

M. M. Chambers
Dept of Ednl Administration and Foundations
Illinois State University, Normal, Illinois 61761

GRAPEVINE

SINCE
1958

23rd
YEAR

Number 274

April 1981

Page 1727

TIMELY DATA CIRCULATED WHILE CURRENT

Reports on state tax legislation; state appropriations for universities, colleges, and junior colleges; legislation affecting education beyond the high school.

IN THIS ISSUE

THE FIVE MOST POPULOUS STATES: Appropriations for operating expenses of higher education, fiscal 1981, per \$1,000 of personal income. . .	1728
Composite standings on eight selected scales.	1729
How the five states stand among the fifty states.	1730
<u>State-level Structures</u> of coordination and governance: Five most populous states	1731
<u>Top-level Universities</u> in five populous states.	1732
<u>Utah</u> reports appropriations of state tax funds for operating expenses of higher education for fiscal 1982: \$174 million--a gain of 20 percent over fiscal 1980	1732.

* * * * *

GRAPEVINE 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 to numerous key persons in each of the fifty states.

Not copyrighted. If you quote or paraphrase, please credit the source in appropriate manner.

Table 22. State Appropriations for Operating Expenses of All Higher Education, 1981, Per \$1,000 of Personal Income, 1979.

States	Appropriation Per \$1,000 Personal Income	Rank Among Five States	Rank Among Fifty States
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
CA	13.85	1	11
TX	12.46	2	18
NY	10.23	3	33
IL	8.77	4	41
PA	7.39	5	47
US	10.88		

Source: Chronicle of Higher Education, October 14, 1981. Page 10.

2	1
4	3
6	5
8	7
10	9
12	11
14	13
16	15
18	17
20	19
22	21
24	23
26	25
28	27
30	29
32	31
34	33
36	35
38	37
40	39
42	41
44	43
46	45
48	47
50	49

A clue to the priority that higher education has in the fiscal affairs of state government is provided by the amounts of state tax funds appropriated per \$1,000 of personal income in the state, for annual operating expenses of higher education.

Column (4) of Table 22 above, shows that the five most populous states rank among the fifty states in 1981 as follows: California, 11th; Texas, 18th; New York, 33rd; Illinois 41st; and Pennsylvania, 47th.

This is the same general order (though not precisely the same individual rankings) held by the five most populous states in Table 14, State Appropriations Per Capita for Higher Education, Fiscal 1981.

Table 22 suspends GRAPEVINE's mini-study of tax support of higher education by the five most populous states, because reporting of state appropriations for fiscal 1982 has begun (with the tabulation of Utah on page 1732 in this issue) and reports of the other 49 states will occupy most of GRAPEVINE's space for the next half-year.

The mini-study, complete to its present stage, occupies pages 1715-1728 (Nos. 273, 274, and 275--February, March, and April 1981).

Such studies can be made of other groups of states, and can be frequently updated and refined to focus public attention on state tax support of higher education.

M. M. Chambers, Illinois State University, Normal, Illinois 61761

THE FIVE MOST POPULOUS STATES COMPARED AS TO THEIR TAX SUPPORT
OF ALL HIGHER EDUCATION

(Concluded from two preceding issues of GRAPEVINE, pages 1716-20 and 1722-26)

The application of eight scales to the five states, as already exhibited on pages 1716-1726 and page 1728 this issue, is briefly and partially summarized in Table 23 at the bottom of this page.

Out of the eight measures, it seems that California ranks first among the five states four times, and second four times.

New York ranks first twice, second once, third four times, and fifth once.

Texas ranks first twice, second twice, fourth once, and fifth three times for a composite rank of third.

Illinois ranks second once, third twice, fourth four times, and fifth once.

Pennsylvania ranks third twice, fourth three times, and fifth three times, placing it as fifth among the five.

There are so many differences among the populations, resources, histories and traditions of these five states that to classify them on the basis of a few coldly quantified criteria may perhaps

seem to be an exercise in near-futility; yet it is by no means useless if due thought is given other pertinent conditions, quantifiable and imponderable, which may provide bases for present and future improvement.

Within the limits of the eight scales and among the five states, California's primacy is clear.

New York's glaring inconsistency is its fifth place in the ratio of appropriations for higher education to total state revenues, explainable partly by relatively heavy reliance on private higher education and tardiness in developing public universities, and partly by its urbanized condition and its practice of relatively high state and local taxes and comprehensive public services.

Texas is only fourth among the five in ratio of students to total population, partly because of its relatively heavy immigration of underprivileged Chicanos; and fifth in total of state taxes per capita and two other measures of state taxation partly because it has no state income taxes.

Table 23. Composite Rankings on Each of Eight Simple Scales, of Each of the Five Most Populous States, As Compared with Each Other.

Table	Scale	CA	NY	TX	IL	PA
12	H.E. students as % of total population	1	3	4	2	5
14	Appropriations H.E. per capita	1	3	2	4	5
15	Appropriations per headcount student	2	3	1	5	4
16	Use of state tax potential (Quindry)	2	1	5	3	4
18	Total of state taxes per capita	1	2	5	4	3
20	Income tax collections and potentials	2	1	5	4	3
21	Appropriations H.E. as % of state and local revenue	2	5	1	3	4
22	Appropriations per \$1,000 of personal income	1	3	2	4	5
Numerical totals of each state's standings		12	21	25	29	33
Composite standings among the five states		1	2	3	4	5

(Continued from page 1729)

Illinois stands fifth in state appropriations per headcount student. This may be explained by the fact that slightly more than half of all students in the state are in community colleges for which about half the annual operating funds are levied and appropriated by the community college districts and are not included in GRAPEVINE's statistics of appropriations of state tax funds. This also helps to explain why Illinois ranks second in ratio of students to total population.

On the other six scales, Illinois has four rankings of fourth and two of third, giving it a composite standing of fourth among the five states. The scales on which it ranks fourth are: appropriations per capita for higher education, total of state taxes per capita, income tax collections and potentials, and appropriations per \$1,000 of personal income.

Pennsylvania, with two standings of third, three of fourth, and three of fifth, is fifth among the five states. Pennsylvania's only rankings as high as third among the five states on the eight scales are in total of state taxes per capita and income tax collections and potentials. Relatively high state taxes are characteristic of the heavily urbanized Northeastern "Middle Atlantic" states.

How the Five States
Stand Among the Fifty

Equally or more important are the relative standings of the five states among all fifty. Three of the foregoing tabulations (Tables 14, 18, and 22) include extensions showing rankings of the five among the fifty.

These have been extracted and shown separately in Table 24, below. Conspicuous is the fact that when placed in their proper ranks among all fifty states, their ranks among themselves continue to be the same, but they are widely spread almost from top to bottom of the fifty-state continuum.

Their composite standings on the three scales in Table 24 range from California's seventh to Pennsylvania's 36th. At least one of these five states is in each of the four quartiles of the fifty states.

Though these five states share the common characteristic of being most populous (together they have more than one-third of the nation's people), their support of higher education is diverse enough to repay much more comparative observation than it has yet received. Only a few additional features can be briefly noticed on pages 1731 and 1732 which follow.

Table 24. Composite Rankings on Each of Three Simple Scales, of Each of Five States, As Standing among the Fifty States.

Table	Scale	CA	NY	TX	IL	PA
14	Appropriations H.E. per capita	4	25	19	30	45
18	Total of state taxes per capita	6	11	45	19	17
22	Appropriations H.E. per \$1,000 personal income	11	33	18	41	47
Numerical totals of each state's standings		21	69	82	90	109
Composite standings among the fifty states		7	23	27	30	36

M. M. Chambers, Illinois State University, Normal, Illinois 61761

STATE-LEVEL STRUCTURES OF COORDINATION AND GOVERNANCE
IN THE FIVE MOST POPULOUS STATES

Each of the five states has at least one agency (created by law) which is charged with functions pertinent to coordinating the progress of institutions, segments, or systems within its statewide higher educational enterprise, without exercising the plenary powers of a governing board over any campus or system.

These are the California Postsecondary Education Commission; the Board of Regents of the University of the State of New York and State Board of Education; The Coordinating Board, Texas State Universities and Colleges; the Illinois State Board of Higher Education; and the Council on Higher Education, a panel within the Board of Education of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

The California commission's job is mainly to maintain liaison among four segments: the nine-campus University of California, governed by the constitutionally independent and powerful Board of Regents; the nineteen-campus "California State University and Colleges," governed by its Board of Trustees; the network of some 106 local public community colleges, headed by its board of governors; and the universities and colleges of the private sector.

The New York Board of Regents is a well-known regulatory body having jurisdiction over many matters concerned with education at all levels. It is often said to be the most powerful state board of education in the nation. It has supervisory responsibility over two governing boards of large systems of higher education: the Board of Trustees of the State University of New York (SUNY) which governs some thirty universities and colleges and also heads the network of forty or more two-year community colleges and technical institutes; and the Board of Higher Education of the City of New York, which governs the eighteen-campus City University (CUNY).

The Texas coordinating board is atop at least four systems (U of Texas; Texas A&M U; Texas State U; and U System of South Texas) each having its own governing board and from three to a dozen component campuses. There are also some 15 other institutions having their own separate governing boards, among the largest and best-known of which are U of Houston,

Texas Tech U, North Texas State U, and Texas Woman's U. The Coordinating board also has jurisdiction over the state's network of local public state-aided community colleges.

The Illinois board of higher education is a coordinating board for a "system of systems" consisting of the U of Illinois (3 campuses); Southern Illinois U (2 campuses); the regency system (3 campuses); the governors' system (5 campuses); and the statewide network of 51 local public state-aided community colleges. (There is also a community college board at the state level; and a state scholarship commission for student financial aids.)

Pennsylvania's state board of education is a sort of joint body including two panels, one for higher education and one for elementary and secondary. The public higher education system is capped by Penn State U, with twenty or more branch campuses; together with two heavily state-subsidized private universities-- Temple U and the U of Pittsburgh, and the predominantly black Lincoln U; these four are collectively dubbed the "Commonwealth segment." The "state-owned segment" consists of 14 state colleges (one of which is named university), governed by a collective board of directors. There are also about 15 institutions, mostly small, but including the private U of Pennsylvania, that are classified "private, state-aided"; and a complement of about 35 local public state-aided community colleges.

TOP-ECHELON UNIVERSITIES
IN FIVE STATES

A fruitful change of perspective may be had by changing the focus from the complex and confusing picture of statewide structures for coordination and governance to the campuses of the major state universities. The single university campus, as an academic community, is the fundamental and crucial unit not to be lost sight of.

GRAPEVINE, Number 270, page 1708 (December 1980) carried Table 8, including a listing of 24 major campuses in seventeen states, each campus receiving \$100 million or more of state tax funds for operating expenses in fiscal 1981.

Table 25, on this page, shows eight of these major campuses in the five most populous states.

Table 25. Top-Echelon State Universities in the Five States

Universities	State Appropriations* For Fiscal 1981
U of Cal (Los Angeles)	239,879
U of Cal (Berkeley)	189,595
U of Illinois (Champaign-Urbana)	169,628
U of Cal (Davis)	152,415
Texas A&M U (College Station)	143,216
U of Texas (Austin)**	128,225
SUNY (Stony Brook)	113,713
SUNY (Buffalo)	107,134

*In thousands of dollars.

**Does not include the medical school located in another city.

The City University of New York reported \$190,597,000 appropriated to it by the state for its several senior campuses, but we do not have figures separately for the major components.

The multi-campus Pennsylvania State University received \$127,040,000 in appropriated state tax funds for fiscal 1981, but the break-down for the 22 separate campuses is not available. It is doubtful that any one of them received \$100 million of the total appropriation.

UTAH. Appropriations of state tax funds for operating expenses of higher education, fiscal year 1981-82:

Table 26. State tax-fund appropriations for operating expenses of higher education in Utah, fiscal year 1981-82, in thousands of dollars.

Institutions (1)	Sums appropriated (2)
University of Utah	65,163
Coll of Medicine & hospital	10,305
Research & training grants	1,612
Special enterprises*	910
Subtotal, U of U - \$77,990	
Utah State University	29,592
Ag experiment station	4,382
Coop extension	3,492
Research & training grants	553
Special enterprises**	1,794
Subtotal, USU - \$39,813	
State Colleges -	
Weber State College	20,456
Utah Tech Coll, Salt Lake	7,953
Utah Tech Coll, Provo	6,992
Southern Utah State Coll	6,285
Dixie College	3,461
Snow College	3,418
Coll of Eastern Utah	2,776
Subtotal, S C's - \$51,341	
Board of Regents	888
Statewide TV	1,331
Coop nursing	739
WICHE	921
Computer services	305
Student loans	157
Intercollegiate assembly	3
Skills center (est)***	569
Zion Park amphitheater	29
Fifth Pathway	54
Subtotal, B of R - \$4,427	
Total	174,139

*Includes: Educationally disadvantaged, \$482,700; Center for Economic Development, \$62,900; Seismograph stations, \$152,400; Museum of Natural History, \$168,400; State Arboretum, \$43,600.

**Includes: Educationally disadvantaged, \$77,400; Water Research Lab, \$651,200; Ecology Center, \$421,000; Southeastern Utah Con Ed Center, \$148,400; Uintah Basin Cont Ed Center, \$376,800; Man and His Bread Museum, \$75,900; Coop M.Ed. program with SUSC, \$43,600.

***Funded from the uniform school fund.