

My concern, as I think I tried to convey on General File, is, is this the proper way to look at the significant questions facing higher education? And I have passed out to you a map which my highly competent staff took out their box of Crayolas and colored for you, and you have a map, and I deliberately did not label this but one label that I would call this, I think it might be appropriate, would be the "New 500-Mile Campus". That little triangle down there doesn't quite make it. It covers a very small portion of the state. My concern is for the citizenry of the whole state and one I suppose could counter and say, well that's where all the people are, but I guess if that's the case then maybe we should just think about restructuring the state as well as higher education. I don't think anybody is saying because you happen to live in a less populous area you should get fewer higher educational services, at least I hope that is not what we're saying here today. And so I would disagree with the statement that has been here earlier and the issue is, what are we going to do with Kearney and who should govern Kearney? I think the issue before us is really much broader than that and that issue is, how do we best serve the citizens of Nebraska and a related issue is how do we best use our resources in the State of Nebraska to make sure that our higher education system is responsive to the entire state? I think higher education has changed significantly over the years but not enough and I think the populous has moved ahead and changed much more greatly than higher ed. And I think I would suggest that the way we ought to look at higher education in this state is a continuum of starting down the extreme left-hand end, what are you going to do with vocational technical education? They play an important role. I don't think they are getting enough attention in this study. I think the assumption is...nobody is questioning the four-year role and mission apparently of any institution in the state. The big issue seems to be who is going to deliver graduate programs, who is going to have the governance authority over the delivery of graduate programs? And I think we should also separate out from that those graduate programs that are clearly so expensive and so specialized that it is only reasonable to think they would be one place in the state. I would cite the medical school, the law school, pharmacy and so on. So I think the place we're really disagreeing here is how do you handle the need for new masters programs? And the state has changed enough that we need more masters level programs than we have traditionally offered and I'm suggesting that we should keep an open mind about how to do that. You're all probably very much aware of the concern the