for the rating scale analysis for all 9 parts of each of the 7 processes; 14 for the rating scale analysis of 14 products; and 13 ANOVAS for the rating scales of 13 outcomes. Kendall's (W) coefficients of Concordance were also used to indicate the average group rankings on purposes, product, and outcomes and to test the advisors' rankings of purposes, products, and outcomes were the same among the groups. Three multiple range tests were also conducted for paired comparisons on all the criteria. These tests were Scheffé', Duncan, and Fisher's LSD (least significant difference). However, Duncan is the only one discussed in the analysis of this data, because Scheffé indicated no differences on any of the criteria, and Fisher's LSD found large numbers of differences. Duncan is more a liberal test than Scheffé' but more conservative than Fisher's test.

All statistical tests were computed by computer using the program

language statistical package for the social sciences (SPSS). The ANOVA tests resulted in computed ratios which were compared to table values using the appropriate degrees of freedom at the .05 level of significance. Duncan's multiple range tests were also computed at the .05 level of significance.

Response Rate

There were seventy-five evaluators selected and who received questionnaires. Of those seventy-five, fifty-six (75%) responded and are included in the data analysis. Table 3 indicates the number of respondents from each of the eight groups in the evaluation. All fifty-six respondents

Table 3. Number of respondents from the eight criteria advisory groups

Group	Number in sample	Number of respondents
College presidents	10	8
Executive branch	2	2
Faculty	13	11
Lay board	8	3
Legislators	10	5
Out-of-state professionals	9	9
Private college administrators	8	5
Public college administrators	15	13
TOTAL	75	56

completed the rating scales of all four parts of the questionnaire-- purposes, processes, products, and outcomes. However, eleven of the responding advisors did not rank-order the purposes, products, and outcomes. Among those nonresponding, one out-of-state advisor stated that "the criteria are all important and to rank them would be equivalent to ranking the importance of the carburetor, wheels and brakes to a car". In the same spirit, a faculty advisor commented that "asking one to rank the criteria, is a bit like asking which is more important to sustain human life: food or water?" Some others who did not rank the criteria stated it was not possible to do and did not give any other explanation. The forty-five advisors who ranked the criteria represent 79% of the responding advisors. The rankings will still be discussed but could not be compared directly to the ratings because several groups were not equally represented in both. For example, eight college presidents rated the criteria while only two ranked the criteria.

The remainder of this chapter consists of the analysis and discussion of the advisors' evaluation responses. Each category is analyzed separately under the major headings of purposes, processes, products, and outcomes. Under each major heading an analysis of the overall responses of the advisors on each scored item followed by the analysis and interpretation of statistical test on the relative criteria.

Purposes

For this study, master planning purposes were defined as "the reason why master planning is conducted." It is well-understood that master planning is conducted at the state level because it is the will of state legislatures to have it done. However, it is the intention of this evaluation to go beyond the legislative statutes by identifying the purposes to be served for other constituents of the plan as well.

Ten master planning purposes were listed for the advisors to rate on the five-point scale of importance, and to rank from 1 to 10 in order of importance. Table 4 illustrates how the advisors rated the planning purposes, and Table 5 illustrates the overall rankings of the purposes. The advisors' ratings and rankings of the purposes will now be discussed, followed by the statistical analysis for both the rating scale and rank-order data.

Goal setting

The advisors rated and ranked goal setting as the most important purpose. Goal setting was defined as "to establish an agenda for action by setting goals and objectives for higher education and a clear pattern for pursuing those goals and objectives." Goal setting was ranked first in the rank ordering and rated as most important by 86% of the advisors and of average importance by the other 14%. Ratings are consistent with the views of scholars of both higher education and corporate planning. Goal setting is one area that has provided planners with much

Table 4. Advisors' ratings of master planning purposes (percentages)

Planning purpose	Scale Response				
	1 No importance	2 Little importance	3 Average importance	4 Very important	5 Undecided
Goal setting			14	86	
Coordination		4	21	70	5
Effectiveness		2	25	64	9
Responsiveness			39	61	
Accessibility		2	36	59	4
Efficiency		5	38	55	2
Issues identification		7	41	52	
Accountability		16	43	36	5
Trend analysis	2	18	48	32	
Minimize competition	5	14	43	30	7

difficulty.

Goal setting will be given more attention in each of the remaining three sections of this chapter (process, product, and outcomes) as it is very important in all three. It will also be discussed in more detail in Chapter V with recommendations for the future use in state planning.

Table 5. Mean ranking of master planning purposes by the eight advisor groups

Planning purpose	Mean rank ^a	Relative rank
Goal setting	1.8	1
Coordination	3.0	2
Effectiveness	4.7	5
Responsiveness	4.4	3
Accessibility	4.5	4
Efficiency	5.1	6
Issues identification	5.8	7
Accountability	8.6	9
Trend analysis	8.1	8
Minimize competition	8.6	10

^aMean rank based on total rank of 44 advisors in eight groups.
(Maximum rank = 10.)

Coordination

Coordination was thought to be the second most important purpose in both the rating scale responses and in the rankings by the advisors. Coordination was rated very important by 70% of the advisors and of average importance to 21%. This purpose is much like the purposes given for planning in legislative statutes. It is defined in this study as "to establish principles of equity in funding and program distribution by providing a clear understanding of different roles for higher education

institutions." One important service planning and coordinating agencies perform for state legislatures is that they keep individual campus lobbyists from requesting funds and programs directly from the legislature. In most cases, state agencies have developed formulae for the equitable distribution of funds, and a system of determining the placement of academic programming. One advisor who is a college president commented that one purpose of master planning "should be to remove some of the guess work and wonder from the funding and program proposals. As institutions approach the future, there should be clear understanding of what should be funded and what should be set aside as non-priority." Prior to the development of coordinating agencies, much of funding and program distribution was guess work, especially for smaller, newly developing institutions.

Effectiveness

Effectiveness as a purpose was defined as "to develop a system of colleges and universities with emphasis on providing high quality higher education." Effectiveness was 5th in the rankings, but was rated as being very important by 64% of the advisors and of average importance by 24%. This purpose had the highest percentage of undecided responses (9%). This may be related to one out-of-state advisor's comment about the use of "high quality" in the definition of effectiveness. One advisor pointed out that "high quality is defined differently for different types of institutions. For example, the quality for a large private university would be different from that at a small community college." One of the responsibilities of planners at the state level, is to consider the

potential of institutions of all types. There is no doubt that there is high quality at community colleges just as at public and private four-year colleges and comprehensive public and private universities. This quality, however, cannot be compared just as the educational functions cannot be compared for they are conducted with different goals.

Practically everyone would believe that there should be a system of high quality higher education, but the one question often raised by public officials is: Can high quality public higher education be provided to all of higher education, given the other responsibilities of state government? Another question raised by higher education faculty and administrators is: If one believes that quality is the actual learning and teaching found in the instructional process, then what role does anyone outside the institution have in providing quality? State-level planners are caught in the middle of these important questions and must continue to consider effectiveness as an important aspect of planning. Or, as one faculty advisor commented that one purpose of state level planning is "to increase public awareness of the relationship between quality education and financial cost."

Responsiveness

Responsiveness is another purpose which was expected to be viewed as very important by the advisors. Responsiveness was defined as "to develop strategies for adjusting to enrollment growth and decline: as well as economic growth and decline." The importance of responsiveness to the advisors may be indicated by the fact that it was ranked as the third most

important purpose, and was rated very important by 61% while the remaining 39% rated it as of average importance. Responsiveness is another purpose which is closely related to the legislative intent of planning. Master planning evolved during the period of expansion of higher education enrollments and demand for additional financing. This enormous expansion was not expected to be temporary; therefore, it was believed that planning could provide for an orderly means of accounting for rapid changes. Even now, with the prospect of declining enrollments in the 1980s, planning can serve as a means for managing decline.

Accessibility

Accessibility as a planning purpose was defined as "to insure that higher education programs and services are accessible and available to citizens who desire to participate." Accessibility was ranked as the fourth most important purpose and rated very important by 59% of the advisors and of average importance to 36%. The concern for accessibility grew out of a national mood in the sixties that the more educated the population, the better off the society. The ideal of a completely educated society is not new. Such notable educators and historic figures as Horace Mann, Henry Barnard, and Thomas Jefferson years ago advanced the benefits of an educated society. They believed that ignorance was responsible for most human problems and thought education was the solution for social ills. Innovations such as the community college, extension education, the open university, open admissions, and adult education have been justified by the philosophy of an educated society. State-level

planners have had the task of achieving the desired outcomes. One faculty advisor in this evaluation commented that one purpose of planning should be to "design alternatives to an open admissions system which recognizes the designation of one or two institutions as selective in admissions." This, no doubt, will be a future challenge of planners to strike a balance between accessibility and high productivity in public higher education.

Efficiency

Efficiency was defined as "to organize public resources so that they can be used in the most cost efficient manner." Although efficiency was ranked sixth in importance among purposes, it was rated very important by 55% of the advisors and of average importance by 28%. Even though state coordinating agencies and governing boards can influence the placement of programs, physical facilities, and funding, many such resources were committed prior to the existence of such planning agencies. The distribution of limited new resources provides such agencies with the difficult task of prioritizing with the ultimate result of equity rather than efficiency or excellence. Another problem of planning for efficiency is that a great part of efficiency is the daily internal operation and manipulation of resources, of which planners are not directly involved in. About this problem, one advisor who is a public college administrator commented that the role of master planning should be "to promote a common understanding of the roles of different institutions that will enable local autonomy in initiating and overseeing true

excellence, as opposed to imposed standards and supervision from a removed central authority."

Issues identification

Issues identification was defined as "to prepare higher education institutions to respond to the social and technological needs of the future by identifying issues." Although the identification of issues and projecting future developments is an essential element of planning, it was ranked seventh and rated as very important by only a slight majority (51%) of the advisors while 41% rated it of average importance. It could be that while the identification of issues in planning is necessary, it may not be the purpose for planning, but the means for achieving other purposes such as goal setting and responsiveness.

Other planning purposes

The remaining three purposes of accountability, trend analysis, and the minimization of competition were thought to be of lesser importance among the ten purposes. Accountability, which was defined as "to provide for increased accountability of higher education to government officials and the general public," was expected to be of high importance to the advisors because the reference by many observers of higher education governance to the 1960s, 1970s, and 1980s as the age of accountability. This is further substantiated by the pressure being placed upon all social institutions to justify their functions in order to maintain their existence. Accountability was ranked ninth and rated very important by 36% of the advisors and of average importance by 43%. This, however, does

provide optimism in that planning should not be conducted for the purpose of showing the government and the public that higher education is worthwhile. Rather, the time can be better spent by planning for the purpose of actually making higher education more worthwhile.

Trend analysis was defined as "to record and examine social, economic, political and educational trends and accomplishments and to raise the public consciousness of their future effect on higher education." Trend analysis was ranked eighth and only 32% of the advisors saw this as a very important purpose and 48% as of average importance with the remaining 20% viewing trend analysis as having little or no importance as a master planning purpose. Much like issues identification, trend analysis is a necessary part of planning but is probably best realized as supportive of other major purposes. One out-of-state advisor stated that "issue identification and trend analysis are things done as a part of planning but they are not purposes for planning."

The final purpose identified was planning as a means of minimizing competition or "to eliminate unproductive tensions and conflicts among institutions by creating a spirit of sharing and cooperation." Minimize competition was ranked tenth and rated as very important by 30% of the advisors, of average importance by 43%, and of either little or no importance by 19%. One out-of-state advisor commented that "competition should be desirable and state-organized monopolies should be discouraged."

Statistical analysis

A one-way analysis of variance test was conducted for each of the ten planning purposes to determine if there was any overall significant difference among the groups on the five-point rating scale responses of the purposes. Table 6 illustrates the computed F-ratio for each ANOVA test along with the corresponding F probability for 7 and 48 degrees of freedom (8 groups - 55 respondents) at the .05 level of significance for the ratings of planning purposes. The computed F ratio proved to be significant for the rating of only one planning purpose--issues identification.

Duncan's Multiple Range Test was applied at the .05 level of significance to identify where the "group differences existed on the planning purposes of issues identification." Duncan's test showed that the executive branch respondents differed significantly on the ratings with a mean rating of 2.5 from three other groups' ratings--college presidents, public college administrators, and legislators--ranging from 3.6 to 3.8 on the five-point scale. In other words, the executive branch respondents as a group ranked Issue Identification as of little importance, while the others considered it as being closer to very important. The group differences as found by the Duncan test are found in Figure 2.

Table 6. The F ratios and probabilities associated with the eight advisory groups' ratings of planning purposes

Purposes	Rating Scale	
	<u>F</u>	<u>P</u>
Goal setting	.42	.89
Coordination	.52	.81
Effectiveness	1.06	.41
Responsiveness	1.89	.09
Accessibility	.52	.82
Efficiency	1.43	.21
Issues identification	2.35*	.04
Accountability	1.09	.38
Trend analysis	1.48	.20
Minimize competition	.69	.68

Using Kendall's W-coefficient of concordance a fairly high positive correlation of .55 was found. On page 200, in Appendix C, the average ranks of each of the advisory groups is shown. Kendall's W shows the similarity of the groups rankings of planning purposes. When applying the chi-square test of significance at the .05 level, the ranked responses produced a computed χ^2 value of 39.6 which exceeds the table value of 16.91. Thus, the hypothesis that there is agreement among the advisory groups rankings is accepted.

Overall, the ten planning purposes were considered as being valid and important reasons for conducting state-level planning. Each planning purpose was thought to be very important by at least 30% of the respondents, and every purpose was considered at least of average importance or very important by at least 73% of the advisors. This is a clear indication that while planners may give more attention to a very important purpose (i.e., goal setting), they cannot afford to neglect one of lesser importance (i.e., efficiency), which is also essential. With the exception of one purpose--issues identification--there was not significant amounts of difference to reject the hypothesis that all the advisory groups agree on the importance of the planning purposes.

<u>Mean Rank</u>	<u>Group Name</u>	<u>Executive Branch</u>	<u>Faculty</u>	<u>Lay Board</u>	<u>Out-of- State</u>	<u>Private College Admin.</u>	<u>College Pres.</u>	<u>Public College Admin.</u>	<u>Legis- lators</u>
2.50	Executive Branch								
3.09	Faculty								
3.33	Lay Board								
3.33	Out-of-State								
3.40	Private College Admin.								
3.63	College Presidents	- *							
3.77	Public College Admin.	- *							
3.80	Legislators	- *							

* Denotes pairs of groups significantly different at the .05 level using Duncan's Multiple Range Test.

Figure 2. Group mean comparison on the rating scale responses to issue identification as a planning purpose

Processes

The state level master planning process was defined in this study as the "steps or procedures taken by planners to develop a planning document." Seven steps were identified in the literature which constitute the necessities of the planning process. These are: 1. Preparation for planning; 2. Problem solving; 3. Goal setting; 4. Prioritizing; 5. Editing; 6. Authorization; and, 7. Activating. The advisors were asked to determine the extent of participation nine constituent groups should have in each of the seven steps of the planning process (refer to questionnaire in Appendix B). The advisors' ratings of each of the participants in each process can assist planners to decide where constituents can contribute most in the planning process. The advisors' responses to the seven processes will now be analyzed. This will be followed by an analysis of the statistical comparisons of the eight advisory groups' responses.

Preparation for planning

The first of the master planning processes was preparation for planning which was defined as "developing strategies for planning, including establishing time frames, determining the information needed by planners, and the tasks to be accomplished during the planning process." Table 7 shows how the advisors rated the role of the nine groups in the process of preparing for planning. An overwhelming majority (73%) indicated that the state coordinating staff should be the primary leader in this process. Governing board administrators were indicated by 39% of the advisors to be primary leaders and by 50%

Table 7. Advisors' ratings of participants in process #1 - Preparation for Planning (percentages)

Groups	Scale Response				
	1 No partici- pation	2 Limited partici- pation	3 Continu- ous advisor	4 Primary Leader- ship	5 Undecided
Coordinating staff		5	16	73	4
Governing board administration staff	2	7	50	39	2
Lay board and commission members	4	21	43	30	2
Campus administrative staff	2	13	57	29	
Faculty	11	36	38	11	5
Legislators	14	46	23	7	9
Private college administrators	20	40	38	4	5
Out-of-state consultants	11	5	35	2	2
Private citizens	25	57	14	2	2

to be continuous advisors in the preparation for planning. Campus administrators were rated by 29% of the advisors in a primary leadership role and 57% thought they should be continuous advisors.

It is somewhat surprising that out-of-state consultants were rated as limited participants in the preparation for planning by 51% of the advisors. Earlier in the literature review, it was suggested that consultants be utilized in the early stages of the planning process to share objective insights and experience and provide direction for

in-state planners. It is also interesting to note that 2% believed consultants should be leaders in the preparation to plan but that 35% supported them as advisors.

Another surprising, yet not unreasonable, result is that 30% of the advisors indicated that lay board and Commission members should be leaders in the preparation for planning and another 43% thought of them as continuous advisors. It is surprising because one generally views professionals as making preparations and carrying out the work, while the lay boards and commission members later participate in endorsing and approving or disapproving of their work and recommendations. These data would suggest a rational theory that lay members should participate in directing their professional staffs in the beginning so that the end product will not be unfamiliar or unexpected to them. The remaining groups-- faculty, legislators, private citizens, and private college administrators-- were rated by the advisors as having secondary roles in the preparation for planning receiving 11%, 7%, 2%, and 4%, respectively, as primary leaders in the preparation for planning; and, a relatively large percentage of the advisors ranging from 49% to 82% rated these four groups as having limited or no participation in the preparation for planning.

Problem solving

The second planning process was problem solving which was defined as "the identification of relevant problems, and the consideration of alternative solutions for those problems." Table 8 shows how the advisors

Table 8. Ratings of participants in Process #2 - Problem Solving (percentages)

Group	Scale Response				
	1 No partici- pation	2 Limited partici- pation	3 Continu- ous advisors	4 Primary leader- ship	5 Undecided
Coordinating staff		9	22	67	2
Governing board administrative staff	2		53	44	2
Lay board and commission members	4	16	42	36	2
Campus administra- tive staff		9	56	35	
Faculty		36	51	13	
Legislators	11	56	20	9	3
Out-of-state consultants	7	54	30	6	4
Private college administrators	16	35	42	4	4
Private citizens	15	66	15	2	4

rated the participants in this process. While slightly lower than the preparation for planning process, state coordinating staff was rated by a large percentage of the advisors (67%) as the primary leader in the problem solving process. Governing board administrators and campus administrators received a slightly higher percentage of support as primary leaders in problem solving than in preparation for planning--44% and 35%, respectively. This stands to reason because much of the work of administrators, even unrelated to planning, is the resolution of

operational and organizational problems. The majority of the advisors, however, consistent with the first process viewed campus and governing board administrators as advisors in the problem solving process.

It comes as an even greater surprise with less substantiation than in the first process that lay board and commission members were seen as primary leaders in the problem solving process by, 36% of the advisors and in a continuous advisory role by 42%. This is much the same level of participation as the advisors suggested for campus and governing board administrators. This is interesting in light of the role usually describing lay board members as private citizens who have a strong interest in higher education and its progress, but whose expertise and professions are mostly in the corporate world which consumes the greatest amount of their interest and time (Gomberg and Atelsek, 1977, p. 16). The advisors' ratings of lay board and commission members in the remaining processes will be closely observed.

Faculty members were seen to have a larger role in problem solving than in preparation for planning. While only a slightly higher percentage (13% as compared to 11% in the first process) saw faculty as primary leaders in problem solving, a much higher percentage (51% as compared to 35%) saw faculty as continuous advisors in problem solving. The expertise of faculty members could be a valuable resource when identifying economic, sociological, and political, as well as environmental and technological changes during the planning process. Faculty members can also be helpful in relating their observation of student changes and conditions.

Out-of-state consultants, private college administrators, legislators, and private citizens were rated as having limited or no participation in the problem solving process. It must be mentioned again that out-of-state consultants are likely to be of most use in the earlier stages of the planning process. The advisors' ratings may be an indication that the planning process should be conducted with only very limited participation from out-of-state consultants. This is a reminder of the cautions given by Lyman Glenny concerning the use of out-of-state consultants.

The use of consultants or consulting firms is generally followed by states that do not have adequate planning staffs and related resources or when political issues about the future of higher education have become so heated and the atmosphere so tense that an outside perspective seems needed. This approach has two major disadvantages. First, plans made by outsiders are not readily accepted and subsequently implemented by professional persons in the state. Second, overdependence on outsiders erodes leadership within the coordinating agency and the state. Each state needs a cadre of leaders who can effectively plan higher education matters (Glenny, et al., 1971, p. 33).

In the case of private college administrators, it should be noticed that a slightly higher percentage of advisors considered them in an advisory role in problem solving than in preparation for planning (42% as compared to 28%).

Goal setting

The third process, goal setting, was described as "the formulation of immediate and long-range goals and objectives for higher education." The advisors' ratings of this process are shown in Table 9. Again, the state coordinating staff was viewed as the primary leaders by an overwhelming majority (72%) of the advisors. The trend thus far gives

Table 9. Advisors ratings of participants in Process #3 - Goal Setting (percentages)

Group	Scale Response				
	1 No partici- pation	2 Limited partici- pation	3 Continu- ous advisors	4 Primary leader- ship	5 Undecided
Coordinating staff		6	20	72	2
Lay board and commission members	4	13	38	45	2
Campus administra- tive staff	2	7	49	42	
Governing board administrative staff	4	2	56	36	2
Faculty	2	31	47	20	
Legislators	13	39	34	14	
Private college administrator	13	35	40	11	2
Private citizens	11	66	15	7	2
Out-of-state consultants	22	41	30	4	4

support for state coordinating agencies being the appropriate organization to conduct long-range planning on a statewide basis. Campus administrative staff were rated as primary leaders in the goal setting process by 42% of the advisors, and continuous advisors by 49%. The majority of the advisors (56%) indicated that governing board administrative staff should serve in an advisory capacity in the goal setting process,

while 36% indicated they should be primary leaders in this process. One of the major roles of state-level planners is to somehow coordinate the planning goals of the individual institutions and develop overall statewide goals and objectives which are compatible or at least reflect the same general direction that institutions are heading. Therefore, in actuality, campus administrative staffs must play an active role in the early stages of goal setting. The governing board in this process may serve best as facilitators or advisors to campus administrators. Ultimately, the responsibility belongs to the coordinating staff to organize and prepare statewide goals and objectives. The difficult task for coordinating staff will be explored in the next process which follows goal setting.

Lay board and commission members were indicated as primary leaders in goal setting by 45% of the advisors and as continuous advisors by 38% of the advisors. Only 17% of the advisors indicated that lay board and commission members should have limited or no participation in the goal setting process and 2% were undecided. This is further indication of the popularity of lay governance in higher education. This is somewhat encouraging considering the fact that lay governance in higher education is an American phenomenon which began with the American university. It has been suggested in the literature, however, that during the current time period organizations such as lay boards would be under attack from the general public. Among such speculators was Richard Lyman, President of Stanford University:

It is inevitable that boards of trustees should nowadays be the targets of reformists and even abolitionist wrath. We live in tough times for institutions whose chief functions are preservation and conservation. Boards of trustees are by nature conserving institutions, or they are nothing. They exist to conserve the colleges and universities to their trust. In our time, it is inevitable, given the massive dissatisfactions with things-as-they-are that such conserving institutions should not only suffer from attacks from outside, but also from attacks of self-questioning and self-doubt from inside (Richard Lyman, 1979, p. 3).

It is thus far apparent that the advisors of this study support the active participation of lay board and commission members in the master planning process. In a paper last year, Keith Briscoe, a college president, wrote in a letter to his trustees:

Lay trustees and board members have been asked to guarantee that the chief executive, faculty members, staff and students of higher education institutions are properly serving society in the most efficient way. To make sure, you must first of all ask the right questions. A trustee is legally responsible for institutions meeting its educational objectives. Even though an educational facility has the best available managers and educators, it is up to the governing board to keep a careful eye on progress in reaching intended goals. Therefore, you must ask some budget questions, ask questions on policy, about money management, about your president, about your legal responsibilities, about trend lines, and about the physical plant (Briscoe, 1979, p. 23).

Thus, the major role of lay members of a governing board or coordinating commission may be as an active participant and advisor in the process whose leadership abilities must be present.

Faculty were believed to play an advisory role by 46% of the advisors and a leadership role by 20% in goal setting. In a 1968 ACE study by Archie Dykes, it was found that faculty were most interested in participating in such decision-making activities as goal setting when the activities involved academic matters (Dykes, 1968, p. 6).

Private college administrators and legislators were supported by 40% and 34% of the advisors, respectively, as continuous advisors in the goal setting process. However, private college administrators were rated to have limited or no participation by 48% of the advisors, and legislators by 52%. The majority of the advisors rated out-of-state consultants and private citizens as having limited or no participation in goal setting--63% and 77%, respectively.

Prioritizing

The fourth planning process is prioritizing which was defined as "establishing priorities for the distribution of funding, programs, and facilities." This phase of the planning process follows goal setting and entails the difficult task of making decisions about which goals can be implemented through public support. The advisors' ratings are shown in Table 10.

Again the state coordinating staff was rated by a majority of the advisors (57%) as primary leaders in this process. However, this majority is less than the previous three processes, and for the first time in the processes some advisors, although only a small percentage (8%), thought state coordinating staff should have limited or no participation in the prioritizing process. Thirty percent thought coordinating staff should be continuous advisors and 5% were undecided. Even though a clear majority percentage of advisors supported state coordinating staff in prioritizing, the decline from the support in the earlier three processes may be an indication that the expertise of state coordinating staffs are recognized, but

Table 10. Advisors ratings of participants in Process #4 - Prioritizing (percentages)

Group	Scale Response				
	1 No partici- pation	2 Limited partici- pation	3 Continu- ous advisor	4 Primary leader- ship	5 Undecided
Coordinating staff	4	4	30	57	5
Lay board and commission members	4	9	38	45	5
Governing board administrative staff	4	5	45	41	5
Campus administra- tive staff	2	9	55	32	2
Legislators	10	23	41	20	5
Faculty	7	39	38	13	3
Private college administrators	30	23	36	5	5
Private citizens	23	48	18	5	5
Out-of-state consultants	31	38	22	2	7

the authority of making prioritizing decisions may be less certain. In 1976, Elizabeth Johnson, an Oregon lay board member, expressed the view held by many that the responsibility of the coordinating staff is to advise--not to govern:

Occupying as they do a middle no-man's land position between the agencies and bureaucracies of state government on one hand and powerful education institutions on the other, the chief job of coordinating agencies is to establish communication, cooperation,

confidence and credibility with both. Their job is to recommend and advise--not govern. Not an easy or even, perhaps, adequately achievable set of assignments. Balance, at least, should be the goal (Johnson, 1976, p. 11).

Lay board and commission members were rated to be in primary leadership roles by 45% of the advisors and in an advisory capacity by 38%. They continue to be seen as important participants in the planning process. However, in the prioritizing process, lay board and commission members along with legislators make the ultimate decision about the distribution of programs, finances, and facilities. Legislators were viewed by the advisors as having a more active role in prioritizing than in the previous processes, and this may be justified by the fact that state legislatures allocate the funds for new programs, facilities, and operating expenditures for public higher education. Twenty percent of the advisors declared legislators as primary leaders in the planning process, 41% rated them as continuous advisors. Still, a rather substantial percentage (33%) indicated that legislators should have limited or no participation in the prioritizing process. This is not to suggest that legislators should not make the appropriations, but that they should not during the planning process.

Governing board administrators were also considered to play a more active role in the prioritizing process than in the previous processes. Governing board administrators were recommended as primary leaders by 41% of the advisors and as continuous advisors by 45%. Campus administrators were regarded by most respondents (55%) as continuous advisors and as primary leaders by 32%. Faculty were seen as primary leaders by 13% of

the advisors, and as continuous advisors by 38%.

The other three categories of out-of-state consultants, private citizens, and private college administrators were considered to have limited or no participation in the prioritizing process by more than half the advisors.

Editing

The fifth planning process was editing which was defined as "critique of planning drafts with suggestions for improvements." This is an important planning process in which the literature suggests that all who are addressed in the plan should be involved. However, consistent with the previous processes state coordinating staff were considered the primary leaders by 67% of the advisors and as continuous advisors by 20% (Table 11). Lay board and commission members were seen as primary leaders by 30% and as continuous advisors by 39%.

Governing board and campus administrators were rated as primary leaders by 32% and 30%, respectively, and as continuous advisors by 48% and 50%, respectively. Governing board and campus administrators play a very important role in editing the planning document. For them this is an opportunity to see the results of the prioritizing process, and to see how their institutions are represented in the plan. This is also an opportunity for these administrators to negotiate changes in the plan before its final approval. Glenny explains that the participation of these administrators cannot be for purposes of window-dressing or superficial involvement. While all views and recommendations of those involved cannot

Table 11. Advisors' ratings of participants in Process #5 - Editing (percentages)

Group	Scale Response				
	1 No partici- pation	2 Limited partici- pation	3 Continu- ous advisor	4 Primary leader- ship	5 Undecided
Coordinating staff	2	7	20	67	4
Governing board Administrative staff	7	9	48	32	4
Campus administrative staff	4	14	50	30	2
Lay board and commission	9	18	39	30	4
Faculty	7	50	23	18	2
Out-of-state consultants	16	38	35	9	2
Private college administrators	34	27	29	5	5
Private citizens	34	50	11	4	2
Legislators	27	44	23	2	2

be included in a final plan, every person must feel that his contributions have been considered seriously and have been altered or omitted for sound planning reasons (Glenny et al., 1971, p. 55).

For the editing process, the advisors regarded the out-of-state consultants as having a more active role than in the previous four processes. Out-of-state consultants were recommended as primary leaders by 9% of the advisors and in an advisory role by 35%. Although

18% of the advisors viewed faculty in a leadership role, 57% thought they should have limited or no participation in the editing process. Legislators, private citizens, and private college administrators were rated as having limited or no participation in the editing by a majority percentage of the advisors (71%, 84%, and 61%, respectively).

Authorization

The sixth process identified in the criteria evaluation was authorization which was defined as "the approval of the plan by authorities who can affect implementation of the plan." The authorized body is commonly specified in the statutory authority. Most often, lay board and commission members are designated as having the authority to approve a plan, thereby making it the official planning policy for a state system of higher education. And, so it is fitting that 71% of the advisors indicated support of lay board and commission members as the primary leaders in the authorization process (Table 12). Another 16% thought of lay board and commission members as continuous advisors while 9% said they should have limited or no participation in the planning process and 4% were undecided.

Legislators were indicated as primary leaders in the authorization process by nearly half (48%) of the advisors and as continuous advisors by 14%. A rather large percentage (32%) indicated that legislators should have limited or no participation in the authorization process. Whether the planning is conducted by a governing board or a coordinating body, they most often have some responsibility to the legislature in providing

Table 12. Advisors' ratings of participants in Process #6 - Authorization (percentages)

Group	Scale Response				
	1 No partici- pation	2 Limited partici- pation	3 Continu- ous advisor	4 Primary leader- ship	5 Undecided
Lay board and commission members	2	7	16	71	4
Legislators	7	25	14	48	5
Coordinating staff	8	9	34	42	8
Governing board administrative staff	9	9	39	39	4
Campus administrative staff	18	14	39	25	4
Faculty	36	32	25	4	4
Private college administrators	48	16	27	2	7
Out-of-state consultants	66	22	9	8	4
Private citizens	48	16	27	2	7

information and advice through the plan to assist legislators in making laws. Even though the lay board and commission members are the legal authorizers of the plan, they were most often granted that authority by legislative statutes.

Coordinating staff and governing board administrators were suggested as primary leaders by 42% and 39% of the advisors respectively, and as continuous advisors by 34% and 39%, respectively. Both coordinating and governing board staffs have the responsibility of articulating their plans to lay board members who ultimately authorize the plan. Thus, they do have an important function in the authorization process. Campus administrators were seen as primary leaders by 25% and as advisors by 39%. They too must represent to lay board members their level of support for the plan. Their role is an important one to give the planning authority a feeling for the potential impact of the plan on their institutions.

While faculty and private college administrators were only seen as leaders in the authorization process by 4% and 2% of the advisors, respectively, they were considered as advisors in this process by 25% and 34%, respectively. Faculty and private college administrators, private citizens and out-of-state consultants were indicated by a majority of the advisors ranging from 64% to 88% as having limited or no participation in the authorization process.

Activating

The final planning process is to activate the authorized plan which should consume as much time until there is a new plan to serve as its replacement. Activating is simply defined in this study as "the implementation of the plan." Table 13 shows that an overwhelming majority of the advisors (87%) specified campus administrative staff as primary leaders in the activating process. This by far exceeded all other groups and also represented the one process and group in which the advisors were most able to agree. Another 16% recommended campus administrators as continuous advisors while only 2% thought they should have limited participation. It is proper to consider campus administrators as the leaders in the activating process because this is where the planning policies and recommendations become operational, and most planners from both governing board and coordinating agencies would agree that no one is in a better position to handle the day-to-day operations of an institution than the people on the campus.

Coordinating staff were considered primary leaders by 59% of the advisors and continuous advisors by 30%. Governing board administrators were indicated by 52% as primary leaders and 36% as continuous advisors in the activating process. Both coordinating staff and governing board administrators are responsible to the lay board members and the legislature for seeing to it that the plan is implemented. Their instruments for implementation are the budget, and program review processes plus whatever influence they have on state legislation.

Lay board and commission members were viewed as the primary leaders

Table 13. Advisors' ratings of participants in Process #7 - Activating (percentages)

Group	Scale Response				
	1 No partici- pation	2 Limited partici- pation	3 Continu- ous advisors	4 Primary leader- ship	5 Undecided
Campus administrative staff		2	16	82	
Coordinating staff	4	5	30	59	2
Governing board administrative staff	4	8	36	52	2
Lay board and commission members	9	7	43	38	4
Legislators	30	25	20	20	5
Faculty	7	18	59	16	2
Private college administrators	45	16	23	11	5
Out-of-state consultants	64	24	11		2
Private citizens	55	38	4		4

in the activating process by 38% of the advisors, and as continuous advisors by 43%. They too, like coordinating staffs and governing board administrators, can have their most influence on activating the plan through the budgeting and program review process which they are authorized

to approve based on staff recommendations. However, ultimate responsibility for the budget resides in the legislature. The legislature was rated by 20% of the advisors as primary leaders in the activation process and by 20% as continuous advisors. However, 55% viewed legislators as having limited or no participation in activating the plan.

The majority of the advisors (57%) indicated that faculty should serve as continuous advisors in the activating process and 16% said that faculty should be primary leaders. Like campus administrators, faculty are very important in the activating process at the campus level. Such organisms as the faculty senate can be instrumental in matters of carrying out programs which are recommended by the plan.

Private college administrators, private citizens, and out-of-state consultants were rated by the majority of the advisors as having limited or no participation in the implementation of the plan. This was especially expected in the case of out-of-state consultants, who after completing their specified tasks, had no authority for, nor allegiance to implementing the plan. The same can be said for private college administrators who had no legal responsibility to activate the plan, and whose total involvement in any planning process was voluntary.

It is interesting, however, that the advisors did not have much support for public citizens participation in any of the planning process. This would suggest that either the lay board members and legislators are enough to represent the citizens participation, or that higher education plans should not be subjected to unconditional pluralism.

Another way of looking at the process is to view the advisors overall

rating of each groups' participation in the planning process. A summary of each groups' role in the process is provided below.

State-Level Coordinating Staff: The state-level coordinating staff was rated as primary leaders in developmental stages of the plan from preparation for planning through editing. They were rated as continuous advisors in the authorization of the plan, and halfway between continuous advisors and primary leaders in activating the plan.

Higher Education Lay Board and Commission Members: These participants were continuous advisors in all of the processes except authorization. In the authorization of the plan, this group was rated as the primary leaders.

Campus Administrative Staff: The campus administrative staff was rated as continuous advisors in the first six processes, but as the primary leaders in the seventh process activating the plan. They received the highest rating of all groups on activating the plan.

Governing Board Administrative Staff: The governing board administrative staff were rated as continuous advisors in all seven of the planning processes. They were rated nearly halfway between continuous advisors and primary leaders in the problem solving, prioritizing, and activating processes.

Faculty: The faculty was rated very high above limited participants but just slightly below continuous advisors on the first five processes which are the developmental stages of the plan. Faculty were rated as limited participants in the authorization of the plan. They received their highest rating in the activation of the plan in which they were rated as continuous advisors.

Legislators: Legislators were regarded as having halfway between limited participation and continuous advisory role in the first and third processes (preparation for planning and goal setting, respectively). They were rated as having limited participation in the problem solving, editing, and activating of the plan. And, they were rated as continuous advisors in both prioritizing and authorizing processes.

Private College Administrators: Private college administrators were rated as limited participants in all the planning processes. They received their highest rating in the goal-setting process, half-way between limited participation and continuous advisors.

Private Citizens: Private citizens were rated as limited participants in all of the planning processes.

External Consultants: External consultants were seen as limited participants in all seven planning processes. They were rated halfway between limited participants and no participation in both the authorization and activating processes.

Statistical analysis

The analysis of variance test on the first planning process, "preparation to plan," pointed out a significant difference among the eight advisory group ratings of the participation of only one of the nine constituent groups. Table 14 shows the F ratios and probabilities associated with the first planning process, preparation for planning.

The advisors differed significantly in their rating of the participation of private college administrators in this process. The Duncan test indicated that the significant difference existed between legislators and college presidents when compared to faculty and private administrators as shown in Figure 3. Recalling the previous chapter, there might be some uncertainty and disagreement about the participation by private college officials in the planning process. It is interesting to recognize that the mean scores in Figure 3 indicate that private college administrators thought that they should have between a continuous advisory and a primary leadership role in the first process. No other group supported private college administrators to that extent in this process. The role of private college administrators

Table 14. The F ratios and probabilities associated with the eight advisory group ratings of Process #1 - Preparation for Planning

Group	F	P
Coordinating staff	2.01	.07
Governing board administrative staff	.85	.56
Lay board and commission members	1.57	.17
Campus administrative staff	1.73	.12
Faculty	.69	.68
Legislators	1.79	.11
Private college administrators	2.62*	.02
Out-of-state consultants	.81	.59
Private citizens	.53	.81

* Significant at the .05 level.

will be given further attention in reviewing the remaining six processes.

In the second planning process (problem solving) as in the first process, the only F ratio which is significant relates to the participation by private college administrators. Table 15 shows the F ratios and F probabilities for the problem solving process. In the paired comparisons, again using Duncan's test, there were even more group differences judged to be significant but with the same general affect as the first process (see Figure 4). On this process, legislators who supported a low level of

Mean Rating	<u>Legislators</u>	<u>College Pres.</u>	<u>Lay Board</u>	<u>Public college admin.</u>	<u>Out-of- state advisors</u>	<u>Executive branch</u>	<u>Private Faculty admin.</u>
1.8	Legislators						
2.0	College presidents						
2.0	Lay board & commission						
2.0	Public college admin.						
2.4	Out-of-state advisors						
2.5	Executive branch						
3.1	Faculty	-*	-*				
3.4	Private admin.	-*	-*				
1 = No participation 2 = Limited participation 3 = Continuous advisory participation <u>4 = Primary leadership</u>							

* Denotes pairs of groups significantly different at the .05 level using Duncan's Multiple range test.

Figure 3. Group mean comparisons on the ratings of private college administrators in planning process #1--Preparation for Planning

Mean Rating	<u>Legislators</u>	<u>College Pres.</u>	<u>Lay Board</u>	<u>Public college admin.</u>	<u>Out-of- state advisors</u>	<u>Executive branch</u>	<u>Faculty</u>	<u>Private admin.</u>
1.8 Legislators								
2.0 College presidents								
2.0 Lay board & commission								
2.2 Public college admin.								
2.5 Out-of-state advisors								
2.7 Executive branch								
2.9 Faculty	-*							
3.5 Private admin.	-*	-*	-*	-*				
1 = No participation 2 = Limited participation 3 = Continuous advisory participation 4 = Primary leadership								

* Denotes pairs of groups significantly different at the .05 level using Duncan's Multiple Range Test.

Figure 4. Group mean comparisons on the ratings of private college administrators in planning process #2--Problem Solving

Table 15. The F ratios and probabilities associated with the eight advisory group ratings of Process #2 - Problem solving

Group	F	P
Coordinating staff	1.70	.13
Governing board administrative staff	1.21	.32
Lay board and commission members	1.03	.43
Campus administrative staff	1.45	.21
Faculty	1.30	.31
Legislators	.63	.73
Out-of-state consultants	1.18	.33
Private college administrators	2.43*	.03
Private citizens	1.70	.13

*Significant at the .05 level.

participation for private college administrators differed significantly from private college administrators. The group mean scores mainly indicate that private college administrators are themselves desirous of a responsible role in the planning process.

The analysis of variance for process number 3 indicates significant overall F ratios relative to four groups (Table 16). It can be expected that the most important element of planning, goal setting, may produce the greatest amount of controversy. Each of the four groups with a significant F will now be considered separately.

For campus administrative staff, a significant overall F ratio of

Table 16. The F ratios and probabilities associated with the eight advisory group ratings of Process #3 - Goal setting

Group	F	P
Coordinating staff	2.68	.02
Lay board and commission	.59	.76
Campus administrative staff	3.11*	.01
Governing board administrative staff	1.21	.32
Faculty	2.12	.05
Legislators	.28	.96
Private college administrators	3.43*	.00
Private citizens	.69	.67
Out-of-state consultants	3.04*	.01

* Significant at the .05 level.

3.11 was computed. Duncan's test showed that the major differences existed between the executive branch ratings with three other groups-- public college administrators, college presidents, and lay board and commission members (see Figure 5). The executive branch rated the campus administrators as having a relatively low level of involvement in the goal-setting process, while the others rated them high. It is of special interest that all the lay board and commission members recommend that campus administrators have a primary leadership role in this process. This may be related to lay boards' reliance upon their staffs for some leadership on issues in which they are experts.

Mean Rating	Executive branch	Legislators	Out-of- state advisors	Private college Admin.	Faculty	Public college admin.	College pres.	Lay board
2.0	Executive branch							
3.0	Legislators							
3.0	Out-of-state adv.							
3.0	Private college admin.							
3.5	Faculty	- *						
3.5	Public admin.	- *						
3.6	College presidents	- *						
4.0	Lay board & commission	- *						
1 = No participation 2 = Limited participation 3 = Continuous advisory participation 4 = Primary leadership								

* Denotes pairs of groups significantly different at the .05 level using Duncan's Multiple Range Test.

Figure 5. Group mean comparison of advisors' ratings of campus administrative staff in planning process #3--Goal Setting

The rating of external consultants also produced a high significant F ratio (3.04). Duncan's test showed several groups significantly different as shown in Figure 6. Probably the most striking rating was that by the executive branch who firmly supported out-of-state consultants as primary leaders in goal setting. All the other groups considered out-of-state consultants functioning in a relatively low role.

Consistent with the first two planning processes, the advisors' ratings of private college administrators produced a significant overall F ratio of 3.43. Duncan's test indicated that the paired differences again existed between private college administrators (who rated themselves as deserving of a high level of participation) and four other groups of advisors--legislators, lay board and commission members, public college administrators, and college presidents (see Figure 7). A pattern can be noticed in which it is clear that legislators, lay board, and college presidents consistently rate private college administrators out of the planning process while private college administrators indicate a desire to actively participate. These three groups are most important in deciding who is heard in the planning process.

Finally, in rating the goal-setting process, the advisors' ratings of the coordinating staff had a significant F ratio (2.68). An interesting factor may have caused the overall significance in the legislators' ratings. Duncan's test indicated that the legislators' ratings differed from all other groups of advisors. Although the legislators' ratings were not extremely low, they supported the coordinating staff as

Mean Rating	<u>College pres.</u>	<u>Faculty</u>	<u>Public college admin.</u>	<u>Out-of- state advisors</u>	<u>Lay Board</u>	<u>Legislators</u>	<u>Private college admin.</u>	<u>Executive branch</u>
1.5 College presidents								
2.0 Faculty								
2.0 Public college admin.								
2.6 Out-of-state adv.								
2.7 Lay board & comm.								
2.8 Legislators	- *							
2.8 Private college admin.	- *							
4.0 Executive branch	- *	- *	- *					
1 = No participation 2 = Limited participation 3 = Continuous advisory participation 4 = Primary leadership								

* Denotes pairs of groups significantly different at the .05 level using Duncan's Multiple Range Test.

Figure 6. Group mean comparisons of advisors ratings of external consultants in planning process #3--Goal Setting

Mean Rating	<u>Legislators</u>	<u>Lay board</u>	<u>Public college admin.</u>	<u>College pres.</u>	<u>Out-of-state advisors</u>	<u>Faculty</u>	<u>Executive branch</u>	<u>Private college admin.</u>
1.8 Legislators								
2.0 Lay board								
2.1 Public college admin.								
2.3 College presidents								
2.9 Out-of-state adv.								
2.9 Faculty								
3.0 Executive branch								
3.6 Private college admin.	- *	- *	- *	- *				
1 = No participation 2 = Limited participation 3 = Continuous advisory participation 4 = Primary leadership								

* Denotes pairs of groups significantly different at the .05 level using Duncan's Multiple Range Test.

Figure 7. Group mean comparisons of advisors' ratings of private college administrators in planning process #3--Goal Setting

continuous advisors in goal setting, all the other groups tended to think of coordinators more as primary leaders in the goal-setting process (see Figure 8). It should also be noted that on the previous two processes, legislators rated coordinating staff as primary leaders.

Only the advisors' ratings of one group, campus administrative staff, produced a significant F ratio (2.31) in the prioritizing process as shown in Table 17. The group mean scores indicated that the executive branch advisors thought that campus administrative staff should have limited participation in the prioritizing process. Duncan's Multiple Range Test indicated that the executive branch advisors differed significantly from faculty, college presidents, and lay board and commission members ratings (see Figure 9). While the latter three groups tended toward primary leadership for campus administrators, the out-of-state advisors, legislators, and private college administrators recommended an advisory role for campus administrative staff. This is important to recognize because politicians often express the opinion that elected officials should make the ultimate decisions and set priorities in matters concerning state government.

It should be pointed out that this is the first planning process in which there was no significant difference in the advisors' ratings of private college administrators' roles in a planning process. All eight groups of advisors, including private college administrators themselves, realized a low level of participation in the prioritizing process. The group mean scores ranged from a rating of 1.6 (between no participation

Mean Rating	<u>Legislators</u>	<u>Faculty</u>	<u>Lay board</u>	<u>Public college admin.</u>	<u>College pres.</u>	<u>Executive branch</u>	<u>Out-of- state advisors</u>	<u>Private college admin.</u>
2.8 Legislators								
3.5 Faculty	- *							
3.7 Lay board & commission	- *							
3.6 Public college admin.	- *							
3.9 College presidents	- *							
4.0 Executive branch	- *							
4.0 Out-of-state advisors	- *							
4.0 Private college admin.	- *							

- 1 = No participation
- 2 = Limited participation
- 3 = Continuous advisory participation
- 4 = Primary leadership

* Denotes pairs of groups significantly different at the .05 level using Duncan's Multiple Range Test.

Figure 8. Group mean comparisons of advisors' ratings of coordinating staff on planning process #3--Goal Setting

<u>Mean Rating</u>	<u>Executive branch</u>	<u>Out-of- state advisors</u>	<u>Legislators</u>	<u>Private college admin.</u>	<u>Public college admin.</u>	<u>Faculty</u>	<u>College pres.</u>	<u>Lay board</u>
2.0	Executive board							
2.9	Out-of-state advisors							
3.0	Legislators							
3.0	Private college admin.							
3.0	Public college admin.							
3.5	Faculty	-*						
3.6	College presidents	-*						
3.7	Lay board & commission	-*						
1 = No participation 2 = Limited participation 3 = Continuous advisory participation 4 = Primary leadership								

* Denotes pairs of groups significantly different at the .05 level using Duncan's Multiple Range Test.

Figure 9. Group mean comparisons of advisors' ratings of campus administrative staff on planning process #4--Prioritizing

Table 17. The F ratios and probabilities associated with the eight advisory group ratings of Process #4 - Prioritizing

Group	F	P
Coordinating staff	1.09	.39
Lay board and commission members	.62	.74
Governing board administrative staff	1.50	.19
Campus administrative staff	2.31*	.04
Legislators	.73	.65
Faculty	1.10	.38
Private college administrators	1.22	.31
Private citizens	.40	.90
Out-of-state consultants	1.61	.16

* Significant at the .05 level.

and limited participation) by lay board and commission members to 3.0 (continuous advisory participation by the executive branch).

For the fifth planning process, editing, there were no significant differences as shown by the relatively low F ratios in Table 18. The same applies on the sixth planning process, authorization, in which the analysis of variance test also presented no significant F ratios as shown in Table 19.

According to the overall analysis of variance test on the seventh and final process, there were significant differences in the advisors ratings regarding both private college administrators and coordinating

Table 18. The F ratios and probabilities associated with the eight advisory group ratings of Process #5 - Editing

Group	F	P
Coordinating staff	.91	.51
Governing board administrative staff	.97	.46
Campus administrative staff	.65	.71
Lay board and commission members	.99	.45
Faculty	.96	.47
Out-of-state consultants	1.42	.22
Private college administrators	1.19	.33
Private citizens	.94	.48
Legislators	1.85	.10

Table 19. The F ratios and probabilities associated with the eight advisory group ratings of Process #6 - Authorization

Group	F	P
Lay board and commission members	1.30	.27
Legislators	1.22	.31
Coordinating staff	1.77	.12
Governing board administrative staff	1.51	.19
Campus administrative staff	.75	.63
Faculty	.70	.67
Private college administrators	.46	.86
Out-of-state consultants	1.20	.32
Private citizens	.82	.57

staff participation in the activating process (see Table 20). Duncan's test of the advisory groups' ratings of private college administrators in this process indicated that the differences existed between legislators when compared to out-of-state advisors; private college administrators; and lay board members' ratings compared to private college administrators (Figure 10). While private college administrators rated themselves between continuous advisors and primary leaders in the activation of the plan, most of the other advisory groups viewed them as having limited or no participation in this process.

Table 20. The F ratios and probabilities associated with the eight advisory group ratings of Process #7 - Activating

Group	F	P
Campus administrative staff	.87	.54
Coordinating staff	2.57*	.02
Governing board administrative staff	.58	.77
Lay board and commission members	1.85	.10
Legislators	.45	.87
Faculty	.65	.71
Private college administrators	2.51*	.03
Out-of-state consultants	.44	.87
Private citizens	.51	.82

* Significant at the .05 level.

<u>Mean Rating</u>	<u>Legislators</u>	<u>Lay board</u>	<u>Public college admin.</u>	<u>College pres.</u>	<u>Faculty</u>	<u>Executive branch</u>	<u>Out-of- state adv.</u>	<u>Private college admin.</u>
1.0 Legislators								
1.3 Lay board & comm.								
1.8 Public college admin.								
2.1 College presidents								
2.1 Faculty								
2.5 Executive branch								
2.9 Out-of-state adv.	- *							
3.4 Private college admin.	- *	- *						
1 = No participation 2 = Limited participation 3 = Continuous advisory 4 = Primary leadership								

* Denotes pairs of groups significantly different at the .05 level using Duncan's Multiple Range Test.

Figure 10. Group mean comparisons of advisors' ratings of private college administrators participation in planning process #7 - Activating

For coordinating staff, Figure 11 shows that Duncan's test indicated that legislators differed significantly from all other groups. Legislators rated coordinators as having between limited participation and advisory participation, while all other groups leaned more toward a primary leadership role for coordinating staff.

Before going on to the planning products, three important points need to be made concerning the advisors' ratings of the participants of the planning process. First, there is general support for state legislatures' decision to place the state planning function into a centralized agency such as a coordinating agency. Second, the private college and university sector appear desirous of a larger role in state level planning activities, but without the broad support necessary to achieve an increased role. Third, the active role of lay boards is encouraged by all groups of advisors. This may be true more so now than in the past due to the active appearance of higher education in the political arena. Lay board members often have direct linkages to the key decision makers who also serve as support shields for the educational process.

In light of the results of this evaluation, two elements must be explored further that will likely produce different results in different states. One is the role of private colleges and universities in state level publicly supported higher education affairs and the other is the involvement of faculty expertise in state level planning.

Mean Rating	<u>Legislators</u>	<u>Faculty</u>	<u>Public college admin.</u>	<u>Lay board</u>	<u>Out-of- state adv.</u>	<u>Private college admin.</u>	<u>College pres.</u>	<u>Executive branch</u>
2.4 Legislators								
3.4 Faculty	- *							
3.4 Public college admin.	- *							
3.7 Lay board	- *							
3.8 Out-of-state adv.	- *							
3.8 Private college admin.	- *							
3.9 College presidents	- *							
4.0 Executive branch	- *							
1 = No participation 2 = Limited participation 3 = Continuous advisory participation 4 = Primary leadership								

* Denotes pairs of groups significantly different at the .05 level using Duncan's Multiple Range Test.

Figure 11. Group mean comparisons of advisors' ratings of coordinating staff participation in planning process #7 - Activating

Products

Fourteen criteria for the master planning product were identified in this study. Master planning product was described to the advisors as "the document (the plan) which is published at the end of the planning process." The advisors were asked to rate the fourteen product components on the five point scale of importance, then rank-order from 1 to 14 according to importance, and then to add any additional product components or comments. The advisors' ratings and rankings of the criteria are illustrated in Tables 21 and 22. Three product components were considered to be more important than all the others. They were: funding priorities, educational goals and institutional mission and role statements. Each of these as well as the other product components will be discussed in the next few pages.

Funding priorities

Funding priorities were rated as the most important and ranked third most important of the planning product components. Funding priorities was defined as "to estimate the need for economic resources and to determine the priorities for funding in the future." Only two of the rating scale responses were used by the advisors for this criterion--82% rating it very important, and the remaining 18% rating it of average importance. Elizabeth Johnson in 1976 gave an indication of what is needed by planning constituents regarding funding priorities:

What is clearly indicated and needed by both the government and legislature--and by institutions and segments, too is a reliable source of standardized data and information applicable to the state, of unbiased analysis, comparable unit cost

Table 21. Advisors' ratings of master planning products (percentages)

Planning product	Scale Response				
	1 No impor- tance	2 Little impor- tance	3 Avg. impor- tance	4 Very impor- tant	5 Undecided
Funding priorities			18	82	
Educational goals	2	5	18	71	4
Adaptable to change		4	25	71	
Institutional mission and role		5	27	68	
Supportive trends		5	36	39	
Specific goals and time tables		5	36	59	
Authentic endorsement		5	39	53	2
Explicit style	2	2	46	50	
Orderly structure			52	48	
Planning assumptions		5	54	41	
Complete information		11	54	32	4
Social goals		11	59	30	
External and internal appearance	5	27	46	21	
Significant information	5	32	60	2	

Table 22. Mean ranking of master planning products by the eight advisory groups

Planning product	Mean rank	Relative rank
Funding priorities	3.7	3
Educational goals	1.9	1
Adaptable to change	7.3	7
Institutional mission & role	3.4	2
Supportive trends	6.3	4
Specific goals & time tables	7.9	8
Authentic endorsement	9.4	12
Explicit style	9.1	11
Orderly structure	10.4	13
Planning assumptions	7.1	6
Complete information	8.9	10
Social goals	7.9	9
External and internal appearance	13.5	14
Significant information	6.5	4

estimates, common definitions and accounting charts and recommendations that are based on a statewide perspective, the public's interest and ability to finance (Johnson, 1976, p. 11).

One of the major reasons for establishing coordinating boards and agencies was to establish a systematic method for funding higher education, rather than having individual institutions lobbying year round

for funds wondering how they will fare from one fiscal year to the next in appropriations from the legislature. Master planning can be used to remove some of the uncertainty and also provide some priorities and alternatives for discretionary (nonformula) funding for the duration of the plan.

Educational goals

Educational goals were ranked highest among the product components and rated second highest on the rating scale responses. Educational goals are defined as "providing standards of excellence for all levels of the higher education system." Seventy-one percent of the advisors rated educational goals as very important, while 18% rated it of average importance, 8% indicated it had little or no importance, and 4% were undecided. The support for educational goals is consistent with the earlier rating of goal setting as a master planning purpose, and suggests that goal setting should emphasize educational goals. Goal setting is discussed further in Chapter V.

Adaptable to change

Another criterion which was considered very important to a great majority of the advisors was that the master plan has the appearance of being adaptable to change. This criterion was defined as "the plan appears changeable if conditions warrant a change--does not appear as an iron-clad statement of mandates." This criterion was ranked seventh and rated very important by 71% of the advisors, and 25% rated it of average importance with only 4% rating it of little importance. The

support for adaptable to change reflects the spirit of which coordinating agencies have been received. It has been the fear of many higher education institutions that such agencies would attempt to control all public institutions usurping the on-campus autonomy. It was also feared, as it was pointed out in previous chapters, that state higher education planners would attempt to implement their plans at all cost, being more concerned about achieving their goals than to responding to new developments which may be different from the planning goals. In other words, the coordinating agencies would have to at first establish credibility. One way to do that is to produce plans which can be viewed by legislators and others as the right plan. Flexibility in planning, however, should not be viewed as wishy-washy or inexactness, and it is a necessary function of long-range plans. The fact that this criterion was rated very important by a larger percentage of the advisors than some of the more substantive products is indicative of the sensitivity to flexibility by governing authorities toward local autonomy.

Institutional mission and role

Another very highly regarded criterion was the institutional mission and role which was defined as "to illustrate the role and mission of each institution and demonstrate how they differ and how they are similar." The advisors ranked institutional role and mission as the second most important product component, 68% considered it to be very

important, 27% rated it of average importance and only 5% indicated it was of little importance. One common intent of most legislative statutes creating planning agencies is that they are interested in state institutions having coordination and cooperation with one another so that there is not unnecessary, costly duplication. The first step in establishing a cooperative spirit is to determine the strengths of each institution and other characteristics which distinguish each from all the rest. The end result should be for institutions to rely upon one another for certain programs and services of strength and for students to be able to identify state institutions which can best serve their interests.

Significant information

Significant information as a criterion of the planning product was defined as "to consist of information which affects decision-making at all levels in the higher education system." This includes information on students, staff, faculty, and finances that can normally be a part of management information systems commonly provided by institutional research departments, except on a statewide basis. Significant information was ranked seventh and 61% of the advisors rated it very important, 32% viewed it of average importance, 5% of little importance and only 2% were undecided.

Supportive trends

Supportive trends were another product criterion considered very important by the advisors. This criterion, which was defined as "to illustrate the trends regarding student enrollment, program distribution, and funding of higher education institutions, which support planning goals and recommendation," was ranked fourth and rated very important by 59% of the advisors, and of average importance by 36%. Only 5% considered supportive trends as having little importance. This is another part of planning in which planners must show their skill in identifying and analyzing relevant issues.

Specific goals and time tables

Receiving exactly the same ratings from the advisors as supportive trends was the criterion specific goals and timetables. This was defined as "to quantify the goals and tasks to be accomplished with an established time frame, and assign responsibilities for implementing the plan." Although it received an overall ranking of 8, just as in supportive trends, 59% of the advisors rated it very important, 36% thought it was of average importance and 5% considered it of little importance. This criterion may be the one most important factor in encouraging people to implement the plan by illustrating what has to be accomplished and when it has to be accomplished.

Authentic endorsement

Authentic endorsement which was defined as "shows official initial authority for preparation, and approval of its content by a body that can affect implementation," was ranked twelfth; however, 54% of the advisors rated it as being very important, 39% of average importance and of little importance by 5% and the remaining 2% were undecided.

Orderly structure

Orderly structure which was defined as the plan that "presents information in a logical and organized fashion," was recognized as very important by 52% of the advisors and the remaining 48% rated it of average importance.

Explicit style

Explicit style was defined as "written in a style and language that is easily understood by its intended audience," was considered very important by 50% of the advisors, of average importance by 46%, and of little or no importance by 4%. All three of these criteria have to do with the structural design of the planning document. It is somewhat encouraging that the advisors regarded substantive criteria as having more importance than the structural criteria.

Other product components

Social goals, complete information, and planning assumptions were the only other criteria which were considered of average importance by the majority of the advisors. Social goals was defined as "the recognition of the impact of contemporary social problems on higher edu-

cation, and indicating the adjustments which should be made as a result of such problems". Only 30% of the advisors viewed social goals as a very important product component, while 59% indicated it was of average importance and 11% rated it of little importance. This suggests that the kind of goals required of master planning should be on educational standards rather than directing colleges and universities in relating to social problems.

Complete information was defined as "includes complete information on subjects about which judgments or decisions are made in adopting the plan." This criterion was ranked tenth and rated very important by 32% of the advisors, of average importance by 54%, of little importance by 11% and 4% were undecided. Because the plan is tentative, in that most of it is future oriented, it is not expected to provide all of the answers. However, it is the responsibility of planners to thoroughly analyze the issues and alternatives and provide as complete an examination as possible. Planning assumptions were defined as an "estimation of the social, economic, and political conditions of higher education system for the duration of the plan (five years)." Only 41% of the advisors viewed planning assumptions as very important, while 54% rated it of average importance, and 5% rated it as having little importance. This criterion, like social goals and complete information, is probably more important for planners to use in making rational and calculated decisions and recommendations rather than just to show in the planning document.

Statistical analysis

One-way analysis of variance was used for each of the planning products to test the eight groups' rating scale responses of the planning products. Table 23 shows the F ratios and probabilities for each ANOVA test. Only one planning product on the rating scale responses, funding priorities, produced an overall F ratio which is significant at .05 level.

Figure 12 shows that Duncan's Multiple Range Test indicated that faculty members' ratings of funding priorities differed from both legislators and private college administrators. There were eleven faculty respondents, and all eleven rated funding priorities as very important (4 on the rating scale). The mean of the group ratings of legislators and private administrators was 3.4 (between average importance and very important). Of all 55 respondents, none rated funding priorities below 3--of average importance--which still indicates that all the groups are pretty much in agreement on the importance of funding priorities in planning.

Kendall's W coefficient of concordance indicated a fairly high positive correlation of .52. The groups average rankings and their similarities are shown in Appendix C on page 201. Using the chi-square test of significance at the .05 level, the ranked responses produced a computed χ^2 value of 54, which exceeds the table value of 22.36. Therefore, it can be concluded that the hypothesis that there is agreement among the advisory groups' rankings of planning products is accepted.

Before proceeding to planning outcomes, one final point should be made

Table 23. The F ratios and probabilities associated with the eight advisory groups' ratings of planning product components

Planning products	F	P
	RATING SCALE	
Funding priorities	3.30*	.01
Educational goals	1.36	.25
Adaptable to change	.78	.63
Institutional mission and role	1.57	.17
Supportive trends	1.45	.21
Specific goals and time tables	.69	.68
Authentic endorsement	1.04	.42
Explicit style	1.44	.21
Orderly structure	.94	.49
Planning assumptions	.77	.62
Complete information	1.63	.15
Social goals	1.44	2.1
External and internal appearance	.53	.80
Significant information	1.87	.10

Mean Rating	<u>Legislators</u>	Private college <u>admin.</u>	Lay board & <u>comm.</u>	Out-of- state <u>adv.</u>	Public college <u>admin.</u>	College <u>pres.</u>	Executive <u>branch</u>	<u>Faculty</u>
3.40 Legislators								
3.40 Private college admin.								
3.67 Lay board & comm.								
3.78 Out-of-state adv.								
3.92 Public college admin.								
4.0 College presidents								
4.0 Executive branch								
4.0 Faculty		- *	- *					
1 = No importance								
2 = Of little importance								
3 = Of average importance								
4 = Very important								

* Denotes pairs of groups significantly different at the .05 level using Duncan's Multiple Range Test.

Figure 12. Group mean comparison of advisors' ratings of funding priorities as a planning product

concerning the hypothesis of this study regarding planning products. The results make it clear that while the advisors view all the products as being important, they clearly distinguish the criteria which is most important from the lesser important. The ANOVA test indicated, also, that there was little difference among the groups concerning the relative importance of the product criteria.

Outcomes

Master planning outcomes were defined in this study as "the effects in higher education and government which are caused by master planning." Thirteen planning outcomes were identified in the literature and subsequently rated and ranked by the advisors. The ratings by the advisors are illustrated in Table 24, and the rankings in Table 25. The rating scale responses and rankings will be discussed followed by the results of the statistical comparisons of the group responses.

Established an agenda for action

Consistent with the high ratings of goal setting in the purposes and products of master planning, goal setting was also considered the most important outcome of planning. As a master planning outcome, goal setting was defined as "to establish an agenda for action by setting goals and objectives for a state higher education system providing a clear pattern of developmental choices among programs." This outcome was ranked highest among the 13 outcomes and rated as very important by 80% of the advisors, while 16% rated it of average importance, only 2% saw it as of

Table 24. Advisors' ratings of master planning outcomes (percentages)

Planning outcome	Scale Response				
	1 No imp.	2 Little imp.	3 Avg. imp.	4 Very imp.	5 Undecided
Establishes an agenda for action by setting goals and objectives		2	16	80	2
Enables administrators to make decisions using economic and enrollment forecasts		7	16	75	2
Raises consciousness about social and economic problems about higher education		2	38	61	
Unites the public sector of higher education	2	7	34	57	
Integrates higher education with other sectors of society	2	9	36	54	
Improves and enables communication among top officials	2	4	41	52	2
Encourages the public and professionals to view higher education as a system	4	9	41	46	
Helps create a more favorable attitude toward higher education		2	52	45	2
Differentiates the functions for higher education institutions		13	45	43	
Encourages innovation and change in higher education	2	7	50	41	
Lessens tensions and conflicts		14	43	41	2
Promotes opportunity for evaluation	4	16	43	34	4
Provides renewal for planners		16	55	25	4

Table 25. Mean ranking of master planning outcomes by the eight advisory groups

Planning outcome	Mean rank	Relative rank
Establishes an agenda for action by setting goals and objectives	1.8	1
Enables administrators to make decisions using economic and enrollment forecasts	3.9	2
Raises consciousness about social and economic problems about higher education	4.8	3
Unites the public sector of higher education	5.6	4
Integrates higher education with other sectors of society	5.9	5
Improves and enables communication among top officials	6.4	6
Encourages the public and professionals to view higher education as a system	7.4	7
Helps create a more favorable attitude toward higher education	7.7	8
Differentiates the functions for higher education institutions	8.3	9
Encourages innovation and change in higher education	8.4	10
Lessens tensions and conflicts	10.6	12
Promotes opportunity for evaluation	9.3	11
Provides renewal for planners	11.3	13

little importance, and 2% were undecided. This very clearly confirms that the primary role of master planning is to establish goals for the state system of higher education.

Differentiates functions

The outcome ranked second and rated very important by the second highest percentage of advisors was "the differentiation of function for higher education institutions by clearly defining the roles for each institution." This outcome was considered very important by 75% of the advisors, of average importance by 16%, of little importance by 7%, and 2% were undecided. This outcome is similar to the planning product of "providing institutional mission and role," which was rated nearly the same by the advisors.

Improves communication

The outcome ranked third highest and rated third most important by the advisors related to master planning was a communication process defined as follows: "Improves and enhances communication among top officials on goals and issues in higher education." Here the planning process of establishing and communicating goals is viewed as an outcome because it is a continuous process. A large majority (61%) of the advisors rated this outcome very important, 38% rated it of average importance, and only 2% rated it of little importance.

Creates a favorable attitude

Another important outcome of master planning is for the plan to give the image of proper and productive operation by higher education to its primary supporters. This outcome was described in the questionnaire as follows: "helps to create among legislators and state executive officers a more favorable attitude toward higher education." This outcome was ranked fourth, rated very important by 57% of the advisors, of average importance by 34%, of little importance by 7% and of no importance by 2%. This outcome indicates that higher education planners have the responsibility of selling higher education to legislators and the governor so that these government officials will in turn be supportive of higher education. One legislative advisor, however, commented that "the plan should not be used as a lobbying tool."

Enables administrative decision-making

The outcome defined as "enables higher education administrators to make decisions using economic and enrollment forecasts," was ranked sixth most important and rated as very important by 57% of the advisors. Thirty-six percent rated it as of average importance, 9% of little importance and 2% of no importance.

Unites public sector higher education

Another outcome considered very important by the majority of the advisors was "unites the public sector of higher education by providing a clear understanding of different roles and creating a spirit of sharing

and cooperation." This outcome was ranked fifth and rated as very important by 52% of the advisors, of average importance by 41%, of little importance by 4%, and of no importance by only 2%.

Other planning outcomes

The seven remaining outcomes were rated as very important by less than half of the advisors (ranging from 25% to 45%). However, all were rated as of average importance or very important by a substantial majority of the advisors when combined. While this indicates overall support for all the outcomes, it is somewhat surprising that one of those seven outcomes was that planning should "encourage innovation and change in higher education institutions." One major finding in the literature was that long-range planning serves as an instrument of change or improvement. Therefore, it would have been expected to be rated very important by a clear majority of the advisors. Consequently, it was ranked eighth and 45% of the advisors viewed it as very important, 52% of average importance, 2% of little importance and 2% were undecided. One advisor who is a college president rated this outcome very important and commented that "great care should be taken to make sure that planning does not do the opposite of encouraging innovation and change. Planning should enable institutions to greet the future not merely head on but in an important "avant garde" sense of the word. Planning should be more trend setting than reactive."

Similarly, it is surprising that the outcome "encourages the public and professionals to view higher education as a system rather than as

individual isolated institutions," was not rated very important by the majority of the advisors, especially since this is one aim of most legislative statutes regarding equity in funding. However, it was ranked seventh in importance and 46% viewed systematizing as a very important outcome, 41% of average importance, 9% of little importance and 4% of no importance.

Among the other five outcomes considered to be of lesser importance was that planning "raises consciousness about social and economic problems concerning higher education that may otherwise have been overlooked." Although it was ranked ninth, the advisors ratings indicate that this outcome is fairly important in that 42% rated it as very important, 41% of average importance and the other 13% thought it had little importance. It was pointed out in Chapter III that planners should not be judged on the accuracy of their economic and social forecasts alone. So many factors contribute to this outcome that the most that can be expected is for planners to make logical projections with substantial supportive evidence. It is also necessary to have broad support in shaping this outcome.

For the planning outcome "promotes opportunity for future evaluation of accomplishments by providing performance indicators, for goals and objectives," the advisors ranked it tenth and 41% rated it very important, 50% of average importance, 7% of little importance, and 2% of no importance. The rating of this outcome is interesting when considering the highest criterion throughout the evaluation has been goal setting.

The rating of this outcome indicates that it is more important to set goals than to set performance evaluation indicators for those goals. However, planners cannot ignore evaluation standards in planning, for this has much to do with goal setting in the future planning process.

Another outcome which was considered of average importance by the advisors was "provides renewal and crystallizes the thinking of higher education officials who are involved in the process of planning or reviewing the plan." The advisors ranked this outcome twelfth and 47% rated it very important, 43% of average importance and 14% rated it of little importance and 2% were undecided. This is a natural outcome of master planning, and planners and administrators are forced to examine new issues and to reassess existing policies.

For the planning outcome "lessens or eliminates unproductive tensions and conflicts among institutions," the advisors ranked it eleventh and only 34% of the advisors rated it as very important, 43% of average importance, 16% of little importance, 4% of no importance and 4% were undecided. This is consistent with the low rating of the related planning purpose "minimize competition." One out-of-state advisor commented that "some tension and competition is good."

Finally, the outcome which was considered very important by the least number of advisors was "integrates higher education with other sectors of society by studying the effects those other sectors of society have on higher education." This outcome was ranked thirteenth, 25% rated it very important, 55% of average importance, and 16% of

little importance, and 4% were undecided. However, as stated earlier in this chapter, planners have to be sensitive to the social demands on higher education, but it is definitely not the top priority in the planning process or outcome.

All of the planning outcomes were rated very important or of average importance by a majority of the advisors. This is an indication that all the outcomes should be given some attention by state level planners.

Statistical analysis

The analysis of variance test on the planning outcomes indicates a significant F ratio for two outcomes. Table 26 shows the F ratios for the thirteen planning outcomes. The first outcome with a significant F ratio at the .05 level was "encourages the public and professionals to view higher education as a system rather than individual isolated institutions." Duncan's multiple range test indicated a significant difference between two groups: out-of-state advisors and public college administrators with a mean rating of 2.78 and 2.92, respectively, differed from lay board and commission members with a mean of 4.0 (see Figure 13).

Table 26. The F ratios and probabilities associated with the advisors' ratings of planning outcomes

Ranking planning outcomes	F	P
Establishes an agenda for action by setting goals and objectives	1.58	.16
Differentiates the functions for higher education institutions	1.42	.22
Improves and enhances communication among top officials	.69	.68
Helps create a more favorable attitude toward higher education	1.78	.11
Unites the public sector of higher education	2.54*	.03
Enables administrators to make decisions using economic and enrollment forecasts	.517	.82
Encourages the public and professionals to view higher education as a system	2.45*	.03
Encourages innovation and change in higher education	1.58	.16
Raises consciousness about social and economic problems about higher education	1.27	.28
Promotes opportunity for evaluation	.59	.76
Provides renewal for planners	1.88	.09
Lessens tensions and conflicts	1.76	.12
Integrates higher education with other sectors of society	1.13	.36

* Significant difference at the .05 level.

Mean Rating	<u>Out-of- state adv.</u>	<u>Public college admin.</u>	<u>College pres.</u>	<u>Legislators</u>	<u>Private college admin.</u>	<u>Faculty</u>	<u>Executive branch</u>	<u>Lay board & comm.</u>
2.78	Out-of-state adv.							
2.92	Public college admin.							
3.38	College presidents							
3.40	Legislators							
3.40	Private college admin.							
3.73	Faculty							
4.00	Executive branch							
4.00	Lay board & comm.	- *	- *					
1 = No importance 2 = Of little importance 3 = Of average importance 4 = Very important								

* Denotes pairs of groups significantly different at the .05 level using Duncan's Multiple Range Test.

Figure 13. Group mean rating scores on Outcome #7--"Encourages the public and professionals to view higher education as a system rather than individual isolated institutions"

Legislators	3.0
Faculty	3.1
Private administrators	3.2
Out-of-state advisors	3.2
Lay board & commission	3.7
Public college administrators	3.8
College administrators	4.0
Executive branch	4.0

Figure 14. Group means for planning outcome #4 unites the public sector of higher education by providing a clear understanding of different roles and creating a spirit of sharing and cooperation

The analysis of variance test of the eight groups' ratings of another planning outcome produced an F ratio which was significant at the .05 level. This outcome was defined as "unites the public sector of higher education by providing a clear understanding of different roles and creating a spirit of sharing and cooperation." While the overall F ratio of 2.54 exceeds the table value of 2.21, the Duncan tests indicated that no two groups were significantly different in their rating of this outcome at the .05 level. As shown in Figure 14, the group means ranged from 3.0 (of average importance) to 4.0 (very important).

Using Kendall's W coefficient of concordance, a positive correlation of .42 was found. The average rankings of each group and their similarities are shown on page 202 in Appendix C. When applying the chi-square test of significance at the .05 level, the ranked responses produced a computed χ^2 value of .40 which exceeds the tabled value of 22.04. Therefore, it can be concluded that the hypothesis that there was agreement among the advisors' rankings of planning outcomes, is accepted.

Summary

In regard to the hypothesis that no differences exist among the eight groups' evaluations of the criteria, it must be concluded that there is an overall consensus on the criteria; therefore, the hypotheses that there is a consensus on the criteria should not be rejected. Out of the 100 ratings tested by analysis of variance, significant differences were found in only 13 (13%). Also, Kendall's W coefficient of concordance indicates that there was a high degree of similarity in the eight groups' rankings of the criteria.

Of the planning purposes, there was a statistically significant difference found relative to only one criterion--issues identification. Some advisors rightfully expressed the opinion that the planning purpose goes beyond the identification of issues, and that issues identification was only a means to achieving the larger purpose.

Much of the differences in the rating of the participants in the planning processes had to do with private college administrators. Private college administrators were desirous of a large role in all the planning processes with the exception of prioritizing and authorization, whereas such advisory groups as public college administrators, public college presidents, and legislators viewed them as having a limited role in the planning processes. There was broad agreement on the state coordinating staff providing the primary leadership in most of the planning processes.

Like the planning purposes, the planning products produced very

little disagreement among the advisors. Only one product, funding priorities, had a significant F value. However, funding priorities was rated as the most important planning product and no advisor rated it anything other than very important or of average importance. It was also clear in the evaluation that the advisors considered the content oriented products such as funding priorities, goal setting, and institutional role and mission as being more important than the stylistic and structural features, such as external and internal appearance or orderly structure. One important product component, about which the advisors were particularly expressive, was that the plan have the appearance of being adaptable to change.

On the planning outcomes, the differences among the advisors were also minimal. One of the statistically significant differences concerned the question of whether planning causes public colleges to unite and become more systematized. The paired comparisons on this criterion, however, indicated that no differences existed on the rating scale responses, and that, overall, this outcome was considered to be important. Another related outcome which produced some differences in responses was that planning causes the public and professionals to view higher education as a system rather than as individual isolated institutions. It is very interesting that all the lay board members viewed this outcome

as very important while public college administrators and the out-of-state consultants saw this as having less importance among the outcomes. It could be that many state-level lay board members view their role as to systematized. It is also understandable that public college administrators may favor having a unique and clearly distinguishable institution.

Overall, the planning outcomes, like the other criteria, was viewed as very important by the advisors. The advisors' general overall support of the criteria further proves the earlier assertion that there can be a consensus reached on a well-defined comprehensive set of criteria for evaluation of state level long-range planning. The final chapter will discuss the application of the criteria in a formal evaluation of state level plans and provide an instrument for evaluation.

CHAPTER V. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The two goals of this study have been accomplished. First, the identification of criteria for state level planning by reviewing the literature; and second, the validation of the criteria by an advisory group of planning constituents. This final chapter has four purposes: 1) to analyze the challenges for planners regarding the most important criteria verified by the advisory group (goal setting, funding priorities, and institutional mission and scope); 2) to discuss the use of the evaluation of the planning process; 3) to re-emphasize the importance of criteria evaluation; and 4) to recommend a method and instrument for evaluating existing state level plans.

As stated in the previous chapter, the advisors considered all the criteria to be important enough to warrant the attention of planners during their preparation and evaluation of master planning. However, goal setting, funding, and institutional role and mission statements were the criteria that were most important to the advisors, in addition to being the criteria that received the most comments from the advisors in the evaluation. These were also the criteria which were mentioned most repeatedly in the literature. Each of these three criteria provide some special challenges to planners, therefore, each will now be discussed and their unique challenges explored.

Goal Setting

It was noted in Chapter III that past peer evaluations found that a major fault of state level planners for higher education was in setting goals which were challenging and ambitious. This failure has been attributed in part to the tendency of state planners to negotiate goals with all the state institutions which have different interests. The end results are statements of compromise. There is a need for planners to exert leadership and objectivity in goal setting in order to best serve the public. Goal setting in state level plans has often been no more than a broad statement of policy, whereas institutional master plans more appropriately have been used to set goals which were operational statements on which the institution proposed to take action. State planners have tended to spend too much time on safe noncontroversial topics such as projecting enrollments, and anticipating labor market supply and demand. State planners have often avoided setting goals on admission standards and other important issues; instead they make statements about the need to do so and delegate the responsibility to the institutions who may or may not carry them out. State plans would be much better if they contained goals about educational quality such as defining the role of faculty members or specifying curriculum requirements. However, the reluctance of state planners to set goals may be in order to avoid conflicts with institutions and other constituents of the plan. Therefore, too often abstract and bland statements serve as the planning goals which are, to a large extent, written

for public consumption, and not for direct action. This is an indication that state planners need to exert leadership in establishing goals for the higher education system. This was also reflected by the criteria advisors who rated coordinating staff as primary leaders in the goal setting process.

Goal setting provides the biggest challenge for state level planners, and the criteria advisors in this evaluation confirm this by rating it the most important purpose, product, and outcome. The advisors were also in agreement in recognizing that educational goals were more important than any other type goals but that some attention also has to be given to economic goal setting. The problems which planners are most likely to confront when taking a more aggressive approach to setting goals, will be in obtaining the cooperation of higher education officials and elected public officials in implementing the objectives necessary to reach the goals. It was found in the literature that higher education institutional leaders will continue to contest any perceived threat to autonomy, especially if they perceive themselves as losers in the planning recommendations; public officials will contest planning goals which they view as having negative impact on their home institutions even if it is clear that the planning goals are beneficial for the overall state system; and some public citizens will contest departures from tradition while others will contest the failure to change. Despite these obstacles, state level planners will be forced by their constituents to make difficult decisions in the interest of being effective and providing the needed functions of planning. At the

same time some organized method has to be employed by state planners so that participants can be included and still come up with meaningful non-negotiated goals.

There is still a need for further study on the subject of goal setting. A different approach may be necessary for each state because of its unique history and its unique organizational patterns for postsecondary education. The following six recommendations are based on this study and other pertinent reports and appear to be essential considerations for planners involved in goal setting:

1. Goals should be based upon sound information about the past. State level planners are responsible for knowing the history of higher education in their state and of past trends concerning enrollment, personnel, funding, curricula, research and public service.
2. Goals should be future oriented with a focus on building upon current strengths and eliminating weaknesses. Planners must distinguish the difference between policy statements and goals. For example, many states that have open admissions policies also have state plans which list the maintenance of free access and open admission as a planning goal when it is actually a policy statement. A goal on the same subject would recognize that there is an open admissions policy but would go further by illustrating how standards should be raised as well as the qualifications of student applicants.
3. Goals should represent a set of value commitments on the part of the planning authority. Planners must have the courage to confront the planning issues head-on with the objectives of making rational decisions concerning the future direction of the higher education system. This most often means that planners have to make decisions on issues about which there are contrasting views, but yielding to extreme compromises may result in mediocrity.
4. Goals should be accompanied by a sequential plan for implementation and a channel for receiving continuous constructive feedback and evaluation during implementation. In addition to envisioning a goal, planners must demonstrate some leadership

by illustrating alternatives and suggestions for how to get there from here. This also allows planners to know if they are within the limits of their planning authority.

5. Goals should be challenging but tangible. Planners should be imaginative, but must be careful not to set goals for which there are no resources available for implementation.
6. Goals should be set by the planning authority providing leadership with all other participants serving as advisors. Planners have the difficult task of determining how to involve broad participation in the planning process and especially in goal setting. However, what must be avoided is the negotiation of goals.

Funding

Another criterion of special interest to the criteria advisors as evidenced by a large number of comments was funding priorities. Several advisors commented that plans should illustrate clearly the programs and operations to be of high priority for receiving funds during the length of the plan. It was pointed out in Chapter II, that in addition to planning and academic program review, funding is another major function of state coordinating and governing boards. The major role of these boards is to find equitable means for allocating funds to higher education institutions. Therefore, the desire of the planning constituents to have funding plans is justified. However, planners face some difficult challenges in this regard as well.

First of all, most states utilize formulas for annual allocations of operating funds. Therefore, any projections of future funding levels will be based upon other variables such as enrollment and credit hours produced. To indicate accurately the operating funds to be appropriated

will depend upon how accurate the projections of other associated variables are. A second difficulty is that in any state, funding for higher education or any other government function, has the involvement of elected officials in the legislative and executive branch. Commitments for funding can only rightfully be made by these officials. And, still another difficulty is that funding to higher education in any given year will depend to a large degree on how well the state is doing fiscally. It has been difficult over the past few years to measure this from year to year.

Those matters for which planners do not have control, however, should not prohibit planners from fulfilling the planning requirement of establishing priorities for needed programs, capital outlay needs, and research. In fact, it was pointed out in Chapter III that successful planners can affect political decisions by providing more complete and persuasive information and data on future needs. State planners also have the opportunity to build credibility with public elected officials who will have direct impact on decision-making.

The criteria evaluator's interest may be interpreted as a request for strong representation by planners of the funding needs of higher education and active defense of higher education and its fiscal needs. In this sense, state planners are seen as protectors and promoters of higher education institutions in the budgetary process.

Role and Mission

Role and mission statements were other major criteria for state level planning that the advisors considered very important. The criteria advisors showed interest in the related outcome of differentiating functions of higher education institutions by role and mission statements. It was confirmed by the criteria advisors, that this is an essential requirement of state plans. The most compelling arguments for role and mission statements are that they are the means by which institutions can identify areas of common interest so that they can share resources and coordinate into an integrated system. It is important for plans to clearly differentiate functions among types of institutions.

Role and mission statements, however, may also present some problems for planners. Among them are the following: 1) role and mission statements too often appear to show aspirations of every state institution to become like the large state comprehensive university; 2) role and mission statements may be contrary to the institution's faculty, staff, and administrators' views which can cause some frustration to the institution; 3) because state-supported institutions are part of a system, the incentive and rewards are often systematic and do not often enough encourage uniqueness and difference; and 4) the spirit among institutions is often one of competition rather than coordination and cooperation.

It is the role of the state-level planner to illustrate and complement the different functions of each college and university with regard to its program offerings, environmental setting, instruction, public

service, and research. There must also be incentives provided which encourage institutions to emphasize their unique strengths. There is some question as to what the contents of role and scope statement should be, how they should be organized, and whether it should be the role of state planners to develop these statements, or should it be the responsibility of institutional officials. These questions will have to continue to be studied by state planners.

The challenges associated with the above three criteria are by no means the only ones. However, they do represent the challenges which are deserving of priority attention of state planners who desire to improve the effectiveness of planning.

Planning Process

Another major part of the evaluation was to identify the role and amount of participation the planning constituent groups should have in the planning process. The planning process was clearly defined in the literature and the experts in long-range planning were in agreement about the necessary steps to be taken in developing a plan. Many were also in agreement that the process was as important if not more important than any other aspect of planning. What was not apparent in the literature was who should participate in the planning process and the role the participants should play. The Literature Review illustrated how many of the authors made general statements which in essence said that there should be broad participation in order to get support of the plan to assure its

implementation. It was also illustrated earlier in this chapter how improper use of participants can be detrimental to master planning resulting in watered-down planning recommendations.

The problem of participation is compounded when considering the fact that newly created state coordination and governing boards are responsible for planning for more long-standing traditional institutions which have often been opposed to centralized planning and other governing authorities. Therefore, because there was more uncertainty about the participants in the process rather than the process itself, it was more useful to determine how the constituents should get involved in the process. The analysis of the advisors' ratings as in the other parts of the evaluation indicated that in most cases there were no significant differences among the advisory groups' ratings of the participants. There were, however, some differences among the advisors' ratings of private college administrators as participants in the planning process. In general, it was found that private college officials desired an active continuous role in the process, while all other groups of advisors viewed them as having little or no participation in state-level planning. This will vary from state to state and will depend largely upon how much public financial support is provided to the private institutions. There may be some reluctance to include private college administrators in public activities for which they have no legal responsibility nor commitment to implement.

The most interesting result of this evaluation was that it provided a clear distinction of who the leaders are in each stage of the planning

process. The state coordinating staff was viewed as the primary leader in the early developmental stages of the plan; lay board and commission members as the leaders in authorizing the plan; and college faculty and administrators as the leaders in implementing the plan. The process evaluation also indicated that many perceptions of lay board and commission members as participants in public approval and not process are not broadly supported. Lay board and commission members were seen as active participants throughout the planning process. Finally, the advisors indicated a minor role for out-of-state consultants in the planning process. This indicates that a caution should be given to state planners about the over reliance upon outsiders who have no allegiance to seeing that the plan is implemented.

The method used in the process evaluation can be very useful to state planners in determining how best to apply their human resources in developing a master plan. Not only does it indicate how much participation there should be in the planning process, it also shows at what stages the constituents can be most helpful. This is consistent with the importance attached to criteria evaluation throughout this study, and will be briefly re-examined.

Criteria Evaluation

The need for developing criteria for evaluating state planning is supported by the fact that the only current means for planners to assess the success of their plans is through peer review or by comparison of ones

own state plan with those of other states. It was shown in Chapter I that the first method has limited advantages and is not often utilized, and the latter method may suffice for structural and stylistic evaluation, but each state's historical developmental uniquenesses prohibit the comparison of substance. Thus, the development of criteria is a necessary first step.

While it has been recommended in this study to apply the theory of pluralism in determining the criteria for planning and evaluation, other options do exist. One option is simply to utilize the legislative statutes and allow eventual legislative judgment to serve as the criteria. This approach for the planning agency has the advantage of fulfilling the immediate requirement of being responsive to the government branch that created it. It also means that the principal purpose of planning would be to advise lawmakers in their decision-making, using the master plan as the guiding light. The liabilities of this approach far outweigh the benefits. First of all, because of the turnover in state legislatures due to retirements, resignations, and elections, the primary legislative developers of the criteria and supporters of the planning agency are not to be in office permanently. Therefore, the criteria may be temporarily effective for as long as its developers are in office. Second, this approach runs the risk of isolating and alienating other planning constituents, namely, the executive branch, and college and university officials. And third, legislative statutes are most often for the purpose of establishing a principal expectation and providing the necessary machinery to fulfill that expectation. It does not, nor should

it, dictate the methods and professional standards for carrying out the mission.

Another approach to establishing criteria is for higher education officials to collectively develop it themselves. This approach has the benefit of allowing the experts to determine what the plan should contain. It also has the benefit of having the appearance of protecting institutional authority and autonomy. The major liability of this approach is that it closely resembles voluntary coordinating activities of the 20th century. It was revealed in Chapter II that voluntary attempts at coordination failed due to the competitiveness of higher education institutions during the early and middle decades of this century.

The method of establishing criteria prescribed in this study appears to contain the benefits of the other approaches minus the liabilities. The use of all the constituent groups in the criteria evaluation allows the planner to identify any unique needs to any group and also to determine the similarities in their planning needs. It avoids alienating any group while serving all. This form of criteria evaluation also serves to identify changing requirements of planning as well. For example, the impetus of planning was the rapid expansion of higher education for which planned growth was essential. Today, the issues are no longer expansion, but retrenchment. The changed condition does not eliminate the need for planning but does alter its emphasis. Instead of planning public access, the new emphasis may be on providing better quality, and planners must align themselves with the planning needs.

Three major concluding recommendations for criteria development are:

1. Criteria for evaluation should consist of the following: an examination of the specific planning purposes; a determination of the parts of the planning process and the participants in each process; an examination of the product components of the plan; and an examination of the desired outcomes of the plan.
2. Any development of criteria for planning and evaluation should view input from the planning constituency as essential.
3. Criteria evaluation should be cyclical so as to identify changes in the emphasis of planning criteria.

Evaluating State Level Plans

The major reason for developing and validating the criteria in this study was for application in an actual evaluation of state higher education planning in Tennessee. An evaluation instrument which contains the criteria is illustrated in Appendix D. The evaluation of master planning focuses upon the purposes, process, product, and outcomes of long-range state level planning for higher education.

Evaluations of state level plans should be both formative and summative. The evaluation should be concerned with the performance outcomes of the previous plan, but also with helping the developer of the future plan to make improvements. The primary goals of master planning evaluation are first, to determine the strengths and limitations of the plan; second, to distinguish between the planning goals that have been accomplished from those that have not; and third, to get feedback about

the past plan in order to improve future plans. In terms of the criteria validated in this study by the advisors and applied to the evaluation questionnaire in Appendix D, the goals of the evaluation are:

1. To determine the extent to which the master planning purposes have been served.
2. To determine the strengths and limitations of the contents of the planning document.
3. To determine if the planning goals have been accomplished and what other outcomes have been attained.
4. To determine if constituency groups were given adequate participation in the planning process.

Master planning evaluations should apply the principal of pluralism similar to that used in validating the criteria in this study. Much is to be learned by planners through an open form of evaluation, and it allows the constituents of the plan to be formally involved in the process.

The primary impetus for this study was to provide a method for formal evaluation in order to remove some uncertainty of state planners concerning the function of state planning in higher education. The findings of this study indicate that the planning constituency is not in great disagreement about its expectations of state level plans. Continuous evaluation of planning is essential to continue to respond to public need; to respond to changing conditions; and above all to improve the overall function of master planning.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Abrahams, Louise. Present Planning for Higher Education. Washington, D.C.: Academy for Educational Development, 1967.
- Abrahams, Louise. State Planning for Higher Education. Washington, D.C.: Academy for Educational Development, 1969.
- Alabama's Challenge: Higher Education for the 1980's. A Report of the second committee to evaluate the effectiveness of the Alabama Commission on Higher Education, Montgomery, Ala., March 1979.
- Albright, A. D. "Statewide Perspective on Planning with Faculty." In More for Less - Academic Planning with Faculty without New Dollars, edited by James Nesmith. New York: Society for College and University Planning, 1975.
- Anderson, Charles, ed. A Fact Book. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1977.
- Anderson, Scarvia B., Samuel Ball, and Richard T. Murphy. Encyclopedia of Educational Evaluation. Washington, D.C.: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1975.
- Balderston, Frederick E. "Statewide Planning and the Individual Institutions Response." In Statewide Planning for Postsecondary Education: Issues and Design, edited by Lyman A. Glenny and George B. Weathersby. Boulder, Colorado: NCHEMS, 1971.
- Beeby, C. E. Planning and the Educational Administrator. Paris: UNESCO, International Institute for Educational Planning, 1967.
- Bender, Louis W. "Planning After the Golden Decade." In Improving Statewide Planning. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Inc., 1974.
- Berdahl, Robert O. Statewide Coordination of Higher Education. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1971.
- Berdahl, Robert O., ed. Evaluating Statewide Boards. Washington, D.C.: Jossey-Bass Inc., 1975.
- Biennial Survey of Education in the United States 1946-48. Washington, D.C.: Federal Security Agency Office of Education, 1948.
- Bolin, John G. Institutional Long-Range Planning. Athens, Georgia: Institute of Higher Education, University of Georgia, 1969.

- Boyer, Ernest. "Encouraging Innovation Through Long-Range Planning." In Planning for State Systems of Postsecondary Education, edited by Fred Hurclerod. Iowa City: American College Testing Program, 1973.
- Briscoe, Keith G. "Dear New Trustee." Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges 21, No. 6 (November/December 1979): 23.
- Brown, David. "The Supreme Role of Faculty in Planning - Why and How?" In More for Less, Academic Planning with Faculty without New Dollars, edited by James M. Nesmith. New York: Society for College and University Planning, 1975.
- Browne, Arthur D. "The Institution and the System: Autonomy and Coordination." In Long-Range Planning in Higher Education, edited by Owen A. Knorr. Boulder, Colorado: WICHE, 1965.
- Brumbaugh, A. J. Statewide Planning and Coordination of Higher Education. Atlanta: Southern Regional Education Board, 1963.
- California Education Code, Sec. 22712, 1961.
- Callan, Patrick M. "Evaluating Planning by Statewide Boards." In Evaluating Statewide Boards, edited by Robert O. Berdahl. Washington, D.C.: Jossey-Bass Inc., 1975.
- Cantlon, John E. "The Threat of Efficiency: Perspective of the Large University." In More for Less - Academic Planning with Faculty without New Dollars, edited by James Nesmith. New York: Society for College and University Planning, 1975.
- Carnegie Council on Higher Education. The Capitol and the Campus State Responsibility for Postsecondary Education. Washington, D.C.: The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 1971.
- Chambers, M. M. The Campus and the People. Danville, Illinois: The Interstate Printers & Publishers Inc., 1960.
- Cheit, Earl B. "Planning for Quality." In More for Less - Academic Planning with Faculty without New Dollars, edited by James Nesmith. New York: Society for College and University Planning, 1975.
- Churchman, Charles W. The Systems Approach. New York: Delacorte Press, 1968.

Colm, Gerhard. Integrated of National Planning and Budgeting.
Washington, D.C.: National Planning Association, 1968.

Conference on Postsecondary Statewide Planning for 1980-1985.
(Proceedings). Alabama Commission on Higher Education, Montgomery, Alabama, 1978.

Coordination or Chaos? Report of the Task Force on Coordination,
Governance and Structure of Postsecondary Education. Denver:
Education Commission of the States, 1973.

Dunlap, E. T. "Development and Implementation of a State Higher
Education Plan." In Planning for State Systems of Postsecondary
Education, edited by Fred Harclerod. Iowa City: American
College Testing Service, 1972.

Dykes, Archie R. Faculty Participation in Academic Decision Making.
Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1968.

Eurich, Alvin C. and Sidney G. Ticton. Long-Range Planning and
Budgeting at Colleges and Universities. Washington, D.C.: Academy
for Educational Development, 1975.

Fact Book on Higher Education in the South 1977 and 1978. Atlanta:
Southern Regional Education Board, 1978.

Federal Register. Public Law 92-318, Section 196, 86 Stat., June 23,
1972.

Fincher, Cameron. Planning in Higher Education. (Monograph). Athens,
Georgia: Institute of Higher Education, University of Georgia,
1966.

Folger, John K. "SSTRR" (Seek Systems that Reward Results). In
Planning and Management Practices in Higher Education: Promise
or Dilemma?, edited by Richard Millard et al. Denver: Education
Commission of the States, 1972.

Ford, Paul Leicester, ed. The Writings of Thomas Jefferson, Vol. IX.
New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1898.

Gardner, Don E. "Five Evaluation Frameworks: Implications for Decision
Making in Higher Education." The Journal of Higher Education
48, No. 5. (September/October, 1977):571.

Glenny, Lyman. Autonomy of Public Colleges. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1959.

- Glenny, Lyman, Robert Berdahl, Ernest Palola, and James Paltridge. Coordinating Higher Education for the 70's. Berkeley: Center for Research and Development in Higher Education, 1971.
- Glenny, Lyman, and George Weathersby, ed. Statewide Planning for Postsecondary Education: Issues and Design. Boulder: National Center for Higher Education Management Systems, 1971.
- Glenny, Lyman. "What are We in For?" In Planning and Management Practices in Higher Education: Promise or Dilemma?, edited by Richard Millard et al. Denver: Education Commission of the States, 1972.
- Glenny, Lyman, and Julie Hurst. "Current Statewide Planning Structures and Powers." In Statewide Planning for Postsecondary Education: Issues and Design, edited by Lyman Glenny and George Weathersby. Boulder: National Center for Higher Education Management Systems, The American Council on Education, and Education Commission of the States, 1971.
- Glenny, Lyman, and Thomas Dalglish. Public Universities, State Agencies, and the Law: Constitutional Autonomy in Decline. Berkeley: University of California, 1973.
- Gomberg, Irene L., and Frank J. Atelsek. "Who's on the Governing Board?" Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges 19, No. 6 (November/December, 1977): p. 16.
- Halstead, Kent. Statewide Planning in Higher Education. Washington, D.C.: United States Government Printing Office, 1974.
- Harclerod, Fred F. "Planning: A Basic Responsibility for a State System." In Planning for State Systems of Postsecondary Education. Iowa City: The American College Testing Service, 1973.
- Higher Education in Tennessee, A Statewide Master Plan, 1979.
- Johnson, Elizabeth H. "Why Statewide Boards". Association of Governing Boards 18, No. 2 (March/April, 1976):11.
- Keller, John E. "Planning and Resource Allocation." In Planning and Management Practices in Higher Education. Promises and Dilemma?, edited by Richard Millard et al. Denver: Education Commission of the States, 1972.
- Kelly, F. J., and J. H. McNeely. The State and Higher Education. New York: Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 1933.

- Klasson, Charles R. "The Economic Base for Statewide Systems Planning: The Nature of the Problem." In Planning for State Systems of Postsecondary Education, edited by Fred Harclerod. Iowa City: The American College Testing Program, 1973.
- Kneverich, Stephen J. Administrative Technology and the School Executive. Washington, D.C.: American Association of School Administrators, 1969.
- Knorr, Owen A. Long-Range Planning in Higher Education. (Proceedings of the Annual Institute on College Self-Study of College and University Administrators). Boulder: WICHE, July 1964.
- Koontz, Harold and Cyril O'Donnell. Principles of Management, New York: McGraw-Hill, 1968, p. 81.
- Kratz, Robert Norman. Educational Planning Literature Review. Monticello, Illinois: Council of Planning Librarians, 1971.
- LeBreton, Preston P. and Dale A. Henning. Planning Theory. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1961.
- Lyman, Richard W. "A Toast to Trustees." Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges 21, No. 5 (September/October, 1979).
- McGrath, Earl J. General Education and the Plight of Modern Man. Indianapolis: The Lilly Endowment Inc., 1976.
- McGuinness, Aimes, Harry McKinney, and Richard Millard. The Changing Map of Postsecondary Education. Denver: Education Commission of the States, 1975.
- McManis, Gerald L., and James L. Harvey. Planning Management and Evaluation Systems in Higher Education. Littleton, Colorado: Ireland Educational Corporation, 1978.
- Maher, Thomas H. "Academic Planning and Faculty Involvement: The Invisible College Perspective." In More for Less - Academic Planning with Faculty without New Dollars, edited by James N. Nesmith. Washington, D.C.: Society for College and University Planning, 1975.
- Mayhew, Lewis. Long-Range Planning for Higher Education. Washington, D.C.: Academy for Educational Development, 1969.

Millett, John ed. "Statewide Planning and Coordination of Higher Education." (Presentation). Atlanta: Southern Regional Education Board, 1967.

Millett, John, ed. Planning in Higher Education: A Manual for Colleges and Universities. Washington, D.C.: Academy for Educational Development, 1976.

Millett, John. Higher Education Planning: A Report of Experience and a Forecast of Strategies for Change. New York: Academy for Educational Development, 1978.

Millett, John. "The States Face Issues of Quality in Higher Education." A Presentation to the Invitational Seminar for Members of Statewide Coordinating and Governing Boards, July 31, 1979. Washington, D.C.: Academy for Educational Development, 1979. (a)

Millett, John. Challenges in Statewide Planning for the 1980's. (Occasional Paper Number Nine). New York: Academy for Education Development, 1979 (b).

Nesmith, James N., ed. More for Less - Academic Planning with Faculty without New Dollars. New York: Society for College and University Planning, 1975.

North Carolina Government Statute, Section 116, 1971.

Odegaard, Charles E. "Statewide Coordination: A Personal Comment." In Evaluating Statewide Boards, edited by Robert Berdahl. Washington, D.C.: Jossey-Bass Inc., 1975.

Ohio Board of Regents. Management Improvement Program. Columbus: Ohio Board of Regents, 1974.

O'Neil, June. Resource Use in Higher Education. Washington, D.C.: Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, 1971.

Palola, Ernest, Timothy Lehmann, and William Blischke. Education by Design: The Sociology of Planning. Berkeley: University of California, 1970.

Paltridge, James G. Boards of Trustees: Their Decision Patterns. Berkeley: Center for Research and Development in Higher Education, University of California, 1973.

Pliner, Emogene. Coordination and Planning. Baton Rouge: Public Affairs Research Council of Louisiana, 1966.

Public Acts of Tennessee. Senate Committee Resolution 189, 85th Congress, 1967.

Scott, Brian W. Long-range Planning in American Industry, New York: American Management Association, 1965.

State Postsecondary Education Profiles Handbook. Denver: Education Commission of the States, 1978.

Statewide Comprehensive Planning for Postsecondary Education. Denver: Education Commission of the States, 1973.

Stufflebeam, Daniel T. Educational Evaluation and Decision Making. Bloomington: Phi Delta Kappa, 1971.

Tennessee Code Annotated 49-4203. Section 1, 1967.

The Capital and the Campus: State Responsibility for Postsecondary Education. Carnegie Council on Higher Education. Hightstown: McGraw-Hill, 1971.

The State of South Carolina General Assembly Legislative Audit Council Management and Operational Review of the South Carolina Commission on Higher Education. Columbus: June 14, 1978.

Theodore, James L. Crisis in Planning. Columbus: Council of Educational Facility Planners, 1968.

Weathersby, George B. "Tools and Techniques for Planning and Resource Allocation." In Planning and Management Practices in Higher Education: Promise or Dilemma?, edited by Richard Millard et al. Denver: Education Commission of the States, 1972.

Wilson, Logan. "Institutional Autonomy and Heteronomy." In Whose Goals for American Higher Education, edited by Charles G. Dobbins and Calvin T. T. Lee. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1968.

Wing, Paul. Statewide Planning for Postsecondary Education: Conceptualization and Analysis of Relevant Information. Boulder: WICHE, 1972.

Worthen, Blaine R. and James R. Sanders. Educational Evaluation: Theory and Practice. Worthington, Ohio: Charles A. Jones Publishing Company, 1973.

Wrapp, Edward H. "Organization for Long-Range Planning." In Long-Range Planning for Management, edited by D. W. Ewing. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1964.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Several people have made valuable contributions to this study, and to each of them I owe personal recognition and gratitude. To Grady Bogue, who offered a healthy mixture of candid criticism and encouragement from start to finish. To Wayne Brown, who provided endless support and encouragement at crucial stages, and also allowed me release time to complete this study. To Charles Achilles, Robert Berdahl, Kent Caruthers, Cameron Fincher, Dan Hobbs, and Melvin Todd, all of whom provided invaluable reactions to the original proposal and to the criteria evaluation instrument. To the members of my doctoral committee, namely, Stanley Ahmann, Larry Ebbers, Roger Heimstra, George Kiser, Richard Warren, and Robert Wessell, I express sincere appreciation for their cooperation, advice and open communication throughout this study. To Richard Larsen whose reactions to my ideas on Chapter IV were most helpful. To Delores Rice, who provided endless support, encouragement and assistance in proofreading and editing. To Arie Nettles whose care, patience, support, and last minute editorial assistance was essential.

Finally, I express special appreciation to my parents, Willie and Harriette Nettles, and my two sisters, Evelyn and Francine, who provided caring moral support without which this project would never have been possible.

APPENDIX A

IN-STATE ADVISORY(Criteria Group)

Executive

Keel Hunt

Marc Levine

Legislators

Rep. Ben Atchley
Sevierville, TennesseeSen James Elkins
Clinton, TennesseeRep. Sharon Bell
Knoxville, TennesseeRep. Wendell Hartzog
Memphis, TennesseeRep. Harper Brewer
Memphis, TennesseeSen. Halbert Harvill
Clarksville, TennesseeRep. Steve Cobb
Nashville, TennesseeSen. Curtis Person
Memphis, TennesseeRep. Lois Deberry
Memphis, TennesseeRep. C. B. Robinson
Chattanooga, Tennessee

IN-STATE ADVISORY (Cont.)

 LAY BOARD AND COMMISSION MEMBERS

Mrs. Ann Baker Furrow University of Tennessee	Mrs. Johnella Martin State Board of Regents
Mr. Tom Elam University of Tennessee	Mr. Glenn Rainey Tennessee Higher Education Comm.
Mr. James W. Hawkins State Board of Education	Mrs. Nannie Rucker State Board of Education
Mrs. Sarah Elizabeth Hawkins Tennessee Higher Education Commission	Mr. Howard Warf State Board of Regents

COLLEGE PRESIDENTS

Dr. Jerry Boone Memphis State University	Jr. Hal Ramer Volunteer State Community College
Dr. Jack Campbell Walters State Community College	Dr. Jack Reese University of Tennessee, Knoxville
Dr. E. B. Eller Dyersburg State Community College	Dr. Arliss Roaden Tennessee Technological University
Dr. Sam Ingram Middle Tennessee State University	Dr. Charles Whitehead State Technical Institute, Memphis
Dr. Jess Parrish Shelby State Community College	Dr. James Drinnon University of Tennessee, Chattanooga

IN-STATE ADVISORS (cont.)

PUBLIC HIGHER EDUCATION ADMINISTRATION

Mrs. Brenda Albright Tennessee Higher Education Commission	Dr. Larry McGehee University of Tennessee
Dr. Grady Bogue Tennessee Higher Education Commission	Dr. John Millett Tennessee State University
Dr. Karen Bowyer Shelby State Community College	Dr. John Prados University of Tennessee
Mr. Wallace Burke State Department of Education	Dr. Wallace Prescott Tennessee Technological University
Dr. Charles Fancher State Board of Regents	Dr. James Reeves Tennessee State University
Dr. Frank Glass Motlow State Community College	Dr. Paul Sands Columbia State Community College
Dr. Jane Harbaugh University of Tennessee, Chattanooga	Dr. John Shively UTCHS
Dr. Roy Lassiter State Board of Regents	

FACULTY

Dr. Charles Achilles University of Tennessee College of Education	Dr. J. N. Snyder, Industrial Eng. University of Tennessee, Knoxville
Dr. Arthur Chickering Memphis State University College of Education	Dr. George Spiva, Economics University of Tennessee, Knoxville
Dr. Joseph Devitis, Elementary & Secondary Education University of Tennessee, Knoxville	Dr. Thomas Stovall Peabody-Vanderbilt
Dr. Richard Dumont, Sociology Tennessee Technological University	Dr. William Tallon, Chemistry Columbia State Community College
Dr. Janice Frye Volunteer State Community College	Dr. Herbert Temple, Mathematics Shelby State Community College
Dr. John Harris Middle Tennessee State University	Dr. Fred Terry, Engineering Christian Bros. College, Memphis
	Dr. T. D. Unga, Political Science University of Tennessee, Knoxville

IN-STATE ADVISORS (Cont.)

 PRIVATE COLLEGE
ADMINISTRATORS

Dr. John Arradondo
Meharry Medical College

Dr. James Wilder
Lambuth College

Dr. Rutherford Adkins
Knoxville College

Dr. William Odom
Bethel College

Dr. Nyles Ayers
Tennessee Council of Private Colleges

Dr. Walter Leonard
Fisk University

Dr. Emmett Fields
Vanderbilt University

Dr. Hyran Barefoot
Union University

OUT-OF-STATE

Dr. Robert Barak
Iowa Board of Regents

Dr. John Folger
ECS

Dr. Robert Berdahl
SUNY Buffalo

Dr. William E. Troutt
McManis Associates, Inc.

Dr. Kent Halstead
NIE

Dr. Kent Caruthers
NCHEMS

Dr. Fred Harclerod
University of Arizona

Dr. Cameron Fincher
University of Georgia

Dr. Dan Hobbs
Oklahoma Board of Regents

APPENDIX B

GLENN RAINEY
Chairman

WAYNE BROWN
Executive Director

WALTER F. BROWN, JR.
JOSEPH H. DAVENPORT, JR.
SARAH ELIZABETH HAWKINS
JOE LANCASTER
LARRY D. PERRY
WALTER LEE PRICE
J. BRAD REED
ROBERT SCALES

June 10, 1980

Dear Dr. Devitis:

The Tennessee Higher Education Commission is in the process of developing an instrument for evaluating the purposes, processes, products, and outcomes of master planning. Such an evaluation will lead to improvements in future planning for higher education in our state.

The criteria for the evaluation have been developed by the THEC staff and are listed on the enclosed materials with instructions provided at the top of each section. The instructions for purposes, products, and outcomes generally request that you rate the criteria using the scales provided, then rank order the criteria, and finally recommend additional criteria. For master planning processes, the instructions request that you indicate the extent to which various groups should be involved in the planning processes.

You have been selected by our staff as one of seventy advisors to rate the criteria because of your knowledge and/or participation in planning and related activities. Your immediate role is not to evaluate the current Tennessee Master Plan, but rather to rate the criteria. Your rating of the criteria will be combined with the ratings of the other advisors to serve as standards in the subsequent evaluation.

Following the advisory group ratings of the criteria, a questionnaire will be mailed to a larger group, to evaluate the 1979 Tennessee Master Plan, and all in-state advisors will be included.

Please use the enclosed envelope to return your rating sheets to our office on or before June 15.

Sincerely,

Wayne Brown
Executive Director

GWB:MN:ag

Enclosures

501 UNION BUILDING ■ SUITE 300 ■ NASHVILLE, TENNESSEE 37219 ■ (615) 741-3605

PURPOSES FOR STATE-LEVEL POSTSECONDARY MASTER PLANNING

A. The following is a list of general purposes or reasons for state-level master planning for postsecondary education. Please indicate the relative importance of each purpose in the following ways:

1. Circle the number on the scale to the right of each purpose statement which indicates the importance you believe the purpose has in state-level master planning. (1) No Importance (2) Of Little Importance (3) Of Average Importance (4) Very Important (5) Undecided.
2. Using the space provided below each statement, rank order the purposes from 1-10 with 1 being the most important purpose and 10 being the least important for state-level master planning.
3. Add additional purposes for state-level master planning which are not included in the ten statements.

Master Planning Purposes

	<u>No Importance</u>	<u>Of Little Importance</u>	<u>Of Average Importance</u>	<u>Very Important</u>	<u>Undecided</u>
1. <u>Goal Setting.</u> To establish an agenda for action by setting goals and objectives for higher education and a clear pattern for pursuing those goals and objectives.	1	2	3	4	5
2. <u>Issues Identification.</u> To prepare higher education institutions to respond to the social and technological needs of the future by identifying issues.	1	2	3	4	5
3. <u>Responsiveness.</u> To develop strategies for adjusting to enrollment growth and declines as well as economic growth and decline.	1	2	3	4	5

Master Planning Purposes

	No Importance	Of Little Imp	Of Average Im	Very Important	Undecided
1. <u>Goal Setting.</u> To establish an agenda for action by setting goals and objectives for higher education and a clear pattern for pursuing those goals and objectives.	1	2	3	4	5
2. <u>Issues Identification.</u> To prepare higher education institutions to respond to the social and technological needs of the future by identifying issues.	1	2	3	4	5
3. <u>Responsiveness.</u> To develop strategies for adjusting to enrollment growth and declines as well as economic growth and decline.	1	2	3	4	5
4. <u>Coordination.</u> To establish principles of equity in funding and program distribution by providing a clear understanding of different roles for higher education institutions.	1	2	3	4	5
5. <u>Effectiveness.</u> To develop a system of colleges and universities with emphasis on providing high quality higher education.	1	2	3	4	5

Efficiency. To organize public resources so that they can be used in the most cost efficient manner.

Trend Analysis. To record and examine social, economic, political and educational trends and accomplishments and to raise the public consciousness of their future effect on higher education.

Accessibility. To insure that higher education programs and services are accessible and available to citizens who desire to participate.

Accountability. To provide for increased accountability of higher education to government officials and the general public.

Minimize Competition. To eliminate unproductive tensions and conflicts among institutions by creating a spirit of sharing and cooperation.

<u>No Importance</u>	<u>Of Little Importance</u>	<u>Of Average Importance</u>	<u>Very Important</u>	<u>Undecided</u>
1	2	3	4	5
1	2	3	4	5
1	2	3	4	5
1	2	3	4	5
1	2	3	4	5
1	2	3	4	5

accomplishments and to raise the public
consciousness of their future effect on higher
education.

-
- . Accessibility. To insure that higher education
programs and services are accessible and
available to citizens who desire to participate.

1 2 3 4 5

-
- . Accountability. To provide for increased
accountability of higher education to
government officials and the general public.

1 2 3 4 5

-
- . Minimize Competition. To eliminate unproductive
tensions and conflicts among institutions by
creating a spirit of sharing and cooperation.

1 2 3 4 5

Additional Purposes:

192

PROCESSES OF STATE-LEVEL POSTSECONDARY MASTER PLANNING

B. The state-level master planning processes are the steps or procedures taken by planners to develop a planning document. The following is a list of 7 major processes of postsecondary master planning and various groups of persons who may be participants in each process. Please indicate the degree of involvement you think each group should have in each of the 7 processes by placing an x in one box beside each group for each process. (Each grid should have 9 x's for completion).

1. Preparation for Planning. Develop strategies for planning, including establishing timeframes, determining the information needed by planners, and the tasks to be accomplished during the planning process. ...

	No Participation	Limited Participation (One Time) (Public Forum)	Continuous Advisory Participation	Primary Leadership	Undecided
(1) Campus Administrative Staff					
(2) External Consultants					
(3) Faculty					
(4) Governing Board Administrative Staff					
(5) Higher Education Lay Board & Commission Members					
(6) Legislators					
(7) Private Citizens					
(8) Private College Administrators					
(9) State Level Coordinating Staff					

2. Problem Solving. Identification of relevant problems, and the consideration of alternative solutions for those problems.

	No Participation	Limited Participation (One Time) (Public Forum)	Continuous Advisory Participation	Primary Leadership	Undecided
(1) Campus Administrative Staff					
(2) External Consultants					
(3) Faculty					

- | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |

No Participation	Limited Participation (One Time) (Public Forum)	Continuum Advisory Participation	Primary Leadership	Undecided
---------------------	--	--	-----------------------	-----------

- [illegible]

3. Goal Setting. Formulation of immediate and long-range goals and objectives for higher education.

	No Participation	Limited Participation (One Time) (Public Forum)	Continuous Advisory Participation	Primary Leadership	Undecided
(1) Campus Administrative Staff					
(2) External Consultants					
(3) Faculty					
(4) Governing Board Administrative Staff					
(5) Higher Education Lay Board & Commission Members					
(6) Legislators					
(7) Private Citizens					
(8) Private College Administrators					
(9) State Level Coordinating Staff					

4. Prioritizing. Establishing priorities for the distribution of funding, programs, and facilities.

	No Participation	Limited Participation (One Time) (Public Forum)	Continuous Advisory Participation	Primary Leadership	Undecided
(1) Campus Administrative Staff					
(2) External Consultants					
(3) Faculty					
(4) Governing Board Administrative Staff					
(5) Higher Education Lay Board & Commission Members					
(6) Legislators					
(7) Private Citizens					
(8) Private College Administrators					

!

- (9) State Level Coordinating Staff**

[illegible]

5. Editing. Critique of planning drafts with suggestions for improvements.

	No Participation	Limited Participation (One Time) (Public Forum)	Continuous Advisory Participation	Primary Leadership	Undecided
(1) Campus Administrative Staff					
(2) External Consultants					
(3) Faculty					
(4) Governing Board Administrative Staff					
(5) Higher Education Lay Board & Commission Members					
(6) Legislators					
(7) Private Citizens					
(8) Private College Administrators					
(9) State Level Coordinating Staff					

6. Authorization. Approval by authorities who can affect implementation.

	No Participation	Limited Participation (One Time) (Public Forum)	Continuous Advisory Participation	Primary Leadership	Undecided
(1) Campus Administrative Staff					
(2) External Consultants					
(3) Faculty					
(4) Governing Board Administrative Staff					
(5) Higher Education Lay Board & Commission Members					
(6) Legislators					
(7) Private Citizens					
(8) Private College Administrators					
(9) State Level Coordinating Staff					

6. Authorization. Approval by authorities who can affect implementation.

	No Participation	Limited Participation (One Time) (Public Forum)	Continuous Advisory Participation	Primary Leadership	Undecided
(1) Campus Administrative Staff					
(2) External Consultants					
(3) Faculty					
(4) Governing Board Administrative Staff					
(5) Higher Education Lay Board & Commission Members					
(6) Legislators					
(7) Private Citizens					
(8) Private College Administrators					
(9) State Level Coordinating Staff					

7. Activating. Implementation of the plan.

	No Participation	Limited Participation (One Time) (Public Forum)	Continuous Advisory Participation	Primary Leadership	Undecided
(1) Campus Administrative Staff					
(2) External Consultants					
(3) Faculty					
(4) Governing Board Administrative Staff					
(5) Higher Education Lay Board & Commission Members					
(6) Legislators					
(7) Private Citizens					
(8) Private College Administrators					
(9) State Level Coordinating Staff					

PRODUCT OF STATE-LEVEL MASTER PLANNING

195

C. The product of state-level master planning is the document (the plan) which is published at the end of the master planning process. The following is a list of components of master planning document. Please indicate the relative importance of each component in the following ways.

1. Circle the number on the scale to the right of each product statement which indicates the importance you believe the product component has in state-level master planning. (1) No Importance (2) Of Little Importance (3) Of Average Importance (4) Very Important (5) Undecided
2. Using the space provided below each statement, rank order the product components from 1-14 with 1 being the most important component and 14 being the least important for the state-level master planning document.
3. Add additional product components of state-level master planning which are not included in the 14 statements.

Master Planning Products

1. Educational Goals. Provides standards of excellence for all levels of the higher education system.
2. Social Goals. Recognizes the impact of contemporary social problems on higher education, and indicates the adjustments which should be made as a result of such problems.

No Importance
Of Little Importance
Of Average Importance
Very Important
Undecided

1 2 3 4 5

1 2 3 4 5

1 2 3 4 5

Master Planning Products

	<u>No Importance</u>	<u>Of Little Impor</u>	<u>Of Average Impo</u>	<u>Very Important</u>	<u>Undecided</u>
1. <u>Educational Goals.</u> Provides standards of excellence for all levels of the higher education system.	1	2	3	4	5
2. <u>Social Goals.</u> Recognizes the impact of contemporary social problems on higher education, and indicates the adjustments which should be made as a result of such problems.	1	2	3	4	5
3. <u>Funding Priorities.</u> Estimates the need for economic resources and determines the priorities for funding in the future.	1	2	3	4	5
4. <u>Supportive Trends.</u> Illustrates the trends regarding student enrollment, program distribution, and funding of higher education institutions, which support planning goals and recommendations.	1	2	3	4	5
5. <u>Institutional Mission and Role.</u> Illustrates the role and mission of each institution and demonstrates how they differ and how they are similar.	1	2	3	4	5

	<u>No Importance</u>	<u>Of Little Importance</u>	<u>Of Average Importance</u>	<u>Very Important</u>	<u>Undecided</u>
6. <u>Planning Assumption.</u> Estimates the social, economic, and political conditions of the higher education system for the duration of the plan (five years).	1	2	3	4	5
7. <u>Explicit Style.</u> Written in a style and language that is easily understood by its intended audience.	1	2	3	4	5
8. <u>Significant Information.</u> Consists of information which affects decision-making at all levels in the higher education system.	1	2	3	4	5
9. <u>Complete Information.</u> Includes complete information on subjects about which judgements or decisions are made in adopting the plan.	1	2	3	4	5
10. <u>Specific Goals and Timetables.</u> Quantifies the goals and tasks to be accomplished with an established timeframe, and assigns responsibilities for implementing the plan.	1	2	3	4	5
11. <u>Adaptable to Change.</u> Appears changeable if conditions warrant a change. Does not appear as an iron-clad statement of mandates.	1	2	3	4	5
12. <u>Authentic Endorsement.</u> Shows official initial authority for preparation and approval of its content by a body that can	1	2	3	4	5

subjects about which judgement or decisions are made in adopting the plan.

- | | | | | | | |
|-------|--|---|---|---|---|---|
| 0. | <u>Specific Goals and Timetables.</u> Quantifies the goals and tasks to be accomplished with an established timeframe, and assigns responsibilities for implementing the plan. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| <hr/> | | | | | | |
| 1. | <u>Adaptable to Change.</u> Appears changeable if conditions warrant a change. Does not appear as an iron-clad statement of mandates. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| <hr/> | | | | | | |
| 12. | <u>Authentic Endorsement.</u> Shows official initial authority for preparation, and approval of its content by a body that can affect implementation. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| <hr/> | | | | | | |
| 13. | <u>Orderly Structure.</u> Presents information in a logical and organized fashion. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| <hr/> | | | | | | |
| 14. | <u>External and Internal Appearance.</u> Attracts the readers attention as an interesting document to read--not boring. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| <hr/> | | | | | | |

Additional Product Components: _____

OUTCOMES OF STATE-LEVEL POSTSECONDARY MASTER PLANNING

- The outcomes of state-level master planning are those effects in higher education and government which are caused by master planning. The following is a list of outcomes of state-level postsecondary master planning. Please indicate the relative importance of each outcome in the following ways:

1. Circle the number on the scale to the right of each purpose statement which indicates the importance you believe the outcome has in state-level master planning. (1) No Importance (2) Of Little Importance (3) Of Average Importance (4) Very Important (5) Undecided
2. Using the space provided below each statement, rank order the outcome statements from 1-13 with 1 being the most important and 13 being the least important outcome of state-level master planning.
3. Add additional outcomes of state level master planning which are not included among the 13 statements.

Master Planning Outcomes

1. Establishes an agenda for action by setting goals and objectives for a state higher education system providing a clear pattern of developmental choices among programs and services.

<u>No Importance</u>	<u>Of Little Importance</u>	<u>Of Average Importance</u>	<u>Very Important</u>	<u>Undecided</u>
1	2	3	4	5

2. Enables higher education administrators to make decisions using economic and enrollment forecasts.

1	2	3	4	5
---	---	---	---	---

3. Add additional outcomes of state level master planning which are not included among the 13 statements.

Master Planning Outcomes

	<u>No Importance</u>	<u>Of Little Importance</u>	<u>Of Average Importance</u>	<u>Very Important</u>	<u>Undecided</u>
1. Establishes an agenda for action by setting goals and objectives for a state higher education system providing a clear pattern of developmental choices among programs and services.	1	2	3	4	5
2. Enables higher education administrators to make decisions using economic and enrollment forecasts.	1	2	3	4	5
3. Raises consciousness about social and economic problems about higher education that may otherwise have been overlooked.	1	2	3	4	5
4. Unites the public sector of higher education by providing a clear understanding of different roles and creating a spirit of sharing and cooperation.	1	2	3	4	5

	<u>No Importance</u>	<u>Of Little Importance</u>	<u>Of Average Importance</u>	<u>Very Important</u>	<u>Undecided</u>
	1	2	3	4	5
6. Intergrates higher education with other sectors of society by studying the effects those other sectors of society have on higher education.					
7. Improves and enhances communication among top officials on goals and issues in higher education.	1	2	3	4	5
8. Encourages the public and professionals to view higher education as a system rather than individual isolated institutions.	1	2	3	4	5
9. Helps to create among legislators and state executive officers a more favorable attitude toward higher education.	1	2	3	4	5
10. Differentiates the functions for higher education institutions by clearly defining the roles for each institution.	1	2	3	4	5
11. Encourages innovation and change in higher education institutions.	1	2	3	4	5
	1	2	3	4	5

Institutions.

- | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 9. Helps to create among legislators and state executive officers a more favorable attitude toward higher education. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| <hr/> | | | | | |
| 9. Differentiates the functions for higher education institutions by clearly defining the roles for each institution. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| <hr/> | | | | | |
| 0. Encourages innovation and change in higher education institutions. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| <hr/> | | | | | |
| 1. Lessens or eliminates unproductive tensions and conflicts among institutions. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| <hr/> | | | | | |
| 2. Promotes opportunity for future evaluation of accomplishments by providing performance indicators, for goals and objectives. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| <hr/> | | | | | |
| 3. Provides renewal and crystalizes the thinking of higher education officials who are involved in the process of planning or reviewing the plan. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

Additional Outcomes: _____

APPENDIX C

THE EIGHT GROUPS RANKINGS OF PLANNING PURPOSES:

	COLP	EXEC	FACU	LAYB	LEGI	OUTS	PRVA	PUBA	R
Goal setting	1	5	1	2	1	1	2	1	14
Issues ID	7	9	4	8	4	6	1	3	42
Responsiveness	6	6	2	6	2	4	3.6	6	35.5
Coordination	2	3.5	5	1	7	2	6.5	5	32
Effectiveness	4	3.5	7	4	7	5	5	2	37.5
Efficiency	4	1.5	3	3	3	9	8	9	40.5
Trend analysis	8.5	10	9	10	7	7	6.5	7	65
Accessibility	4	1.5	6	5	9	3	3.5	4	36
Accountability	10	8	8	7	10	8	9.5	8	68.5
Minimize competition	8.5	7	10	9	5	10	9.5	10	<u>60</u>
									440

THE EIGHT GROUPS RANKINGS OF PLANNING PRODUCTS:

	COLP	EXEC	FACU	LAYB	RELI	OUTS	PRVA	PUBA	R
Educ goals	1	2.5	3	2	1	1	4	1	15.5
Social goals	13	4	10	9.5	11	4	3	9	63.5
Fund prior	5.5	1	2	4	2	3	4	5	29.5
Support Trnds	8	5	5	3	5	7.5	14	3	50.5
Inst mission & Scope	3.5	2.5	1	1	3	2	12	2	27
Planning assump	10.5	10	4	11.5	9	6	2	4	57
Explicit style	7	12	13	8	12	11	1	10	73
Sign info	2	8	6	6.5	7.5	5	11	6	52
Complete info	3.5	9	11	6.5	10.5	14	5	12	71.5
Specific time tables	10.5	7	9	5	10.5	7.5	6	7.5	63
Adap to change	5.5	6	7	7	7.5	9	9	7.5	58.5
Euthentic endor	12	11	8	9.5	5	10	10	10	75.5
Orderly structure	9	13	12	11.5	5	12	8	13	83.5
External/internal appear	14	14	14	13	13	13	13	14	<u>108</u>

828

THE EIGHT GROUPS RANKINGS OF PLANNING OUTCOMES:

	CORP	EXEC	FACU	LAYB	LEGI	OUTS	PRVA	PUBA	R
Agenda R	2	5	1	1	1	1	2	1	14
Dec mkg R	8	7	5	6	4	7	6	8	51
Unites pub sec R	5	2.5	8.5	4	9	6	8.5	3.5	47
Rais cons R	11	11.5	12	8	3	2.5	11	7	66
Indgrates hgr ed R	12	10	13	9.5	13	10	13	10	90.5
Impr. comm R	1	2.5	6.5	4.5	2	12	3.5	6	38
Energ ed as sys view hgr R	6	1	6.5	4.5	12	11	5	13	59
Hlps create for R	3	8	4	7	7.5	9	1	5	44.5
Diffrents func R	4	4	3	2	5	2.5	8.5	2	31
Encrg chng innov	7	11.5	2	9.5	10	8	10	3.5	61.5
Elmntes tens	9	6	8.5	11	6	13	12	9	74.5
Provides oppor for goal	10	9	10	12	7.5	4	3.5	11	67
Prvds renewl	13	13	11	13	11	5	7	12	<u>85</u>

729

APPENDIX D

Statewide Higher Education Planning Evaluation

Indicate your opinion regarding the Higher Education Commission's performance in statewide planning by responding "Yes" or "No" to the following questions, and if appropriate whether you think the particular item needs improvement. A comment section is provided at the end and you are encouraged to add comments especially for items which you think should be improved.

	Yes	No	Need Improvement
1. Does the master plan establish an agenda for action by setting goals and objectives for the state system of higher education?	___	___	___
2. Does the master plan contain a clear pattern for pursuing those goals and objectives?	___	___	___
3. Does the master plan identify the major issues that prepare higher education institutions to respond to the social and technological needs of the future?	___	___	___
4. Does the master plan propose strategies for adjusting the enrollment growth and decline?	___	___	___
5. Does the master plan propose strategies for adjusting to economic growth and decline?	___	___	___
6. Does the master plan establish principles of equity for funding higher education institutions?	___	___	___
7. Does the master plan establish principles of equity for program distribution?	___	___	___

- | | | | |
|---|-------|-------|-------|
| 8. Does the master plan foster the development of a system of colleges and universities with emphasis on providing high quality higher education? | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| 9. Does the master plan encourage the organization of public higher education resources so that they can be used in the most cost efficient manner? | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| 10. Does the master plan examine the following tends in higher education: | | | |
| a. Social trends? | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| b. Economic trends? | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| c. Political trends? | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| d. Educational trends? | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| 11. Does the master plan insure that higher education programs and services are accessible and available to all citizens of the state who desire to participate? | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| 12. Does the master plan provide increased accountability of higher education to government officials and the general public? | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| 13. Does the master plan contain standards of excellence for all levels (i.e., technical institutes community colleges, universities, graduate and professional schools) of higher education? | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| 14. Does the master plan recognize the impact that contemporary social problems have on higher education? | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| 15. Does the master plan indicate the adjustments that should be made in higher education as a result of contemporary social problems? | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| 16. Does the master plan contain a clear picture of funding priorities for the 5th year duration of the plan? | _____ | _____ | _____ |

- | | | | |
|---|-------|-------|-------|
| 17. Does the master plan contain estimates of the need for economic resources? | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| 18. Does the master plan accurately illustrate the trends regarding the following: | | | |
| a. Student enrollment? | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| b. Academic program demand? | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| c. Funding patterns? | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| 19. Do the trends mentioned above generally support the master planning goals and recommendations? | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| 20. Does the master plan contain role and mission statements that illustrate how higher education institutions differ and how they are alike? | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| 21. Does the master plan contain goals and tasks which are quantified in terms of the following: | | | |
| a. What exactly is expected of higher education institutions? | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| b. Who is expected to accomplish what? | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| c. Timeframe for when goals should be accomplished? | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| 22. Does the master plan appear to be flexible if changes are needed due to changing conditions? | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| 23. Does the master plan present information in a logical and organized fashion? | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| 24. Does the master plan attract your attention as an interesting document to read-not boring? | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| 25. Is the master plan written in a style and language that is easily understood? | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| 26. Does the master plan provide a clear pattern of choices in recommending programs and services? | _____ | _____ | _____ |

- | | | | |
|---|-------|-------|-------|
| 27. Has the master plan aided campus administrators in making decisions based on the plans? | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| a. Enrollment forecasts? | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| b. Economic forecasts? | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| 28. Has the master plan raised the public consciousness on social and economic problems about higher education that might otherwise have been overlooked? | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| 29. Has the master plan united the public sector of higher education by providing a clear understanding of the different roles; creating a spirit of sharing and cooperation? | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| 30. Has the master plan encouraged the integration of higher education with other sectors of society? | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| 31. Has the master plan caused improvement in communication among top higher education officials concerning goals and issues in higher education? | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| 32. Has the master plan caused the public and professionals to view higher education as a system rather than as individual isolated institutions? | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| 33. Has the master plan helped to create a more favorable attitude toward higher education among legislators and state executive branch officials? | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| 34. Has the master plan encouraged innovation and change in higher education institutions? | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| 35. Has the master plan helped to eliminate unproductive conflicts among higher education institutions? | _____ | _____ | _____ |

36. Has the master plan promoted opportunity for future evaluation of accomplishments by providing performance indicators for goals and objectives?

___ ___ ___

37. Has the master plan provided renewal for higher education officials who were involved in the planning process or in reviewing the plan?

___ ___ ___

38. Does the higher education commission have sufficient authority or influence to see that the plan is implemented?

___ ___ ___

39. Do you think the participation by the following groups in the planning process was adequate:

a. Campus administrative staff?

___ ___ ___

b. External consultants?

___ ___ ___

c. Faculty?

___ ___ ___

d. Governing board administrative staff?

___ ___ ___

e. Higher Education Lay Board and Commission Members?

___ ___ ___

f. Legislators?

___ ___ ___

g. Private citizens?

___ ___ ___

h. Private college administrators?

___ ___ ___

i. State level coordinating staff?

___ ___ ___

Comments

Question No.

[illegible]