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FOREWORD

Goal 18 of the State Plan for Higher Education in Michigan calls for the State Board of Education to develop, in cooperation with institutional representatives, a statewide plan whereby off-campus education can be encouraged, fostered, and coordinated. This planning document represents a major step toward meeting this charge.

The report describes and analyzes the existing collegiate off-campus services provided by public and non-public institutions in the state as far as present data permits. The document also examines several alternative means of planning and coordinating collegiate off-campus services which have been proposed or are presently in operation in the state, and recommends:

1. A feasibility study is recommended to review the coordination of collegiate off-campus services by means of regional consortia.

2. A feasibility study is recommended to investigate the development of an external degree program at the state level.

3. A feasibility study is recommended to review alternatives for funding of off-campus credit courses.

John W. Porter
Superintendent of Public Instruction
INTRODUCTION

A series of recent studies and expert testimony indicates that there is a serious gap between actual collegiate off-campus services available (both public and private) for all Michigan citizens, and the need/demand for such services. For example, Patricia S. Faunce argues in her recent study, *The Feasibility of an External Degree Program Among the Member Institutions of the Michigan Council of State College Presidents*, that it is obvious that a great demand exists within the state. "The demand exists and the opportunity is now at hand to lead and to mold a meaningful model for an external degree program among the institutions of higher education in the state rather than to allow these institutions to drift."¹

A similar conclusions was reached in a 1973 study by the State Department of Education. The report pointed out that although there appears to be some questions raised concerning higher education having lost its market and that a new line of goods needs to be found, this is simply not true. "These services are urgently needed" the study argues.²

It appears that the prime problem is not in the demand for services, but in the capacity of the system or systems in the state to make delivery. Milton Goldstein, Associate Director of the Institute for Personal and Career Development of Central Michigan University has been involved in

---


collegiate off-campus service programs for over ten years, and has had the opportunity to study the market and demand for these services throughout the state. His studies have shown that hundreds of thousands of potential students cannot partake of course offerings in the normal fashion.

Housewives and people working on a shift basis are of course obvious examples. In rural areas, isolated persons are also potential students. A look at larger urban areas around the state will indicate many population centers that are only served by a community college and that don't have extensive junior and senior level courses available. In many instances, it is an extreme hardship for students to enroll and complete courses that are offered in the evening because of conflicting demands on their time by family, overtime work, physical handicaps, and other commitments such as involvement in community affairs and civic organizations.3

Another recent report focusing on adult and continuing education services by the Department of Education points to the fact that there are increasing numbers of adults seeking postsecondary educational experiences where formal recognition of learning is provided. However, although current delivery systems offer many good programs, "they are limited in number, and are diverse in offerings, geographic dispersion, appropriate delivery, and in some instances, quality could be improved."4

While it may be safely concluded with the data at hand that there appears to be a substantial unmet need/demand for collegiate off-campus services in the state (especially among veterans, minorities, the elderly, the handicapped and in specific program areas), the state legislature has indicated concern at the same time that current off-campus instruction,

3. Cited in Patricia S. Faunce, op. cit., p. 76.

extension course, and continuing education services of public baccalaureate institutions are unnecessarily duplicative, and in conflict with community college programs and services. This has resulted in a policy of not funding off-campus instructional programs, and the requirement that such programs be self-supporting (i.e., student fees for off-campus coursework be set high enough to produce sufficient revenues for the full cost of instruction). Furthermore, the Legislature in the 1974 appropriations act for higher education (Public Act 227 of 1974) requested that the public colleges and universities propose a plan for "coordinating statewide coverage of public higher education programs and services including off-campus instruction, extension courses, and continuing education services" to the Senate and House Appropriations Committees of the Legislature by February 15, 1975 before a modification of the current funding policy would be considered.  

The Michigan Council of State College Presidents has submitted a study entitled, A Proposal for the Funding and Coordination of Off-Campus Public Higher Education Services in response to this request which concludes that the legislative concern that there is a great deal of unnecessary duplication in off-campus instruction is not supported by the facts. The study confirms that the actual extent of inter-baccalaureate institutional duplication of off-campus coursework is 2% of all coursework offered off-campus. However, it should be noted that the study is confined to baccalaureate institutional offerings, and does not include an analysis of community college offerings.


Available data in the study does suggest that there may not be as much overlap between baccalaureate and community colleges as the Legislature fears since only 15.5% of all the off-campus activities of the four year institutions in 1971-72 were lower division coursework, and 188 of the total 553 courses taught off-campus were located in counties not having a community college. As we shall see later, however, there is some evidence to indicate that the number of off-campus courses being offered by baccalaureate institutions presently is far larger than suggested by the 1971-1972 data used in the MCSCP study, and that the exact pattern of these offerings in relation to public community college and non-public institutional offerings, and their location throughout the state in terms of statewide need/demand and institutional roles requires detailed study.

Taken together, the MCSCP, Faunce, and Department of Education studies noted earlier do raise several central questions concerning collegiate off-campus services from a statewide perspective:

1. What is the present pattern of collegiate off-campus services offered by public baccalaureate and community college, and non-public institutions?

2. How should public and private collegiate off-campus services be organized so that they are available to meet the needs/demands of all the citizens of this state?

3. Who should be responsible for the statewide planning and coordination of these public and private off-campus services?

7) Ibid., p. 12.
4. Should the state fund collegiate off-campus services provided by public baccalaureate and community college institutions, and at a rate equal to on-campus instruction:

Goal 18 of the State Plan for Higher Education in Michigan calls for the State Board of Education to develop, in cooperation with institutional representatives, a statewide plan whereby off-campus education can be encouraged, fostered, and coordinated. This planning document represents a first step toward meeting this charge. The report will first describe and analyze the existing collegiate off-campus services provided by public and non-public institutions in the state as far as available data permits. Secondly, we will examine several alternative means of planning and coordinating collegiate off-campus services which have been proposed or are presently in operation in the State. Finally, the report will conclude with several recommendations concerning future planning and coordination of collegiate off-campus services.

COORDINATION OF OFF-CAMPUS SERVICES

Overall, there appears to be very little coordination of collegiate off-campus services laterally between the three basic groups of public baccalaureate, public community college, and non-public institutions on a statewide basis at present. According to a recent study of the MCSCP, there is some very limited cooperation between the MCSCP institutions and the public community colleges or private institutions. In 1971-72, there were approximately 58 activities statewide offered jointly. The present number of such activities is unknown.


Services provided by these institutions seem to be governed primarily by the objective of meeting student demand with relatively minimal concern for meeting the actual need of each geographical area or the aggregate need of the state's citizens. Neither it appears is there accurate statewide or institutional data which provides a profile of the potential off-campus student vs. the on-campus student in terms of projected enrollment, program needs, or potential location.

### Baccalaureate Institutions

A group-by-group analysis indicates that the greatest degree of voluntary cooperation for providing off-campus services exists between the public baccalaureate institutions - through the Coordinating Council for Continuing Higher Education (a sub-group of the Michigan Council of State College Presidents comprised of Deans and Directors of Continuing Education which was formed in 1959) and several other consortium/regional inter-institutional arrangements.

The Coordinating Council for Continuing Higher Education seeks to work cooperatively to coordinate off-campus offerings among baccalaureate institutions. Where there is a conflict between two or more members over offering of new programs, a "structured consultation procedure" is used as a grievance mechanism to attempt to resolve the differences.

Another example of inter-institutional cooperation is the University Consortium Center in Grand Rapids. Four of the public baccalaureate institutions (Grand Valley State Colleges, Michigan State University, the University of Michigan, and Western Michigan University) have pooled their resources.

---

10) Ibid., pp. 18-22.

11) A complete description of coordinating mechanisms between public baccalaureate institutions may be found in Ibid., pp. 15-17.
educational resources to help meet the needs of the Grand Rapids area. The center has one director and operates under a unified budget funded by all four of the participating institutions. One limitation of this arrangement, however, is that it does not integrate all the services and program offerings of the public community colleges and non-public institutions in the area.

There are also a series of formal and informal regional centers operating between baccalaureate institutions. The Saginaw-Bay City area is served by a regional center located on the campus of Saginaw Valley College where the University of Michigan, Michigan State University, and Central Michigan University have their regional offices. While it is not strictly a formal consortium organization there, the institutions coordinate their programs through an informal cooperative relationship including credit exchange and joint course offerings. At Benton Harbor, Western Michigan University and Michigan State University work cooperatively to serve southwestern Michigan off-campus, and share common office facilities and services.

In the Traverse City area, an Inter-Institutional Committee has been formed composed of Michigan State University, Central Michigan University, Ferris State College, Northwestern Michigan Community College, and the University of Michigan to provide some coordinated and cooperative programs and services to the citizens there. Three public baccalaureates in the Upper Peninsula have created a consortium which serves as a vehicle for coordinating off-campus instructional programs in the region.

The Detroit metropolitan area has the benefit of several joint programs in addition to the course work provided by the individual
institutions. For example, Wayne State University and the University of Michigan conduct a cooperative sponsorship of non-credit courses. Statewide, there were 137 jointly sponsored activities by MSCP institutions in 1971-1972.

Community Colleges

Data available to the State Department of Education does not provide a complete picture of the current scope, availability, and statewide coverage of off-campus services provided by community colleges, nor the degree to which coordination exists laterally among community colleges. The most recent information made public is a Survey of 1971-72 Community Services in Michigan Community Colleges conducted by the Michigan Community College Association which resulted in twenty (70%) of Michigan's twenty-nine public community colleges returning usable instruments to the MCCA. Of those responding, 16 (80%) were operating off-campus extension centers, and an additional 3 (15%) of the community colleges indicated they planned such activities in the future.12 The survey did not provide information as to the location of these programs, what programs were offered, the type of student serviced by these programs, or whether these off-campus activities involved cooperation with other collegiate institutions. The MCCA survey also stressed the fact that the twenty persons with primary responsibility for community services activities at their respective institutions collectively possess thirteen different administrative titles.

It should be noted that community colleges appear over the last several years to be in the process, however, of forming cooperative

regional consortium arrangements to coordinate the delivery of off-campus services. For example SEMLOC (Southeastern Mich. League of Community Colleges) is made up of nine member institutions, and has cooperated on a regional placement project and other related activities for several years now.

**TABLE I**

PUBLIC COMMUNITY COLLEGES: OFF-CAMPUS
ACTIVITIES 1971-1972

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Offered</th>
<th>Institution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Off-Campus Extension</td>
<td>Alpena, Delta, Gogebic, Jackson, Kellogg, Lake Michigan, Lansing, Macomb, Mid-Michigan, Montcalm, Mott, Muskegon, North Central, Northwestern, St. Clair, Southwestern, West Shore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Off-Campus Organized Tours</td>
<td>Alpena, Delta, Jackson, Lansing, Macomb, Mid-Michigan, Northwestern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Off-Campus Community Service Centers</td>
<td>Delta, Highland Park, Jackson, Kellogg, Lansing, Macomb, Mott, St. Clair, West Shore</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Non-Public, Proprietary, Other Institutions

The State Department of Education does not have access to comprehensive statewide data concerning off-campus services being provided by these
institutions. Preliminary inquiries concerning information on coordination of these programs being offered indicates that it is probably quite limited.

PRESENT PATTERN OF DELIVERY OF OFF-CAMPUS SERVICES

It was noted earlier that there appears to be very little lateral coordination of off-campus services provided by public baccalaureate, public community college, and non-public institutions in the state. An analysis of available data on existing services also suggests that this situation has resulted in serious gaps in meeting statewide needs for programs in terms of the geographical availability of programs, the type and quantity of programs, and the educational model or delivery system to provide such programs. There is also some evidence to indicate that the quantity of off-campus services offered by baccalaureate institutions may have grown dramatically in recent years. The relationship between these programs and existing community college activities as well as non-public institutions requires detailed study and analysis to determine whether or not the existing pattern is the most efficient and effective system of delivery from a statewide perspective.

Pat Faunce examined all of the off-campus activities of the member institutions of the Michigan Council on State College Presidents in order to determine whether the establishment of an external degree program was feasible. Using 1971-1972 data, she found that there were 6,571 off-campus activities available in 29 identified subject areas falling into the five broad categories of Social Sciences; Verbal-Linguistic and Humanities; Science, Mathematics, and Engineering; Education; and Other.

13) The discussion below relies primarily on Patricia S. Faunce, op.cit., pp. 59-76.
But, when one examines the geographical availability of these programs, it is found that fifteen of Michigan's 83 counties have no activities: Alger, Baraga, Clinton, Crawford, Gogebic, Ionia, Kalkaska, Lake, Mackinac, Manistee, Menominee, Montmorency, Newaygo, Oceana, and Ontonagon (See Table II). Forty-two counties each have less than one percent of all activities. Furthermore, while each of the subject category activities tend to be located in some of the 68 counties with activities, the spread of activities is greatest for Education (58 counties) followed by Social Sciences (45). The spread is less wide for Science, Mathematics, and Engineering (37); Verbal-Linguistic and Humanities (32); and Other (27 counties).

It is important to also note that most of the institutions (11) which offer the greatest proportion of the off-campus activities also offer mostly graduate level activities. Furthermore, most of the undergraduate offerings at these institutions are at the senior level. No sophomore designated activities are offered by these institutions, and only one MCSCP institution has mostly freshman level activities. For all MCSCP institutions, the overall distribution of activities at all levels was:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>freshman</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sophomore</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>junior</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>senior</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>graduate</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Most of the undergraduate activities are in the subject categories of Social Science (30%) and Verbal-Linguistic and Humanities (25%). Fewer are in Education (19%); Science, Mathematics, and Engineering (13%); and Other (13%). Over half (59%) of the graduate level activities (generally open to undergraduates) are in Education. Much fewer are in the Social Services and other fields.
### TABLE II
Location of Activities by Educational Level
(1971-72 Continuing Education Activities = 3,589)
11 CCHEE Institutions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Alcona</th>
<th>Allegan</th>
<th>Alpena</th>
<th>Antrim</th>
<th>Arenac</th>
<th>Barry</th>
<th>Bay</th>
<th>Benzie</th>
<th>Berrien</th>
<th>Branch</th>
<th>Calhoun</th>
<th>Cass</th>
<th>Charlevoix</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>01</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>06</td>
<td>07</td>
<td>08</td>
<td>09</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>13.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>13.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>13.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>13.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>13.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>13.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**
- Patricia S. Faunce, *The Feasibility of an External Degree Program Among the Member Institutions of the Michigan Council of State College Presidents* (1975)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Educational Level</th>
<th>Huron</th>
<th>Ingham</th>
<th>Iosco</th>
<th>Iron</th>
<th>Isabella</th>
<th>Jackson</th>
<th>Kalamazoo</th>
<th>Kent</th>
<th>Keweenaw</th>
<th>Lapeer</th>
<th>Leelanau</th>
<th>Lenawee</th>
<th>Livingston</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fr</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soph</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jr</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>71.4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sr</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>57.1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>21.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grad</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>85.7</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>87.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total f &amp; % b</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Educational Level</th>
<th>Luce</th>
<th>Macomb</th>
<th>Marquette</th>
<th>Mason</th>
<th>Muskegon</th>
<th>Monroe</th>
<th>Montcalm</th>
<th>Muskegon</th>
<th>Oakland</th>
<th>Ogemaw</th>
<th>Osceola</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fr</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>85.7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soph</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jr</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>54.1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sr</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>49.3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>57.1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grad</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>75.7</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>68.2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>71.4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total f &amp; % b</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE II (Cont'd.)
II COCNE Institutions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Educational Level</th>
<th>Oscoda 68</th>
<th>Otsego 69</th>
<th>Ottawa 70</th>
<th>Presque Isle 71</th>
<th>Roscommon 72</th>
<th>Saginaw 73</th>
<th>St Clair 74</th>
<th>St Joseph 75</th>
<th>Sanilac 76</th>
<th>Schoolcraft 77</th>
<th>Shiawassee 78</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fr</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soph</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jr</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sr</td>
<td>1 20.0</td>
<td>6 50.0</td>
<td>4 44.4</td>
<td>2 100.0</td>
<td>11 52.4</td>
<td>10 82.7</td>
<td>8 72.7</td>
<td>11 47.8</td>
<td>1 100.0</td>
<td>2 14.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grad</td>
<td>5 100.0</td>
<td>6 50.0</td>
<td>4 44.4</td>
<td>2 100.0</td>
<td>19 90.5</td>
<td>31 85.1</td>
<td>8 72.7</td>
<td>18 78.3</td>
<td>1 100.0</td>
<td>13 92.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total f & %b 5 0.1 12 0.3 9 0.3 2 0.1 21 0.6 173 4.8 36 1.0 11 0.3 23 0.6 1 0.03 14 0.4

---

**a** Educational levels are not mutually exclusive categories.

**b** Actual observed frequency and percentage of activities in a given location (of the total activities = 3,588).

**c** Percentage of total column frequency (e.g., in Allegan county column, a frequency of 2 is 50% of 4).

Interpretation: Of the 4 activities located in Allegan county, 50% were Freshman level activities.

**d** Frequency and percentage of activities at a given educational level.

**e** Within Michigan, but exact location not specifiable because the activity may have been an internship, student teaching, etc., located at several places or schools.

**f** No specific location because the activity could take place anywhere, e.g., correspondence.

**g** Incorrect or no location on computer printout.
Equally significant is the fact that although non-traditional educational alternatives for earning college credit are available, some of these are offered on a very limited basis by only a few institutions. Faunce finds especially limited in use and offering are life experience credit and learning packages. Also, while institutionally developed proficiency examinations are available in 13 institutions, and standardized proficiency examinations (e.g., CLEP) in 14, neither of these opportunities is utilized or encouraged extensively; and some of the institutions do not permit many credit hours earned through such examinations to be applied to a degree.

Faunce also points out that although a variety of instructional techniques and resources are used to deliver the activities, far too few of these techniques are widely utilized. Slightly less than half (48%) of the activities use the "course" instruction technique. The next most frequently used technique is "Independent Study" for 37% of the activities, followed by "Work Study, Internship" (7%). Used less frequently are "Correspondence" (3%); "Field Study, Workshop, Institute, Conference" (2%); "Travel-Study" (1%); and "Broadcast Radio" and "Closed Circuit or Broadcast T.V." for less than one percent of the activities.

Despite this overall pattern of offerings, it is interesting to note that Faunce finds there was very little co-sponsorship of activities between MCSCP institutions, or between the MCSCP and non-MCSCP institutions. Faunce recommends, therefore, that "vigorous, sincere, and constructive cooperation among the MCSCP institutions be pursued . . . and that the resources available through community colleges across the state which would enable the community colleges to provide lower division activities for an external degree program be recognized."
The establishment of some more systematic form of cooperation between public baccalaureate, public community college, and non-public institutions concerning the statewide distribution and quantity of off-campus programs would appear to be even more imperative now because of the rather large number of students currently enrolled in off-campus programs offered by baccalaureate institutions. Fall, 1974 data provided by the institutions to the State Department of Education indicates that there are 25,758 students (headcount) enrolled in off-campus programs (See Table III). Although the MCSCP study using data on 1971-72 programs indicates there is very little overlap between courses offered by baccalaureate institutions, we have no data presently which analyzes the offerings statewide of public baccalaureates/public community colleges/non-public institutions to definitely determine whether the whole system of offerings meets the disparate needs of all the citizens of Michigan in the most effective and efficient manner possible.

PROPOSED ALTERNATIVE PATTERNS OF DELIVERY OF OFF-CAMPUS SERVICES

Several proposals have been offered for coordinating the delivery of off-campus services in order to meet the needs and demands of all Michigan citizens.

Institutional Consortium

One of the simplest models is the formation of an institutional consortium such as the University Consortium Center in Grand Rapids. The advantage of this approach is that the educational resources and facilities of several colleges and universities may be pooled and administered in such a way as to meet more program needs of a particular area in a cost efficient...
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Number of Courses</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Type of Course</th>
<th>Enrollment (Headcount)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Central Michigan</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>44 Locations</td>
<td>13 12 233</td>
<td>1,987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Michigan</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>Plymouth, Trenton, Brighton, Ypsilanti, Belleville, Adrian, Jackson, Centerline, Cherry Hill, Davison, Flint, Livonia, Monroe, Mt. Clemens, Dearborn, Taylor, Marlette, Tecumseh</td>
<td>9 84 1</td>
<td>2,067</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ferris State</td>
<td></td>
<td>(No extension courses of their own, but Central Michigan, Univ. of Michigan and Michigan State hold courses on the campus)</td>
<td>- - -</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Valley</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Muskegon, Grand Rapids, Holland, Grand Haven, Spring Lake</td>
<td>14 6 6</td>
<td>497</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake Superior</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Newberry</td>
<td>- 1 -</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan State</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>8 regions in the State and foreign countries</td>
<td>26 13 95</td>
<td>3,908</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mich. Technological Univ.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>K.I. Sawyer Air Force Base and Battle Creek</td>
<td>1 1 1</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Michigan</td>
<td>37 16</td>
<td>Sawyer Air Force Base Iron Mountain - Kingford Upper Peninsula</td>
<td>x x x</td>
<td>779 261 594</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oakland</td>
<td>over 100</td>
<td>Detroit, Framington, Royal Oak</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE III (Cont'd.)

**OFF-CAMPUS AND EXTENSION COURSES OF BACCALAUREATE INSTITUTIONS - FALL, 1974**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Number of Courses</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Type of Course</th>
<th>Enrollment (Headcount)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Saginaw Valley</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>On Campus</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Utica</td>
<td></td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Michigan</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>Detroit, Dearborn, Flint, Grand Rapids, Saginaw</td>
<td>43 13 163</td>
<td>3,518</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wayne State</td>
<td>398</td>
<td>Wayne Campus, Detroit, Out-state locations, Canada and Europe</td>
<td>125 18 255</td>
<td>7,376*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Michigan</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>Battle Creek, Benton</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,429</strong></td>
<td><strong>Harbor, Muskegon</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>25,758</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* College of Lifelong Learning
manner. However, care must be taken to include public community colleges and non-public institutions in such an arrangement if possible. Even if this goal is accomplished, the consortium is designed to solely meet the needs of the local area served. Institutional arrangements and offerings may not mesh with overall statewide plans or goals.

Regional Consortia

A second proposal offered recently by the MCSCP is for the creation of a statewide system of regional consortia of the institutions of higher education including public baccalaureate, public community college, and non-public institutions. The MCSCP proposal calls for the establishment of a consortium in each geographical area in which a coordination problem is perceived and agreed to exist, whether that problem be the underavailability of educational services or an overavailability of such services. All institutions would be equal and joint partners in the consortium. Each regional grouping of institutions would have the specific charge to respond cooperatively to the legitimate higher education needs of the area, and to do so without unnecessary duplication of services.

Under the proposal, the decision to provide educational services would remain an institutional responsibility of each participant - the coordinating responsibility would be that of the consortium. It is also proposed that a structured consultation procedure for new programs be established by public community colleges similar to the structure presently used by MCSCP institutions. Once established, the procedure would be expanded to include both two-year and four-year institutions so that conflicts between

14) For further details, see the Michigan Council on State College Presidents, op. cit., pp. 2-3, and also Chapter 7 on Interinstitutional Cooperation in the Kellogg Foundation Sponsored Study on Lifelong Learning (East Lansing, Mi: M.S.U., 1973). A recent example of such an arrangement is an agreement between Schoolcraft College and Wayne State University on respective institutional roles and programs.
the two types of institutions might be resolved within the framework of an overall grievance procedure.

The MCSCP also recommends that the State Legislature fund off-campus programs beginning in 1975-1976, and that the level of funding be equal for on-campus and off-campus for all credit activities. State support for non-credit instruction on the same equal basis is an additional goal.

Private institutions which participate in such regional arrangements would benefit from the present state tuition grant program which provides up to $1,200 toward tuition for students at private colleges in order to help equalize private and public school tuition costs.

The MCSCP proposal obviously must be considered as a step forward from a statewide perspective. As noted previously in this report, serious gaps appear to exist in the current delivery and coordination of off-campus services provided by both baccalaureate and community college institutions. The MCSCP plan has the potential of working to fulfill some of the state’s unmet needs. However, it should be noted that a special effort would be required to insure not only that services are not unnecessarily duplicative, but also that adequate offerings do exist in all the regions of the state not presently being served.

Statewide System of Coordination

The third major proposal recommended is the creation of a statewide system of planning and coordination of off-campus services under the guidance of the State Department of Education in cooperation with the public and private institutions offering collegiate programs. State level coordination could be accomplished in several ways, but the approach most persistently recommended has been the establishment of an external degree...
program in Michigan. Under this proposal, a program for earning undergraduate and college credit by non-traditional methods would be developed and coordinated on a statewide basis including credit by examination, credit by transfer, credit for off-campus study, and credit for experience. Through these and other methods, access and availability of service would be given to many currently denied target populations (e.g., veterans, minorities, low income groups, shift workers, the elderly, the handicapped, housewives, those seeking additional career education opportunities) at substantially reduced cost by utilization of existing facilities and by reducing high cost contact time.

The program would be guided by a new constituent authority under the State Board of Education. This authority would advise the Board on the general supervision and control of the external degree program, and would work in cooperation with such groups and organizations as the Executive Office of the Governor, the State Legislature, the Michigan Council of State College Presidents, the Michigan Community College Association, the Association of Independent Colleges and Universities, the Higher Education Assistance Authority, the Michigan Association of Private Schools, and the Michigan Business School Association.

The State Department of Education established a task force in 1974 to study the practicability of initiating a major feasibility study on an external degree program. The Task Force recommended to the Board of Education in August, 1974 that a feasibility study be initiated, and that legislation be introduced requesting funds to implement the proposal.

15) This proposal has been suggested in several Michigan State Department of Education publications. For a recent discussion, see Michigan State Department of Education, Report of the Task Force on External Degree (Lansing, Mi: 1974).
The advantage of this approach would be that the needs and demands of all Michigan's citizens in every geographical area of the state would be taken into account. Total statewide concerns such as meeting manpower needs for future economic growth of Michigan, and the establishment of the most effective and efficient delivery system of off-campus services would also be weighted heavily in planning and coordination efforts. But, the development of a statewide coordinated approach to the delivery of off-campus services under the guidance of the Department of Education would need to count on the willing cooperation of the public baccalaureate and community colleges in view of the constitutional autonomy enjoyed by these institutions. The recent MCSCP position paper on off-campus services indicates that the member institutions oppose such a proposal, and would prefer to rely on their own proposal for the establishment of regional consortia to coordinate the delivery of off-campus services.

Another means of establishing a statewide external degree program has been proposed in the form of legislation to establish a separate degree granting institution, Wolverine State College (House Bill 5988 of 1974 and Senate Bill 998 of 1973). Under this proposal, the instructional programs would be provided to geographical areas of the state not presently served by existing institutions. Non-traditional instruction systems and services would be developed, and a centralized academic credit accounting and recording system would insure recognition of academic efforts of all persons not enrolled in an institution presently engaged in external degree or similar programs.

16) Another recent proposal which is quite similar has been presented by Professor Daniel H. Kruger of Michigan State University entitled, "A Proposed State University of Michigan" (Lansing, Mi:, 1975).
Analysis of this proposal indicates that there are programs of an "external degree" nature operating currently by at least two major Michigan institutions of higher education - with other programs in the offing. The independent development of this programming could lead to an uncoordinated and self-defeating effort.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Existing data indicates that there is no question that a serious gap exists between the statewide needs and demands of all Michigan citizens for collegiate off-campus services and the present pattern of services being provided by Michigan colleges and universities. It is also apparent that there is a need for more systematic data and information on existing programs offered by public and non-public institutions of higher education in the state, and about the mechanisms of lateral coordination for providing these services which currently exist or might be formed in the future. It would also appear that there is no empirical justification for the state legislature's present policy of not funding off-campus vs. on-campus programs - or for non-credit vs. credit courses.

While it would appear that the most economical and efficient mechanism for meeting statewide needs/demands of all Michigan's citizens for off-campus services might well be the creation of an external degree program under the direction of the State Department of Education, it is recognized that the effective implementation of such a program depends on the cooperation of the state's higher education institutions. The MCSCP members have indicated a preference for coordinating off-campus services through the creation of regional consortia among public and private institutions throughout the state. If these consortia arrangements are
begun in the near future, and if such arrangements are able to identify and meet the needs/demands of all Michigan's citizens, such efforts should be supported in the near term. Simultaneously, it appears desirable to proceed with the implementation of a feasibility study for the establishment of a state-level external degree program as recommended by the Task Force on External Degree in 1974.

Recommendations

1. A feasibility study is recommended to review the coordination of collegiate off-campus services by means of regional consortia.

2. A feasibility study is recommended to investigate the development of an External Degree program at the state level.

3. A feasibility study is recommended to review alternatives for funding of off-campus credit courses.