

M. M. Chambers, U.H.S. 4200-G  
Center for the Study of Higher Education  
The University of Michigan  
Ann Arbor, Michigan

Number 24

DECEMBER 1960

Page 155

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

New 2-year basic medical school to be established in Connecticut.....156  
Board of Higher Education asks increases for institutions in North Dakota..156

MEETING THE INCREASING DEMAND FOR HIGHER EDUCATION IN NEW YORK STATE...157-160

\* \* \* \* \*

1960 IN RETROSPECT

The calendar year 1960, though an "off-year" for state legislative sessions, has been a big year for GRAPEVINE. We were able to report historic developments in California in our issues for January, May, October, and other months (See GRAPEVINE, pages 85-86, 112-116, and 143-144). More recently came the significant Heald-Gardner-Folsom report on the future of higher education in New York State (GRAPEVINE pages 88, 146, 153-154, and 157-60). These events in the 2 most populous states in the nation are high points. They have been accompanied by a large grist of developments in many other states which GRAPEVINE has found it a pleasure to report during 1960.

We have found more than \$587 million appropriated out of state tax funds for the support of higher education for the single fiscal year 1960-61 by 16 of the states whose legislatures meet annually (GRAPEVINE, page 129); and nearly \$57 million appropriated for the same fiscal year by 18 states contributing to the annual operating incomes of local public community-junior colleges (GRAPEVINE, page 147). The first figure represents an increase of about 30% over the comparable figure of 2 years ago (for fiscal 1958-59). The second figure shows an increase of more than 21% for the same period. Together they refute the defeatist argument that the states can not or will not support higher education on a rapidly increasing scale.

Early in 1961 the legislatures of 47 states will convene; a majority of them for a binomial session. Nineteen sixty-one will be a notable year. Please keep GRAPEVINE informed of the important happenings in your state. All credit for GRAPEVINE'S success belongs to you. May you and yours have a Merry Christmas and a Happy New Year!

-----  
Statement of ownership and circulation of GRAPEVINE appears on page 156 (reverse hereof).

CONNECTICUT. The daily press reports that a new 2-year school of basic medical sciences will be established in Hartford as a unit of the University of Connecticut, financed in part by the W. K. Kellogg Foundation of Battle Creek, Michigan. This will help to alleviate the shortage of medical school facilities available to qualified applicants in Connecticut and New England.

Earlier this year the Kellogg Foundation announced its aid to a similar regional 2-year medical school to be set up as a unit of the University of New Mexico; and the Foundation is said to be considering aid to like enterprises in other regions.

As to the need for additional physicians, one projection indicates that by 1975 the nation's medical schools should produce 3,600 more graduates each year than they are producing now. Note that the Heald-Gardner-Folsom report on higher education in New York State (page 160, this GRAPEVINE) recommends 2 or 3 new medical schools for that state within 10 to 15 years.

At present 2-year basic medical schools are operated at the University of North Dakota, the University of South Dakota, and at Dartmouth College. The 2-year medical school at West Virginia University has recently been expanded to become a full-fledged 4-year medical school.

NORTH DAKOTA. The asking budgets of the 9 state institutions of higher education for the biennium 1961-63, after having been adjusted and approved by the State Board of Higher Education, are shown in Table 10. After examination and adjustment or approval by the State Budget Board, they will go to the 1961 legislature.

Table 10. Requests (as approved by the State Board of Higher Education) for state tax funds for biennium 1961-63 for state university and colleges in North Dakota.

| Institution             | For operations | For capital outlays |
|-------------------------|----------------|---------------------|
| (1)                     | (2)            | (3)                 |
| U of N Dakota           | \$6,675        | \$3,223             |
| N D Ag Coll             | 5,468          | 2,854               |
| Ag Exten Div            | 769            |                     |
| Ag Exp Sta              | 2,448          | 649                 |
| St T C, Minot           | 1,903          | 770                 |
| St T C, Mayville        | 832            | 588                 |
| St T C, Dickinson       | 832            | 547                 |
| St T C, Valley City     | 1,095          | 557                 |
| Sch Sci, Wahpeton       | 1,424          | 1,058               |
| N & I Coll, Ellendale   | 614            | 332                 |
| Sch Forestry, Bottineau | 510            | 151                 |
| Totals                  | 22,570         | 10,729              |

The State Geological Survey, though located at Grand Forks, is not budgeted as a part of the University of North Dakota. It separately asks \$454,000 for operations and \$25,000 for capital improvements.

\* \* \* \* \*

MORE NEW GOVERNORS. Governor-elect William Wallace Barron of West Virginia has a law degree from West Virginia University. Governor-elect William L. Guy of North Dakota was graduated from North Dakota Agricultural College and has a Master's degree from the University of Minnesota. Governor-elect Edwin L. Mechem of New Mexico is a graduate of New Mexico A & M, now New Mexico State University.

New Mexico authorized an \$8 million state bond issue for capital improvements at the state universities and colleges.

-----  
 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.

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

THE NEW YORK STORY

The report of the Governor's Committee on Higher Education (Marion B. Folsom, John W. Gardner, and Henry T. Heald, Chairman), briefly noted on GRAPEVINE page 153 on the basis of fragmentary newspaper stories which appeared immediately after its release in mid-November, can now be discussed at a little more length.

The 74-page printed document is entitled Meeting the Increasing Demand for Higher Education in New York State. Copies may be had, presumably free of charge, from the Board of Regents, State Education Department, Albany, New York.

Present enrollment in all colleges and universities in New York State, says the report, is 425,000, and is estimated to reach 804,000 in 1970 and 1,270,000 by 1985. At present 60% are in private institutions, but these proportions may be reversed by 1985, because it is highly probable that the public institutions will necessarily have to absorb the bulk of the huge increases.

The number of high school graduates will grow from the present 150,000 a year to 325,000 by 1985; and the percentage of high school graduates attending college full-time or part-time will rise from today's 36% to 53% by 1985.

The report frankly points to a well-known fact-- that New York is currently exporting many "educational emigrés" to colleges and universities in other parts of the country because educational opportunity is not available to them at home. It candidly "lays on the line" the fact that New York's per capita expenditure of state and local tax dollars for current operation of higher education in 1957-58 was only \$5.41 as compared with \$15.17 for California, \$11.82 for Michigan, \$10.29 for Iowa, \$8.55 for Indiana, \$8.08 for Illinois, \$7.65 for Wisconsin, \$7.61 for Texas, and so on.

Among the goals advocated by the Committee are two superb ones: (1) wide availability and diversity of educational opportunity to students with various intellectual capabilities and of all income classes in the State; (2) a strong system of

public as well as private education, including strong public universities. The underscoring is mine. The underscored part of (2) would inaugurate a new policy for New York State.

Pointing to the seal of the State University of New York: "Let each become all he is capable of being", the Committee wants public higher education in New York to "cease to be a limping and apologetic enterprise," and "achieve the spirit and style which characterize the nation's great public institutions."

The Committee would have this recommendation implemented by the establishment and development of two great centers of graduate education and research within the State University of New York. One would be at the newly-developing plant at Stony Brook, Long Island. The other would be upstate at an undesignated location, in connection with some one of the institutions now in operation-- perhaps one of the units of the State University or possibly a converted private institution which would thus become a part of the State University.

Improvement of the public system would also be implemented by transforming the 11 state colleges of education into high-grade colleges of liberal arts with appropriate departments of education; by enlarging the existing public community colleges, converting the six state technical institutes into community colleges, and building new 2-year community colleges, as rapidly as a minimum enrollment of 500 students can be anticipated within 2 years after establishment. It is also recommended that the state's contribution to the annual operating expenses of public community colleges (now about one-third) be increased to perhaps one-half.

The Committee touched off an instant storm of opposition from the students and faculties of the municipal colleges of the City of New York, and from many persons at various ranks in the vast New York City system of public (continued on page 158)

NEW YORK (Continued from page 157)

schools, with its 40,000 teachers and more than 1 million pupils, by its recommendation that the city colleges, which have hitherto been free of tuition, should charge \$300 a year tuition fees to all students except those whose families are shown by state income tax returns to be earning less than \$5,000 a year.

The viewpoint of the Committee is that this would make tuition fees approximately uniform in all public institutions of higher education in the state; and that moderate charges for tuition are essential to the financing of higher education, even in public institutions. This runs counter to a long tradition in New York City, as well as in other municipal universities in other cities, and to the state university and land-grant college idea prevailing in most states--that tuition should be free or at merely nominal rates, and that other fees should be kept at low levels.

The issue of whether public education shall or shall not be on a basis of substantial charges to students is a fundamental and important one, from the standpoint of the availability of educational facilities to qualified persons of all economic classes. The Committee says it espouses the principle of availability, but somehow is able to reconcile this with the idea of charging fees to all except those who show an extremely low family income, and at the same time stand among the top 20% of their high school graduating classes. What happens to those who are merely in the top half of their classes or whose family incomes are \$5,100 instead of \$5,000, the Committee does not say.

Strongly committed to the idea of scholarships, the Committee recommends that the statewide system of scholarships for which New York has been known for many years be supported by larger State appropriations, and that the scholarships be made tenable in institutions outside the state as well as within it.

Another highly controversial feature of the report is the recommendation that public tax funds be paid directly to private institutions, including denominational institutions. It is suggested that this be in the form of a specified sum

paid to each institution for each student receiving a degree, under a contract between the State and the institution, negotiated for that purpose; and that the payments should start at some such figure as 6% of the total cost to the institution of educating the student, and any rise above about 10% should not be contemplated. It is thought by the writers of the report that questions of unconstitutionality would be obviated by the use of contracts instead of outright grants of tax money to the institutions. The plan could be started in 1961-62 at a cost of about \$10 million a year, the Committee estimates.

As to the need for the projected over-all expansion of education beyond the high school, the report quotes and indorses some recent statements of the New York State Industrial Commissioner, referring to the period 1957-1970:

"...there will be over 600,000 job vacancies to be filled by professionally qualified persons... The greatest needs will be for teachers (150,000) and engineers (110,000).

"Large needs will arise for engineering and physical science technicians, electronic technicians, and medical and dental technicians.

"About 600,000 persons must become qualified craftsmen if the State's need for skilled workers during the 1960's is to be satisfied."

The Committee estimates that gross personal income in New York State between 1959 and 1975 will rise by \$45 billion; the increase in higher educational operating expenses (excluding capital outlays and costs of organized research) will be \$600 million to \$900 million. The total of these costs is now two-thirds of 1% of the gross personal income. This percentage will have to rise to somewhere between 1% and 1½% by 1975.

In the area of top-level organization for the administration of higher education in the State, the Commission recommends that the historic Board of Regents of the University of the State of New York continue at the apex, with its traditional supervisory powers over private and public institutions; but that in addition to these, its only (continued on page 159)

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

NEW YORK (Continued from page 158)  
duty relating to public higher education should be to receive, examine, and act upon a Master Plan for the development of public higher education, which should be submitted at least once every 3 years by the Board of Trustees of the State University of New York.

The Board of Trustees of the State University of New York would be fully responsible for planning and promoting public higher education in the State, and the implementation of plans approved by the Regents.

Two recommendations for changes in the present status and role of the State University of New York seem significant, and much to be desired: "Its present powers of self-determination should be extended and clarified to bring them up to the level which is taken for granted by the great public universities of the nation;" and, more specifically, "The State University should be granted a large degree of freedom from existing budgetary requirements for the establishment of individual positions and more leeway in shifting appropriated funds from one educational purpose to another and in the use of non-appropriated income."

Moreover, "The State University should also be granted the right to determine what positions within its structure are 'educationally related' and hence can be established by the State University on its own initiative, rather than requiring approval of the Civil Service Commission."

Still further, the Committee believes the State University should have the option to make purchases through sources other than the State Division of Standards and Purchase; and to avoid intolerable red tape and delays, the State University should probably be staffed with appropriate officers of its own to handle its own architectural, engineering, and construction contracting services.

One can not fail to note that these recommendations would loosen the stranglehold of one of the tightest state bureaucracies in existence over higher education; and that they are in harmony with the conclusions of the already-famous 1959 report

of Milton Eisenhower's Committee on Government and Higher Education (See GRAPEVINE pages 62 and 85), which was based at the Johns Hopkins University in Baltimore.

The recommended changes just referred to could all be made by legislative action or by executive orders of the governor; but they would appear more permanent and secure if made by an amendment to the State Constitution.

A further recommended change would establish "local boards of overseers" for each of the numerous institutions composing the State University of New York, "to supplant existing advisory boards, trustees, or councils." The language of the report is somewhat equivocal regarding precisely how the duties of these boards would differ from those of the present advisory boards. In almost a single paragraph it refers to them as "strong local boards" available "to help govern the institution", and then lists their duties as to "make recommendations . . ., advise the president . . ., and marshal local constituency support . . .," and then again speaks of "making them responsible for operational management." This leaves it quite unclear as to whether they would be governing boards or advisory boards; but the object, expressed also, that they would serve to relieve the Board of Trustees of the State University of New York from some of its administrative duties and leave it free to assume a larger role in statewide planning, seems to make it clear that New York may be getting ready to make a belated retreat from the over-centralization established in the act of 1948 which created the University.

The report also suggests that the state's financial support to the municipal colleges in New York City be rapidly increased; that the 21-member Board of Higher Education of the City of New York be reduced to 15 members as present terms expire, and that the State be allowed to fill a number of memberships on the Board in proportion to its annual financial contribution-- the members representing the State to be (continued on page 160)

NEW YORK (Continued from page 159)  
nominated by the governor and "selected from among the Trustees and high administrative officials of the State University." This somewhat curious "interlocking directorate" may be of questionable promise.

One new top-level organ is proposed by the Committee; a Council of Higher Education Advisors to be appointed by the governor and the Board of Regents for a term of 4 years coincident with that of the governor, with the sole duty to "observe, assess, review, and recommend," and make an annual report to the governor, the Board of Regents, and the public. Members should be "outstanding leaders in the cultural, professional, civic, and economic life of the State," but not employed by an institution of higher education. This Council should have a small but highly-qualified staff for research purposes only, and an adequate budget. All terms would expire at the end of each gubernatorial term.

Regarding the needs for health personnel, the recommendation is that the governor appoint, with legislative approval, a Temporary Special Executive for Medical Education to draw up a detailed Master Plan for the Expansion of Medical Education in New York State during the next 10 to 15 years, to be presented by the governor, after approval by the Trustees of the State University and the Regents of the University of the State of New York, to the 1962 legislature. The Committee believes the Master Plan should include the construction of 2 or 3 new State medical schools; expanded appropriations to the State's present upstate and downstate medical centers; State grants to private medical schools; and various provisions for better financial treatment of medical students, interns, residents, nurses at various levels, and other auxiliary medical personnel.

A recommendation which seems unique is that the State should create and finance an agency of management improvement for higher education, which, among other

duties, would "encourage prompt use of emerging knowledge about administration and educational practices," and "train a corps of people capable of serving as outside consultants and as members of the staffs of colleges and universities." This agency (for which the Committee has not invented a name) "should not be located administratively or geographically within an institution of higher education or in an existing State government organization," but would be expected to maintain close working relationships with the State Education Department and the central office of the State University.

The report as a whole is superbly organized and extremely well-written, in 13 succinct chapters filling only 50 pages (the additional 25 pages being a statistical appendix).

In the main it is unquestionably constructive and will meet with widespread approval. To this reviewer it seems possibly unfortunate that 2 of the many recommendations (imposition of fees on the city colleges of New York, and direct transfer of tax funds to private institutions) are such as to arouse strong and persistent opposition which is not without basis, and thus the dust of controversy may obscure some of the more meritorious proposals made by the Committee.

It will be keenly interesting to observe the reactions to the recommendations by Governor Rockefeller, the legislature, and the public of the Empire State.

\* \* \* \* \*

THE BEST CHRISTMAS GIFT

YOU COULD SEND TO GRAPEVINE WOULD BE AN INFORMATIVE LETTER ABOUT DEVELOPMENTS IN YOUR STATE, WITH A CLIPPING OR A DOCUMENT

TUCKED IN.

\* \* \* \* \*

**IOWA** (Continued from page 163)  
enrollments will necessarily be in the public institutions. Only 2 private institutions in Iowa now offer graduate work, and on a comparatively very small scale.

A rough indication of the probable trend of the balance between enrollments in public and private institutions in Iowa appears to be as follows: By 1970 enrollments in public institutions (including community colleges) will double, while enrollments in private colleges may increase by about one-half. The proportion of all students attending public institutions will go up from the present slightly over 50% to near 60%.

One interesting feature of the Iowa situation is that in 1958 there were 1,000 more in-migrant students than out-migrants. Pointing out that the total operating budgets of all higher education in Iowa will be \$300 million by 1970 (more than 3 times the total of \$90 million for 1959-60), the report recommends "A careful study and analysis of cost factors in the three state institutions of higher education," which would "result in a formula on which the administrators and Regents agree and which can be accepted and implemented by the legislature." This language, without modification or amplification, falls short of indicating the immense complexities and difficulties involved in any attempt to reduce higher education, even at the junior college level, and especially at the graduate level, to "formula".

Intimating that the Regents have at times in the past used such rough-and-ready devices as "equal amounts to the 2 state universities and half that sum to the state teachers college," the report rightly calls for a little more precision; but fails to mention at all the indisputable fact that a hastily-constructed "formula" can result in great harm to the best and most essential activities of the universities unless the most painstaking account is taken of the necessarily enormous differences in cost among different types and levels of instruction and research under differing conditions. For example, any new institution, department, or course, or research project is very likely to constitute an "island of high cost" during its first few months or

years, until it has had opportunity to get into regular operation. Does this mean that nothing new should ever be started?

In fact, research undertakings, including doctoral dissertations, can never be routine enterprises reducible to "formula". By their nature and by definition they are new and risky enterprises, uncertain as to result and as to cost. This is true of the upper years of graduate study, where it is essential to obtain and hold famed professors who are foremost authorities in their fields, as well as unique and extraordinarily costly library resources and laboratory equipment which are required in many cases. Reducing the financial support of education at this level to "formula" can easily mean disaster, and ultimately cause more loss than gain.

Especially is this true of a great university which has built its eminence for a century. A few years of "formula" could wreck the work of generations, if it caused the loss of leading professors, a cutting of funds for expensive specialized libraries, or any similar results tending to reduce advanced graduate work to the level of a mediocre mass operation. This is a real danger of too-hasty and too-literal worship of "formula".

Even the best of formulas, made after the most careful weighing of differences among types and levels of instruction, necessarily requires constant revision; and no formula is of itself a sufficient base for a budget decision. In every case the application of judgment must precede decision; and there is great danger that this will be forgotten in the heat of a burst of enthusiasm for "formulas". There is an undeniable tendency to take the easy way and "follow the formula" to arrive at decisions without effort. This produces a tendency to proceed unimaginatively and incuriously, spurning innovations and ignoring appeals for change. This can mean incalculable loss to any college or university, and especially to a graduate school. It is regrettable that the report contains no word of caution on this point.

Wisely the report recommends added state appropriations to local public school districts, noting that Iowa's contribution of state funds (Continued on p.165)

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

IOWA (Continued from page 164)  
To local schools is nowhere near the national average of 40% of their operating costs.

The only further recommendation to be discussed here is that the legislature appropriate \$1 1/4 million for 2,000 college tuition scholarships, for Iowans attending any Iowa college, at \$600 maximum for the year 1962; this program to be stepped up by 2,000 each year until 8,000 scholarships are in operation by 1965.

Note that the money would be for tuition and fees only. Thus the measure would exert a powerful leverage toward the raising of fees to \$600 or more by every college in Iowa, if its fees are not already above that point. Incidentally, the persons attending the state institutions or other low-fee colleges would be at a disadvantage. No mention is made of the vast amount of bureaucratic work, or of the unavoidably somewhat subjective and arbitrary decisions that would have to be made in selecting the scholarship-holders. Nor is notice taken of the fact that such a scholarship system usually results largely in benefiting top-ranking students who would go to college anyway, and merely enables them to attend an expensive college of their choice.

To oppose a scholarship system seems to be about on a par with being against Home, Mother, and the United States Marines, but to this writer it seems that scholarship systems of the type recommended are primarily a left-handed device for channeling public funds to private colleges; that they can perhaps demoralize the whole public school system of a state by causing teachers to abandon teaching in favor of coaching their pupils for a scholarship examination; that they have very little impact on the problem of getting competent students into college who would not otherwise be there; and that they are no substitute at all for opportunities to attend public institutions of higher education free of tuition or at nominal fees. In other words, a better investment of Iowa's \$5 million a year would be to keep fees low at the public institutions, or to make them free of fees.

One must concede, of course, that there is value in enabling a worthy student to attend the college of his choice, especially if his choice is based on religion or other worthy cause; but is it not enough to preserve this freedom without subsidizing it with public funds?

My reservations are not intended to condemn the whole report. On the whole, it is a valuable document, worth much more than its cost, even though the original \$25,000 had to be supplemented.

KANSAS. The report of the Legislative Council regarding the higher education section of the recent comprehensive survey of education in Kansas constitutes pages 4-8 of the November 17, 1960 Journal of the Kansas Legislative Council.

Among the recommendations which the Council endorses in general terms are (1) a higher level of financial support for state educational institutions, (2) the expansion of the physical plants of the public institutions of higher education, and (3) immediate major increases in faculty salaries.

Somewhat less definite are the statements regarding "a review of tuition and fee charges and of provisions for additional student aids; the possibility of a state system of scholarships; and tuition and fee charges to provide a reasonable share of the income of junior colleges"; but these phrases could indicate an unfortunate tendency to forget and depart from the historic Kansas policy of providing public higher education tuition-free or at merely nominal fees.

A commendable recommendation is that the Board of Regents and its staff, now a governing agency for state institutions of higher education only, should be made also a statewide research agency for all higher education. This would involve adding the following words to the statutes: "The board shall have responsibility for studying all aspects of the problems of higher education in Kansas, including those relating to private colleges and universities, municipal universities, junior colleges, as well as state institutions, and may propose plans and programs by which the future needs of higher education in Kansas can be met."

(Continued on p. 166)

KANSAS. (Continued from page 165)

Further: "The board of regents is hereby authorized and empowered to appoint a secretary and such other consultants or professional personnel and other employees as may be needed to properly carry out their functions and to study, survey or develop plans for meeting the problems of higher education in Kansas. The salary of the secretary and the compensation of consultants or professional persons shall be fixed by the board. Such employees shall not be under the classified service of the Kansas Civil Service Act."

The underscoring above is mine, inserted to emphasize its relationship with another statement of much importance: "Kansas makes no distinction between higher educational institutions and other state departments and agencies insofar as state financial administration is concerned. In contrast, the constitutions of certain states make the university independent in such matters as a budgetary, personnel, and purchasing procedure. We would be inclined to favor a provision authorizing the educational institutions to make direct purchases of scientific and technical supplies and equipment for experimentation, research and teaching."

The two underscored sentences above indicate a favorable feeling toward freeing public higher education from the grip of the state bureaucracy. This feeling is widespread nationally. Compare, for example, the recommendations of the Governor's Committee on Higher Education in New York State (GRAPEVINE, page 159) which, among several items having the same general tendency, urges that the State University be given the option of making purchases without going through the state central purchasing office.

Both the survey team and the Council flatly reject the idea of merging the separate retirement system for faculty members of state educational institutions with the separate plans for other state employees, and urges the legislature to establish a TIAA-type plan for college faculties, in order to reduce excessive turnover and attract talent from outside the state.

The Council recommends state aid for public junior colleges, but not on the high school formula; it prefers a credit-hour basis, and suggests \$6 per credit hour.

Apparently this would mean about \$180 a year for each full-time student.

The final recommendation is that the survey of higher education be continued, with reasonable financial support from the legislature, by a statewide committee of lay and professional persons, chosen by their respective groups, and maintaining their headquarters in the office of the Board of Regents. The committee would include representatives of the different types of public and private higher educational institutions in Kansas. This is in harmony with the current trend toward encouraging voluntary research and coordinative efforts, statewide.

It seems that the survey team recommended that the legislature adopt a policy of making lump-sum appropriations to the Board of Regents, and authorizing the Board to apportion the money among the various institutions. The Legislative Council rejects this proposal unequivocally.

MASSACHUSETTS. The measure to establish a state-supported medical school at a total cost of \$14 million and providing for \$1½ million to start the project, advocated by Governor Furcolo, was considered in the 3-day special session of the legislature in early December and passed by the House, but was blocked in the Senate by the passing of a substitute measure to appropriate \$100,000 to study the subject. The two houses reached no agreement, and nothing was accomplished.

MINNESOTA. Budget requests of the University of Minnesota (for state tax funds only) are as in Table 11, for operating expense only.

Table 11. Requests of the University of Minnesota for state tax fund appropriations, separately for fiscal years 1961-62 and 1962-63, for operating expenses.

| Units  | For 1961-62 For 1962-63 |     |                       |
|--|-------------------------|-----|-----------------------|
|  | (1)                     | (2) | (3)                   |
| Lump sum for campuses at Minneapolis, St. Paul, Duluth |                         |     |                       |
| U Hospitals  | \$31,908 <sup>x</sup>   |     | \$34,848 <sup>y</sup> |
| Ag Extension   | 5,827 <sup>*</sup>      |     | 6,221 <sup>**</sup>   |
| Gen Ag Research  | 786                     |     | 853                   |
| Special projects <sup>***</sup>                        | 657                     |     | 683                   |
| Morris campus <sup>****</sup>                          | 1,173                   |     | 1,214                 |
|  | 223                     |     | 356                   |
| Total  | 40,574                  |     | 44,175                |

\*Includes \$2,142,806 from the county.

(Continued on page 167)