

M. M. Chambers  
Education Building, Indiana University  
Bloomington, Indiana  
7401

SINCE NINTH  
1958: YEAR  
Number 96 March 1967 Page 621

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

Illinois State Board of Higher Education recommends lower division enrollments at the state universities be "frozen" at 1970 . . . . . 622

PUBLIC PROVISION FOR THE FIRST TWO YEARS OF EDUCATION BEYOND THE HIGH SCHOOL . . . . . 623

STATE TAX SUPPORT FOR OPERATING EXPENSES OF LOCAL PUBLIC JUNIOR COLLEGES IN 23 STATES. . . . . 625

\*\*\*\*\*

"Our long-range objective must be free education beyond high school for every Maine boy and girl who has the desire and talent to use this education."

-- Governor Kenneth M. Curtis of Maine, in his Inaugural Address, 1967

\*\*\*\*\*

-----  
Statement of ownership and circulation of GRAPEVINE is on Page 622 (reverse hereof).

ILLINOIS. Having praised one feature of the current recommendations of the Illinois State Board of Higher Education--namely, that Northern Illinois University and Illinois State University at Normal be placed under a new Board of Regents and encouraged to develop doctoral programs in arts and science fields, GRAPEVINE now takes occasion to hurl a few brickbats at another feature--namely, that freshman and sophomore enrollments at the state universities should be frozen at 1970.

Obviously this might restrict the freedom of choice of thousands of students for no discernible reason that is worth the candle. Do the people of Illinois want to force students to attend the community-junior colleges or the high-fee private colleges?

This is linked with the demand that the state universities construct no additional self-liquidating student housing (at no expense to the taxpayers) without the specific approval of the State Board of Higher Education. Manifestly this is a crude attempt to limit the size of the state universities in an arbitrary manner.

The stated reason is that the state universities should devote major emphasis to upper-division and graduate programs. Standing by itself, this is good policy; but it is a policy which the state universities will inevitably follow without coercion from the Statehouse. It is a trend taking place everywhere because students are staying longer in the universities and their graduate

schools are growing faster than any other segment.

The scheme of coercion is a bald borrowing of some of the key rigidities of the California "master plan" of 1960, which proceeded from such unwarranted assumptions as (1) there must be a ceiling on the growth of the universities, and (2) many thousands of freshmen and sophomores must be diverted from their choice of a university or state college to the junior college which they do not want to attend.

Now the merit of the junior college is that it can accommodate students who would not otherwise be able to get any education beyond high school, plus many others who may prefer it for one reason or another; and there is no virtue in making it a bullpen in which to delay thousands of students who are able and desirous of attending a senior college or a university. This will not conduce toward institutional or individual morale, nor toward the highest productivity of the educational dollar.

It has not been shown that first- and second-year students can properly be educated in a junior college at any less expense to the taxpayers than in a state college or university; and generally no such claim is made.

This part of the scheme of the State Board of Higher Education is a thrust for "naked power" to constrict the universities and to defeat the choices of thousands of capable young citizens of Illinois.

-----  
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 47401.

PUBLIC PROVISION FOR THE FIRST TWO YEARS OF  
EDUCATION BEYOND THE HIGH SCHOOL

Today's high school graduate may get further formal schooling in four main types of public institutions: (1) the first two years (commonly called "lower division" of a state or municipal university or college; (2) a university two-year branch located at a distance from the university's main campus, and often more accessible and less crowded; (3) a state junior college, which is a 2-year institution not a branch of a university and not based on a local taxing district; or (4) a local public junior college, primarily supported and controlled by a local taxing subdivision, but receiving some state tax support in about half of the states. (Some other states have local public junior colleges wholly locally supported and receiving no state funds).

We omit from this brief discussion the non-public institutions, among which are the lower divisions of private nonprofit colleges and universities; the private junior colleges; the proprietary vocational or technical schools; and various training programs afforded by private employers for young trainees.

Many of the federal-state "area vocational-technical schools" are receiving and training increasing numbers of high school graduates at various ages, and they are presently in a phase of their development such that it is practically impossible in many cases to ascertain precisely to what extent they are "post-high-school" institutions. It is clear that they are en route in that direction.

Reverting to the four types enumerated above in the first paragraph, separate comprehensive financial statistics of the lower divisions of state universities and colleges are not available, nor can such statistics be had on

any comprehensive scale for the numerous university branches. With few exceptions the income and expenditures of such branches are carried in the budgets of the parent institution, and not widely reported separately.

Within the modest scope of GRAPEVINE's fact-gathering, we do, however, obtain statistics of state tax support of types (3) and (4); and it is only with those two types that Tables 14 and 15, page 624 (on the reverse of this sheet) are concerned.

Apparently about \$330 million of state tax funds are involved for this current fiscal year: about \$41 million for operating expenses of state junior colleges in ten states; and about \$289 million as the contribution of the states to the operating expenses of local public junior colleges in some twenty-two states.

This total of \$330 million (less than 10 per cent of the grand aggregate of \$3½ billion reported by GRAPEVINE in October, 1966 (page 596) is included therein and is a part thereof, and nothing is added to the grand aggregate by showing it separately.

There is a tendency for the post-high-school vocational-technical institutions to be established as state institutions; and in view of this current movement the figure of \$41 million for state junior colleges may well be too low. During the ensuing decade there will undoubtedly be large increases in state tax support of all four categories of institutions enumerated above.

Table 14. Appropriations of state tax funds for annual operating expenses of state junior colleges in ten states, fiscal year 1966-67, in thousands of dollars.

Appropriations for <u>state</u> junior colleges (not based on local taxing districts)		
Alabama	\$5,386	
Alaska *	440	(1)
Connecticut	1,147	STATE
Georgia **	4,201	JUNIOR
Minnesota +	4,088	COL-
		LEGES.
Oklahoma ++	3,183	
Rhode Island***	1,200	
New York +++	16,121	
North Dakota @	1,183	
Massachusetts @@	3,926	
<b>Total</b>	<b>40,875</b>	

+++ Six Agricultural & Technical institutes, at Alfred, Canton, Cobleskill, Delhi, Farmingdale, and Morrisville.

@ State School of Science at Wahpeton and State School of Forestry at Bottineau

@@ Twelve regional institutions.

\* Six branches of the U of Alaska

\*\* Eight regional institutions, units in the U System of Georgia.

\*\*\* One institution--Rhode Island Junior College

+ Institutions at Austin, Brainerd, Ely, Eveleth, Fergus Falls, Hibbing, Itasca, Rochester, Virginia, Willmar, and Worthington -- 11 in all.

++ Seven institutions: Cameron, Connors, Eastern, Murray, Northeastern, Northern, and Oklahoma Military Acad.

Table 15. Appropriations of state tax funds for operating expenses local public junior colleges in 22 states, fiscal year 1966-67, in thousands of dollars.

Arizona	\$ 7,836
California	66,000
Colorado	3,277
Florida	53,605
Georgia *	690
(2)	
ILLINOIS LOCAL PUBLIC JUNIOR COL- LEGES	22,900
Iowa	4,000
Kansas	1,467
Maryland	4,033
Michigan	16,706
Mississippi	5,000
Missouri	4,362
New Jersey	7,492
New York	25,000
North Carolina +	12,814
North Dakota +++	830
Ohio **	1,680
Oregon ++	3,411
Pennsylvania ***	3,400
Texas	13,931
Wyoming	1,245
Washington	29,442
<b>Total</b>	<b>289,121</b>

\* One local institution on a county tax base. There are eight state junior colleges.

+ The figure covers both junior colleges and area vocational schools, and is therefore considerably overstated.

\*\* Two institutions, at Cleveland and Elyria. Ohio's state universities have some 30 local 2-year branches.

++ Oregon also has one state 2-year college-- Oregon Technical Institute.

\*\*\* Pennsylvania also has some 15 local 2-year branches of the Pennsylvania State University.

+++ North Dakota has two state 2-year colleges, at Wahpeton and Bottineau.

STATE TAX SUPPORT FOR OPERATING EXPENSES OF  
LOCAL PUBLIC 2-YEAR COLLEGES.

The comments on this page appertain to Table 16, on the reverse of this sheet, placed there by design so the two can not become separated.

The total of \$289 million of state tax funds involved for fiscal year 1966-67 was included in the grand aggregate of \$3½ billion of state tax funds appropriated for annual operating expenses of higher education in the fifty states, as reported by GRAPEVINE in October 1966 (page 596), and represents no addition thereto. (The reported grand aggregate was, however, raised to slightly above \$3½ billion by virtue of late reports from Massachusetts and Pennsylvania; and the revised aggregate was circulated in Appropriations of State Tax Funds for Operating Expenses of Higher Education 1966-67, by M. M. Chambers, a 30-page mimeographed document available from the Office of Institutional Research, National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges, 1785 Massachusetts Avenue N.W., Washington, D. C. 20036.)

In this particular field of state tax support for operating expenses of local public junior colleges, comparisons and contrasts between fiscal year 1966-67 and fiscal year 1960-61, six years earlier, are full of surprises; of which most citizens, to say nothing of most governors and legislators, are blissfully unaware.

For example, California's appropriation for this purpose is currently two and one-half times what it was six years ago, though its rate of growth over the six-year period appears to have been slower than that of many of the 23 states except one (Mississippi's appropriation is about two and one-third times what it was six years ago).

Looking at the most recent two years only (1965-67, in Columns 4 and 5 in Table 16), it appears that Cali-

fornia's modest rate of change (37½ per cent over two years) is lowest of all, and that only three other states show rates less than 100 per cent--these being Texas (68%), Mississippi (75½%), and New York (96½%). The fact that California and New York are by long odds the two most populous states in the nation, and that both have developed considerable statewide networks of local public junior colleges, holds the nationwide percentage of gain over these two years down to only 121 per cent, despite the fact that astronomical rates of gain have occurred in many of the states that are smaller in population and in much less mature stages in the development of statewide junior college networks.

Another impression of the growth that is taking place can be had by contrasting certain features of the composite picture in the 23 states, as between fiscal year 1966-67 and the fiscal year six years earlier.

Observe that only nine states appropriated more than \$1 million in 1960-61, but that now twenty states are above that mark. Then only three states were above \$5 million; now ten states. Then only one was above \$10 million; now six. In 1960-61 two states (California and any one of five others) appropriated more than half of the whole nationwide total. In 1966-67, it took the three top states (California, Florida, and Washington) to aggregate one-half of the total.

Over the six-year period the number of states grew from 17 to 23, but one was eventually lost when Minnesota made the 2-year colleges state institutions.

APPROPRIATIONS OF STATE TAX FUNDS AS STATE AID FOR OPERATING EXPENSES OF LOCAL PUBLIC TWO-YEAR COLLEGES, FOR FOUR ALTERNATE FISCAL YEARS BEGINNING WITH 1960-61, IN TWENTY-THREE STATES

Table 16. State tax-fund appropriations as state aid for operating expenses of local public junior colleges, for fiscal years 1960-61, 1962-63, 1964-65, and 1966-67, with dollar gains and percentage gains over the most recent two-year period, in twenty-three states, in thousands of dollars.

States (1)	Year 1960-61 (2)	Year 1962-63 (3)	Year 1964-65 (4)	Year 1966-67 (5)	2-year gain (6)	Percentage gain (7)
Cal	\$26,280	\$33,900	\$48,000	\$66,000	\$18,000	37½
Fla	4,149	7,409	15,767	53,605	37,838	240
Wash	5,433	6,630	11,330	29,442	18,112	160
N Y	4,610	7,100	12,711	45,000	12,289	96½
Ill	2,150	3,250	6,759	22,900	16,441	246
Mich	3,820	5,677	6,905	16,706	9,801	142
Texas	5,178	7,000	8,284	13,931	5,647	68
N C	234	462	850	12,814**	11,964	1,407½
Ariz	400	585	3,858	7,836	3,978	103
N J	30	100	1,700	7,492	5,792	340½
Miss	2,147	2,363	2,850	5,000	2,150	75½
Mo	NR	350	1,839	4,362	2,523	137
Md	432	869	1,512	4,033	2,521	167
Iowa	631	791	840	4,000	3,160	376
Ore	NR	840	1,425	3,411	1,986	139½
Minn	670	1,059	2,188*	*	-2,188*	*
Pa	0	0	500	3,400	2,900	580
Colo	1,050	1,339	1,523	3,277	1,754	115
Ohio	0	0	461	1,680	1,219	266½
Kans	0	385	480	1,467	987	205½
Wyo	200	317	360	1,245	885	246
N D	115	119	250	830	580	232
Ga	NR	NR	300	690	390	130
Total	57,529	80,545	130,692	289,121	158,429	
Weighted av (approximate)	-	-	-	-	-	121

\* The Minnesota local public two-year colleges became state junior colleges, and hence do not appear in this tabulation after 1964-65.

\*\* The North Carolina figure includes appropriations for area vocational schools as well as junior colleges, and hence is considerably overstated.

\*\*\* The Georgia figure is for only one local public two-year college. Georgia also has a statewide system of state junior colleges.