This document presents the results of a survey of the relationships between statewide agencies and consortia of postsecondary education. The survey indicates a trend toward interrelating consortia and coordinating agencies; however different approaches are being taken. The states of Illinois, New York, Pennsylvania and Virginia are among the most aggressive in the effort to develop regional alliances. A brief summary of state/consortia relationships is given for 30 states. (MJM)
In early 1973, Fritz Grupe, executive director of the Associated Colleges of the St. Lawrence Valley, and Anthony Murphy, of Clarkson College of Technology, conducted a survey of the relationships between statewide agencies and consortia of postsecondary education. The survey, which included 30 states, was conducted under funds from the EXXON Education Foundation. With the increasing concern of the states about regionalization of programs, emphasized by a resolution from the ECS Steering Committee in the spring of 1974, Dr. Grupe was asked to update the survey for publication in the ECS Higher Education in the States. This updated version is included in this issue.

SURVEY OF STATEWIDE AGENCY/CONSORTIA RELATIONSHIP* 
By Fritz H. Grupe and Anthony Murphy

Voluntary consortia in higher education emerged rapidly during the 1960s when colleges and universities were themselves expanding in both size and numbers. Much of the impetus for the creation of consortia came from governmental and philanthropic agencies which themselves sought ways of producing rich educational opportunities for college students. A new pressure for voluntary cooperation coming from statutory statewide coordinating agencies only recently has begun to appear. But the motivation is now consolidation, not expansion.

A trend toward interrelating consortia and coordinating agencies is clearly in evidence. However, quite different approaches are being taken as this survey shows. The states of Illinois, New York, Pennsylvania and Virginia are among the most aggressive in the effort to develop regional alliances. The objectives are approximately the same, but the means are not. This survey was prepared in the belief that all states will eventually benefit from knowing about programs already under way. The experiences of the states stimulating cooperative networks should be of assistance to those states that are beginning to plan for efforts of their own.

Data reported herein was originally collected for a conference held early in 1973 under the cosponsorship of the Education Commission of the States, the American Association for Higher Education, the State Higher Education Executive Officers Association and the Johnson Wax Foundation. At the request of Education Commission of the States, an updating of the inventory was made in April 1974.

ALABAMA

Legislation approving the creation of a Marine Environmental Sciences Consortium was adopted in 1971. The grouping, consisting of 17 colleges and universities, initiated its activities in 1966. Additional cooperation has been stimulated through two multipurpose consortia known as the Alabama Center for Higher Education and the Alabama Consortium for the Development of Higher Education.

A consortium arrangement whereby the University of Alabama and Jacksonville State University will cooperatively offer courses at Gadsden State Junior College was established to make upper-division courses available. The two universities received $100,000 for the 1971-73 biennium to operate the Gadsden Center for Higher Education.

*For further information and/or corrections concerning the material contained in this survey, contact Fritz Grupe, Executive Director, Associated Colleges of the St. Lawrence Valley, Administration Building, State University of New York, Potsdam, N.Y. 13676.
ARIZONA

The Arizona Board of Regents has mandated that the three public senior universities (Arizona State University, University of Arizona, Northern Arizona University) establish and strengthen, after deliberate planning, cooperative relationships where feasible. The areas being considered by an interuniversity planning committee include: (a) interlibrary loans, (b) placement and training of interns, (c) cooperative graduate programs, (d) intercollegiate class attendance privileges, (e) sharing of faculty expertise, (f) sharing of major facilities, (g) sharing of computers and computer programs, (h) joint purchase and use of major scientific equipment, (i) distinguished professorships with lectures on all campuses, (j) systemwide closed-circuit television network with one-way video and two-way audio connections and (k) other special programs. The cooperative relationships will be included in a long-range plan for the university system.

In 1973 the Board of Directors of the Community Colleges and the Arizona Board of Regents formed a trustee-level committee to provide for additional cooperation, primarily focusing on academic coordination.

ARKANSAS

The State Board of Higher Education recently adopted a “role and scope” statement for state-supported higher education which encourages regional and instate cooperation. Role and scope designsations are reviewed on a biennial basis by the board. Representatives of each of the state-supported institutions joined with the State Board of Higher Education to construct criteria against which all requests for programs would be measured. These criteria, plus proposal preparation formats and submission procedures, were placed in a manual which has been sent to all institutions.

CALIFORNIA

A study of cooperative facilities utilization was conducted in 1971 by Jerome Evans for the Coordinating Council for Higher Education under Title VI of the Higher Education Act. That study recommended increased cooperation in the use of specialized facilities. The most recent California master plan contained several specific references to regional consortia. The plan suggested that coordination by geographic regions “may be advisable in those areas where differentiated functions require programs by more than one segment in the same locality.” It was proposed that:

a. Such consortia should have an intersegmental board to develop policy proposals for the respective boards and to coordinate and administer segmental policies for cross-registration of students, for continuing higher education programs and for facilities utilization (including public libraries and facilities of private businesses and other organizations).

b. The consortia should establish a multimedia division: (1) to develop through maximum utilization of current capability; production of academic instructional films and tapes; (2) to develop contracts and procedures for utilizing education and commercial multimedia facilities in the instructional process; and (3) to coordinate the offering of televised and correspondence instruction for appropriate academic credit by member institutions.

c. The consortia should also organize testing and evaluation centers for administering challenge examinations for credit, arrange for independent study and internship experience, develop cooperative and “on-the-job” programs and other educational experiences and organize on-site instruction in business facilities in the region. In general, the consortia should place high priority on developing and utilizing community resources.

The transition of the coordinating council into the California Postsecondary Education Commission has hindered implementation. In addition, the desirability of joint doctoral programs was supported in concept. Since the issuance of the master plan, encouragement to pursue joint degrees has been withdrawn because of the apparent high cost and low productivity of such programs.

The Joint Committee on the Master Plan for Higher Education of the legislature undertook a study of interinstitutional cooperation in California that was completed in 1973. The Academy for Educational Development conducted the study which contained a number of recommendations for legislative consideration.

State-administered Title I (Higher Education Act of 1965) funds have been utilized extensively to initiate cooperative arrangements in continuing education throughout the state.

COLORADO

The Colorado Commission on Higher Education recently revised its master plan and published Planning for the Seventies. It is also encouraging institutions to prepare institutional master plans for review by the commission. There has been some revision in the state's constitution to give the University of Colorado Regents clear authority to
offer programs at the Colorado Springs Center. The commission has recommended a new policy on the funding of "Outreach" (continuing education) activities. A statewide study of Outreach programs has been under way for the last year, and outcomes of the study include provision for stronger leadership by the commission and for the development of new education centers.

Under funding through the Higher Education Act of 1965 Title I funds, several cooperative organizations have been fostered. The Colorado Consortium includes 16 institutions of higher education which organized for the purpose of coordinating their respective programs of community service and continuing education. Most of the programs are partially funded under Title I of the Higher Education Act of 1965.

The Denver Urban Observatory is a consortium of four institutions of higher education formed for the purpose of carrying out programs of urban action research under contract with the city and county of Denver. It is part of a national network which presently comprises 10 such urban observatories. Through its policy board, the research efforts of the Denver Urban Observatory are related to the community service programs of cooperating member institutions of the Colorado Consortium.

Some $10 million has been appropriated for the Auraria Higher Education Center. Auraria is a single campus to be utilized jointly by three state-supported institutions. Extensive academic and administrative cooperation will be required.

CONNECTICUT

The Commission for Higher Education retained the consulting firm of Caudill Rowlett Scott to do a study of the potential for sharing higher education facilities through four higher education centers. These centers' campuses would be centrally located between the participating colleges and would contain classrooms and special facilities for joint utilization. A second document, Higher Education Center: Recommendations for Central Naugatuck Region, outlined the possibilities for one such facility in Waterbury.

In 1972 the consultant firm of Kane Farrell and White issued Volume I of a Comprehensive Master Plan which provided additional details of programs, site selection and development concepts. During the summer of 1972 the board of the higher education centers approved $720,000 to plan the $41-million complex. Funds have already been appropriated for constructing this center, which is to be the first of three in the state. While two other centers are anticipated, final action on them is waiting until the Naugatuck Center is operating and has been evaluated.

A contract with the Higher Education Center for Urban Studies in Bridgeport has been effected, with the commission to study the feasibility of creating a regional university. An interim report has been developed.

Since 1972 the commission has been holding regional meetings through informally structured groupings of colleges. The primary purpose of these forums is to further planning recommendations made by the Arthur D. Little Co. The master plan also stresses cooperative planning.

DELAWARE

The master plan for Delaware has called for a cooperative college development consortium and a career placement consortium. The former is to focus on fund-raising activities in cooperation with some 60 colleges. The career placement consortium is to function on a nationwide basis to find employment for graduates of its member institutions.

Delaware State College has encouraged the establishment of rural information programs with designated groups assisting farmers on various problems (crops, taxes, etc.) through its cooperative extension with the University of Delaware. Legislation for land-grant colleges has been supported and funded by the consortium.

A cooperative engineering program between Delaware State College and the University of Delaware has been established.

FLORIDA

Five major cooperative efforts are presently under way in Florida between public and private institutions. The state universities, in cooperation with the public community and private colleges and universities, are developing a common-course numbering system which will be used as a basis for a variety of cooperative academic efforts. The State University System and the Independent Colleges and Universities of Florida (ICUF) are exploring establishment of formal mechanisms for joint efforts toward improving effectiveness and efficiency in the total program of higher education in Florida.

The Florida Interinstitutional Committee on Oceanography, comprised of the nine state universities and three private institutions—University of
Miami, Nova University and Florida Institute of Technology—is engaged in joint use of facilities, equipment, personnel and money in oceanography instruction and research.

Through state appropriations of subsidies on a per-student basis to the University of Miami Medical School, this private institution and two state-supported medical schools at the University of Florida and the University of South Florida are engaged in joint medical education programs. A consortium agreement between Florida International University and Barry College will provide a mechanism whereby the two institutions can develop cooperative and exchange programs in the allied health fields.

GEORGIA

All of the public two-year, four-year and university-level institutions in Georgia are under the Board of Regents of the University System of Georgia which has constitutional authority to manage these institutions. Hence all academic and administrative matters for public postsecondary education are coordinated as a consortium relation.

The University System of Georgia works closely with the State Department of Education in many programs, particularly in connection with the vocational-technical schools located throughout the state.

IDAHO

Idaho is working on a master plan that will include encouragement of interinstitutional relationships as well as reaffirmation of current relationships in continuing education, nursing and the Education Professions Development Act. Existing legislation seems to be nonrestrictive, and thus there probably is no need for new legislation. The state currently supports some interinstitutional cooperative relationships for nursing education and provides for a medical educator in the Office of Higher Education to promote increased cooperation. Some state effort is made to support a graduate center in Boise at which graduate courses from the University of Idaho and Idaho State University may be offered for resident credit.

Information is being gathered concerning the possibility of improved interinstitutional relationships as well as interstate relationships with other institutions. Currently, a good relationship exists between the University of Idaho and Washington State University at Pullman.

ILLINOIS

In the spring of 1972, the Board of Higher Education issued a comprehensive Survey of Interinstitutional Cooperation in Illinois which documents the pervasiveness of existing cooperative arrangements in the state. The following September, the 77th General Assembly, with the support of the governor, passed the “Higher Education Cooperation Act” which provided $350,000 to partially support the administrative costs of two Cooperative Graduate Centers in Rockford and Rock Island. Several new consortia and some 21 projects were selected on a competitive basis. An interstate advisory committee of consortium directors was created to work with the board in establishing policies conducive to cooperative relationships.

The Master Plan for Higher Education: Phase III places extensive stress upon the concept of a “collegiate common market.” Unlike other master plans which recommend cooperation in an isolated manner, this plan frequently refers to the concept throughout the text. It is recommended that the Board of Higher Education give high priority, in its review of new and existing programs, to those programs that reflect efforts toward interinstitutional cooperation. A task force will consider alternative mechanisms for the operation of the collegiate common market, including as one alternative, the establishment of regional councils.

The master plan notes that one of the more important aspects of the common market concept will be a statewide network of learning resources centers. The proposed centers include a wide variety of library, educational communications materials, staff capabilities for measurement evaluation and facilities for media instruction. A state computer network is also proposed to fit within the concept, as are regional activities in other fields such as health education, social work, public service and continuing education. The report also recommends that the board generally encourage and support public and private junior and senior institutions as they develop cooperative programs of instruction, reasonable similarity of curricula, shared faculty and facilitation of ready transfer of credits from one public administration program to another. Further, senior institutions should contribute to public service education by supplementing their regular curricula and their career counseling programs with summer and evening classes and by cooperating with each other in the development and execution of special degree and nondegree-oriented programs that focus on public service.

In 1974 a proposal was made by the governor to
increase the funds available under the Higher Education Cooperation Act to $600,000. This proposal is under consideration by the legislature. Since the first year, the board has assisted in the creation of several regional councils. The Southern Illinois Common Market has offered a joint associate in nursing degree and an American Institute of Banking education program.

INDIANA

The Commission for Higher Education distributed in 1973 the preliminary draft of The Indiana Plan for Postsecondary Education. The plan recommended that: "Every effort should be made to effect economies in the operation of the state institutions of higher education, both public and independent, through cooperative actions. Potential economies may exist in expanded use of the Indiana Higher Education in Telecommunications System, coordinated academic calendars, shared use of libraries, computers and other resources, and contractual agreements for instructional programs.

"A federally funded project, which was approved for funding by the Commission for Higher Education of the state of Indiana, is studying the training needs in Indiana for people active in the area of Child Development (Care) Education. The project will develop suggested state guidelines in Child Development (Care) Education. Participants in the study include both public and independent postsecondary education institutions. The project's activity hopes to combine different resources as it works toward a common goal."

While no major new effort at regionalism is presently in progress, regional subdivisions were adopted several years ago by the Indiana Conference on Higher Education that have varied in impact. A major study of private higher education is presently under way that includes a subsudy of interinstitutional relationships.

KANSAS

The Board of Regents in Kansas has a systematic plan for evaluation to: (a) prevent duplications among its six institutions and (b) insure resources are available to produce programs of high quality. Joint and cooperative programs have been developed by pooling resources of the regents' institutions in areas such as joint doctoral programs, library efforts, clinical training for physicians and multi-institutional teacher education centers. The highest priority given to any new program proposals was a joint computer science curriculum. The system now has a common system of course coding and a uniform calendar.

A team endeavor among regent institutions is also under way to develop comprehensive long-range plans to provide for logical and orderly physical growth and change on each campus. To this end, a Physical Development Planning Manual has been adopted as a general guideline to establish a uniform process of physical development plan among the regent institutions.

As a result of the Higher Education Amendments of 1972, a more formal relationship is expected to be established between the junior colleges and vocational-technical schools and the state's four-year colleges and universities.

LOUISIANA

Louisiana's master plan calls for "unitary systems" for public institutions of higher education, and high priority was to be assigned to developing interinstitutional and interdisciplinary programs including cooperative arrangements and contractual programs with nonpublic institutions and with other states. The Coordinating Council for Higher Education was, in this regard, instrumental in the development of a cooperative computer curriculum arrangement between Southern University at Baton Rouge and Louisiana State University. The council also was directly involved in programs of cross registration, cooperative special education offerings and coordinated geography offerings at the same institutions. Action by the council on new degree program proposals has often been deferred until appropriate statements of cooperation (in the area of the new program) between institutions in close proximity have been drawn up.

MASSACHUSETTS

Following steps taken by the governor to reorganize the agencies of state government into a cabinet structure, the secretary of education proposed a regional structure for education planning and management. Intended to restructure separate statewide boards for each segment of elementary, secondary and higher education, two regional boards would have been created in each region identified. One board would have dealt with elementary and secondary education and one would have focused upon higher education. Overlapping memberships would have brought about intraregional continuity, and comparable state boards would be similarly interrelated. After hearings around the state, the legislation implementing
this approach met strong opposition. It does not appear likely that the concept will be pursued.

Although formal adoption of a regional structure has not been instituted, the process of discussion and debate led to the formation of several new regional groupings in higher education. Also, cooperative arrangements are being encouraged through administrative means.

The Massachusetts Advisory Council released a report by University Consultants, Inc., Cambridge, Mass. which proposed methods of improving this aspect of the education system. Regional boards for continuing education were proposed, but no effort to establish these mechanisms is now under way. A regional open university was also proposed, however, and this institution is expected to involve regional application mechanisms.

MICHIGAN

The present master plan urges the State Board of Education to "expedite coordination of regional programs within the state, with neighboring states and with private organizations." Particular stress is placed on planning efforts, cooperative research and educational programs cosponsored with private industry.

A regional study of the higher education needs in the southeastern section of Michigan was the first such planning study. The advisory committee responsible for the report called for a center for the study and development of urban higher education, for an ongoing system for regional planning and coordination, for a closer articulation of program offerings, for a regional system to facilitate equality of opportunity and for the creation of a formal commission to implement the recommendations.

MINNESOTA

Upon the request of the governor, a special survey of the quality of cooperative efforts among all postsecondary institutions was conducted to identify additional opportunities for cooperation. The study was completed in November 1972. The Higher Education Coordinating Commission had previously supported cooperative activities in television, computer development, library systems, academic program development and interstate reciprocity in its report, Meeting the Challenge.

The 1973 legislature faced the dilemma of fluctuating enrollments, limited finances and a need for improved access to postsecondary education opportunities. To avoid the establishment of new institutions, the legislature approved the following:

"The Higher Education Coordinating Commission is directed to develop and administer three experimental regional postsecondary education projects aimed at improving the efficiency and effectiveness of postsecondary education in meeting regional needs through increased interinstitutional cooperation and coordination of programs and planning within a region. In developing the three experimental projects, the Commission shall attempt to: (1) improve the accessibility of all levels of postsecondary education to residents of the regions, (2) eliminate any unwarranted duplication of effort in the regions, (3) facilitate effective use of postsecondary education facilities and services for meeting regional needs, (4) provide for more effective liaison between regional planning and coordination of postsecondary education with regional planning and coordination of other public services, and (5) test means for accomplishing greater interinstitutional cooperative efforts for meeting local and regional needs of Minnesota residents. The Commission shall report on the results of the experimental regional projects in its next biennial report to the Governor and the Legislature. All postsecondary institutions and systems are requested to cooperate with and to assist the Commission in developing these projects.

At this point in time there are active local advisory groups for each center and each has hired full-time coordinators. The centers are sponsoring courses, workshops and training programs this fall and have several course groupings worked out. The Rochester center is moving rapidly and, due to the involvement of institutions with external degree programs, should progress rapidly in a number of degree-granting modes.

Southwest State College, with financial support from the Kellogg Foundation and assistance from the commission, has established a countryside education and service project. Particular attention is given to linkages with nongovernmental agencies.

MISSOURI

The master plan for Missouri actively encourages and supports interinstitutional cooperation and recommends that public and private institutions develop joint academic and professional programs on a contractual basis. Graduate councils of academic disciplines were also suggested as means of stimulating the combining of facilities, the movement of graduate students, the elimination of duplicate programs and the continued development
of graduate education. An example of this proposal was a contract with two major consortia in Missouri for participation in a study project on urban higher education.

NEW JERSEY

A combination of funds from the State Department of Higher Education, Model Cities and the Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education has financed the creation of two-year level curriculum offerings among three institutions in Hoboken. The Hudson Higher Education Consortium administers the contractual agreements among St. Peter's College, Jersey City State College and Stevens Institute of Technology.

The State Department of Higher Education, the Council for Higher Education in Newark and 11 participating colleges created in 1974 an educational media consortium. This consortium seeks to maximize the cost effectiveness of instructional media in a variety of ways.

NEW YORK

In 1968 the Select Committee on the Future of Independent and Private Higher Education recommended the appropriation of $1 million for interinstitutional cooperation between public and private institutions. This authorization and the commensurate appropriation had been sought unsuccessfully. An inventory and study of all cooperative programs in the state was completed in 1970. The 1972 legislature enacted a law which permitted the State University of New York (SUNY) to promote and participate in institutional arrangements on a regional basis. The Association of Colleges and Universities of the State of New York adopted, in principle, the concept that public and private institutions constituted a single educational resource in 1971.

Governor Nelson A. Rockefeller's request that all state agencies utilize Office of Planning Services' regions for planning and development led to the creation of eight commonly defined regions by the State Education Department and SUNY. The State Education Department emphasizes planning and coordination and, thus far, has approved the formation of three regional councils—in New York City, the Genesee Valley and in the Northeastern Region. Each council consists of college presidents and selected lay representatives. Some of the guidelines for regionalism are:

1. Regional advisory councils will continue to be established at the initiative of the institutions in the individual regions.

2. Regional advisory councils will be responsible for the selection of their own staffs and for the definition of their agendas in terms of needs identified within the regions.

3. The State Education Department will seek the advice and counsel of regional councils with respect to planning decisions that are the responsibility of the Board of Regents with advice of the department.

4. The regional council's primary responsibility is for planning and coordination, with the specific pattern for regional operations to be determined on a case-by-case basis and to be consistent with its objectives.

SUNY stresses regionalism as a means for operating programs. Its master plan states these goals:

a. "Councils composed of all campus presidents in a region will be responsible for determining overall regional policy and will give general impetus to cooperative endeavors.

b. "Special project teams involving faculty, students and other campus personnel will be organized by the presidents as needed to carry out special regional projects.

c. "Staff support from the chancellor's office will be made available to each region to support project activity."

A joint memorandum on the principles of regionalism was issued this spring by the commissioner of the State Education Department and the chancellor of the State University of New York. The memorandum stressed the complementarity of the two systems. It is hoped that state appropriations for regionalism can be realized this year.

OREGON

Oregon is currently in the process of developing a master plan. One of the areas that will be included relates to consortium arrangements in higher education. No revision of legislation is anticipated in the area of consortia. The state provides partial financial support for an environmental field study facility in Eastern Oregon, which is operated by a consortium of public and private institutions.

The Educational Coordinating Council is also currently involved in a study of human services training programs. One of the recommendations of this study is the establishment of a clearinghouse for career information in the human service area.

Major efforts are also under way to establish an interinstitutional data processing network for both community colleges and public colleges and universities in the state.
PENNSYLVANIA

The Master Plan for Higher Education in Pennsylvania does not specifically speak to consortial arrangements. The State Board of Education has created, however, 10 higher education planning regions. In a resolution adopted in January 1973, the board endorsed the principle of regionalization, thereby authorizing and directing the Department of Education to develop a plan for implementation. Such a plan, A Design for Regionalization in Higher Education, was crystallized and discussed in April 1973, one regional council was formally approved in April 1974 and several others are likely to be approved within a month. The secretary of education has made $50,000 available on a matching basis to provide professional staffing in the regions. A special assistant for regional planning coordination has also been established.

The voluntary nature of the institutional involvements in the regional councils has permitted each region to emphasize a different theme. Two regions have been developing flexible curriculums at the baccalaureate and associate degree level through grants from the Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education. Others are stressing planning and rural studies, and several are in the organizational phase.

RHODE ISLAND

The master planning process in Rhode Island has only recently been initiated. The primary orientation toward cooperative programs is at the interstate level through the New England Board for Higher Education and the New England Library Network rather than at the intrastate level. This orientation tends to be true of most states with smaller numbers of institutions of higher education.

SOUTH CAROLINA

The Commission on Higher Education established a six-college consortium in Charleston in 1969 and has recommended that a consortium graduate center be established. It has also recommended that cooperative arrangements between public and nonpublic institutions be expanded. In 1972 the General Assembly revised the commission's statutory authorization to include an Advisory Council of Nonpublic College Presidents. Members of the advisory council are to be selected by a private college consortium, the South Carolina College Council, Inc.

SOUTH DAKOTA

All credit received from any one state college campus within the state will be fully transferable to any other state college within the state. A common-course numbering system is being developed for the seven state colleges and universities. A student who registers on one campus may also take coursework on any of the other campuses in the state university system without paying additional tuition charges and without actually registering as a student on that campus.

Limited state funds are being provided to the campuses for the purpose of enabling academic offices on those campuses to meet more frequently to discuss cooperative educational efforts.

TENNESSEE

Included in the master plan are recommendations which point out the necessity for cooperation between public and private institutions, particularly among those within the same community.

Studies are currently being conducted on the potential for computer and library cooperation involving both public and private institutions. Local planning committees are being established in all communities where multiple numbers of institutions are located to review new program plans and to achieve voluntary coordination.

UTAH

No generalized effort exists to expand the degree of interinstitutional cooperation outside of the statewide governing powers of the State Board of Higher Education. Recommendations had been made by the board pertinent to the establishment of four coordinating committees in different allied health areas.

An advisory planning committee in the health-care occupations is also functioning. A statewide television network exists to serve all of the institutions in the state, as well as the general public, and is administered under the authority of the Board of Higher Education. A voluntary library council for sharing resources is in operation. An Interinstitutional Committee on Computer Services was established by the board in 1972. A cooperative meteorology program exists between Utah State University and the University of Utah.
VERMONT

There is no master plan for higher education in Vermont since there is no single agency responsible for that purpose. Consequently there are no pertinent statewide recommendations. Neither have any funds been solicited from the state legislature to support cooperative ventures. Earlier efforts to merge the University of Vermont and the Vermont State Colleges under one governing board failed to gain legislative approval. Some federal funds under the Developing Institutions Program have supported cooperative assistance programs.

VIRGINIA

The 1973 session of the General Assembly passed legislation which provided for six regional consortia for the coordination of continuing education offerings. The law requires member institutions in each consortium to eliminate duplicate offerings and to provide cooperative programs for the citizens of the region, all such decisions being subject to the review of the State Council of Higher Education. The General Assembly called for "the immediate establishment of a consortium for continuing education in Northern Virginia," and this was accomplished. The council adopted, "Policies for the Coordination of Continuing Education Offerings," under which the planning operates.

Each consortium will have a senior public institution acting as the "primus inter pares," but will involve all private as well as public colleges offering significant off-campus coursework in the region. The six consortia:

... shall be governed by a Board of Directors. The Board will be composed of the president or his designated representative of each state-supported institution of higher education which is a member of the consortium. A representative of the State Council of Higher Education's staff, who shall have vote but no voice, shall also be a member of the Board. The Chairman of the Regional Consortium shall be the president of the designated senior institution located in that region or his designee. Each regional consortium shall operate within the policies and procedures developed by the Continuing Education Advisory Committee and approved by the State Council of Higher Education."

Responsibilities of each consortium shall include the following:

1. To assess the needs for continuing higher education programs in the consortium region;
2. To provide maximum higher education opportunities for continuing education students;
3. To encourage mutual acceptance and interchangeability of course credits among participating institutions;
4. To facilitate the earning of degrees at all levels by continuing education students;
5. To make efficient and appropriate use of the resources of all state-supported institutions offering courses within the consortium region;
6. To approve or disapprove specific course offerings by member institutions engaged in continuing higher education activities in the consortium region;
7. To publish periodically an announcement listing offerings available in the consortium region for continuing education students;
8. To ensure counseling services by participating institutions for continuing education students;
9. To ensure the maintenance of academic records by participating institutions for continuing education students;
10. To facilitate interinstitutional cooperation in the development of community service programs for the consortium region;
11. To evaluate, where appropriate, the effectiveness of continuing education offerings and activities conducted through the consortium;
12. To report semiannually to the State Council for Higher Education the ongoing activities of the consortium;
13. To report to the State Council of Higher Education on the desirability and need for educational services from state-supported institutions not engaged in continuing higher education within the consortium region when educational expertise is not available within the member institutions of the consortium.

In addition to the six regional councils (four are operating), a subcommittee of the Statewide Continuing Education Advisory Committee has been
designated as the Coordinating Committee for Regional Consortia. The committee shall: "hear appeals of decisions of the various regional consortia in accordance with procedures to be established by the Committee, and shall deal with matters of inter-consortium concern. No institution shall have more than one representative on the Coordinating Committee." The role of the consortia can be extended to include other functions beyond continuing education, and some have done so.

WASHINGTON

A master plan is under development, which is expected to refer to interinstitutional arrangements. Funds have been budgeted for planning attempts to initiate a joint Washington State University/Eastern Washington State College graduate program in social work in the Spokane area. A study of graduate education needs in the Spokane area recommended creation of private/public two-year/four-year institution consortium in Spokane.

Education's Share of State Funds

Education's share of state revenues is declining. In 1973 it dropped below the 50 per cent mark for the first time in more than 10 years. According to a survey conducted by the Center for Research and Development in Higher Education at the University of California, Berkeley, state appropriations for all education declined from a 10-year high of 53.5 per cent in 1969 to 48.9 per cent in 1973. Based on data from all 50 states, the survey indicates that higher education's share of state revenues increased from 11.2 per cent in 1963 to 14.3 per cent in 1973. At the same time, public elementary and secondary education's share of state revenues declined from 41.2 per cent in 1963 to 33.3 per cent in 1973.


“*The Consortium Director and Interinstitutional Change,”* an address presented in March 1974 to the Cooperative Programs Seminar of the American Association for Higher Education (to be reprinted in *The Acquaintancer* and in the seminar proceedings).


The *Formation of Intercollegiate Cooperative Centers*, a report published by the New York State Education Department, 1970.


*Interinstitutional Cooperation at the Departmental Level*, Associated Colleges of the St. Lawrence Valley, Potsdam, N.Y.; 1972, distributed under an EXXON Education Foundation grant. (ERIC document ED 065 023)

*Interinstitutional Cooperative Arrangements in Higher Education in New York State*, a report published by the New York State Education Department, April 1970.
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