

Center for Higher Education
Department of Educational Administration and Foundations
Illinois State University, Normal, Illinois 61761-6901

Grapevine

Since
1958

32nd
Year

Number 360

January-February 1990

Page 2273

TIMELY DATA CIRCULATED WHILE CURRENT

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

IN THIS ISSUE

COLLABORATION: OHIO STYLE 2274-2277

By Duane Rogers

Duane Rogers, author of this contributed essay, has served as an active member of the Grapevine Advisory Committee. His many contributions to Grapevine are acknowledged with gratitude. He recently retired from the Ohio Board of Regents, where he was Vice Chancellor for Administration. This article pertains to the leadership of the state higher education agency in stimulating collaboration among campuses in Ohio.

STATE SUPPORT FOR COMMUNITY COLLEGES 2278-2280

Appropriations of State Tax Funds for Operating Expenses of Two Types of
Community Colleges

Table 52: "State-aided" Community Colleges 2279

Table 53: "State" Community Colleges 2280

COLLABORATION: OHIO STYLE
By Duane R. Rogers

Most state boards of higher education find collaboration among colleges and universities difficult to achieve because boards deal with many diverse and autonomous institutions. Too often, natural competition among institutions keeps campuses from working together toward the accomplishment of important system-wide objectives. So, when state-wide collaboration occurs, it is a success that is indeed noteworthy. Three recent successes in Ohio are reported: a stepped-up workforce training effort among two-year colleges; the formation of the Ohio Aerospace Institute; and establishment of the Ohio Supercomputer Center.

EnterpriseOhio

Many states, especially industrial states, have recently experienced a shift from reliance on manufacturing as the mainstay of their economy to growth in the service sector. One result is a profound adjustment in the educational needs of the workforce. Since industrialization, it has been possible for young people to get good jobs and spend their productive years in the steel, automobile, mining and related industries without the need for postsecondary education. Today's economy, and projections of the future, demand a workforce better prepared to meet the needs of a technological society. Higher education, and especially two-year college programs, must respond to these challenges.

In late 1984, the Chancellor of the Ohio Board of Regents called together six two-year college presidents who had recognized the challenge before them and had begun programs to meet new demands from manufacturing companies. Growing from these conversations, in early 1986, the Board of Regents adopted a major policy report that challenged the two-year colleges to step forward to meet Ohio's growing need for workforce training and retraining. A major focus of the report was the need for the two-year colleges to band together in a quick response system to meet company training needs. Several of the colleges had developed specialized training packages on request; others had neither the opportunity nor the need for the same scale of operations. Much was to be gained through collaboration where experienced colleges could offer their assistance and consortia could tackle training issues that no individual college could justify.

What has emerged is a network including all 53 two-year campuses across the state in an endeavor that has become known as EnterpriseOhio. This organization functions as a high-level service, quick response system to meet the needs of both large manufacturers and small companies. Early EnterpriseOhio collaborative projects include: Train-the-Trainer, a faculty development program in highly specialized training fields; Training Exchange, a program that develops customized packages in response to new manufacturing and management techniques; and ONet, an electronic network to increase awareness of training needs and promote a shared approach to program development. Funds have also been secured to permit outreach to companies in each college's service district. Recently, EnterpriseOhio has been called upon to meet

the needs of public sector employers. Twelve two-year colleges will provide a customized training package to upgrade over 2800 Department of Human Services employees working across the state in child support enforcement and income maintenance programs. This is an early step in implementing recent federal legislation, i.e., the Family Support Act of 1988. It is anticipated that the colleges also will be active in supplying services to many human services clients as requirements for educational service are phased in.

An executive committee of two-year college presidents meets monthly to plan strategies and monitor activities of EnterpriseOhio. A full-time administrator, who is a Board of Regents staff member, carries out the policies of the committee and continues to scan the rapidly changing training scene for opportunities.

Ohio Aerospace Institute (OAI)

One of Ohio's best kept secrets is its aerospace industry. In addition to some very strong industrial development, Ohio has two major federal aerospace laboratories: NASA Lewis (Cleveland) and Wright Aeronautical Laboratories, part of a larger Air Force base in Dayton. For the most part, however, the state had never considered these important centers in its economic development policies.

During 1987, personnel at NASA Lewis developed a proposal for the state to build a major educational facility in Cleveland to greatly enhance the role of that center. At first, the proposal was not widely supported. Linkages between higher education institutions and the Lewis Center had not been established and the role of the Dayton laboratories had not been identified. Eventually, the Governor and General Assembly provided a planning grant and asked the Board of Regents to lead the planning for the conceptual development of an aerospace institute. As a policy planning committee was being impaneled, the deans of Ohio's colleges of engineering, with staff support from the Regents, began an inventory of activities related to aerospace science and engineering. It soon became apparent to policy planners that Ohio's public and private universities had developed significant, but generally unfocused, strengths in fields supporting aerospace. An Action Planning subcommittee quickly developed a plan to draw together these strengths in order to greatly increase the state's effort to compete for a larger role in this expanding industry. The plan calls for participating universities to provide instruction at the Lewis Center and for students and faculty to collaborate with Lewis-based scientists and engineers on research projects.

A non-profit corporation was formed and an application for a planning grant was submitted to NASA. In September 1989, OAI was named as part of NASA's space grant college network. A start-up grant has been provided from the state operating budget in order to hire a director and to sponsor research fellowships at the Institute. A request has been prepared for the state to build a facility on property leased from NASA Lewis to allow students and faculty to greatly expand a presence at the NASA laboratories. The long-range plan calls for an expanded university presence at the Wright Laboratories as well.

Ohio Supercomputer Center

During 1985, The Ohio State University sought National Science Foundation designation as a regional supercomputer center. The request was not successful. Yet demand from university researchers for convenient supercomputer resources continued. Ohio State had made plans to secure a Cray XMP and requested state assistance to expand limited services to other universities. At the same time the Ohio Board of Regents was developing a strategy to both expand university research activity and to improve its quality. In considering the Ohio State proposal for state assistance, the Chancellor embraced an upgrade of the supercomputer proposal to a state-of-the-art facility that was compatible with the stated research and excellence goals of the entire state. The state provided \$22 million to secure a Cray YMP that was delivered in July 1989.

A critical element of the state's policy was that the supercomputer, while located on the Ohio State University campus, would be accessible to all university researchers on an equal basis and to industrial researchers as well. In order to accomplish this objective, the Chancellor appointed a Supercomputer Governing Board of university presidents to oversee the policies of the Center, establishment of a communication network linking each campus to the Center, and to assure equitable allocation of the computing resource among researchers. A separate Users Group meets regularly to work out day-to-day operating problems and to recommend policies to the governing board. Clearly, researchers in Ohio's universities, both public and private, have access to a resource that would not be available without the collaboration of faculties across the state. Excess time is being made available to private companies on a cost recovery basis. As an added benefit, the communications backbone of the Ohio Supercomputer Center has made available a statewide communications network that has other academic applications and will facilitate the collaborative work of faculty members. With the state's investment to date, and with modest operating support, the Ohio Supercomputer Center may emerge as one of the nation's strongest.

The State Board Role

From these three examples, as well as others in the experience of the Ohio Board of Regents, several observations can be shared as to the important role of the state board of higher education in bringing about successful collaborative projects.

The Board as Convener. The state board can call together representatives from institutions to discuss an issue and set a tone that might not be otherwise possible. By convening experts who share a common interest in an objective discourse and, at the same time, represent their institutions, it is possible to lessen or avoid institutional competition that often becomes a barrier. It is possible to raise most issues beyond self-interest where the larger benefits of collaboration are evident.

The state board can seek input and assist in adding focus to an idea that may be at an embryonic stage and where leadership is needed for nurturing and development. Also, the board can sometimes be used to protect the interests of an institution by mollifying undue external pressures that might not be compatible with the institution's mission. Further, a state board can inject a focus on harmonies with state-level policy

objectives that might be absent from purely institutional discussions. It was found in each example of successful collaboration that state policy objectives of economic development and quality enhancement were evident. It became possible for the board to aggressively pursue the advancement of both objectives through each project. Also, by working together, it is possible that the resulting program may be of broader scope and offers greater benefits.

Another role of the board is to tackle an issue that has become a political "hot potato" or one in which interinstitutional competition has risen to a dysfunctional level. While these issues may be draining on the psyche, successful disposition can add to the status and reputation of the state board.

Validation. State board endorsement of a proposal originating in an institution can add great credibility to an idea that otherwise might not receive the necessary attention from state policy-makers in order to result in favorable action. What may appear as a weak proposal from disparate interests can often be brought into focus and presented in a coherent fashion. On the other hand, the board must exercise good judgment and not endorse every institutional proposal. Also, there is a danger that factions may try to seek state board endorsement as a means of circumventing normal procedures and protocols.

Funding. Like any other engine where friction is present, a little "grease" is necessary to ensure smooth functioning. Appropriations from the state can provide the extra incentive for collaboration. In Ohio, the Board of Regents recommends a higher education budget to the Governor and General Assembly. In each example above the Board recommended and received funding for the collaborative projects. In addition, these funds have been leveraged by seeking support from other sponsors.

It is often necessary for the board not only to recommend funding for the project, but also to fight for the project all the way through the budget process. Each of the projects described in this paper was included on the Board's "short list" for special attention during budget deliberations.

Cautionary Note. Although the state board's role was paramount during the study and focus part of the process, Ohio's board has been careful not to actually manage the project. Rather, an ongoing organizational structure has been established to carry out the project. The board has continued to address ongoing policy concerns as an equal member of the executive committee or governing board. The Chancellor of the Board of Regents is a member of each project board according to its bylaws.

In summary. As shown above, the benefits of colleges and universities working together can be clearly demonstrated. When there is an established pattern of success, there seems to be a tolerance in the system that allows for new problems and challenges to be addressed in a collaborative way. There are several new collaborative efforts currently underway in Ohio. One involves coordination of graduate program development in Northeast Ohio among four state universities; a second involves development of a statewide electronic library catalogue and information access system that would have been beyond the most optimistic promise a few years ago. Success begets success!

STATE SUPPORT TO COMMUNITY COLLEGES

As is the custom in Grapevine, the amount of state tax support for the operating expenses of community (and other public two-year colleges) is shown in Tables 52 and 53. In FY1990, 40 of the 50 states provided state support to community colleges. There were 19 states where community colleges were supported primarily by the state with little or no local tax support, and there were 24 states where support to community colleges was characterized by the "state-aided" or state and local tax support configuration. Both types of community colleges are found in Colorado, New Mexico and New York.

The "state only" grouping is smaller with these campuses found in 19 states, including three of the 11 "megastates" where state tax support to higher education is larger than \$1 billion dollars appropriated annually by each state. This grouping is likewise smaller in amount of dollars appropriated with \$1.8 billion having been appropriated by these states for FY1990.

The "state-aided" group is larger in several respects. There were 24 states where community colleges had a combination of state and local tax dollars appropriated to community colleges. Of the 11 "megastates" -- those industrialized states with large populations and higher education systems -- nine were represented among the 24 states having state-aided community colleges. In FY1990, over \$4 billion were appropriated in state support for state-aided institutions.

In total, over \$6 billion were appropriated to community colleges for FY1990. This amount represents over 15 percent of the national total of \$39.3 billion appropriated to higher education in the current fiscal year. The importance of community colleges to the total higher education enterprise, as represented by the magnitude of these figures and the continued level of support of these campuses by state governments, cannot be overstated.

Continued state support of community colleges over a five-year period is demonstrated by the figures shown below. The reader is cautioned about some imprecision inherent in these data, because the exact number of states in either grouping is variable along with the classification of campuses included in each grouping. Nonetheless, within these limitations, the figures are deemed to be of some utility if interpreted with caution. The increases in state support to community colleges approximates the national percentage increases for all higher education. The percentage increases experienced by the state group were at or greater than the national two-year percentage gains for three out of the five years. There appear to be some differences between the two groups of colleges. The state college group, although smaller and perhaps more homogeneous as measured by operating budget size, received two-year percentage increases which were larger than those received by the state-aided group for four years out of the five years shown (all years except FY1988). This trend has been reversed during the most recent two-year period (FY1989 and 1990) with the state-aided college group showing gains within one percentage point of the state college group in both years. The differences in percentages are small in size, and these differences should not be exaggerated. Of greater significance is the fact that in FY1990, the percentages of gain for both state and state-aided colleges exceeded the national percentage gain.

PERCENTAGES OF TWO-YEAR GAIN IN APPROPRIATIONS FOR COMMUNITY COLLEGES AND FOR ALL HIGHER EDUCATION OPERATING EXPENSES

	<u>1986</u>	<u>1987</u>	<u>1988</u>	<u>1989</u>	<u>1990</u>
State-aided	15	11	7	13	15
State	18	14	12	12	16
50-state total	19	13	12	14	14

Table 52. Appropriations of State Tax Funds for Operating Expenses of State-aided Public Community/Junior Colleges, Fiscal Years 1987-88, 1988-89, and 1989-90, with Percentages of Two-Year Gain. (In thousands of dollars)

States	Year 1987-88	Year 1988-89	Year 1989-90	2-yr gain Percent
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
California	1,312,366	1,388,896	1,480,033	13
Texas	413,584	413,584	512,064	24
Florida	421,526	460,908	494,028	17
New York*	295,460	309,255	333,721	13
Illinois**	193,008	207,416	237,114	23
Michigan	196,595	205,361	212,491	8
Maryland	99,149	105,921	118,936	20
Ohio	91,177	94,912	102,075	12
Pennsylvania	79,141	95,641	92,589	17
New Jersey	92,865	98,843	92,011	- 1
Iowa	75,343	82,122	88,458	17
Arizona	68,520	75,204	78,549	15
Mississippi	57,014	68,661	72,960	28
Oregon	60,486	62,954	69,693	15
Missouri	56,417	62,463	67,176	19
Kansas	30,145	35,619	40,778	35
Wyoming	34,272	36,920	36,920	8
Nebraska	22,285	23,127	27,000	21
Arkansas	21,403	23,393	22,618	6
Indiana***	16,577	17,640	20,031	21
Colorado*	11,713	12,621	13,921	19
Idaho	6,155	6,407	6,988	14
Montana	3,051	3,042	3,208	5
New Mexico*	887	932	1,887	113
Totals	3,659,139	3,891,842	4,225,249	
Weighted average percentage of gain				15

*One of the states having both "local" and "state" community colleges.

**Includes State Community College in East St. Louis which does not receive local tax support.

***For Vincennes University, a two-year college supported primarily by state, but partly by the county.

Table 53. Appropriations of State Tax Funds for Operating Expenses of State Community Colleges, Fiscal Years 1987-88, 1988-89, and 1989-90, with Percentages of Two-Year Gain. (In thousands of dollars)

States	Year 1987-88	Year 1988-89	Year 1989-90	2-yr Gain Percent
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
North Carolina	323,594	325,587	364,829	13
Washington	218,407	232,440	259,758	19
Virginia	156,242	177,664	187,100	20
Massachusetts	134,658	152,469	144,765	8
Tennessee	93,282	97,984	105,872	13
New York*	93,070	95,937	105,204	13
South Carolina	87,814	92,836	95,243	8
Alabama	73,492	82,470	89,858	22
Minnesota	65,923	75,788	88,147	34
Georgia	63,454	66,453	78,967	24
Oklahoma	64,823	65,582	73,488	13
Connecticut	53,699	61,246	61,860	15
Colorado*	48,507	52,052	57,016	18
Nevada	21,565	23,522	28,286	31
Rhode Island	23,260	25,711	27,453	18
Delaware	22,285	24,149	26,756	20
Utah	15,401	15,706	17,109	11
West Virginia	9,921	10,538	12,218	23
New Mexico*	5,790	6,378	7,209	25
Totals	1,575,187	1,684,512	1,831,138	
Weighted average percentage of gain				16

*One of the states having both "local" and "state" community colleges.

Center for Higher Education
Dept of Educational Administration and Foundations
Illinois State University, Normal, IL 61761

GRAPEVINE

Edward R. Hines, Director and Editor
M. M. Chambers, Founding Editor
Gwen B. Pruyne, Managing Editor

Responsibility for any errors in the data or for opinions expressed is not to be attributed to any organization or person other than the Editors. GRAPEVINE is circulated to key persons in the fifty states. Not copyrighted.

Non-Profit Org.
U.S. POSTAGE
PAID
Normal, Illinois
Permit No. 1