

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

Number 47

JANUARY 1963

Page 321

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 timely newsnotes regarding pertinent events in their respective states.

IN THIS ISSUE

- Illinois. Six state universities need \$307 million for operating expenses for biennium 1963-65 322
- Indiana. Four state institutions want \$174 million for operating expenses, plus \$56 million for capital outlays in 1963-65 322
- Iowa. Three state institutions request \$104 million for operating expenses, and \$17 million for capital outlays 323
- Kansas. Panel of distinguished educators recommends a plan for the future development of public higher education. 323
- Nebraska. Jurisdictional dispute between legislative budget committee and State Normal Board 325
- Ohio. Cuyahoga County Community College to open in September 1963 326
- Vermont. First annual report of Board of Trustees of State Colleges 326

* * * * *

CHANCE AND CHOICE IN HIGHER EDUCATION

Forty thousand forthright words
by M. M. Chambers

Available from the INTERSTATE Printers and
Publishers, Inc., Danville, Illinois

Paper bound \$2.50 125 pages
Discounts on quantities

Statement of ownership and circulation of GRAPEVINE is on page 322, (reverse hereof).

ILLINOIS. Budget askings for the six state universities for biennium 1963-65 were presented to the State Board of Higher Education early in December. Press reports indicate that the Board will, after conferring further with the presidents, determine its recommendation at a meeting to be held January 7, 1963. Thereafter the matter goes to the state budget commission and the governor.

According to the press reports, the askings of the six institutions total about \$307 million for operating expenses for the biennium. It seems, however, that this includes income from student fees, and should be reduced by some \$20 million to reveal the actual net appropriations of state tax funds requested. If this estimate is correct, the amount of state tax funds requested represents an increase of about 38% over the sums actually appropriated for the preceding biennium (1961-63).

The present enrollment of somewhat less than 70,000 students in the six institutions is expected to go to approximately 85,000 within the ensuing two years.

Lacking the figures indicating net state tax funds requested, GRAPEVINE reports the gross requests as they were reported in December. This will serve to show the approximate proportions among the six universities.

Table 7. Requests of six state universities in Illinois for state appropriations for operating expenses for biennium 1963-65 in thousands of dollars.

Institutions	Sums requested (Including some funds from non-tax sources)
(1)	(2)
U of Illinois	\$175,800
Southern Illinois U	63,273
State U's (T C Bd)--	
Northern Illinois U	23,042
Ill State Normal U	20,979
Western Illinois U	12,345
Eastern Illinois U	11,472
Total	306,911

INDIANA. The four state institutions are requesting an aggregate of about \$174 million for operating expenses for the biennium 1963-65. This would be a gain of about 47% over the operating appropriation of \$118 million for the preceding biennium (1961-63).

For 1963-65 the aggregate requested for capital outlay is slightly less than \$48 million, as the first step in a ten-year construction and rehabilitation program. This is exclusive of \$7,690,000 requested for capital outlay for the medical program in 1963-65.

Indiana's two universities both have large and important graduate schools; and the two state colleges, among the best of their kind, are becoming multi-purpose institutions with four- and five-year programs and inaugurating advanced graduate work.

GRAPEVINE is owned and circulated by M. M. Chambers. It is not a publication of any 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, Michigan.

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

IOWA. The requests of the State Board of Regents for operating and capital appropriations for the two state universities and for the state college for the biennium 1963-65 are reported as in Table 8.

Table 8. Requests for state tax funds for biennium 1963-65 by the Iowa State Board of Regents for the state universities and the state college, in thousands of dollars.

Institutions	Operating expenses	Capital outlays
(1)	(2)	(3)
State U of Iowa		
Gen operations	\$37,015	\$6,723
U Hospitals	14,251	605
Psychopath Hosp	2,971	70
Bacterio Lab	964	625
Hospital School	1,747	87
Lakeside Lab	10	
Subtotals	56,958	8,110
Iowa State U		
Gen operations	26,712	6,050
Ag Exp Sta	5,818	225
Coop Exten	4,287	
Subtotals	36,817	6,275
State Coll of Ia	10,282	2,338
Grand totals	104,057	16,723

The total for operating expenses seems to represent a gain of about 33½% over the \$78 million appropriated for the preceding biennium (1961-63).

KANSAS. After having had nine reports on statewide higher education since 1922, this state has received under date of November 8, 1962 a new set of data and recommendations by a distinguished panel of seven advisors headed by Alvin C. Eurich, Vice President and Director of the Fund for the Advancement of Education.

Other members of the panel are Frank H. Bowles, Samuel B. Gould, Francis Keppel, Millicent C. McIntosh, Sidney G. Tickton, and Douglas Whitaker. They had the assistance of 12 additional consultants, chiefly eminent educators selected from several states, to examine their respective specialized fields.

The report, an admirably concise 54-page printed document, is entitled Kansas Plans for the Next Generation. Something of its tenor can be savored in some words of Walter Lippman which it quotes on page 5: "I do not mean we are doing a little too little. I mean we are doing much too little... Our education effort... has not been raised to to the plateau of the age we live in."

And on the final page, the words of the report itself have a sound ring; "The money requirements can be financed by allocating to higher education a small percentage of the increase in the state's gross personal income and productivity."

Further: "Financing higher education adequately in Kansas, therefore, is a problem of policy, not of resources. The problem is to select the basis on which to make a small portion of the state's increased income and productivity available for a service the people of Kansas need and desire."

Remarking with notable cogency that the cost increases can be expected to be greater than proportional to the larger number of students because of the nationwide trend toward higher faculty salaries, and also because of the need for a larger number of able research personnel, the report then indicates that part of the increase can be expected to be financed out of economic growth of the state, pointing out that the personal income of the people of Kansas has increased 60% in the past ten years.

There are, says the report, three ways of financing the rest of the necessary increase. Two of these involve no new taxes; (1) putting the auxiliary enterprises (dormitories, dining halls, student services, etc.) on a more nearly self-supporting basis, including amortization of building costs, and (2) "moderate increases in tuition rates". Both of these involve some additional financial burdens on students.

The third recourse would be to new tax sources. The report hastens to point out that tax increases for higher education could be held to a minimum if the

KANSAS. (Continued)

state would plan to educate a larger proportion of high-school graduates in junior colleges, where "the per capita costs are likely to be lower both to the state and to the student"; establish a priority in higher educational expenditures; and use private financing or a relatively small state revolving fund (dormitory authority) for the construction of residence halls.

Mindful that "equal educational opportunity, or the open door policy for higher education, is important to the people of Kansas;" and that "our technological and democratic society requires that every boy or girl should have the opportunity to develop whatever talents he or she may have," the panel declares that "By reconstituting the junior college system the state can maintain that policy and render even greater service to its young people."

All will agree that Kansas may well improve and expand its network of public junior colleges. It is, however, a trifle doubtful that junior college education can always be cheaper for the taxpayer than freshman-sophomore education elsewhere. State universities are not about to drop their first two years; and the more they develop their senior college and graduate and research work, the more are they able to offer to a certain number of freshmen and sophomores relatively high quality opportunities at relatively low cost to the state, because of their concentrated resources of faculties, libraries, laboratories, and other facilities. This is in no sense an argument against local public junior colleges. It is merely by way of notation that, especially in Kansas, where the state universities are not huge leviathans, they can continue for some time to provide offerings both excellent and economical for freshman-sophomore students (not all high-school graduates, but a slowly decreasing proportion of them, as the report recommends).

As this review has already noted, the report begins and ends on expansive and optimistic notes; hence it is a

trifle disappointing to find, in its discussion of finances, an underlying tone which seems to assume that tax support of public higher education is something to be "held to a minimum" by every possible device, including raising of student fees for tuition as well as charges for room and board.

A different approach is possible, and seems to GRAPEVINE to be most timely: Tax support of public higher education is a superb investment of public money, and ought to be increased rapidly with confidence and without qualms, because it is a mainspring of the industrial productivity and economic growth on which we depend, as well as a necessity for national survival and the advancement of humane civilization.

Observing that Kansas has two comparatively small areas of concentrated population (Wichita-Hutchinson, south-central; and Kansas City-Topeka, north-east), the Panel recommends a rapid build-up of a facility for higher education in Wichita, in the form of a "State Universities Center" which would take over and absorb the facilities of the University of Wichita (originally Congregational, but a municipal institution for 3 or 4 decades).

The new State Universities Center would offer many programs of a technical and subprofessional character in a new technical institute component; many programs leading to four-year bachelors' degrees; and such graduate and professional offerings as became necessary or feasible, the graduate degrees in such instances to be awarded by one or the other of the two state universities.

Although the Center would have a board of 11 members "reporting to the State Board of Regents", ten of these would be administrative officers of the two state universities, and the Center is spoken of as "to be established by" the two universities, and under their joint jurisdiction. Thus it seems that the new institution would be a branch--a chip off two blocks. But mayhap the Panel has been significantly inventive in this instance, and we do not labor the point. At any rate, one must endorse the idea of "putting the college where

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

KANSAS. (Continued)

the people are."

The Wichita case would afford another interesting example of the transformation of a substantial formerly private or formerly municipal institution into a state establishment, as has recently happened in the cases of the universities of Buffalo and Houston, and of the Upstate and Downstate medical centers in New York, to name a few.

Regarding the other municipal institution in Kansas (Washburn University of Topeka), the Panel is silent; and the reader is apparently left to infer that no change is recommended because its location between and rather near the seats of the two state universities, and the fact that though the area is populous, it is not now the part of the state seemingly promising the most rapid industrial growth, lead to the conclusion that the two municipal universities should not be dealt with in similar manner, and that the state need not take an immediate and direct hand in the development of public higher education in the state capital.

GRAPEVINE has not the space in which to do justice to all parts of the report. Among other major recommendations are; Establishment of a "unified" state universities extension system; creation of the post of chief executive officer of the state college system, who would be chairman of a new Council of State Colleges, including the presidents of the three state colleges at Emporia, Pittsburg, and Fort Hays; reconstitution and upgrading of the local public junior colleges, each under an independent local board (evidently meaning a special junior college district and not a 12-grade public school district), and operation under the general supervision of the State Board of Regents. (This would be a recognition of junior college education as "higher education", in accord with the current facts of life in this country).

Somewhat after the fashion of recent happenings in California and New York, the Panel urges the State Board of Regents to develop a ten-year "master plan" to focus public attention on the

policy decisions needing to be made. Copies of the report are available from the Board of Regents, State Office Building, Topeka, Kansas.

NEBRASKA. Press reports from Lincoln in early December indicated that the Interim Budget Committee of the one-house legislature will explicitly recommend separate appropriations to each of the four state teachers colleges. This was reported as having been strongly condemned by the president and members of the State Normal Board (governing board of the four institutions), on the ground that the Normal Board is closer to the institutions than is the legislative budget committee, and is in a position to know their needs. Hitherto a lump appropriation has been made to the Normal Board, which then determined the amounts allocated to each teachers college.

It is said that under this practice the smaller teachers colleges have usually received slightly more tax funds per student than the larger ones-- not at all an unusual or inexplicable outcome, because unit costs (costs per student) are often unavoidably somewhat higher in smaller colleges, especially until they reach or exceed 1,000 students. It is therefore not generally wise from any standpoint to attempt to support colleges of different sizes by an exactly uniform allocation of operating funds.

Moreover, no two colleges are exactly alike in function, even though they may be of the same general type. What each one actually does, and how it develops its services, is necessarily affected by the character and needs of the region of the state in which it is located. Thus some diversity will characterize any "system" of several colleges, and this is to be encouraged to a reasonable extent, rather than trammelled by imposing a deadening uniformity.

If Nebraska actually transfers a large part of the responsibility of the State Normal Board to the legislative budget committee, this will be a backward step. The Normal Board is in a position to consult the presidents, faculties, and leading citizens in the

NEBRASKA (Continued)

region of each school, to deliberate with them regarding the statewide scene, and make wiser decisions than any other agency. Its decision-making is, of course, limited by the boundaries of the clause of the Nebraska Constitution which provides "the general government of the state normal schools shall be vested under the direction of the Legislature in a board of 7 members."

OHIO. Cuyahoga County (in which Cleveland is located) has a population of 1,680,000 and an assessed tax valuation of \$5½ billion, but no public college or university. Early in December 1962 the Ohio Community College Commission approved the plans of the board of trustees of the Cuyahoga County Community College District to begin classes in September 1963 in an unused junior high-school building in downtown Cleveland for day and evening students. Two suburban high schools will also be used temporarily for evening classes.

Acting under a grant of \$75,000 from the Cleveland Foundation (a community trust), the board of trustees in July 1962 appointed Charles E. Chapman, former director of the Barstow Junior College in California, to direct the planning. A proposed bond issue for capital outlays will be submitted to the voters of the district in 1963, and it is contemplated that the construction of a major campus will be completed by 1966.

Some 4,000 full-time and part-time students are expected during the first full year of operation, and a full-time enrollment of over 10,000 is projected for 1970.

VERMONT. The Board of Trustees of Vermont State Colleges, created in 1961, recently made its first annual report to the governor. The report is a concise mimeographed document. The Board is now responsible for four institutions: state colleges at Castleton, Johnson, and Lyndon, and the Vermont Technical College at Randolph.

The Board is authorized to appoint a president for the system, and two officers to be known as director of

educational affairs and director of financial affairs. Early in 1962 Colonel John T. Bankus was appointed director of financial affairs, and at last report no other administrators had been appointed. The office is at 481 Main Street, Burlington, Vermont, on premises of the University of Vermont.

Total budget for the four institutions for fiscal year 1962-63 is \$1,642,000, of which about 47% (\$774,000) is expected to come from appropriations of state tax funds. The question of whether the state college at Lyndon shall be metamorphosed into a private liberal arts college has been under study for some time, and may be determined soon.

CHANCE AND CHOICE

IN

HIGHER EDUCATION

Forty
thousand
forthright
words

by

M. M. Chambers

Available from the
INTERSTATE Printers
and Publishers, Inc.,
Jackson at Van Buren,
Danville, Illinois

Paper bound

125 pages

\$2.50

Discounts on quantities