

P R O G R E S S R E P O R T

IOWA LEGISLATIVE TASK FORCE ON HIGHER EDUCATION

February, 1989

BACKGROUND

The Higher Education Task Force was established by Senate File 2312 (1988 Session), to "study and make recommendations regarding the goals, and the legislation necessary to meet the goals, of the state's postsecondary education system in the future."

During the summer of 1988, the following members were appointed to serve on the Higher Education Task Force:

Edgar H. Bittle, Co-chairperson  
Roxanne B. Conlin, Co-chairperson  
Senator Richard Varn  
Senator Dale Tieden  
Representative Johnie Hammond  
Representative J. Brent Siegrist  
Susan Clouser  
Judy McCoy  
Arthur Neu  
Harry Slife  
Tim Sylvester

Pursuant to Senate File 2312, the Task Force filed an organizational plan with the Legislative Council on August 25, 1988. The plan called for hiring an executive director, research assistants and outside consultants to staff the task force and identified six public hearings to receive comments from the public. The following public hearings were held:

October 12, 1988 - Des Moines  
October 13, 1988 - Council Bluffs  
October 14, 1988 - Sioux City  
October 18, 1988 - Waterloo  
October 19, 1988 - Clinton  
October 20, 1988 - Mt. Pleasant

The public hearings were designed to elicit the issues, concerns and ideas that Iowa citizens feel should be on the agenda when planning for higher education in the twenty-first century (See Appendix A for a summary of the public hearings).

The Task Force chairs subsequently organized the Task Force into five subcommittees to address a broad range of issues. Recommendations for membership on the subcommittees were solicited from business, community, education, and political leaders. Subcommittee members were chosen for their interest and knowledge in higher education policy issues and balanced by geographic region, political party and gender. Subcommittee members serve at their own expense. The subcommittees and their membership are listed below.

Quality and Capacity Subcommittee

Susan Clouser, Coon Rapids, Chair and Task Force Member  
Richard Christie, Council Bluffs  
Dr. Jan Friedel, Davenport  
Thomas Jolas, Mason City  
Michael Kennedy, New Hampton  
Kathy Kreykes, Marshalltown  
Sara Lande, Muscatine  
Robert Norris, Shenandoah  
Marvin O'Hare, Dubuque  
Sister Margaret Wick, Sioux City

Educational Opportunity, Access, and Affordability Subcommittee

Tim Sylvester, Ames, Chair and Task Force Member  
Robert Cahoy, Davenport  
Gregory Cusack, Des Moines  
Rachel Fulton, Waterloo  
Barbara Gentry, Des Moines  
Ruth Holtan, Forest City  
Philip Hubbard, Iowa City  
Louise McCormick, Mount Pleasant  
Ila Plasencia, West Des Moines  
Rita Sealock, Council Bluffs

Articulation and Vocational Education Subcommittee

Arthur Neu, Carroll, Chair and Task Force Member  
Phil Burmeister, Mount Ayr  
Don Buryanak, LeMars  
Barbara Crittenden, Creston  
Dr. Frances Disselhorst, Burlington  
B.J. Fergerson, Waterloo  
Jack Neuzil, Solon  
Mark Schantz, Des Moines  
Mark Smith, Des Moines  
Marilyn Stamp, Clinton  
Gary Thomas, Des Moines  
Dr. Richard Vaniten, Ames  
Dr. Jean Sweat, Cedar Rapids

Finance Subcommittee

Harry Slife, Cedar Falls, Chair and Task Force Member  
John Axel, Muscatine  
Raymond Bailey, Clarion  
Lanna Dettbarn, Davenport  
Nancy Evans, Cedar Rapids  
Melinda Hess, Iowa City  
Arthur Hessburg, Waverly  
Lowell Norland, Dike  
Phyllis Pearson, Des Moines  
Marvin Selden, West Des Moines

Governance Subcommittee

Judy McCoy, Dubuque, Chair and Task Force Member  
Samuel Becker, Iowa City  
Michael Delaney, Des Moines  
Daniel Dykstra, Sioux City  
Mary Jean Montgomery, Spencer  
Wayne Newton, Blairstown  
Steve Govern, Cedar Rapids  
William Sueppel, Iowa City  
Pat Van Bremer, Sioux City

During the organizational phase of the Task Force, the consultants (John Augenblick and Gordon Van de Water of AVA in Denver, Colorado, and William Chance of Olympia, Washington) conducted interviews with business, education, community, and political leaders around the state. The results of these interviews were reported to the Task Force in December (See Appendix B for summaries of the interviews).

At the Task Force meeting of November 2, the subcommittees were charged with identifying the priority state-level policy issues facing higher education in Iowa over the next twenty years and asked to report back to the Task Force at its January 26 meeting. During November, December and January, the subcommittees gathered and reviewed information on Iowa's demography, economy, and education systems. At their meetings they heard from a variety of experts and discussed a wide range of state policy issues that are likely to be important to the future development of higher education in Iowa. On January 26, the subcommittee chairs reported their findings to the Task Force. This progress report reflects the efforts of the Task Force and its subcommittees through that meeting.

Special mention must be made of the separate charge by the legislature (Senate File 2278) "to conduct a comprehensive study of the provision of vocational education courses for secondary school students." This study was made a part of the charge to the Legislative Task Force on Higher Education. The Task Force's

Subcommittee on Articulation and Vocational Education made this effort its first order of business and submitted its report to the Task Force on January 26. The Task Force discussed and amended the report and urged the legislature not to take immediate action on the report's recommendations in order to allow the Task Force a free hand in developing its overall strategic plan for higher education (See Appendix C for a copy of the report on vocational education).

#### HIGHER EDUCATION IN IOWA - A SUMMARY OF PRELIMINARY FINDINGS

Iowa, the United States, and the world have experienced and continue to experience tremendous change.

- The U.S. economy now operates in a highly competitive global economy.

- The nation's mass production and consumption traditions are changing.

- Technological development is rapidly changing production processes.

- The largest growth in the economy is in the service sector.

- The rate of growth of the work force is slowing.

- Women and minorities will comprise a larger share of the work force.

- Family structure continues to change with ongoing shifts toward both single-parent households and two-earner families.

In Iowa, we are feeling the effects of global competition and seeing structural changes in our economy. We have an aging population and work force, have experienced recent out-migration, changes in industry mix, and changes in the agricultural production system.

How is higher education faring amidst this change? Based on the public hearings, interviews with over 50 Iowa opinion leaders, and a review of documents, Iowa's system of higher education appears to be fundamentally strong despite recent fiscal tightening and changing demographics. Some typical comments made by Iowans included:

"If it ain't broke don't fix it."

"The current system is pretty darn good."

"We need a plan for the future."

"I have gnawing doubts about the efficiency of the system."

"The pain level is not high enough to push change."

"No one has a vision of the system."

"Uniform mediocrity is coming."

"Iowans are very stubborn; they resist change."

"Dollars are shrinking, and nobody wants to give up a piece."  
"Let the market decide which colleges and programs survive."  
"The quality of education is slipping; we can't afford a second-rate system of education."  
"I wonder if we can afford all these colleges."

A review of the record of the public hearings and the interviews provided the following general impressions:

(1) Iowans sense that the world is changing around them and they may not be preparing to change with it. They fear that the nation, and perhaps the rest of the world, is leaving Iowa behind both economically and educationally. They do not like the feeling that events beyond Iowa are shaping its future and the state seems unable to set its own course. They are not eager to change, yet the general sense of unease they feel pushes them to think about change - in society, in the workplace, and in education.

(2) Iowans are upset about the "political gridlock" they see in the state and concerned about what they view as the increasingly partisan nature of political decision-making.

(3) Iowans are sensitive to recent fiscal struggles, yet, despite their feelings of unease, remain generally optimistic about the future of the state. They place a high value on education as a means to ensure a sound future.

(4) Iowans are very proud of their educational institutions - particularly their local institution. They are, however, uneasy about the future because they expect increasing difficulty in providing the money to support the current system of higher education.

(5) Iowans do not exhibit a sense of urgency about the need to change their higher education institutions. They are, however, concerned about a variety of issues and believe that some changes need to be made.

#### PRIORITY ISSUES FOR THE FUTURE

At its meeting on January 26, the Task Force discussed the broad range of issues identified by its subcommittees. As a result of that discussion, four general issue areas were identified that provide a backdrop for the more focused issues that each subcommittee will be addressing in the future. These four issue areas have been designated as focal areas for discussion at the next four Task Force meetings. They are:

1) Telecommunications/technology/information exchange (February meeting) What is the likely impact of this rapidly developing area on our traditional means of delivering higher education services? What is the state's role in shaping and supporting these developments?

2) Higher education missions - do they need to change? (March meeting) What is "higher education"? What are the appropriate missions for various levels and sectors of higher education? Does the future require shifts in higher education's basic missions of teaching, research and community service? If so, how? What is the role of the state in encouraging and supporting such shifts?

3) Economic Development and Rural Revitalization (April meeting) What is the proper role for higher education in the areas of economic development and rural revitalization? How can the state draw on the talents of its higher education system without unduly politicizing its institutions or constraining academic freedom?

4) Paying For Higher Education -- The Role of the State and the Role of the Student (May meeting) What is the appropriate split between funding institutions and funding students? What is the state's role in controlling the cost of college? Is there a state role in assisting families with the rising cost of college? What innovative financing mechanisms might be developed to encourage saving for college?

The Task Force's consideration of these questions will provide a backdrop for each subcommittee's work on more specific issues. Between February and May, each subcommittee will meet at least three times to consider the issues on its agenda. The issues to be addressed by each subcommittee are identified below.

#### QUALITY AND CAPACITY SUBCOMMITTEE

##### Issue Area #1. Faculty and Staff Recruitment and Retention

##### Policy Questions To Be Addressed

(1) What incentives can the state provide to ensure quality teaching? For example, should the state require certification of faculty? Should the state encourage research into effective teaching techniques? Should the state sponsor or fund summer institute programs on effective teaching? Should the state encourage peer review of teaching or mentoring relationships?

(2) Should the state set minimum standards for teaching faculty? In addition to appropriate academic preparation and credentials, this might include level of ability to speak and write English, familiarity with various methods of instruction, and currency in technological applications to teaching the subject area.

(3) Should the state identify and reward exemplary teaching faculty? This might include endowed chairs for exceptional teaching faculty and/or a "Teaching Professor of the Year" designation that carries with it a one-time monetary award, or special support for attending professional meetings, or a grant for books, equipment (computer or laboratory) or the like.

(4) Should the state sponsor a program for improving teaching? Such a program might include research on teaching, support for experimental or pilot projects, or support for developing innovative techniques.

(5) Should the state play any role in determining the appropriate priorities for faculty promotion and tenure? The general categories typically reviewed for these decisions are research, teaching, public service and campus service. Should every faculty member be evaluated on the same criteria or should the criteria differ depending on the primary responsibility of the faculty member?

(6) Relative to peer groups, what level of average faculty salary should the state support? For example, at the average, % above or below the average.

(7) Should Iowa be taking steps to replace its aging faculty? What state level efforts would be appropriate? In addition to faculty salary and working condition concerns, this might include some means of encouraging exceptional students to choose teaching or faculty careers, perhaps including increased support for teaching and research for graduate students.

(8) Should the state be making special efforts to retain faculty and administrators through improving working conditions, for example, special support for sabbaticals, travel, equipment, office space, child care, maternity leave?

## Issue Area #2. Institutional Accreditation, Program Quality, and Program Duplication

### Policy Questions To Be Addressed

(1) Is there a state role in accrediting institutions of higher education? If so, what is the role? How does it differ from the role of accrediting associations? Should the state be working with regional accrediting associations to alter or strengthen the accreditation process, for example, in terms of measuring institutional outcomes? Who at the state level would do this? How might it be done?

(2) Are there national or international associations or groups that Iowa's colleges and universities should continue to be a part of or should aspire to belong to, for example, the American Association of Universities?

(3) Is there a state responsibility to ensure that degree programs meet specified standards? If so, what state agency should discharge that responsibility (a) for universities, (b) for community colleges? What criteria should the state use, for example, input measures (such as dollars per student, faculty

credentials, library resources, class size, laboratory equipment) or output measures (such as faculty productivity, scores on standardized examinations, employer ratings of graduates)?

(4) Who should be responsible for defining and identifying program duplication? Who should decide what happens when unnecessary program duplication is identified?

### Issue Area #3. Student Outcome Measures

#### Policy Questions To Be Addressed

(1) Should the state require definition and measurement of student outcome?

(2) Should student outcome measures be uniform for all institutions, for institutions of similar type, or vary by individual institution?

(3) Should institutions be required to report outcomes to the state? To whom should they be reported?

(4) How should the state use the results?

- a) to inform the public?
- b) to set policy?
- c) to adjust funding levels?
- d) some combination of the above?

### EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITY, ACCESS, AND AFFORDABILITY SUBCOMMITTEE

#### Issue Area #1. Financial Access and Affordability

##### Policy Questions To Be Addressed

(1) How can the state assure that postsecondary education is financially accessible to every resident?

(2) How can the state encourage parents to save for college?

Can the state provide new ways for parents and students to finance an education, possibly through a pre-paid tuition program or a long term post payment plan?

(3) Should the state expand current need based financial aid programs?

(4) Should student financial access to independent institutions be a concern of the state?

(5) What portion of the cost of education should a student pay at public institutions?



(6) Should the level of tuition vary according to a student's ability to pay, academic performance, type of institution, level, or program?

## Issue Area #2. Educational Opportunities and Geographic Access

### Policy Questions To Be Addressed

(1) How can the state provide improved educational opportunities to minorities, nontraditional students and returning students?

(2) How can the state provide educational opportunities and what kind of educational opportunities can the state provide throughout every Iowan's lifetime?

(3) Should geographic access vary by level of institution?

(4) How can private institutions play a role in geographic access?

(5) How can Iowa cooperate with other states in the region to provide both geographic access and access to specialized programs?

(6) What is the state role in encouraging exceptional students, especially minorities and women, to choose a career in education, either at the elementary/secondary or college/university level?

## Issue Area #3. Academic Standards

### Policy Questions To Be Addressed

(1) Should admissions standards vary by type of institution and, if so, how?

a) For example, should community colleges and universities have different admission standards?

b) In general, how should admission standards differ?

c) Should admission standards vary by level and/or program?

(2) Who should set admission standards?

(3) How can state policy provide for ease of transfer and integrated programs among Iowa's colleges, universities and secondary institutions?

FINANCE SUBCOMMITTEE

Issue Area #1. Capacity Issues

Policy Issues To Be Addressed

(1) What is the current capacity of a higher education physical plant in terms of number of full-time equivalent students it can serve?

- a) at the Regents universities
- b) at the community colleges
- c) at independent institutions

(2) At current enrollment levels, what percentage of capacity is currently being utilized?

- a) at the Regents universities
- b) at the community colleges
- c) at independent institutions

(3) How do you expect enrollments to change over the next 20 years?

- a) at the Regents universities
- b) at the community colleges
- c) at independent institutions

(4) What implications do projected changes in enrollments have for physical plant capacity?

- a) at the Regents universities
- b) at the community colleges
- c) at independent institutions

(5) What should the range of out-of-state enrollments be in Iowa public universities (minimum/maximum as a percent of total enrollments)?

(6) What role should private colleges play in meeting expected enrollment demand?

(7) What is the anticipated effect of any recommendations on restructuring elementary/secondary education on future physical plant needs of higher education?

(8) What is the anticipated impact of changes in technology (including computer data bases and video and audio linkages) on the future space needs for libraries?

Issue Area #2. Allocation of Resources.

Policy Issues To Be Addressed

(1) How should all of the state's educational resources be allocated?

Regents institutions  
Community colleges  
Tuition grants  
K-12

a) Should there be a formula for distributing state resources to public universities and community colleges? If yes, what might such a formula look like?

(2) Who should have authority to set tuition levels at public colleges and universities?

(3) Should universities be allowed to retain tuition revenues and determine how to expend them?

(4) What should be the state's policy on external funds?

a) Should the legislature adjust its funding based on levels of external funding entering the colleges and universities?

or

b) Should the legislature disregard levels of external funding in order to encourage additional entrepreneurial activity at the colleges and universities?

(5) Should state policy address issues surrounding nonstate funded research institutes/centers and revenue generating services provided by such entities? If so, how?

(6) Should the state encourage or discourage the raising of private funds by public colleges and universities?

a) Should the state be concerned about the potential impact of such efforts on private colleges in the state?

(7) What are the financial implications of the Access and Affordability Subcommittee's recommendations on tuition levels?

(8) What are the financial implications of the Quality and Capacity Subcommittee's recommendations on faculty salaries and recruitment/retention?

Issue Area #3. Overall Costs and Revenue Sources

Policy Issues To Be Addressed

(1) Compared to other states, is Iowa spending too little, too much, or about the right amount on higher education now?

- a) at the Regents universities
- b) at the community colleges
- c) at independent institutions

(2) Over the next 20 years, taking into account the recommendations of the Quality and Capacity Subcommittee and the Access and Affordability Subcommittee, should the state's commitment to funding higher education change?

(3) Over the next 20 years, should the state be putting in place innovative financing strategies to help families and students pay for college, for example, savings plans, service programs, or tax breaks? (This issue will also be addressed by the Access and Affordability Subcommittee.)

(4) What is the anticipated financial impact on Iowa's universities and community colleges of national and international competition from out-of-state educational institutions offering academic work via telecommunications?

GOVERNANCE SUBCOMMITTEE

Issue Area #1. Reviewing Private and Out-Of-State Institutions

Policy Issues To Be Addressed

(1) Is there a state role in monitoring independent institutions of higher education in Iowa? If so, what is it?

(2) Is there an appropriate state structure to review private and out-of-state institutions?

(3) To what level and what extent should out-of-state institutions which offer programs in Iowa be regulated by the state? What state agency should administer regulations governing out-of-state institutions and delivery of educational services via telecommunications when such services cross state lines?

(4) Is the current accreditation process adequate to assure that Iowa students are receiving a good education? (A similar question is being addressed by the Quality and Capacity Subcommittee.)

Meeting #2/Issue Area #2. Examining Current Governance Structures

Subcommittee Statement of Criteria: "Good governance should:

- Be flexible - able to adapt to the changes that come
- Be able to resolve conflict
- Be accountable - both the institution(s) and the governing body must be accountable to those they serve
- Be capable of facilitating planning and articulation
- Be able to communicate both to those in their institutions as well as to the outside world
- Have adequate authority to lead
- Be representative of those they serve
- Be able to insure quality education"

Policy Issues To Be Addressed

- (1) Do the current structures meet the criteria?
- (2) Can the current structures meet the criteria?
- (3) What can be done to improve existing structure to more adequately serve the needs?
- (4) At what level of governance is, or should there be, ultimate accountability for the various criteria?
- (5) Is the structure of state governance appropriate to ensure quality postsecondary education?

Issue Area #3. Examining Possible Alternative Governance Structures and State and Institutional Roles in Strategic Planning

Policy Issues To Be Addressed

- (1) Should there be statutory consideration of coordinating postsecondary education?
- (2) What is the state's role and the institution's role in strategic planning?
- (3) Should Iowa have a single state agency charged with strategic planning for all of higher education?
- (4) If yes, are there other state level responsibilities that should be assigned to the agency, for example, budget review, program review, or program coordination (duplication issues)?
- (5) If no, how should the state go about making long range decisions for the future development of higher education?

ARTICULATION AND VOCATIONAL EDUCATION SUBCOMMITTEE

Because of its charge to report in January on the Department of Education's proposed requirements for offering vocational-

education programs in secondary schools, this committee has not had the same opportunity as the other committees to discuss future issues. At its next meeting on February 28, the committee will be discussing these issues and setting its agenda for the next four months. While it is too early to say precisely how the subcommittee will focus its work, the following general areas are likely to be included:

Policy Questions To Be Addressed in the Area of Vocational Education

Issue Area #1. Articulation in Iowa Education

Policy Questions To Be Addressed

- (1) What is the "fit" between educational sectors -- high school/college, area school/four-year institution, etc. -- in Iowa?
- (2) What procedures or devices exist to facilitate the transfer of students between sectors? Are these adequate? Are claims of student credit loss substantial? Are they substantiated?
- (3) Do the entrance requirements of one sector, e.g., college or university, unduly affect another, e.g., high school? Are such standards negotiated or unilaterally developed? What inter-sector arrangements, committees, agreements exist? Are they effective?
- (4) Are integrated curricular arrangements (2+2, 2+1, etc. programs) prevalent in Iowa? Are they effective?
- (5) Do college admissions officers work with high school guidance counselors on matters associated with college entrance? Do baccalaureate and community college faculty and administrators work together to ensure the facile transfer of credits? Are there statewide high school/college relations councils or intercollege relations councils addressing matters of articulation and transfer?
- (6) Have colleges and universities in Iowa formed comprehensive sending/receiving relationships with high schools and area schools, perhaps on a regional basis?
- (7) What is and what should be the state policy in Iowa on inter-sector articulation? Is this issue important to the future of higher education in Iowa? What is the state's role in addressing it? What are the major policy options?

Issue Area #2. Vocational Education

Policy Questions To Be Addressed

(1) What is "vocational education"? Should it be called something else? What if any distinctions exist between vocational education and adult education or continuing education? What should be the connection between vocational education/training/retraining and state economic development and welfare programs and policies?

(2) Who should provide vocational education? What should be the role of the secondary schools, the community colleges, the universities, proprietary schools, businesses and industry? Should institutional responsibilities differ according to whether the work is exploratory or preparatory? How should the education system respond to an adult needing training or retraining?

(3) Is there a state role in determining where vocational education programs are offered, especially high cost/low demand programs?

(4) Should vocational education students be treated any differently in terms of tuition levels, student financial aid, or admission standards?

(5) Is there a state role in assuring uniform opportunities for training and retraining for local businesses?

(6) Is this issue important to the future of higher education in Iowa? What is the state's role in addressing it? What are the major policy options?

Issue Area #3. Examining a Competency Based System

(1) Should the educational system rely more on student competencies than credits or Carnegie Units?

(2) Should students moving through the education system demonstrate specific competencies at certain points?

(3) What competencies should students display upon completion of each level?

(4) How does the education system need to change to accommodate a competency based system? For example, should Iowa develop a statewide "college without walls" designed to draw on all of Iowa's higher education capacity to deliver instruction to students (including high school students) via telecommunications or other means of long distance learning.

(5) What is the potential for the application of other technologies? For example, could computerized competency

portfolios be prepared for each student and augmented as additional education and training is received and the appropriate competencies demonstrated?

(6) Is this issue important to the future of higher education in Iowa? What is the state's role in addressing it? What are the major policy options?

#### THE HIGHER EDUCATION FORUM

As part of its effort to stimulate innovative thinking about future policies for higher education in Iowa, the Task Force is sponsoring a Higher Education Forum in Des Moines on March 14, 1989. (Appendix D for a tentative Forum schedule) The Forum will focus on the future of higher education in Iowa. Dr. Frank Newman, president of the Education Commission of the States, will be the featured speaker on the topic "The State and Higher Education -- The Challenges That Await Us". Other topics include "Challenges Facing Iowa Over The Next Twenty Years", "Interaction Between K-12, and Postsecondary Education During the Next Two Decades", and "Women and Minorities in Higher Education in the Next Two Decades?" Following these presentations, Task Force members and other attendees will participate in a futures exercise designed to stimulate thinking about what Iowa will look like in the year 2010 and how higher education might change during this period.

#### Future Activities of the Task Force

From February until May, the Task Force and its subcommittees will be addressing the issues identified. During June, the Task Force will work on "bringing it all together". This will be followed by the drafting of the Task Force's preliminary report which will be the subject of public hearings in the fall. The Task Force will issue its final report after considering comments received during the hearing process.

The Task Force has set the following schedule for its work:

February 24, 1989	Topic: State Level Policy Issues Related to Telecommunications, Technology, and Information Exchange
March 14, 1989	Higher Education Forum
March 15, 1989	Topic: State Level Policy Issues Related to the Definition and Missions of Higher Education
April 19, 1989	Topic: State Level Policy Issues Related to Higher Education's Role in Economic Development and Rural



Revitalization

May 24, 1989	Topic: State Level Policy Issues Related to Institutional and Individual Financial Support
June 7-8, 1989	Topic: Presentation and Discussion of Subcommittee Reports
Mid-August 1989	Topic: Draft Preliminary Report
September-October	Public Hearings on Preliminary Report
October	Topic: Final Report
November	Issuance of Final Report

Respectfully submitted,

John Schmidt  
Executive Director

#### APPENDICES

Reference is made in the Progress Report to Appendix A, Appendix B and Appendix C. These appendices accompanied copies of the report submitted as required by statute to the Legislative Council. Several, or all, of them had been sent previously to a number of those receiving this Progress Report. They are available for examination at the Higher Education Task Force, ground floor, Lucas Building. Or, copies will be made upon request.