

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

Number 48

FEBRUARY 1963

Page 327

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

Colorado adds to its continuing series of voluntary agreements concerning development of the statewide system of public higher education..... 328

Missouri receives report of survey of higher education by committee of three consultants from Indiana University, the University of Minnesota, and the University of Michigan..... 330

* * * * *

THIS is GRAPEVINE'S fifth year of operation. This is possible only because there is a "hard core" of 500 collaborators in 50 state capitals and elsewhere who repeatedly write that they want GRAPEVINE continued.

The early months of each odd-numbered year make a high point for GRAPEVINE. Forty-five or more state legislatures are in session. About one-third will enact annual appropriations for the ensuing fiscal year, and two-thirds for the next biennium.

Facts and figures are GRAPEVINE'S stock-in-trade. As soon as your state appropriations of tax funds for operating expenses of higher education become law or reach the form in which they will become law, GRAPEVINE wants the figures for each institution and for all higher educational purposes. GRAPEVINE wants the figures for tax-fund appropriations, excluding student fees or any other income from non-tax sources.

Good friend, look at the small tabulation of figures for your state which appeared in one of last year's GRAPEVINE issues, and as early as possible in 1963 give us a comparable tabulation for 1963, noting any new institutions or other additions, and giving us enough comments so we will understand the changes.

For your lively cooperation, many from coast to coast are grateful.

Statement of ownership and circulation of GRAPEVINE is on page 328, (reverse hereof).

COLORADO. The Association of State-Supported Institutions of Higher Education in Colorado is now a well-organized and functioning agency of voluntary statewide coordination. It maintains an office in Denver, with Harry S. Allen as staff director.

Near the end of December 1962 the Association publicly announced plans which go into some detail regarding a continuing series of voluntary understandings regarding the roles of each of the eight state institutions during the ensuing years up to 1970.

Being as yet a state of comparatively small total population (about 2 million), Colorado probably has better reason to be concerned about duplication of different types of instruction among several institutions than have most of the more populous states in this age of increasing population and "explosion of knowledge."

For example, Colorado has three important schools of engineering:-- at the University of Colorado at Boulder, Colorado State University at Fort Collins, and the Colorado School of Mines at Golden. These were all established in Territorial days (They date respectively from 1861, 1876, and 1874). They are all in the northeast quadrant of the state, not separated by vast distances or by difficult natural barriers.

According to press reports, the present agreement is that the University of Colorado will have sole responsibility for programs in aeronautical engineering, architecture and architectural engineering, and chemical engineering. Colorado State University will have sole responsibility for programs in the engineering sub-fields related to agriculture, forestry, and watershed management;

engineering programs in the areas of climate, water, land and forests, with increasing specialization in hydrology, environmental engineering, nuclear engineering, fluid mechanics, heat transfer and irrigation.

The Colorado School of Mines will have sole responsibility in its historic fields dealing with minerals and related materials; geological engineering, mining engineering, petroleum and petroleum refining engineering.

It is understood that the University of Colorado has a certain freedom to develop in other general engineering fields not conflicting with the agreed specialties of the other two schools.

A Council of Engineering Deans is functioning as a guide in the development of the plan for engineering instruction and research at the three schools.

At this point GRAPEVINE interjects a few comments. There are some undeniable disadvantages in having three fragmentary schools of engineering, because studies and discoveries in one department have a way of spilling over boundaries and stimulating the work of other departments. However, probably the disadvantages are least at the elementary levels, and greater as the level proceeds upward toward doctoral work in engineering. At the top stratum the work in each of the major specialties becomes too expensive in faculty and equipment to be maintained in more than one place (at least in a sparsely peopled state). At this level the students are mature and, in cooperation with their own faculty men, able to maintain some ongoing contact with the activities of a neighboring school and thereby derive

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.

COLORADO (Continued)

some stimulation.

Whatever may be the disadvantages, in Colorado the plan as sketched seems to be the only feasible one, because a state university (either "separate" or land-grant) without any engineering is rather difficult to envision; and to concentrate all engineering at one of Colorado's state universities, or even at both of them, would involve either the abolition or a radical change in the character of the school of mines which is not in the cards.

Probably the principal advantage of the plan is that it has some resiliency. It is a living, moving organism, guided by living men, and capable of being adjusted to new necessities;-- not a rigid, final-for-all-time blueprint that can not be modified without being destroyed.

The fact that it was arrived at and agreed upon voluntarily by representatives of the institutions, and that no legal or administrative compulsion is asked for, comports well with the proper dignity and unique function of public higher education.

The foregoing comments apply also to other features of the plan, some of which we now mention briefly.

The University of Colorado will have "the broadest range of graduate and undergraduate programs, and the widest range of doctoral level and research responsibilities"; but will not be expected to offer degree programs in such areas as special education, industrial arts, the vocational fields and certain other specialties now available at other institutions.

Colorado State University (the land-grant institution) will increase its stress on the humanities, and carry forward in the physical and biological sciences and engineering, but will not offer any new doctoral programs without review by the Association.

The School of Mines will expand its work in earth sciences and materials engineering.

Colorado State College at Greeley (a teachers college dating from 1890,

located in the same region of the state and one of only a few of its type in the nation offering doctoral degrees) will concentrate its doctoral work in professional education, and build up the liberal arts and sciences at the undergraduate level, while continuing principally as a comprehensive institution for the education of teachers.

The four other institutions (Adams State College at Alamosa, Western State College at Gunnison, Fort Lewis A & M at Durango, and Southern Colorado State College at Pueblo will be "general colleges," with emphasis on undergraduate teaching, though the first two named will offer masters' programs in subject fields for secondary school teachers. All four will have more liberal admissions policies than the four older institutions, and will offer a variety of undergraduate programs, including some technical and subprofessional programs of less than four years.

Seven of the institutions will have some programs for the education of teachers, but Mines will have no work of this kind, and Colorado State University will have no work for elementary school teachers. So many teachers are needed that any fear of duplication has largely lost its point.

Professional education in journalism, law, medicine, pharmacy, and physical therapy will continue to be available only at the University of Colorado. Nursing is now offered only at the University, but the possibility of establishing a second school elsewhere is now under study.

New doctoral programs in physical sciences, biological sciences, engineering or humanities, it is agreed, will not be inaugurated at either UC or CSU until jointly studied by the two institutions and reviewed by the Association. This is not a "No" plan, however, for broad expansion is contemplated.

The plan is reported to have been in gestation since May 1962, and was drafted by a committee composed of Mr. Allen, John W. Bartram of UC, J. Stanley Ahman of CSU, Charles Shull of Mines,

COLORADO (Continued)

and Sam Gates of CSC. It won the approval of the presidents and of the governing boards. Its announcement came at a timely moment to inspire the confidence of the 1963 legislature. It was, in fact, requested by the legislative Committee on Education Beyond the High School, in accord with the understanding now prevailing in Colorado that voluntary coordination of the state system of higher education will be given an opportunity to prove its worth.

MISSOURI. James A Finch, President of the Governor's Council on Higher Education, received on December 17, 1962 a 42-page mimeographed report on Expansion and Coordination of Higher Education in Missouri. This is the product of a committee of three consultants: Raymond C. Gibson of Indiana University, Robert J. Keller of the University of Minnesota, and Allan O. Pfnister of the University of Michigan.

The report is to be printed, possibly with some modifications and additions made by the Governor's Council. At this point GRAPEVINE is summarizing and commenting upon the mimeographed version.

In 1962 Missouri's accredited institutions, public and private, enrolled 66,500 full-time students-- a gain of 85% over 1952, ten years earlier. The projected gain up to 1975 is 142%, to a total of 138,000.

During the decade 1952-62 enrollment in public institutions increased by 133%, while the increase in private institutions was 44%. The ratio of public to private in 1962 was 58% to 42%. If these trends continue, says the report, public institutions will possibly enroll 75% of the students by 1975.

Something of the general tenor of the report is condensed in three brief paragraphs which GRAPEVINE applauds:

"Employment opportunities in the decades of sixties and seventies will

be in those occupations requiring education beyond the high school. Higher education in Missouri must be responsive to the changing manpower requirements.

"Moreover, community colleges with emphasis upon general and technical education, transfer liberal arts courses, and in-service adult education should be encouraged and supported...

"Economic, business and industrial development of the state of Missouri will depend upon advanced education and research designed to capture the great natural resources of the state and to use them wisely in advancing the social, cultural and economic well-being of the people."

Very properly much emphasis is put on the two metropolitan areas at opposite sides of the state-- St. Louis and Kansas City. Projected enrollments in 1975 are as follows:

| | |
|-------------------|--------|
| St. Louis..... | 60,000 |
| Kansas City..... | 30,000 |
| Rest of state.... | 47,000 |

The two big cities have always been notoriously short of local public facilities for higher education.

St. Louis, it is true, has two very distinguished middle-sized private universities-- Washington University (non-sectarian), and St. Louis University (Catholic); and only recently a public junior college district for St. Louis and St. Louis County has been rather belatedly created, but shows promise of developing a much-needed local system of community colleges.

All this, however, taken in its most sanguine aspect, leaves a great gap for senior college and graduate school opportunities. The private universities draw heavy proportions of their students from outside the area, and this will become even more true as they raise their fees.

Kansas City has a public junior college of long standing which has not expanded in a manner commensurate with the size of the city (though there are

MISSOURI (Continued)

signs that this may take place); and has a history of three decades of valiant efforts to build up the private University of Kansas City, with only modest success.

To get to our main point quickly, the report recommends that the University of Missouri (with its main campus at Columbia and the Mines campus at Rolla) should establish two new campuses, soon to become full-scale institutions, one in St. Louis and one in Kansas City.

At St. Louis this development would begin at the Normandy site where the University already has a small extension center. At Kansas City, a joining of private and public efforts is proposed, and the report urges the governing board of the private University of Kansas City to initiate a plan whereby its campus would become the campus of the University of Missouri, Kansas City, under the present Board of Curators of the University of Missouri. The private governing board itself would be continued as a corporation, for the purpose of receiving private gifts, conserving the private assets, and paying the expendable income to the university.

This scheme is analogous to the modus vivendi et operandi currently found at Rutgers, the State University of New Jersey, and at several places in New York State where private institutions have become state institutions. It is, probably a practicable and useful plan. It may involve extensive litigation regarding the equitable execution of each of the several trusts held by the private university; but even if this cannot be obviated it should not be an excuse for blocking progress of great ultimate public necessity and benefit.

The language of the report is couched in euphemisms entirely avoiding and even disavowing state take-over of the private University of Kansas City, but that is essentially what it proposes. Of course it would have to be with the consent of the private governing board; and that board could continue in a useful role as an agency of private support of the

metamorphosed institution. All in all, the joining of private and public support is indeed attractive; but the university would be a state institution, as perhaps it ought to be. Many state institutions receive substantial private support.

In a nutshell, the University of Missouri would have four campuses, including one in each of the big cities, each having a president and all governed by the present Board of Curators-- one board, four executive officers. There is suggestion that coordination of graduate work be accomplished by the dean of the faculties at Columbia. Though nothing is said of it, one can at least surmise that the president of the University of Missouri at Columbia, if not actually designated as senior executive, would be recognized as primus inter pares at the head of the statewide university system.

A small state scholarship system is recommended (begin with 500 scholarships and move up to 2,000 by 1966, each paying no more than \$700 per year). This is more or less openly a device to help impecunious Missourians to attend the local private institutions (though the recipients of scholarships could use them to attend public institutions if they chose). GRAPEVINE would rather see public money used to operate public institutions maintaining low fees or no fees; but will not use space here to bemoan a small state scholarship system which may perhaps be a useful minor element in the scene.

The recommendation that Missouri's five regional state colleges should be placed under one new governing board, and their present separate governing boards abolished, merits the opposition that it is said to be receiving. There is certainly nothing new, and little that can be commended, in the spectacle of a lay governing board struggling with five coordinate and co-equal professional executives. This has been a fizzle for many years in many places. But the more important reason is that a college or university needs its own autonomous lay governing board, and that this is in the

MISSOURI (Continued)

best interest of the state as a whole, as the Michigan Constitutional Convention of 1961-62 recognized when it wrote a proposed new Constitution removing four institutions from control of the State Board of Education and giving each its own governing board.

The report, after conceding that "experiences of other states have indicated that a single board for all higher education may be inimical to effective development in higher education", and inveighing heavily against the recent actual control of the whole system by the State Budget Office, recommends that the state set up a Council on Higher Education as a coordinating agency for all higher education, public and private (faintly indicating no intent to assume any mandatory powers over any private institution), with powers, if any, very fuzzily defined.

The proposed Council would have an executive secretary and a small research staff, busying itself with such matters as "student station utilization", unit cost studies, and other methods of arriving at institutional budgets by the application of rigid formulas. Only a minority of the 15 members of the proposed Council would be laymen-- seven persons appointed by the governor from the state at large, "representing the professions, business, and industry." The other eight would be "nominated by a statewide conference of the college and university presidents" from "the faculties and administrators, other than presidents, of both public and private colleges and universities in Missouri" and appointed by the governor.

Happily, perhaps, Lincoln University at Jefferson City is almost unmentioned. A ceiling of 25,000 students at the University of Missouri at Columbia is gratuitously recommended, with no data, evidence, or argument to support it.

Rather amusing is the fact that the committee of consultants, evidently alarmed by loud rumblings from various parts of Missouri, hastily added a detached Letter of Transmittal bearing the same date as the report, in which they

modified "Two recommendations dealing with the matter of coordination: (1) The establishment of a single state college board (for the five state colleges), and (2) The development of a coordinating council on higher education."

The letter proceeds: "We urge that you give special consideration to the timing of action on these recommendations in light of the many factors which exist in Missouri. You may decide, for example, that the first of these recommendations, establishment of a single state college board, may be too drastic for the present time. You might decide that a more moderate approach would be worthy of initial trial. Such approach might seek to provide existing state college boards with an opportunity to establish a workable plan of voluntary coordination among these institutions before coordination becomes compulsory under a single board. A minimum period of five years might be well spent as an outside limit in which to establish the feasibility of the voluntary coordination thus suggested."

This seems an extremely tardy recognition that voluntary coordination of state institutions may have merits. Will sentiment chrySTALLIZE in Missouri, as it has in Indiana, Ohio, Michigan, Minnesota, Colorado, and other states, to the effect that voluntary methods shall have fair opportunity to demonstrate their advantages to the state in the management of higher education?

Although GRAPEVINE is critical of the Missouri report for its unimaginative repetitions of the hackneyed incantations about "coordination" ad nauseam, we take pleasure in praising the report for a generally constructive attitude, and for its recognition of Missouri's unique problems, and particularly for its frank statements that Missouri has ample resources to support higher education on the redoubled scale which the times require. It is the job of the people of Missouri to mobilize those resources and allocate them appropriately.

* * * * *