

379
N81d
No. 128

THE EXTENT TO WHICH UPPER-LEVEL INSTITUTIONS
ARE UNIQUELY MEETING THE NEEDS OF PUBLIC
HIGHER EDUCATION IN TEXAS

DISSERTATION

Presented to the Graduate Council of the
North Texas State University in Partial
Fulfillment of the Requirements

For the Degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

By

Lawrence Ray Smith, B.A., M. Ed.

Denton, Texas

May 1978

© Copyright by
Lawrence Ray Smith

1978

Smith, Lawrence R., The Extent to Which Upper-Level Institutions are Uniquely Meeting the Needs of Public Higher Education in Texas. Doctor of Philosophy (Higher Education), May, 1978, 122 pp., 22 tables, 30 titles.

The problem with which this study was concerned was that of determining some of the ways and to what extent Texas upper-level universities in their academic units and the individual university as a whole have uniquely met the needs of public higher education in Texas.

The purpose of the study was to analyze and evaluate the extent to which the upper-level institutions are uniquely fulfilling their initial goals and purposes in specified areas. A questionnaire was developed to be used in the study. The questionnaire requested information concerning seven categories of data. They were (1) innovative or experimental programs, (2) planning curricula for minorities, (3) student advisement, (4) faculty evaluation, (5) faculty exchange programs, (6) transition for junior college/ community college graduates, and (7) fiscal procedures.

The questionnaire consisted of fifty-four questions which required one of these five responses:

1. All = if the academic units are totally involved.
2. Most = if the academic units are greatly involved.

3. Half = if the academic units are equally divided in involvement.
4. Few = if the academic units are somewhat involved.
5. None = if the academic units are not involved.

Academic units were defined as colleges or schools within the university.

Questionnaires were sent to the eight upper-level institutions and the twenty-three state universities in Texas. The data reflected returns from twenty-five of the thirty-one total subjects for an eighty-one percent (81%) return. The percentage of returns was calculated as follows: seventeen or seventy-four percent (74%) from the four-year universities and eight or one hundred (100%) from the upper-level institutions.

Mean scores and standard deviations were applied to each of the first thirty-eight questions. To secure these measures point values were given to each question. Percentages were applied to the sixteen Yes and No questions.

Chapter I contains the introduction to the study. Chapter II reviews the literature by giving information about the history, planning and development, and innovations pertaining to Texas and the upper-level institution. Chapter III describes the methods and procedures for analyzing the data. Chapter IV analyzes the data by looking at responses to each question, development of data, and comparison and

interpretation of data. In Chapter V are found the summary, findings, conclusions, implications, and recommendations.

It was concluded that upper-level universities are fulfilling their roles in innovative/experimental programs. However, as a group upper-level universities are not advancing any more rapidly toward meeting their initial goals and purposes than the four-year universities.

The data revealed in this study seemed to indicate that not all upper-level universities are uniquely meeting the needs of public higher education in Texas. In many instances the upper-level university does not differ from the four-year university. Though upper-levels may be doing more in some areas the significance lies in the fact that the four-years are contributing to the areas, also.

Some recommendations suggested included:

1. Upper-level universities should develop specific programs in their academic units.
2. Experimentation in educational methods and materials needs to be encouraged.
3. More faculty exchange is needed in the upper-level university.
4. More needs to be done to study curriculum, methods, transition from junior college/community college, and fiscal procedures.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
LIST OF TABLES	vi
Chapter	
I. INTRODUCTION	1
Statement of the Problem	
Purpose	
Research Questions	
Definition of Terms	
Limitations	
Basic Assumptions	
Summary	
II. REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE	15
Introduction	
History	
Planning and Development	
Innovations	
Texas and the Upper-Level Institution	
Summary	
III. METHODS AND PROCEDURES	51
Introduction	
Description of the Instrument	
Procedure for Collecting Data	
Procedures for Analysis of Data	
Summary	
IV. PRESENTATION OF DATA	59
Introduction	
Responses to Each Question	
Summary	
Development of Data	
Comparison and Interpretation of Data	
V. SUMMARY, FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS, IMPLICATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS	92
Introduction	
Summary	
Findings	

TABLE OF CONTENTS--Continued

Chapter	Page
Conclusions Implications Recommendations	
APPENDIX	103
BIBLIOGRAPHY	120

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
I. Frequency Distribution of Responses of Universities to Innovation or Experimental Programs	63
II. Frequency Distribution of Responses of Universities to Specific Efforts to Plan Curricula	67
III. Frequency Distribution of Responses of Universities to Student Academic Advisement	69
IV. Frequency Distribution of Responses of Universities to Faculty Evaluation Methods	70
V. Frequency Distribution of Responses of Universities to Faculty Exchange Programs	71
VI. Frequency Distribution of Responses of Universities to Providing Transition for Junior College/Community College Graduates	72
VII. Frequency Distribution of Responses of Universities to Unique Fiscal Procedures .	73
VIII. Mean Scores and Standard Deviations of Responses of Universities to Innovative or Experimental Programs	74
IX. Mean Scores and Standard Deviations of Responses of Universities to Specific Efforts to Plan Curricula	75
X. Mean Scores and Standard Deviations of Responses of Universities to Student Academic Advisement	76
XI. Mean Scores and Standard Deviations of Responses of Universities to Faculty Evaluation Methods	76

LIST OF TABLES--Continued

Table	Page
XII. Mean Scores and Standard Deviations of Responses of Universities to Faculty Exchange Programs	77
XIII. Percentage Breakdown of Responses of Universities to Innovative or Experimental Programs	78
XIV. Percentage Breakdown of Responses of Universities to Specific Efforts to Plan Curricula	79
XV. Percentage Breakdown of Responses of Universities to Student Academic Advisement . . .	79
XVI. Percentage Breakdown of Responses of Universities to Faculty Evaluation Methods . . .	80
XVII. Percentage Breakdown of Responses of Universities to Faculty Exchange Programs . . .	80
XVIII. Responses of Four-Year Universities to Providing Transition for Junior College/Community College Graduates	81
XIX. Responses of Upper-Level Universities to Providing Transition for Junior College/Community College Graduates	82
XX. Responses of Four-Year Universities to Unique Fiscal Procedures	84
XXI. Responses of Upper-Level Universities to Unique Fiscal Procedures	84
XXII. Percentage Breakdown of Values for Sections I-V of Four-Year and Upper-Level Universities	90

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Transformation of the traditional four-year state college into a multi-purpose state university has encouraged educational diversity. In some cases the differences have created new organizational structures.

The rapid growth of higher education enrollments in the early 1970's was one of the main reasons for creating different types of institutional organizations. One of these types, the upper-level college, has played a unique role by serving "career" program community college graduates in the commuter-oriented setting.

In Texas the upper-level institution was one of an entirely different nature from previous "preparatory" and "university" segments. In its 1972 publication "Upper-Level Institutions: A Report to the Texas Legislature," the Coordinating Board, Texas College and University System defined the upper-level institution as designed

to be in direct support of junior colleges and to provide educational experiences uniquely tailored to the needs of the junior college transfer student, as well as to other students who choose to change institutions after completion of their sophomore year (5, pp. 7-8).

In 1973 the Texas Coordinating Board was directed by the state Senate of the 63rd Legislature to conduct

. . . a study covering the requirements of postsecondary education in the State of Texas until 1980 for faculties, buildings, staff, programs, facilities, and other factors affecting the orderly growth and development of higher education . . . (4, p. 1).

Texas Higher Education 1968-1980 was the response to that request. As defined in the report the structure of the Texas higher education system included the following as the primary functions of upper-level institutions:

Provide junior, senior, and sometimes first-level graduate programs in direct support of regional community colleges, avoiding costly duplication of the first two years of college work. In general, programs are designed to prepare students for direct entry into occupational rather than research oriented professions (4, p. 8).

Robert A. Altman has noted that planning for the upper-level college is complicated by "the inability to assume the constant and direct flow of students from the sophomore to the junior years as occurs in a four-year college situation (1, p. 167)." In Texas it remains to be seen whether that type of flow has developed effectively. At best it is an assumption as to the number of junior college graduates at the upper-level college.

Such new directions and responsibilities as those mentioned above affect state centralization and new systems of academic organization. With the educational environment changing state colleges and universities must work to forge their available resources into a positive force for higher education. Texas has responded to this need by incorporating

an upper-level system considered vital to the future of higher education in this state.

The utilization of and need for upper-level institutions are [and will continue to be] major considerations of the Texas Coordinating Board. No present plans have been laid for new four-year institutions in Texas. Therefore, in the case of upper-level colleges the effective use of state resources must be assured.

Academic innovations also have created a new kind of structure. This has been motivated by the desire to serve in a better way than the traditional academic organizations. The development of innovations in these institutions needs to be explored in seeking an assessment of the productivity of this new form.

Statement of the Problem

The problem with which this study was concerned was that of determining some of the ways and to what extent Texas upper-level universities in their academic units (departments, schools, etc.) and the individual university as a whole have uniquely met the needs of public higher education in Texas.

Purpose

The purpose of the study was to analyze and evaluate the extent to which the upper-level institutions are uniquely fulfilling their initial goals and purposes in

such areas as (1) innovative or experimental programs, (2) program planning, (3) transition from junior/community colleges, (4) faculty exchange programs, (5) faculty evaluation, and (6) fiscal procedures. These areas are the ones emphasized in Coordinating Board reports and the professional literature.

Research Questions

1. Are upper-level institutions in Texas meeting their initial conceptual goals in program development and special programs?
2. How do the common elements in experimental programs in upper-level institutions compare with these same elements in the four-year institutions?
3. In the areas of academic advisement, evaluation, and exchange programs does faculty involvement differ significantly between upper-level and four-year institutions?
4. In what ways do both upper-level and four-year institutions utilize unique cost reduction techniques and how do the institutions differ?

Definition of Terms

For the purpose of this study the following definitions were formulated:

Academic units -- are basic disciplines of study, i.e. departments, schools, etc. within the university.

Four-year institution -- is any four-year senior

college or university of higher learning.

Multi-purpose university -- is a university that has taken on more comprehensive programs with more options, more diversity, and greater enrichment of programs.

Preparatory -- is course work that prepares one for a special purpose (art, languages, etc.) designed for a distinct type of student.

Unique -- is the description applied to upper-level institutions whose programs, according to the Coordinating Board, are distinct and exceptional when compared to the four-year institutions.

Upper-level center -- is a unit operated by a main campus; junior, senior, and graduate level work is offered.

Upper-level institution (upper-level college) -- is an institution, free-standing or otherwise, which offers courses on the junior, senior, and graduate levels, only.

Limitations

The study was limited to the senior universities of the Texas public system of higher education and to the following upper-level institutions and centers:

Institutions -- Corpus Christi State University

Texas Eastern University

University of Houston at Clear Lake City

University of Texas at Dallas

University of Texas of the Permian Basin

Centers ----- East Texas State University Center
 at Texarkana

Laredo State University

University of Houston Victoria Center

Higher education authorities used in the study were Chief Administrators of each of the aforementioned universities, upper-level institutions, and upper-level centers.

Basic Assumptions

It was assumed for the purpose of this study that the respondents could provide accurate data as to how their respective units had contributed to the higher education system of the state of Texas.

Background and Significance of the Study

The theory of having "preparatory" and "university" segments within the university was introduced nationally in the early twentieth century. Traditional four-year colleges responsive to the new approach were predominantly privately supported. The movement led to junior colleges and contributed to the establishment of the upper-level institution:

More important, later upper division institutions reflected changing social, industrial, and educational factors; with the rapidly expanding needs for baccalaureate education in the 1950's and 1960's, upper division institution appeared to develop as a logical conclusion to the existing system of publicly supported education (1, p. 158).

As American education saw the number of junior colleges

grow the upper-division institution gained numerically, also. It was in the 1950's that the theory began to be considered practical because it would

1. Provide spaces and appropriate programs for burgeoning numbers of community college graduates.

2. Meet needs of industry for qualified personnel.

3. Respond to growing political pressure for institutions to be established to serve the specific needs of geographically defined areas (5, p. 1).

In Texas the upsurge of the junior college movement caused demand for more spaces at the four-year institution. Community college enrollments in the state increased from about 62,000 in 1966 to more than 150,000 in 1971 (5, p. 1).

The 61st and 62nd Texas Legislatures authorized a total of seven new upper-level institutions to be created in Odessa, Midland, Dallas, Corpus Christi, Houston, Laredo, Texarkana, and Tyler. As part of a statewide system of public higher education Texas was getting involved in a new concept.

The 1972 Coordinating Board annual report made this observation:

To meet the needs of these new students in higher education, educational planners and legislators could (1) convert existing junior colleges into four-year institutions, which would duplicate the programs available in the two-year colleges, or (3) create a new kind of educational institution (5, p. 1).

This kind of educational institution was no exception

to politics. Pressure to convert two-year colleges, to create four-year institutions to serve area needs, to make land and facilities available -- all contributed to the option of establishing the upper-level institution in Texas.

Basically, the decision makers reasoned that the new upper-level system could

1. Provide an educational experience tailored to the needs of the junior college transfer student and the student who changes institutions at the junior year.

2. Encourage experimentation in educational methods and materials.

3. Offer programs that relate specifically to the needs of the local area.

4. Provide the depth of educational experience necessary for specialization in the junior and senior years of the baccalaureate program.

5. Provide an economically and educationally feasible alternative to the creation of four-year institutions in areas lacking in baccalaureate degree opportunities (5, p. 2).

The Coordinating Board, Texas College and University System felt that the impact of enrollments in the upper-level institutions would affect distribution of students during the remainder of the decade of the 1970's (4, p. 23). Sources of the majority of the students were to be the counties in which the institution is located and two-year colleges or contiguous counties (3, p. 8).

The establishment of the University of Texas at Dallas and The University of Texas of the Permian Basin came as the

result of acts of the 61st Legislature, Regular Session in 1969. The 62nd Legislature, Regular Session in 1971, established Texas A&I University at Corpus Christi, the University of Houston at Clear Lake City, and Tyler State College. Since 1971 two institutions have been redesignated. They are Texas A&I University at Corpus Christi, now Corpus Christi State University, and Tyler State College, now Texas Eastern University.

Basic characteristics regarding the operation of these five upper-level institutions are

They operate as separate, degree-granting universities, authorized to offer only junior, senior, and graduate level programs.

None has been in full operation for more than four years.

They are organized with a complete, well defined internal administrative structure, and either now have or are in the process of obtaining permanent campus facilities.

They receive appropriations from the Texas Legislature as individually designated agencies.

They are geographically located in the proximity of two-year colleges with a combined enrollment (Fall 1975) of approximately 10,000 or greater.

They are primarily commuter institutions. Students enrolled at these institutions are, on the average, taking fewer semester hours of work than the norm for all senior institutions.

Business administration, teacher education and liberal arts courses account for nearly all semester credit hours; except for UT

Dallas, where science enrollment is high (3, p. 4).

Texas A&I University at Laredo was established by the 61st Texas Legislature, Regular Session in 1969. This center is the only one of the upper-level centers which has statutory authority. Two other similar institutions were approved by the Coordinating Board in 1971. They were East Texas State University Center at Texarkana and the University of Houston Victoria Center. Both were established acting under authority of an Attorney General's opinion of March 31, 1969. But neither of these last two have the statutory authority that Laredo has.

The Laredo center has since been redesignated as Laredo State University. In 1970 this university was the first to accept undergraduate students. Laredo set the pattern for other units of the upper-level universities. Using the success of the Laredo center others have offered baccalaureate and master's degree opportunities in similar ways (5, p. 9).

Basic characteristics regarding the operation of the three upper-level centers are

All are located on the campus of a two-year college and lease facilities from that college and (in some cases) in the community.

They share library facilities with the two-year college; however, administrative arrangements vary from center to center.

They are somewhat geographically isolated, primarily dependent upon a single two-year college.

Students enrolled in these centers (and extension centers) are, on the average, enrolled in fewer semester hours of work than students at the five separate upper-level institutions.

Enrollees are basically part-time commuter students, many are dually enrolled at the on-campus two-year college. The heaviest class schedules are in the late afternoon or evening.

Teacher education accounts for 45% or more of all semester credit hours offered. A large part of these hours are at the master's level. Liberal arts and business administration are the other major programs offered (3, pp. 22-23).

A significant factor in consideration of the upper-level concept was the estimate of savings. This was to be realized through maintenance and operating costs, investment in physical plants, and avoiding duplication of costs in such areas as faculty, library and teaching supplies associated with the first two years of college (5, p. 9).

Some distinct advantages of upper-level institutions have been suggested by the Coordinating Board in their 1972 report to the Texas Legislature:

1. Where large numbers of junior college students are in an area which has limited baccalaureate degree opportunities, the upper-level institution provides an economically and educationally feasible alternative to the creation of four-year institutions which duplicate both facilities and programs of existing junior colleges.

2. The new institution also can be responsive to identified weaknesses in the traditional system of higher education.

3. The upper-level institution

concept is responsive to implementation of curricular reforms suggested by recent study groups.

4. The new upper-level institutions can be planned to meet new needs for specific concentrations in baccalaureate education (5, pp. 12-13).

Another advantage is that more entry and exit points are available in the educational system.

(1) Older persons who had to interrupt their educations can return to a collegiate environment void of the stigmas associated with the freshman and sophomore years. . . . Colleges seem to prefer older students because in most cases, they make wiser decisions concerning their curricula and their overall educational objectives than do traditional students. It might be added that as these older students are served, the average age will probably decrease over time.

(2) A student has the opportunity to re-evaluate his progress and objectives periodically and if he so chooses, can change his course of action instead of remaining locked into a four-year program. Many students who elect to change their majors in mid-stream at four-year institutions often find that they must spend an extra semester or even an extra year in college in order to do so (2, p. 2).

Organization and content of programs at the upper-level institution are planned to avoid narrow specialization and to encourage interdisciplinary merging of traditional liberal arts and professional preparation aspects of higher education.

The potential must be there for continued success. Educationally and economically there must be soundness. A study of this nature deserves serious consideration.

Summary

In Chapter I an introduction to the study has been presented. Additionally the problem, purpose, and research questions have been stated. Certain key terms have been given in the definition of terms. To establish which institutions will be involved in the study, limitations were defined. Also, basic assumptions relative to the individuals involved were indicated. Finally, a summary was included.

Chapter II of this study on the uniquenesses of upper-level institutions will review the literature and related research data. The concept of upper-level colleges is new and not much has been written. Most of that which has been done on the uniquenesses of upper-level institutions is brief, but important to the history of the concept. Chapter III will describe methods and procedures used to secure data for the study. Contained in the chapter will be the results and information pertaining to the pilot study done earlier. Chapter IV will analyze the results statistically by looking at responses to each question, development of data, and comparison and interpretation of data. In Chapter V will be the summary, findings, conclusions, implications, and recommendations.

CHAPTER BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Altman, Robert A., The Upper Division College, San Francisco, Jossey-Bass Inc., 1970.
2. Shell, Helene I., A Profile of Upper-Level Colleges, Washington, D.C., ERIC Clearinghouse on Higher Education, 1973.
3. Study of Upper-Level Institutions and Off-Campus Educational Units of Public Universities, Coordinating Board, Texas College and University System, Austin, 1976.
4. Texas Higher Education 1968-1980, Coordinating Board, Texas College and University System, Austin, 1975.
5. Upper-Level Institutions: A Report to the Texas Legislature, Coordinating Board, Texas College and University System, Austin, 1972.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

Introduction

Past efforts to improve higher education led to many changes in the structure of the university. One of these changes was the development of the upper-level university, a new type of institution of higher learning. Within the college of earlier years the movement to separate preparatory from university work contributed to the establishment of the upper-level institution:

More important, later upper division institutions reflected changing social, industrial, and educational factors; with the rapidly expanding needs for baccalaureate education in the 1950's and 1960's, upper division institution [sic] appeared to develop as a logical conclusion to the existing system of publicly supported education (1, p. 158).

A review of the literature indicated the relative newness of upper-level institution studies. The literature related various aspects of the movement. Among them were the problems created by changing enrollment patterns.

The student interested in higher education was no longer hindered by distance or opportunity. Even the older student could stay "home" and achieve what once might have taken major sacrifices of the family life and finances. Universities have found the enrollment patterns totally different today

than in the past. The 1973 Carnegie Commission's Priorities for Action stated,

Enrollments of "traditional" students will most likely decline on established campuses in the 1980's and subsequently advance more with, than so rapidly ahead of, the growth of the American population (17, p. 4).

The Coordinating Board, Texas College and University System felt that the impact on enrollments of the upper-level institutions would affect distribution of students during the remainder of the decade of the 1970's (24, p. 23). Sources of the majority of the Texas students were the counties in which the institution was located and two-year colleges or contiguous counties (23, p. 8). All this has led to serious thinking about upper-level institutions and what they can accomplish.

History

Shell (21) in her research indicates that in the 1850's the first truly upper-level institution was formed. This was the University of Georgia, first known as Franklin College. The college converted from a four-year to a two-year institution for primarily financial reasons resulting from an enrollment drop.

Plans to create other such institutions were drawn up across the country as early as 1864. However, none appeared successful until 1935. It was then that the College of the Pacific eliminated the first two years. Later, the college reinstated the freshman and sophomore years. But, for some

sixteen years this was an upper-level college in Stockton, California.

When the history of the upper-level institution is considered, it is necessary to return to 1892 and the opening of the University of Chicago. President William Rainey Harper, an outstanding contributor to the university scene, had established a new "model" American institution. Frederick Rudolph's The American College and University states that Chicago divided the traditional four college years into two equal parts. This first was to be the junior college or academic college. Emphasis here was collegiate and preparatory. The second part was to be the senior college or the university college. This emphasis was to be advanced and scholarly. It would be a university where major and minor studies permitted the student to pursue a subject in depth while devoting less time to another (19, p. 351).

An important contribution to the literature is the work by Altman (1). This book is one of the more extensive works. It is a study of the establishment in the United States of the upper division college. Altman relates a history of attempts to alter the four-year baccalaureate degree structure in higher education. The study documents and traces the development of upper division colleges in a larger context than other contributions in higher education literature.

Chronologically, Altman's chapters are guides of the movement. Chapters One and Two record the period when

William W. Folwell (Minnesota Plan), William Rainey Harper (University of Chicago), David Starr Jordan (Stanford University), and Tully C. Knoles (College of the Pacific) had urged the "bisection of the baccalaureate." These four men advocated the separation of the first two years from the upper two years.

In another chapter Altman comments on the period of time when major changes influenced educational thought throughout the nation. This period was during the war years. Again, the University of Chicago promoted a new plan. President Robert M. Hutchins proposed that Chicago and all institutions of higher education offer the baccalaureate degree at the close of the traditional sophomore year of college (1, p. 56). Altman wrote,

Hutchins' basic reasoning was simple and was logically derived from the steps taken previously in the reorganization of the University of Chicago. Hutchins was concerned, as was Johnson at the New School, with providing a liberal education; Hutchins' reasoning, however, was more closely related to that of Jordan at Stanford or Knoles at the College of the Pacific. Following the reorganization of 1931 and 1933, Hutchins concluded, probably correctly, that the liberal education function of most colleges was concluded by the end of the sophomore year, at which point the student began his specialization, or university, work. "An institution which wishes to disentangle the university and the college must fix the point at which the college ends and the university begins," Hutchins wrote, "in conformity to some notion of the aim of collegiate as distinguished from university work" (1, p. 57).

Before 1950 alternative organizational patterns were suggested by educational questions asking what to do about

the appropriate structure of a baccalaureate program, what about the distinction to be made between university and nonuniversity work, and what is considered the best point for dividing the baccalaureate experience among various levels of institutions (1, p. 68)? But the years following 1950 saw the emphasis of the public junior college system and its rapid expansion. This made the alternate patterns difficult to organize.

Given the two-year junior college and a growing demand for more baccalaureate degrees, planners turned to new questions involving the best way to provide for the industrial and educational needs of their communities. In several instances, answers to these new questions pointed to the same organizational pattern arrived at by those considering the earlier questions in Stockton, New York, and Chicago: the upper division college (1, p. 68).

Also, Altman reviews the various attempts and successes of the upper division college. As his book was published in 1970, the history of the movement is not yet fully recorded. Since 1969 Texas alone has had five free-standing institutions and three centers added.

In his conclusions Altman states two real dangers to the upper division college:

Most upper division institutions have also encountered difficulty because of their inability to offer lower division courses which are often needed as prerequisites for further study or are desired simply as general education options during a student's normal upper division studies. To a great extent, this difficulty is less real than perceived, as there is no reason why an

upper division institution cannot offer certain lower division courses; in fact, some programs such as language, music, and other fine arts do not lend themselves to the preparatory-professional dichotomy on which the upper division institution is predicated but require a parallel availability of both general and specialized courses throughout the four years of collegiate study.

Perhaps the greatest danger to those upper division institutions now in operation lies within the concern over enrollment. Admittedly, most upper division institutions have failed to meet the initial enrollment projections; this failure, however, may be due to any number of factors, of which "upper divisionness" is only one (1, pp. 168-169).

Emphasized was the caution to use careful planning in developing the institutions. Reduction in enrollment can be overcome through such innovative practices as faculty exchange programs. This allows the upper division faculty to teach at other institutions. Some of the advantages include increasing faculty utilization and improving the drawing power of upper-level institutions among junior college students who have the benefits of the exchange program.

Planning and Development

The planning and development of a concept undergo many studies and considerations. The community college went through extensive development stages and upper-level institutions benefitted.

Sames in his publication "The Upper-Level Universities and the Community Colleges" advances the following idea:

The difficulties in which the community college system found itself in curricular development and in the admission of its graduates to upper-division work was the principal reason why some states established upper-level universities. These upper-division institutions were established to serve as partners with the community colleges and, through co-operative effort, to give direction to themselves and to the community colleges (20, p. 351).

Sames refers to this coupling of the community college system with upper-division institutions as a third alternative system of higher education. He places it with the traditional liberal arts and land-grant universities (20, p. 351). Woolf (27) goes even further. He states that a chief advantage is keeping intact the operations and philosophy of the community college.

It is assumed that upper level colleges would be established only in regions with fully developed community colleges. A primary mission of community colleges is to offer a broad range of academic, occupational, technical, and continuing education programs. Any institutional developments which undermine this philosophy would be counter to the best public interest and purpose. It is doubtful whether a community college could become a bachelor's degree granting institution without losing the essential community college complexion. Therefore, creation of an upper level college with its freedom from traditional structure is more feasible when demand for senior colleges becomes strong (27, p. 2).

In her national study Shell (21) notes several major advantages of the upper-level institutions. Among them are these two:

(1) Older persons who had to interrupt their educations can return to a collegiate environment void of the stigmas associated with the freshman and sophomore years.

(2) A student has the opportunity to reevaluate his progress and objectives periodically and if he so chooses, can change his course of action instead of remaining locked into a four year program. (21, p. 2).

Too, Shell writes about some of the problems of upper-level institutions:

- (1) the problems associated with attracting a sufficient number of students; and
- (2) the problem of providing courses for students with deficiencies or students wishing to change their majors (21, p. 3).

Reflecting on her study and experience she realizes the importance of good planning. Her recommendations for planning upper-level institutions include

- (1) Make a realistic assessment of potential enrollment. . . . Enrollment ceilings may be raised year by year as admission applications increase.
- (2) Plan the site of the upper-level institution near an area of need. Metropolitan areas are generally in more need of educational institutions than small towns simply by virtue of the great numbers of people located in cities.
- (3) Make the admission process as easy as possible. Credit should be readily accepted from the colleges from which the students are transferring, and credit should be accepted for life experiences.
- (4) Match curricular offerings with the needs and interests of junior college students.
- (5) Plan academic programs that promote the proper utilization of faculty members. Faculty

exchange programs among various area colleges can be highly beneficial to an institution. In addition, the upper-level institution offers an opportunity for using nontraditional professors, such as practitioners in various fields who can give students more first-hand experience than can many academics (21, p. 4).

J. B. Culpepper, former Commissioner of Higher Education in Florida, speaking before the International Conference on The Upper-Level University/Junior College Partnership in 1970 stated certain assumptions that are used to decide the planning and development of the upper-level undergraduate institution. He remarked that there was a need to avoid unnecessary duplications. He encouraged location of the institutions be in heavily populated areas because of the clear need for additional upper-level educational offerings (18, p. 11).

In addition to his commissioner's role, Culpepper has had experience with the upper-level institution through association with Florida Atlantic University. Two assumptions made by him stressed university services and physical aspects of buildings.

The upper-level institution is not designed to provide all university services for all people but rather to provide offerings in those disciplines and programs with heaviest enrollment where there is greatest demand. Programs having heaviest enrollments such as business administration, teacher education, and arts and sciences (those are the pre-professional and liberal arts programs) should be points of beginning. Other offerings such as technology, engineering science, and the master's degree in areas of need may be authorized

when there is justification.

The location of the site and construction of buildings and facilities will take into account that a large percentage of the students will commute, though it is recognized that the service area of the new institution will be sufficiently broad to warrant some housing for students (18, p. 11).

At this same conference Altman commented in an address that the upper-level universities will remain predominantly public and most of them will be located in two states.

One of them is Florida, which will probably peak with four institutions in a couple of years. The other is Texas which, if it gets the two additional upper-level institutions it is talking about, will also have four by the middle of the next decade (18, p. 81).

Innovations

Freedom from historical traditions and structures allows the upper-level institution to be more unusual and to use innovative methods. Shell states: "Since the upper-level college is a relatively new concept in the United States, it has the opportunity to form its own philosophy with relation to curriculum offerings, degree requirements, grading procedures, facilities innovation, and educational administration (21, p. 2)."

Also, Shell mentions several universities that serve specific areas of programs, special emphases, and similar conceptual approaches.

Florida Atlantic University primarily focuses on the study and development of

innovative instructional media and technology; Florida International University concentrates on urban affairs and inter-American studies; and the University of North Florida has as its main thrust the study of commerce, local and international trade, civic affairs, and transportation (21, p. 2).

She singles out the University of Texas of the Permian Basin because of the completely flexible classroom buildings and other features. The buildings are equipped with snap-panels that permit a meeting room any size within minutes.

Other unique facilities featured at UTPB include flexible laboratories, classrooms equipped with student response systems that permit the student to push a button at his desk that indicates at the lectern whether he understands the instruction and a fully automated and computerized library (21, p. 3).

Lewis B. Mayhew very briefly examines Florida Atlantic University's approach to uniqueness and innovation. The idea behind the movement is that the more mature student will be the result of not having a freshman or sophomore program. Florida Atlantic planned to make much use of independent study. "It will also give major attention to the use of the new media and technology in teaching and learning. Its learning resources center will serve as a core unit in the instructional process (6, p. 18)."

Charles E. Perry (15) in writing about Florida International University states the reason for this institutions' opening as an upper-level university was primarily due to the high quality of academic programs offered by community colleges

in that region (15, p. 9). The organization involved in planning might account for this feeling. For instance, coordinating councils were established early to work with several community colleges in the FIU area. Together they were to determine curriculum needs and assure proper articulation and coordination. Also, similar councils were established with area private colleges and universities.

Crowson and others (10) write about the University of Texas at Dallas. UTD has developed one of the more innovative plans used in upper-level institutions. Crowson, et al emphasize that the UTD innovative plan was not innovative merely for the sake of innovation.

The basic plan evolved as a result of (1) careful consideration of the mandate of the Legislature, (2) subsequent compilation of relevant objectives commensurate with both the mandate and the requirements and pressures of today's and tomorrow's educational process and, finally, (3) the development of a plan designed to meet such objectives in an optimal manner within reasonable resource constraints (10, p. 2).

The basic underlying goal will provide for:

- (1) disciplinary integrity within an interdisciplinary context;
- (2) the establishment of meaningful relationships between the student's specific curriculum and the entire world of work and ideas; and
- (3) a reduction in the scale of the undergraduate program, as it relates to the individual student, so that personalization occurs in a process which has in too many cases undergone severe de-personalization (10, p. 2).

At UTD the combination of program budgeting, interdisciplinary activity, and undergraduate cluster cell features was designed to depart from traditional academic organizations.

1. The University of Texas at Dallas will literally be a university without traditional colleges, schools, and departments.
2. . . . units comprised of faculty disciplines with basic cohesion encouraged by common scholarly interests, not budgetary considerations.
3. All budgeting will be accomplished along program lines.
4. Graduate programs . . . will be administered by Graduate Program Heads with budget.
5. Undergraduate programs leading to a degree . . . will be administered through cluster colleges headed by college masters and staffed by an interdisciplinary college faculty. The college master will have a budget.
6. Each undergraduate college will have a small (10 to 15 member) college faculty associated with it. The college faculty will assist the master in implementing the programs aimed at fulfilling the personal and educational goals of the students in the college. The principal teaching duty of the college faculty will be to offer a four-semester interdisciplinary seminar intended to relate the student's major to the entire world of work and ideas. Thus, a student will take his interdisciplinary seminar within his own college and from his college faculty. He will have many of his other courses from faculty other than his college faculty. Each member of a college faculty will be expected, beyond his responsibility in the interdisciplinary seminar, to teach in his own discipline,

to be heavily involved with academic advising, and to participate in the co- and extra-curricular life of the college with which he is associated. In this connection, it should be noted that only about 80 to 100 of a 1975 faculty of 200 will be a part of a college faculty (10, pp. 3-4).

This combination was planned to avoid the negative aspects of mass education (10, p. 7).

Ted F. Andrews and Peter Fenner (2) have written two articles dealing with organization and structure of science programs at Governors State University in Illinois. The university encourages experimental-innovative practices:

Centralized-Decentralized Concept. Instructional support such as student services, counseling, academic advising, library services, research and evaluation, and cooperative education are centrally coordinated but are decentralized into the respective colleges to effect the most direct influence on and be responsive to the needs of students.

Learning Modules. Instructional materials are packaged into learning modules, which are vehicles for direct faculty-student contact. Learning modules vary in form, time for completion, credit, and mode of instruction. The instructional objectives of a module are expressed in performance terms that are measurable. The objectives may be faculty developed or student-faculty developed.

Competency-Based Instruction. All components of the instructional system have stipulated competencies that a student is expected to demonstrate before being awarded a degree.

Instructional Systems Paradigm. The university has developed the ISP to serve as a guide for all curriculum development and instruction in the university. The ISP assists faculty and students alike in relating the expected competencies in a learning module to the expected competencies of the area of

emphasis; the area of emphasis competencies to those specified for the instructional program; and the instructional program competencies to the mandates, goals, and objectives of the university. (Governors State University, 1973, Instructional Systems Paradigm).

Interdisciplinary-Intercollegiate Study. All curricular elements are interdisciplinary. It is also expected that students take 20 to 25 percent of their work in colleges other than the one in which they are based.

Year-Round Calendar. The university has a 12-months academic year, consisting of six sessions, each of two months, duration. Students normally may enroll for up to eight units of credit each session. Six units is considered a full load.

Professional Work Plan Agreement. Each university professor completes a PWPA in cooperation with the appropriate dean. The PWPA states the intention of the faculty member to participate in direct instruction, curriculum development, research activities, community services, and professional services. The PWPA is usually prepared annually in September, but may be amended any time during the year by mutual agreement of faculty member and dean. The PWPA is used as a guide in peer appointments to tenured positions.

Student Evaluation and Transcripts. Students are evaluated on essentially a continuing basis by their instructors, using many traditional and nontraditional means in order to verify that they have achieved the specified competencies. When the competency is achieved, it is recorded on the student's transcript. The transcript is a computer printout listing title of learning module, units of credit earned, and the competencies achieved. There are no grades on the transcript; no pass/fail notations; and no indications of work attempted, but not completed (2, pp. 19-20).

These approaches were valuable studies for future institutions. Some of what Texas has incorporated into its upper-level system has been due to the successful endeavors

of such institutions as this one.

The transfer from a two-year to an upper-division university presents several problems. In his report Warren W. Willingham discusses ten major transfer problems:

(1) Principal among these is the need to maintain articulated curricula across the two institutions. There are also unique problems of (2) guidance at the junior college and (3) orientation at the senior college. (4) Admission procedures and (5) academic standards for transfer students pose special problems of accessibility since these students are typically moving through an open-door college into a more selective, upper-division program. An especially visible problem characterizing transfer admissions is that of (6) properly recognizing previously earned credit. A much less visible problem is that of (7) monitoring the flow of transfer students in a state to determine whether the higher education system is operating as the state intended. Increasing numbers of community college transfers create a special need for (8) financial aid and (9) institutional space beyond normal allotments for freshmen. Finally, (10) special mechanisms must be set up to maintain these various forms of articulation (26, p. 8).

Authorities on upper-level institutions emphasize upper division institutions as the most reasonable alternative in meeting the overall space need resulting from the junior college transfer (26, p. 40). In other words, the competition with other institutions in quotas, admission procedures, etc. is lessened through a transfer to the upper-level institution. Briefly, Willingham summarizes the ten transfer problems thus:

Curriculum Articulation

One basic problem in curriculum articulation is the fact that students from one junior college fan out to several senior

institutions that may have different graduation requirements for the same degree, and the student may not be able to anticipate the college to which he will transfer. Another fundamental problem is the fact that the junior college answers to two masters: its own unique educational commitment and its responsibility to prepare transfer students.

Guidance at the Community College

Adequate counseling of students prior to transfer remains a serious problem hampered by inadequate information at the junior college. Important problems that students encounter in transferring seem traceable to their not being informed early about admission and financial aid procedures.

Orientation at the Senior College

There is widespread agreement that efforts to orient the transfer student to the 4-year college are often inadequate and ineffective.

Diverse Admission Procedures

Admission practices vary a great deal among institutions. This variation is important for students to understand because it often reflects basically different conditions for student transfer.

Diverse Academic Standards

A drop in students' grades after transfer seems largely due to a grade differential typically found between 2- and 4-year colleges. This differential varies widely among pairs of colleges as does the transfer attrition rate.

Credit - The Persistent Question

The matter of transferable credit always raises a variety of specialized questions. Most senior institutions now accept D grades, credit policies are generally liberalized. But as institutions move to generous credit allowances and acceptance of formula plans, the critical question becomes not how much credit is awarded but how many courses are required for graduation.

Access/Retention - The Salient Problem

There is amazingly little data on what proportions and what sorts of students transfer from junior to senior college, even though such information is critical in evaluating the operation of higher education systems.

The Need for Aid

Inadequate financial aid for transfer students continues to be one of the most serious problems in transfer articulation.

The Need for Space

. . . But in all periods there seems to be the continuing threat of localized inadequate space for expanding cadres of transfer students.

Articulation Procedures

There is wide variation from state to state in the procedures that have been established to develop and maintain articulation. These procedures have tended to develop on an ad hoc basis; they are not yet routinized in many states, though there is evidence of steady progress (26, pp. 47-51).

In his document on curriculum and credit transfer problems Robert Marsh (14) also suggests ways to alle-

viate transfer problems between upper-level institutions and "sister institutions." This particular problem dealing especially with junior colleges seems to be one of the more serious ones because of the transition phase. Many questions arise involving the articulation process. Marsh suggests some ways to relieve the problems:

1. The philosophy of an upper division school plays an important role. For most students, upper division institutions should be a capstone in their educational process. Credit should readily be accepted from the junior colleges. The upper level institutions should be primarily liberal arts and graduate level schools serving students transferring from a dozen or so junior colleges. Careful thought should be given to those programs that depend heavily on lower division courses that are highly specialized and technical in nature. An example of this would be engineering programs or certain foreign languages. Strength should be in the social sciences, psychology, business and education.
2. The upper level institution should accept graduates from the junior colleges that have earned the Associate of Arts or Associate of Science degree. There should be no quibbling about whether this course or that course counted. Let us assume that the junior college has done its job well in educating the student.
3. Consideration must be given to the upper level colleges to students transferring credit from junior and/or senior colleges. Ordinarily, we would expect 90 quarter hours or 60 semester hours at the freshman-sophomore level. Again, schools must not get tied down to accrediting individual courses. . . . The colleges must not say he has to have 3 quarter hours of Music or Math 104.

4. Upper level schools must reconsider the premise that a student must have 90 quarter hours for admission regardless of his previous educational, social or work background. Tests are now on the market which can help us in deciding whether a person has the educational pre-requisites to do senior college work. If he can do senior college work, why penalize him by requiring two years at the freshman-sophomore level and then more years at the junior-senior level (14, pp. 1-4).

Marsh touches on another area of consideration - that of transfer between schools at the upper-division level. The real heart of his discussion centers on residency requirements. In essence, he asks why have a residency when it is immaterial whether the person is there for a year or not. As Marsh notes, "I really doubt that schools are that much unique and different, especially the state universities at the junior-senior college level (14, p. 4)."

In a pamphlet published by the Association of Upper Level Colleges and Universities in November, 1971, the question "What are the main advantages of an upper-level institution?" is raised. It was answered primarily emphasizing the junior college transfer. The following is of particular interest:

The upper level institution -- by concentrating its efforts and resources on the education of the transfer students -- can provide an educational program uniquely suited to their needs, while minimizing the "shock" which often accompanies transfer to a traditional four-year institution. The students at this type of institution have already undergone the principal sifting and sorting and are more mature and more highly motivated. Therefore,

more individual attention is both feasible and justified (5, pp. 4-5).

J. Marvin Higbee (11) responds to the problem of transfer of students from junior or community colleges to upper-level universities. His "Upper Division Colleges: An End to Transfer Hurdle" presents a series of advantages of upper-level universities which benefit the transfer student:

1. If there are large numbers of junior college students in an area where opportunities for further education are limited, the upper level school provides an economically and educationally feasible alternative to the creation of four-year institutions which duplicate both facilities and programs of existing junior colleges.

2. Developing upper level institutions can look at higher education in a more responsive manner and identify weakness in the traditional system. This is especially true of the upper division work presently being done at four-year colleges and universities throughout the country. Innovation that is being attempted in higher education in America is generally at the lower division or junior college level. Presently, very little is being done to study curriculum, teaching methodology, and the management of learning at the upper division or graduate level.

3. New upper level institutions can be planned to meet needs for specific concentration in baccalaureate education and thus partially eliminate the cost and pain that often accompany change.

4. "The upper level institution can be more responsive to local needs and serve as a means of direct entry into occupations rather than research oriented professions" (11, p. 46).

Even more advantages are offered in another section of the

same article:

1. Curricular programs in the upper level institution are developed primarily with the junior college transfer in mind. . . . we have spent a considerable amount of time working with junior college administrators, faculty, and students in developing our academic and student services programs so that the programs can more effectively meet the needs of the transfer student.

2. The academic program is designed to fit "hand in glove" with that of the junior college. Therefore, the transfer can make the transition with a minimum loss of time, credit, money, and emotion.

3. At the upper level institution there is no competition with people who have already been there two years. All students start even, academically, socially, and in the area of student services.

4. The faculty at the upper level institution is positively oriented to the transfer student. His attitude toward the transfer student is not affected by his commitment to the native student.

5. A curricular tolerance exists at the upper level institution that is often not possible at the traditional four-year institution. The upper level school is able to be much more flexible in accepting transfer credit than most four-year institutions.

6. Upper level institutions like junior colleges are primarily teaching oriented. Students are not thrown into classes taught by a teaching assistant as is often the case in traditional four-year schools. This does not mean there will not be research. Research is important because it gives life to teaching process. Junior college transfer students will feel more comfortable in this type of atmosphere.

7. Instruction can be tailored to be optimal for the transfer student (11, pp. 46-48).

As has been emphasized many times the primary purpose

for the creation of upper-level institutions was to meet the demands of junior college transfers and not duplicate efforts and facilities in the four-year institutions. In this respect Wayne Thomas, former chairman of the Coordinating Board, Texas College and University System, suggested,

that the creation of the upper-level institution seemed to fulfill needs created by urbanization, technology and changing life styles. These institutions have offered not only accessibility but also diversity. The growth and development of upper-level institutions would depend partially on their success in articulating with community colleges and also in their ability to assume major leadership roles in meeting the demands created by a future-oriented society, with its dwindling energy resources, and an entirely different American life style (20, pp. 352-353).

Texas and the Upper-Level Institution

During the years 1969 through 1972 the Coordinating Board, Texas College and University System had recommended planning funds for establishment of eight new upper-level institutions. These institutions were to offer junior, senior, and sometimes master's work. Their creation has resulted in extension of needed baccalaureate opportunities.

The 1972 Annual Report of the Coordinating Board comments on the results of a study of upper-level institutions.

Results of the study of upper-level institutions indicate that the State of Texas would realize an immediate savings of more than \$150 million as a result of implementing seven upper-level rather than

four-year institutions. (When the study was conducted, the University of Houston had not received approval to establish its Victoria Center.) In addition to the lump-sum savings, the state would realize additional savings in maintenance and operating cost of more than \$4 million each year. The study concluded, "It is obvious that savings will result from not duplicating faculty, library, and teaching supplies and equipment for the first two years of college work." Upper-level institutions are designed to complement and take advantage of the excellent public community junior college facilities and programs that exist in Texas (3, p. 6).

This same 1972 report expresses concern about the continued expansion of upper-level centers. The interest centered on pressure to convert them to free-standing universities. This, the report feels, "could lead to a proliferation of efforts and costly duplication (3, p. 6)."

At the time of the 1973 Annual Report there was fear of overexpansion and loss of quality in present programs should more four-year universities be created. Thus, the emphasis on transition from community colleges to upper-level institutions was suggested. Further, no new institutions were to be created pending a study of the needs of higher education in Texas.

Through adoption of Senate Resolution 209, the Texas Senate in March 1973 declared a temporary moratorium on "creation of new public senior colleges or universities and upper-level colleges, branches or centers of public senior colleges, universities, or junior colleges, as well as the expansion of any existing upper-level college, branch, or center into four-year institutions," pending completion of the

Board's re-evaluation of the Texas system of higher education (4, p. 4).

Prior to this the upper-level institution was being considered by the Texas Legislature. The movement received its first real impetus in 1965. This came in the form of the publication Challenge for Excellence (7). It is the result of the following mandate from the Texas Legislature to the Coordinating Board:

To establish in the field of public higher education in the State of Texas an agency to provide leadership and coordination for the Texas higher education system, institutions and governing boards, to the end that the State of Texas may achieve excellence for efficient and effective utilization and concentration of all available resources and the elimination of costly duplication in program offerings, faculties and physical plants (7, p. 3).

Thus, the seed was planted for conceptualizing some new type of institution of higher learning.

Because the enrollment was continuing to increase at the time and because the Coordinating Board desired to effectively and efficiently increase the rising level of excellence in higher education a "Blueprint for Progress in Higher Education" was developed. Alternatives listed in this publication are suggested to meet the problem of planning senior college and university growth:

1. Existing senior colleges and universities could be allowed to expand their enrollments to the totals required.
2. The state could contract with private colleges to add to their enrollments and

help accommodate new students of the future.

3. Enrollments could be stabilized and new senior units planned (7, p. 11).

One theme the Coordinating Board continues to emphasize is that of stabilizing enrollment. "To allow existing institutions to grow without limitation would be to ossify a process which deters institutions from emphasizing academic excellence because they remain in a state of enrollment increase crisis (7, p. 11)." Some of these deterrents to the higher educational system of Texas include

It causes college and university leaders such concern with annual enrollment increases that they cannot devote appropriate energy to the careful development of student programs.

It prohibits careful development of faculty involvement in academic life of studied evaluation of faculty performance and faculty needs because the frenzied recruitment and minimal orientation of new faculty in large numbers erode time and effort for other undertakings.

It prohibits stabilization of existing curricula, acquiring sufficient equipment, and maintaining adequate library acquisition levels.

It keeps a campus in a continuous upheaval of construction, renovation, and land acquisition in a hectic effort to keep up (7, pp. 11-12).

The above factors were stressed because of the need to thrust the higher education system into a viable movement for educational quality. In Challenge for Excellence the following recommendations pertaining to upper-level institutions, the Legislature and the Governor are made:

4. (a) That there be authorized in 1969, for an initial enrollment in September, 1973, of 800 students, an institution to be located in the Midland-Odessa area, designed to accept only junior, senior and master's collegiate level men and women; and that the public junior colleges in Odessa and Big Spring be expected to enlarge their college transfer classes in direct support of the new upper-level senior institution.

The Midland-Odessa upper-level college is expected to be primarily a commuter-type institution, especially in its relationship to Odessa Junior College. The governing board of the new upper-level college may, however, deem it wise to approve dormitories for students who would otherwise have a commuting distance of more than seventy-five miles per day.

(b) That the upper-division, master's level senior institution in the Midland-Odessa area be placed under a separate governing board.

5. (a) That there be authorized in 1969, for an initial enrollment in September, 1973, of 2,200 men and women students, a second campus of the University of Houston, to be located in the Houston metropolitan area primarily as an institution serving commuter students and offering programs from the freshman year through the master's degree.

(b) That there be authorized in 1971, for an initial enrollment in September, 1977, of 1,800 students, a third campus of the University of Houston, to be located in the Houston metropolitan area, designed as a commuter-type institution to accept only junior, senior and graduate collegiate level men and women, in direct support of Houston area junior colleges.

(c) That the two proposed new units in Houston be made campuses of the University of Houston and be administered by that institution's governing board.

6. (a) That there be authorized in 1969, for an initial enrollment in September, 1974, of 1,000 students, an institution to be located

in the Corpus Christi area, designed to accept only junior, senior and master's collegiate level men and women; and that Del Mar and Bee County Junior Colleges be expected to enlarge their college transfer classes in direct support of the new upper-level institution.

The Corpus Christi upper-level college is expected to be primarily a commuter-type institution, especially in its relationship with Del Mar Junior College. The governing board of the new college, however, may deem it wise to approve dormitories for students who would otherwise have a commuting distance of more than seventy-five miles per day.

(b) That the upper-division, master's level senior institution in Corpus Christi be placed under a separate governing board.

7. In regard to the North Texas area:

(c) (i) That there be authorized in 1969, for an initial enrollment in September, 1973, of 1,800 students, an upper-level senior institution to be located in the Dallas metropolitan area, primarily to serve commuter students and offering programs only for junior, senior, and graduate level men and women.

The college is to be in direct support of the Dallas and Tarrant County Junior College Systems. . . .

(ii) That the upper-division, master's level senior institution in Dallas be placed under a separate governing board.

(d) To insure the orderly growth and development of all public institutions of higher education in the North Texas area and to comply with the mandate of Subsection (3), Section 10, of the Higher Education Coordinating Act of 1965, which requires the Board to "classify, and prescribe the role and scope for, each public institution of higher education in Texas and make such changes in classification or role of such institution as it deems necessary," that institutions will be assigned roles and scopes as follows: . . .

(1) Institutions under the governance of

The University of Texas System Board of Regents:
. . .

(iii) The new upper-division institution in Dallas.

The new upper-division, master's level unit in Dallas will be developed initially with emphasis on the arts and sciences through the master's level. It will be developed as a strong liberal arts college at the junior, senior, and master's levels and will offer business administration through the bachelor's level (7, pp. 14-21).

Preceding the publication of Challenge for Excellence in 1969, the Coordinating Board issued Policy Paper 4 "Public Senior College Development in Texas to 1980." Much of what is set forth can be found in Challenge for Excellence. The 1969 Policy Paper contains an appendices section which the later publication does not have. Appendix B "The Nature and the Role of an Upper-Division Institution" has this paragraph in it:

While recognizing the integral part that research plays in all learning, the upper-division institution emphasizes teaching and encourages experimentation in educational methods and materials related specifically to the local situation. Special attention is given to student counseling and the design of individual study programs to meet the needs of all transfer students, regardless of their educational origin (16, p. 21).

Even before the first upper-level institution, Texas A&I-Laredo, was fully conceived the ideas were in print as to the role of the upper-level institution in Texas. It is interesting to note the emphases on experimental methods and materials, student counseling, and needs of transfer students.

Billy Cowart, now President of Laredo State University, and F. Allen Briggs (9) presented a report about the first upper-level college in the state, formerly Texas A&I-Laredo. In the brief history such topic areas as community involvement, institutional priorities, and planning were included.

According to the then President of Texas A&I University in Kingsville James C. Jernigan, the Laredo beginning was related to getting the upper-level concept off the ground somewhere in Texas. As early as 1968 the Coordinating Board wrestled with the Laredo problem. Jernigan commented that in February, 1968, the Coordinating Board requested certain enrollment data for all colleges and universities in the state system. Then in May, 1968, a meeting of an advisory committee on the development of roles and scopes of the universities was held. Evidently, this was the first presentation by the Coordinating Board of the upper-level reality for Texas (12).

Texas A&I was asked to consider establishing an upper-level center at Laredo. The minutes of the September 16, 1968, Coordinating Board meeting tell the rest:

The other recommendation of your two sub-committees has involved a real problem for all of us. We have been deeply concerned about it and at a loss to know what to do with it, but we have finally come up with an idea which we hope not only that the Board will approve but which those distinguished administrators here today who are knowledgeable on these subjects will also find feasible. Your sub-committees wish to express their thoughts on the subject in these words:

Laredo also does not meet the criteria on which the Board's recommendations for the establishment of new senior institutions were based, and it does not appear from population projections and other criteria that it will do so in the near future. However, during the course of the public hearings conducted on this subject, Laredo's citizens made numerous dramatic and compelling presentations on the sociological, economic, and educational isolation of the area and the importance of education as a tool for social change and economic betterment of the people. The Board is convinced that although the area does not now meet the criteria established for a freestanding institution and will not do so for some time to come, immediate measures should be taken to provide additional educational opportunities without involving the state in expensive capital outlays at this time. The Board suggests a two-pronged approach:

- (1) That Laredo Junior College take the necessary steps to provide a meaningful expansion of the vocational-technical programs as now offered and which might be offered to meet the educational needs of the community and state, and
- (2) that there be established immediately a Center in Laredo to offer upper-division college-level work, giving special emphasis to upper-division programs in teacher education and business administration leading to the baccalaureate degree.

The Board is of the opinion that the Center should be administered by Texas A&I University, which has a distinctive teacher education program and is rapidly developing a bilingual business administration program with a grant from the federal government.

The Coordinating Board is of the further opinion that Texas A&I can provide these facilities through contract with Laredo Junior College for the use of its appropriate facilities. The

use of the Center by Laredo residents can demonstrate to the Coordinating Board the effectiveness of higher educational opportunities in helping to solve the problems of the region and can serve to support a recommendation for the ultimate establishment of a free-standing upper-division master's level institution in Laredo (8, pp. 8-9).

The planning of the Laredo institution involved other area institutions, also. Cowart and Briggs comment on the planning by citing some of the circumstances surrounding the upper-level center at Laredo.

After a careful review, the administration of Texas A&I University at Kingsville made a favorable recommendation to its board with the following conditions:

1. that Texas A&I University at Kingsville not be excluded from consideration as the parent institution for any expansion of higher education in Corpus Christi, Texas;
2. and that adequate funding be provided (as established by administrative recommendations) (9, p. 2).

The 61st Legislature authorized the establishment of Texas A&I-Laredo however, the legislative body failed to provide funds to finance state programs. This preempted the possibility of recruiting faculty and starting classes in September, 1969 (9, p. 2). A compromise measure was worked out with Texas A&I University at Kingsville. Money was provided for planning, organization and recruitment during the first year.

To this date Laredo continues to operate its own facilities and share others with Laredo Junior College. Laredo State

University's history is unique in this respect.

Summary

The development of the upper-level university was aided by the movement to separate preparatory from university work. From 1892 with the opening of the University of Chicago to the 1960's when Texas began to seriously think about upper-level institutions there has been a long history of attempts to alter the four-year degree structure.

Dr. Ernest L. Boyer, former Chancellor of the State University of New York and presently U.S. Commissioner of Education, comments on this change:

As we serve a wider range of students we must permit greater flexibility in the length of study arrangements. I think for example that the four years of high school/four years of college cycle must be challenged. There is, after all, no sacredness about the four-year baccalaureate (13, p. 2).

Little has been written historically in the form of books. The most outstanding contribution is Robert A. Altman's The Upper Division College. Helene I. Shell has written her research about the history and problems in planning an upper-level university. Others have contributed to such areas as location, credit transfer, overexpansion, loss of quality, and experimental methods.

The upper-division institution may be reaching a mature status in American higher education. Just as the process has continued to improve so might the quantity of the literature pertaining to the upper-level institution.

CHAPTER BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Altman, Robert A., The Upper Division College, San Francisco, Jossey-Bass., 1970.
2. Andrews, Ted F. and Peter Fenner, "An Experimenting College of Environmental and Applied Science: Part I," Community College Frontiers, 3 (Winter, 1975), 17-22.
3. Annual Report of the Coordinating Board, Texas College and University System, Austin, Coordinating Board, Texas College and University System, 1972.
4. Annual Report of the Coordinating Board, Texas College and University System, Austin, Coordinating Board, Texas College and University System, 1973.
5. Association of the Upper Level College and University, The Upper Level College and University Movement, Boulder, Association of the Upper Level College and University, 1971.
6. Baskin, Samuel (Ed.), Higher Education: Some Newer Developments, New York, McGraw-Hill, 1965.
7. Challenge for Excellence, Austin, Coordinating Board, Texas College and University System, 1969.
8. Coordinating Board, Texas College and University System, "Minutes, Special Called Meeting of September 16, 1968," Coordinating Board, Texas College and University System, Austin, Texas, 1968.
9. Cowart, Billy F. and F. Allen Briggs, A Brief History of Texas A&I University at Laredo, Laredo, Texas A&I University, 1973.
10. Crowson, James L., An Innovative Academic Plan for an Upper Level University, Dallas, Texas University 1973.
11. Higbee, Marvin, "Upper Division Colleges: An End to Transfer Hurdles," Community and Junior College Journal, 43 (March, 1973), 44-48.
12. Jernigan, James C., Interview at Fort Worth, Texas, July, 1976.

13. Lauper, Russell T. and Victor P. Meskill, "An Experiment in Upper-Division Education," Planning for Higher Education, 4 (February, 1975), 2-5.
14. Marsh, Robert, "Curriculum and Credit Transfer Problems in the Upper Level Institution," Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Association of Upper Level Colleges and Universities, March 3, 1972.
15. Perry, Charles E., "The First Thousand Days," Speech presented before the Florida State Board of Regents, July 6, 1972.
16. Policy Paper 4, Austin, Coordinating Board, Texas College and University System, 1968.
17. Priorities for Action: Final Report of the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, St. Louis, McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1973.
18. Proceedings of the International Conference on the Upper-Level University/Junior College Partnership, Pensacola, The University of West Florida, 1970.
19. Rudolph, Frederick, The American College and University, New York, Alfred A. Knopf, 1965.
20. Sames, Richard W., "The Upper-Level Universities and the Community Colleges," Liberal Education, 60 (October, 1974), 348-358.
21. Shell, Helene I., A Profile of Upper-Level Colleges, Washington, D. C., ERIC Clearinghouse on Higher Education, 1973.
22. Southern Regional Education Board, Issues in Higher Education, Number 2, Atlanta, 1971.
23. Study of Upper-Level Institutions and Off-Campus Educational Units of Public Universities, Austin, Coordinating Board, Texas College and University System, 1976.
24. Texas Higher Education 1968-1980, Austin, Coordinating Board, Texas College and University System, 1975.
25. Upper-Level Institutions: A Report to the Texas Legislature, Austin, Coordinating Board, Texas College and University System, 1972.

26. Willingham, Warren W., The No. 2 Access Problem: Transfer to the Upper Division, Washington, D. C., ERIC Clearing house on Higher Education/American Association for Higher Education, 1972.
27. Woolf, J.R., Planning and Developing an Upper Level Senior College, Austin, Coordinating Board, Texas College and University System, 1974.

CHAPTER III

METHODS AND PROCEDURES

Introduction

This was a study to determine certain ways in which upper-level institutions are uniquely meeting the needs of public higher education in Texas. Information was sought on program development, special programs, experimental programs, student advisement, faculty evaluation, faculty exchange programs, and certain cost reduction techniques in Texas upper-level and four-year state institutions. The purpose of this chapter is to describe the instrument used, the sources used in data collection, and the procedures for analyzing the data.

Description of the Instrument

A questionnaire was developed to be used in the study. The questionnaire requested information concerning seven categories of data. They were (1) innovative or experimental programs, (2) planning curricula for minorities, (3) student advisement, (4) faculty evaluation, (5) faculty exchange programs, (6) transition for junior college/ community college graduates, and (7) fiscal procedures. The seven categories were the ones contained in official Coordinating Board reports and were verified in the literature

by the experts and the professional experience of the author. These categories apparently are related to the unique features of these institutions.

The original questionnaire consisted of seventy-nine questions which required responses to a value scale. It included five responses to each question. The responses were as follows:

1. All = if the academic units are totally involved.
2. Most = if the academic units are greatly involved.
3. Half = if the academic units are equally divided in involvement.
4. Few = if the academic units are somewhat involved.
5. None = if the academic units are not involved.

Academic units were defined as colleges or schools within the university. The questions were designed to seek information pertaining to the academic units within the university being questioned.

To improve the content of the questionnaire, a pilot study using this instrument was conducted. For the pilot study the questionnaire, along with a cover letter (see Appendix) was mailed to seven professionals in the field. They were asked to view each item critically as to its worth in securing the necessary data to answer the research questions. The respondents in the pilot study were asked

to evaluate each item on its clearness, relationship to the research question and its potential in securing proper information.

Each response was studied for possible elimination of weak or faulty questions. Three or more responses expressing a negative viewpoint eliminated a statement or question. Also, should the response be of such nature that a question was asked for clarification purposes then a closer study of the meaning was made.

There were certain questions modified, replaced, or removed. In one section questions were added to aid in clarification. Some questions revealed repetition with others in the same section.

The pre-test respondents were asked to give each statement a percentage corresponding to the appropriate value. As an example: if the academic unit was greatly involved (Most = 90%/80%/70%) then one of the three percentages was to be placed in the proper blank. The values and their percentages were as follows:

All	=	100%
Most	=	90% / 80% / 70%
Half	=	60% / 50% / 40%
Few	=	30% / 20% / 10%
None	=	0%.

These values and percentages proved to be confusing and elicited a difference in judgment from several of the

respondents. The percentage value was eliminated.

Through correspondence, conference, and study the final questionnaire was formed. The elimination method left fifty-four final questions. This excluded certain questions which did not apply because of irrelevancy.

Procedure for Collecting Data

Following the pilot study a cover letter (see Appendix), revised questionnaire (see Appendix), a stamped return envelope and a return pre-addressed postcard were mailed to each chief administrator of Texas' twenty-three, four-year universities and to each chief administrator of the eight state upper-level institutions (see Appendix). The postcard asked for the name and title of the person responding to the questionnaire. A two week period was allowed for the return of the questionnaire. The chief officers were requested to answer each inquiry with one of the responses mentioned above.

Each questionnaire was coded with a number. In this manner a system was used to account for returns. The postcard indicated with whom to follow-up for returns. For purposes of this study at least 70% return of the four-year universities and a 100% return of the upper-level universities were expected to proceed. Once the questionnaires had been returned the data were analyzed and evaluated.

Follow-up was accomplished by the mailing of letters to four-year institutions that had not responded either by questionnaire or card. In some cases additional questionnaires

were sent.

The follow-up stage began on September 4, 1977. All upper-level university questionnaires were returned by September 27, 1977. Because of the various delays the final four-year university questionnaire was received by November 15, 1977.

Procedures for Analysis of Data

Because the data for this study were secured by using total population of both upper-level institutions and four-year universities, statistics were descriptive. Inferential statistics were not applied to these data.

Each response item on the questionnaire was arranged according to its original sequence. For ease of interpretation and communication the data were arranged in a two-way layout giving frequency distribution.

From this table comparisons were made and conclusions drawn as to the important differences or similarities in the two categories of universities. Research questions posed earlier were answered more readily.

Points were assigned to each of the categories used (All, Most, Half, Few, None). This provided the opportunity to treat the data with interval type measurement. The most favorable response category (All) was given a value of 5 points and lesser values to the remaining four categories. Thus, in a five-point scale, "All" would indicate a value of 5 points, whereas "None" would receive only 1 point. The

values with points are as follows:

All = 5 points
Most = 4 points
Half = 3 points
Few = 2 points
None = 1 point.

The score an institution received was the sum of the scores he received on each item. All items were scored. Means and standard deviations were applied. By analyzing these measures a description could be presented.

Means were used to describe the central tendency of the distribution of the scores. Standard deviations were computed to describe, statistically, variability within a distribution. Also, it reveals differences in variability among distributions.

Populations vary on one or more dimensions. In order to secure an index to accurately describe the manner in which they vary, a measure of dispersion was used. Standard deviation was chosen because differences in variability represent important differences. They must be recognized to describe adequately the distributions.

When small the standard deviation reveals small variability or that there is relative homogeneity. A large standard deviation means the opposite condition, heterogeneity.

Summary

This study was conducted to assess ways in which upper-level institutions are uniquely meeting the needs of public higher education in Texas. Certain information was sought

to gain a meaningful evaluation. The areas considered include program development, special programs, experimental programs, student advisement, faculty evaluation, faculty exchange programs, and certain fiscal procedures in Texas upper-level and four-year state institutions.

One way for the study to be successful was to develop a questionnaire. Seven basic categories of data were asked for in the finished instrument. They were (1) innovative or experimental programs, (2) planning curricula for minorities, (3) student advisement, (4) faculty evaluation, (5) faculty exchange programs, (6) transition for junior college/ community college graduates, and (7) unique fiscal procedures. Each question had five possible responses.

The investigation consisted of obtaining data from the eight upper-level institutions and the twenty-three state universities in Texas.

Statistical techniques utilized in the study were as follows: frequency distribution; mean; and standard deviation.

CHAPTER BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Roscoe, John T., Fundamental Research Statistics for the Behavioral Sciences, Dallas, Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1975.
2. Sax, Gilbert, Empirical Foundations of Educational Research, Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey, Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1968.
3. Underwood, Benton J., Carl P. Duncan, Janet A. Taylor, and John W. Cotton, Elementary Statistics, New York, Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., 1954.

CHAPTER IV

PRESENTATION OF DATA

Introduction

Data used in this study were obtained from the presidents of Texas' four-year institutions and upper-level institutions. A questionnaire (see appendix) was sent to the thirty-one chief officers.

The data in this chapter reflect returns from twenty-five of the thirty-one total subjects for an eighty-one percent (81%) return. The percentage of returns was calculated as follows: seventeen or seventy-four percent (74%) from the four-year universities and eight or one hundred percent (100%) from the upper-level institutions.

The questionnaire developed for this study was divided into seven sections. They were innovative or experimental programs, specific efforts in curriculum, student academic advisement, faculty evaluation, faculty exchange programs, junior college/community college transition and fiscal procedures. The fifty-four statements in the questionnaire are as follows:

- I. These innovative or experimental programs
are employed:
 - A. Interdisciplinary studies (fusing separate specialities toward a particular objective) are

1. offered in the academic units.
 2. required in the academic units.
- B. Instructional planning that is self-paced instruction
1. and involves a structured plan of study.
 2. and uses the tutorial setting.
 3. and involves wide use of media and technology.
 4. and includes contract study.
- C. Learning resources as follows:
1. multi-media classrooms.
 2. instructional television.
 3. self-instruction units -- language labs, audio-listening centers, etc.
 4. microforms (Microfilm, microfiche, etc.).
 5. master teachers who record on television.
 6. direct line interrogation by computer or card catalogs at other campuses.
- D. Media center
1. records audio of courses.
 2. records film of courses.
 3. prepares and orders teaching materials.
- E. Faculty chairpersons assist in designing innovative changes by
1. using lay people (Community input, professional advice, etc.).
 2. employing a time plan for termination or incorporation of experimental programs.
- II. Specific efforts have been made to plan curricula to reflect history, culture, and current roles of minorities
- A. through regular curriculum offerings.
 - B. through Center for Continuing Education.
 - C. through special programs (outside guests, special observances, etc.).
 - D. through federal/state government programs (Adult Ed., Bilingual Title VII, HEMP, etc.).
- III. Students are advised academically by

- A. full-time counselor.
 - B. peer counseling.
 - C. faculty.
 - D. faculty chairperson.
- IV. Faculty evaluation methods include
- A. teaching effectiveness.
 - B. research.
 - C. faculty review committee.
 - D. senior professors, administrators review.
 - E. student evaluations.
 - F. observation of classes.
- V. Faculty exchange programs consist of
- A. teaching in another discipline (second field).
 - B. teaching at another senior (four-year) university.
 - C. teaching at another upper-level university.
 - D. teaching at a junior college/community college.
 - E. others teaching in your university
 1. from a senior (four-year) university.
 2. from an upper-level university.
 3. from a junior college/community college.
- VI. Provides transition for junior college/community college graduates by:
- A. counseling
 1. admissions.
 2. peer.
 3. departmental.
 4. literature (catalogs, brochures, newsletters, etc.).
 5. films.
 6. "hot-line" for transfer information.
 7. commercial radio/television special programs.
 9. conference(s) on campus.
 - B. direct efforts to coordinate transferred courses through
 1. specific literature about transfer policies and procedures.

- VII. Utilizes unique fiscal procedures in the following ways:
- A. offers incentives such as retaining (in the academic units) carryover unspent balances (local funds).
 - B. shares computer time with nearby institution(s).
 - C. contracts commercially for computer services.
 - D. charges for computer expenditures made in instructional and departmental research against academic units' budgets.
 - E. have academic units' budgets that include rental charges for space, equipment, etc.
 - F. incorporates management information systems (MIS) (in addition to the state systems).

Each of the chief officers was asked to check an appropriate response using the following values:

- 1. All = if your academic units are totally involved.
- 2. Most = if your academic units are greatly involved.
- 3. Half = if your academic units are equally divided in involvement.
- 4. Few = if your academic units are somewhat involved.
- 5. None = if your academic units are not involved.

Responses to Each Question

Tables I-VII show the frequency distribution. Both four-year and upper-level institutions are indicated.

TABLE I

FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONSES
OF UNIVERSITIES TO INNOVATIVE
OR EXPERIMENTAL PROGRAMS

Statements Concerning Innovative/Experimental Programs Employed	ALL		MOST		HALF		FEW		NONE	
	FY	UP	FY	UP	FY	UP	FY	UP	FY	UP
Interdisciplinary studies Offered in academic units	..	2	7	3	1	1	9	1
Required in academic units	..	2	..	1	..	2	10	3	5	..
Self-paced instruction Involves structured plan of study	..	2	..	1	1	..	14	4	1	1
Uses tutorial setting Involves wide use of media and tech- nology	..	1	..	1	1	..	12	6	2	..
Includes contract study	1	2	1	1	14	4
Learning resources Multi-media class- rooms	1	..	2	9	3	6	1
Instructional tv	..	2	2	2	2	1	11	3	2	..
Self-instructional units	..	2	..	1	1	1	15	3	1	1
Microforms	..	3	..	1	5	1	12	3
Master teachers	..	5	2	1	1	..	12	1	1	..
Direct line interro- gation - computer	1	5	4	10	3
Media center Records courses - audio	2	1	1	..	1	..	4	3	8	4
Records courses - film	1	12	7	4	1
Prepares and orders teaching materials	1	11	7	5	1
Faculty chairpersons - innovative changes Using lay people	1	4	3	..	10	4	2	..
Employing time plan	..	3	1	..	5	2	9	3	2	..
	..	2	1	1	11	2	5	1

The institution presidents were asked to indicate whether the academic units within their universities were employing innovative or experimental programs. The responses are given in Table I.

The first question asked about interdisciplinary studies. As a program "Offered" in the academic units the upper-level institution appeared to be accomplishing the objective. But, as a requirement only two upper-level institutions employ it in all academic units. Five institutions were recorded at "Half" or below for the "Required" program response.

Four-year institutions recorded five "None" for required while seven said that most of their units offer interdisciplinary studies. For both required and offered a large number are concentrated in "Few." Two did not respond to "Required in academic units" in the four-year institutions. However, one of these checked "Most" for offered and the other checked "Few" for offered.

For four-year universities all parts about "Self-paced instruction" tended to be overwhelmingly negative. Each of the four parts is related to instructional planning that is self-paced instruction. Though all parts pertained to a different approach to self-paced instruction none of them seemed to be used by all academic units and only three had one "Most." One each in the first three items was marked under "Half." "Few" and "None" accounted for the

rest. "Few" was marked thus:

Involves structured plan of study	14
Uses tutorial setting	12
Involves wide use of media and technology .	14
Includes contract study	9

"Includes contract study," mentioned above, had the largest number of "None" (6) in this division.

Interestingly, upper-level universities had emphasis in the "Few" category. Especially with "Uses tutorial setting" response was heavy. Six out of eight universities responded in this category. One each checked "None" for structured plan of study and contract study. Two checked "All" for the structured plan while one checked it for tutorial setting. The others were scattered in "Most" and "Half." No heavy concentration could be found for items in the "All" or "Most" areas.

"Learning resources" of Table I for four-year institutions continued the trends of the preceding two parts. The emphases were in the "Few" and "None" categories. Such learning resources as the first four items were concentrated in "Few." The question about master teachers had ten out of seventeen responding to the "None" category. "Direct line interrogation-computer" was more spread out as indicated in Table I. Still the majority of responses lay in the "Few" and "None" categories with eight "None."

Somewhat in contrast upper-level institutions responded with four for two items in the "All" and "Most" columns

combined. "Instructional tv" had two in "All" and one each in "Most" and "Half." The other concentration, for the first three, lay in "Few." "Microforms" reflected a large use at all universities (five of eight). Responses to "Master teachers" and "Direct line interrogation" were seven of eight in the "Few" and "None" areas for both items. The eighth response was "Most" in "Master teachers" and an "All" for the last question.

For the section pertaining to "Media center" both groups reflected a lack of recording courses on audio and film. In the upper-level group seven of eight were in the "Few" column with one in "None." Respectively, the same two items of the four-year group had twelve and eleven under "Few" and four and five under "None." The upper-level institutions split between "All" and "Few" on "Prepares and orders teaching materials" with four each. For four-year institutions three responses were "Half," ten for "Few" and two for "None." The other one checked "All."

The last section in Table I pertained to faculty chairpersons assisting in designing innovative changes. To the question of using lay people the four-year institutions checked one for "Most" with five for "Half" and nine for "Few." Two four-years indicated "None." The question about "Employing time plan" was more skewed. "Most" had one check. For "None" there were five and "Few" had the remaining eleven.

Responding to "Faculty chairpersons - innovative changes" upper-level universities recorded three in "All" for "Using lay people" and two in "All" for "Employing time plan." For lay people two checked "Half" and three checked "Few." For the time plan one checked "Half," two "Few," and there was one "None."

TABLE II

FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONSES
OF UNIVERSITIES TO SPECIFIC
EFFORTS TO PLAN CURRICULA

Statements Concerning Specific Efforts to Plan Curricula	ALL		MOST		HALF		FEW		NONE	
	FY	UP	FY	UP	FY	UP	FY	UP	FY	UP
Through <u>regular</u> offerings	..	3	6	2	1	..	10	3
Through Center for Continuing Education	1	..	12	2	4	6
Through special programs	4	2	3	3	9	3	1	..
Through federal/state programs	3	..	2	1	8	5	4	2

Table II was more evenly distributed among the four-year institutions. As shown there were no checks in "All." But, four-year universities did indicate that six institutions felt most of their academic units were making specific efforts to reflect history, culture, and current roles of minorities through regular curriculum offerings. Only one indicated half of their units were making the effort. Ten universities checked that "Few" of theirs were making the

effort. There was a difference shown in the upper-levels where three indicated "All" and two indicated "Most." The other three were in the "Few" category. For this question there were no checks for "None" for either four-years or upper-levels.

"Through Center for Continuing Education" for upper-level and four-year universities skewed left. The heaviest marks were in "None" (6) for upper-level and "Few" (12) for four years. One four-year institution marked "Half" and four marked "None." The other two for upper-level institutions marked "Few."

"Through special programs" contained no "All" marks for both groups. In upper-level institutions "Most" accounted for two and "Half" for three. There were three that checked "Few." For the four-year institutions "Most" had four, "Half" had three and "Few" had nine. The concentration was in the middle values. There was one "None" in the four-years.

Finally, "Through federal/state government programs" recorded no marks for "All," also. The majority of marks in both institutions were under "Few" (five for upper-level and eight for four-year). There were two that checked "None" in the upper-level. One checked "Half." The four-year group recorded three in "Most," two in "Half," and four in "None." The largest response was eight in "Few."

TABLE III
 FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONSES
 OF UNIVERSITIES TO STUDENT
 ACADEMIC ADVISEMENT

Statements Concerning Student Academic Advisement	ALL		MOST		HALF		FEW		NONE	
	FY	UP	FY	UP	FY	UP	FY	UP	FY	UP
Full-time counselor	3	1	1	..	1	..	5	2	7	4
Peer counseling	1	..	3	..	1	..	8	2	3	4
Faculty	7	7	10	1
Faculty chairperson	6	2	4	1	2	2	5	1

Table III showed results of the third section which asked about student academic advisement. This involved four ways this could be accomplished: (A) full-time counselor; (B) peer counseling; (C) faculty; (D) faculty chairperson. Faculty and faculty chairpersons were indicated as the advisers in "All" and "Most" more than for full-time counselor and peer counseling in both four-year and upper-level universities.

The upper-levels reflected over half of the institutions used faculty as adviser ("All" = 7; "Most" = 1). A similar pattern had been reflected in four-year institutions. Pertaining to "Faculty chairperson" the upper-levels indicated two "All," one "Most," two "Half," and one "Few." The four-year institutions were "spread." However, the larger responses were in "All" (6) and "Few" (5).

TABLE IV
 FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONSES
 OF UNIVERSITIES TO FACULTY
 EVALUATION METHODS

Statements Concerning Faculty Evaluation Methods	ALL		MOST		HALF		FEW		NONE	
	FY	UP	FY	UP	FY	UP	FY	UP	FY	UP
Teaching effectiveness	14	6	2	1	1	1
Research	10	4	3	..	1	1	3	2	..	1
Faculty review committee	9	5	3	..	1	..	2	..	2	3
Senior professors, admin- istrators review	10	5	4	1	1	1	1
Student evaluations	4	6	5	1	5	1	2
Observation of classes	1	14	5	2	3

In the "All" category of Table IV four-year and upper-level groups responded with fourteen and six for "Teaching effectiveness;" ten and four for "Research;" nine and five for "Faculty review committee" and ten and five for "Senior professors, administrators review." For "Student evaluations" the responses for four-years were four for "All," five for "Most," five for "Half," and two for "Few." Upper-levels marked six in "All," with one each in "Most" and "Half."

For "Observation of classes" both institutional groups tended toward "Few" and "None." In the four-year universities fourteen marked "Few" and two "None." One marked "Most." In the upper-levels five marked "Few" and the remaining three marked "None."

TABLE V
 FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONSES
 OF UNIVERSITIES TO FACULTY
 EXCHANGE PROGRAMS

Statements Concerning Faculty Exchange Programs	ALL		MOST		HALF		FEW		NONE	
	FY	UP	FY	UP	FY	UP	FY	UP	FY	UP
Teaching in another discipline	1	2	..	2	10	3	5	..
Teaching at another university	7	2	9	5
Teaching at another upper-level university	3	..	12	7
Teaching at a junior college/community college	15	4
Others teaching in your university										
From a senior univer- sity	1	7	3	9	3
From an upper-level university	3	..	12	7
From a junior college/ community college	..	1	..	1	1	4	14	2

In Table V with the exception of "Teaching in another discipline" responses for faculty exchange programs in four-year universities were contained in the "Few" and "None" categories. The one exception was a lone "Most." For the same question upper-levels had two in "Most," two in "Half," and three in "Few." For "Others teaching in your university from a junior college/community college" one each of the upper-level institutions marked "All" and "Most." One marked "Half" for upper-levels for "Others teaching in your university from a senior university."

TABLE VI
 FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONSES OF
 UNIVERSITIES TO PROVIDING TRANSITION
 FOR JUNIOR COLLEGE/COMMUNITY
 COLLEGE GRADUATES

Statements Concerning Providing Transition for Junior College/ Community College Graduates	YES		NO	
	FY	UP	FY	UP
Counseling				
Admissions	17	8
Peer	8	2	8	5
Departmental	17	8
Literature	17	8
Films	6	2	11	6
"Hot-line" transfer information	3	2	14	6
Commercial radio/tv special programs	2	7	15	1
Conferences on campus	14	7	3	1
Direct efforts				
Specific literature	16	8	1	..
Accepting intertransferability	11	7	2	1

Table VI gave frequency distributions for Yes and No responses. All four-year institutions indicated "Yes" for "Admissions," "Departmental," and "Literature." All but one answered "Yes" to "Specific literature," with fourteen and eleven in the "Yes" column for "Conferences on campus" and "Accepting intertransferability" respectively. In the "No" category the highest numbers were recorded corresponding with low responses in "Yes."

Upper-levels recorded high "Yes" numbers for "Admissions," "Departmental," "Literature," "Commercial radio/tv special programs," and "Conferences on campus." Also, the

same was true for "Specific literature," and "Accepting intertransferability."

TABLE VII
FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONSES
OF UNIVERSITIES TO UNIQUE
FISCAL PROCEDURES

Statements Concerning Unique Fiscal Procedures	YES		NO	
	FY	UP	FY	UP
Offers incentives	7	2	9	6
Shares computer time	7	6	10	2
Contracts commercially	6	1	11	7
Charges academic units	12	4	5	4
Budgets that include rental charges	5	2	10	6
Incorporates MIS	13	5	4	3

In Table VII the four-years indicated seven "Yes" and nine "No" for incentives. Computer time had seven "Yes" and ten "No." Contracts recorded six "Yes" and eleven "No." Academic units had twelve "Yes" and five "No." The last two questions answered five "Yes" and ten "No" and thirteen "Yes" and four "No," respectively.

The upper-levels indicated two "Yes" and six "No" for both the incentives and rental charges questions. Six "Yes" and two "No" were given for computer time. Just one "Yes" and seven "No" were recorded for contracts. It was evenly divided for academic units and almost so for the last one ("Yes" = 5, "No" = 3).

MEAN SCORES AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS
OF RESPONSES OF UNIVERSITIES
TO INNOVATIVE OR EXPERI-
MENTAL PROGRAMS

I. Statements Concerning Innovative/Experimental Programs Employed	Four-Year		Upper - Level	
	Means	S.D.	Means	S.D.
A. Interdisciplinary studies				
1. Offered in academic units	2.88	.96	3.86	.99
2. Required in academic units	1.67	.47	3.25	1.2
B. Self-paced instruction				
1. Involves structured plan of study	2.0	.35	2.88	1.45
2. Uses tutorial setting	1.93	.44	2.63	1.11
3. Involves wide use of media and technology	2.19	.53	2.71	.88
4. Includes contract study	1.60	.49	2.43	.90
C. Learning resources				
1. Multi-media classrooms	2.24	.81	3.38	1.22
2. Instructional tv	2.0	.34	3.0	1.41
3. Self-instructional units	2.29	.46	3.5	1.32
4. Microforms	2.25	.75	4.43	1.05
5. Master teachers	1.33	.47	1.88	.93
6. Direct line interrogation - computer	2.06	1.39	1.88	1.27
D. Media center				
1. Records courses - audio	1.88	.68	1.88	.33
2. Records courses - film	1.82	.71	1.88	.33
3. Prepares and orders teaching materials	2.25	.90	3.5	1.5
E. Faculty chairpersons - innovative changes				
1. Using lay people	2.29	.75	3.38	1.32
2. Employing time plan	1.82	.71	3.0	1.53

Beginning with Table VIII point values of All = 5, Most = 4, Half = 3, Few = 2, and None = 1 were applied. Multiplying the total number by the point value and then using the formulas means and standard deviations were found.

As shown in Table VIII mean responses ranged from 1.33 for statement C.5. at the four-year level to a high of 2.88 (A.1.). Standard deviations were small for C.2. (.34) and broad at C.6. (1.39). With the upper-levels the mean range was from 4.43 to a low of 1.88 for several questions. Standard deviations were from .33 to 1.53.

TABLE IX
MEAN SCORES AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS
OF RESPONSES OF UNIVERSITIES
TO SPECIFIC EFFORTS
TO PLAN CURRICULA

II. Statements Concerning Specific Efforts to Plan Curricula	Four-Year		Upper-Level	
	Means	S.D.	Means	S.D.
A. Through <u>regular</u> offerings	2.76	.94	3.63	1.32
B. Through <u>Center</u> for Continuing Education	1.82	.51	1.25	.43
C. Through special programs	2.59	.91	2.88	.78
D. Through federal/state programs	2.24	1.0	1.88	.6

As shown in Table IX four-year means included those of 1.82 (lowest) to 2.76 (highest). The standard deviations ranged from .51 (lowest) to 1 (highest). Upper-level means were from 1.25 to 3.63 with standard deviations .43 to 1.32.

TABLE X
 MEAN SCORES AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS
 OF RESPONSES OF UNIVERSITIES
 TO STUDENT ACADEMIC
 ADVISEMENT

III. Statements Concerning Student Academic Advisement	Four-Year		Upper-Level	
	Means	S.D.	Means	S.D.
A. Full-time counselor	2.29	1.49	1.86	1.36
B. Peer counseling	2.44	1.17	1.33	.47
C. Faculty	4.41	.49	4.88	.33
D. Faculty chairperson	3.65	1.23	3.67	1.11

Table X four-year means were from 2.29 to 4.41. Standard deviations were from .49 to 1.49. Upper-level means were 1.33 to 4.88. Standard deviations were .33 to 1.36.

TABLE XI
 MEAN SCORES AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS
 OF RESPONSES OF UNIVERSITIES
 TO FACULTY EVALUATION
 METHODS

IV. Statements Concerning Faculty Evaluation Methods	Four-Year		Upper-Level	
	Means	S.D.	Means	S.D.
A. Teaching effectiveness	4.77	.55	4.63	.70
B. Research	4.18	1.15	3.5	1.58
C. Faculty review committee	3.88	1.45	3.5	1.94
D. Senior professors, administrators review	4.44	.86	4.13	1.36
E. Student evaluations	3.69	.98	4.63	.70
F. Observation of classes	2.0	.59	1.63	.48

Table XI reflects a high mean score among the four-year universities of 4.77 (A) and a low of 2.00 (F). Standard deviations were highest for C (1.45) and lowest for A (.55). The upper-levels scored the high of 4.63 (A/E) and a low of 1.63 (F). High and low standard deviations for this group were found in C (1.94) and F (.48).

TABLE XII
MEAN SCORES AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS
OF RESPONSES OF UNIVERSITIES
TO FACULTY EXCHANGE
PROGRAMS

V. Statements Concerning Faculty Exchange Programs	Four-Year		Upper-Level	
	Means	S.D.	Means	S.D.
A. Teaching in another discipline	1.81	.73	2.86	.83
B. Teaching at another university	1.44	.50	1.29	.45
C. Teaching at another upper-level university	1.20	.40	1.0	0
D. Teaching at a junior college/ community college	1.0	0	1.43	.50
E. Others teaching in your university				
1. From a senior univer- sity	1.44	.50	1.71	.70
2. From an upper-level university	1.20	.40	1.0	0
3. From a junior college/ community college	1.07	.25	2.38	1.32

In Table XII the means were low for four-year universities. The highest was found in A. It was 1.81. There were two at 1.44. Again, the first question was high with

2.86 (A) for upper-levels. Standard deviations ranged from lows of 0 (four-years - D) and 0 (upper-levels - C and E.2.) to highs of .73 (A) for four-years and 1.32 (E.3.) for upper-level universities.

Tables XIII-XVII show percentage breakdown of responses for upper-level and four-year universities. Totals for each value were summed. The percent was found by dividing the total number of each value by the total number of upper-level or four-year universities responding to the division.

TABLE XIII
PERCENTAGE BREAKDOWN OF RESPONSES
OF UNIVERSITIES TO INNOVATIVE
OR EXPERIMENTAL PROGRAMS

Universities	ALL	MOST	HALF	FEW	NONE
Four-Year	.01	.06	.08	.65	.20
Upper-Level	.22	.12	.09	.47	.10

In Table XIII both groups responded to "Few" with more emphasis than to the other values. For their high percentage four-year universities recorded .65. Upper-level universities recorded a high of .47. The four-year institutions responded for their low with .06 in the "Most" column, .08 in "Half," and .01 in "All." Only .09 percent answered "Half" for upper-level institutions and .10 responded to "None."

TABLE XIV
 PERCENTAGE BREAKDOWN OF RESPONSES
 OF UNIVERSITIES TO SPECIFIC
 EFFORTS TO PLAN CURRICULA

Universities	ALL	MOST	HALF	FEW	NONE
Four-Year	..	.19	.10	.57	.13
Upper-Level	.09	.13	.13	.41	.25

"Few" accounted for the majority of responses in Table XIV. No one of the four-year universities responded to "All" and .10 only replied to "Half." Low for upper-levels was "All" with .09.

TABLE XV
 PERCENTAGE BREAKDOWN OF RESPONSES
 OF UNIVERSITIES TO STUDENT
 ACADEMIC ADVISEMENT

Universities	ALL	MOST	HALF	FEW	NONE
Four-Year	.25	.27	.06	.27	.15
Upper-Level	.37	.07	.07	.19	.3

Table XV reflected .37 the most for upper-level universities. This was in the "All" column. Lows were found in both "Most" and "Half." For four-years "Most" and "Few" recorded .27 for the highest percentage. However, "All" was

.25. This was close to the "Most" and "Few" just mentioned. The low percentage was "Half" with .06. The other value was .15 in the "None" percentage.

TABLE XVI
PERCENTAGE BREAKDOWN OF RESPONSES
OF UNIVERSITIES TO FACULTY
EVALUATION METHODS

Universities	ALL	MOST	HALF	FEW	NONE
Four-Year	.47	.18	.09	.22	.04
Upper-Level	.55	.06	.09	.15	.15

Upper-level and four-year universities recorded highs of .55 and .47 in the "All" value. Lows were not similar and indicated upper-levels to be .06 (Most) and .04 (None) for four-years. For both groups "Half" had .09. "Few" was .22 for four-years and .15 for upper-levels.

TABLE XVII
PERCENTAGE BREAKDOWN OF RESPONSES
OF UNIVERSITIES TO FACULTY
EXCHANGE PROGRAMS

Universities	ALL	MOST	HALF	FEW	NONE
Four-Year	..	.01	..	.29	.70
Upper-Level	.02	.06	.06	.26	.60

Four-year institutions had no response for "All" and "Half" in Table XVII. Otherwise the low was .01 in "Most." "Few" had .29 and a big high of .70 was recorded in "None." For upper-level institutions the high was in "None" (.60), also. A low percentage of .02 was recorded in "All," and low in "Most" and "Half" with .06.

The following two tables show Division VI for both four-year institutions and upper-level institutions. The tables include the frequency of response and a comparable percentage.

TABLE XVIII

RESPONSES OF FOUR-YEAR UNIVERSITIES TO PROVIDING
TRANSITION FOR JUNIOR COLLEGE/COMMUNITY
COLLEGE GRADUATES

VI. Statements Concerning Providing Transition for Junior College/ Community College Graduates	Four-Year Universities			
	Yes	%	No	%
A. Counseling				
1. Admissions	17	100
2. Peer	8	50	8	50
3. Departmental	17	100
4. Literature	17	100
5. Films	6	35	11	65
6. "Hot-line" transfer infor- mation	3	18	14	82
7. Commercial radio/tv special programs	2	12	15	88
9. Conferences on campus . . .	14	82	3	18
B. Direct efforts				
1. Specific literature	16	94	1	.06
2. Accepting intertransfer- ability	11	85	2	15

TABLE XIX
 RESPONSES OF UPPER-LEVEL UNIVERSITIES TO PROVIDING
 TRANSITION FOR JUNIOR COLLEGE/COMMUNITY
 COLLEGE GRADUATES

VI. Statements Concerning Providing Transition for Junior College/ Community College Graduates	Upper-Level Universities			
	Yes	%	No	%
A. Counseling				
1. Admissions	8	100
2. Peer	2	29	5	71
3. Departmental	8	100
4. Literature	8	100
5. Films	2	25	6	75
6. "Hot-line" transfer infor- mation	2	25	6	75
7. Commercial radio/tv special programs	7	87.5	1	12.5
9. Conferences on campus . .	7	87.5	1	12.5
B. Direct efforts				
1. Specific literature	8	100
2. Accepting intertransfer- ability	7	87.5	1	12.5

The responses sought in Section VI of the questionnaire were either yes or no to the questions posed. Tables XVIII and XIX show the emphasis in using new and different approaches in providing transition. The tables contain a percentage of responses for each question.

Of the two Yes-No groupings Section VI was more definitive. For both four-year and upper-level institutions the one sidedness was apparent. All groups of universities used admissions (A.1.), departmental (A.3.), and literature (A.4.) to counsel in providing the transition for junior college/

community college graduates. These three were 100 percent responses. One other item (9) (conferences on campus) recorded heavy yes responses for four-years (82%) and upper-levels (87.5%). Also, both groups indicated a high yes percent in "Direct Efforts."

For the four-year institutions items 6 ("hot-line" for transfer information) and 7 (commercial radio/television special programs) recorded a large percentage of numbers in the "No" column. But, of the upper-levels responding to the same two items (6 and 7) there were differences. Item 6 showed more no than yes. Item 7 showed seven yes and one no. Item 8 was eliminated because not all universities have radio/television stations.

In Item B the upper-level institutions recorded eight yes (100%) and seven yes (87.5%) for number one and number two. The four-year emphasis was similar. Two of these institutions indicated N/A (Not Available). Question number 2 sought information about intertransferability of credits. All upper-level universities responded with seven indicating yes. The low number of four-year universities responding was due to several not being involved in a system arrangement. They did indicate eleven yes and two no to parallel closely upper-levels.

The following two tables show Division VII for both four-year and upper-level institutions. The tables included the frequency of response and comparable percentage.

TABLE XX
RESPONSES OF FOUR-YEAR UNIVERSITIES TO
UNIQUE FISCAL PROCEDURES

VII. Statements Concerning Unique Fiscal Procedures	Four-Year Universities			
	Yes	%	No	%
A. Offers incentives	7	44	9	56
B. Shares computer time	7	41	10	59
C. Contracts commercially	6	35	11	65
D. Charges academic units	12	71	5	29
E. Budgets that include rental charges	5	23	10	67
F. Incorporates MIS	13	76	4	24

TABLE XXI
RESPONSES OF UPPER-LEVEL UNIVERSITIES TO
UNIQUE FISCAL PROCEDURES

VII. Statements Concerning Unique Fiscal Procedures	Upper-Level Universities			
	Yes	%	No	%
A. Offers incentives	2	25	6	75
B. Shares computer time	6	75	2	25
C. Contracts commercially	1	12.5	7	87.5
D. Charges academic units	4	50	4	50
E. Budgets that include rental charges	2	25	6	75
F. Incorporates MIS	5	62.5	3	37.5

Also, Tables XX and XXI reveal either yes or no to questions posed and the percentages for involvement or non-involvement. An attempt was made to discover whether any of the universities surveyed were utilizing fiscal

procedures (cost reduction techniques) of a unique nature. Tables XX and XXI reflect the frequency of distribution of section VII of the questionnaire.

In response to whether a university offers incentives such as retaining unspent balances (A), seven four-year universities indicated yes and nine indicated no. Of the upper-level two responded yes and six no. Item B (shares computer time with nearby institutions) did show a difference in the two groups. For this item upper-levels showed six yes and two no. The four-years had seven yes and ten no.

Section VII.C. (contracts commercially for computer services) showed six yes and eleven no for the four-year institutions and seven no with only one yes for the upper-levels. It was evenly split for the upper-levels in Item D (charges for computer expenditures made in instructional and departmental research against academic units' budgets). The four-years had twelve yes and five no. Item E (have academic units' budgets that include rental charges for space, equipment, etc.) recorded four-year institution marks of five yes and ten no. The upper-level institutions marked two yes and six no. Finally, in response to Item F (incorporates management information systems (MIS) (in addition to the state systems) there were thirteen yes and four no for the four-year universities with five yes and three no for the upper-levels.

Summary

Development of Data

This chapter was concerned with analyzing data related to the extent in which the upper-level institutions are uniquely fulfilling their initial goals and purposes in such areas as (1) innovative or experimental programs, (2) program planning, (3) transition from junior/community colleges, (4) faculty exchange programs, (5) faculty evaluation, and (6) cost reduction techniques. The results helped to determine some of the ways and to what extent Texas' upper-level institutions have uniquely met the needs of state public higher education.

Analyses of this data, in summation form, are as follows:

1. The data reflected returns from twenty-five of the thirty-one total subjects for an eighty-one percent return. This included 100% of upper-level universities and 74% of the four-year universities.

2. Frequency distribution for each question of each section of the questionnaire was gathered. Both university groups were included.

3. Mean scores and standard deviations were applied to each of the first thirty-eight questions. To secure these measures point values were given to each question. Again, both university groups were included.

4. Percentages were applied to the sixteen Yes and No questions. Both university groups were included.

Comparison and Interpretation of Data

1. Section I. (Innovative/Experimental Programs Employed) showed the highest number of responses was in the "Few" column for both groups of universities. Upper-level universities were higher in "All" than the four-years. The lowest accounting for upper-levels was in "Half" (12) and for four-years "All" (3). The "Few" and "None" columns revealed many academic units of the upper-levels were not involved in all the programs.

Interdisciplinary studies, learning resources, and innovative changes using lay people programs were used more by the upper-level academic units than by the four-years. Several of the upper-levels recorded "All" and "Most," but very few of the four-years. Overall, upper-level universities were more involved in innovative or experimental programs.

2. Section II. (Specific Efforts to Plan Curricula) revealed that many four year universities indicated "Few" were making the effort in any of the ways asked. Ten marked "Most" "Through regular offerings" and "Through special programs."

Upper-level universities showed that five of their institutions marked "All" and "Most" for "Through regular offerings." Also, five marked "Most" and "Half" for "Through special programs."

It appeared the upper-level universities were involved

in this area either in regular curriculum offerings or in special programs. They were not responding through the center for continuing education nor through federal/state programs.

Regular offerings and special programs accounted for the four-year university's involvement in this area of consideration. It was not the same emphasis as the upper-levels. Where 63% of upper-levels were in "All", "Most", and "Half" only 41% were recorded for four-years.

3. Section III. (Student Academic Advisement) revealed clearly that faculty served as academic advisers in both university groups. Full-time counselors and peer counseling were being used by "Few" and "None" in both universities, also. The faculty chairperson appeared to be advising in both upper-level and four-year universities. Neither group marked "None" in this area. Generally, there were no real differences in either university group.

4. Section IV (Faculty Evaluation Methods) indicated both institutions were using several methods to evaluate faculty. "Observation of classes" was the only method which ranked low for both upper-level universities and four-years. Otherwise, upper-level universities did not seem to be doing any more than the four-years. One exception did apply and that was in the area of student evaluations. Upper-levels were using this method some.

5. An attempt to see if either group of universities

was exchanging faculty with other institutions was the question in Section V. (Faculty Exchange Programs). Within the institution some were "Teaching in another discipline." Four-years responded with five "None" to this question.

Most upper-levels and four-years were not involved in this experiment to any great extent. However, the fact that "Few" were teaching elsewhere is significant. Seven out of sixteen four-years said they allowed "Few" faculty to teach at another university. Only two upper-levels responded similarly. Of interest was the response of three four-years to the question of "Teaching at another upper-level university." They indicated that a "Few" of their faculty did so.

There were seven four-year universities allowing "Few" from another senior university to teach at their university. Four upper-levels were allowing "Few" from a junior college/community college to teach in their institutions.

6. A major problem among upper-level universities was considered in Section VI (Providing Transition for the junior college/community college graduates). Significantly, both university groups responded in the same way. The use of "Commercial radio/tv special programs" was being used much more by upper-level universities. "Conferences on campus" was used by both four-years and upper-levels. Direct efforts indicated similar answers of "Yes." Overall, both universities were involved in major efforts to provide transition from the junior/community college.

7. In Section VII. (Unique Fiscal Procedures) the "No" column accounted for most of the responses, but not an over-emphasis. Besides "Charges academic units" and "Incorporates MIS" four-years recorded mostly "No." "Shares computer time" and "Incorporates MIS" were the ones to score mostly positive for upper-levels. It appeared that neither group was using the other responses to any great extent.

TABLE XXII

PERCENTAGE BREAKDOWN OF VALUES FOR
SECTIONS I-V OF FOUR-YEAR AND
UPPER-LEVEL UNIVERSITIES

Sect.	ALL		MOST		HALF		FEW		NONE	
	FY	UP	FY	UP	FY	UP	FY	UP	FY	UP
I	.01	.22	.06	.12	.08	.09	.65	.47	.20	.10
II	..	.09	.19	.13	.10	.13	.57	.41	.13	.25
III	.25	.37	.27	.07	.06	.07	.27	.19	.15	.30
IV	.47	.55	.18	.06	.09	.09	.22	.15	.04	.15
V	..	.02	.01	.06	..	.06	.29	.26	.70	.60

A percentage breakdown of the first five sections revealed strong similarities in four of five sections. Section I (Innovative/Experimental Programs) indicated the majority of responses (Few) to be 47% to 65% for upper-level and four-year respectively. For Section II (Specific Efforts to Plan Curricula) "Few" again was high for the same two

universities - 41% and 57%. However, Section III (Student Academic Advisement) differed as upper-levels indicated 37% for "All" and a spread of 25% (All), 27% (Most) and 27% (Few) for four-years. Section IV (Faculty Evaluation Methods) showed the high percentages for both institutions to be "All" - 55% (upper-level) and 47% (four-year). Section V (Faculty Exchange Programs) was 70% and 60%, in the "None" category. This was the only time "None" showed the highest percentages.

Looking at Table XXII might indicate that most institutions were not involved in the areas of consideration mentioned in the questionnaire. However, previous discussion has revealed the separate differences within each section.

A comprehensive look at the analysis of the data and the attempt to interpret the findings suggests that the upper-level institutions and the four-year institutions show such similarities that no real unique characteristics are present. A brief survey of the tables presented in this chapter also indicates this impression.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS, IMPLICATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Introduction

A study to determine some of the ways and to what extent Texas upper-level universities in their academic units and the individual university have uniquely met the needs of public higher education in the state had not been made. In specific areas this study analyzed and evaluated certain initial goals and purposes of these institutions. Therefore, this research was to determine whether these goals and purposes had been fulfilled.

Summary

For the purpose of this study both four-year universities and upper-level universities were involved. Several areas of higher education were included. They included questions about innovations, program and curriculum planning, faculty, and cost reduction techniques.

The following questions were considered in conducting the research:

1. Are upper-level institutions in Texas meeting their initial conceptual goals in program development and special programs?

2. How do the common elements in experimental programs in upper-level institutions compare with these same elements in the four-year institutions?

3. In the areas of academic advisement, evaluation, and exchange programs does faculty involvement differ significantly between upper-level and four-year institutions?

4. In what ways do both upper-level and four-year institutions utilize unique cost reduction techniques and how do the institutions differ?

A questionnaire with seven basic categories was developed. The categories were (1) innovative or experimental programs, (2) planning curricula for minorities, (3) student advisement, (4) faculty evaluation, (5) faculty exchange programs, (6) transition for junior college/community college graduates, and (7) unique fiscal procedures.

The data used in the study came from the following: twenty-five, or 81% of both university groups; seventeen, or 74% of four-year universities; and eight, or 100% of upper-level universities. The universities were selected from the list compiled by the Coordinating Board, Texas College and University System.

Descriptive statistics were utilized in this study. Statistical techniques used were as follows: frequency distribution; mean; and standard deviation. Means were used to describe the central tendency of the distribution of the scores within one item. Standard deviations were used to

describe variability among distributions.

Findings

The following are findings concerning responses of universities to innovative or experimental programs.

1. Upper-level institutions were offering and requiring interdisciplinary studies more so than four-years. Especially was this true for "Required in academic units." Though the upper-level standard deviation was more than 1 the concentration was in "All," "Most," and "Half" on these two questions.
2. There was not much difference in how self-paced instruction was being achieved at either of the universities. Both indicated a low mean. The four-year universities were at "Few" or "None" more than upper-levels. This is supported by the small standard deviation. The upper-levels did indicate use of a structural plan of study and the tutorial setting. The wide standard deviation is not indicative of the true reading.
3. Upper-level universities were making some use of most learning resources. Standard deviation scores revealed that the actual distribution is scattered. The four-years' means were low again. Both groups revealed little involvement of the master teacher concept. Standard deviations were less than 1 for both groups. Overall the other low mean was scored for direct line interrogation - computer.
4. Both university groups were not using audio or film

to record courses to any great extent. The means averaged in the "None" range. Standard deviations support the findings of the first two questions. The third part of the media center question was higher for upper-level universities.

5. Means indicated that upper-level institutions were high on use of innovative changes using lay people and employing time plan. However, the standard deviation was broad. This indicated the variability was heterogeneous.

The following are findings concerning responses of universities to specific efforts to plan curricula: Upper-level institutions appeared to be fulfilling their role through regular offerings. Though the standard deviation was greater than 1 more than half the institutions were in "All" and "Most." Otherwise, for both institutions means were low. Of course, this would be reflected in this manner if the institutions were using only one effort to achieve their goal. However, four-year institutions are lacking in all four efforts. The small standard deviations indicated this, also.

The following are findings concerning responses of universities to student academic advisement: Both upper-level and four-year institutions revealed a high mean for faculty as advisers. Also, faculty chairpersons were high. The standard deviations were very low for faculty. This indicated a homogeneous relationship. The scores were located in "All" and "Most." That explains the low

standard deviation.

Another finding shows that both university groups tend not to use full-time counselor nor peer counseling to any great degree. Most institutions were using faculty as advisers.

The following are findings concerning responses of universities to faculty evaluation methods: With the exception of "Observation of classes" both university groups recorded high means. Four-year universities had smaller standard deviations in all but student evaluations and observation of classes. This would indicate more homogeneous variability and tend to show that the four-years are fulfilling this role better. However, it should be remembered that any one or a combination of several of the methods could be used by the universities.

The following are findings concerning responses of universities to faculty exchange programs: Neither the upper-levels nor the four-years were greatly involved in exchanging faculty. Upper-levels showed the only 2 or above means. Means were all in the 1 range with standard deviations less than 1 down to 0 for four-year institutions. For one upper-level response (From a junior college/community college) the standard deviation was 1.32. This was due to a one in "All" and a one in "Most."

The following are findings concerning responses of universities to providing transition from the junior college/

community college: Upper-level and four-year universities revealed similarities in providing counseling by admissions, departmental, literature and conferences on campus. One major difference was that upper-levels were utilizing commercial radio/tv special programs more than four-years. Both groups were using direct efforts to assist in the transition from a junior college or a community college.

The following are findings concerning responses of universities to unique fiscal procedures: Four-year institutions indicated that more of their institutions were utilizing these procedures. Many have charged academic units and incorporated MIS (Management Information Systems). Overall, the four-year institutions were about 50-50 while the upper-level institutions showed 71% not using the cost reduction techniques.

More specifically, major findings include the following:

1. In the areas of interdisciplinary studies, learning resources, and innovative changes using lay people upper-level universities are positively involved.
2. Self-paced instruction and media center are not being fully utilized in either university group.
3. In comparison with the four-year university the upper-level university academic units are using more innovative or experimental programs.
4. Specific efforts to plan curricula to reflect

history, culture and current roles of minorities are being carried out through regular curriculum offerings by the upper-level institutions.

5. In student academic advisement upper-level and four-year universities tend to use faculty as the adviser.

6. Upper-level and four-year universities depend on teaching effectiveness, research, senior professors' review and administrators' review for the primary sources of faculty evaluation. The faculty review committee rates high, also.

7. Four-year universities show more interest in peer counseling than the upper-levels.

8. Upper-level universities use student evaluations more than four-year universities as a method for evaluating faculty.

9. The majority of upper-level and four year universities indicated only a few of their academic units evaluated by observation of classes.

10. As an innovation or experimental program faculty exchange is practiced very little. Teaching in another discipline is the most commonly used exchange.

11. There are no apparent differences between upper-level and four-year universities in the area of faculty exchange programs.

12. The use of commercial radio/tv special programs is popular with upper-level universities. Four-year institutions tend to ignore this type of counseling.

13. A majority of both institutions are incorporating MIS in addition to the state system.

14. Most upper-levels share computer time with nearby institutions.

Conclusions

Based on the results of this study certain conclusions are drawn:

1. Upper-level universities are fulfilling their roles in innovative/experimental programs.

2. As a group upper-level universities are not advancing any more rapidly toward meeting their initial goals and purposes than the four-year universities.

Implications

The data revealed in this study seem to indicate that not all upper-level universities are uniquely meeting the needs of public higher education in Texas. These institutions were to have encouraged innovation and experimentation in educational methods and materials. In this they would provide program development that would give a particular meaning to this new type of education.

In many instances the upper-level university does not differ from the four-year university. Though upper-levels may be doing more in some areas the significance lies in the fact that the four-years are contributing to the areas, also.

Several factors may account for the failures among

upper-level institutions. The decrease in enrollment in certain areas has had some effect. The Coordinating Board moratorium on new degree programs undoubtedly affected development. Another fact is that four-year institutions have evaluated their own programs. Internally many four-years have realized they needed to retrench. These insights have helped create an attractive and viable educational institution. Thus, the four-year university has utilized these development approaches to make a stronger and more competitive institution.

Recommendations

Findings and conclusions of the study suggest the following recommendations:

1. Upper-level universities should develop specific programs in their academic units. Such areas as learning resources and media centers evidently are not being used nor encouraged. Other areas such as interdisciplinary studies and self-paced instruction may be more a matter of philosophy. However, not enough upper-levels indicate their academic units are involved in these programs.
2. Experimentation in educational methods and materials needs to be encouraged. There is little indication that this is being done in any general way among upper-level universities.
3. Full-time counselors for academic advising are not employed by seven out of eight upper-level universities. If

academic advisers are not provided through an organized program in academic units then full-time advisers might be considered. Also, peer counseling needs to be initiated at more upper-level institutions.

4. More faculty exchange is needed in the upper-level university. It is noted that both groups of universities seem to have little or no interest in this approach. Yet, one of the major reasons offered for establishing an upper-level university was the estimate of savings. We have long passed the point of harboring talented faculty. In every survey category pertaining to this there should be positive reactions. Two institutions employing cooperatively could gain scholarship and retain prestige. Among other advantages the exchange professor could teach a needed course to accommodate changes in programs.

5. To assist in transition from the junior college/community college more peer counseling is needed. The transfer student needs to be oriented to the upper-level institution. Inadequate information provides poor guidance.

6. More needs to be done to study curriculum, methods, transition from junior college/community college and fiscal procedures. Research of some nature needs to be conducted.

7. The three upper-level centers are lacking in population. This is probably one principal reason why they are referred to as centers. Care should be taken that these units be given the same opportunity to develop programs,

methods, etc. as the other upper-level institutions.

8. Those upper-level universities without the advantage of surrounding junior colleges and community colleges should be given the opportunity to establish dormitories for residence living. If they do not have this option limited growth will peak and remain constant.

9. Change is one of the most difficult actions to initiate and maintain. To implement programs and to provide an alternative to traditionalism the upper-level academic unit must be responsive to the current trends.

APPENDIX



Coordinating Board
TEXAS COLLEGE AND UNIVERSITY SYSTEM

P.O. BOX 12786 CAPITOL STATION

AUSTIN, TEXAS 78711

(512) 475-3413

March 29, 1977

Lawrence Ray Smith
Assistant to the President
Texas A&I University
Kingsville, TX 78363

Dear Mr. Smith:

I enjoyed meeting you today and reviewing with you the plans for your doctoral research at North Texas State University. We will be very much interested in seeing the results of the study.

It is clear from my review of your study that it does not duplicate any previous or current study of the Coordinating Board. To my knowledge, there is no similar study within the state of Texas.

Please feel free to call upon my office for information if we can be of assistance.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "David T. Kelly".

David T. Kelly, Head
Division of Program Development

DTK/db

HARRY PROVENCE, CHAIRMAN; NEWTON GRESHAM, VICE-CHAIRMAN; JACK ARTHUR; TONY BONILLA; G. V. BRINDLEY, JR., M.D.; O. H. ELLIOTT; JOHN W. FAINTER, JR.; MARSHALL FORMBY; BETTY JO (MRS. JESS) HAY; HAROLD D. HERNDON; FRED H. MOORE; L. F. PETERSON; RICHARD S. SLOCOMB; RALPH SPENCE; R. PAUL TEAGUE, SR.; WAYNE E. THOMAS; M. HARVEY WEIL; AND SAM D. YOUNG, JR.; KENNETH H. ASHWORTH, COMMISSIONER.

R 3 1 1977

March 16, 1977

Dear Chief Administrator:

The attached questionnaire is part of a dissertation concerned with the extent to which Texas upper-level institutions are uniquely meeting the needs of public higher education in Texas. I plan to compare Texas State four-year universities with Texas State upper-level institutions and centers.

You can help me in my study by assisting in a pre-test. To the left of each question indicate which of the following might cause problems in getting the desired response. You may use the numbers 1, 2, 3 to correspond with this criteria:

1. Clarity - is it clear in its meaning and wording?
2. Related to research question - does it relate to one of the stated research questions.
3. Potential in securing information.

Be assured that strict confidentiality will be adhered to in this pilot study. Please return the information to me in the enclosed self-addressed, stamped envelope.

Thank you in advance for your help in this research project.

Sincerely yours,

Lawrence Ray Smith
Assistant to the President
Texas A&I University

enclosures

Each category (All, Most, Half, Few, None) is given a value as follows:

All	=	100%
Most	=	90%/80%/70%
Half	=	60%/50%/40%
Few	=	30%/20%/10%
None	=	0%.

Please place a percentage, corresponding to the appropriate value, in the blank. As an example: if the academic unit is greatly involved (Most = 90%/80%/70%) then place one of the three percentages in the blank. It is requested that you respond to each statement. The values are defined in the following ways:

1. All = if your academic units are totally involved.
2. Most = if your academic units are greatly involved.
3. Half = if your academic units are equally divided in involvement.
4. Few = if your academic units are somewhat involved.
5. None = if your academic units are not involved.

Please note that academic units are defined as basic disciplines of study, i.e. departments, schools, etc. within the university. The questions are designed to seek information pertaining to the academic units within your university.

In the academic units within your university:

II. Faculty chairpersons assist in

- | | <u>All</u> | <u>Most</u> | <u>Half</u> | <u>Few</u> | <u>None</u> |
|---|------------|-------------|-------------|------------|-------------|
| A. institutional planning through | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| 1. administrative decision-making. | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| 2. budgeting input. | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| 3. curriculum construction. | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| B. designing innovative changes by | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| 1. using lay people (community input, | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| professional advice, etc.). | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| 2. utilizing special funds. | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| 3. employing a time plan for termination or | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| incorporation of experimental programs. | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ |

III. Specific efforts have been made to plan curricula to reflect history, culture, and current roles of minorities

- | | | | | | |
|--|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| A. through <u>regular</u> curriculum offerings. | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| B. through <u>special</u> curriculum offerings. | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| C. through Center for Continuing Education. | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| D. through special programs (outside guests, special observances, etc.). | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| E. through federal/state government programs (Adult Ed., Bilingual Title VII, HEMP, etc.). | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ |

In the academic units within your university:

IV. Students are advised academically by

- | | <u>All</u> | <u>Most</u> | <u>Half</u> | <u>Few</u> | <u>None</u> |
|-------------------------------------|------------|-------------|-------------|------------|-------------|
| A. faculty chairperson. | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| B. faculty. | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| C. full-time counselor. | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| D. peer counseling. | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| E. vocational-technical counseling. | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| F. paid advisor. | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| G. student assistant. | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ |

V. Faculty evaluation methods include

- | | | | | | |
|---|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| A. teaching effectiveness as the primary criterion. | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| B. research. | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| C. observation of classes. | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| D. faculty review committee. | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| E. senior professors, administrators review. | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| F. student evaluations. | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| G. determining overall performance: | | | | | |
| 1. student advising. | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| 2. faculty service and relations. | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| 3. management (administration). | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| 4. performing and visual arts. | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| 5. publications. | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| 6. public service. | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ |

In the academic units within your university:

	<u>All</u>	<u>Most</u>	<u>Half</u>	<u>Few</u>	<u>None</u>
VI. Faculty <u>exchange</u> programs consist of (while employed here)	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
A. teaching in second field.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
B. teaching at a senior (four-year) university.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
C. teaching at an upper-level university.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
D. teaching at a junior college/community college.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
E. adjuncts at your university.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
F. others teaching in your university.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
1. from a senior (four-year) university.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
2. from an upper-level university.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
3. from a junior college/community college.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____

This university:

	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>
VII. Provides transition for junior college/community college graduates by		
A. counseling		
1. admissions.	_____	_____
2. peer.	_____	_____
3. departmental.	_____	_____
4. literature (catalogs, brochures, news letter, etc.)	_____	_____
5. films.	_____	_____
6. "hot-line" for transfer information.	_____	_____
7. commercial radio/television special programs.	_____	_____
8. university radio/television special programs.	_____	_____
9. conference(s) on campus.	_____	_____
10. allowing participation in social and extra-curricular activities.	_____	_____
11. giving appropriate advice at first registration.	_____	_____
B. direct efforts to coordinate transferred courses:		
1. specific information in catalogs.	_____	_____
2. literature about transfer policies and procedures.	_____	_____
3. accepting intertransferability of credit if in same system.	_____	_____
C. an over-all grade point average (regardless of D or lowest grade concept) as standard for admission from junior college/community college.	_____	_____
VIII. Utilizes unique fiscal procedures in the following ways:		
A. offer incentives such as retaining in the department/division carryover unspent balances.	_____	_____
B. contract for computer expenditures.	_____	_____
C. charge for computer expenditures made in instructional and departmental research against departmental/division budgets.	_____	_____
D. share computer costs with nearby institution(s).	_____	_____
E. have departmental/division budgets that include rental charges for space, equipments, etc.	_____	_____

July 25, 1977

Dear Chief Administrator:

The attached questionnaire is part of a dissertation concerned with the extent to which Texas upper-level institutions are uniquely meeting the needs of public higher education in Texas. I plan to compare Texas State four-year universities with Texas State upper-level institutions and centers.

You can help me in my study by responding as quickly as possible. Please return the information to me in the enclosed self-addressed, stamped envelope.

Be assured that strict confidentiality will be adhered to in gathering the data and publishing the results. No institution, or individual, will be referred to in the published dissertation.

The coded number on the questionnaire is for my use in comparing responses within individual institutions.

Thank you in advance for your help in this research project.

Sincerely yours,

Lawrence Ray Smith
Assistant to the President
Texas A&I University

enclosures

Please place a check (✓) on the appropriate line. It is requested that you respond to each statement. The values are defined in the following ways:

1. All = if your academic units are totally involved.
2. Most = if your academic units are greatly involved.
3. Half = if your academic units are equally divided in involvement.
4. Few = if your academic units are somewhat involved.
5. None = if your academic units are not involved.

Please note that academic units are defined as basic disciplines of study, i.e. departments, schools, etc. within the university. The questions are designed to seek information pertaining to the academic units within the university.

In the academic units within your university:

I. These innovative or experimental programs are employed:

	<u>All</u>	<u>Most</u>	<u>Half</u>	<u>Few</u>	<u>None</u>
A. Interdisciplinary studies (fusing separate specialities toward a particular objective) are	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
1. offered in the academic units.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
2. <u>required</u> in the academic units.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
B. Instructional planning that is self-paced instruction	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
1. and involves a structured plan of study.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
2. and uses the tutorial setting.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
3. and involves wide use of media and technology.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
4. and includes contract study.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
C. Learning resources as follows:	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
1. multi-media classrooms.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
2. instructional television.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
3. self-instruction units --	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
language labs, audio-listening centers, etc.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
microforms (microfilm, microfiche, etc.)	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
5. master teachers who record on television.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
6. direct line interrogation by computer of card	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
catalogs at other campuses.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
D. Media center	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
1. records audio of courses.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
2. records film of courses.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
3. prepares and orders teaching materials.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
E. Faculty chairpersons assist in designing innovative changes by	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
1. using lay people (community input, professional advice, etc.).	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
2. employing a time plan for termination or incorporation of experimental programs.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____

	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>
VI. Provides transition for junior college/community college graduates by:		
A. counseling.		
1. admissions.	_____	_____
2. peer.	_____	_____
3. departmental.	_____	_____
4. literature (catalogs, brochures, news letters, etc.).	_____	_____
5. films.	_____	_____
6. "hot-line" for transfer information.	_____	_____
7. commercial radio/television special programs.	_____	_____
8. university radio/television special programs.	_____	_____
9. conference(s) on campus.	_____	_____
B. direct efforts to coordinate transferred courses through		
1. specific literature about transfer policies and procedures.	_____	_____
2. accepting intertransferability of credit if in same system.	_____	_____
VII. Utilizes unique fiscal procedures in the following ways:		
A. offers incentives such as retaining (in the academic units) carryover unspent balances (local funds).	_____	_____
B. shares computer time with nearby institution(s).	_____	_____
C. contracts commercially for computer services.	_____	_____
D. charges for computer expenditures made in instructional and departmental research against academic units' budgets.	_____	_____
E. have academic units' budgets that include rental charges for space, equipment, etc.	_____	_____
F. incorporates management information systems (MIS) (in addition to the state systems).	_____	_____

TEXAS PUBLIC SENIOR
COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES

116

ANGELO STATE UNIVERSITY
President Lloyd D. Vincent
2601 West Avenue N
San Angelo, Texas 76901

EAST TEXAS STATE UNIVERSITY
President F. Henderson McDowell
East Texas Station
Commerce, Texas 75428

EAST TEXAS STATE UNIVERSITY
CENTER AT TEXARKANA
President John F. Moss
Box 5518
Texarkana, Texas 75501

LAMAR UNIVERSITY
President C. Robert Kemble
Lamar Station, Box 10001
Beaumont, Texas 77710

ORANGE CENTER
Director Joe Ben Welch
410 Front Street
Orange, Texas 77630

PORT ARTHUR CENTER
Director W. Sam Monroe
1500 Proctor Street
Port Arthur, Texas 77640

MIDWESTERN STATE UNIVERSITY
President John Grove Barker
3400 Taft
Wichita Falls, Texas 76308

NORTH TEXAS STATE UNIVERSITY
President C. C. Nolen
Denton, Texas 76203

PAN AMERICAN UNIVERSITY
President Ralph Schilling
Edinburg, Texas 78539

BROWNSVILLE EXTENSION CENTER
Director Fred Cunningham
80 Fort Brown
Brownsville, Texas 78520

SAM HOUSTON STATE UNIVERSITY
President Elliott T. Bowers
Huntsville, Texas 77340

SOUTHWEST TEXAS STATE UNIVERSITY
President Lee H. Smith
SWTSU Station, Box 1002
San Marcos, Texas 78666

STEPHEN F. AUSTIN STATE UNIVERSITY
President William R. Johnson
SFA Station, Box 6078
Nacogdoches, Texas 75961

SUL ROSS STATE UNIVERSITY
President Charles R. Richardson
Alpine, Texas 79830

UVALDE EXTENSION CENTER
Director William A. Tindol
Uvalde, Texas 78801

TEXAS A&I UNIVERSITY SYSTEM
Acting Chancellor
D. Whitney Halladay
Kingsville, Texas 78363

TEXAS A&I UNIVERSITY AT
CORPUS CHRISTI
President D. Whitney Halladay
6300 Ocean Drive, P.O.Box 6010
Corpus Christi, Texas 78411

TEXAS A&I UNIVERSITY IN
KINGSVILLE
President Gerald Burns Robins
Kingsville, Texas 78363

TEXAS A&I UNIVERSITY AT
LAREDO
President Billy F. Cowart
P. O. Box 537
Laredo, Texas 78040

TEXAS A&M UNIVERSITY SYSTEM
President Jack K. Williams
College Station, Texas 77843

MOODY COLLEGE OF MARINE SCIENCES
AND MARITIME RESOURCES
Provost William H. Clayton
Galveston, Texas 77550

PRAIRIE VIEW A&M UNIVERSITY
President Alvin I. Thomas
Prairie View, Texas 77445

TARLETON STATE UNIVERSITY
President W.O. Trogdon
Stephenville, Texas 76401

TEXAS A&M UNIVERSITY
President Jack K. Williams
College Station, Texas 77848

TEXAS EASTERN UNIVERSITY
President James H. Stewart, Jr.
3900 University Boulevard
Tyler, Texas 75701

TEXAS SOUTHERN UNIVERSITY
President Granville M. Sawyer
3201 Wheeler Avenue
Houston, Texas 77004

TEXAS STATE UNIVERSITY SYSTEM
Executive Director Gary Whittle
505 Sam Houston Building
Austin, Texas 78701

ANGELO STATE UNIVERSITY
President Lloyd D. Vincent
2601 West Avenue N
San Angelo, Texas 76901

SAM HOUSTON STATE UNIVERSITY
President Elliott T. Bowers
Huntsville, Texas 77340

SOUTHWEST TEXAS STATE UNIVERSITY
President Lee H. Smith
SWTSU Station, Box 6078
San Marcos, Texas 78666

TEXAS TECH UNIVERSITY
President M. Cecil Mackey, Jr.
P.O. Box 4349
Lubbock, Texas 79409

TEXAS WOMAN'S UNIVERSITY
President Mary Evelyn Huey
Drawer A, TWU Station
Denton, Texas 76204

THE UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS SYSTEM
Chancellor Charles A. LeMaistre
601 Colorado
Austin, Texas 78701

THE UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS
AT ARLINGTON
President Wendell Nedderman
Arlington, Texas 76019

THE UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS
AT AUSTIN
President Lorene Rogers
University Station
Austin, Texas 78712

THE UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS
AT DALLAS
President Bryce Jordan
P. O. Box 688
Richardson, Texas 75080

THE UNIVERISTY OF TEXAS
AT EL PASO
President Arleigh B. Templeton
El Paso, Texas 79999

THE UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS
OF THE PERMIAN BASIN
President V. R. Cardozier
Odessa, Texas 79762

THE UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS
AT SAN ANTONIO
President Peter Flawn
San Antonio, Texas 78285

UNIVERSITY OF HOUSTON
President Philip G. Hoffman
3801 Cullen Boulevard
Houston, Texas 77004

DOWNTOWN COLLEGE
Chancellor J. Don Boney
One Main Plaza
Houston, Texas 77002

UNIVERSITY OF HOUSTON
AT CLEAR LAKE CITY
Chancellor Alfred Neumann
2700 Bay Area Boulevard
Houston, Texas 77058

UNIVERSITY OF HOUSTON
AT VICTORIA
Acting Chancellor
George C. Taulbee
2302-C Red River
Victoria, Texas 77901

WEST TEXAS STATE UNIVERSITY
President Lloyd I. Watkins
P.O. Box 998
Canyon, Texas 79016

September 4, 1977

Dear Chief Administrator:

The beginning of the fall semester is always a busy time at a university, I know. Recently, a letter with a questionnaire pertaining to the extent Texas upper-level institutions are uniquely meeting the needs of public higher education in the state was mailed to you.

May I ask your assistance in securing this information and returning it to me? Thank you very much.

Sincerely yours,

Lawrence Ray Smith
P.O. Box 2064
Kingsville Tx 78363

November 5, 1977

Dear Chief Administrator:

This letter pertains to a survey seeking the extent Texas upper-level institutions are uniquely meeting the needs of public higher education in the state.

May I ask your assistance in securing the information on the enclosed questionnaire and returning it to me? This is very important to my completion of a dissertation.

Thank you very much.

Sincerely,

Lawrence Ray Smith
P.O. Box 2064
Kingsville Tx 78363

enclosures

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books

- Altman, Robert A., The Upper Division College, San Francisco, Jossey-Bass., 1970.
- Baskin, Samuel (Ed.), Higher Education: Some Newer Developments, New York, McGraw-Hill, 1965.
- Roscoe, John T., Fundamental Research Statistics for the Behavioral Sciences, Dallas, Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1975.
- Rudolph, Frederick, The American College and University, New York, Alfred A. Knopf, 1965.
- Sax, Gilbert, Empirical Foundations of Educational Research, Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey, Prentice-Hall Inc., 1968.
- Underwood, Benton J., Carl P. Duncan, Janet A. Taylor, and John W. Cotton, Elementary Statistics, New York, Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., 1954.

Articles

- Andrews, Ted F. and Peter Fenner, "An Experimenting College of Environmental and Applied Science: Part I," Community College Frontiers, 3 (Winter, 1975), 17-22.
- Higbee, Marvin, "Upper Division Colleges: An End to Transfer Hurdles," Community and Junior College Journal, 43 (March, 1973), 44-48.
- Lauper, Russell T. and Victor P. Meskill, "An Experiment in Upper-Division Education," Planning for Higher Education, 4 (February, 1975), 2-5.
- Sames, Richard W., "The Upper-Level Universities and the Community Colleges," Liberal Education, 60 (October, 1974), 348-358.

Reports

- Annual Report of the Coordinating Board, Texas College and University System, Austin, Coordinating Board, Texas College and University System, 1972.
- Annual Report of the Coordinating Board, Texas College and University System, Austin, Coordinating Board, Texas College and University System, 1973.
- Association of the Upper Level College and University, The Upper Level College and University Movement, Boulder, Association of the Upper Level College and University, 1971.
- Challenge for Excellence, Austin, Coordinating Board, Texas College and University System, 1969.
- Cowart, Billy F. and F. Allen Briggs, A Brief History of Texas A&I University at Laredo, Laredo, Texas A&I University, 1973.
- Crowson, James L., An Innovative Academic Plan for an Upper Level University, Dallas, Texas University, 1973.
- Policy Paper 4, Austin, Coordinating Board, Texas College and University System, 1968.
- Priorities for Action: Final Report of the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, St. Louis, McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1973.
- Proceedings of the International Conference on the Upper-Level University/Junior College Partnership, Pensacola, The University of West Florida, 1970.
- Shell, Helene I., A Profile of Upper-Level Colleges, Washington, D.C., ERIC Clearinghouse on Higher Education, 1973.
- Southern Regional Education Board, Issues in Higher Education, Number 2, Atlanta, 1971.
- Study of Upper-Level Institutions and Off-Campus Educational Units of Public Universities, Austin, Coordinating Board, Texas College and University System, 1976.
- Texas Higher Education 1968-1980, Austin, Coordinating Board, Texas College and University System, 1975.
- Upper-Level Institutions: A Report to the Texas Legislature, Austin, Coordinating Board, Texas College and University System, 1972.

Willingham, Warren W., The No. 2 Access Problem: Transfer to the Upper Division, Washington, D.C., ERIC Clearinghouse on Higher Education/American Association for Higher Education, 1972.

Woolf, J.R., Planning and Developing an Upper Level Senior College, Austin, Coordinating Board, Texas College and University System, 1974.

Unpublished Materials

Coordinating Board, Texas College and University System, "Minutes, Special Called Meeting of September 16, 1968," Coordinating Board, Texas College and University System, Austin, Texas, 1968.

Jernigan, James C., Interview at Fort Worth, Texas, July, 1976.

Marsh, Robert, "Curriculum and Credit Transfer Problems in the Upper Level Institution," Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Association of Upper Level Colleges and Universities, March 3, 1972.

Perry, Charles E., "The First Thousand Days," Speech presented before the Florida State Board of Regents, July 6, 1972.