

M. M. Chambers  
Education Building, Indiana University  
Bloomington, Indiana  
47405

Number 57

November 1963

Page 381

GRAPEVINE

\* \* \* \* \*

A newsletter on state tax legislation; state appropriations for universities, colleges, and junior colleges; 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

Alabama to have two new state institutions..... 382

Indiana sales tax became effective October 23, after delay..... 382

Maryland has 425-acre site near Baltimore for new undergraduate branch of the University of Maryland..... 382

Nevada Report by Dean Frank C. Newman of University of California Law School "places the University of Nevada among the small but important group of universities that can claim constitutional autonomy"..... 383

New York Report of State Committee on Medical Education calls for two additional state-supported Medical Centers, operative by 1970 and 1980. Says State University should be freed from "rules and regulations developed for other types of agencies, which are not adapted to the needs of a University"..... 384

New York City Board of Education of City of New York is regaining fiscal independence. Will Board of Higher Education do the same?..... 385

Quotation from Claude Bissell, President, University of Toronto..... 385

Study of the government of Canadian universities..... 386

Brakeley reports on voluntary support for public higher education..... 386

ALABAMA. A revision of Table 55 (GRAPEVINE, Page 370) shows several details not appearing in the original, and slightly larger annual totals for the two fiscal years of the ensuing biennium. These added details are exhibited in Table 61.

Table 61. State tax-fund appropriations for operating expenses of higher education in Alabama, separately for fiscal years 1963-64 and 1964-65, in thousands of dollars.

Institutions	1963-64	1964-65
(1)	(2)	(3)
U of Alabama	\$10,453	\$10,873
Auburn University	9,755	10,142
Ala State College	1,317	1,370
Ala A & M Inst	1,265	1,316
Jacksonville S C	1,114	1,150
Florence St Coll	1,020	1,054
Alabama College	962	998
Troy State College	919	949
Livingston St Coll	493	508
U of Southern Ala*	500	700
Tuskegee Inst (Private)**	452	470
Student aids***	116	116
Regional education	99	99
Northwest Ala Jr Coll****		
<b>Totals</b>	<b>28,465</b>	<b>29,745</b>

\* A new institution at Mobile.

\*\* The famous private institution for Negroes receives state funds as indicated.

\*\*\* These include elementary teachers' scholarships (\$25,000 per year) and student aid in graduate and professional fields (\$91,395 a year).

ALABAMA (Continued)

\*\*\*\* A new institution now in the planning stage, to which \$175,786 was appropriated for further planning and initial construction.

INDIANA. The general sales tax of 2% enacted early in 1963 and intended to become effective July 1 (GRAPEVINE, Page 347), was declared unconstitutional for certain technical reasons by a county circuit court. On appeal, the constitutionality of the act was upheld by the supreme court of Indiana, and it went into effect October 23, 1963. It is expected to produce about \$112 million a year in new revenue, of which a large part will be used as state aid to local public school corporations, enabling them to reduce slightly their local property tax rates.

MARYLAND. The Regents of the University of Maryland have selected a 425-acre site for a new undergraduate branch in Baltimore County west of the City of Baltimore. This is another example, out of many, illustrating the policy of "putting the college where the people are" which is being followed in many states. The 1963 legislature also authorized the University of Maryland to establish three other branches, respectively in the western, eastern, and southern parts of the state.

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, and legislation affecting education at any level.

Address communications to M. M. Chambers, Education Building, Indiana University, Bloomington, Indiana 47405

M. M. Chambers, Education Building, Indiana University, Bloomington

NEVADA. The University of Nevada has published an important 60-page document entitled The Legal Position of the University of Nevada as an Agency of the Government of the State of Nevada.

In mid-1962 the University commissioned the Dean of the University of California School of Law at Berkeley, a distinguished authority on constitutional and administrative law, to perform necessary legal and other research to clarify the meaning of the clauses of the Nevada Constitution of 1864 which created the Board of Regents of the University of Nevada and gave it a sphere of constitutional autonomy.

Dean Frank C. Newman produced a scholarly and authoritative report resulting from study of the constitution and statutes of Nevada, the proceedings of the constitutional convention, the 1948 decision of the Nevada supreme court in King v. Board of Regents, and the historic decisions in Michigan, Minnesota, Idaho, and other states, bearing on the question.

He concluded that the University of Nevada is unmistakably one of the comparatively small company of state universities whose large degree of independence of other governmental agencies is defined and guaranteed in their respective state constitutions. He was careful to advise the state universities to be slow to adopt a combative or contentious attitude toward other state governmental departments whose services they can often voluntarily accept with mutual advantage; but to maintain a conciliatory and cooperative stance except where this cannot be done without compromising their constitutional dignity and autonomy.

In addition to his thorough canvass of scholarly legal writings on the subject, Dean Newman also takes occasion to quote such educators as Logan Wilson, James Lewis Morrill, Lloyd Morey, and the Milton Eisenhower Committee on Government and Higher Education whose report is entitled

The Efficiency of Freedom (Johns Hopkins Press, 1959).

From the talented historian Allan Nevins, author of the recent volume, The State Universities and Democracy, Dean Newman quoted as follows:

"In this task of coordinating and harmonizing a university of huge size, the trustees or regents are more important than ever before. The importance of an alert, liberal-minded, hard-working board cannot be overestimated. It should be a board which, if not completely free from interference by the state government, like that of Michigan, is at any rate open only to strictly limited pressures."

President Charles J. Armstrong of the University of Nevada, in a brief introduction, notes that "In this report one of the nation's leading authorities on constitutional law affirms that the weight of the law places the University of Nevada among a small but important group of universities which can claim constitutional autonomy."

He also indicates that the crux of the problem which exists in every state has been well summed-up by President C. Clement French of Washington State University, who recently cautioned a regional meeting of state officials against treating the state university as "just another state department". Said President French: "If you succeed in this, you will gain a state department, but you will most certainly lose a good university."

A copy of Dean Newman's report, published in attractive form by the University of Nevada, should be near the desk of every governor and legislator, every state administrative or fiscal officer, and every university president and dean, to say nothing of myriads of citizens and students who wish to understand their policy-making role with regard to the future of public higher education in the United States.

NEW YORK. A three-man New York State Committee on Medical Education (Malcolm Muir, Chairman; Dr. Thomas Parran and Dr. William R. Willard), produced under date of June 1963 a 114-page printed report on Education for the Health Professions: A Comprehensive Plan for Comprehensive Care to Meet New York's Needs in an Age of Change.

Copies may be had from the Board of Regents, State Education Department, Albany, New York.

There are nine recommendations.

(1) Institute an advisory State Council for Health Profession Education.

(2) Establish a new medical center at Stony Brook, Long Island, by 1970; and another medical center, probably in Westchester County, to be functional by 1980.

(3) Encourage private institutions to expand and improve their capacities.

(4) Proceed promptly with existing plans for expansion within the State University of New York.

(5) "Revise and increase the State's schedule of scholarships and fellowships to the point that economic considerations are no longer a barrier to qualified youth seeking an education in the health professions."

(6) Emphasize research and graduate study to supply teachers, research specialists, and administrators.

(7) Increase and assure the autonomy of the State University of New York, and create a new vice-presidency for program planning and policy in health affairs.

(8) "Set an example toward the goal of comprehensive medical care by practicing it in State University medical schools and centers, so that it may be taught by practical demonstration, as well as theoretical discussion."

(9) Call a conference of governors

and educators of the New England and Middle Atlantic states to form a permanent organization for the continuing study and cooperative solution of regional problems in education for the health professions.

Concerning the autonomy of the State University of New York (Recommendation 7) the report says: "As a latecomer among state universities, and among older agencies of the State, the University has operated under rules and regulations developed for other types of agencies and institutions, which are not adapted to the needs of a University.

"The Health Committee Report (Governor's Committee on Higher Education which reported in November 1960) observed, for example, that 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 nonappropriated income...'"

Remarking that "While some steps have been taken in this direction, especially by permitting the University to create its own authority for capital construction, much remains to be done"; the authors of this report on medical education then recommend that the University be given authority and held responsible for its own budgetary, personnel, and other operating policies.

This is merely another strong voice in the chorus that is calling in rising crescendo for the unlocking of state universities and colleges from the strangling grasp of absurdly tight and complicated state bureaucracy, especially in New York State, but also in many other states.

M. M. Chambers, Education Building, Indiana University, Bloomington

NEW YORK CITY. A development of great importance appears to be quietly taking place with respect to the fiscal relationship between the City of New York and the Board of Education of the City of New York, each of which is a separate public corporation.

As is well known, the Board of Education has hitherto been virtually powerless fiscally, operating under line-item budgets without authority to make transfers without permission from city officials, and with every expenditure subject to pre-audit by the City Controller.

In mid-October the metropolitan press revealed that a "memorandum of agreement" which had actually been in effect since July 1, had been signed for the city by Mayor Wagner and City Controller Abraham D. Beame, after having been signed some weeks earlier for the Board of Education by its president, Max J. Rubin.

It appears that the agreement enables the Board of Education to exercise nearly complete authority over its own expense budget: that is, to shift funds within the budget without first obtaining approval from city authorities, and to pay for supplies, maintenance, and repair of buildings (in cases not exceeding \$25,000) without pre-audit by the Controller's office.

These changes have been often recommended in recent years, but were adamantly resisted by Controller Beame's predecessor, Lawrence E. Gerosa, whose name has often appeared in earlier issues of GRAPEVINE. There is legal opinion to the effect that the Board of Education actually possesses the power, under New York statutes, to do the things the agreement provides for; but that about a quarter of a century ago, under the administration of Fiorello H. LaGuardia, then Mayor, an aggressive City Controller was allowed to usurp these powers without legal warrant.

Illustrative of the trend of today, the leading editorial in the New York Times for October 14, 1963 reverses the former position of that great newspaper, and says forthrightly: "We believe the time has come to reconsider the wisdom of this dual, divided management, to the end that New York join with the other large cities of the state in seeking for itself, as well as them, the fiscal independence for the school system that would mean escape from political control over funds for education."

The Board of Higher Education of the City of New York, which bears much the same relation to the city government, is apparently not presently a party to the current transactions and debate; but in view of the importance of fiscal freedom to the City University, it can confidently be expected that the Board, under its redoubtable president, Gustave G. Rosenberg, will not for long sit by in somnolence.

QUOTATION FROM CLAUDE BISSELL,  
PRESIDENT, UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO

"In this new age of governmentalization, I think it is important for universities to formulate their own Bill of Rights--the freedoms that they think are basic to their own health, the violation of which would threaten their very existence. I would suggest that there are three basic freedoms: the freedom to determine who shall be taught, the freedom to determine what shall be taught, and the freedom to determine who shall teach. I shall add a fourth, although it is implied in the first three: the freedom (of the university) to distribute its financial resources as it sees fit."

STUDY OF THE GOVERNMENT OF  
CANADIAN UNIVERSITIES

With the aid of a grant of \$50,000 from the Ford Foundation, the Canadian Association of University Teachers and the National Conference of Canadian Universities and Colleges will conduct a study of university government in Canada.

The recently-appointed director of the survey is Sir James Mountford, retiring Vice-Chancellor of the University of Liverpool. It is expected that the report will have been completed by the spring of 1965.

The effort will be to accomplish the following tasks:

(1) Trace the historical origins of present patterns of university government.

(2) Include a critical analysis of the nature and governmental functions of such agencies as boards of governors, senates, administrative officers, faculty councils or boards, and committees of all of these.

(3) Probe beneath legal and other formal statements of responsibilities and powers to reveal how, by whom, and how effectively, decisions are actually made and executed.

(4) Pay special attention to the changing interests and roles of the state, the church, the business community, professional associations, alumni and the teaching body in the government of universities.

BRAKELEY REPORTS ON VOLUNTARY SUPPORT  
FOR PUBLIC HIGHER EDUCATION

The firm of G. A. Brakeley & Co., Inc., of 400 Park Avenue, New York 22 (also 235 Montgomery Street, San Francisco, and 3460 Wilshire Boulevard, Los Angeles), has issued a 16-page, large-format report of A Study of Voluntary Support for Public Higher Education, 1960-1961, bearing date of May 1963.

This is the second report of this character, the earlier one having covered the year 1958-59. The current one is based on returns from 128 public colleges and universities, and shows total voluntary support of more than \$135 million during 1960-61. Amounts received by the top ten institutions reporting ranged from nearly \$16 million for the University of California to \$3½ million for the University of North Carolina.

About 69% of the total was given for current operating expenses, and about 31% for capital outlays.

The report is a treasure-house of data on alumni annual giving, as well as on the volume of gifts from business corporations, philanthropic foundations, non-alumni individuals, and other private sources.

President Clark Kerr of the University of California has said that the greatness of that institution is attributable in part to "the continued recognition by all the people that the University needs both public and private support to fulfill its mission in a free society."