

GRAPEVINE

\* \* \* \* \*

VOLUNTARY STATEWIDE COORDINATION PROGRESSES

In California state-supported higher education is governed by two "big boards": the Regents of the University of California, controlling the largest state university in existence, with its eight campuses; and the State Board of Education, in charge of fourteen state colleges. In 1945 these two giants voluntarily set up a joint committee of liaison from their own membership, and in recent years this liaison committee has maintained an active full-time joint staff selected from the faculties of the principal institutions.

The confidence of the legislature in this committee and its staff is evidenced by a concurrent resolution adopted in the 1959 session, requesting the committee to undertake a supremely important task to be reported upon by January 1961: to prepare a ten-year plan for the development of higher education in California.

In the words of the resolution, the request is "to prepare a plan for the development, expansion, and integration of the facilities, curriculum, and standards of higher education, in junior colleges, state colleges, the University of California, and other institutions of higher education of the state, to meet the needs of the state during the next ten years and thereafter."

Voluntary planning and coordination within statewide systems of higher education, by the governing boards of the institutions themselves, is by no means confined to California. Without the compulsion of any statute, agencies of liaison

and cooperation have been in operation with notable success for varying lengths of time in such states as Colorado, Indiana, Ohio, and Michigan, to mention but a few.

The Colorado Association of State-supported Institutions of Higher Education, in existence since at least as early as 1926, has recently acquired the beginnings of a research staff, and has developed and adopted a suitable budget form for the presentation of institutional requests for state appropriations. Previously the requests were required to be submitted on a standard form used by all state agencies, not at all well adapted to the use of educational institutions.

The new form was constructed in consultation with the State Division of Accounts and Controls, and the Joint Budget Committee of the legislature. These fiscal offices now receive collated copies of the seven institutional budgets, accompanied by a report of an analysis of them made by the Association's director of studies, James I. Doi, who is currently director of institutional research at the University of Colorado, with about 60 percent of his time and office resources allocated to the service of the statewide Association.

The Association also makes studies of instructional programs,

Colorado (Cont'd.) enrollment trends, and space utilization; and takes the lead in encouraging the institutional registrars, admissions officers, business managers, and deans to work together on special studies of common concern and to develop recommendations for coordinated action, upon which the legislature can rely.

Indiana is famed for the manner in which its four state universities and colleges work together voluntarily. Higher education in Indiana maintains "good legislative relations" and enjoys what is undoubtedly an outstanding degree of confidence, respect, and understanding by the people of the state.

Experienced observers in Indiana are inclined to attribute this not only to the fact that the four presidents work long and hard to hammer the four institutional budgets into a good plan for statewide higher education and then unitedly stand by the results; but also to the fact that for a long time emphasis has been placed upon "performance budgeting" which shows what is intended to be accomplished with the money asked for, in terms of educational output. Inter-institutional Study Committees have developed practicable methods of computing unit costs.

Ohio, with six institutions, has also had since the early 1930's a voluntary agency known as the Inter-University Council of Ohio, composed of the presidents, the chief business officers, and one member of each of the six governing boards.

GRAPEVINE is owned and circulated by M. M. Chambers. It is not a publication of the University of Michigan or of any other 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. Address communications to M. M. Chambers, U.H.S. 4200-G, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Mich.

Joint budgets for operating expenses and for capital outlay funds to be requested from the legislature have been made up regularly since 1942. In recent years the Council has studied standards for probation and retention of marginal students, uniform reporting of enrollments, methods of encouraging the superior student, policies regarding selective admissions, plans for support of faculty research and staff fringe benefits, and the development of a statewide broadcasting and telecasting network.

A current project is a cost analysis of the educational programs of all the institutions, to be carried on with the aid of an expert consultant from outside the state, and with the cooperation of the department of finance of the state of Ohio.

Michigan has nine state establishments of higher education, including three major universities; four multi-purpose regional institutions which were formerly normal schools and later colleges of education; a college of mining and technology; and a recently-acquired institution offering degree programs in pharmacy, commerce, and education, and a variety of non-degree curriculums of a technical, semi-professional and pre-professional nature.

The presidents of the nine institutions have maintained for several years an informal organization known as the Michigan Council of State College Presidents. Apparently its origin was at least as early as 1951, and by the end of

M. M. Chambers, U.H.S. 4200-G, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor

Michigan (Cont'd.) 1955 it had completed and published, with the temporary assistance of collaborating professors, two significant statewide studies, relating respectively to future enrollment trends and to the future economic growth of the state. In 1956 five other statewide survey reports were published, dealing respectively with teacher-supply and demand, pharmacy, forestry, music, and extension education.

In the latter part of 1958 this council employed a fulltime coordinator of studies, Bruce K. Nelson (on leave from his post as vice president for instruction at Eastern Michigan University), who has visited several other states to observe their practices in fiscal and educational coordination, and who worked with the nine Michigan institutions toward evolving acceptable and reasonably comparable methods of reporting, accounting, budgeting and fiscal analysis, adapted to the particular characteristics of the Michigan scene.

In September Vice President Nelson resumed his full-time duties at Eastern Michigan University; but it is highly probable that the Council will appoint a successor to continue its office of statewide research, and that this work will be strengthened and become permanent.

Indeed the picture in any state is vastly different from that in any other state; and this of itself is a factor which gives strong support to the idea of voluntary planning and coordination, as distinguished from the prescription of any rigid form of administrative organization as a panacea.

\* \* \* \* \*

EVOLUTION OF HIGHER EDUCATION  
IN WYOMING

By George Duke Humphrey  
President, University of Wyoming

A biennium appropriation of \$400,000 for community and junior colleges by the 1959 Legislature was another step in the evolution of higher education in the State. From the date of its establishment in 1886 to 1945, the University of Wyoming was the only institution in the State offering college-level instruction. In 1945 an act was passed authorizing school districts to offer freshman and sophomore year academic programs and terminal and adult education courses. Three University centers and one junior college were organized during the next four years. Under memoranda of agreements, the University worked very closely with the centers, approving courses, maintaining various records and jointly appointing faculty members. The junior college chose independent status, but there was considerable cooperation between it and the University.

An act passed in 1951 authorized the two-year institutions to become community colleges with their own college districts and boards of trustees. All except the one junior college elected to come under the provisions of the Community College Law. The cooperative arrangements between the colleges and the University were continued.

In 1957, for the first time there was a state appropriation, \$80,000 for the biennium, for the four two-year institutions. About this same time, by mutual agreement, supervision and service provided by the University for the two-year colleges was reduced.

## WYOMING (Cont'd.)

Prior to the 1959 legislative session there was considerable interest in putting the two-year colleges under the Board of Trustees or some other statewide coordinating board, but legislation for this purpose was not passed. The act appropriating \$400,000 in state aid stipulated that to qualify for an allocation of the money, a college must be accredited by the University or a recognized regional accrediting agency. It also provided for cooperation and consultation between the University Board of Trustees and the Community College Commission and among the faculties on matters pertaining to higher education. As the situation now stands, the University has the legal responsibility for accrediting the two-year colleges and the two types of institutions are working in harmony to best serve the higher education needs of the State.

A fifth two-year college opened this fall. It was organized under the 1945 law and is operating under the same type of detailed memorandum of agreement which was used when the University centers were started in the late 1940's. As the new college gains experience, supervision and service by the University will be reduced until it also becomes autonomous, with the exception of accreditation, as is now the case with the institutions established 10 to 15 years ago.

### NOTES FROM THE STATES

ILLINOIS. The formula enacted for state aid for operating expenses of local public junior colleges provides approximately \$218 per year per full-time pupil.

Another act authorizes two or more high school districts to join for the purpose of establishing an area junior college.

Newspapers have reported that some 20 communities have applied for approval of incipient plans to establish junior colleges.

MASSACHUSETTS. The Massachusetts League of Women Voters has adopted public higher education as a principal subject of study during the ensuing year, and study chairmen for this purpose have been appointed in over 80 cities and towns. Action by this alert nonpartisan organization may eventually mean a great deal to the ancient Commonwealth.

MICHIGAN. On September 23 the legislature recessed until October 21. A \$6 million capital outlay appropriation was passed as a stop-gap to enable certain uncompleted building projects to be continued. The legislature is really marking time until the supreme court decides the constitutionality of the new 1¢ "use tax" which, added to the 3¢ sales tax, creates the practical equivalent of a 4¢ sales tax. (GRAPEVINE, page 62). It is rumored that if the "use tax" is declared invalid, there may be no appropriations this year for new capital construction. However, if the tax is valid, it promises to bring in \$110 to \$120 million a year, and appropriations for much-needed new construction will undoubtedly be made.

NEW JERSEY. At the popular election on November 3, 1959, the fate of the proposed bond issue of \$66,800,000 for capital improvements at 8 state-supported institutions of higher education will be decided. (See GRAPEVINE, page 15, and page 40).

NEW YORK. On November 3, 1959 a statewide popular referendum will determine the fate of a proposed constitutional amendment which would authorize New York City to issue up to \$50 million in bonds each year for the next 10 years, in excess of its established debt limit, if matched by equal amounts within the limit, and all for public school building purposes. (GRAPEVINE, page 24). Adoption of the amendment has been bitterly but not very convincingly opposed by City Controller Lawrence E. Gerosa, but is urgently advocated by Mayor Wagner and many other city and state officials, including the Board of Regents of

M. M. Chambers, U.H.S. 4200-G, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor

NEW YORK (Cont'd.) the University of the State of New York and its executive officer, Commissioner of Education James E. Allen.

STATE APPROPRIATIONS FOR HIGHER EDUCATION, 1959

Tables 51 and 52, below, are a consolidation and revision of the several tabulations circulated monthly in GRAPEVINE since June 1959. Forty-two states are now reported in the two tables. Never before has so comprehensive a report been circulated nationally so promptly. The date of this circulation is, October 1, 1959. Observe the cautions on the reverse of this page.

Table 51. Biennial state appropriations for operating expenses of institutions of higher education, 1957-59 and 1959-61, with percentages of increase for the latter biennium over the former.

States	Biennium 1957-59	Biennium 1959-61	Dollar increase	Percentage increase
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Alabama	\$30,725,200	\$43,884,671	\$13,159,471	43
Arkansas	31,641,110	32,460,274	819,164	2 $\frac{1}{2}$
Connecticut	21,825,000	25,504,000	3,679,000	17 $\frac{1}{2}$
Florida	66,671,044	74,527,011	7,855,967	12
Hawaii	7,924,000	12,789,000	4,865,000	61 $\frac{1}{2}$
Idaho	17,579,000	21,031,000	3,452,000	19 $\frac{1}{2}$
Illinois	148,248,000	176,279,000	28,031,000	19
Indiana	76,360,616	95,625,808	19,265,192	25 $\frac{1}{4}$
Iowa	62,390,000	73,160,000	10,770,000	17 $\frac{1}{4}$
Maine	8,982,000	10,925,000	1,943,000	21 $\frac{1}{2}$
Maryland	38,208,221	44,429,000	6,220,779	16 $\frac{1}{4}$
Minnesota	66,463,500	73,717,000	7,253,500	11
Missouri	41,957,904	49,488,082	7,530,178	18
Montana	23,646,000*	26,036,000*	2,390,000*	10
Nebraska	25,934,168	30,434,600	4,500,432	17 $\frac{1}{2}$
New Mexico	19,145,101*	25,558,710*	6,413,609*	33 $\frac{1}{2}$
North Carolina	48,937,637	59,866,049	10,928,412	22 $\frac{1}{4}$
North Dakota	16,802,443	18,505,956	1,703,513	10
Ohio	74,422,000	91,323,000	16,901,000	22 $\frac{1}{2}$
Oklahoma	45,000,000	54,000,000	9,000,000	20
Oregon	49,535,000	57,439,000	7,904,000	16
South Carolina	11,856,000	12,577,000	721,000	6
South Dakota	16,048,000	16,285,000	237,000	1 $\frac{1}{2}$
Tennessee	29,395,000	34,045,000	4,650,000	16
Texas	114,460,732	129,677,799	15,217,067	13 $\frac{1}{2}$
Utah	16,155,000	20,740,000	4,585,000	28 $\frac{1}{4}$
Vermont	5,988,000	6,612,000	624,000	10 $\frac{1}{2}$
Washington	70,118,000	84,015,000	13,897,000	20
Wisconsin	57,610,743	66,556,691	8,945,948	15 $\frac{1}{4}$
Wyoming	8,353,850	9,414,789	1,060,939	13

\*In the figures for Montana and New Mexico, appropriations for operating expenses and for capital outlays are included, undistinguished and unsegregated.

(OVER)

Table 52. Annual state appropriations for operating expenses of institutions of higher education, for fiscal years 1957-58, 1958-59, and 1959-60, with percentages of increase for 1959-60 over 1957-58.

States	Year 1957-58	Year 1958-59	Year 1959-60	2-year increase	Percentage increase
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
Alaska	\$1,640,000	\$1,640,000	\$2,185,223	\$545,223	33 $\frac{1}{4}$
Arizona	9,366,000	11,041,000	13,742,000	4,376,000	47
California	130,807,000	146,248,000	153,949,000	23,142,000	17 $\frac{1}{2}$
Georgia	18,600,585	21,596,300	24,225,000	5,624,415	30
Kansas	21,342,000	23,642,000	25,136,000	3,794,000	18
Louisiana	35,380,000	37,248,000	43,677,000	7,847,000	22
Michigan	78,131,471	79,048,900	91,979,358	13,847,887	17 $\frac{1}{2}$
Nevada	*	2,411,416	3,636,416	*	51*
New Jersey	18,484,000	20,561,000	22,228,000	3,744,000	20 $\frac{1}{4}$
New York**	40,767,000	44,122,000	48,600,000	7,833,000	19 $\frac{1}{4}$
Rhode Island	3,589,300	4,215,140	5,026,000	1,436,700	40
West Virginia	12,741,605	13,527,821	14,790,714	2,049,109	17

\* The increase here is for one year only, 1958-59 to 1959-60.

\*\*These figures are for the State University of New York only. Sums appropriated to the municipal colleges of the City of New York are not included.

**CAUTIONS AND EXPLANATIONS:** Note that the figures are intended to include only appropriations for operating expenses, and to exclude appropriations for capital outlays, except for the states of Montana and New Mexico, from which reports segregating these two purposes were not obtained.

In the case of land-grant institutions and state universities, effort has been made to include appropriations for operating expenses of university hospitals, agricultural extension services, agricultural experiment stations, branch institutions, and similar affiliated units, though in some states these are customarily reported separately.

Effort has been made to exclude institutional income derived from student fees and other institutional sources, although in some states these sums are required to be transmitted to the state treasury and held there until appropriated by the legislature. In other words "state appropriations" in our tables is intended to mean "state appropriations of tax moneys."

It must be kept in mind that state appropriations of tax funds do not constitute the entire budget income of most institutions of higher education, but only a portion thereof, usually major, but in some instances less than half. Thus a percentage increase in state appropriations does not automatically import the same percentage increase in the budget of an institution or system.

Many other qualifications must be taken into account in order to give accurate meaning to gross comparisons among states. The tabulations mean no more than their captions say they mean, and sometimes not that much. We maintain "a healthy suspicion of our own figures."