Changes that higher education is experiencing and forecasting and approaches to improve higher education management are considered. In addition to declining enrollment, rising costs, and diminishing financial resources, colleges are faced with the task of managing these changes under the pressures of new constraints and new constituencies. Collective bargaining is affecting faculty participation on governance, and the influence of faculty is also being affected by its changing composition and distribution; the tenured professoriate is projected to continue to age. Additionally, students now serve on academic advisory bodies at most institutions, and most colleges have defined due process for students with regard to their rights. It is suggested that with trends toward centralization of authority and demands for increased accountability, governing boards have increased the scope of their activities and will become an increasingly important constraint on higher education's decision-making processes. Among the external constituencies are state government, accrediting agencies, local communities, benefactors, and business interests. Each has a vehicle for exerting influence on an institution. It is suggested that the inability to measure its effectiveness is important to higher education's adaptation to the changes it is experiencing, and that criteria for evaluation must be established. Decisions must be based on specificity of goals, comprehensiveness in developing plans to achieve those goals, and innovation in measuring outcomes. Executives need an aggressive and open-minded approach in searching for and testing new methods and need to recognize constraints that affect a decision. (SW)
HIGHER EDUCATION MANAGEMENT: THE NAME OF THE GAME IS CHANGE.

by James H. Brahney

American Association of University Administrators

ERIC Clearinghouse on Higher Education
Higher Education Management: The Name Of The Game Is Change

By James H. Brahney

Everyone knows what management is. We all manage our personal finances and other domestic affairs. Supervisors manage assembly-line workers, teachers manage the classroom, scientists manage the laboratory and their experiments. Some people manage the office, others the sales force, and we all manage to get by.

The term "management" is used in almost every facet of human endeavor. Everyone uses the term, but few could agree on a definition of what it actually is.

We hear and read about management theories, schools, processes, principles, styles, fundamentals, and elements. There are management functions and functional management, management systems and systems management, scientific management and management science. We have risk management and contingency management. There are financial managers, human resource managers, project managers, laissez faire managers, good managers, and bad managers.

The term "management" is used in almost every facet of human endeavor. Everyone uses the term, many practice the art (or science) of management, but few could agree on a definition of what it actually is. Simon (1960) and Lewitt (1978) concur in that the very essence of management is decision making. Drucker has said that "management is tasks. But management is also people" (1973, p. xiii). Most definitions of management allude to productivity, or profitability, or some other measure of "organizational success." Some theorists relate management to terms such as efficiency and effectiveness; some equate management to both terms and call it performance (Drucker 1973, p. 17).

The literature is full of well-worn phrases describing "organized anarchy" and "mismanagement" in higher education. One can easily find descriptions such as "they don't know how to govern themselves" or "their fiscal policy is to raise as much money as possible and spend it all." Based on evidence of past performance, "colleges and universities apparently do not know what their business is" (Stewart 1975, p. 17). Many would argue that "there is no such thing as academic management and that the subtitle is an impossibility" (Richman and Farmer 1977, p. 1).

Impressed throughout the criticisms of higher education is that its executives have not given adequate attention to the concepts of efficiency and effectiveness. Drucker (1964) differentiates the two: efficiency is doing things right, effectiveness is doing the right things. The task of management is to ensure the proper balance between the two.

Higher education institutions must learn to do the right things right. As their executives begin to address the problem of maintaining a balance between efficiency and effectiveness, they become acutely aware of the impact of previous inattention to specificity of goals and outcome measurement. It is extremely difficult to measure efficiency when institutions' goals are "shrouded in vagueness" (Balderston 1978, p. 5). It is also difficult to assess effectiveness when outcomes are so "extraordinarily hard to isolate and measure" (Bowen 1978, p. 5). But it must be done. There has been a recent push for increased efficiency in higher education management (Ross 1976), and there have been cautions against a diminishing concern for effectiveness in light of that push. Executives must find and maintain the proper balance.

Superimposed on the structure of higher education is its commitment to meet the needs of the society it serves efficiently and effectively.

Superimposed on the structure of higher education is its commitment to meet the needs of the society it serves, efficiently and effectively. In order to accomplish its mission, higher education utilizes much of society's resources: Society demands that its institutions provide a reasonably return on its investment of resources. Higher education is not unlike profit-oriented institutions in terms of this social obligation. The college or university is no more exempt than other institutions to "justify its claims on society's resources" (Simon 1967, p. 68).

The future for higher education is most certainly one of change (Mayhew 1978). New and unfamiliar constraints are being imposed upon its operations. Various constituencies are exercising their influence on institutions more than ever before. Available resources are diminishing, enrollments are declining, and phrases such as program cutback, retooling, and financial exigency have entered the vernacular.

One of the most significant changes in higher education is the type of change itself.
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One of the most significant changes in higher education is the type of change itself. The great majority of institutions are planning for a future that reflects, as a maximum, maintaining the status quo. In most of the literature on organization and management, it is assumed that the institution is expanding or at least interested in expanding (Cyrst 1978). This is not the case in higher education. It is planning for an ominous future, one in which the majority will try to manage the change from rapid expansion to a state of equilibrium or possible contraction.

This paper highlights some of the changes that higher education is experiencing and forecasting. The changing environment is described, with emphasis on its many new constraints and constituencies. The problems of non-specificity of goals and difficulty in measuring outcomes are related to attempts to maintain a balance between efficiency and effectiveness. The paper concludes by suggesting that the higher education executive's search for success in meeting the formidable challenge of the future will be enhanced by a new open-mindedness, a new way of thinking about management and decision making.

The Changing Environment

During the quarter century following World War II, higher education witnessed enormous growth. The 1970s continued to reflect expansion, but it was accompanied by increasing complexity, strong emphasis on accountability, and demands for improved efficiency. The decade also saw new constraints such as student protests, unprecedented energy costs, faculty unionism, spiraling inflation. In 1979, American higher education became a $50 billion business, with a growth rate that exceeded the Consumer Price Index (Magerrell 1980).

The 1980s, however, were welcomed with a noticeable lack of enthusiasm in higher education. The outlook for the next twenty years is dominated by the threat of declining enrollment and continuing cost pressures. The Carnegie Council (1980) estimates a 40 percent enrollment decline between 1983 and 1989 and a 60 percent decline between 1991 and 1997. Diminishing financial resources require that change in higher education occur under conditions of limited growth or even retrenchment (Ashby 1974). The decade of the 1980s will be one in which American colleges establish a basis for continuing development without the cushion of continuous growth (Barnett and Shoemaker 1976, p 1).

Institutions of higher education are faced with the task of managing the aforementioned changes under the pressures of new constraints and new constituencies. There are more claims for power than ever before (Kerr 1970). The broad expansion of power and influence that numerous factions contended for during the 1970s resulted from higher education's inherently ambiguous nature. One of the main problems is that, traditionally, authority in higher education institutions has been diffused across several hierarchies. Only recently has there been a trend toward centralization of authority (Newmann 1981, p 123).

One reason is the new "interest groups vying for power and influence in higher education." (Richman and Farmer 1977, p 4) was the void created by the isolation of its institutions from the rest of society in terms of accountability. "Higher education was often viewed as a unique enterprise which could regulate itself through reliance on traditions, and consensus agreement" (Kaplin 1979, p 4). During the growth period, it was not necessary to make choices. Constraints rarely played a critical role in the decision making process. (Arns and Poland 1980, p 268). In situations of financial strife, however, decision making often appears to gain some influence, but then the pendulum swings another way. Change itself is cyclical in nature. When groups attempt to maintain a balance between accountability and the degree of authority delegation, it is not an uncommon problem. But it is a particular challenge to higher education executives (Sprunger and Berquist 1978, p 61). Certain constraints have caused a centralization of authority, and consequently, a crisis of authority. Bonham (1978) attributes the severity of the crisis to unqualified or complexity, but to the fact that higher education institutions rarely have access to the amount of resources that other institutions do.

At various times in the annals of higher education, both internal and external constituencies have made attempts to influence institutional policy and decision making. These attempts are cyclical in nature; one group appears to gain influence, but then the pendulum swings another way. Early institutions were dominated by their presidents and governing boards (Veysey 1965). By the start of this half century, the "administration" as we know it today had evolved. An aura of collegiality pervaded higher education in the 1960s as faculty became an integral part of governance in this unique social institution. Several attempts were made to describe higher education decision making via models of governance. Corson (1960) identified both a faculty and administrative hierarchy in the dual-organization model. Millett (1968) described the collegial model, heavy in faculty participation. Bennis (1971) characterized the bureaucratic model and Baldrige (1971) the political model. None of the models is flawless, and none is universal. They were all devised prior to higher education's current set of circumstances. They were not portrayed in an environment of change. Nor were they subjected to the constraints that act upon today's institutions.
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Several of the major issues that face executives in higher education in this era of change are interrelated. In coping with the changing environmental pressures acting on their operations, managers will weigh emphasis on efficiency against concerns of effectiveness. To be able to do this properly, it is first necessary to develop suitable measures of efficiency and effectiveness. This, then, leads to a viable decision making process, one that will permit higher education executives to better plan for the future of their institutions, and one if hopes are realized, of continued success.

Efficiency is commonly measured by comparing resources used to benefits achieved. The underlying concept is that resources can be equated to dollars and that benefits should at least be commensurate with cost. "It is often argued that a concept so basic as efficiency is quite out of place in endeavors so lofty as education" (Gagne Panel 1976, p. 27). But higher education is in the midst of an era of accountability, a period in which calls for efficiency are loud and clear from all sectors. "The demand for efficiency and accountability is legitimate" (Bowen 1978, p. 21). Institutional leaders are searching about the business of increasing efficiency.

A wide array of tools is being used in higher education to improve its efficiency. Prior to the 1970s, a widespread opinion in higher education was that corporate management techniques were not at all transferable to higher education. There has been, however, a considerable degree of acceptance and testing of many applicable business management methods in the past decade. These include management information systems (MIS), management planning and budgeting systems, computer-based simulation models, and the application of quantitative techniques of decision making.

Many institutions tested and now use the Department of Defense Planning, Programming, and Budgeting System (Knezevich 1973). Several cost-projection models have been devised specifically for higher education. They are identified by a veritable alphabet soup (RRPM, SEARCH, HELP/PLANTRAN, CAMPUS, and others) (see Plourde 1976, for critiques). There has also been a movement in many institutions to build data bases and MIS for aiding decision makers. Management by objectives (MBO) has been employed in numerous institutions, and "generally speaking, [it has been] relatively successful" (Schroeder 1977, p. 101). There are many other indications that higher education is searching for new ways to improve its efficiency. Quantitative techniques are being applied in over half the colleges and universities in the United States (Heim 1975). Institutions have also expanded their views of the total environment in which they function, their planning processes are systemic and comprehensive (Freeman 1977).

Many critics of higher education claim that the structure and process of governance seem more important than its outcomes (Cohen and March 1974). Participation has become an end in itself, rather than a means to an end. In its recent attempts to address the dramatically changing environment, higher education has turned its attention to outcomes. Outcomes are the results of the efforts of an institution, they determine measures of an organization's effectiveness.

It has become apparent that the inability to measure its effectiveness has had significant impact on higher education's adaptation to the changes it is experiencing.

As an integral part of the overall goal setting and outcome measurement process, criteria for evaluation must be established. Frequently this reduces the complexity of a problem to whatever level is required to make the decision. Simon coined the term "satisfice," a combination of satisfy and suffice. He claims that a manager tends to satisfy rather than to pursue the best possible solution. A comprehensive review of the literature leads one to conclude that higher education has been satisfying for too long.

An appropriate balance between efficiency and effectiveness in institutions of higher education can be achieved only through a comprehensive approach to decision making and planning. Decisions must be based on specificity of goals, comprehensiveness in developing plans to achieve those goals, innovation in measuring outcomes, and on a moral commitment to meet society's needs and to utilize its resources efficiently. The process focuses on a new way of managerial thinking—new
2000. With or without collective bargaining, executives will have to operate with much less flexibility than is afforded by a younger group, which is less entrenched in the traditions of higher education, and is inherently less resistant to change.

Although student pressure for participation in governance has waned in the past several years, their involvement in the late 1960s did precipitate some changes. Students now serve on academic advisory bodies at most institutions. In addition, most colleges and universities have defined duties and for students with regard to their rights as members of the institutions (Balderson 1978, p. 252). The courts have decided on most due process questions with regard to faculty employment rights in the 1970s, this was an expensive proposition for colleges and universities. Similar questions were raised about student rights, but most institutions took "preventive maintenance" steps rather than being forced to spendordinate amounts of money in continuous litigation. Those institutions will now have to live with the many internally developed administrative rules and procedures that govern the rights of their faculty and students. A future of contractive change may make that an awesome challenge.

In addition to projections of enrollment decline, the composition of the student body also is changing. In 1960, enrollment was primarily composed of full-time, young white males. By the year 2000, it is envisioned that there will be more female than male students, as many over twenty-one years old as under, nearly as many part-time as full-time, and about one quarter of all students will be minorities (Carnegie Council 1980). Executives in higher education will be faced with dealing with different kinds of attitudes, needs, and values as the student body completes this transition. A broader scope of sociological parameters will be entering the decision making process, and there will be shifts in emphasis to new and unfamiliar considerations.

Since the early 1970s, boards of trustees have come under increasing criticism from within as well as outside the institutions they serve. Governing boards have become the focus of concern, assertiveness, and managerial accountability (Budd 1974). With current trends toward centralization of authority and demands, for increased accountability, boards have become more involved in a broader scope of institutional activities. Many see that pattern evolving into a joint relationship between the trustees and the central administration (Riley 1976). The influence (and authority) of governing boards will become an increasingly important constraint on higher education's decision making processes.

In addition to faculty, administration, boards, and students, the higher education environment is being influenced more and more by a widening group of external constituencies. Just a few are professional societies, accrediting agencies, local communities, alumni groups, benefactors, and business interests. Each has a vehicle for exerting influence on an institution; each is being heard more now than ever. As part of the large society, that higher education serves, they are demanding that institutions be operated efficiently, fairly, and effectively (Jencks and Riesman 1977).

"State government is still the chief source of funding for higher education" (Glenny 1977, p. 183). Via planning and coordinating boards, and, of course, by virtue of their budgets, states are exercising more controls over their institutions than ever before. Higher education journals are replete with reports about the austerity of state budgets. Some cutbacks have ultimately resulted in cancellation of programs. States are taking a much greater interest in the efficiency and effectiveness with which their institutions are being managed. "They want the use of precious resources to be planned wisely, carried out efficiently, and accounted for honestly" (Huit 1978, p. 80). State governments represent a constituency to be reckoned with in managing the changing higher education environment.

Gladeix and Véran (1978, p. 199) assert that "there exists no conscious, coherent national policy [on higher education]." Yet, the federal government has been involved at least indirectly in the support of higher education since the Morrill Act. The influence of the federal government has increased dramatically in the past three decades. From 1951 to 1976, federal expenditures for higher education rose from 15 percent of the Gross National Product (GNP) to 62 percent of the GNP (Rigolot 1980). American colleges and universities and their students received approximately $12 billion in fiscal year 1976 from the federal government (Brémenan and Finif 1978, p. 32). This substantial financial support has brought about increased compliance requirements. It is easy to see how higher education could be accountable for the use of the funding it receives. Institutional leaders, will regard the continued demand for accountability as one of the prime environmental constraints on their decision making capability.

These changes in the environment, including its new constraints and new constituencies, provide the setting for higher education's attempts to manage change. The way in which institutions systematically plan for the long range and changing future will dictate their success or failure. What is needed is a comprehensive view of the total environment in which institutions exist. Many institutional planning efforts fail over the long run because they consist of a strategy of "disjointed incrementalism"—shortsighted, piecemeal responses to complex social problems (Michael 1973). "There seems to be growing recognition, even within academic institutions, not only that they are seriously mismanaged, but also that something should and must be done about it" (Richman and Farmer 1977, p. 13). The problem becomes more "challenging when managers consider the kind of changing environment in which attempts will be made to correct this management. "In the United States we have demonstrated our capacity to plan and to act for growth. We have yet to demonstrate our capacity to plan and to act for stabilised operation, let alone for decline" (Millett 1977, p. 94).

Coping With Change: A New Way of Thinking

It is said that "colleges and universities are always changing," and that change is "a topic constantly being discussed in higher education circles" (Baldridge and Deal 1977, p. 50). Yet, in a review of the literature before the mid-1970s, it is difficult to locate discussions of change and impossible to discover anything pertaining to contraction. The reason is obvious. Higher education was riding the crest of enormous growth and expansion. Not until the mid-1970s did higher education begin to come to grips with the changes affluded to earlier. There have been numerous forces acting upon higher education, some have dictated growth and others have caused decline. "Only if these issues are explored and realistically can the effectiveness and vitality of colleges and universities be maintained" (Dresch 1977, p. 20).
to higher education. It requires an aggressive and open-minded approach on the part of its executives. It will not be sufficient to merely accept new methods, executives will have to search them out and test them. Paramount in the decision making process must be consideration of the many constraints that act upon a given decision. Equally important will be the consideration of the many factions who expect to play a role in the process. The degree of involvement of those constituencies will be determined by those in authority. It will take a delicate and sometimes intuitive touch to know who, when, and how much when executives turn to delegate authority in an era of contractive change.

Maccoby suggests that the successful leaders will be those who can stand back and let others share the functions of leadership but be able to assert authority on issues of principle. Articulating those principles in terms of essential values. (1979 p. 22) There are ways of managing the institution efficiently and effectively without destroying academic freedom or autonomy or its other revered values and purposes. An inquiring and receptive attitude toward "new ways of coping" will be needed to manage the changes from rapid expansion to tenuous equilibrium or gradual contraction, while avoiding stagnation or catastrophic failure.
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