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Chapter I

INTRODUCTION

The states have long been the major sources of funding for American public higher education and during the past few decades have also taken on the role of major policy decision makers (Carnegie Commission, 1973a, chpt. 12). Twenty-seven states have statewide coordinating councils (Education Commission of the States, July, 1980, pp.17-18; Education Commission of the States, 1983, pp.250-258 and Chronicle of Higher Education, September 1, 1988).\(^1\) Forty-eight states since 1972 have designated or created "1202 Commissions" for statewide planning in response to the federal Higher Education Amendments of that year.\(^2\) Each state's system is unique, which requires that comparisons be made with a broad brush. The coordinating council and the 1202 Commission are the most common themes.
The control of public higher education is gradually becoming more centralized in every state; major decisions on higher education are increasingly centered in state capitals rather than on the campus, as demonstrated in the third chapter of this study. Aside from requiring statewide planning and desegregation and providing funds for research and financial aid programs, the Federal government has traditionally left the country's higher education locus of power on the state level (Finn, pp.1 and 47; Thelin, pp. 88-102).

The paradox is that with the increasingly important state role in support and involvement in American higher education, there is not a clear identity, not a sharp image of any state's presence. This study will attempt to determine if such an identity exists, and, if so, to describe it using a distinctive approach to the recent history of American higher education. Most organizational higher education studies have been "house histories" of a particular college or university. This study will be a "house history," or saga, of that understudied locus: the state agency of governance or coordination of higher education. It will seek to discover an organizational saga for
an agency and its director rather than for a campus and its president.

With the control of higher education policy residing largely in the states and the statewide coordinating councils and governing boards, how can students of higher education best understand these agencies? The question is not only "what are the structural arrangements under which each agency operates?" but also a deeper more philosophical question concerning the identity of the agency: "has it acquired an image, a psyche, a saga?" If so, "what are these?"

This study will focus on these questions, using the State Council of Higher Education for Virginia (SCHEV) as the case study. SCHEV is Virginia's umbrella agency for all higher education in the Commonwealth and for 15 years has been its 1202 Commission. The study will describe a ten year period in SCHEV's evolution, 1977-1987, an important decade in American higher education when predicted enrollment and budgetary declines followed upon a quarter century of dramatic growth. Virginia proved atypical, however. It was braced for declines but at the end of the decade, despite some difficult years, had experienced demographic and economic growth.
At the onset there are several serious considerations. First, there is the question of how to analyze the state coordinating council beyond its structural dimensions. Second, it must be understood why Virginia is an important state to use as a case study and why information revealed in the study is pertinent to other states with similar higher education governance systems.

Another serious consideration in describing state coordinating councils of higher education is the usefulness of the campus model. Burton Clark used the campus model in *The Distinctive College* (1970), in which he describes the sagas of Clark, Antioch and Reed colleges. Auchincloss uses the campus model in *The Rector of Justin* (1964) to show organizational saga of a school headmaster. Are there functional equivalents between the campus and the coordinating organization? Is the composite statewide higher education budget at all comparable to an individual college's budget? What is the agency equivalent to a dramatic increase in a college's alumni giving or endowment? What is the agency corollary to the buildings erected on a specific campus during a given period? This research will attempt
to draw these corollaries and to draw reasonable relationships
between other facets and actors in the agency and the college campus.

As a method in analyzing and describing a state higher education
council, this dissertation will attempt to apply the concept of
organizational saga developed by Burton Clark by which he explained
campus image and evolution. A "saga" as used in this study is a
detailed account of an organization, group or institution including
elements of the great leader, the key event or events, legends, and
tales of crises and survival. The examination will focus on the State

Virginia is an appropriate state upon which to focus. Virginia is
taking its place among the leading states in public higher education
such as California, New York and Texas. Since the mid-1970s,
Virginia's colleges and universities have increased in national
prominence because of the excellent academic reputations of the
University of Virginia, The College of William and Mary, and George
Mason University and because of the diversity and number of reputable
public and private institutions of higher education in the
Commonwealth (Newman, 1987). More states have the statewide coordinating council form of governance for public higher education similar to Virginia's than have the other types of statewide governance combined. The quality and statewide governance structure of Virginia's higher education system is respected and typical enough to be a useful research subject.

Need for the Study

Organizational histories of institutions contribute to the understanding of higher education. An organizational history, a saga, of a state agency integrally involved with higher education will offer insights into the governance of higher education in a state with a coordinating council. Through this research which uses Virginia's statewide higher education coordinating council as a case study, a recent decade of evolution in this model of statewide governance may be more clearly understood.
Purpose of the Study

This study will contribute to an understanding of the milieu in which higher education policy is formed in the United States, using the Commonwealth of Virginia as a case study seeking to explain the image and saga of its State Council of Higher Education.

This research will describe and analyze internal and external environmental factors, key events, crises, the organizational culture, legends and leaders that contributed to the changes in Virginia's system of higher education in the active decade 1977-1987. The focus will be on an institution which is not often considered an institution of higher education per se: the state agency, the council or commission of higher education coordination, the State Council of Higher Education for Virginia.

The Research Problem

This research will offer a distinctive approach to the recent history of higher education by examining the evolution of the State Council of Higher Education for Virginia in the decade 1977-87,
seeking to discover an organizational identity that has influenced this state-level organization. This study is unique, in that no work on saga in state agencies has been published.

Research Questions

This research will address the following questions:

1. What are the saga, the image, the beliefs of this representative organization?

2. What describes the sphere of influence of the State Council of Higher Education for Virginia? How has this evolved since its inception in 1956, with emphasis on the decade beginning with 1977? One contextual finding is that legislators and higher education officials generally believe that SCHEV holds a great deal of influence and power in the Commonwealth. This study will establish criteria upon which this belief is based.

3. What factors, events, legends and persons contributed to the development of SCHEV's role in a state with a distinctive traditional political culture, with a strong legislature and with
a history of well-established autonomous institutions of higher education?

4. How have college officials, other members of the state bureaucracy, and legislators interacted with SCHEV?

**The Hypothesis**

The concept of organizational saga which Burton Clark developed to explain campus image and evolution is useful as a method of analyzing and describing a statewide coordinating council of higher education. The State Council of Higher Education for Virginia evolved since 1977 into its 1987 status because of its identity, the quality of its leadership and membership (Rourke, 1969) and its development of professional expertise. Its identity has contributed to its performance as an organization.

The techniques of analysis applied in this research are applicable to states other than Virginia and are therefore a meaningful tool for understanding the state level of governance of public higher education.
Methodology

With Burton Clark's organizational saga theory as a basis, this research will examine SCHEV's evolution 1977-87. Major events, situations and personalities contribute to the organization's actions and to the development of a story, an organizational saga, a set of legends and traditions. Through these factors the organization can be better understood, thereby leading to a better understanding of an important institution in higher education governance.

To present a chronicle of the historical evolution of this agency in higher education, SCHEV's role in higher education in Virginia since 1977 will be explored through:


2. Other SCHEV policy and position papers during the decade ending with June of 1987.

3. Minutes from all SCHEV meetings, January of 1977 through June

5. Documents, speeches and articles written by the director since his arrival at SCHEV in 1973 through his ten-year report.

6. A questionnaire (Appendix B) mailed to each member of the 1988-89 General Assembly seeking legislative opinion on the State Council of Higher Education for Virginia. Two categories of questions were included. One category sought information similar to that covered in the interview questionnaire discussed above. The other category of questions elicited legislative opinion on SCHEV's statutory powers, performance and possible expansion of power. This second category was based on data collected from the 1974-75 General Assembly (Hager, 1976) and allowed comparison of legislative opinion prior to the decade being studied with legislative opinion after that decade. No interviews were conducted with current legislators since this questionnaire offered a broader survey
group than possible with individual interviews. Survey results are in Appendix D.

7. Newspaper reports and SCHEV news releases during the relevant period.

8. Documented interviews with persons involved with higher education in the Commonwealth 1977 to 1987. Key persons from SCHEV, from the institutions of higher education and from the Governors' staffs were interviewed for this research. These were focused interviews rather than interviews utilizing fixed questionnaires, even though a one page questionnaire (Appendix A) was sent to most interviewees in advance for two reasons. First, it allowed the interviewee to have advance feel for the general tone of the interview and secondly, it provided a structure by which some of the data could be organized. The subjects' opinions were sought on the indicators of SCHEV influence, which indicators are most crucial, and how they can be recognized and traced. Facts and impressions were solicited to provide background or commentary on points drawn from
sources listed above. Interview participants were asked for their opinions on the status of SCHEV and reasons for its expanding powers. These governmental and institutional leaders were asked to trace the evolution of their relationships with SCHEV and to comment on its leaders' roles within the agency and among governmental agencies.

Assumptions

This study is based on the following assumptions:

1. Because Virginia is widely recognized as one of the national leaders in higher education,\textsuperscript{5} it is a significant state in which to study the council for coordination of higher education, its designated 1202 Commission, and that lessons learned from the study of Virginia's Council can be translated to studies of other states.

2. The persons interviewed hold a reasonably complete memory of the events discussed and they were truthful in their commentary.
3. This saga will select important events and personalities upon which to focus and that, even though there were as many or more events and personalities that could have been selected, the saga will reveal sufficient crucial elements of SCHEV's functions, crises and survival that it will be a meaningful study.

4. This study, which is designed to understand SCHEV's role in the Commonwealth's higher education system, will be objective and balanced.

5. At least two sets of factors other than its saga contributed to SCHEV's increasing sphere of influence during the period under study:

   (a) efforts by Virginia's strong legislature to protect itself from the political ramifications caused by allocation of scarce resources among autonomous institutions of higher education with politically powerful alumni (Morrow, 1975; Bagley interview 2/19/88; Department of Planning and Budget interview
(b) the need for systematic information to help in the management of such areas as the large amounts of state funds consumed by higher education and the data required to predict enrollments, to recommend assignments of personnel positions, to comply with affirmative action mandates, to coordinate use of classroom space and capital expenditures and most recently to allocate the equipment trust fund.

Limitations and Delimitations

This research is limited by the following considerations:

1. Restructuring past events holds evident dangers of lost materials, hazy memories and "benefits" of "twenty-twenty" hindsight.

2. Among the multitude of events and personalities in a ten year period, my research may have inadvertently missed some salient factors.
3. The study will be restricted to the State Council of Higher Education for Virginia 1977-1987. Earlier studies provided the background prior to 1977, and no original research was undertaken concerning those 21 years.

4. This research is essentially historical and analytic; it will not attempt to evaluate the State Council of Higher Education. The design and validation of evaluation instruments for statewide coordinating councils is beyond the scope of this study.

Organization of the Study

The major focus of the study will be on the evolution of the State Council of Higher Education for Virginia from 1977 to 1987. The bases of the study are public documents from SCHEV, including and ending with the director's ten-year report presented in June of 1987; public statements in the media; and documented interviews. The director's publications and speeches since he joined the SCHEV staff in 1973 were examined to trace trends that culminated in his 1987 report presented ten years after he assumed directorship.
Interviews with higher education leaders and a mail survey of the legislators contributed heavily to this research.

In order to understand Virginia's Council and system of statewide coordination of higher education, the study will present as background the history of states' involvement in higher education and will report information about Virginia's system prior to 1977.

Definition of Terms

The State Council of Higher Education for Virginia (SCHEV or the Council) is the agency designated by the General Assembly to coordinate matters relating to post-secondary education in the Commonwealth: the 15 state supported four-year colleges and universities, the 23 colleges under the State Board for Community Colleges, private colleges, out-of-state institutions teaching in Virginia, and proprietary schools. It has 11 members appointed for staggered four-year-terms by the Governor, confirmed by the General Assembly. These members are public at-large members, not representing any institutions. The State Council of Higher Education
appoints its director who serves at its pleasure. The Council advises both the Governor and the General Assembly on higher education policy. It holds statutory responsibility for planning, coordination and program approval for public colleges; it is responsible for development of budget guidelines and formulae, reviews institutional budgets and makes budget recommendations to the Governor and General Assembly for all public colleges. SCHEV was established in 1956 with major statutory amendments in its structure and responsibility in 1974. It was named by the General Assembly as the "1202 Commission" in response to the federal Higher Education Amendments of 1972.

The General Assembly or the Legislature is the chief legislative unit of the Commonwealth, composed of two bodies: the Senate with 40 members elected every four years and the House of Delegates with 100 members elected every two years. The General Assembly operates on a biennial cycle, adopting the budget for the two year period in the "long session" held in even numbered years and modifying it in the "short session" in odd numbered years. Its sessions are 45 to
60 days long, beginning the second Wednesday of January. The Virginia General Assembly relies heavily on its committee system; committees and subcommittees meet year-round.

The Governor is the chief elected executive officer of the Commonwealth of Virginia who serves one four-year term, unable by law to succeed himself.

The Secretary of Education holds a Cabinet appointment from the Governor and serves at his pleasure. The Secretary is responsible for all educational areas of state government from early childhood education and the public primary and secondary school systems to higher education and is an ex officio nonvoting member of SCHEV. The Cabinet system of state government was added in 1972 in Virginia; prior to that date there was no Secretary of Education.

Virginia, South Dakota and Pennsylvania are the only three states with the Secretary of Education position. (State postsecondary education structures handbook 1986: state coordinating and governing boards. Denver: Education Commission of the States.)
Coordinating agency for higher education, statewide

governing board, advisory board or coordinating council refer
to the agency in each state that coordinates, advises or governs
higher education.

The Code of Virginia contains all current laws of the
Commonwealth adopted by the General Assembly.

Higher education includes degree-granting postsecondary
educational institutions, public and private, community colleges and
universities. The term as used here is synonymous with the
definition used in the Code of Virginia.

Power is the influence of one person or group over another. The
acceptance of this influence through legal norms transforms power
into legitimate authority (from Jacob, C. Policy and Bureaucracy, pp.
4, 23n-24n, based on references to Robert Dahl, Bertram Russell, H.D.
Lasswell and A. Kaplan).

Authority refers to powers and duties granted by statute.

Influence is the capacity to cause an effect in indirect or intangible
ways.
Control is used here to indicate the ability to exert authority or influence so that the controller is in charge of the outcomes of the actions of the controlled person or agency.

Saga is a detailed account of an organization, group or institution including elements of the great leader, the key event or events, legends, and tales of crises and survival.
Endnotes

1 The 27 states with coordinating councils of various configurations are Alabama, Alaska, Arkansas, California, Colorado, Connecticut, Delaware, Illinois, Indiana, Kentucky, Louisiana, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New Mexico, North Dakota, Ohio, Oklahoma, Oregon, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, Virginia and Washington (State postsecondary education structures handbook 1986: state coordinating and governing boards, Denver, Education Commission of the States).

2 The two states without 1202 Commissions are North Carolina and Wisconsin (Higher Education in the States, Education Commission of the States, 1983).

3 Several popular polls have pointed with favor at Virginia's universities, particularly naming the University of Virginia and The College of William as Mary as "public ivys" (U. S. News & World
The Director of The State Council of Higher Education for Virginia, Gordon Davies states: "Several Virginia colleges and universities have achieved new levels of national recognition. The University of Virginia and the College of William and Mary are noteworthy today not merely for their origins and founders, but because they have become truly distinctive state-supported institutions of higher education. These two institutions probably offer the most selective undergraduate programs in American public higher education....Adjusted for inflation, the average faculty salary has increased over $5,000 in ten years....Unadjusted, it has more than doubled....Since 1984, average faculty salaries have increased almost 40 percent.... Three major universities - UVA, VPI and VCU - have increased their research grants from $35 million to $150 million over ten years...(Davies, June, 1987).

"Virginia has long been known for the quality and traditions of its colleges and universities. Two of its public institutions, the University of Virginia and The College of William and Mary, have
acquired national reputations that have led to dramatic increases in applications in recent years....All the state's public colleges received generous increases in appropriations in recent years, with much of the money going for student aid, facilities, and improvements at professional schools....Governance of higher education in Virginia is highly decentralized, largely because of the long history of independence of some of the public institutions. The coordinating board is the State Council of Higher Education, which is relatively weak in statutory power but has gained influence by producing respected studies and recommendations for the General Assembly and Governor....State funds for higher education operating expenses: $915,836,0000, up 19% in two years" (Chronicle of Higher Education, September 1, 1988, pp. 75-77).

The Council of Higher Education for Virginia has acted on three goals since 1974: access, excellence and accountability. In 1985 it adopted a new goal and reaffirmed in 1987: "to place Virginia's colleges and universities among the best systems of
higher education in the nation." The Council notes that the bedrock of higher education in the Commonwealth is undergraduate education.... The state's average appropriation from tax revenues for each full-time-equivalent student was 23rd highest nationally and a move up from 37th in 1984 (State Council for Higher Education for Virginia: The Virginia plan for higher education 1987).

Other factors cited as a part of Virginia's improving higher education system are its Higher Education Equipment Trust Fund, its Eminent Scholars program, its newly implemented Commonwealth Centers, its diversity of higher education institutions, both public and private colleges, its Center for Innovative Technology, its Virginia Scholars Program, its Graduate Televised Engineering Program, its Outstanding Faculty Awards, its Transition Program, its Tuition Assistance Grants, and its Funds for Excellence.

An evaluation team for the Funds for Excellence Program led by recognized higher education scholar Robert O. Berdahl stated
after a three-month study in 1988 that "We found excellence throughout Virginia's higher education system, from research universities to liberal arts colleges, to community colleges" (Berdahl, 1988, p. iii).

Governor Gerald L. Baliles since he took office in 1986 has strongly supported higher education. He acted positively to SCHEV Director Davies' proposal to establish a "Commission on the University in the 21st Century" in response to expected growth rather than simply adding campuses or expanding current ones. He supported funds to halt increases in community college tuition, to further increase faculty salaries, to establish the equipment trust fund and to support innovative approaches to bonding academia and trade while advocating the liberal arts. Governor Baliles stands squarely behind the higher education system in Virginia (Blumenstyk, G. "Va. governor advocates more than an economic role for colleges." Chronicle of Higher Education, February 1, 1989, pp. 1, 16-17).

5 For discussion of Virginia's higher education system, see footnote 3.

6 As Clark (1983), March and Cohen and Viadeka have explored, there are extreme ambiguities and difficulties in evaluating nonprofit organizations supplying services, not producing easily measured "widgets." It is unclear how one measures a "good job" by an organization such as a college or a statewide coordinating council nor how such an organization can justify itself. It is not established, even if there were specific measures of outcomes in colleges, that these apply in measuring the accomplishments of a statewide coordinating council.
Chapter II

ORGANIZATIONAL SAGA

Burton Clark's concept of organizational saga is based on his contention that there is more to understanding governance of higher education than its formal static structure; he holds that the organizational culture, the social bonding and shared ideals, the real and embellished past, the soul of the institution, are integral parts of a successful organization. In The Distinctive College he applies this theory in his study of three colleges: Antioch, Reed and Swarthmore.

The institutional saga is a historically based, somewhat embellished understanding of a unique organizational development. It offers in the present a particular definition of the organization as a whole and suggests common characteristics of members. Its definitions are deeply internalized by many members, thereby becoming a part, even an unconscious part, of individual motive. A saga is, then, a mission made total across a system in space.
and time. It embraces the participants of a given day and links together successive waves of participants over major periods of time.

His premise is that there are:

ideational elements in complex organizations that do not lie outside of matters of governance but rather exist as basic sentiments that help determine the structures of governance and how they work (1971, page 499).

As a sociologist Clark sees two broad dimensions of social bonding: "the structural consisting of patterns of relation and interaction of persons and groups, and the normative, consisting of shared beliefs, attitudes and values. The two dimensions appear in complex organizations as organizational structure, including informal patterns, and organizational culture" (1971, page 499). Most studies of colleges focus upon the structure and the formal lines of authority. Students of state agencies coordinating higher education including Robert O. Berdahl, D. Kent Halstead, Lyman A. Glenny and John D. Millett, focus on the structure, on the bureaucratic lines of authority between and among coordinating councils, on other governmental agencies, on the executive and legislative branches of state
government, and on the colleges themselves. Clark demonstrates the sense of romance and mystery that may imbue a college: the faculty and student alumni can be "passionate to the point where...they partake of the gospel of the organization...turning a formal place into a deeply beloved institution" (Clark, 1971, p. 501).

Clark claims that two stages can be distinguished in the building of an organizational saga: its initiation and its fulfillment. *Initiation*, he says, "takes place under widely varying conditions and occurs within a relatively short period of time. *Fulfillment* converges on certain inescapable features of organization that are enduring and more predictable" (1971, p. 503). To develop, the saga requires one of several conditions: a new autonomous organization, an established organization in a crisis of decay, or an established organization in a state of readiness for evolutionary change. This study will seek to demonstrate that the State Council of Higher Education for Virginia in the mid-1970s paralleled the third condition for initiation of organizational saga.

As two comparisons for the sake of illustration, consider
approaches to studying medicine and business. Compare the usual structural approach and the organizational saga approach of studying higher education with the medical model of two doctors examining the brain. The neurologist focuses on its anatomy and physiology and describes these in minute detail. The psychiatrist, without ignoring the brain's physical detail, expands the research to the mind, to its history, its feelings, its psyche and its ideology. A similar comparison can be made in the study of a business organization. The usual approach is to study the flow chart, the president's power, the vice-presidents' scopes of responsibility, the general reporting format. Another corporate analyst, the currently popular Thomas J. Peters in *In Search of Excellence* (1982) and other writings, recognizes the bureaucratic and formal structure of the organization, but he is far more interested in describing the relationships among the people. Even though he does not use the term organizational saga, it is that to which he refers: the staff members and their devotion, loyalty and belief in the organization and its mission. Peters' illustration of Federal Express, for example, is not of its flow chart
but of the flow of dedication that permeates the organization down to
the lineman who commandeers a helicopter to restring damaged
mountaintop wires during a blizzard. The people cited by Peters have
"bought into" the legend, the saga, of the organization.

Clark points out that while the conditions under which a legend
is initiated vary, the means by which it becomes a durable integral
part of the organization are more predictable and are central to the
development of a saga: the personnel core, the program core, the
external social base, the student subculture and the organizational
ideology (Clark, 1971, p. 506). In commentary of Clark's article,
Richard C. Richardson, Jr., suggests that

the development of an institutional story or saga as a
source of belief and loyalty is dependent upon a
number of variables that must come into being or
exist concurrently. Among these variables may be
included a strong and preferably charismatic leader, a
receptive faculty, a viable and compelling ideology
that lends a sense of purpose, limited size, relative
isolation, and a period of grace or freedom from the
impingement of strong external influences....A strong
saga, as is pointed out in [Clark's] paper, requires a
high degree of internalization of values by all
constituencies (Clark, 1971, pp. 516-517).
Can the state coordinating agency be analyzed using Clark's model? This research will use the working hypothesis that the agency director is comparable to the college president and that the agency's appointed Council is comparable to the college's appointed Board of Trustees. Individual colleges in the state system will be considered analogous to departments within the college model. The study will demonstrate that agency staff members can be reasonably considered comparable to college faculty and staff. The analogies will not be perfect fits, but they can be useful in examining the state coordinating agency effectively utilizing Burton Clark's model of organizational saga within colleges.

Can we imagine devotion to the State Council of Higher Education? Where are the shared memories? Where is the romantic response to the alma mater? What is the tune of the old fight song? Which buildings evoke cherished memories? In state coordinating agencies we certainly will not find photographs of the '54 football team, but we may find shared goals and shared commitments to achieving a quality higher education system that the "special state,"
in this case Virginia, deserves. We may find that the concept of the
culture, the belief, the absolute devotion turned to determination, is a
key to understanding a successful state agency over a span of time.

Can a state agency have unannounced latent ways in which the
regular program, examined through minutes and documents, "may
express and support an organizational legend" (Clark, 1970, p. 249)?
Can and do staff members of a state coordinating agency have loyalty
and belief in institutional mission to such a degree that it becomes a
legend, almost a religious experience, constituting a saga? Is it
reasonable to pursue the analysis of a state coordinating agency using
this model? To answer that question, this study will utilize Burton
Clark's theory of institutional/organizational saga as found in two of
his writings: The Distinctive College (1970), particularly the book's
final chapter, "The Making of An Organizational Saga," and a 1971
article from the Journal of Higher Education, "Belief and Loyalty in
College Organization."

As will be explored later in more detail, the State Council of
Higher Education for Virginia was established by the General
Assembly in 1956 as a relatively weak advisory council. Through legislative action, it was further weakened in the early 1960s. After it was given the responsibility of serving as Virginia's 1202 Commission under the Federal Higher Education Act of 1972 and after a 1973 legislatively mandated study, SCHEV's power and authority were expanded considerably by the 1974 General Assembly. Its staff was expanded to enable it to meet its new responsibilities and its budget increased dramatically. Hager's research in 1976 indicated that the legislators were satisfied with the Council's work and scope and that SCHEV could expect support and no major changes from the lawmakers in the predictable future. The following year, a new Director was selected for the Council and it is the first decade of his leadership that this study encompasses: 1977-1987. The Council had been through its period of being new in the 1950s, its period of crisis of decay in the 1960s and by the mid-1970s was poised for a period of evolutionary change. Its structure then and now is similar. This study will attempt to demonstrate that the decade under examination is one in which the new conditions and the new leader converged with
other environmental factors to create an organizational saga for the
Council. Through examination of that saga may come a new
understanding of this state agency.
Chapter III

THE DEVELOPMENT OF STATEWIDE COORDINATION AND GOVERNANCE OF HIGHER EDUCATION IN THE UNITED STATES AND IN VIRGINIA UNTIL 1977

Background

In this chapter, an examination of the development of statewide governance or coordination of higher education throughout the country will place Virginia in context among the 50 states. Then the focus will change to coordination of higher education in Virginia.

Classical literature on statewide coordination was written from the late 1950s to the mid-1970s by Moos and Rourke, Berdahl, Glenny, Halstead, Millard and Millett. From the large amount of literature available on statewide coordination of higher education, selection was made from representative works by these leading authors. A highly acclaimed study by John D. Millett was published in 1984, Conflict in Higher Education: State Government Coordination Versus
Institutional Independence. Robert O. Berdahl continues to be a nationally recognized expert on statewide coordination of higher education and is an international scholar on various forms of higher education governance. Continuing concern about statewide coordination is indicated by the numbers of articles and reports about the issue in regarded journals including the Association of Governing Boards' bimonthly AGB Reports, the weekly Chronicle of Higher Education and publications by the Education Commission of the States.

Statewide Coordination and Governance of Higher Education in the United States

Public education in the United States has been primarily state-oriented since its inception, even though the degree of state legislative and bureaucratic involvement has varied from time to time, from state to state and from school to school (Moos and Rourke, 1959; Berdahl, 1971; Glenny, 1976; Glenny and Kidder, 1973; Glenny and Schmidtlein, 1980; Chambers, 1974; Halstead, 1974; Hager, 1976; Carnegie Council of Policy Studies, 1977; Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, 1972; Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement
of Teaching, 1976; Education Commission of the States, July of 1980; Kerr, 1982; Keller, 1983; Millett, 1984). Higher education historians such as Rudolph, Veysey and Thelin agree with Chester Finn that the state is the level of government most intimately involved with the governance of higher education in our country.

To bring order and some degree of understanding if not control over the states' expenditures for education, state boards of education were organized for secondary and primary schools. Higher education is more diverse and autonomous than the lower levels; its statewide coordination has progressed at a slower and different pace.

Trends toward statewide coordination and unification of higher education date back to New York's State Board of Regents in 1784 and the establishment of the University of Georgia in 1785 (Moos and Rourke, 1959). Statewide governing boards for higher education in the nineteenth century included Florida's State Board of Education established in 1885, Idaho's in 1890, South Dakota's Board of Regents established in 1897. Hawaii's board was established in 1907, Iowa's in 1909, and Mississippi's Board of Trustees for Institutions of Higher
Learning was established in 1910 (Education Commission of the States, 1983). Statewide coordinating boards became commonplace in the 1960s and 1970s during the "golden era" of higher education with soaring enrollments and an illusion of unlimited growth. When Congress passed the Education Amendments of 1972 granting funds to states for higher education planning under section 1202, existing and/or newly organized agencies claimed the funds and became known as "1202 Commissions" (Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 1982). By 1980, all states except North Carolina, which has a strong central governing board, had carried out the intent of that legislation by either designating the existing state higher education agency or board, augmenting existing agencies for the purpose or by creating new agencies as state postsecondary commissions. "The primary impact of the 1202 legislation has been to expand recognition in all states of the need in statewide planning to include all sectors of postsecondary education in the planning process" (Education Commission of the States, 1983, p. 19).

The diversity among the statewide agencies for higher education
is as rich as the cultural and historical diversity among the states themselves. Different levels of higher education are included (four-year public, two-year public, public vocational education, independent colleges, and/or proprietary schools) and different sources of power (statutory, constitutional, policy or executive order). Some states have more than one agency. Robert Berdahl in his classic Statewide Coordination of Higher Education (1971) classifies the major types of statewide coordinating agencies based on the degree of centralized coordinating authority over all of the senior public institutions of higher education in the state. With minor modifications his stratification is still used:

Class I: Neither a single coordinating agency created by statute nor a voluntary association performing significant statewide coordinating functions.

Class II: Voluntary statewide coordination performed by the institutions themselves, operating with some degree of formality.

Class III. Boards/coordinating agencies or councils created by statute but not superseding institutional governing boards: (a) membership composed mainly of institutional representatives with essentially
advisory powers; (b) mixture of institutional representatives and public members with essentially advisory powers; (c) mostly or all public members, usually appointed by the governor, with regulatory powers in some areas but not holding governing responsibility.

Class IV. Consolidated governing board with power to administer each institution. Members usually appointed by the governor. This is the most powerful type of coordinating agency or board.

Millett (1984) discusses the advantages and disadvantages of the three major types of state coordinating boards:

1. Statewide governing board, comparable to Berdahl's Class IV;
2. State coordinating board, comparable to Berdahl's Class III;
3. State advisory board, comparable to Berdahl's Class II.

Millett clearly favors the coordinating board because of the flexibility it allows the members of the system while still retaining enough power to be effective in the coordinating process. Millett is very sensitive to the question of institutional independence, that
delicate balance between academic autonomy and state accountability. The major distinction between a powerful board or coordinating agency and a less powerful one is whether it holds advisory/coordinating or regulatory/governing power (Berdahl, 1971 and 1980, Millett, 1984; Pettit and Kirkpatrick, 1984). These and other scholars agree that a major issue in examining the powers and functions of state coordination of public higher education is the conflict between (1) institutional autonomy and diversity and (2) standardization and control. Paul Dressel in *The Autonomy of Public Colleges* (1980) and Millett (1984) examine possible and actual impacts on institutional autonomy by various forms of state coordination. The important issue of autonomy is recognized but is not within the scope of this study.

The Education Commission of the States (1980) cites Berdahl's (1975a) work in setting standards by which statewide higher education coordinating agencies can be evaluated. In the decade since Berdahl described the difficulty of setting criteria, little progress seems to have been made. One roadblock may be the diversity among
and between states, the various forms of governance needed to coordinate differing institutions in differing sizes and types of states. Guidelines are being developed, however, particularly in the area of institutional autonomy and state accountability. Even though there is no strong body of literature on criteria for judging the effectiveness of types of statewide governance of higher education, there is fairly wide agreement that the coordinating board (Berdahl's Class III) is more effective than the looser voluntary board or the stronger consolidated governing board (Millet, 1980 and 1984; Berdahl, 1971; Education Commission of the States, 1980).

Berdahl, in a review of Millett's 1984 book, Conflict in Higher Education and reflection on his earlier Politics and Higher Education, agrees that higher education leaders must recognize the "...inevitable extent to which higher education policies get made through the political process....(but) that structures can still play a significant role in helping the policy process to realize its best potential" (AGB Reports, 1985, Jan./Feb., p. 45). These two experts believe that the structures and functions of state coordinating boards will lead
American higher education to higher quality and greater accessibility. Public policy is the outcome of the political process, but many bitter battles among interest groups are kept at the bureaucratic level to protect elected officials from the wrath of losing groups (Morrow, 1975; Dye, 1975). Therefore, the officials in the State Council of Higher Education for Virginia can be expected to absorb some of the political heat, solving or minimizing problems among contending colleges and interests before these choices reach the legislators in raw form. This theory will be explored as one reason why most of the decisions on higher education in Virginia are made by SCHEV rather than by the General Assembly.

With this background of national development of statewide coordination of higher education, the State Council of Higher Education for Virginia can be introduced.

*Coordination of Higher Education in Virginia*

The Virginia General Assembly in 1908 recommended coordination of financial support for state institutions through a
Virginia Education Commission. In 1914 the Normal Board was established to govern the Commonwealth's four normal schools: James Madison, Longwood, Mary Washington and Radford. Several studies of proposals for a statewide agency were commissioned by the General Assembly in the 1940s and 1950s. In 1956 the General Assembly established the State Council of Higher Education for Virginia. This coordinating agency was selected following aborted attempts in the 1952 and 1954 legislative sessions to set up a state board of higher education or coordinating councils with varied degrees of power. (Hager, 1976; Kellog, 1974). The statute creating the State Council of Higher Education for Virginia (SCHEV or the Council) states that the purpose of the Council is to promote "...the development and operation of a sound, vigorous, progressive and coordinated system of higher education...assembling data (for) preparing plans under which the several state-supported institutions of higher education shall constitute a coordinated system...." (Kellog, 1974, quoting Virginia Acts (Richmond, VA:DPP, 1956), Vol. I., Chap. 311, pp. 258-61; Virginia Code, 1956, Section 23-9.9).
The 11 Council members are appointed by the Governor and approved by the General Assembly for four-year staggered terms. The director is the executive officer and serves at the pleasure of the Council; in 1986 he had a staff of 55 persons including 34 professionals (Fact Book 1986-87, p. 54).

In response to the report of its Commission on Higher Education which recommended a strong coordinating and planning council, the 1974 General Assembly strengthened the provisions in the Code of Virginia affecting SCHEV, making it a true coordinating and planning council rather than the advisory body that it had been since 1956. SCHEV was specifically assigned decision-making functions to approve changes in mission statements of the Commonwealth's public institutions of higher education, to approve new academic programs and enrollment projections, to expand its data collection, to discontinue academic programs it determined unnecessarily duplicative or nonproductive and to advise the Governor and General Assembly concerning biennial institutional budget requests.

Virginia's Commission on State Government Management headed by
Senator W. B. Hopkins stated in 1976 that SCHEV itself was one of the Commonwealth's powerful collegial bodies because of its "substantial subject matter, strong constituencies, and broad formal authority."^1

In 1977 an entire chapter was added to the Code of Virginia designating SCHEV as Virginia's Postsecondary Education Commission as required under section 1202 of Title XII of the Higher Education Act of 1965, amended. In 1980 another chapter was added to the Code extending SCHEV's responsibilities to out-of-state colleges which offer diplomas or degrees in Virginia. In 1986 the State Council assumed control of the multi-million-dollar Equipment Bond Trust Fund established by the General Assembly for the benefit of all public institutions of higher education in Virginia. The General Assembly continues to fund numerous programs through SCHEV including the Tuition Assistance Grant Program for Virginia students in Virginia private colleges, the Funds for Excellence Program providing millions of dollars to colleges selected by SCHEV, all financial aid programs, and the new outstanding faculty awards for which SCHEV will select the recipients based on criteria it designed, and the Commonwealth
Centers established in doctoral-granting institutions in their competitively determined fields of excellence for research, scholarship and teaching.

In Virginia as in most states, the complexity of government, dependency on systematic information, advances in technology and required expertise have contributed to strengthened bureaucracies. Therefore it is not surprising that SCHEV's power has increased in the past decade, following the trends of increasingly centralized statewide coordination of higher education as cited by Millett, Berdahl, Gilley and Fulmer and others.

Studies by Kellog, Finley and Hager in the mid-1970s trace the development of the State Council of Higher Education for Virginia. By then SCHEV had moved from a relatively weak position through a period of even less centralized control to a position of relative strength. Even so, its power has dramatically increased in the decade since their writings. The current provision of the Code of Virginia under which SCHEV operates has been amended in 14 legislative sessions since 1956 and provides a broader set of responsibilities.
Among the significant responsibilities of the Council are:

1. To develop a master plan for Virginia's higher education system and to conduct other planning activities. By law, *The Virginia Plan for Higher Education* must be updated biennially.

2. To establish guidelines for both operating and capital outlay budgets for the institutions of higher education and to review and make recommendations on institutions' budget requests to the Governor and the General Assembly.

3. To approve changes in institutional missions. This responsibility is basic to the development of a coordinated system of higher education. An institution's mission is demonstrated by what it does; when it projects significant change in what it is doing, the Council must approve the action.

4. To approve any new degree program proposed by a public institution.
5. To terminate nonproductive degree programs in the public institutions.

6. To approve the enrollment projections of the individual institutions. These projections are used in determining the operating and capital outlay budget recommendations.

7. To grant approval to in-state private institutions to confer degrees by level and to approve degree programs and coursework offered in Virginia by out-of-state institutions.

8. To involve the private and proprietary institutions in the state's overall planning for postsecondary education.

9. To administer five statewide student financial assistance programs.

10. To provide guidelines for determining the domiciliary residence of students applying for in-state tuition rates.

11. To establish guidelines for patent and copyright policies developed by the public colleges and universities.

12. To coordinate the continuing education offerings, including telecommunications and all off-campus programs and courses
of the public institutions through six regional consortia.

13. To conduct special studies as directed by the General Assembly.

14. To assist in the coordination and implementation of Virginia's affirmative action plan for state-supported institutions of higher education; (Fact Book 1986-87 Higher Education in Virginia, Richmond: SCHEV, pp. 52-54.)

15. To administer the Higher Education Equipment Trust Fund (Council Notes, March 5, 1986).

16. To establish guidelines for designing good assessment programs, and publish institutional responses (Council Notes, April 1, 1987).

As a coordinating agency, the State Council of Higher Education for Virginia is a board created by statute to coordinate but not supersede institutional governing boards. Its design is not as powerful as that of the governing board or state board of regents found in approximately 20 states. (Fact Book 1986-87, p. 51)
Nevertheless, SCHEV is pivotal in major decisions affecting the Commonwealth's 15 senior institutions, the community college system, private in-state and out-of-state institutions and proprietary postsecondary institutions. As in other states (Millett, 1984), the Virginia Council's growth shows signs of gradually increasing centralization of higher education coordination, affecting autonomy of the institutions in fact if not in purpose. Its role in higher education in Virginia is likely to remain prominent. Therefore, it is important that higher education leaders thoroughly understand state systems and governance of higher education.

Like coordinating councils in some other states (Chronicle of Higher Education, September 1, 1988), the State Council of Higher Education for Virginia holds power over the state's colleges and universities even though final decisions on budgetary allocations are made by the legislature. Since the Council's decisions can be overturned or rejected by the Governor and by the legislators, its decisions appear basically advisory, recommendations to elected government officials. What, then, is the Council's degree of power
and how did that evolve, especially over the past decade? This is a question addressed by this research in its search for the organizational saga of State Council.

Research on the higher education coordinating council in Virginia may serve as a model for similar research in other states, particularly in the 27 with the statewide coordinating council form of governance. As discussed earlier in this study, Virginia is important in American higher education of the 1980s. This research will seek to describe an organizational saga during the 1977-1987 period in the life of the State Council of Higher Education for Virginia, a decade in which Virginia's higher education institutions moved into the national spotlight (State Council of Higher Education for Virginia, 1959, 1967a & b, 1968, 1972, 1974, 1977, 1979, 1981, 1983; Virginia Code Commission, 1983 and 1985).
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CHAPTER IV

THE STATE COUNCIL OF HIGHER EDUCATION FOR VIRGINIA

If the State Council of Higher Education for Virginia is to fit the model of Clark's organizational saga, there must be a major event and a charismatic leader. This research demonstrates that the Code revision of 1974 was the event and that Gordon Davies' 1977 appointment as SCHEV director provided the charismatic leader. These were the turning points in the evolution of the Council.

The 1974 General Assembly strengthened the provisions in the Code of Virginia affecting SCHEV, making it a true coordinating and planning council rather than the advisory body that it had been since 1956. SCHEV was specifically assigned decision-making functions to approve changes in mission statements of the Commonwealth's public institutions of higher education, to approve new academic programs and enrollment projections, to expand its data collection, to
discontinue academic programs it determined unnecessarily
duplicative or nonproductive and to advise the Governor and General
Assembly concerning biennial budget requests (Code of Virginia, Chp.
1.1, Sec. 23-9.6:1).

Virginia's General Assembly in its 1977 session acted upon the
report of the Hopkins Commission on governmental management
which, among other governmental reorganizations, recommended that
the governor, rather than the Council, appoint the SCHEV director.
This report, in the form of Senate Bill 667, was considered by the
General Assembly as SCHEV Director Daniel E. Marvin prepared to
leave his post February 15. In the midst of the legislative session, the
Council appointed associate director Gordon Davies acting director.
The General Assembly rejected the Hopkins Commission
recommendation, which left the Council free to continue the search
for Marvin's replacement. In June, the Council appointed Davies
director after considering 150 to 180 applications and nominations
(News Leader, Feb. 2, March 16 and June 7, 1977). So, Gordon Davies,
who had spent four years as SCHEV's associate director working on
the specifics of strengthening the council, now moved into the
directorship which he still holds.

The decade from 1977 to 1987 began with hard economic times,
high inflation and rapidly rising energy prices causing major concerns
for the entire country. Revenue shortfalls in Virginia forced
across-the-board budget cuts and reversions of revenue in the late
1970s and early 1980s which had major impact on higher education.
Enrollments at many of the Commonwealth's colleges fell or leveled
off but increased rapidly at others. In times of financial difficulties,
tough decisions have to be made about the allocation of scarce
resources. This was SCHEV's job in 1977; it was responsible for
finding the means to distribute the Commonwealth's limited higher
education funds equitably among the competing institutions and to
placate the long-established institutions which chaffed under
SCHEV's new authority. At the same time SCHEV had to improve the
entire higher educational system.

Dr. Davies published a report in 1987 on his first ten years as
SCHEV director, and it is on this document and this period that this
saga is based. Major changes occurred in Virginia higher education in this decade; these changes are chronicled in the legally required biennial report of the Council, *The Virginia Plan* (1.1 23-9.3. Code of Virginia). The first plan update of the original 1969 publication was released in January, 1974, a few weeks prior to the legislative decision to require its biennial update. Subsequent editions of these major documents have been distributed in odd numbered years beginning in 1977. The staff recommends to Council which issues should be covered in the upcoming plan; staff reports to Council and receives direction from these appointed members periodically as the research and writing are done.

The overarching themes of the Council have been retained since the 1969 Plan: access, quality and accountability of higher education in the Commonwealth. In 1974, the Council adopted these three concerns as its goals. In each Plan, these themes have been reiterated and expanded.

The 1974 Plan was, in the words of SCHEV Director Daniel E. Marvin, Jr., a "picture of higher education in Virginia in 1973" (State
Council of Higher Education for Virginia, *The Virginia Plan for Higher Education, 1974*, p. iii). The picture was one of 15 public senior institutions, 23 community colleges and one two-year public college, all at the end of an unprecedented growth curve facing a period of predicted dropping enrollments. The 1974 Plan was also an explanation of, or a justification for, the statutory escalation of SCHEV's powers. This plan was developed over 18 months and was called a "consensus based on contributions from over three hundred faculty, students, legislators and citizens in addition to the SCHEV staff, the eleven appointed Council members and public and private institutional presidents" (SCHEV, 1974, pp. iii and 2). The 1974 Plan includes 14 objectives for higher education, 46 recommendations for action, and detailed planning statements for all public colleges and private colleges chartered in the Commonwealth. To provide each citizen of the Commonwealth accessibility to the form of higher education most appropriate to his interests and abilities, SCHEV planned to ensure the opportunity for full and equal access to higher education by all citizens, to ensure that financial condition does not
become a barrier to higher education, to provide timely and relevant opportunities for the continuing education of each citizen, and to provide an educational system responsive to state and national manpower requirements. To maintain institutional excellence in teaching, research and public service, SCHEV planned to encourage an increased commitment on the part of the Commonwealth to provide quality higher education, to protect and enhance institutional diversity with a coordinated system of higher education, to encourage a continuing emphasis on instructional quality and to foster appropriate innovative modes of instruction, and to encourage research and public service activities that meet local, regional and national needs. To guarantee to the citizens of the Commonwealth the accountability of the total educational process, SCHEV planned to assure the most effective and efficient use of all resources provided to higher education, to assure opportunities for both the intellectual and personal development of the individual student and to help prepare the individual for productive participation in society, and to ensure statewide and institutional accountability through
coordination and cooperation among all elements of the State's total higher education community and between higher education and all other levels of education.

The issues highlighted in subsequent years' Virginia Plans for Higher Education are:

1977:

1. Finance -- reviewing and predicting hard economic choices and their impacts on higher education;

2. Facilities -- discussing space guidelines, areas of underutilized space and areas of need;

3. Degrees conferred -- discussing the need for rapid response to programs in the community college system and noting the trends in degrees conferred by senior institutions;

4. Faculty -- denoting low salaries in comparison with national figures, and discussing tenure administration, sex-age-rank and race statistics;

5. Students -- noting a 83% increase in enrollments 1970-1976 and a predicted growth rate of 21% 1976-81 but 5%
1981-1987; Community College system has allowed great increases in part-time, minority, and older students.

1979:

6. Enrollment issues -- reviewing demographics and predicting leveling enrollments, encouraging reversal of "student export," fearing a possible reduction of 12-15,000 undergraduate Full Time Enrollments (FTEs) by 1985; expressing concern about enrollment projections from Virginia's private colleges; planning for possible closing of institutions;

7. The emerging role of Virginia's urban universities in Northern Virginia, Richmond and Tidewater and their relationships with each other, with community colleges and with the comprehensive universities (UVA & VPI);

8. Teacher education programs -- the oversupply of teachers being graduated by Virginia colleges and the opportunity to provide leadership in teacher preparation;

9. Higher education finance in the 1980s, which in Virginia is predominantly enrollment-driven -- calling for changes in
Virginia's method of budgeting operating costs to establish a
fixed and varied cost model; calling for changes in the fee and
tuition policies as well as restraint in building new facilities;

10. Future support for research -- noting that Virginia cannot
support substantial research at all institutions and
recommending no further institutions be authorized to confer
doctoral degrees; supporting Virginia Marine Science
consortium (designated as Virginia's Sea Grant College) as
example of cooperative approach to research;

11. Off-campus credit courses and programs -- with particular
attention to the role of the six consortia and of private and
out-of-state institutions' offerings.

1981:

12. Teacher education -- calling for stricter admission
requirements, improved curriculum, alternative paths to
certification, close work between SCHEV and the Board of
Education;

13. Student aid in Virginia -- facing Federal student aid
reductions, must be increased to assure access;

14. Postsecondary education for military personnel in Virginia --
    quality evaluations, focusing on out-of-state institutions
    which supply a majority of these services;

15. The costs of state-supported higher education to the state and
    to the students -- calling for redesigning of policies
    supporting maintenance reserves and policies on indirect costs
    of public service and research;

16. Business administration programs in Virginia's senior colleges
    and universities.

1983:

17. Undergraduate education for the mid-eighties-- calling for
    emphasis on liberal education;

18. Research and higher education in Virginia -- supporting the
    establishment of the Center for Innovative Technology;
    Southeastern Universities Research Association (SURA)
    consortium of 23 universities organized in Newport News at
    Virginia Associated Research Center to attract a Department of
Energy National Electron Accelerator Laboratory (became CEBAF);

19. Financing higher education in Virginia -- measured as proportion of the Commonwealth's General Fund 1944-46 7.5%, 1964-66 11.2%, 1974-76 17.6%, 1982-84 19.3%. Faculty salaries are improving but are still not up to national averages. Budget guidelines developed by SCHEV are to "assist in defining resource needs necessary to the attainment of the goals and objectives of higher education as articulated by the Governor, the General Assembly and the higher education community itself" (Virginia Plan for Higher Education-1983, p. 43).

1985:

20. "A time of opportunity" -- what must be done to move Virginia colleges and universities from their position of relative strength, particularly in undergraduate education but also in some research areas, to the very forefront of American higher education? The new goal is that Virginia will build a
system of colleges and universities that is among the best in the nation by:

21. Increasing funding of budget guidelines from 93% to full funding by 1990;

22. Setting aside a substantial portion, about 5%, of the positions and funds of the fully funded guidelines for a competitive grant program;

23. Creating a Higher Education Equipment Trust Fund that can be used to overcome deficiencies in instructional equipment inventories, to replace obsolescent equipment on a predictable schedule, and to transfer equipment from one institution to another in order to extend its useful life;

24. Advancing the average faculty salaries at Virginia's colleges and universities into the top 40% of each institution's benchmark group by 1990, and into the top one-fourth by 1992;

25. Requiring, as a condition of full guideline funding, that each institution develop systematic non-anecdotal methods for assessing student learning;
26. Establishing cost containment procedures that will help to control price increases to students;

27. Creating institutional incentives for better planning and increased efficiency;

28. Affirming Virginia's commitment to the Eminent Scholars Program;

29. Increasing the volume of sponsored research at Virginia's major research universities;

30. Containing the cost of higher education for the student and for the state and reducing students' reliance on loans.

1987:

31. Building upon progress -- goals for Virginia higher education, 1988-90, include commitments to

   1) continue efforts to fund fully budget guidelines,

   2) expand support to colleges that respond to requests for proposals addressing specific state priority issues,

   3) affirm a realistic and consistent enrollment policy,

   4) advance average faculty salary into top one-fourth of each
institution's benchmark group by 1992,

5) require continued progress in assessing student learning as a condition for special initiative funding,

6) increase sponsored research at the major research universities,

7) create institutional incentives for better planning and efficiency,

8) affirm commitment to the Eminent Scholars Program,

9) increase number of black students and of black and women faculty,

10) develop new supports for Virginia's private colleges and revise the Tuition Assistance Grant Program,

11) establish cost containment procedures to control price increases to students;

33. Virginia's academic libraries in the age of information technology -- calling for more sophistication and interlibrary cooperation;

34. Report on student assessment -- required by the legislature, assessment is being developed individually by each institution
with supervision and support from SCHEV.

The goals stated in the biennial reports reveal the changing issues and problems over the 1977-87 decade. During this decade the country weathered its economic crisis and moved into a period of relative affluence; Virginia's higher educational system gained national prominence, access to college education was broadened, but the costs of such an education burgeoned. By the end of the decade rising student costs were a key issue for SCHEV and colleges everywhere. This research now turns to the director to show how his charismatic leadership defined the issues and guided SCHEV through the problems of the 1977-87 decade.

The Director

Who is SCHEV's director who fills the criterion of charismatic leader? Gordon Davies grew up near New York City, across the George Washington Bridge in Ft. Lee, New Jersey. He attended Yale on an undergraduate scholarship and later earned his Master's and Doctorate
degrees in philosophical theology there (McCreary, June 7, 1977). He served as a United States Naval officer for two years before graduate school, then worked for IBM and two programs for minority youths. The last of these was a program he directed for Yale, Harvard and Columbia University designed to prepare minority college students for graduate English studies. He realized after three years that it was not a feasible program and recommended its closure.

He went to New Jersey as Director of Academic Advising at the new Richard Stockton State College (Grant and Reisman, p. 329). His innovative nontraditional ideas were not accepted by the students, so after two years he moved again, this time to Virginia as associate director of SCHEV in 1973 (Cleary, p. 17). Stockton's flexible curriculum based in the liberal arts was nondepartmentally based and "free-wheeling," creating a great deal of faculty instability. Many faculty members, "including Davies, were either released by [President Richard] Bjork or themselves concluded it was best to leave" (Grant and Reisman, p. 329). In the first five years, 17 deans and many administrators left (Grant and Reisman, p. 330). There was
considerable dissatisfaction among students, faculty and administration.

"I had worked a lot with the people in the central agency up in Trenton and what became very clear to me was that the focus of decision making in American higher education in the next ten years, at least, was going to be in the state capitols" (Cleary, p. 17). What he found was a very remarkable system, this higher education system in Virginia. First of all, it's supported politically by people who believe very, very strongly in autonomy of institutions. They believe that major decisions have to be made on campus and they can't be made in a central office. There are states where a central board approves every course, approves all the teaching loads, all the faculty appointments, promotions, tenure, and even approves the parking permit system. We don't do all that, and I'm delighted that we don't. Because as much as I think I could run the world effectively if I were king, I also know that I really can't. Nobody can. Nobody can sit in Richmond and tell people how to teach in Harrisonburg. And not having to try to do it gives me more time to try to sense what's in the air, to try to find the ideas that will help Virginia's higher education. And ultimately, the nation's (Cleary, p. 18).

Gordon Davies is a complex leader perceived in many different
ways by persons from varying viewpoints. "Davies is tremendously influential but not universally popular" (Hamel, interview May 12, 1988). Dr. Dana Hamel, former Chancellor of the Virginia Community College System, sees Davies reflecting some of former U. S. Secretary of Education William Bennett's ideas, especially when he speaks of the liberal arts. "Davies' emphasis on liberal arts and his demeanor cause some to perceive him as elite," according to Hamel.

Davies had been in the state for four years and gathered strong support for his promotion to director in 1977. But then William and Mary President Thomas Graves nominated Longwood College President Henry I. Willett, Jr., as SCHEV director. "Presidents of some of the tax-supported colleges have pushed the candidacy of Dr. Henry I. Willet, Jr....Some presidents...were known to oppose any move to make Willett director....Some of the presidents have also opposed putting Davies in the director's chair" (Cox, March 16, 1977).

Virginia college presidents have continued their ambivalent feelings toward Davies. Some say that he is universally disliked by Virginia's public college presidents; others recognize his power and
work around it. Former Longwood President Janet Greenwood in 1986 and 1987 was very open about her dissatisfaction with SCHEV's treatment of her college and of the General Assembly's support of the Governor's budget which she felt unduly limited faculty salaries at Longwood.

The Assistant to the President at The College of William and Mary, James Kelly, admires Davies' leadership abilities. And he believes that without SCHEV and its director, "William and Mary wouldn't be as well off as we are today" (Kelly, interview April 11, 1989).

Davies is highly regarded by some key legislative leaders including Richard Bagley, chairman of the powerful House of Delegates' Appropriations Committee from the time Davies came to Virginia until 1985 and member of the higher education study committee (the Stone Commission) that proposed the 1974 Code changes strengthening SCHEV. Their close relationship was one that left Bagley feeling that the SCHEV director is leading the Council as its designers expected: not solely an advocate of higher education but
"more importantly a responsible factor in the governance of higher education and a tool for checks and balances of public money, for avoidance of duplication and as a monitor of the system." Bagley feels that SCHEV is in the position to monitor favoritism and to reduce political influence on the allocation of these resources. This, he points out, causes resentment among the colleges and universities accustomed to the favoritisms of the past. He does not feel that SCHEV has evidenced political bias or favoritism to any one college or type of college. If anything, Bagley feels that SCHEV needs more power to balance the tremendous political power held by colleges with their well-placed alumni. His opinion of Davies is one of an outstanding professional who carries out the policies of a highly capable Council (Bagley, interview February 19, 1988).

One of the most powerful members of the Virginia General Assembly, Senator Hunter B. Andrews, has on several occasions indicated his trust and high opinion of the SCHEV director in regard to higher education issues in the Commonwealth. Andrews depends on Davies' recommendations concerning higher education policy.
A former SCHEV staff member stated that SCHEV under its current director has become progressively more elitist. In the mid to late 1970s, this anonymous source states, "SCHEV’s philosophy flip-flopped. It became an elitist body that wanted to educate the brightest kids. Community colleges and regional colleges were designed to take care of blacks and persons from working class backgrounds so they wouldn’t push to get into the more selective colleges and universities. Whatever the reasons, there was a major shift between 1974 and 1980 in SCHEV’s attitude about opening up educational opportunities. SCHEV’s philosophy by 1980 was no longer supportive of continuing education and nontraditional higher education" (interview April 22, 1988). He agrees with the director of the Tidewater Consortium that SCHEV’s emphasis under Davies has decidedly turned to more support for elite higher education in the Commonwealth. He points out that any additional support during these years to the urban institutions,\(^1\) traditionally black colleges,\(^2\) and lesser endowed institutions\(^3\) was due to decisions made in the early 1970s on expanding the urban institutions and on formula-based
funding as well as to pressures from the United States Office of Civil Rights. Therefore he believes that Davies should not be credited with egalitarian actions during his term that in fact have roots in early actions or reactions.

The director of the Tidewater Consortium of Continuing Higher Education, Dr. Lawrence Dotolo, calls Davies an elitist who is not interested in promoting nontraditional college interests. "His main interest is in the traditional university with the residential full time 18 to 22-year-old undergraduate. He doesn't understand the urban institutions with many adult part-time students and the community work these colleges do" (interview, January 8, 1988).

A legislative analyst close to higher education issues says there is a "clear perception that SCHEV is elitist in terms of hierarchy. A lot of special initiatives and programs are geared to the doctoral institutions. Some legislators believe that SCHEV is elitist. To the degree that the legislators want to be the champions of the little guys they conflict with SCHEV." In the legislative allocation procedure, this analyst points out that "what Gordon Davies decides to
do and what major new programs or projects he proposes, have great impact" (interview May 12, 1988). Davies works more closely with Senator Andrews and the Senate Finance Committee staff members than with the House Appropriations Committee and its staff. The House staff's contacts with Davies are during the sessions; between legislative sessions they work with his staff. This person says it is clear that "Gordon Davies is the spokesperson for higher education. He usually sits down with the Chairmen [of the General Assembly appropriations and finance committees] and goes over in private things that would affect everyone in higher education" (interview May 12, 1988).

The term "elitist" is frequently used in discussions about Gordon Davies and the State Council of Higher Education. What is meant by this? Why is the word used so often, either in accusation, admiration or denial? What do Davies' actions, guidance of Virginia's higher education system, and writings say about his orientation? How do these concepts contribute to SCHEV's saga? Is it true that SCHEV has since 1977 been more supportive of educational opportunities for a
select group in Virginia society? Is this select group the wealthy? Is it the "traditional power-holders" in Virginia, i.e. white males of "famous old families?" Or are these increased educational opportunities for the students who, because of their innate abilities and academic achievements, are able to take advantage of an improved system of higher education? Has Virginia opened doors for persons of all backgrounds; are we dealing with meritocracy instead of aristocracy?

Gordon Davies says that SCHEV "greatly values access and diversity in Virginia's higher education system. Politically SCHEV has been a real defender of these values in the system even against the tide. When the community college system in the Robb years was about to lose hundreds of staff positions, SCHEV played a key role in cutting its loss to less than half the proposed cut. SCHEV has defended the smaller colleges from "being eaten alive by the big ones" (Davies, interview April 17, 1989). State Council member and former chairman, nationally recognized educator and former president of two universities, American Association of Higher Education and the United
Negro College Fund, Dr. Stephen J. Wright says that SCHEV is "deeply committed to access in the system but not necessarily an individual student's access to a particular institution" (Wright, interview April 17, 1989). He believes that flagship institutions such as the University of Virginia and Virginia Polytechnic University should be treated differently and funded as flagship universities. SCHEV is deeply committed to the educational value of diversity within the student bodies. The missions of the flagship universities and of the other colleges are different; both are just as deserving of support and get it. But he does not see this as a sign of "elitism."

The cost of higher education to a great degree controls access for the student with moderate family support. The State Council has expressed concern about the relatively high tuition and fees in Virginia's public colleges and universities (SCHEV Plan 1985, p. 26) and about the heavy reliance of Virginia students on loans which create heavy burdens on the less wealthy after graduation (SCHEV Plan 1985, p. 28). Tuition Assistance Grants supported by SCHEV and the General Assembly were $1350 per year in 1987 for each Virginia
undergraduate student attending private Virginia colleges. Financial aid allows students from less affluent families to have access to all the Virginia institutions, not just to the less expensive community colleges or to whatever college may be near his or her home. SCHEV has firmly stated its position.

The Council does not believe that higher tuition is in itself undesirable. But the increases in tuition must be accompanied by increases in student financial aid, or needy students will find themselves educationally disenfranchised. The 1984-86 budget contains increases in financial aid to help offset the sizeable increases in the amount of tuition institutions must collect. This budget decision re-emphasizes Virginia's intention to guarantee access to higher education to all who want and can benefit from it (SCHEV Plan-1983, pp. 38-39).

Virginia's College Scholarship Assistance Program (CSAP) is one among more than 20 financial aid programs in the Commonwealth. SCHEV supported increases in funding of this "statewide need-based program which was intended to help ensure access....Without a significant increase in funds to the CSAP program in order to provide access in the first place, however, a large number of students may be
restricted in their ability to enroll in higher education" (SCH EV

Davies suggested in speeches and in written proposals a program
that would give Virginia workers one year full tuition or two years
half tuition at a state supported college or university for every seven
years of employment within the Commonwealth. This $26 million per
year program, he proposed, would include homemakers as workers.

Unless we prepare now for changes that will occur, sizable
numbers of older Virginians who grew up certain that they
were skilled and useful members of society will find
themselves unemployed and unemployable as manufacturing
and assembly jobs are moved abroad to cheaper labor markets
with higher productivity and an automation replaces them.

The thesis has a corollary not related to age: The minority
population of Virginia will increase to about 1.6 million
people, most of whom have not had equal opportunities to
become skilled workers; as business and industry change
their opportunities for economic security will diminish.

There will be jobs in Virginia, but probably not the same
kinds of jobs and perhaps not as many. The glamorous
technical positions will increase in number, but not nearly
even enough to absorb displaced manufacturing and assembly
workers. Jobs in the service industries will increase, but
displaced workers will need to be trained for them. They will
also need new understandings of what "useful work" is and
new ways of fitting their work into their family, social, and
personal lives.
At present, Virginia's colleges and universities serve adults in a variety of ways, but not with any clearly focused goal in view....The array of activities is impressive, but it is largely random, tacked on to higher education almost as an afterthought, and lacking a firm state commitment of support. By themselves, Virginia's colleges and universities cannot solve the problems of an aging population in a rapidly changing world. But the colleges and universities can contribute to the solution through a state commitment to provide continuing education to the men and women of the workforce.

All Virginians should have opportunities to become and to remain economically productive and to seek greater understanding of themselves and the world in which they live. A program of higher education "credits" for the men and women of Virginia's workforce would increase their access to higher education for these purposes (Davies, 1984, spring. p. 12).

Davies writes in his ten year report that his proposal for a work-force sabbatical was "greeted, to be charitable, with whimsical skepticism. I still think it was a good idea" (p. 16).

The SCHEV Director strongly supports the educational and human value of liberal arts in higher education. This insistence on more than a vocational education in Virginia's colleges has led to many accusations of "elitism." Following a SCHEV-sponsored statewide conference, "The Liberal Arts and Sciences: A Renewed Commitment," in December, 1984, which was televised in part throughout the state,
he wrote in *Public Education in Virginia* that

the liberal arts and sciences are the core of the curriculum, and they *do* prepare men and women to work and live responsible lives in a complex, rapidly changing society (Davies, 1985 winter).

His position was supported in a strongly worded editorial in the Richmond *Times-Dispatch*, July 20, 1984, and has been promoted by educators throughout the nation. Some may consider it elitism to support the liberal arts, but it is a position with wide acceptance in 1989.

In claiming a good higher education system in Virginia, one of the examples that Davies gives in his ten year report is that "while the premier universities of other states have moved pell-mell toward graduate programs and advanced research, Virginia's colleges and universities have maintained a commitment to undergraduate education" (p. 8). This position again challenges the claim that SCHEV is "elitist."

SCHEV has initiated and implemented numerous programs to encourage black students' recruitment and retention at traditionally
white institutions. For two years SCHEV supported a less than successful program awarding scholarships to white students attending traditionally black institutions and faculty exchange programs between Virginia institutions with different racial backgrounds. The Office of Civil Rights has monitored Virginia very closely; only in 1988 was the state removed from Federal court surveillance.

Gordon Davies commented at length on the desegregation issue in the Richmond newspaper (Davies, April 17, 1983). He felt that Governor John Dalton made a serious error in 1978 in accepting numerical goals for black faculty and students. As discussed elsewhere in this paper, SCHEV strongly opposed that response in very open disagreements with Governor Dalton and Secretary of Education J. Wade Gilley. Davies continues in his newspaper article in 1983 to admit that between 1978 and 1982 Virginia did not make reasonable progress in recruiting either students or faculty and did not act to correct this. Nor did "the person responsible" respond to the Office of Civil Rights (OCR) inquiries in 1981. Therefore, Virginia had to
renegotiate with OCR and nonetheless was put under court order again in 1983. Davies states that he agree(s) with those who say that most of our traditionally white institutions enroll too few blacks and graduate too few of those they do enroll. I think it is possible to achieve better racial balance among their student bodies. But I also know that the problem is enormously complex, and that we desperately need educational reform so that colleges and our public schools will serve all Virginians better than they do now (Davies, April 17, 1983).

Council member Dr. Stephen Wright has been acutely aware of this issue. "Virginia is under obligation to the Office of Civil Rights to eliminate vestiges of segregation in all institutions. SCHEV has a number of programs that seek to do that" (Wright, interview April 17, 1989). In addition to its commitment to meeting these obligations and to its support of programs to encourage minority students to attend college, he feels that the Council members and staff are deeply committed to the educational value of broad diversity within student bodies.

To ensure that diversity not only within the student bodies but
among the institutions, SCHEV and the General Assembly have supported formula funding for Virginia's colleges since the late 1970s. Even though the formulas are outdated (Eagle, March 20, 1989), they have offered protection to the smaller institutions with less political power and influence (Bagley, interview February 18, 1988).

Urban institutions provide access to many nontraditional students, especially older students, minorities and women, and those who work and attend college part-time. The Virginia urban institutions accept at least three-fourths of their applicants (SCHEV Plan-1979, pp. 26-30). Urban institutions and SCHEV's support for them are discussed later in this chapter.

Some claim that even though he is considered extremely politically aware, Davies has upon occasion misjudged political reality. He was not prepared for the 1984 defeat of House Appropriations Committee's Higher Education Subcommittee Chairman Cleaves Manning of Portsmouth. Because of Manning's surprise defeat, SCHEV suffered a setback in terms of influence. "Manning, [Senator]
Andrews, and Davies were a strong close team. Gordon Davies never built a base with the other House Appropriations Committee members, including [Chair] Dorothy McDiarmid and [current Higher Education Subcommittee Chairman] Earl Dickinson, due to the tight link between him and Manning. Because of the change there was some slippage in relationships between Davies and the House committee leadership" (Anonymous, interview May 12, 1988).

On one point this researcher has found no one to disagree: Davies is brilliant, a mental giant with an unusually quick mind.

Is Davies through his staff and with the Council an effective advocate for higher education in Virginia? A SCHEV staff member from 1976 to 1980 who is currently Staff Director of the House of Delegates' Appropriations Committee, Robert Schultze praises Davies as an extremely effective advocate for Virginia institutions of higher education (Schultze, interview May 12, 1988). Recent research finds that most of the responding General Assembly members agree that SCHEV is such an effective advocate. Davies says that the Council is "the advocate for higher education but not for any one institution of
higher education. This distinction is difficult to grasp, but it is important to the health of Virginia's system of colleges and universities" (Davies, June, 1987, p. 12).

Legislative Opinion

In his ten year report to the State Council of Higher Education for Virginia, Gordon Davies states that "the Council's relations with the General Assembly continue to be excellent" (Davies, June, 1987, p. 7). To determine the accuracy of his statement, a survey of General Assembly members' opinion was conducted in December 1988 and January 1989 and results compared with similar research done in 1975 by Marlene Hager (Appendixes B and C). Findings are presented in Appendix D.

Since 1975 there have been few dramatic changes in legislative opinion toward the statutory authority. Legislative opinion is similar to that in 1975 with few changes in SCHEV's power likely to be adopted (Appendix D, Table 1).

There were increases in the level of approval of SCHEV's
performance, especially in its planning function. Nearly three-fourths of the responding legislators in 1988 agreed that SCHEV's performance in carrying out its overall planning functions has effectively contributed to the strength of higher education in the Commonwealth (Appendix D, Table 4).

The responding 1988 legislators also claimed a higher satisfaction level than in 1975 with SCHEV's performance in projecting and approving enrollment figures. These enrollment projections are very important since they are used as a basis from which the appropriations are made; the institutions cannot grow without funds and a large percentage of the funding in Virginia is enrollment driven (Appendix D, Table 5).

Legislators of the eighties apparently had more confidence in SCHEV's budget recommendations after 13 years' experience than they did when these powers had just been strengthened in the mid-1970s. There was a great increase in agreement that SCHEV's budget recommendations have provided the information required for the General Assembly to make informed decisions on allocations of funds.
for higher education (Appendix D, Table 7).

More than in the 1970s, recent sessions of the General Assembly have requested SCHEV to produce studies on various aspects of higher education. Two-thirds of the 1988 respondents agree that SCHEV's studies and reports are satisfactory (Appendix D, Table 9).

Nearly three-fourths of the 1988 responding legislators agree that SCHEV is an effective advocate for higher education in the Commonwealth. This must be seen as a vote of confidence. There is a definite feeling that SCHEV is more effective in its advocacy for doctoral-granting institutions than for community colleges. Tables 12 and 13 in Appendix D report the results of this part of the survey.

As in 1975, there is little support for creating a superboard, a strongly centralized form of governance of higher education. The diversity of Virginia's system of higher education and its tradition of autonomous institutions within that system lends itself much more readily to a coordinating board (Appendix D, Table 3).

It is safe to assume from this survey that SCHEV's relations with the General Assembly are as Davies reported: excellent. In the
14 years since its statutory expansion, in the 13 years since Hager's research and in the 10 years covered in Davies' report, SCHEV has retained and increased the confidence and respect of the Virginia General Assembly.

These are important findings. The General Assembly's increasing confidence in SCHEV supports a part of the legend of excellence that the Council has developed.

The Council

In this research a number of persons have referred to the high quality of the Council appointees: Richard Bagley, Gordon Davies, Stephen Wright, and John Molnar among others. It seems worthwhile and relevant to look at four of the Council members in order to understand the kinds of persons to whom the SCHEV director reports and in whose hands the governor has placed the general welfare of the Commonwealth's higher education system. The 11 Council members are appointed to four year terms by the Governor and are eligible for reappointment to one more term.
Frank Batten of Norfolk served on the Council from 1972 until 1980 (SCHEV: Virginia plan for higher education 1977 and 1979). A successful businessman widely respected as a philanthropist, Batten is primary stock holder, founder and chairman of Landmark Communications, Inc., a major national newspaper-television conglomerate headquartered in Norfolk. He was chairman of the Board of Associated Press from 1982 until 1987. Born in 1927, he grew up in Norfolk, received his undergraduate degree in economics from the University of Virginia and earned a Masters in Business Administration from Harvard in 1952. As Old Dominion University's first rector, he "worked tirelessly to bolster state funding and start a first-rate oceanography program and an engineering school. Today Batten and his corporation remain among ODU's top 3 benefactors" (Hartman, p. 57). In 1987 he raised $2 million for higher education scholarships in Virginia, giving half of that himself. "Education is my prime interest outside the company. It allows people the opportunity to progress from all income levels" (Hartman, p. 57). For 35 years Batten has donated so much time and money to the community that
Joshua P. Darden, president of Darden Properties, Inc., for whom ODU's Darden School of Education is named, says "I'd put him at the very, very top" of Hampton Roads' citizens. He's been so generous that when he asks people to do things, it's hard to refuse" (Hartman, p.57).

Batten left the Council in 1980 since he was ineligible for reappointment after serving two four-year terms (SCHEV minutes July 1, 1980).

Dr. Stephen J. Wright of Hampton has been a member of SCHEV since 1982. Virginia Plan for Higher Education 1987, 1985 and 1983; SCHEV minutes July 19, 1984). He was elected chairman of the Council in 1984 and 1985 (SCHEV minutes September 4, 1985) but declined a third term as Chair in 1986 (SCHEV news release September 10, 1986). He is a widely respected black educator, former president of Fisk University, Bluefield State College, United Negro College Fund and the American Association for Higher Education. He was a member and vice chairman of the New Jersey State Board of Higher Education (SCHEV minutes July 19, 1984). Since 1976 he has been a senior advisor to the College Entrance Exam Board and was vice
president of that organization from 1970 until 1976. Dr. Wright is a former member of Christopher Newport College Board of Visitors, and of the boards of the University of Richmond and Shaw University in North Carolina. He has been a member of the President's National Library Commission and of the U.S. State Department's Advisory Committee on International Organizations (SCHEV Council Notes, July, 1984). Dr. Wright still travels throughout the United States as a consultant in higher education.

Lewis A. McMurran, Jr, of Newport News, was a Democratic member of House of Delegates for 29 years. Revered as an "elder statesman" in Richmond, he served as assistant to Republican Governor John Dalton after he was unexpectedly defeated by the current State Senator Bobby Scott. One of the founders of Christopher Newport College, Delegate McMurran was also a strong supporter of the college in the General Assembly. The plaque in his honor on the Lewis Archer McMurran, Jr., Hall at Christopher Newport College acknowledges his chief sponsorship in 1960 of House Bill 466 which created the college. He served on the Jamestown Foundation for

William B. Spong, former member of the Virginia General Assembly, former United States Senator, and former Dean of the Marshall Wythe School of Law at The College of William and Mary, was appointed to the State Council of Higher Education in 1984. He resigned in January, 1988, to serve as interim president of Old Dominion University (SCHEV Plan 1985 and 1987).

These men and other appointees are persons with long experience in the public and private sectors of the Commonwealth. They understand board service and, according to sources quoted above and according to my own observation at numerous Council meetings, they take their responsibilities very seriously. They expect quality, and this becomes woven into the fabric of the Council and its staff as a
part of its legend (Wright, interview April 17, 1989).

The Urban Institutions

In 1978 Davies proposed to Council that it attempt to switch millions of dollars in state appropriations from outside the eastern corridor, which stretches from Tidewater through Richmond to Northern Virginia, to some of the colleges in the corridor. Through the late 1980s this plan would divert funds from Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University (VPI) and James Madison University (JMU) in order to enhance growth at the three focal institutions for higher education in Virginia's major urban areas: George Mason University (GMU) in Northern Virginia, Old Dominion University (ODU) in Tidewater, and Virginia Commonwealth University (VCU) in Richmond (Cox, August 23, 1978 and September 8, 1978 and SCHEV Plan-1979). According to the Times-Dispatch of August 24, Davies was caught between Governor Dalton's administration's desire to freeze enrollments allowing no growth in the higher education system and his role as "protector of the colleges." His plan to selectively cap
enrollment at VPI and JMU and promote growth in the urban corridor institutions was presented to his Council, leaving the college presidents to read about the plan in the newspaper. The presidents were "outspoken in assertions that Davies should have come to the presidents first with his proposal" (Cox, August 24 and September 8, 1978). Secretary of Education J. Wade Gilley gave the plan immediate backing. Davies was quoted in the August 24 article that he "won't apologize for consulting council members first or for having my own [professional] opinions about higher education's future."

Under Davies' plan, in addition to the three focal urban universities, the colleges that would receive money for growth included, Virginia State University, Christopher Newport College and Norfolk State University and community colleges in their service areas (Cox, August 23, 1978). The Council dedicated an entire section of its 1979 plan to discuss the emerging role of Virginia's urban universities.

A major issue facing higher education in Virginia today is that of defining the mission of the
designated, focal urban universities within the system of higher education, given the fact that they are not the designated, established comprehensive universities in the system. As the populations of these three areas grow, so do their demands for increased services from the State, including access to higher education opportunities. The urban university's mission includes 1) access to undergraduate education for the urban population, including minority students; 2) graduate and professional education, largely part-time, for the urban population in general; and 3) response to the public service and research needs associated with the various problems of densely populated areas (SCHEV Plan-1979, p. 27).

Because the urban students are often adults with complex lives, they place heavy demands for educational opportunities upon the colleges to which they commute. Consequently, there is strong regional political support for these institutions. The emergence of the urban colleges and universities in Virginia is a reflection of the fact that there are more of these students in the three major urban areas than elsewhere and that these students demand to be served (SCHEV Plan-1979, p. 27).

Was this plan carried out? At the April, 1979, SCHEV meeting previewing the position paper for the 1979 update of The Virginia
Plan. Davies predicted problems from the growth of the urban institutions; the population centers would demand college services yet the institutions there were not prepared to meet their requirements (Cox, May 1, 1979). At the same meeting Gilley indicated that because of economic conditions in the Commonwealth, the 1980-82 budget would not allow growth of the higher education system. Comparing full time equivalent (FTE) enrollments prior to this period (SCHEV 1976-77 data) with those following this research (SCHEV 1986-87 data), the following changes indicate that Virginia institutions fared in a pattern different from predicted:
### Table 1

**FULL TIME EQUIVALENT ENROLLMENTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>1976-77 FTE</th>
<th>1986-87 FTE</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Christopher Newport Col. (CNC)</td>
<td>2,017</td>
<td>2,435</td>
<td>20.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinch Valley College (CVC)</td>
<td>747</td>
<td>810</td>
<td>8.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Mason University (GMU)</td>
<td>5,635</td>
<td>11,076</td>
<td>96.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Madison University (JMU)</td>
<td>7,343</td>
<td>9,297</td>
<td>26.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Longwood College (LGC)</td>
<td>2,222</td>
<td>2,692</td>
<td>21.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Washington College (MWC)</td>
<td>2,211</td>
<td>2,722</td>
<td>23.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norfolk State University (NSU)</td>
<td>6,083</td>
<td>6,213</td>
<td>21.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old Dominion University (ODU)</td>
<td>9,555</td>
<td>11,007</td>
<td>15.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radford University (RDU)</td>
<td>4,460</td>
<td>6,401</td>
<td>43.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Virginia (UVA)</td>
<td>15,041</td>
<td>16,823</td>
<td>11.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Va. Commonwealth Univ. (VCU)</td>
<td>13,116</td>
<td>12,666</td>
<td>-3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Va. Military Institute (VMI)</td>
<td>1,476</td>
<td>1,480</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Va. Polytechnic Inst. &amp; St. Univ. (VPI)</td>
<td>18,546</td>
<td>21,410</td>
<td>15.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia State University (VSU)</td>
<td>4,148</td>
<td>2,994</td>
<td>-27.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William &amp; Mary (W&amp;M)</td>
<td>5,520</td>
<td>6,633</td>
<td>20.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total 4-year institutions: 98,120 to 114,659 (16.8%)

Total 2-year institutions: 44,810 to 45,794 (2.1%)

(Urban corridor colleges are in bold print.)

Table 2
GENERAL ASSEMBLY APPROPRIATIONS FROM GENERAL FUND\textsuperscript{a}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CNC</td>
<td>1005</td>
<td>3936</td>
<td>292%</td>
<td>510</td>
<td>3779</td>
<td>641%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CVC</td>
<td>1452</td>
<td>2894</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>736</td>
<td>2778</td>
<td>277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GMU</td>
<td>1254</td>
<td>4796</td>
<td>282</td>
<td>636</td>
<td>4604</td>
<td>624</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JMU</td>
<td>1280</td>
<td>4239</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>649</td>
<td>4069</td>
<td>527</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LCG</td>
<td>1320</td>
<td>4134</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>669</td>
<td>3969</td>
<td>493</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MMC</td>
<td>1324</td>
<td>4396</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>671</td>
<td>4220</td>
<td>529</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSU</td>
<td>1421</td>
<td>4999</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>720</td>
<td>4799</td>
<td>567</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ODU</td>
<td>1122</td>
<td>5004</td>
<td>346</td>
<td>569</td>
<td>4804</td>
<td>744</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RDU</td>
<td>1131</td>
<td>3861</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>573</td>
<td>3707</td>
<td>547</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UVA</td>
<td>1925</td>
<td>8287</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>976</td>
<td>7956</td>
<td>715</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VCU</td>
<td>2258</td>
<td>8613</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>1145</td>
<td>8268</td>
<td>622</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VMI</td>
<td>2165</td>
<td>7262</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>1098</td>
<td>6972</td>
<td>535</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VPI</td>
<td>1816</td>
<td>6646</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>921</td>
<td>6380</td>
<td>593</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VSU</td>
<td>1279</td>
<td>5664</td>
<td>343</td>
<td>648</td>
<td>5437</td>
<td>739</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W&amp;M</td>
<td>1823</td>
<td>6339</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>924</td>
<td>6085</td>
<td>559</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

|        | 1656                  | 6125                  | 270%     | 840                 | 5880                | 600%     |
| All 4-yr | 1245                  | 2454                  | 97%      | 631                 | 2356                | 289%     |

(Urban colleges are in bold print.)

\textsuperscript{a} College and university name abbreviations are explained in Table 1. The FTE figure for each institution were developed by dividing total appropriation by enrollment figure projected and used for budgeting purposes.

\textsuperscript{b} General Assembly Appropriations Act, Approved April 12, 1976, Chpt. 779; SCHEV Annual Fulltime Equivalent Enrollment (Actual/Estimated Compared to Budgeted), July 12, 1984.


\textsuperscript{d} To convert 1977 dollars and 1987 dollars to common 1988 dollars, SCHEV statistician provided the following: using Consumer Price Index, 1988=100; 1977=50.7; 1987=96.0 (per telephone April 18, 1989).
Among the urban universities and colleges projected for growth, George Mason University in northern Virginia has expanded most dramatically. Norfolk State and Christopher Newport in Hampton Roads have increased more than the system average, but Old Dominion in the same geographical area has increased slightly below the system average. Virginia Commonwealth University in Richmond has decreased in size since 1976. James Madison and VPI in the late 1970s were concerned that the urban university support would curtail them, but instead both have grown, as have Longwood and Radford, both in small towns. William and Mary was intended to stay small but has grown by 20% in this decade. Only George Mason University among the three major urban institutions has demonstrated great increases.

During this decade, all urban institutions received more than the average appropriation increase for the four-year institutions. The individual community colleges' appropriations were not examined. There is not an exact relationship between percentage increase in appropriations and growth. George Mason University had the most dramatic growth, 96.5%, but was only 24% above the average 600% (in
1988 dollars) per full time equivalent (FTE) student increase for senior institutions of higher education in Virginia. Virginia Commonwealth University, according to these figures from SCHEV's Plans, was the only designated urban university or college to lose enrollment, but it received almost the same percentage per FTE student increase in funds over the ten year period as rapidly growing George Mason University. Old Dominion University received the highest increase in the system yet did not grow at the average rate.

SCHEV recommends funding levels to the Governor and General Assembly, and, as former House of Delegates Appropriations Committee Chairman Bagley pointed out, the political powers of the major institutions of higher education in Virginia are formidable (interview February 29, 1988). It seems, however, that the urban institutions more than held their own. Davies' proposal apparently had not been rejected. According to Davies, "...Virginia has avoided the worst traumas [of its major universities not being located in urban areas] by continuing to fund institutions equitably while creating three strong doctoral universities in its most densely populated
regions" (Davies, June, 1987, p. 5). The five urban institutions' increase in appropriations per FTE averaged (in 1988 dollars) 639.6%, 39.6% more than the average for all senior institutions. Their average growth in full time enrollments was 31.4%, nearly double the average four-year institutional growth of 16.8% during the decade 1977-1987.

In the midst of this period, SCHEV's recommendations were used by Governor Dalton in preparing his executive budget for the 1980 session of the General Assembly in which it adopted the 1980-82 biennial budget. For the doctoral institutions, SCHEV recommended an average appropriation increase of 21.3% per FTE. The three urban focal institutions' recommended increases were: George Mason University 25.6%, Virginia Commonwealth University 21.5% and Old Dominion University 34.5%. The average recommended increase for comprehensive institutions was 20.8%. Recommendations for institutions in urban areas were: Christopher Newport College 20.3%, Norfolk State University 15.2% (expected to be adjusted during the session when more data was available) and Virginia State University 21.7%. It appears that Old Dominion University was the only one
among this urban group that actually received SCHEV's recommendation for extraordinary resources. SCHEV rejected dormitory requests from all three major urban universities as well as from Norfolk State and Christopher Newport College because these urban institutions have essentially nonresidential missions. (SCHEV Council Notes, of September 18, October 2 and 8, November 13, December 6, 1979 and January 3, 1980; McCreary, October 8, 1979) Secretary of Education Wade Gilley apparently thought growth of the urban institutions was a real possibility when he predicted that if the urban institutions threaten to drain off students from residential institutions such as VPI and JMU, these institutions will "combat such moves effectively by simply lowering their admission standards to attract more students" (Cox, November 5, 1979).

**Interagency Relations**

In 1978 there was a major rift between SCHEV and Governor John Dalton's new administration concerning his desegregation agreement with the United States Office for Civil Rights (OCR), Department of
Health, Education and Welfare (HEW). At the governor's request, SCHEV conducted studies which provided the basic materials for reports submitted to HEW in support of Virginia's desegregation plan under Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. The plan approved in March, 1978, (SCHEV Council Notes, August 22, 1978) affected all 39 public institutions of higher education, with great impact on Norfolk State University (NSU), a predominately black institution, and Old Dominion University (ODU), a mostly white institution, located within a few miles of each other in Norfolk.

At its October 3, 1978, meeting, Council accepted various planning and other responsibilities "thrust upon it by the plan."

According to a news report, Dalton had originally said the Council and boards of visitors of the colleges would be asked to approve his plan. However, "after Dalton discovered some on the council who supported [former Governor] Godwin's hard-nosed no-quota stance would not endorse the plan, he decided that their endorsement had never been required in any case." (Cox, October 14, 1978)

After the four-year Dalton administration with Secretary of
Education Wade Gilley ended, Davies wrote that

Acceptance of numerical goals in 1978 was a significant change in Virginia's response to federal pressures. In the years before 1978, Virginia had refused to set numerical goals for recruiting black students to the traditionally white institutions. Students freely choose the colleges they attend, we argued, and agreeing to increase black student enrollment by a specific number was therefore unrealistic. Numerical goals, moreover, had no relationship to our efforts to provide a good education for all Virginia students.

The second error lasted four years. Between 1978 and 1982, when Virginia did not make reasonable progress in recruiting either students or faculty, it did not act to correct this, but put its head in the sand, hoping OCR would not notice. OCR did notice, however, and began to inquire whether Virginia was doing anything to improve its performance. During 1981, the persons responsible for the plan did not respond to OCR's specific inquiries (Davies, April 17, 1983).

The governor signed the addendum to the agreement calling for massive restructuring of the curricula in NSU and ODU [both in Norfolk] and admissions/recruitment policies in all colleges without consulting SCHEV, and there was deep resentment by Council and staff. (News Leader, December 6, 1978) SCHEV had to forego its
usual requirements for program approval but at its October meeting approved 16 new programs "in order to fulfill the Commonwealth's commitment to place unduplicated high-demand degree programs at the State's two traditionally black institutions, [NSU and Virginia State University in Petersburg] thereby strengthening them academically and making them more attractive to white students."

(SCHEV Council Notes, October 2-3, 1978; Cox, October 4, 1978)

SCHEV Chairman H. Merrill Pasco said he found the "truncated program approval process imposed by the plan most unsatisfactory." (Cox, October 14, 1978)

During the same period there were at least three areas of contention between SCHEV and the institutions of higher education: 1) establishment of a law school at George Mason University, 2) VPI's right to offer the doctoral program in public administration in northern Virginia and 3) the final actions on the establishment of a veterinary school at VPI (SCHEV Council Notes, November 7, 1978; Cox, September 21 and November 8, 1978 and News Leader, November 8, 1978; Gaunt).
SCHEV had resisted George Mason's efforts to affiliate with a private law school, the International School of Law, and at its November meeting transmitted a study to the 1979 General Assembly which stated that "the need for a third state-supported law school in Virginia has not been demonstrated." Because of cost and lack of need, SCHEV recommended that "the General Assembly deny authorization for George Mason University to operate a law school." (SCHEV Council Notes, November 7, 1978) At its next meeting, with "some reluctance voiced" (Cox, January 10, 1979) a recommendation was sent to the governor and to the General Assembly that George Mason University be approved to offer degrees at the doctoral level. SCHEV endorsed its own site visit committee's evaluation that GMU "could well serve northern Virginia at the doctoral level, but that it should monitor its growth carefully 'to avoid too much, too fast.'" (SCHEV Council Notes, January 9, 1979) The 1979 General Assembly approved George Mason for doctoral rank and reversed SCHEV's recommendation concerning the new law school. The doctoral rank issue had been hotly fought by VPI which wanted to offer the
doctorate in public administration in northern Virginia (Cox, September 21, 1978 and March 7, 1979). Again, note Bagley's concern about the political power of the institutions. In this case an old giant, VPI, was pitted against the emerging giant, GMU, and its political allies from northern Virginia. SCHEV had reluctantly sided with GMU on the doctoral issue but opposed it on the law school issue.

In the third area of contention, SCHEV was clearly on the opposite side from VPI. Following years of SCHEV objections to a veterinary school and bitter dispute, the 1978 General Assembly approved the school but appropriations were not to be released until SCHEV verified that VPI had met the conditions of major outside funding and cooperative agreement with at least one other state. Still harboring reservations, SCHEV approved release of the temporary funds at its March 1979 meeting even though the conditions had not been met (Gaunt).

Burton Clark's theory of organizational saga proposes that dramatic events lead to bonding within an organization. The implication here, then, is that the environment in the early years of
Davies' administration was filled with periods of adversity and "enemies to bond:" HEW and the governor, ascending institutions' expansionists' dreams and end-runs to the General Assembly, one institution's insistence on a veterinary school and its victory in spite of years of resistance from SCHEV, decreasing enrollments putting SCHEV in the position of recommending the allocation of scarce resources in complicating tight economic times. These sorts of conditions can create the bonding within and among organizational members who are besieged from without. In hard times, politicians have been known to create an enemy if one is not available to provide this bonding; SCHEV and higher education in the late 1970s and early 1980s had natural enemies and therefore no need to create others.

The Colleges

During the 1980s, major issues facing higher education in Virginia included finances, libraries, remedial education and foreign language requirements. Newspaper reports throughout the period highlight discussions and disagreements between SCHEV and the
college presidents. The presidents convene monthly as a SCHEV standing committee, the General Professional Advisory Council (GPAC) which is open to the press. As the unofficial Council of Presidents, they meet privately the night prior to each GPAC meeting. A college or university president rarely attends SCHEV meetings unless the meeting is held on his or her campus.

Gordon Davies' proposals seemed to generate negative responses from the institutional presidents on a number of occasions, but there were other times when they worked together. An example of cooperation was the budget for the 1984-86 biennium.

The Council supported efforts by the presidents as a group to increase higher education funding, asking Governor Robb and the General Assembly to budget enough money and personnel positions to "maintain academic quality and to start some new programs" (McCreary, November 3, 1983). The presidents said that the colleges were operating in 1983 on "92% of the money and personnel needed to maintain academic quality as determined by Council budget guidelines" following years of underfunding. SCHEV supported about
two-thirds of their requests in the budget addendum (McCreary, November 3, 1983).

President Ronald Carrier of James Madison University joined Gordon Davies in asking the House Appropriations Committee for increased funding. They and Council Chairman William Zimmer III said that "the universities are approaching the point where someone has to decide whether the twin goals of providing access to higher education to all Virginians who can benefit from it and providing quality higher education are realistic." In pleading for more funds, Dr. Davies asked for direction from the committee. "We are trying to carry out the policies of the governor and the General Assembly as we understand them. If it is time for the system of higher education to change more dramatically than in the past, I ask you to tell us so" (Wasson, December 20, 1983).

Even though $1,697,569,878 was appropriated from the general fund for the 1984-86 biennium (SCHEV Council Notes April 4, 1984) which was a 40% increase over the 1980-82 biennium (Baliles, Higher Education in Virginia: The Next Four Years), the presidents still felt
severely underfunded (testimony at House of Delegates Appropriations Committee hearings, January, 1985).

In 1985 SCHEV received reports from four task forces composed of Virginia college professors and administrators working with SCHEV staff (SCHEV, Council Program Evaluations). The reports covered remedial education and foreign language programs as well as baccalaureate business, computer science and graduate teacher education programs.

The remedial education report recommended tightening of college entry requirements and placement tests with the community colleges and secondary schools handling most of the remediation. This was implemented throughout much of the system. Dr. William C. Boshner, Superintendent of Public Schools in Henrico County, chaired the committee studying remedial education. He reported to the Council that if public schools trained students correctly and colleges raised admissions standards, the need for remediation would disappear. He continued, "The answer to those who say that is elitist may be that equal opportunity would be retained for all who are properly prepared"
(Cox, October 6, 1983). Follow-up studies by SCHEV found that colleges were responding to the 1983 suggestions (SCHEV Council Notes, May 1, 1985). Later SCHEV and the Virginia Community College System undertook a joint study to define the minimum levels of competence required of a student wishing to do college level work for degree credit, to develop methods and criteria for assessing student learning during and success after remediation, and to propose ways in which remedial work at the public institutions could be undertaken by the community colleges. The community colleges by that time were handling 90% of remedial education within Virginia's higher education system (SCHEV Council Notes, January 14, 1987).

The other report receiving a lot of public attention was that from the foreign language task force (SCHEV, On Line, July 1985; Cox, May 2, 1985; News Leader, June 6, 1985; SCHEV Council Notes, May 1, 1985). Council cannot dictate admission or curricula requirements to the colleges, but it has strongly recommended more emphasis on foreign languages. This complements Governor Baliles' emphasis on international programs and Davies' emphasis on the liberal arts.
The colleges seemed to respond positively to the suggestion on foreign languages. But the presidents became upset over a proposal by Davies to develop an electronic repository of little-used materials from state university libraries, a suggestion first made in 1978 (Churn, July 18, 1985; Cox, July 31, 1985). I attended the SCHEV meeting July 17, 1985, at which the presentation was made and subsequent meetings at which little official information was presented, but at which college representatives listened carefully for any move in the direction of a repository. The proposal was not mentioned in any of the Council Notes until December 1986 when it was alluded to in discussing a study on libraries ordered by the 1986 General Assembly. The study was presented in the Virginia Plan for Higher Education 1987, but does not mention the repository. UVA has built its own and other colleges are using more compact shelving and electronic retrieval. The idea of a central repository for the entire state is no longer viable because of institutional objections, according to Wendell Barborer, a member of SCHEV's library advisory committee.
Another issue of the 1980s that concerned the presidents was the change in space guidelines that geared future construction to the "extended day" -- an academic day theoretically lasting until 10 p.m., rather than the current planning guidelines of utilization until 3 p.m. The presidents felt that this would alter colleges' missions without consent of their boards or of the General Assembly, a charge denied by Dr. Michael Mullen, Associate Director of SCHEV. The guidelines, which would reduce building appropriations (Cox, July 31, 1985), were adopted in spite of the presidents' objections.

Organizational Pride

Burton Clark's theory of organizational saga says that legend is also established by common experiences that develop the organization's culture, the social bonding and shared ideals, the real and embellished past, the soul of the institution, which become integral parts of a successful organization. Pride in one's identity develops from organizational legends. SCHEV prides itself on being
the vehicle to improve upon a system of higher education that
developed over 300 years. In the 1974 Plan, SCHEV pointed with pride
to the great diversity and quality of Virginia's public and private
colleges. The 1979 Plan continued that theme with the claim that
"today it can be said that every Virginian who wishes to participate
in higher education has access to a state-supported or independent
college or university" (p. 6) The 1979 Plan continues, "There is
probably no state in the union with independent and state-supported
colleges and universities as diverse, and as excellent as Virginia's."

Continuing to build on the pride it feels for Virginia's higher
education system, the SCHEV document states that

As it did in 1974, the Council of Higher Education continues to support Virginia's coordinated system of
governance. Coordination is inherently preferable to
strong central control either by a single strong
governing body or by executive agencies. The Council
believes that the efficiencies of strong central control are only apparent; a system of 39
state-supported colleges and universities can be coordinated from a central point, but it cannot be controlled effectively from the central point. The responsibility for controlling Virginia's institutions
of higher education rests with the Boards of Visitors.
Many of the economies which are sought through strong central control could, in fact, do irreparable damage to institutions and prevent them from fulfilling their missions. The Council urges support of a coordinated system of colleges and universities so that the strength of diversity is complemented by that of carefully coordinated system-wide planning. The Council also urges renewed support of the tradition of college and university autonomy which is a hallmark of Virginia higher education. (SCHEV Plan-1979, p. 6)

In the face of all these problems, [inflation, energy shortages, aging population, rising health costs, loss of international prestige, mental health needs, law enforcement and corrections problems] and not diminishing their enormity in the slightest, the Council of Higher Education believes firmly that more, rather than less, higher education is an indispensable part of an effective, democratic response. Any man or woman whose life has been touched and changed by higher education knows that this is true. Anyone who has learned not just a skill, but its place in the social order; who has developed the intellectual capacity to see problems in all of their complexity; who has assumed public, corporate or other responsibility; who has heard the words of great poets, studied the calculations of great scientists, or puzzled over the questions posed by great philosophers, knows that in times of stress or crisis the best educated are the most flexible, the most creative, and the most likely to succeed. New ideas and well-prepared men and women are never more needed than when things are going poorly. In American society, higher education has come to be the major source of new ideas and well-prepared men and women. The Council of Higher
Education believes it would be folly not to move forward at this time in continuing commitment to higher education. (SCHEV Plan 1979, p. 8).

After citing deficiencies in Virginia's funding of higher education, including demands on public services and threatened budgets just when society requires most of higher education, the 1979 Plan continues:

The Council...supports reduced spending where possible..., however, does not believe that the people of Virginia are calling for cuts in the public educational systems of the Commonwealth; neither does it find broad disaffection from the goal of making high quality college and university education available to all who want it....To be sure there are problems...All of these things can be accomplished, however, within the present system of higher education. We have made great progress over the past several years, and our colleges and universities are providing Virginians with an unusually diverse and excellent array of educational opportunities. We believe that they merit continued and vigorous support, for the general well-being of the Commonwealth." (SCHEV Plan 1979, p. 9)

"For the general well-being of the Commonwealth" is heady stuff - the stuff from which legends are made. This language is continued
in the 1985 Plan in which the Council pledges to "build a system of colleges and universities that is among the best in the nation." The 1987 Plan continues:

Since 1985, we have seen Virginia higher education continue its rapid progress toward the goals set by the Council. Strong support from Governors and the General Assembly has put Virginia among the leading states in appropriation increases. A number of special initiatives have been funded to build upon particular strengths of individual colleges and universities. A new program of Outstanding Faculty Awards recognizes the indispensable contributions of the women and men who teach and conduct research and scholarship in our institutions, both public and private.

As Governor Gerald L. Baliles said in his opening address to the 1988 General Assembly, "Virginia higher education is on a roll - and I think we ought to keep it moving." The Council of Higher education agrees with the Governor's assessment and strongly supports his proposal.

The many virtues of Virginia higher education have been enumerated often enough....The catch-up era has past, and we are now able to think about what tomorrow will bring....the Council proposes actions that will continue the Commonwealth's progress toward placing its colleges and universities among the best systems of higher education in the nation. We commend the leaders of Virginia for supporting higher education so well, especially in the last few years. Because we are working together, our efforts are
bearing fruit. We look forward to great progress in
the next few years. (SCHEV Plan 1979, pp. 5-6)

Davies' ten-year report carries on the statements of lofty ideals
that could well be the basis for organizational legend:

...these have been fruitful years....We have maintained
that Virginia higher education, while very good, can
be better....We have held that increased access to
higher education is good, but that increased access to
good higher education is better....we have tried to
shake institutions and their supporters out of the
occasional dogmatic slumbers that are a product of
Virginia's rich history and traditions. We have tried
to find the balance between respect for the past and
responsibility for the future....We have made some
mistakes, but not many....We can motivate persons and
institutions to change, manage it, and to some extent
control its outcomes....I choose to proceed on the
assumption that we can create the conditions
necessary for substantive change in Virginia higher
education. To choose otherwise is to succumb to
despair. We have too much fun, and get too much done,
to despair....Virginia's good system of higher
education can become better, but the changes needed
will not happen by themselves....The Council of Higher
Education is at a point in its life when it should
become a more aggressive promoter of change....We
ought to walk into the next century with some idea of
where we want to go (Davies, June 1987, pp. 3-4).

Pride in his organization is evident as Davies' continues in his
ten-year report to chronicle the accomplishments of the Council

which he claims now sets the agenda for Virginia higher education,

listing nine major issues that SCHEV has brought to the attention of

the Commonwealth:

• the need for undergraduate curriculum reform,
• the need for assessment of student learning,
• emphasis upon international education and foreign language study,
• continued emphasis upon minority recruitment of students and faculty to higher education,
• recognition that the academic profession, in Virginia's colleges and universities and across the nation, is in a time of transition and uncertainty,
• the need for substantial progress in faculty salaries, and
• the importance of higher education in the economic and technological development of Virginia (Davies, June, 1987. pp. 7-8).

"On balance," he says, "the good far outweighs the bad by any criteria I can conceive." After noting the achievements and positive status of 14 senior institutions and of the community colleges and private institutions, Davies points with pride that "at the end of ten years, we have a larger and much better system of state-supported colleges and universities" (Davies, June, 1987, p. 3-4).
Another angle from which to look at the State Council of Higher Education for Virginia is from the position of another state, in fact another Commonwealth, that has critically examined its statewide coordinated system of higher education. Kentucky went through that experience in 1981. The report, *In Pursuit of Excellence*, was presented by the Prichard Committee on Higher Education in Kentucky's Future to the Kentucky Council on Higher Education. Many of its recommendations have been implemented in Virginia. SCHEV Director Gordon Davies is a friend of Harry M. Snyder who was at the time of the Prichard Report the Executive Director of the Kentucky Council. He says that there was and is an exchange of ideas between him and Snyder and among a few other state higher education executive officials (Davies, interview April 17, 1989). The programs in Virginia were developed independently of the Kentucky recommendations, according to Gordon Davies (interview, April 17, 1989), but have several striking points in common.

Recommendations made by the Prichard Committee fall under three elements which, it claims, are central to reform and
improvement: "an increased emphasis on quality in higher education, on creative leadership, and on increased and more effective use of financial resources" (Prichard Committee, p.11). The committee lists 13 prerequisites to quality which, it says, will be met when its recommendations are implemented. The prerequisites are:

- Kentucky and its higher education institutions must concentrate resources in such a way that performance in improving the lives of students and the public, rather than institutional growth, is the measure of excellence. Methods for evaluating performance must be devised and performance must be monitored.
- Kentucky's universities and colleges must use resources to capitalize upon their strengths and must specialize in providing the services that are most needed in a system made diverse through clearly differentiated missions.
- A real system needs agreement between the state and the universities and colleges upon what the nature of the system and the different responsibilities of each institution should be. The Council on Higher Education, in defining Kentucky's system of higher education in 1977, assigned differentiated roles to the institutions. The thrust established by the Council in 1977 should be continued as the system and the universities and colleges within it mature or change. If this means that university mission statement must be rewritten to conform with recommendations in this document and the demands of the future, the Council and the universities should do so.
- The universities and colleges must develop academic programs that balance the immediate needs of the economy
and the broader need to educate persons to live in and deal with a complex and changing society.

- Kentucky's universities and colleges must be encouraged to remain creative and dynamic within flexible standards established by the state so that they may respond to unforeseen needs within the system. Universities and colleges need incentives to be dynamic and flexible.

- Kentucky must invest in excellence by providing scholarships and programs for higher gifted students; by attracting and retaining outstanding faculty and senior scholars and teachers; and by encouraging innovative instructional approaches and high quality research.

- Diversity among institutions must be encouraged, not only through specialization by public universities but through continued financial aid support for students who attend private and independent colleges and universities in Kentucky.

- Universities and colleges must use flexible teaching methods to meet the needs of all student populations aspiring to higher education.

- Kentucky must expect its research universities to help it prosper in an age of competitive economic development and of technological, social, and economic change by focusing financial resources on research and by demanding increased performance of research and increased cooperative research among its universities.

- Financial resources must be used more effectively through good management, hard decisions, cooperative efforts, planning, the elimination of activities that are not central to institutional missions, and the reduction and elimination of external or internal bureaucratic conditions that unnecessarily increase costs.

- Increased cooperation among universities and colleges will improve the performance of the system. Cooperation should take the form of such activities as joint academic programs, cooperative research or public service activities, and shared research equipment and facilities. The Council on Higher
Education should provide guidance and positive incentives to encourage cooperation and should monitor and evaluate the effects of cooperative efforts.

- Leadership at the state and institutional levels will face difficult demands in the future. This challenge must be met without damaging and burdensome controls being exercised. The Council on Higher Education must ensure that the need for a system of higher education is understood, that the uniqueness of each institution is protected, and that performance is monitored closely.

- Additional financial resources will not guarantee increased quality, but the absence of resources is certain to diminish quality. Additional resources from reallocation, from increased appropriations and from increased revenues are imperative. However, higher education institutions must understand that improved performance will be expected as a result of their being provided increased financial resources (Prichard, pp. 12-14).


This list of programs and their corollaries in the Kentucky recommendations are one of the reasons the staff and Council members of SCHEV claim to have a sense of mission to move Virginia into a place of high recognition as one of the best systems of higher education in the country.
Endnotes

1 Urban universities in Virginia include George Mason University in northern Virginia, Norfolk State University and Old Dominion University in Norfolk, Virginia Commonwealth University in Richmond and Christopher Newport College in Newport News. Those designated as focal institutions for higher education in Virginia's major urban areas are GMU, ODU and VCU (Virginia Plan for Higher Education-1979, pp. 26-30).

2 Virginia's public institutions of higher education that are traditionally black are Norfolk State University in Norfolk and the land grant institution in Petersburg, Virginia State University.

3 "Lesser endowed institutions" is a vague term that should be translated "less prestigious institutions." For the benefit of readers not familiar with Virginia's colleges and universities, in the opinion of this researcher "lesser endowed" public
institutions of higher education in Virginia between 1977 and 1987 included all community colleges, the two-year Richard Bland College operated by William and Mary's Board of Trustees, and all four-year institutions except the University of Virginia, College of William and Mary, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University and Virginia Military Institute. By the end of this period Virginia Commonwealth University, George Mason University and James Madison University were becoming more successful both in recruiting students and faculty and in building endowments. Full analysis of this distinction is beyond the scope of this research; data is available from SCHEV in Richmond or from the individual institutions.

4 See section with data on 1975 and 1988 legislative opinion surveys in Appendix D.
CHAPTER V

CONCLUSIONS

Based on Burton Clark's work, this research was designed to reconstruct and analyze a saga for an institution of higher education that was beyond the campus models that Clark used. Specifically, the task was to identify a saga for the State Council of Higher Education for Virginia, the Commonwealth's statewide coordinating agency for its 39 public colleges and universities.

As Clark noted, "There are ideational elements in complex organizations that do not lie outside of matters of governance but rather exist as basic sentiments that help determine the structures of governance and how they work" (Clark, 1971, p. 499). This is the ideational element for which I have searched.

The search for a saga for the State Council of Higher Education for Virginia (SCHEV) has been successful. The shared beliefs, attitudes and values-- the "organizational culture"-- found there are
based on Virginia's traditional belief in its distinctiveness. The Commonwealth believes that it is special: it is the birthplace of five Presidents of the United States, the site of the first permanent English settlement, the home of the oldest continuous English-speaking settlement, the home of the first representative government in the new world, the colony in which the British were defeated in the Revolutionary War, and later its capital was the capital of the Confederacy. The Commonwealth has long prided itself on two historical colleges of distinction: The College of William and Mary was established by royal charter in 1693, and The University of Virginia was established by Thomas Jefferson himself in 1819. SCHEV Director Gordon Davies says that his organization has "used the historically conservative character of Virginia government to help avoid the 'fad-of-the-year' approach to education" (Davies, June 1987, p. 3). Its conservatism also underlies the state's tradition of balanced budgets, labeled and revered as the "pay as you go" philosophy. Virginia's belief in its uniqueness has often been conspicuous and a source of pride. Elazar described Virginia's political culture as
traditional, as opposed to individualistic or moralistic. SCHEV's saga fits into this pattern.

"An organizational saga is a collective understanding of unique accomplishment in a formally established group" (Clark, 1971, p. 500). In searching for SCHEV's organizational saga, a story has unfolded of this formal organization's pride in itself for major accomplishments in improving the state's system of higher education. The focus of this research has been 1977-1987. The setting is in the Commonwealth of Virginia. The actors are important people, leaders accustomed to success: professional educators and administrators, legislators, leading citizens appointed to the Council.

"Sagas do not develop strongly in passive organizations....The saga is initially strong purpose, born in an image of the future conceived and enunciated by a single man or a small cadre" (Clark, 1971, p. 503). In this search for saga, no one --whether SCHEV's admirer or detractor-- has indicated that SCHEV is a passive, invisible organization. It was strengthened by statute in 1974 under Director Dan Marvin and further strengthened several times since 1977 under
the leadership of Gordon Davies. It has authority based in statute as described in Chapters 3 and 4. It also has leverage. Gordon Davies, in his ten year report, said that "leverage is a more interesting and a more difficult concept [than authority]. It requires an Archimedean point outside the system, a fulcrum from which great weights can be moved. The Council's highly ambiguous position - of but not in higher education, advisory to the governor and to the General Assembly, advocate and critic - is essential to leverage. The Council has a great deal of leverage and could have more if it chose to discharge its various responsibilities in coordinated ways" (Davies, 1987, p.22).

There is no passivity here.

Clark's Model

Fitting the State Council of Higher Education for Virginia, an institution of higher education which is not a college, into a model designed for a college is artificial by its very nature. The comparison of the director to the president fits as does the comparison of the council to the college board. The SCHEV staff is evidently comparable
to the administrative staff of a college, but after that the analogy becomes more difficult. Apparently, the coordinating council is different from a college in that it has no students, no graduates, and is not recruiting or accommodating students. SCHEV has no classrooms, and the curricula it deals with are curricula that will be executed by institutions other than itself. But comparisons can still be made here. More importantly, SCHEV's saga is discussed based on its own legends and sets of beliefs.

Clark describes three contexts in which organizational saga is likely to develop. The context into which SCHEV fit during the late 1970s was that of "the established organization that is viable rather than in crisis, secure in person rather than collapsing from long decline, yet is in a state of readiness for evolutionary change" (Clark, 1971, p. 505). According to this model, a college (an organization) with a tradition of presidential power is more fertile ground than the institution with a history of trustees running administrative details and faculty limiting his effectiveness. The SCHEV minutes and reports concerning the organization prior to 1977 indicate that
former directors Daniel Marvin (1972-1977), Roy McTarnaghan (1969-1972), Prince Woodward (1964-1969), and William McFarline (1958-1964) were effective within the limits of the statutes controlling SCHEV at those times. Those who selected and retained the directors, the appointed Council members, have always been leading citizens with broad board or higher education backgrounds (Dorsey, interview May 28, 1987; Wright, April 17, 1989; Davies, interview April 17, 1989). There is no indication that Davies was preceded by notably weak directors even though they were not universally popular.

"Particularly promising [for developing saga] is the college in a state of self-defined need for educational leadership" (Clark, 1971, p. 505). I contend that SCHEV was in that position in 1977. In the 1960s and early 1970s there was tremendous growth in Virginia higher education, great increases in enrollments, facilities, graduate and undergraduate programs, faculty and staff (Davies, 1987, p. 6). Earlier directors had led SCHEV through this growth, through hard times in the late 1950s, through legislative attack on SCHEV's power
in 1960, through the 1974 strengthening of SCHEV's statutory base. The Council was ready for an educational leader, and he was Davies, an Ivy League philosophy graduate with a vision of a quality system of higher education in Virginia. Davies said, "My job is to worry about the education of human beings" (Cleary, p. 16). "Quality improvement has been at the root of virtually every Council initiative....We have held that increased access to higher education is good, but that increased access to good higher education is better" (Davies, 1987, p. 3).

This institution in a state of readiness for evolutionary change searching for educational leadership is the opening for which some reformers watch. "They seek neither the drama and danger of the new college nor the trauma of one deep in crisis, but the solid footing of the sound place that has some ambition to rise in academic stature (Clark, 1971, p. 505).

I contend that the State Council of Higher Education for Virginia is a case in point. Established in 1956, it had weathered good times and bad for more than 20 years (Kellog, Hager, Heath). Virginia's
comprehensive higher education system was not in excellent condition when Davies joined SCHEV's staff in 1973, nor was it excellent when he became its director in 1977. Neither was it in shambles. It was on solid footing with its 1974 Plan, and it had ambition to rise in academic stature. I contend that SCHEV's director is the functional equivalent of a college president and the Council the functional equivalent of the college's board. This institution was, as Clark stated, in a "state of readiness for evolutionary change" searching for educational leadership in 1977 (Clark, 1971, p. 505).

In *The Distinctive College*, Clark presented Swarthmore and its president in 1920, Frank Aydelotte, as his case to demonstrate the situation to which I compare SCHEV (pp. 171-230). The similarities are striking. Aydelotte, like Davies, possessed a magnetic personality and was liked by officials (in Aydelotte's case by foundation officials, in Davies' case Council members). Governor Robb stated in 1985, "Davies is very highly respected in higher education circles" (Cleary, p. 18). Davies was elected president of the State Higher Education Executive Officers organization in 1983 (SCHEV
Council Notes, Sept. 7, 1983). For his mission, Aydelotte picked Swarthmore, a Quaker institution. For his mission, Davies, a Quaker, picked SCHEV for the same reasons: "He perceived openness in a traditional setting and moved in with his mission, his plan for change" (Clark, p. 506). The changes Aydelotte made at the college "supporters were to identify later as the Swarthmore saga" (Clark, 1971, p. 506). I identify Davies' changes from 1977 to 1987 as the SCHEV saga.

Through grouping bits and pieces, Clark suggests, we can seek to assert the components that are at the center of development of a saga: the personnel core, the program core, the external social base, the student subculture, and the organizational ideology itself (Clark, 1971, p. 506).

The personnel core: Clark holds that the key group of believers is the senior faculty who, once invested in the president's vision, will protect it. The senior faculty is independent because of tenure. I contend that a comparable group in SCHEV's saga could be the public college presidents. These 16 persons (15 senior college presidents...
and the chancellor of the community college system) are appointed by the institutional boards therefore have the freedom to speak up to and discuss issues with the SCHEV director. Their independence from the director is comparable to tenured faculty's independence and ability to speak up to the president. The comparison of senior faculty and college presidents is not without flaw but can be considered somewhat analogous if the comparison of the director of SCHEV and the president of a college is accepted. If the presidents march with the SCHEV director in his vision of higher education for Virginia, they will protect the vision against those who wish to hold it back. The presidents have not consistently supported Davies' ideas but, as a group, by the end of the decade under consideration in this study, they have joined him in striving for an excellent system of higher education in the Commonwealth. The benefits are evident: a system of diverse colleges, increased faculty salaries, initiatives that have benefited all the institutions, retention of enrollments by all except one or two institutions, national recognition of an excellent system with strong undergraduate education. "The college presidents and
Davies have bumped heads upon occasions, but we are blessed with a partnership. SCHEV listens to the colleges. Without SCHEV, higher education in Virginia would not be where we are today....

Disagreements are expected in the academic process. The William and Mary faculty becomes enraged with the college administration; the college presidents become enraged with the State Council. The presidents' meetings are like faculty meetings. It is important that they have this place to thrash things out and to establish priorities. The tension is healthy" (Kelly, interview April 11, 1989). If the SCHEV director employs a 'divide and conquer' tactic pitting one cluster of presidents against another, this may remind some of a president who pits a group of business department faculty against liberal arts faculty. Like a senior faculty meeting before a session with the president, the presidents routinely meet without the SCHEV director the night before they meet with SCHEV.

The presidents are very different from a faculty in that they do not formally participate in selection of and evaluation of each other. Each is not bound to another as are faculty members.
The council members are comparable to the members of a college's governing board. They are appointed for defined terms of office and are responsible to no one except the appointing officer. The board of a college, like the members of the council, is responsible for the hiring and firing of the executive officer: at SCHEV, the director; at a college, the president. The SCHEV director, as the final responsible person under the board, is comparable to the college president.

The program core: For an institution to "transform purpose into an exciting story of accomplishment, there must be visible practices around which claims of distinctiveness can be elaborated....On the basis of a few unique practices, the program becomes over time a set of communal symbols and rituals, rich with invested meaning" (Clark, 1971, p. 507-508).

SCHEV has led and responded to changes, has established visible practices around which claims of distinctiveness can be elaborated. Virginia leads the nation in teacher education reform. Virginia has established a unique program in the Higher Education Equipment Trust
Fund. "While the premier universities of other states have moved pell-mell toward graduate programs and advanced research, Virginia's colleges and universities have maintained a commitment to undergraduate education" (Davies, 1987, p. 8). Virginia has stabilized institutional size. There are no state-imposed limitations on out-of-state enrollments. No Virginia public or private college has closed since before 1977. "Virginia's diverse system of higher education offers a place for every person who wants to go to college" (Davies, 1987, page 15).

Virginians have traditionally held that we are different and perhaps superior. I contend that the SCHEV saga has built upon this "cultural arrogance," and thereby complies with Clark's criteria of claims of distinctiveness. I also contend that in reality our system of higher education has achieved some degree of distinctiveness during this decade.

The social base. "The institutional story also becomes fixed in the minds of some outside believers, a segment external to the physical boundaries of the campus, who have become deeply devoted
to the institution" (Clark, 1971, p. 508). Clark holds the alumni as this group for a college. I present the legislature and the governor as this social base for SCHEV. Clark says that the alumni are of the institution yet do not have to deal with the day-to-day details that the college administration does. For the alumni, he says, "the embodied and exciting ideas of the college can be everything, taking on the qualities of untouchable saga" (Clark, 1971, p. 509). This group strives to preserve the institutional uniqueness and attempts to carry forth the potential of the saga's direction.

Governor Baliles said in his 1988 address to the General Assembly, "In Virginia higher education is on a roll." The General Assembly, according to my research, is pleased with SCHEV's performance as a coordinating council and as an advocate for higher education (Appendix D). General Assembly appropriations per full time equivalent student in higher education increased by 270% for the four-year institutions between 1977 and 1987 (see Table 2). These outside forces, most of whom are alumni of Virginia's institutions of higher education, are supportive of SCHEV's saga.
Dr. Stephen Wright, Chairman of the Council of Higher Education 1984-86, believes that gubernatorial support is crucial. "Virginia's governors have been very supportive of higher education, particularly the current governor. There couldn't be realistic expectations for a great higher education system without gubernatorial commitment in this direction" (Wright, interview April 17, 1989). Dr. Davies agrees that Virginia has been fortunate to have governors seriously concerned about higher education (Davies, interview April 17, 1989).

The student subculture: "The student body is the third group within which we find essential believers, not as overwhelmingly important as they in full pride are likely to think but still a necessary support for the legend" (Clark, 1971, p. 509). Rather than students, I submit the members of the college boards as this segment of the SCHEV saga.

Former Delegate Richard Bagley (interview February 19, 1988) underscored the political power of the gubernatorially appointed boards of the independent senior institutions and of the community college system board. William and Mary's James Kelly, Assistant to
the President, speaks of the importance of the selection process that produces the fine quality of Virginia's college boards (Kelly, interview April 11, 1989). I contend that it is the board members, most of whom are former students of Virginia's colleges, who when they define themselves, as Clark states, "personally responsible for upholding what the [institution] has become and are ready to take on enemies, real or imagined, then a design or plan has become to an important degree an organizational saga" (Clark, 1971, p. 509).

Virginians want to be distinctive and even superior. Their commitment to that goal is evident as this study has traced Virginia's higher education system's movement into national prominence since 1977. Without support of citizens who serve on college boards and who exert influence on their legislators, this movement could not have occurred. These citizens who serve on college boards have serious commitments to the colleges for which they are responsible, colleges that are often benefiting from the SCHEV saga.

But there are conflicts between SCHEV and the institutional boards. "It is in the nature of the Council's work that it often is an
impediment to institutional goals or a prod to induce change. Sitting as it does between the colleges and universities and two branches of government, the Council often will be in the way if it is doing its job" (Davies, 1987, p. 7).

It is nevertheless possible to view the boards as a corollary to "the student subculture" of Clark's model and recognize them as important supporters of SCHEV's saga in spite of their differences.

The ideology: The legend, the invested institutional idea, is so widely and deeply embodied in so many linking parts that it becomes a self-fulfilling belief. "Working through institutional self-image and public images, a saga is indeed a switchman, in Weber's famous phrase, helping to determine the tracks along which action is pushed by men's self-defined interests. In short, a developing ideology of a special history can help make a special history" (Clark, 1971, p. 510). There is a strong pride in being associated with the organization, a loyalty and a bonding that make work a joy. Perhaps this is what Gordon Davies meant in his ten year report by "We have too much fun and get too much done to despair" (p. 3).
Again, in his ten year report Davies said, "We have made some mistakes, but not many" (p. 3). This is surely the stuff from which legends and sagas are made. In the Virginia Plan 1985, the Council again reviews its goals of excellence, access and accountability. Then it moves further and commits to placing Virginia's colleges and universities among the best systems of higher education in the nation (p. 4). This is repeated in the Virginia Plan 1987 (p. 5). The Council and its staff truly believe that SCHEV has had ten fruitful years between 1977 and 1987. This research indicates that indeed these have been good years and that the Commonwealth's higher education system has become better. The saga, the legend, happens to be built on reality. The belief in the value of its work is strong. The ideology is intact. SCHEV's belief that "the Council has come to set the agenda for Virginia higher education" (Davies, 1987, p. 7) is very important to the self-fulfilling belief of the sanctity of its role in the life of the higher education system of the Commonwealth.

Clark believes that when the institution becomes too large, decentralization can create units within which sagas can develop and
be kept alive. These autonomous units, perhaps departments, can be compared with the universities and colleges within the system. Kept under 20,000 students each by SCHEV's design, Virginia's colleges participate in the statewide saga, while nurturing sagas of their own. With the possible exception of George Mason University, the universities have willingly accepted this 20,000 limit. Tension may be expected to continue between the colleges and the Council, a relationship Gordon Davies describes as tidal, ebbing and flowing as resources are scarce or plentiful (Davies, 1987, p. 6-7). But if each college nurtures its own saga in its unique way and continues to believe in the "greater saga" of the State Council and the system of higher education in Virginia, the legend may continue.

The Council of Higher Education for Virginia seems at its zenith at the close of the 1980s. It is a leading participant in a series of conferences designing the University of the 21st Century. It is building upon its saga.
The SCHEV Saga

SCHEV Director Gordon Davies agrees that there is a saga that bonds the staff and the Council with its mission. There is a common set of beliefs, a saga, at SCHEV which is more than a common way of thinking. This saga, Dr. Davies believes, will be different depending on when you are talking with whom and about what issue. There are common elements of a saga which grow out of behaviors that are not discernible through written documents. In many ways, he says "the saga and the official documents probably stand in ironic relationship to one another" (Davies, interview April 17, 1989). SCHEV is different, he says, from another state agency such as the highway department. That department carries out its statutory responsibilities because automobiles need tags for identification. SCHEV goes beyond that. The appointed Council members participate in SCHEV's belief system for a number of reasons, some of which have to do with who they are. There is a Jeffersonian attitude; their actions are generally responsive to the rights of the people to educational enfranchisement. Many of the members have been quite elite, according to Dr. Davies, but have strong egalitarian ideas about
access to higher education. Among many of the Council members, he says, there is a sense of *noblesse oblige*.

Professionals who work at SCHEV feel a pride, an ownership of the mission; they have participated in the saga, in the legend. Conversations with more than a dozen of them over the past three years have confirmed this assumption which has been upheld by this research.

I contend that Gordon Davies is the "single man" who led the "small cadre" as SCHEV's organizational saga developed. "Collectively the appointed Council members' perspective about their role, mission and purpose is generally shaped by the Director and by the SCHEV staff through the Director (Molnar, interview April 28, 1988).

Davies worked closely with the appointed Council members. "Davies had a vision and was able to pick up on the strong points he found in Virginia and build on them. Davies had the leadership ability and the Council appointees had the governance ability; that combination is the key to SCHEV's strengths" (Kelly, interview April 11, 1989).
According to John Molnar, SCHEV staff member since 1975, as Davies' and the staff gained each others' confidence and became a team in the late 1970s, Davies was able to devote more time to overall philosophy instead of to nuts and bolts" (Molnar, interview April 28, 1988).

Molnar doesn't see the SCHEV staff as a "bureaucracy." "Davies detests bureaucracy. The SCHEV bureaucracy is more akin to the academic bureaucracy in any kind of higher education institution. It is not the same as the highway department, for instance, with a bell ringing for stop and start times" (Molnar, interview April 28, 1988).

SCHEV staff over the past decade has become more comfortable dealing with the Council, with professional organizations and with the colleges. Davies has given staff members more freedom and urged them to become conversant with diverse areas and issues of higher education, not limiting them to their specific areas of assignment.

Davies has his top level staff team, his "Administrative Group," but the entire staff is encouraged to speak up on broader issues. "These changes are mirrored in staff organization. There is more effective
flow and cross-manpower assignments. That reflects the way SCHEV has changed over the decade" (Molnar).

"The sense of mission and purpose at SCHEV is because of the director and the kinds of people that he selects, people with a commitment to higher education and to quality. He is a man of ideas and he chooses people for their ideas. But SCHEV's mission and purpose is also learned there; the spirit is a part of the atmosphere. Gordon Davies is the leader that creates and maintains this atmosphere of risk-taking, of creativity. Gordon Davies is a powerful charismatic visionary and political genius who uses these skills most effectively. So much at SCHEV, internally and externally, centers on his leadership. He gives his staff support to allow making tough decisions that make them unpopular. He stands behind his staff members and is truly a mentor. He especially wants the senior staff members to feel a sense of partnership. He is always approachable; there is no need for an appointment for the staff members to go into his office and discuss an issue" (Slevin, interview April 21, 1989).

This leader is complex and controversial. Those interviewed for
this research had very definite opinions about him personally and professionally; these opinions were either very positive or very negative. Gordon Davies has the kind of personality about which no one feels ambivalent. He is a strong leader. According to David Potter, former SCHEV Associate Director, "Most people in education are used to polite talk, gentlemanly conversation, indirect language. They like to walk around an issue, massage it, see it from different angles. Gordon, on the other hand, is very forthright. There's no pretense about him. He's a dynamic individual who wants to make sure the system he's working with is dynamic as well" (Potter quoted by Cleary, p. 16).

"The leadership of SCHEV is the most important single ingredient in that behavior [of developing a set of beliefs that bonds SCHEV with its mission of developing a system of higher education for Virginia that is among the best in the nation]. The leadership is highly professional and innovative so that we do things beyond the routine. There is a healthy skepticism [among the appointed Council members] that forces a thorough examination of new issues. That
leadership comes from Gordon Davies and the quality of the staff that he puts together" (Wright, interview April 17, 1989). Dr. Stephen Wright, a Council member since 1982, was a member of the New Jersey Board of Higher Education, director of the College Board, and worked for statewide agencies in several states. These and other responsibilities give him a national perspective from which he evaluates SCHEV. "There is a difference in the level of competence in the areas that the staff functions. This excellence is part of the mystique that complements the work that Gordon Davies does" (Wright, interview April 17, 1989).

Even though he is not universally popular, in fact even though he is thoroughly disliked by some, this research has clearly indicated that Gordon Davies is a very strong leader with his staff, among the most influential legislators, with the colleges, with the executive branch of the state government and with higher education executive officers from other states. Virginia's higher education system from 1977 to 1987 clearly bears his mark. He has led but not dictated to the members of the State Council. To a great degree it has been
Gordon Davies who has kept higher education on the first page of the agendas of three governors. He has certainly made enemies as well as friends, but he has made Virginia's system of higher education one that is taking its place among the top systems in the South and in the country.

**Recommendations for Further Study**

The appointment process by which lay persons fill positions on the higher education boards is of utmost importance to the quality of higher education in the Commonwealth. These boards include the State Council of Higher Education for Virginia, boards of the 15 senior institutions, the Virginia Community College System board and the 23 community college advisory boards. The process is political with many pressure points and many opportunities for input, thoughtful or otherwise. The degrees of commitment and the degrees of effectiveness of these nearly 500 board members are crucial predictors of the quality of Virginia's higher education into the twenty-first century.
Work is needed on measuring the effectiveness of statewide coordinating boards and the influence of their executive officers or directors. This research should build on the work of Robert O. Berdahl and others. Since each state is unique and each system of higher education relates to so many variables, setting criteria of excellence is a challenge.

Building on the 1974 dissertation of R.A. Kellog, State controlled higher education in Virginia and the budgeting process 1950-1972: a move toward formal methods, the systems by which the State Council of Higher Education and the Department of Planning and Budget construct the target budgets, personnel and space allocations for state institutions of higher education would provide a rich field for study.

Finally, a more in-depth study of the relationships between the legislature and the State Council of Higher Education for Virginia would be of interest, particularly examining the involvement of members and nonmembers of the House Appropriations Committee and Senate Finance Committee. The Virginia General Assembly adheres
very closely to its committee system. In the legislative survey conducted for this research, several members of the General Assembly commented on their inability to offer informed responses because they were not on the involved committees and therefore knew little about higher education issues.
APPENDIXES
APPENDIX A

This questionnaire was used as a guide for interviews for the 1988 research with persons other than legislators:

Questionnaire for Dissertation Research by Agnes Braganza at the College of William & Mary, School of Education, 1988. Thank you!

Name_____________________________________________ Date ____________

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>STRONGLY AGREE</th>
<th>NO OPINION</th>
<th>DISAGREE</th>
<th>STRONGLY DISAGREE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The State Council of Higher Education for Virginia (SCHEV) is an effective advocate for higher education in the Commonwealth.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCHEV favors the more elite programs and colleges in Virginia.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCHEV plays an adversarial role with Virginia public colleges.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCHEV's concept of its own power and influence with Virginia's public colleges is consistent with reality.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCHEV's concept of its own power and influence with the General Assembly is consistent with reality.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCHEV's concept of its own power and influence with the Secretary of Education and the Governor is consistent with reality.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCHEV is an effective advocate for Virginia's private colleges.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCHEV is an effective advocate for Virginia's Community College system.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCHEV is an effective advocate for Virginia's comprehensive colleges.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SCHEV is an effective advocate for Virginia's doctoral granting universities.

SCHEV's level of power is appropriate to allow it to effectively accomplish the coordination of Virginia's institutions of higher education.

SCHEV's level of power is too limited.

SCHEV communicates effectively with college Presidents.

SCHEV serves the Commonwealth without evident or strong political bias.
APPENDIX B

The following questionnaire, typeset in an eight page booklet, was mailed first class with a self-addressed stamped envelope to 137 members of the Virginia General Assembly December 7, 1988. Initial responses plus a post card follow up and January 4, 1989, re-mailing to nonrespondents of the questionnaire with another self-addressed stamped envelope elicited a 45.2% response (62).

LEGISLATIVE OPINION OF THE STATE COUNCIL OF HIGHER EDUCATION FOR VIRGINIA

Agnes Braganza
Doctoral Research
School of Education
College of William & Mary

Members of the General Assembly, I appreciate your cooperation in responding to this survey. I understand that it comes at a very busy time for you. Thank you for your consideration.

INSTRUCTIONS:
For each of the following questions, please indicate your opinion by marking one of the responses:

STRONGLY AGREE (SA)  AGREE (A)  NEUTRAL (N)  DISAGREE (D)  STRONGLY DISAGREE (SD)

Throughout this study, the State Council of Higher Education for Virginia is referred to as SCHEV.

Thank you!
1. SCHEV's level of power is appropriate to allow it to effectively accomplish the coordination of Virginia's institutions of higher education.

2. SCHEV's level of power is too limited.

3. SCHEV's performance in carrying out its overall planning functions has effectively contributed to the strength of higher education in the Commonwealth.

4. SCHEV's performance in projecting and approving enrollment numbers in institutions in the state system has appropriately guided growth of Virginia's public institutions of higher education.

5. SCHEV's performance in approving or disapproving requests for new programs in the state system has been equitable in that it has neither favored nor disfavored any kinds of institutions nor any specific institutions.

6. SCHEV's responses to General Assembly requests for studies and reports on higher education issues have met my needs and expectations as a legislator.

7. SCHEV's presentation of data about higher education has provided the information required for the General Assembly to make informed decisions on higher education policies.

8. SCHEV's budget recommendations have provided the information required for the General Assembly to make informed decisions on allocation of funds for higher education.
9. SCHEV's performance in approving out-of-state institutions of higher education has appropriately controlled the quality of these institutions in the Commonwealth.

The Virginia Code, Chapter 1.1, Section 23-9.6:1. describes the duties of the SCHEV generally. In this section, SCHEV is denied statutory authority in several areas. Do you feel that the following areas should be changed?

10. SCHEV should be extended the statutory authority to modify institutional mission statements.

11. SCHEV should be extended the statutory authority to determine admission standards for the individual institutions of higher education. This includes academic standards, residence or other criteria.

12. SCHEV should be extended the statutory authority to select faculty members for the state system.

13. SCHEV should be extended the statutory authority to control escalations of status (degree-granting level) in the various institutions of the state system without General Assembly approval.

14. SCHEV should be extended the statutory authority to review and require discontinuance of academic programs offered by public institutions of higher education using qualitative criteria as well as the currently allowed quantitative criteria.

15. The State Council of Higher Education should be extended the statutory authority to approve all new courses offered in the state system.
The Virginia Code Chapter 1.1, Section 23-9.9 requires that SCHEV develop policies, formulae and guidelines for the fair and equitable distribution and use of public funds among the public institutions of higher education, but each institution retains the right to submit its own budget and may appear "through its representatives or otherwise before the Governor and his advisory committee on the budget, the General Assembly or any committee thereof..." to present its own budget requests. Do you believe that:

16. SCHEV should be extended the statutory authority to present the budget for the entire state system of higher education to the General Assembly and the Governor.

17. SCHEV should be extended the statutory authority to receive the budget monies and disburse them to the state institutions of higher education.

The Virginia Code Chapter 1.1, Section 23-9.14. provides that SCHEV shall have no authority over the solicitation, investment or expenditure of endowment funds of public institutions of higher education. Do you believe that:

18. SCHEV should be extended the statutory authority to control all private endowments, gifts and funds for all state institutions of higher education.

The Virginia Code Chapter 21, Section 23-268 provides criteria by which SCHEV shall evaluate out-of-state institutions of higher education in order to grant approval for their operation in the Commonwealth. Section 23-269. B. prohibits "taking into account duplication of effort by public and private institutions in the Commonwealth or other questions of need within the Commonwealth for degrees or programs of the kind for which approval is sought."

19. In considering applications for out-of-state institutions of higher education, SCHEV should be extended the statutory authority to take into account duplication of effort by public and private institutions in the Commonwealth and other questions of need for degrees or programs of the kind for which approval is sought.

20. The State Council of Higher Education should be abolished along with the individual boards of visitors and the state Board of Community Colleges, and replaced with one Superboard or governing board for the entire state.
21. SCHEV's concept of its own power and influence with the General Assembly is consistent with reality. ................................................................. SA A N D SD

22. SCHEV underestimates its influence; legislators consider it more powerful than it seems to consider itself................................................................. SA A N D SD

23. SCHEV's concept of its own power and influence with the Secretary of Education and the Governor is consistent with reality..................................................................................................................................

24. SCHEV overestimates itself; its power and influence with the Governor and Secretary of Education is less than it seems to believe is true................................................................. SA A N D SD

25. SCHEV serves the Commonwealth without evident or strong political bias. ............................................................................................. SA A N D SD

26. SCHEV is an effective advocate for higher education in the Commonwealth ................................................................................................. SA A N D SD

27. SCHEV is an effective advocate

- for Virginia's private colleges............................................................................ SA A N D SD

- for Virginia's Community College system....................................................... SA A N D SD

- for Virginia's comprehensive colleges............................................................. SA A N D SD

- for Virginia's doctoral granting universities...................................................... SA A N D SD

28. As a member of the General Assembly, interactions with SCHEV staff members and/or utilization of their data has been

- VERY IMPORTANT TO ME ON A REGULAR BASIS
- SOMewhat IMPORTANT
- OF LITTLE IMPORTANCE SINCE I DO NOT REGULARLY WORK WITH HIGHER EDUCATION ISSUES.
DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION

Please check the appropriate spaces:

Political Party:
___ DEMOCRAT
___ REPUBLICAN
___ INDEPENDENT

Geographical Representation: In which general area of the Commonwealth is your district?
___ NORTHERN VIRGINIA
___ TIDewater
___ RICHMOND AREA
___ VALLEY
___ WESTERN
___ CENTRAL

NOTES

Please feel free to make additional comments about SCHEV on this questionnaire. Your comments will be carefully considered. Thank you.

Thank you again for your time in completing this questionnaire and returning it in the enclosed self-addressed stamped envelope.

PLEASE RETURN TO:
Agnes Braganza
Post Office Box 851
Yorktown, Virginia 23692
Marlene Hager's 1976 Dissertation in the School of Education at The College of William and Mary, Legislative Opinions of the Members of the Virginia General Assembly Toward the State Council of Higher Education for Virginia, employed the following questionnaire. Each legislator was asked to indicate strong agreement, agreement, neutrality, strong disagreement or disagreement.

1. The present statutory powers granted to the State Council of Higher Education are satisfactory.

2. The past performance of the State Council of Higher Education in carrying out its overall planning functions for the state system has been satisfactory.

3. The past performance of the State Council of Higher Education in approving or disapproving the mission statements of the various colleges and universities in the state has been satisfactory.

4. The past performance of the State Council of Higher Education in studying the proposed escalation of various institutions in the state system has been satisfactory.

5. The past performance of the State Council of Higher Education in approving or disapproving enrollment projections for the state system has been satisfactory.

6. The past performance of the State Council of Higher Education in approving or disapproving requests for new programs in the state system has been satisfactory.

7. The past performance of the State Council of Higher Education in discontinuing nonproductive programs in the state system has been satisfactory.

8. The past performance of the State Council of Higher Education in approving or disapproving establishment of new branches, schools, departments, etc. has been satisfactory.
9. The past performance of the State Council of Higher Education in developing a data informations system has been satisfactory.

10. The past performance of the State Council of Higher Education in developing uniform standards for reporting, accounting, record keeping has been satisfactory.

11. The past performance of the State Council of Higher Education in approving or disapproving space utilization changes has been satisfactory.

12. The past performance of the State Council of Higher Education in making budget recommendations has been satisfactory.

13. The past performance of the State Council of Higher Education in coordinating continuing education offerings has been satisfactory.

14. The State Council of Higher Education should be extended the statutory authority to determine admission standards for the individual institutions of higher education.

15. The State Council of Higher Education should be extended the statutory authority to select faculty members for the state system.

16. The State Council of Higher Education should be extended the statutory authority to approve all new courses offered in the state system.

17. The State Council of Higher Education should be extended the statutory authority to coordinate all private colleges in addition to its present responsibilities for the public sector.

18. The State Council of Higher Education should be extended the statutory authority to coordinate out-of-state institutions of higher education offering programs in non-federal facilities.

19. The State Council of Higher Education should be extended the statutory authority to present the budget for the entire state system of higher education to the legislature and the Governor.

20. The State Council of Higher Education should be extended the statutory authority to receive the budget monies and disperse them to the state institutions of higher education.

21. The State Council of Higher Education should be extended the statutory authority to have control over all private endowments, gifts, funds, etc. for all state institutions of higher education.

22. The State Council of Higher Education should be extended the statutory authority to modify institutional mission statements previously adopted by the General Assembly.
23. The State Council of Higher Education should be extended the statutory authority to approve or disapprove any organizational changes that fall currently within the internal management prerogatives of the state institutions of higher education.

24. The State Council of Higher Education should be abolished along with the individual boards of visitors and the State Board of Community Colleges, and replaced with one superboard or governing board for the entire state.
In his ten year report, Davies states that "the Council's relations with the General Assembly continue to be excellent." Is this accurate? Marlene Hager's research in 1975 indicated that SCHEV was respected by Virginia's General Assembly members. However, a large number of those legislators have been replaced by new men and women; much has happened in higher education and in the General Assembly in the 13 years that include the decade under examination in this research.

To discover changes during this period that occurred in legislative opinion about the State Council of Higher Education for Virginia, comparisons were made with Hager's results. With appropriate adjustments, I replicated portions of the questionnaire used for that research. Other questions were included in the 1988 questionnaire that related directly to the current study and to interviews with nonlegislators involved with SCHEV during the
decade.

The purpose of Dr. Hager's research was "to investigate the opinions of the members of the 1974-75 General Assembly in the Commonwealth of Virginia toward the statutory authority and the general performance level of the State Council of Higher Education."

(Hager, 1976, p. 7) She tested six hypotheses:

1. That legislative opinion will be favorable toward the existing statutory powers granted to the State Council of Higher Education;

2. That the members of the legislature will be satisfied with the past performance of the State Council of Higher Education with respect to its statutory powers;

3. That legislative opinion will be favorable toward strengthening the powers of the State Council of Higher Education in the future;

4. That there will be no difference in legislative opinion toward a strengthening of these powers of the State Council of Higher Education when controlling for the members' political affiliations;

5. That there will be no difference in legislative opinion toward strengthening of the powers of the State Council of Higher Education when controlling for the members' geographic area of representation; and

6. That there will be no difference between the opinions of the defined leaders of the General Assembly and
the rank and file members with respect to the extension of the power of the State Council of Higher Education (Hager, 1976, pp.7-8).

In addition, Hager tested for support to abolish the State Council of Higher Education and the individual boards of visitors and the State Board of Community Colleges and to replace these with one superboard or governing board for the entire state.

**Methodology for Legislative Opinion Survey**

All members of the General Assembly were sent the mail survey in 1988 (Appendix B). Due to deaths and a resignation, there were not 140 but rather 137 members on December 1, 1988. Sixty-two legislators (45.25%) responded after the initial mailing, a postcard reminder and a final mailing with a second questionnaire enclosed. Dillman's "total design method" for mail questionnaires was utilized in order to obtain this response rate at an inconvenient time of year (Dillman, 1978).

The first 20 questions of the 1988 questionnaire were based on Hager's research. Ten of her questions were deleted due to statutory changes since 1975 or due to question construction; results of nine of these questions are included in Appendix D even though no
comparisons can be made with 1988 data. Hager's question on data information system is compared broadly with the 1988 question on presentation of data (see Tables 8 in this chapter). Fourteen questions adapted from the 1975 research were reworded for clarity but were kept near enough to the original content to allow comparison. Two questions in the 1988 questionnaire, numbers 13 and 14, relate to questions in Hager's research, but were restated in order to be current and cannot be compared to the 1975 responses. Among the first 20 questions are four others that were added in 1988: question 2 to clarify responses to question 1; questions 6, 7 and 9 to cover major roles of SCHEV added since the 1975 questionnaire and cannot be compared to 1975 data.

Questions 21 through 24 deal with legislative opinion about SCHEV's power and influence and its self-concept. These areas were covered in interviews with nonlegislative leaders so were included on the 1988 legislative questionnaire for comparison with those opinions. A related question, number 25, seeks legislative opinion of SCHEV's political bias.

Questions 26 and 27 seek legislative opinion about SCHEV's
effectiveness in advocacy roles for higher education in general and segments of higher education in particular. These questions also reflect opinions discovered during the nonlegislative interviews.

The final question was designed to determine each respondent's estimate of his or her degree of involvement with SCHEV. Following that question, the two demographic questions seek political party and geographical representation so that comparisons could be made with Hager's data.

This research deals only with Hager's first three hypotheses and the question on the superboard concept. In her fourth and fifth hypotheses she found no statistical differences in the data when controlling for political affiliation and geographical areas of representation. In data concerning her sixth hypothesis, she did not discover any statistical differences between leaders and rank and file members in their opinions with respect to the extension of the powers of the State Council of Higher Education. Because only 62 legislators responded to the 1988 questionnaire, the number was insufficient to control for political affiliation or geographical area. No interviews with legislators or separate methodology between
legislative leaders and rank and file members were used in the 1988 research. Therefore the final three Hager hypotheses will not be considered in this study.

**Hypotheses of Legislative Opinion Survey**

The purpose of this legislative survey was to test Hager's first three hypotheses and the superboard question 13 years after her survey was done. The legislators she surveyed in 1975 composed the same body that had voted a year earlier for major statutory changes in the section of the Virginia Code governing the State Council of Higher Education for Virginia. The coordinating council that this body had created was still quite new. Hager found that "several legislators appeared willing to wait and see how the State Council of Higher Education carried out its responsibilities as provided in the 1974 legislative mandate before contemplating any other options. Some legislators observed that the Council should be given the 'time to prove itself.'" (Hager, 1976, p. 63) SCHEV has had time to prove itself. Therefore this research is relevant.

Relating to Hager's research, this research tested four
hypotheses:

1. That since 1975 members of the General Assembly have not significantly changed opinions concerning their satisfaction with the statutory powers granted to the State Council of Higher Education;

2. That since 1975 members of the General Assembly have not significantly changed opinions concerning establishment of a superboard;

3. That since 1975 members of the General Assembly have not significantly changed opinions concerning performance of the State Council of Higher Education; and

4. That since 1975 members of the General Assembly have not significantly changed opinions concerning strengthening the powers of the State Council of Higher Education.

Characteristics of 1988 Respondents

In 1988, 12 of the 62 respondents report that the issue of higher education is very important to them; 27 report that it is somewhat important; 20 profess that it is an issue of little importance since they do not regularly work with higher education issues. Three did not respond to this question.

Thirty-seven (60%) of the 1988 respondents are Democrats; 17
(27%) are Republicans. Two responded as independents, and six did not respond to this question. The General Assembly is 67% Democrat, 32% Republican. Therefore, the political parties are fairly represented among the respondents.

Tidewater (Hampton Roads) and Northern Virginia have the heaviest representation in the General Assembly and were the most numerous among respondents to the 1988 questionnaire: Northern Virginia 15 and Tidewater 16. The following numbers responded from other areas of the Commonwealth: Richmond six, the valley four, the western part of the state five, and the central part of the state 11. There was no geographical area without respondents. Five persons did not supply the geographical information.

This compares with Hager's respondents as follows: 82 Democrats (76%), 18 Republicans (13%), seven independents (6%). The General Assembly at that time was composed of 76.4% Democrats, 17% Republicans and 6% independents (Hager, 1976, p. 135). Her 108 respondents' geographical distribution was as follows: northern 21, Tidewater 33, capitol (Richmond) 12, valley seven, west 18, and the central part of the state 17 (Hager, 1976, p. 156).
Comparisons Between 1975 and 1988 Legislative Opinions About The State Council of Higher Education for Virginia

Dr. Hager's research showed that over 68% of the responding members of the Virginia General Assembly expressed positive opinions toward then existing statutory powers of the State Council of Higher Education for Virginia. Sixty-two percent of the responding legislators expressed overall satisfaction with SCHEV's performance. A majority of the legislators in the 1975 survey indicated opposition to expanding SCHEV's responsibilities. Those legislators virtually unanimously rejected the concept of replacing SCHEV with a superboard or statewide governing board for higher education.

As this research shows, the 1988 legislators agreed that SCHEV is performing adequately and that its powers should not be appreciably expanded. A large majority opposed replacing SCHEV with a statewide governing board for higher education.

Testing of the First Hypothesis:

Present Statutory Powers of the State Council

The first hypothesis is that since 1975 members of the General Assembly have not significantly changed opinions concerning their
satisfaction with the statutory powers granted to the State Council of Higher Education.

The first questions of the 1975 and 1988 questionnaires are compared to test the first hypothesis. If there is no statistical difference between the responses there has been little change in legislators' level of satisfaction with the statutory powers of the State Council of Higher Education.

Appendix D Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>1975a Frequency</th>
<th>1975a Percent</th>
<th>1988b Frequency</th>
<th>1988b Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral/No response</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>32.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>61.1</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>45.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>17.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{a}N=108\) (Hager, 1976, p. 61)

"The present statutory powers granted to the State Council of Higher Education are satisfactory" (Hager, 1976, p. 211).

\(^{b}N=62\)

SCHEV's level of power is appropriate to allow it to effectively accomplish the coordination of Virginia's institutions of higher education.

\((F\ \text{ratio} = .7382, \ \text{probability of error} \ .3915; \ t\ \text{value} \ .86)\)

These results indicate that there has been no significant change since 1975 in legislators' opinions about their satisfaction with the
level of power granted to SCHEV. In 1975, 68.5% agreed or strongly agreed that the statutory powers were satisfactory; in 1988 62.9% agreed or strongly agreed that SCHEV's level of power is appropriate.

The analysis of variance (F-ratio of .7382 with a probability of .3915 that differences were due to sampling error) did not yield a significant difference. The difference of two sample means (t value of .86) is so small that it supports the evidence that there was no significant difference between the opinions of the two legislative bodies on this question.

Appendix D Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>46.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral/No Response</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>33.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N=62  
SCHEV's level of power is too limited.

In 1988, 59.7% disagreed or strongly disagreed that SCHEV's powers are too limited. This second question (Table 2) was added so that if there were a large number of legislators disagreeing with the
first question that SCHEV's powers are appropriate, the direction of inappropriateness could be measured. In the first question, less than 5% disagreed with SCHEV's current level of power. With well over half feeling that SCHEV's power is not too limited, it can be concluded that there is little move to strengthen SCHEV.

These responses and the results of the following question indicate that there is no more eagerness now than there was in 1975 to greatly increase SCHEV's statutory powers or to create a strong central form of statewide governance for higher education in Virginia.

**Testing of the Second Hypothesis: Establishment of a Superboard**

The second hypothesis is that since 1975 members of the General Assembly have not significantly changed opinions concerning establishment of a superboard.
Appendix D Table 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>1975a Frequency</th>
<th>1975a Percent</th>
<th>1988b Frequency</th>
<th>1988b Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>58.3</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>51.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>24.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral/No response</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>19.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

aN=108 (Hager, 1976, p. 178)
"The State Council of Higher Education should be abolished along with the individual boards of visitors and the State Board of Community Colleges, and replaced with one superboard or governing board for the entire state" (Hager, 1976, p. 213).

bN=62
The State Council of Higher Education should be abolished along with the individual boards of visitors and the State Board of Community Colleges, and replaced with one Superboard or governing board for the entire state.
(F ratio = 4.561, probability of error .0342; t-value 2.14)

In 1975, 91.6% disagreed or strongly disagreed with the superboard concept. In 1988, that number was down to 75.8%. In 1975, the issue had been thoroughly discussed by each of the respondents less than one year earlier; in 1988 the issue was not in the forefront of legislative concern. In 1975 only 7.4% were neutral; in 1988 19.4% were neutral or did not respond. Neither year had significant numbers agreeing with the superboard concept: .09% in 1975 and 4.8% in 1988, and in neither year did anyone strongly agree.
The analysis of variance (F-ratio of 4.561 with a .0342 probability of sampling error) indicates that there has been some change in opinion but no great change. There is some significance at the .05 level of confidence but none at any lower level. The difference of sample means (t value of 2.14) supports this conclusion. There is no indication here that there is a strong move toward a centralized form of statewide governance of higher education in Virginia, but it does appear to be a less important issue to nearly one-fifth of the 1,988 respondents. SCHEV Director Gordon Davies expressed concern (April 17, 1989 interview) that few legislators were left with memories of restructuring SCHEV in 1974. "The older (General Assembly) leadership is disappearing. Will the newer members know about SCHEV's role with higher education in Virginia or will a changed legislative body one day repeal the agency?" There is some movement toward a superboard, and higher education leaders should monitor this small but significant change.
Testing of the Third Hypothesis: Past Performance of the State Council

To test the third hypothesis, that since 1975 members of the General Assembly have not significantly changed opinions concerning performance of the State Council of Higher Education, the responses to 1975 questions 2 through 13 will be compared with the responses to 1988 questions 3 through 9. The comparable individual questions are: 1975 question number 2 and 1988 question number 3, 1975 question number 5 and 1988 question number 4, 1975 question number 6 and 1988 question number 5, 1975 question number 12 and 1988 question number 8. The relevant questions in the two test years will be compared to test for changes in the overall satisfaction level of the legislators. Unmatched questions from the 1975 research are included at the end of this appendix. They differ due to statutory changes since 1975 or due to question construction and could not be used in the 1988 research.

Questions from the 1988 survey are included in the discussion of this hypothesis even though they do not have comparable questions from 1975. They concern opinions about SCHEV's political bias and its effectiveness as an advocate for higher education.
Appendix D Table 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>1975 Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>1988 Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral/No response</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>23.2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>24.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>50.9</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>62.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

aN=108 (Hager, 1976, p. 66)
"The past performance of the State Council of Higher Education in carrying out its overall planning functions for the state system has been satisfactory" (Hager, 1976, p. 211).

bN=62
SCHEV's performance in carrying out its overall planning functions has effectively contributed to the strength of higher education in the Commonwealth. (F ratio = 10.61, probability of error .0014; t value 3.26)

In 1975 56.5% of the legislators agreed or strongly agreed that the State Council's performance in its overall planning functions had been carried out satisfactorily. According to Hager, those interviewed who were neutral or nonresponsive most frequently cited their unwillingness to comment so soon after SCHEV's statutory powers had been increased. In 1988, a considerably larger percentage, 74.2%, expressed satisfaction with SCHEV's overall planning functions. There has been a significant increase in the
satisfaction level.

The conclusion that there is a significant difference between the opinions of the two legislative bodies is supported by the large F-ratio of 10.61 with only a .0014 probability that this is due to sampling error; the t value of 3.26 also supports this conclusion. SCHEV is meeting more legislative expectations in planning.

Appendix D Table 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>29.6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral/No response</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>29.6</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>41.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>37.0</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>45.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

aN=108 (Hager, 1976, p. 72)
"The past performance of the State Council of Higher Education in approving or disapproving enrollment projections for the state system has been satisfactory" (Hager, 1976, p. 211).
bN=62
SCHEV's performance in projecting and approving enrollment numbers in institutions in the state system has appropriately guided growth of Virginia's public institutions of higher education.
(F ratio = 5, probability of error .0267; t-value 2.24)

In 1975, 39.8% of the legislators agreed or strongly agreed that
SCHEV's performance in approving or disapproving enrollment projections had been satisfactory. In 1988 still fewer than half (48.4%) of the legislators applaud this SCHEV function.

Hager points out that the colleges and universities were at the end of a growth cycle in 1975. There were political reasons stated for politicians to resent restriction of growth for their "favored institutions." On the other end of the scale, another factor was wariness of starting large building programs when enrollments were projected to drop in the late 1970s. (Hager, 1976, pp. 72-76)

By 1988 the over-enrollment threat of the early 1970s had subsided, the colleges had weathered the low enrollments of the early 1980s, and decisions had been firmly made that prevented the "big state U program" and "universities with 35 and 40 thousand students" feared by legislators interviewed by Hager (Hager, p. 75). Even with these events and changes, fewer than half the 1988 legislators approved SCHEV's enrollment-projecting functions.

The legislative opposition to these activities has subsided, as indicated by the lower percentage in 1988 that disagreed or strongly disagreed with SCHEV's performance related to enrollment
projections. In 1975 30.5% disagreed or strongly disagreed with these functions. In 1988 9.7% disagreed and none strongly disagreed. SCHEV seems to have gained some respect.

Statistical analysis shows that the F-ratio of 5 and the 2.24 t value both indicate that there is difference in the opinions of the two legislative bodies concerning SCHEV's performance in enrollment projection. The shift is toward more agreement and less disagreement with SCHEV's function on enrollment projections; this is evident upon examination of the frequency and response percentages in Table 5 in Appendix D.
Appendix D Table 6

Frequency and Percentage Distribution
New Programs (1975 Question 6 and 1988 Question 5)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>1975a Frequency</th>
<th>1975a Percent</th>
<th>1988b Frequency</th>
<th>1988b Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>26.9</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>24.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral/No response</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>21.3</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>32.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>41.7</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>35.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

aN=108 (Hager, 1976, p. 77)

"The past performance of the State Council of Higher Education in approving or disapproving requests for new programs in the state system has been satisfactory" (Hager, 1976, p. 211).

bN=62

SCHEV's performance in approving or disapproving requests for new programs in the state system has been equitable in that it has neither favored nor disfavored any kinds of institutions nor any specific institutions.

(F ratio = .1576, probability of error .7; t value .4)

In approving new programs, SCHEV's ratings fell with the legislators. In 1975 48.2% approved; in 1988 that had fallen to 40.2%. This is not a dramatic drop, particularly when the disapproval percentages are compared: in 1975 30.6% disagreed or strongly disagreed; in 1988 27.4% disagreed or strongly disagreed. The two stayed within relatively the same limits.

Statistical analysis shows that the difference between the two populations is very small. The t value of .40 supports the F-ratio of
.1576 that the opinions of the two groups are almost the same.

Appendix D Table 7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral/No response</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>37.9</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>38.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>31.5</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

aN=108 (Hager, 1976, p. 94)
"The past performance of the State Council of Higher Education in making budget recommendations has been satisfactory" (Hager, 1976, p. 212).

bN=62
SCHEV's budget recommendations have provided the information required for the General Assembly to make informed decisions on allocations of funds for higher education.
(F ratio = 14.48, probability of error .0002; t value 3.81)

Legislators of the eighties apparently had more confidence in SCHEV's budget recommendations after 13 years' experience than they did when these powers had just been strengthened in the mid-1970s.

In 1975, 28.7% of the legislators were not satisfied with SCHEV's function in this arena. By 1988 that percentage had dropped to 6.5, with none strongly disagreeing with SCHEV's satisfactory rating. In 1975, 33.4% approved; in 1988 54.8% approved. This is a significant difference.
Statistical analysis supports that there is a significant
difference in the opinions of the two legislative bodies. The F-ratio
is 14.48 with a probability of error at .0002. The 3.81 t value further
supports that there is a significant change in the legislative opinion
of SCHEV's performance in making budgetary recommendations to the
General Assembly.

Appendix D Table 8

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>1975a Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>1988b Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral/No response</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>47.2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>19.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>28.7</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>62.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

aN=108 (Hager, 1976, p. 88)
"The past performance of the State Council of Higher Education in developing a data
information system has been satisfactory" (Hager, 1976, p. 211).

bN=62
SCHEV's presentation of data about higher education has provided the information required
for the General Assembly to make informed decisions on higher education policies.

The data information system was not a burning issue in 1975
when nearly half of the legislators were neutral or nonresponding. It
is not an issue with which legislators are concerned except as it
affects the information they need. This was approached using an entirely new question, number 7 on the 1988 questionnaire. In 1975 one-third of the respondents approved of SCHEV's data collecting functions; in 1988 71% agreed or strongly agreed that SCHEV's presentation of data about higher education has provided the information required for them to make informed decisions on higher education policies. Apparently, SCHEV has learned to meet the legislators' needs in this area, but the two questions are not similar enough to make statistical comparisons.

The 1988 survey included two questions concerning SCHEV's performance which were not in the 1975 survey. Therefore, there are no comparisons with the following questions since there are no comparable questions from the earlier research.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral/No Response</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>24.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>48.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N=62
SCHEV's responses to General Assembly requests for studies and reports on higher education issues have met my needs and expectations as a legislator.

Two-thirds of the respondents agree that SCHEV's studies and reports, which are frequently ordered by the legislature, are satisfactory. This question was not in the 1975 survey presumably because this service and cooperation with the General Assembly was not as great a function of SCHEV during that period. Legislative studies and reports in the late 1980s consume a great deal of SCHEV staff time (Dorsey, February 10, 1988).
Appendix D Table 10

Frequency and Percentage Distribution
Out-of-State Institutions (1988 Question 9)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral/No Response</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>59.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>30.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N=62
SCHEV's performance in approving out-of-state institutions of higher education has appropriately controlled the quality of these institutions in the Commonwealth.

Even though competition from out-of-state institutions in the Tidewater and Northern Virginia consortial areas is a problem for state institutions of higher education in those areas, (Dotolo, interview January 8, 1988) their concerns have not been absorbed by the legislators whose responses to this question indicate little interest. In discussion of the fourth hypothesis, there are questions from the 1975 and 1988 surveys related to SCHEV's responsibilities with out-of-state institutions.
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Frequency and Percentage Distribution
Political Bias (1988 Question 25)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral/No Response</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>38.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>43.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N=62
SCHEV serves the Commonwealth without evident or strong political bias.

A surprisingly high number of respondents either did not know or elected not to respond to this question. Nearly half (45.1%) agreed that SCHEV operates without evident or strong political bias, and fewer than one-fifth (16.1%) disagreed. Several of the notes indicated displeasure with SCHEV, particularly in its not having contact with legislators outside the education and "money committees" -- the House Appropriations Committee and the Senate Finance Committee.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral/No Response</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>22.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>59.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N=62
SCHEV is an effective advocate for higher education in the Commonwealth.

This is evidently a vote of approval for SCHEV's role as an advocate for higher education in the Commonwealth. Nearly three-fourths (72.6%) agree that SCHEV is effective in this role. As the following table indicates, however, the responding legislators see this advocacy much stronger for the doctoral institutions than for the community colleges.
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Percentage Distribution
Advocacy by Type of College (1988 Question 27)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCHEV is an effective advocate for</th>
<th>STRONGLY AGREE</th>
<th>AGREE</th>
<th>NEUTRAL</th>
<th>DISAGREE</th>
<th>STRONGLY DISAGREE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-Virginia's private colleges.</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>29.0</td>
<td>38.7</td>
<td>25.8</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Virginia's Community College system.</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>46.8</td>
<td>33.9</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Virginia's comprehensive colleges.</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>54.8</td>
<td>29.0</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Virginia's doctoral-granting universities.</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>58.1</td>
<td>27.4</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N =62

The legislators' opinions that SCHEV is a more effective advocate for doctoral than community colleges among the public institutions may be interpreted as an indication that they believe SCHEV concentrates more attention on the doctoral-granting institutions than on the community colleges. It is interesting to note that none of the respondents strongly disagreed with SCHEV's effective advocacy for any type of institution.

The responses to these questions testing hypothesis three indicate that the opinions of the responding 1988 General Assembly
members are different from the opinions in 1975 in that the current legislators seem even more satisfied with SCHEV's performance than their predecessors, especially in budget recommendations and enrollment projections. The hypothesis can be accepted with some reservations.

Testing of the Fourth Hypothesis:
Strengthening the Powers of the State Council

To test the fourth hypothesis, that since 1975 members of the General Assembly have not significantly changed opinions concerning strengthening the powers of the State Council of Higher Education, eight pairs of questions are examined: 1975 Question 14 and 1988 question 11; 1975 question 15 and 1988 question 12; 1975 question 16 and 1988 question 15; 1975 question 18 and 1988 question 19; 1975 question 19 and 1988 question 16; 1975 question 20 and 1988 question 17; 1975 question 21 and 1988 question 18; 1975 question 22 and 1988 question 10. Two questions were added in the 1988 survey and are presented in conjunction with this hypothesis. Unmatched questions from 1975 are the end of this appendix.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>1975</th>
<th>1988</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>31.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>40.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral/No response</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\text{N=108 (Hager, 1976, p. 107)}\)

"The State Council of Higher Education should be extended the statutory authority to determine Admission standards for the individual institutions of higher education" (Hager, 1976, p. 212).

\(^b\text{N=62} \)

SHEV should be extended the statutory authority to determine admission standards for the individual institutions of higher education. This includes academic standards, residence or other criteria.

(\text{F ratio = .218, probability of error .64; t value .47})

In both 1975 and 1988 more than 70% of the legislators opposed extending SCHEV's statutory authority to determine admission standards for the individual institutions of higher education. The small .218 F-ratio with a 64% probability of error and the t value of .47 indicate that there is almost no difference between the opinions of the two bodies.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>1975a Frequency</th>
<th>1975a Percent</th>
<th>1988b Frequency</th>
<th>1988b Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>39.8</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>32.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>47.2</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>51.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral/No response</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

aN=108 (Hager, 1976, p. 108)

"The State Council of Higher Education should be extended the statutory authority to select faculty members for the state system (Hager, 1976, p. 212).

bN=62

SCHEV should be extended the statutory authority to select faculty members for the state system.

(F ratio = .065, probability of error .8; t value .26)

In both 1975 and 1988 more than 80% of the legislators opposed extending SCHEV's statutory authority to selection of faculty for the individual institutions of higher education. The extremely small .065 F-ratio, even with a 80% probability of error, and the .26 t value indicate that there is almost no difference between the opinions of the two legislative bodies.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>41.7</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>37.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral/No response</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>29.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>17.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^aN=108\) (Hager, 1976, p. 110)

"The State Council of Higher Education should be extended the statutory authority to approve all new courses offered in the state system" (Hager, 1976, p. 212).

\(^bN=62\)

The State Council of Higher Education should be extended the statutory authority to approve all new courses offered in the state system.

(F ratio = .113, probability of error .74; t value .34)

Again, examination of the data and statistical analysis show little change in opinion between 1975 and 1988 in another issue of institutional autonomy: extending SCHEV's authority to approving all new courses offered throughout the Virginia state system of higher education. In both test years, more than half the legislators opposed this power. There was little difference between the two groups indicated by the t value of .34 and the F-ratio of .113 with a 74% chance that even this could be ascribed to error.

This question and the two preceding it indicate that in 1975 and 1988 the legislators were not ready to give SCHEV these powers.
traditionally reserved to the institutions and denied to SCHEV in the Code of Virginia: admission standards, faculty selection and course selection. Higher education has long valued the right to control who is taught, who teaches and what is taught. This tradition is apparently being upheld in the Commonwealth of Virginia.

Appendix D Table 17

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>1975(^a) Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>1988(^b) Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>34.3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral/No response</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>20.3</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>29.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>54.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\)N=108 (Hager, 1976, p. 113)

"The State Council of Higher Education should be extended the statutory authority to coordinate out-of-state institutions of higher education offering programs in non-federal facilities" (Hager, 1976, p. 212).

\(^b\)N=62

In considering applications for out-of-state institutions of higher education, SCHEV should be extended the statutory authority to take into account duplication of effort by public and private institutions in the Commonwealth and other questions of need for degrees or programs of the kind for which approval is sought. (\(F\) ratio = 27.73, probability of error 0; \(t\) value 5.27)

These two questions concerning SCHEV's involvement with out-of-state colleges are worded differently because of statutory
changes between the two test dates. In 1980, SCHEV's authority was expanded over colleges not chartered in Virginia but offering courses or programs within the state. (Code of Virginia Chapter 21, Section 23-265) In 1975 27.8% supported extending SCHEV's power to coordinate out-of-state institutions of higher education offering programs in non-federal facilities. Some authority was granted in 1980, but the authority to take into account duplication of effort and other questions of need were not granted. In the 1988 survey, 58% agreed with extending that power.

The questions are different, but an increased willingness to support SCHEV's activity with out-of-state institutions is indicated. Statistical analysis is of little use with this pair of questions because of the changes, but both the t-test and F-ratio show major differences between the two legislative bodies' opinions.
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Frequency and Percentage Distribution
Single Budget (1975 Question 19 and 1988 Question 16)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>1975(^{a})</th>
<th>1988(^{b})</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>21.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>39.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral/No response</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{a}\)N=108 (Hager, 1976, p. 114)

"The State Council of Higher Education should be extended the statutory authority to present the budget for the entire state system of higher education to the legislature and the Governor" (Hager, 1976, p. 212).

\(^{b}\)N=62

SCHEV should be extended the statutory authority to present the budget for the entire state system of higher education to the General Assembly and the Governor.

(F ratio = 5.18, probability of error .02; t value 2.28)

Colleges and universities are unique among state agencies in Virginia in that they retain the right to submit their budgets individually and directly to the General Assembly and the Governor without going through a Cabinet officer. In 1975 61.1% of the respondents disagreed with extending the statutory authority to present the budget for the entire state system of higher education to the legislature and the Governor. In 1988 72.6% disagreed. In 1975 28.7% agreed or strongly agreed; 13 years later, that agreement had
dropped to only 3.2%. There is evidently less interest now than earlier in extending this power to the State Council. The statistical analyses support this interpretation: F-ratio of 5.18 with a 2% chance of sampling error and a t value of 2.28.

Appendix D Table 19

Frequency and Percentage Distribution
Handling of Budget Monies (1975 Question 20 and 1988 Question 17)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>1975(^a)</th>
<th>1988(^b)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral/No response</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\)N=108 (Hager, 1976, p. 219)

"The State Council of Higher Education should be extended the statutory authority to receive the budget monies and disperse them to the state institutions of higher education" (Hager, 1976, p. 212).

\(^b\)N=62

SCHEV should be extended the statutory authority to receive the budget monies and disburse them to the state institution of higher education.

(F ratio = .54, probability of error .46; t value .74)

In 1975 87% of the legislators disagreed with extending SCHEV's authority to include receiving the budget monies and dispersing them to Virginia's state colleges and universities. In 1988 the disapproval was down to 79%. The agreement level remained static: 3.7% in 1975
down to 3.2% in 1988. This is a small statistical difference: .74 t value and .54 F-ratio with a 46% chance of sampling error. This is significant at the 5% level of confidence but not at the 1% level.

Legislative opinion has not dramatically changed on this issue.

Appendix D Table 20

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>1975</th>
<th>1988</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral/No response</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[N=108 \text{ (Hager, 1976, p. 117)}\]

"The State Council of Higher Education should be extended the statutory authority to have control over all private endowments, gifts, funds, etc., for all state institutions of higher education" (Hager, 1976, p. 212).

\[N=62\]

SCHEV should be extended the statutory authority to control all private endowments, gifts and funds for all state institutions of higher education.

\[(F \text{ ratio } = 5.03, \text{ probability of error .026; t value 2.24)}\]

Even though more than three quarters of the 1988 legislators object to SCHEV's control of private endowments, gifts and funds for all state institutions of higher education, the percentage is down considerably from the 91.7% objecting in 1975. The percentage
agreeing with increasing SCHEV’s control over private endowments increased only 3.9%. Statistical analysis indicates that this is a significant difference: 5.03 F-ratio, with only a 2.6% chance that this is due to error, and t value of 2.24. However, the chance of SCHEV being granted this power remains remote.

Appendix D Table 21

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>1975a Frequency</th>
<th>1975a Percent</th>
<th>1988b Frequency</th>
<th>1988b Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>39.8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>41.7</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>54.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral/No response</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>25.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[N=108\] (Hager, 1976, p. 118)

“The State Council of Higher Education should be extended the statutory authority to have the authority to modify institutional mission statements previously adopted by the General Assembly“ (Hager, 1976, p. 212).

\[N=62\]

SCHEV should be extended the statutory authority to modify institutional mission statements.

(F ratio = 8.43, probability of error .004; t value 2.9)

The State Council has the statutory authority
to review and approve or disapprove any proposed change in the statement of mission of any
presently existing public institution of higher education... provided, however, no such actions shall become effective until thirty days after adjournment of the session of the General Assembly next following the filing of such a report (Code of Virginia, Chpt. 1.1, Sec. 23-9.6:1(b)).

This code provision allows the General Assembly to change actions taken by SCHEV concerning mission changes or to allow them to stand if no legislative action is taken. Prior to this 1974 Code provision, the General Assembly adopted the mission statements of each public college. For public colleges created hereafter, the Code provides that SCHEV shall define its mission, again with the final power resting with the General Assembly.

More than 81% of the 1975 legislators responding to the survey disagreed with the statement that SCHEV should have the power to modify institutional mission statements previously approved by the General Assembly. In 1988 more than 69% disagreed. This is a statistically significant difference: t value of 2.9, F-ratio of 8.43 with a .004 chance of error. The fact that the words "previously adopted by the General Assembly" were not included in the 1988 question, may indicate why there was a drop of 12% who disagreed or
strongly disagreed with this. This may indicate that a number of legislators are not familiar with the mission modification procedure.

The following two questions relating to extending SCHEV's statutory authority were added to the 1988 questionnaire and have no comparable questions from the 1975 data.

Appendix D Table 22

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>48.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral/No Response</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>24.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N=62
SCHEV should be extended the statutory authority to control escalations of status (degree-granting level) in the various institutions of the state system without General Assembly approval.

Nearly two-thirds of the 1988 legislators who responded are not willing to grant SCHEV the right to elevate the status of colleges without the General Assembly's endorsement. This response should be compared to the response concerning mission statements (Table 21).
Appendix D Table 23

Frequency and Percentage Distribution
Qualitative Program Review (1988 Question 14)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>35.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral/No Response</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>32.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>25.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N=62
SCHEV should be extended the statutory authority to review and require discontinuance of academic programs offered by public institutions of higher education using qualitative criteria as well as the currently allowed quantitative criteria.

This is a major question for the State Council of Higher Education and was included at its suggestion. The responding 1988 legislators are nearly evenly divided on agreeing, disagreeing and having no opinion. This is an area to watch over the next few years.

Summary and Conclusions of Legislative Opinion Surveys

The first hypothesis, that there has been no significant change since 1975 in General Assembly members' opinions about their satisfaction with the level of power granted to SCHEV was accepted.

The second hypothesis, that since 1975 members of the General
Assembly have not significantly changed opinions concerning establishment of a superboard of statewide governance of higher education, was accepted.

The third hypothesis was accepted with some reservation; since 1975 members of the General Assembly have changed opinions concerning the performance of the State Council of Higher Education, but overall there is not a statistically significant change. The 1988 legislators appeared more satisfied with SCHEV than were the 1975 legislators, especially in budget recommendations, in dealing with out-of-state institutions and in enrollment projections.

Other questions in the 1988 survey support this interpretation of the third hypothesis. Forty-five percent of the 1988 respondents agreed that SCHEV serves the Commonwealth without evident or strong political bias; 16% disagreed and well over one-third had no opinion. In response to the question concerning SCHEV as an effective advocate for higher education in the Commonwealth, 72.6% agreed; only 4.8% disagreed. The advocacy question was further refined by asking in question 27 for their opinions on advocacy for private colleges, community colleges, comprehensive colleges and doctoral
granting universities. More clearly than in separate tables, the data is presented in aggregate form in Table 13. It indicates that responding legislators feel that SCHEV supports doctoral institutions more than other classifications of institutions of higher education and that advocacy decreases steadily for other public institutions as the more advanced institutions are favored.

The fourth hypothesis, that since 1975 members of the General Assembly have not significantly changed opinions concerning strengthening the powers of the State Council of Higher Education, is more difficult to interpret. There is little change in the General Assembly’s opinion that selection of students, faculty and academic courses should remain with the institutions of higher education as written into the Code of Virginia in 1974. Judging from two related but different questions because of statutory changes since 1975, the legislators indicated an increased willingness to give SCHEV more control over out-of-state institutions offering academic programs in Virginia. There was significant decrease in the responding legislators’ willingness to give SCHEV the power of presenting individual institutions’ budgets, and a small increase in their
willingness to allow SCHEV to receive and disburse monies allocated to the institutions of higher education. The 1988 respondents were more willing to give SCHEV control over private endowments currently controlled by the institutions; however more than three quarters of them still object to this. Concerning extension of SCHEV's power over institutional mission statements, tables 21 and 22 should be examined together. Even though it appears that a significantly increased percentage of 1988 respondents were willing to extend SCHEV's authority over institutional mission statements, more than two-thirds of them still object and nearly two-thirds of them objected to extension of SCHEV's authority to control escalations of status, an integral part of a college's mission.

Hypothesis four can be accepted with some reservations but with confidence that the General Assembly is not ready to considerably expand SCHEV's power.

The 1988 questions dealing with legislative opinion about SCHEV's concept of its own power indicate that the lawmakers are not informed on these questions. Their results are given in the back of Appendix D, but the large percentages of neutral responses make
them of little value.

Additional Data from 1975 Research

This data from Marlene Hager's 1975 research is included to provide background information on opinions of the 1975 members of Virginia General Assembly concerning the State Council of Higher Education. Because of statutory changes these questions were not repeated in the 1988 research.

Appendix D Table 24

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>17.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>38.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>36.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N=108 (Hager, 1976, p. 69)
"The past performance of the State Council of Higher Education in approving or disapproving the mission statements of the various colleges and universities in the state has been satisfactory" (Hager, 1976, p. 211).

This question was not repeated. SCHEV does not approve or
disapprove mission statements of the colleges and universities. That is the function of the General Assembly. SCHEV is empowered by the Virginia Code to approve or disapprove changes in the missions. Because there was no valid question from 1975 with which to compare the data and because this issue had not risen during any of the 1988 interviews, no new data was collected on past performance. There are questions concerning extending SCHEV's authority to change mission statements; the differences between these opinions in 1975 (question 22) and 1988 (question 16) are tested under the fourth hypothesis.

Appendix D Table 25

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>22.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>26.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>43.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N=108 (Hager, 1976, p. 72)
"The past performance of the State Council of Higher Education in studying the proposed escalation of various institutions in the state system has been satisfactory" (Hager, 1976, p. 211).
Escalation of college status through the creation of advanced degree programs was an issue in the 1970s when enrollments were growing rapidly, but it is not a current issue in Virginia. Therefore, no data was gathered in 1988 concerning past performance. A question about giving SCHEV authority to control escalation without General Assembly approval will be discussed in the next section; 1988 legislators were not willing to extend statutory authority for SCHEV to control escalations of status (degree-granting level) in the various institutions of the state system without General Assembly approval.

Appendix D Table 26

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>25.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>36.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N=108 (Hager, 1976, p. 81)

"The past performance of the State Council of Higher Education in discontinuing nonproductive programs in the state system has been satisfactory" (Hager, 1976, p. 211).
Gordon Davies, in his ten year report, stated that an equal number of programs had been started as had been closed over the past decade. There were no major events in the past decade concerning SCHEV's power to discontinue programs. Therefore, this question was not repeated in the 1988 study.

A question discussed under the fourth hypothesis covered an important current issue: extending SCHEV's power to allow qualitative considerations instead of solely quantitative ones in considering discontinuance of academic programs.

Appendix D Table 27

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>27.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>46.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N=108 (Hager, 1976, p. 84)
"The past performance of the State Council of Higher Education in approving or disapproving establishment of new branches, schools, departments, etc. has been satisfactory" (Hager, 1976, p. 211).

It was determined after discussions with SCHEV staff members
and college officials that members of the General Assembly would probably not be familiar with the issues relating to establishment of new departments or schools within colleges and that establishment of new branches is not a current issue. No comparable question was included in the 1988 survey.

### Appendix D Table 28

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>15.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>37.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>35.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N=108 (Hager, 1976, p. 89)

"The past performance of the State Council of Higher Education in developing uniform standards for reporting, accounting, record keeping has been satisfactory" (Hager, 1976, p. 211).

The State Council continues to promote uniform standards for reporting, accounting and record keeping. It was an issue into the early 1980s, but has not been in great discussion during the past few years. It is now accepted practice (Interview with Staff Director of House Appropriations Committee Robert Schultze, a former SCHEV
staff member, May 12, 1988). This area was not included in the 1988 legislative questionnaire.

Appendix D Table 29

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>23.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>30.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N=108 (Hager, 1976, p. 92)

"The past performance of the State Council of Higher Education in approving or disapproving space utilization changes has been satisfactory" (Hager, 1976, p. 211).

As discussed above under the question on enrollments, Bruce Vladek ("Buildings and Budgets: The Over-Investment Crisis," Change, Dec. 1978/Jan. 1979, p.39) points out that this was indeed a major issue of concern in the 1970s. In Hager's research there was no consensus of opinion about SCHEV's performance on space utilization in the mid-1970s. Because the issue is even more complicated now, the issue was not brought up. Today's space utilization questions deal with infrastructure and space conversion as much or more than with
new construction. The 1988 research instrument did not allow for clarification and discussion as the 1975 instrument did, therefore it would not meet the requirements of this issue.

Appendix D Table 30

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>24.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>51.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N=108 (Hager, 1976, p. 97)

“The past performance of the State Council of Higher Education in coordinating continuing education offerings has been satisfactory” (Hager, 1976, p. 212).

In the mid-1970s, the six regional consortia for continuing higher education were fully functioning; they are quite weak in the late 1980s (Tidewater Consortium for Continuing Higher Education Board Meeting discussion August, 1988). Off-campus credit courses are not the serious matter of survival now that they were in the last decade when SCHEV had to mediate between the competing interests of VPI and GMU to offer off-campus credit courses in the same
geographic area (Code of Virginia, Section 23-9.10 in 1973 mandated creation of the regional consortia; "Tempers Short," C. Cox, 
Times-Dispatch, September 21, 1978; Consortium for Continuing 
Education in Northern Virginia: Public Policy in Action, Martha A. 
Turnage, 1978, Blacksburg, VA.; Council Notes of March 3, 1982: 
SCHEV transmits off-campus study by SCHEV for Joint Legislative 
Audit and Review Commission dealing with VPI Extension). SCHEV has not emphasized continuing education since about 1980 (Dotolo, 
terview January 21, 1988). No meeting has been called of the 
mandated Continuing Education Advisory Committee since 1981. 
Recently SCHEV appointed the Instructional Professional Advisory 
Committee, composed of institutional academic vice presidents, to serve as the Continuing Education Advisory Committee in addition to its other duties. In the past year, SCHEV has initiated policies that would weaken the consortia (SCHEV, Report on Telecommunications from the Task Force on Telecommunications SCHEV, 1987). Therefore, continuing education was not considered an issue of great enough importance to have any attention given to it by the legislators, and a question was not included.
Appendix D Table 31

Frequency and Percentage Distribution
Coordination of Private Colleges (1975 Question 17)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>39.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>34.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N=108 (Hager, 1976, p. 111)

"The State Council of Higher Education should be extended the statutory authority to coordinate all private colleges in addition to its present responsibilities for the public sector" (Hager, 1976, p. 212).

Again, this did not appear to be an issue of concern during the past decade so it was not included in the 1988 survey. During these years, private colleges have received increased General Assembly appropriations for Tuition Assistance Grants (TAG) for each of Virginia student. I have observed two presentations to SCHEV on TAG and have discussed the question with private college representatives on several occasions. The private colleges seem pleased with the increasing TAGs; SCHEV appears pleased that the private colleges are serving thousands of Virginia students; and, judging by the increased appropriations, the General Assembly seems satisfied with the arrangement between public and private institutions of higher
education in Virginia. There is no apparent move to have SCHEV assume coordination of private colleges; therefore this question was not repeated.

Appendix D Table 32

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>24.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>51.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N=108 (Hager, 1976, p. 119)

"The State Council of Higher Education should be extended the statutory authority to approve or disapprove any organizational changes that fall currently within the internal management prerogatives of the state institutions of higher education" (Hager, 1976, p. 213).

In a review of the minutes of SCHEV 1977-78, I determined that there was no evidence of dissatisfaction with the current Code provisions concerning SCHEV's role in acknowledging but not approving/disapproving any organizational changes that fall currently within the internal management prerogatives of the state institutions of higher education. Since this is not an issue, the question was not
repeated in the 1988 survey.

**Additional Data from 1988 Research**

Appendix D Table 33

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>17.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral/No Response</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>45.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>33.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N=62

SCHEV's concept of its own power and influence with the General Assembly is consistent with reality.
### Appendix D Table 34

Frequency and Percentage Distribution  
SCHEV's Self-concept re General Assembly (1988 Question 22)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>27.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral/No Response</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>58.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N=62  
SCHEV underestimates its influence; legislators consider it more powerful than it seems to consider itself.

### Appendix D Table 35

Frequency and Percentage Distribution  
SCHEV's Self-concept re Governor & Sec. Education (1988 Question 23)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral/No Response</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>64.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>30.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N=62  
SCHEV's concept of its own power and influence with the Secretary of Education and the Governor is consistent with reality.
Appendix D Table 36

Frequency and Percentage Distribution
SCHEV's Self-concept re Governor and Sec. Education (1988 Question 24)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>29.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral/No Response</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>59.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N=62
SCHEV overestimates itself; its power and influence with the Governor and Secretary of Education is less than it seems to believe is true.

The questions concerning SCHEV's idea of its own power were not questions that most of the responding legislators felt interested in or qualified to answer. Responses were not adequate to analyze any of the four preceding questions.
Endnotes

1 Hager's questionnaire, designed and implemented as doctoral research in the School of Education at The College of William and Mary, is included in Appendix C.

2 "...no one is left in the Assembly from the study commission that recommended the major strengthening of the Council's legislation in 1974" (Davies, June, 1987, p. 7).

The General Assembly redistricting following the 1980 census gave more representation to rapidly growing urban areas; some seats were abolished causing more than usual turnover of legislators.

3 See Hager's questionnaire, Appendix C.
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The purpose of this study was to contribute to an understanding of the milieu in which higher education policy is formed in the United States, using the Commonwealth of Virginia as a case study seeking to explain the image and saga of its State Council of Higher Education. Virginia is an appropriate state upon which to focus because it is taking its place among the leading states in public higher education.

Although control of higher education policy now resides largely in the states and their statewide coordinating councils and governing boards, there is not a clear identity of any state's presence. This study was an attempt to determine if such an identity exists, and, if so, to describe it using a distinctive approach to the recent history of American higher education.

Papers, policy and position statements, documents and Council minutes of State Council of Higher Education for Virginia (SCHEV) from 1977 to 1987 were studied. Interviews were conducted with persons involved in higher education in the Commonwealth 1977 to 1987. To evaluate legislative opinion about SCHEV, a questionnaire was mailed to each member of the 1988-89 General Assembly and responses compared with those from a similar 1976 survey. Newspaper reports and news releases were analyzed.

It was hypothesized that the concept of organizational saga which Burton Clark developed to explain campus image and evolution is useful as a method of analyzing and describing a statewide coordinating council of higher education.

It was concluded that the Clark's concept of organizational saga fits the State Council of Higher Education for Virginia. As the story unfolded, it showed a formal organization with its own legend, with its own set of beliefs, and with pride in itself for major accomplishments in improving the state's system of higher education.

Further study is recommended on the appointment process by which lay persons fill positions on the higher education bodies, on measuring the effectiveness of statewide coordinating boards the the influence of their executive officers, on the construction of target budgets of the state system of higher education, and on the relationship between the State Council and the General Assembly.