

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 202 339

HE 013 847

AUTHOR Martorana, S. V.
 TITLE Dealing with Dwindling Resources.
 INSTITUTION Education Commission of the States, Denver, Colo.
 Inservice Education Program.; State Higher Education
 Executive Officers Association.
 SPONS AGENCY Kellogg Foundation, Battle Creek, Mich.
 REPORT NO IEP-905-5
 PUB DATE May 75
 NOTE 16p.; Paper presented at a Seminar for State Leaders
 in Postsecondary Education (Philadelphia, PA, May
 1975).

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
 DESCRIPTORS Change Strategies; *Cooperative Planning;
 Coordination; Decision Making; Declining Enrollment;
 Educational Trends; Financial Problems; Governance;
 *Higher Education; *Intercollegiate Cooperation;
 Regional Cooperation; *Regional Planning;
 *Retrenchment
 IDENTIFIERS *Seminars for State Leaders Postsec Ed (ECS SHEEO)

ABSTRACT

Factors contributing to the struggle for survival faced by postsecondary institutions and ways to deal with dwindling resources, in particular by regionalism and regionalization, are considered. Among the contributing factors are the leveling off of the college-age population (18-21-year-olds), the declining status of advanced learning in American society, and the possibly continuing decline in financial support. One possible response is for colleges and universities to make the human and material resources they already have stretch further. Five dilemmas that confront resource use coordinators are as follows: how to maintain institutional autonomy; whether decisions should be made by consensus, majority vote, or edict; how to implement decisions in light of expanding collective bargaining; and how to obtain staffing and other resources to do the work of resource allocators. It is suggested that regionalism in higher education is emerging as a middle-ground position in state-level coordination and planning for higher education and may avoid both monolithic, centralized statewide control and a bad market model. Based on preliminary findings of a national study, it is suggested that regional cooperation between institutions be officially recognized by an authoritative agency in the state. Official recognition can separate the concept of regionalism as an aspect of statewide planning and coordination of postsecondary education from the more general phenomenon of voluntary consortium arrangements among institutions. Thirty-one states have engaged in study of regionalizing postsecondary education, and 47 patterns of regionalization have been identified. Seven states have moved into regionalization by virtue of an enabling statutory action.
 (SW)

Inservice Education Program (IEP)

ED 202339

Paper Presented at a Seminar for State Leaders in Postsecondary Education

DEALING WITH DWINDLING RESOURCES

S. V. MARTORANA

Professor
Center for the Study of Higher Education
Pennsylvania State University

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

- Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

ECS

Philadelphia, Pennsylvania
May 1975

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

IEP Reprint No. 905-5

HE 013 847


Education Commission of the States

Inservice Education Program (IEP)
Education Commission of the States
1860 Lincoln Street, Suite 300
Denver, Colorado 80295

SHERO

The IEP Program has been supported primarily by the W. K. Kellogg Foundation with additional funds from the Education Commission of the States, the Frost Foundation and the State Higher Education Executive Officers

DEALING WITH DWINDLING RESOURCES

The title assigned to the module of this in-service workshop for state-level staff in postsecondary education for which this paper is to be a discussion base, effectively poses one side of the survival struggle that operating postsecondary educational institutions are facing today and likely will face for some time to come. Ways for "dealing with dwindling resources" need to be found if these institutions are to continue to exist as we now know them; but it is not just the dwindling of new resources that represents the challenge of the times. Other factors add to create the crisis of survival now becoming a subject of considerable attention and study. Since this paper is to deal with an emerging response that some postsecondary educators are directing toward the crisis, that is, regionalism and regionalization, a brief review of the several factors contributing to the survival concerns of a growing list of postsecondary institutions of different types (schools, colleges, and universities) can serve as a useful introduction.

The Crisis of Survival

Knowledge that colleges and universities today are wrestling with conditions quite different from those of the fabulous 50s and strident 60s and that new responses are needed is spreading beyond the interests of the educators directly involved. It is of such seriousness as to attract the notice of the public press as well. Last week the Pittsburgh Gazette carried a three-part series on the subject and detailed in considerable length how different colleges and universities were establishing new practices to handle their growing difficulties.¹ When Cheit produced his volume The New Depression in Higher Education,² many believed that only the privately controlled institutions were in trouble because they lacked the backstop support of a public constituency. But continuing observations made clear that the trials ahead were to be faced by postsecondary institutions

¹Pittsburgh Gazette, May 13-15, 1975

²E. F. Cheit, The New Depression in Higher Education. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1971.

in general because all would be affected by the "End of College Boom."³

Volumes have been and are being written on the nature and causes of the crisis that are forcing change in post-secondary education; there is no need to review them in detail for workshop participants here. Note needs to be taken, however, that the causes include more than just the prospects of a decline in growth--the cause given most attention in the literature of the day. In its analysis of "the problem" presented by the Board of Trustees of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, the "collegiate sector" of postsecondary education, that is, higher education, is described as, ". . . undergoing the greatest overall and long-run rate of decline in its growth pattern in all of its history,"⁴ and suggests throughout its discussion that the difficulties flow predominately from that fact. Leslie and Miller similarly place primary focus on probable enrollment statistics as generating the conditions of "steady state" and the troublesome accommodations colleges will need to make during the last quarter of the century to adjust to it.⁵

There can be no doubt that the leveling off of the college-age population (18-21 year olds) will have serious and lasting impact on postsecondary educational institutions, especially colleges and universities. But there is more to cause concern than is evident in the population statistics alone. The foundation for the body of this paper must be that it speaks to the broad spectrum of causality of the crisis and it is essential, therefore, that at least two other forces be noted. One of these is basic, but clearly independent of the difficulties generated by the dropping college-age population; it is the softening status of advanced learning in the American society's value construct. The other is a derivative factor and relates to both the dropping college-age population and the apparent diminishing public esteem of a college education; it is the prospect of continuing decline in support, both material and psychic, that colleges can attract in the foreseeable future.

³E. B. Fiske, "End of College Boom." The New York Times, November 11, 1974, p. 39.

⁴Carnegie Foundation for Advancement of Teaching, More Than Survival: Prospects for Higher Education in a Period of Uncertainty. San Francisco, Calif.: Jossey-Bass, 1975, p. 1.

⁵L. L. Leslie and H. F. Miller, Jr., Higher Education and the Steady State. ERIC/Higher Education Research Report No. 4, Washington, D. C.: American Association for Higher Education, 1974.

Dropping Public Esteem

There are measures more direct and valid than public opinion polls by which one can judge the value attached to a given enterprise, but a reference to the polls can serve as a start. According to recent reports of the pollsters, education, in general, and higher education, in particular, are losing public favor.

But other evidence speaks as loudly as the polls. Among such evidence is the report from New York State that the proportion of college graduates going on to further education dropped this past year to reverse a consistent climb each year for over a decade. Also indicative is the increasing questioning, if not actually hostile, press being given these days to higher education. Consider, for example, the two feature stories in the influential editorial section of the Sunday Washington Post this past week. James O'Toole authored a lengthy article entitled suggestively, "Too Much Education for the Job." It ran prominently along with another by Bruce Johnson entitled "Degrees Without Jobs: Anxiety on One Campus."⁶ And any higher educationists who would tend to downplay the significance of such press reports do so at their own peril, for many authors carry strong credentials. O'Toole is on the faculty of the Graduate School of Business, University of Southern California, and Johnson is a 1972 graduate of the University of Washington and a graduate student in journalism at the University of Minnesota.

Also to be viewed as evidence that higher education faces troubles beyond a simple possible diminution of enrollment is the rising tide of demand for a greater accountability from colleges and universities. Gubernatorial offices, legislatures, state-level boards and commissions--all are demanding longer and stronger reports from operating institutions that speak to their effectiveness, that is qualitative and quantitative attainment of their claims in instruction, public service and research; moreover, they ask also for evidence that institutions hold firmly to considerations of efficiency, that is wise and careful action to minimize resources used while seeking maximum effective achievement of their institutional goals.

Finally, one needs to see another emerging development as a form of public disenchantment with higher education as now typically known. It is the widening definition, expectation, and public acceptance of the concept. It is

¹James O'Toole, "Too Much Education for the Job" and Bruce Johnson "Degrees Without Jobs: Anxiety on One Campus," The Washington Post, Sunday, May 1, 1975.

extending not only beyond the old view of traditional colleges and universities to the broader one of postsecondary education now nearly made universal by the language of the Federal Higher Education Amendments of 1972, but even more widely to include any situation or structure which provides a component for the further education or training of the adult learner. The term "communiversity" recently has emerged in the literature with several meanings partially suggestive of its full impact given to it; some writers, this one included, see it becoming an ultimate coalition of all educational components,⁷ and this can lead us to see some new possibilities in the rising interest in regionalism in the several states. Most of the evidentiary references in this paper relate to the "collegiate" sector of postsecondary education; that is (1) because so little data are available on the non-collegiate and (2) most discussions of sharing (i.e., consortia-regionalism) view the matter as essentially involving only public and private resources (CUPIR). The fact is that sharing and regionalism is coming to include much more--communiversity! This concept will be developed further in the concluding section of this paper.

Diminishing Fiscal Support

The opening paragraph of this paper placed emphasis on need to cope with dwindling new resources. This was deliberate to make more dramatic the point that as new resources for postsecondary education, in general, and for the collegiate sector especially, decrease, the pressure and absolute necessity for wise use of old, that is, existing, resources become simultaneously more obvious and more compelling to the future continuation of operations and maintenance of reasonable levels of quality.

Evidence of the decline in new resources to support college and university operations is clear and growing. Again, only minimal documentation of this point is needed here. The decline is in the rates of increase from earlier years; but clearly the "Golden Age" is past.

Sharpest insight with the import of the decline in support provided for higher education is seen in measures that relate it to the total civic enterprise at federal and state levels. According to the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, "The percentage of the GNP spent on higher education (not including capital construction and

⁷S. V. Martorana and Eileen Kuhns, "Communiversity: New Challenge to the Community College." Accepted by Change Magazine for publication, Fall, 1975.

certain other accounts) doubled from 1960 to 1972--from 1.1 to 2.2 percent, but it fell to 2.1 percent by 1975."⁸ And colleges and universities are not doing well in competing with other governmental services of the states either. Glenny and Kidder report that, nationwide, total state appropriations for institutions of higher education as a percentage of total state general revenue rose from 11.24 in 1963 to 14.66 in 1971, but fell to 14.26 in 1973.⁹

A + B + C = Crisis for Survival

That, then, is the more complete basis for sensing that higher education needs now more than ever to marshal its creative capabilities to save itself. The basic challenge is to higher education as an enterprise is to reestablish its historic and recently held public esteem. In their discussion of the parallels between higher education and other social enterprises which display the phenomenon of "transverse progression" in their growth patterns, Leslie and Miller ask and answer the critical question, "What is it that such systems must have in common to fit the transverse progression model? The functions performed by such a system must be essential to the total social system."¹⁰ And later, they caution against an overly optimistic view of the future of colleges and universities, ". . . we have also tried to convey the notion that it is the higher education function, not specific kinds of institutions, that exhibits transverse progression."¹¹

One can argue that higher education, as an essential social function, is secure, as indeed Leslie and Miller do, but if this is done in ways that in effect destroy the integrity of higher education as it has evolved in this country and now known, the question can be raised: Was it--higher education--really the essential function? In other words, if the functions of instruction, research, and public service are the critically essential functions and not their provision to the society by a coordinated, coherent system, these functions will exhibit transverse progression, not higher education. Indeed, the potential disintegration of

⁸ Carnegie Foundation for Advancement of Teaching, op. cit., p. 2.

⁹ Lyman A. Glenny and James R. Kidder, State Tax Support of Higher Education: Revenue Appropriations Trends and Patterns. Berkeley, Calif.: Center for Research and Development in Higher Education, University of California, 1972, p. 17.

¹⁰ Leslie and Miller, op. cit., p. 20

¹¹ Ibid., p. 49.

the academic enterprise (colleges, schools, universities) into a disparate array of instructional "delivery systems," separate research institutes, and various public service agencies has already been noted elsewhere.¹²

Higher education, if it is to survive intact, needs to reestablish its essential character as an integral societal function and to do this, it must respond not only to the lower enrollments, but to other expectations of the public as well. Among these expectations is a continued effectiveness with a greater efficiency. How to do this is, of course, the real and serious question.

If No (or Fewer) New Resources: The Old Must Do

One step to consider is to make the most of the resources at hand. The supporting constituencies expect this; if the colleges and universities react constructively to the expectation, some recapturing of public confidence can result. Beyond this public relations purpose, however, lies the stark fact that if the future prospect for higher education is a continuation of recent moves by public sources at all levels (federal, state, and local), as well as private constituencies, to slow down provisions of new support for higher education, colleges and universities must find ways and means to make the resources they already have stretch further. At first, this may create tensions and some new problems. In the long run, however, it may be found as enlightened action, for, as is now generally accepted in higher education throughout the country, some expansion is expected to occur into the early 80s, but relatively little growth after that for the rest of this century. If colleges and universities can "get over the hump," so to speak, the long run challenge will be to maximize use of existing resources which will be more than necessary if earlier norms of determining need are retained. That time may well be the golden era for improvement of the quality of postsecondary education as the 50s and 60s were for expanding the quantity of opportunity for many other thousands of persons at this level of study.

Let us look at the existing resources that we are talking about. Most obvious to the layman and typical state budget examiners view is the investment the American people have put into the capital plant for higher education.

¹²For example, Eileen Kuhns and S. V. Martorana, "Of Time and Modules: The Organization of Instruction," Journal of Higher Education XLV, 6 June 1974, 430-440 and Ashby, Eric, "The Structure of Higher Education: A World View." AGB Reports 8 (May-June 1973).

According to a nationwide inventory conducted in the Fall of 1973, the 3,019 higher education institutions possessed an estimated 1.8 billion gross square feet of buildings to accommodate 7.4 million FTE students. Of the total gross area reported, approximately two-thirds was in public and one-third in private institutions. Of special interest to a concern that all good existing resources be used, if at all possible, and to the discussion of regionalism to follow in this paper, is the further statistic that a significantly higher proportion of the gross space reported by public institutions was less than satisfactory for use and needed renewal (25.3 percent) than was true for the private institutions (16.5 percent).¹³ Again the questions most pertinent to the discussions in this paper are: Can all that space be put to good use in higher education? If so, how? If any is good and available but not used, waste may be evident; if such non-use exists when simultaneously alternative action toward new construction or renewal is undertaken at current inflated costs, waste becomes obvious! Logically and fairly, the same type of data can be cited and questions raised concerning the investments already made in the material that goes inside the buildings-- library holdings, laboratory and shop equipment, and so on, but the point is clear, so need not be belabored.

The most essential as well as most costly resource available for higher education, however, must not be passed over; it is the faculty and supporting personnel to the instruction, research, and public service functions of higher education. Over a million professionals (faculty and other professional staff) and more than 600,000 full-time faculty are in the collegiate sector to secure the more than 10 million students enrolled. Again, roughly a third of these are in privately controlled institutions.¹⁴ According to the AAUP, 14.5 billion dollars of institutional revenues in 1971-72 flowed to faculty for compensation and another 11.5 billion flowed to other staff for compensation and to supplies.¹⁵

¹³Higher Education Comprehensive Planning Program, Inventory of Physical Facilities in Institutions of Higher Education, Building Survey, Fall, 1973. Raleigh, North Carolina: Higher Education Facilities Services, Inc., June 1974, pp. 2-3.

¹⁴American Council on Education, A Fact Book on Higher Education, Institutions, Faculty and Staff, Students, Third Issue, 1974. Washington, D. C.: American Council on Education, 1974, pp. 74-127, 74-129.

¹⁵AAUP Bulletin, "Hard Times: Report on the Economic Status of the Profession," 60, 2, Summer, June 1974, p. 189.

Once again, we must ask, how can all this specialized talent be utilized for the betterment of society through higher education? Clearly, some new ways to manage resource allocations seems in order. Before turning to a discussion of regionalism as one approach, some of the dilemmas raised by any suggestion of a coordinated approach to resource allocation need to be mentioned.

Resource Use Coordination: Five Dilemmas and Two Spectre-Illusions

The general picture in higher education, then, is one in which for some time, existing rather than new resources will need to support the enterprise. New resources will likely continue to dwindle; perhaps even the acquisition of new fiscal support sufficient to maintain the existing resources of personnel and facilities will be difficult. If, then, more effective and efficient use of existing resources (personnel and material) may be a necessary and desirable response, some way is needed to decide what existing resources will be called upon to bear added burdens, what ones can continue to serve as now, and what ones, if any, are to be discarded as no longer defensible. In other words: What do we save and use to support higher education in the decades ahead and what do we throw away? And when the decisions are reached on the question, how can they be implemented?

In all fifty states, that is the question confronting persons who seek and are responsible for allocations of resources for higher education today. Ideally, it should be resolved with maximum preservation of what are the best and most needed resources with maximum conservation of scarce new resources, and very importantly, with maximum preservation (a) of the traditional values of higher education and (b) of the humane treatment of social organizations and of individual persons in them. Faced with such criteria, the task before resource use coordinators becomes formidable, indeed. Five dilemmas appear that so far have evaded satisfactory handling; space permits only a mere mention of each.

The first is the tradition in higher education of institutional autonomy. Since the resources available for education are held not by a single auspice in any state, but by at least two types of auspices, one publicly, the other privately maintained, whether the several auspices should come together voluntarily or be brought together by some official direction continues to be a "buzzelement" to all concerned. Getting the owners together, then, is a first essential but very hard objective to attain. Should it be "on call" or by "spontaneous" convention?

Second, decisions need to be made, but how? Consensus, majority vote, edict? Each has its advantages but disadvantages, too. So far, no clear conclusion to support any one choice is at hand.

Third, decision implementation is awkward. Critical to this in any educational enterprise is the positive participation of faculty and supporting professional staff. In an age of expanding collective bargaining, this may be increasingly hard to get.

Fourth, what about staff needed to do the work of the resource allocators? Should it be of volunteers from operating segments of the enterprise and institutions or a corps of professionals autonomous and separately supported?

And fifth, resources (other than personnel just mentioned) are needed to support the function. Should some existing resources be diverted to this new function? Can this be done? Or, can and should a case be made for use of some of the scarce new resources to be used for this purpose?

Two Spectre-Illusions

Actually, there are two extremes to the position that can be taken on the foregoing questions. Each presents a kind of spectre-illusion that haunts many in higher education today and causes a quest for some workable, middle-ground view. On the one hand, there is the spectre-illusion of a heavy-handed officialdom taking over control of higher education and setting for it not only the resources it will use, but also the broad policies to govern it. On the other hand, there is spectre-illusion of the use of the "market model" to redistribute resources, and in the claim of advocates of this approach, to preserve the autonomy of institutions of advanced study.

Why are these possibilities labeled in this paper as spectre-illusions? Because NEITHER extreme position can present convincing evidence that it is the likely model for general adoption throughout the states. Proponents of the centralization of control as well as coordination of post-secondary education are confronted with the growing strength of the proprietary sector (which practically and by definition cannot be controlled integrally with the others); with the spreading federal and state practice of funding higher education through direct grants to students; and with the demands (sometimes successful) of faculties and administrations of campuses of collectivized systems for more autonomy in their operations. Note, for example, the recommendations of the recently released Governor's Commission on Education

in Maryland; it recommends autonomy from the system and separate constitutional boards of control for the several state colleges and for the Eastern Shore Campus of the University of Maryland.¹⁶ Proponents of the "market model," chief among them Frank Newman, through the first and second reports to the Secretary of the U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare¹⁷, are faced with the fact that all but four states now have acted to establish a "1202 Commission" to carry on "comprehensive statewide planning" under provisions of Federal Public Law 92-318 (Higher Education Amendment of 1972), that several states in recent years have put all public higher education under statewide governing boards, and that officials of state government and the governors and legislatures are expressing yearly more interest in direct intervention into the conducts of higher education.

Regionalism in higher education is emerging evidently as a move toward a middle-ground position in state-level coordination and planning for higher education. It presents some interesting positive possibilities to escape both spectre-illusion of monolithic, centralized, statewide control and a mad market model. It suggests, moreover, the start toward manageable methods for resolving the five dilemmas to resource use allocation that were presented above.

Regionalism Within Statewide Planning

Just what are regionalism and regionalization and what is the status of development of these notions in higher education in this country? For the past year and a half, Gary McGuire, a research assistant, and I in the Center for the Study of Higher Education/Pennsylvania State University, have been probing this question. With the cooperation of the members of SHEEO the results of a nationwide study is now going to press and will be published by the Center for the Study of Higher Education/Pennsylvania State University. Time and space permits giving only some highlight findings here.

¹⁶ Governor's Study Commission on Structure and Governance of Education for Maryland. Final Report of the Governor's Commission on Education. Baltimore, Maryland: The Commission, 1975, pp. 26-27.

¹⁷ Report on Higher Education. Washington, D. C.: Dept. of Health, Education, and Welfare, 1971 and The Second Newman Report: National Policy and Higher Education, Cambridge, Mass.: The MIT Press, 1975.

For purposes of our study, we define regionalism as that view of a geographic sub-section of a state (or of several adjoining states) which considers all (or a number) of the postsecondary educational components collectively and seeks to establish a coordinated relationship of their goals, programs, and/or resources. That is the idea, the concept; regionalization is then simply the acts or processes by which the concept is put into practice; the implementation of regionalism is regionalization. It is manifested, obviously in some form of interinstitutional, cooperative arrangement.

For purposes of our study, however, we attached another criterion for inclusion of interinstitutional arrangements into the counts of practice we wanted to describe; it was that the regional arrangement be one that was officially recognized by an authoritative agency in the state. This could be, naturally, the Governor or Legislature by executive action or statute, or a state-level coordinating or governing board responsible for postsecondary education in whole or in part in the state.

This matter of official recognition is important, for it is a way to separate the concept of regionalism as an aspect of statewide planning and coordination of postsecondary education from the more general phenomenon of consortia which are more typically ad hoc, voluntary, interinstitutional arrangements. These merit attention because (1) they are, in some sense, forerunners of regionalism, (2) because they are, in some cases, coming into the process of recognized, official regionalism, and (3) because they provide already some basis of experience from which officials considering regionalism can profit. Identification and preliminary examination of these consortia dates back now nearly twenty years,¹⁸ but in recent years, the person most directly following this development is Lewis D. Patterson, headquartered in the AAHE. For several years, he has produced an annual count of formally organized consortiums. The 1975 count is 106. But, as he says, this is only a small glimpse of the interinstitutional connections emerging throughout the land:

Numbers at best only tell a part of the cooperative movement. In the past two years new areas are receiving increased attention such as among community colleges, in continuing

¹⁸S. V. Martorana, James Messersmith, and Lawrence Nelson, Cooperative Projects Among Colleges and Universities. Circular No. 649, U. S. Dept. of Health, Education, and Welfare, Washington, D. C.: GPO, 1961.

education in medical and health programs, in military programs, in theology and in the arts. Two trends to observe in the future will be: the movement to state regionalization where it becomes increasingly difficult to distinguish between voluntary and statutory systems; and a broadening of the base of participation to include the full range of the postsecondary community and related community/regional agencies in cooperative arrangements.¹⁹

In passing, one should note for the record that the achievements of consortia to date are not very impressive. Franklin Patterson (no relation to Lew, I'm told) paints a dim view of their attainments as contrasted to their aspirations in a book-length treatment entitled Colleges in Consort: Institutional Cooperation through Consortia.²⁰

But McGuire and I discovered much stronger interest and action in regionalism and regionalization than we expected to discover. Here only a few highlights from the study can be reported, for time and space are limited. The full report will be published by the Pennsylvania State University, Center for the Study of Higher Education.²¹

We discovered that regionalism and regionalization in the several states has progressed way beyond what we expected to find. Thirty-one states have embarked or are in advanced stages of study of regionalizing postsecondary education in their states. And these thirty-one states have forty-seven different patterns of regionalization than the number of states that were reporting because in some states there are two or more officially recognized plans. That may be surprising at the start, but on further examination, it is not surprising. For example, in New York State the Board of Regents has a plan officially recognized for regionalization of postsecondary education in public, private, and proprietary postsecondary educational resources; since the Regents is an official body, that plan obviously has an official status. Also in the state of New York,

¹⁹Lewis D. Patterson, 1975 Consortium Directory, Washington, D. C.: AAHE, 1975, p. v.

²⁰Franklin Patterson, Colleges in Consort, San Francisco, Calif.: Jossey-Bass, 1975.

²¹S. V. Martorana and Gary McGuire, Regionalism and Statewide Coordination of Postsecondary Education (A preliminary report of a continuing study). University Park, Penn.: Pennsylvania State University, Center for the Study of Higher Education (forthcoming).

put, this concept envisions a mechanism that will bring about, in a region, an organizational arrangement of all of the community-focused educational components that are present--public, private, industrially-based, those based in religious and cultural institutions and centers, and whatever else that exists can be interrelated into the educational service for a "Learning Society." So, I close with a reminder that if we are going to talk about dwindling resources, if "survival through sharing" is to be a viable concept, it will be necessary to recognize that the basic problem is not just dollars, but also recapturing public esteem. One of the questions the public is asking is: How well can we use the resources that are already at hand, regardless of whether these are public or private, in our direct control or not, or formally or informally identified with schools and colleges? The challenge in the question is whether postsecondary educational leadership can bring these all to bear in the public interest.

And finally, one must ask, is regionalism officially now and operationally perhaps soon coming to be recognized as the way of the future in statewide planning and coordination?

however, the State University of New York, which is the state umbrella organization for public higher education outside of New York City, has a regionalization plan which it is seeking to effect. This also has an official status because it is under the aegis of the Board of Trustees of the State University of New York. One should emphasize there is some attempt at coordination going on between those two officially endorsed plans which is, as yet, rather amorphous; in the interim, the two plans for regionalization need to be recognized in any report that pretends to describe the status of the development of this new educational movement in the country at this time.

Seven states have moved into regionalization by virtue of an enabling statutory action. Now that is indicative, we think, of the seriousness by which this matter is being viewed in these states and it may be, again, an indication of things to come. In the other states it has come about as already indicated by administrative action of those agencies that have some authority of law behind them. More information about such topics as their staffing patterns, mechanisms for policy formation, and modes of financing are covered in the report. Most of the regional designs, as yet, do not have fully developed central coordinating or executive staffs. But a number of them do. All have some form or mechanism for arriving at policy and guiding operations, and all that survive, of course, must some way or another be financed. Together they suggest a portentous and fascinating possibility for a new era in American post-secondary education.

Conclusion

Several questions seem to flow from the results of the regionalism study that have quite direct import to the purposes and interest of this conference specifically and to the question of coordination of a state's enterprise in postsecondary education as an approach to conserving scarce resources while, hopefully improving public service in both effectiveness and efficiency terms. The questions bear broadly on the structure, programming, and staffing of post-secondary education as well as the way it is to be financed. They include also: Is this development--regionalism--a manifestation of what by some is coming to be termed "communiversity"²² or "communiversity education"?²³ Simply

²² Samuel B. Gould, Today's Academic Condition. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1971.

²³ S. V. Martorana and Eileen Kuhns, "Communiversity Education: A New Challenge to the Community College," Change (forthcoming).