

GRAPEVINE

* * * * *

A newsletter on state tax legislation; state appropriations for universities, colleges, and junior colleges; state support of public school systems; legislation affecting education at any level. There is no charge for GRAPEVINE, but recipients are asked to send occasional timely newsnotes regarding pertinent events in their respective states.

IN THIS ISSUE

California	143	Nebraska	146
Louisiana	144	New York	146
Maryland	145	North Carolina	146
Michigan	145	Wisconsin	148

State tax fund appropriations for operating expenses of local public junior colleges, for 4 fiscal years147

CALIFORNIA. Prompt action has been and is being taken to implement the Donahoe Higher Education Act of 1960 (enacted after the submission of the "Master Plan" report (GRAPEVINE, pages 112-115).

The new 15-member Coordinating Council for Higher Education has been appointed and held its first meeting October 3. It turns out that 7 of the 15 members are professional educators, making it a mixed body with almost equally balanced representation of laymen and educators. This is a distinctively new development in the composition of statutory boards concerned with higher education in the United States.

The 7 educators are Clark Kerr, President of the University of California; Don B. Leiffer, Professor of Political Science at San Diego State College, recently installed as temporary administrative officer of the new Board of Trustees of the State College System; Arthur G. Coons, President of Occidental College; Robert J. Wert, Vice Provost of Stanford University; John F. X. Connelly, President of the University of San Francisco; Roy E.

Simpson, State Superintendent of Public Instruction; Joseph P. Cosand, President of Santa Barbara City College.

Among the 8 laymen are 2 attorneys-at-law; 4 business executives from fields including banking, retailing, and petroleum production; and 2 women, one of whom is a former newspaper correspondent, and one a trustee of the College of San Mateo. (For the prescribed methods of selecting members of the Council, see GRAPEVINE, page 114).

In the case of these first selections, the minority of professional educators is substantially strengthened by the fact that all three representatives of the private colleges are educators. These were appointed by Governor Brown, as provided in the statute, and he could have chosen lay members of their boards of trustees; but he chose professional members of their staffs.

As nearly as your correspondent can judge from a distance of 2,000 miles, the new Council starts with a burst of enthusiasm, which is perhaps stronger from

CALIFORNIA (Continued) the state college side than from the University and junior college angles. There appears to be some evidence that some state college leaders tend to magnify the functions of the Council beyond what the statute actually sets them out to be, and to predict that it will be exercising bureaucratic control over the entire state system of higher education. Actually it is purely an advisory body.

At its first meeting the Council is reported to have discussed the desirability of an asking budget of $\$1\frac{1}{4}$ million for the fiscal year 1961-62. It will select a salaried executive director and staff. It is said that a salary of \$30,000 a year for the executive director was considered. The Council determined to hold its second meeting in mid-November, but did not specify an exact date.

The new Board of Trustees of the State College System has also been appointed and has established its offices at 1127 Eleventh Street, Sacramento 14. Its Chairman is Louis H. Heilbron, Attorney associated with the firm of Heller, Ehrmann, White and McAuliffe in San Francisco. (For the structure and functions of this new board, see GRAPEVINE, pages 113, 114).

Its temporary administrative officer, pending selection of a permanent executive officer, is Professor Don B. Leiffer, as noted previously in the third paragraph of this note. He has appointed James Whitsell as Fiscal Adviser and George Normington as Management Adviser. The backgrounds of both of these latter gentlemen are apparently in the non-educational fiscal and administrative services of the state.

The actual assumption of full duty by the new Council and the new Board of

Trustees of the State College System is scheduled for July 1, 1961. After that date California will have in operation its new system of "3 big boards" plus an advisory coordinating council. The "big boards" will be the Regents of the University of California, the State Board of Education, and the Board of Trustees of the State College System. Each will be responsible for a major segment of California's tripartite scheme under which effort is made to keep sharply separated the functions, admissions policies, and financing of three distinct types of tax-supported institutions of higher education; the University of California, the state colleges, and the public junior colleges.

Many features of the scheme seem admirable; but the solidification of a vast and deadening bureaucracy needs be guarded against with vigilance. Generous spheres of freedom for institutional and local initiative and experimentation need to be assiduously preserved.

LOUISIANA. Shortly before its adjournment last July the Louisiana legislature proposed a constitutional amendment (by a two-thirds vote of each house) which would drastically reorganize the Board of Supervisors of Louisiana State University. It would increase the membership from 15 to 20, reduce the term of office from 14 to 9 years, and require that at least one member must be appointed from each Congressional district in the state. The governor and the president of the Alumni Council of the University would be members ex officio, included within the 20.

The measure will be on the ballot for popular approval or rejection November 8. Opponents say it is an attempt by Governor Jimmie H. Davis to gain control of the

GRAPEVINE is owned and circulated by M. M. Chambers. It is not a publication of the University of Michigan or of any other institution or association. Responsibility for any errors in the data, or for opinions expressed, is not to be attributed to any organization or person other than M. M. Chambers. GRAPEVINE is circulated chiefly to persons in position to reciprocate by furnishing prompt and accurate reports from their respective states regarding tax legislation, appropriations for higher education, state support for elementary and secondary schools, and legislation affecting education at any level. Address communications to M. M. Chambers, U.H.S. 4200-G, The University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Mich.

LOUISIANA. (Continued) University; but the governor disclaims any interest in the proposal.

The 1960 legislature also enacted a bill changing the name of the largest of the state colleges, Southwestern Louisiana Institute at Lafayette, to University of Southwestern Louisiana.

Another proposed constitutional amendment which will be on the ballot November 8 would authorize the parishes (Louisiana nomenclature for counties) in the area served by Francis T. Nicholls State College at Thibodaux to levy taxes of one mill for capital improvements at the college.

A proposed state bond issue of \$60 million would include a maximum of \$20 million for capital outlays at the state-supported institutions of higher education-- up to \$10 million at Louisiana State University and \$10 million at all the other state colleges in the aggregate.

MARYLAND. Continuing its ancient practice of making occasional allocations of public funds in aid of privately controlled institutions, the Maryland legislature of 1960 authorized a state bond issue of \$1½ million, to be matched equally by gifts from private sources, for the construction of a physics building at the Johns Hopkins University.

The report of the Governor's Commission to study the problem of the expansion of the University of Maryland (digested on GRAPEVINE page 117) appears to be the occasion of much debate as the 1961 session of the legislature draws near. The plan to convert three of the state teachers colleges into branches of the University, and later to establish three additional University centers at designated regions, is reported to be opposed by the State Board of Education and by the State Superintendent of Schools, Dr. Thomas G. Pullen, Jr.

MICHIGAN. For the past year and a half, 82 civic leaders in the Detroit six-county area of Macomb, Monroe, Oakland, St. Clair, Washtenaw and Wayne have been conducting an intensive study of the kind of post-high school educational need in the area.

The Chairman of The Citizens Committee was Mr. Thomas S. Nurnberger, Vice-President of Personnel, Michigan Bell Telephone Co.

Among the major conclusions of the final report published August 1, 1960 were:

College enrollments from the six-county area may more than double by 1970.

Additional community colleges are needed to accommodate this tidal wave of students and to provide specialized technical-vocational programs.

Five new community colleges should be established immediately. Planning should be done for fifteen more.

Each county in the six-county area should be a community college district.

The controlling board of each district should be the County Board of Education.

The method of electing the County Board of Education should be changed so that members are elected from the county at large.

Community college financial support should come from state appropriations, tuition, county-wide taxes.

Community colleges should continue to offer transfer programs; should add more technical-vocational programs; should provide extensive student counselling services.

Certification requirements for community college teachers should be liberalized. Steps should be taken to obtain adequate numbers of teachers and improve teaching efficiency.

Continuing regional studies of community college needs should be made.

The State Superintendent of Public Instruction should appoint a six-county Community College Development Committee.

County Superintendents of Schools should obtain enabling legislation and initiate action to present propositions regarding community colleges to the voters

MICHIGAN. (Continued) in each county.

Copies of the report may be obtained from Dr. Gerald W. Boicourt, Director, Community College Services, Wayne State University, 5215 Second Avenue, Detroit 2, Michigan.

NEBRASKA. The daily press of October 15 reports that the four state teachers colleges of Nebraska are asking for an increase of 50% in state tax funds appropriated for their operating expenses for the biennium 1961-63, over the sums appropriated for the present biennium (1959-61).

Sums appropriated for 1959-61, and requested for 1961-63, appear in parallel columns in Table 7.

Table 7. State tax funds for operating expenses of Nebraska state teachers colleges, appropriated for biennium 1959-61, and requested for biennium 1961-63, in thousands of dollars.

Institutions	Appropriated 1959-61	Requested 1961-63
(1)	(2)	(3)
Kearney S T C	\$1,669	\$2,770
Wayne S T C	1,351	2,260
Chadron S T C	1,053	1,420
Peru S T C	1,030	1,400
Totals	5,103	7,850

Total student enrollments are reported as 4,488 for the four institutions, an increase of 313 over last year. At the respective institutions, enrollments this year are: Kearney, 1,809; Wayne, 1,359; Chadron, 715; and Peru, 615.

NEW YORK. The daily press of October 15 reported Governor Rockefeller as telling a press conference that the development of higher education will be the biggest issue in the 1961 legislative session. Public and private college facilities should be doubled within ten years, said the governor. About 60% of New York's in-state college students attend private colleges.

The governor expects a report on November 14 from his Special Committee on Higher Education, composed of Henry T. Heald, President of the Ford Foundation; Marion B. Folsom of the Eastman Kodak Company; and John W. Gardner, President of

Carnegie Corporation of New York. (See GRAPEVINE page 88).

A 14-member Joint Legislative Committee on School Financing, created by the 1960 legislature and given a \$150,000 appropriation, held its first meeting September 16, and is due to make a first report on state financing of public schools by mid-January. The committee consists of 7 members of the legislature and 7 prominent citizens in business and the professions. (See GRAPEVINE page 123).

On August 26 a proposed capital budget of \$18,734,926 was submitted to the City Planning Commission by the Board of Higher Education of the City of New York for the seven municipal colleges, for the fiscal year 1961-62. This included \$15,669,926 for 19 projects already under way, \$2,675,000 for 10 new projects, and \$300,000 for the architectural and engineering unit of the Board of Higher Education's staff, which supervises construction.

Much evidence of crucial needs was included in the presentation. Mrs. Gladys M. Dorman, chairman of the Board's administrative committee for Brooklyn College, was quoted as saying that within the past year she had interviewed more than 600 students who had been rejected for admission, and concluded that 77% of them would have been admitted 5 years ago. She also reported that most of them could not afford to go to another school.

NORTH CAROLINA. Capital improvement requests for the state-supported institutions of higher education for the biennium 1961-63, aggregate about \$63 $\frac{1}{4}$ million, as shown in Table 8. (Cont'd.p.148).

AFTER NOVEMBER 8

Please write to GRAPEVINE

about the results of the vote in your state on any constitutional amendment, state bond issue, or other measure affecting education.

M. M. Chambers, U. H. S. 4200-G, The University of Michigan, Ann Arbor

APPROPRIATIONS OF STATE TAX FUNDS FOR SUPPORT OF OPERATING EXPENSES
OF LOCAL PUBLIC JUNIOR COLLEGES

Below is a revision and expansion of Table 82, which was circulated on GRAPEVINE, page 120 last June. The 18 states reported in Table 9 account for substantially the whole of the nationwide picture of state aid for local public junior college operating expenses.

Table 9. State tax fund appropriations for operating expenses of local public community-junior colleges (in 18 states), for fiscal years 1957-58, 1958-59, 1959-60, and 1960-61, in thousands of dollars, with percentages of increase for 1960-61 over 1958-59 (representing change over a period of 2 years).

States	Year 1957-58	Year 1958-59	Year 1959-60	Year 1960-61	2-year increase 1958-59 - 1960-61	Percentage increase
California	\$20,390	\$22,947	\$26,539	\$26,240	\$3,293	14 $\frac{1}{2}$
Texas	4,720	4,778	5,178	5,178	400	8 $\frac{1}{2}$
New York	2,200	2,750	3,450	4,610	1,860	67 $\frac{1}{2}$
Washington	3,368	3,368	4,180	4,180	812	24
Florida	1,429	2,521	3,129	4,149	1,628	64 $\frac{1}{2}$
Michigan	3,420	3,600	3,620	3,820	220	6
Illinois	2,150	2,150	2,150	2,150	0	0
Mississippi	1,415	1,683	1,683	2,147	464	27 $\frac{1}{2}$
Colorado	396	426	475	1,050	624	146 $\frac{1}{2}$
New Jersey	700	700	700	700	0	0
Minnesota	400	400	605	605	205	51
Maryland	252	337	405	432	95	28
Iowa	361	396	400	400*	4	1
Arizona	300	300	300	300	0	0
North Carolina	140	168	209	236	68	40 $\frac{1}{2}$
Wyoming	40	40	200	200	160	400
North Dakota	0	0	115	115	115	---
Idaho	NR	NR	134	134**	NR	NR
Totals	41,681	46,564	53,472	56,646	9,948	
Weighted average					Approximately	21 $\frac{1}{2}$

* Estimated to be the same as for 1959-60.

**Estimated. The only provision for state aid is that each junior college shall receive 50 per cent of all liquor profits which are allocated to the county in which it is located.

Observe that the rate of increase over the two years 1959-61, which appeared to be a little over 20% for the 7 states reported in Table 82 (GRAPEVINE page 120), has held up and climbed a little, to over 21% for the 18 states reported in Table 9. California continues to supply almost half of all the money involved in the nationwide picture; but note that for 1960-61 there are 8 other states appropriating from \$1 million to \$6 million each. More of this story later.

All figures are subject to verification and rectification. Informed persons who may detect any substantial error will please notify M. M. Chambers, U. H. S. 4200-G, The University of Michigan, Ann Arbor

NORTH CAROLINA. (Continued)

Table 8. State funds requested by institutions of higher education in North Carolina for capital improvements, biennium 1961-63, in thousands of dollars.

Institutions (1)	Sums requested (2)
U of North Carolina	\$12,002
UNC Div Health Affairs	3,459
North Carolina State Coll	13,807
Agricultural Exp Sta	1,803
Woman's College of UNC	4,312
East Carolina College	7,835
Ag & Tech Coll of N C	3,460
Western Carolina College	3,447
Appalachian St Tchrs Coll	4,941
Pembroke State College	591
Winston-Salem Tchrs Coll	195
Elizabeth City St Tchrs Coll	1,505
Fayetteville St Tchrs Coll	889
North Carolina Coll at Durham	5,040
Total	63,286

A total of \$2,876,000 is also asked for capital outlays by the four community colleges: Asheville-Biltmore College, Carver College, Charlotte College, and Wilmington College.

WISCONSIN. The Coordinating Committee for Higher Education, a body representing the Regents of the University of Wisconsin, the Regents of State Colleges, and the general public (through one-third of its members appointed by the governor), and set up by statute in 1955, has debated a statement of policy for the future of higher education in the state.

Some notion of the statewide background in Wisconsin is essential to an understanding of the statement. It must be noticed that there are now no fewer than three systems of education at approximately the junior college level in Wisconsin: (1) Twenty-two county normal schools, (2) Eight extension centers of the University of Wisconsin, distributed about the state, and (3) A system of state-local vocational and adult schools, in districts overlapping but distinct from the regular public school districts. Most of these vocational schools now have substantial numbers of high-school graduates enrolled, as well as adults and some pupils of high-school age; and their clientele

has long been moving upward into the junior college level, and continues to do so. All this, of course, is in addition to the lower divisions of the University of Wisconsin at Madison and Milwaukee, and of the 4 and 5-year colleges, including nine state colleges and the private colleges of the state, as well as Marquette University in Milwaukee.

With the above backdrop, one is prepared to receive without too much shock the Committee's belief that there is no need "to establish new systems, such as a separate junior college system." Yet this appears to be a conservative view, even in the present situation in Wisconsin.

The Committee recognizes readily enough that the teacher-education program of the numerous county normal schools is an anachronism which should be speedily dropped.

Wisconsin is now a state of approximately 4 million people. Making junior college opportunities, both for general and specialized education, accessible within reasonable distance of the homes of that many people presents a formidable and growing problem. Wisconsin, of course, will solve the problem in its own way, which may be different from the way in which similar problems are being solved in California, Texas, Florida, Michigan, Minnesota, Washington, and a number of other states where a growing system of local public junior colleges forms an important basic stratum in the system of public higher education. Even conservative New York is now in this latter group.

The 40-mile radius or the 60-mile radius, formerly thought of as a suitable measure of the accessibility of 2-year college opportunities, is coming to be regarded as imposing too much of a burden of expense and time in commuting. The 20-mile radius is more realistic everywhere except in relatively sparsely-populated areas.

One recommendation of the Wisconsin Committee with which many will agree is that the technician-level programs of the vocational and adult schools be expanded and strengthened. Another is that the Coordinating Committee should be reconstituted to include representatives of the system of vocational and adult schools.

* * * * *

Not copyrighted, If you quote or paraphrase, please credit the source in suitable manner.