

# GRAPEVINE

APRIL 1972

M. M. Chambers  
Department of Educational Administration  
Illinois State University, Normal, Illinois 61761

SINCE 1958  
Number 165

FOURTEENTH YEAR  
Page 1047

----- April 1972 -----

GRAPEVINE  
\* \* \* \* \*

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

## IN THIS ISSUE

<u>Fifteen states</u> have appropriated more than \$1 1/2 billion for annual operating expenses of higher education for fiscal year 1972-73, making weighted average two-year gain of more than 17 1/2 per cent . . . . .	1048
<u>New Mexico</u> appropriates \$51 million, for gain of 22 1/2 % . . . . .	1049
<u>South Dakota</u> appropriates \$22 3/4 million . . . . .	1049
Ranking of the fifty states according to different measures . . . . .	1050
Combined state and local appropriations per \$1,000 of per capita personal income, 1970-71 . . . . .	1050
Percentage of student enrollment in public institutions to total population, 1970-1971 . . . . .	1051
Percentage of private institution enrollment to total enrollment, 1970-71 . . . . .	1051
Factors affecting per capita tax support of operating expenses of higher education in different states: Excerpts from statement by the Council on Higher Education of the State of Washington . . . . .	1052

\* \* \* \* \*

"It is apparent that the higher educational system in this country performs a wide range of functions, which, collectively, have enormous economic and social value. It is also obvious... that public expenditure on higher education is a national bargain, and not the extravagance many people believe it to be."

-- Alan Pifer, president of the Carnegie Corporation of New York

APPROPRIATIONS BY FIFTEEN STATES FOR FISCAL YEAR 1972-73

To provide a starting base for our reports for the fifty states during fiscal year 1972-73, we offer reports from fifteen states in three groupings:

(1) Eight states appear to have made appropriations in 1971 for the ensuing biennium, but by separate fiscal years. These are Arkansas, Hawaii, Indiana, Iowa, Minnesota, Montana, Ohio, and Oregon. Their figures are shown in Table 39, GRAPEVINE page 1039, and need not be repeated in detail here.

(2) Five states reported appropriations in 1971 for the ensuing biennium, undivided by fiscal years. We compare one-half the biennial appropriation with one-half that of the immediately preceding biennium, and get a result roughly, though perhaps not precisely, equivalent to what would be the result obtained by comparing fiscal year 1972-73 with fiscal year 1970-71 if figures for the separate fiscal years were in hand. These five states are New Hampshire, North Carolina, North Dakota, Washington, and Wyoming. Their figures are set forth here in Table 44, collectively.

(3) Two states have reported appropriations in 1972 for fiscal year 1972-73. They are New Mexico and South Dakota, and are shown here in Table 44, separately and in detail.

Table 44. Appropriations of state tax funds for operating expenses of higher education for fiscal year 1972-73 by fifteen states, as of March 1972, in thousands of dollars.

States	Fiscal year 1970-71	Fiscal year 1971-72	Fiscal year 1972-73	2-year gain	% gain
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
Eight states previously reported - 8 states	\$914,860	\$1,025,147	\$1,093,882	\$179,022	19 1/2
Five states reported in group (2) - 5 states	415,693	472,203	472,203	56,510	13 1/2
Two states reported in group (3) - New Mexico	41,639	45,307	50,968	9,329	22 1/2
South Dakota	21,202	21,844	22,736	1,534	7 1/4
Totals	1,393,394	1,564,501	1,639,789	246,395	-
15 states - weighted average two-year gain				-	17 1/2

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.

Address communications to M. M. Chambers, Department of Educational Administration, Illinois State University, Normal, Illinois 61761.

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

NEW MEXICO. Appropriations of state tax funds for operating expenses of higher education, fiscal year 1972-73:

Table 45. State tax-fund appropriations for operating expenses of higher education, in New Mexico, fiscal year 1972-73 in thousands of dollars.

Institutions (1)	Sums appropriated (2)
U of New Mexico	\$20,578
Medical School	2,500
Student Exchange*	230
Gallup Branch**	70
Los Alamos Branch**	34
Subtotal, U of N M -	\$23,412
New Mexico State U	11,198
Ag Exper Station	1,600
Ag Exten Serv	1,280
State Dept of Agriculture	270
San Juan Branch***	181
Alamogordo Branch**	140
Carlsbad Branch**	117
Grants Branch**	90
Subtotal, N M St U -	\$14,876
Eastern New Mexico U	4,317
Roswell Branch***	466
Clovis Branch***	80
Subtotal, E N M U -	\$4,863
N M Inst of Mining & Tech	1,640
State Bureau of Mines	688
Subtotal, N M I M T -	\$2,328
New Mexico Highlands U	2,955
Western New Mexico	1,752
New Mexico Military Inst+	387
Board of Ednl Finance	130
WICHE - General dues	15
State aid to junior colleges	250
Total	50,968

- \* Includes WICHE student exchange and a supplementary dental student exchange program.
- \*\* Two-year academic program.
- \*\*\* Two-year academic program and vocational-technical program of both college level and less than college level.
- + Two-fifths of students are at college level; three-fifths in grades 10-12. Appropriation is for support of entire program.

NEW MEXICO (Contd fr precedng column)

The total for fiscal year 1972-73 appears to be a gain of 22 1/2 per cent over the comparable figure for fiscal year 1970-71, two years earlier.

SOUTH DAKOTA. Appropriations of state tax funds for operating expenses of higher education, fiscal year 1972-73:

Table 46. State tax-fund appropriations for operating expenses of higher education in South Dakota, fiscal year 1972-73, in thousands of dollars.

Institutions (1)	Sums appropriated (2)
U of South Dakota	\$ 6,867
Medical School	870
Springfield Branch*	1,651
Subtotal, USD -	\$9,388
South Dakota State U	8,326
Ag Experiment Sta	2,302
Co-op Extension Serv	1,498
Remote Sensing Institute	75
Subtotal, SDSU -	\$12,202
S D Sch of Mines and Tech	2,912
State colleges -	
Northern State College	3,402
Black Hills State College	2,491
Dakota State College	1,613
Regents of Education	189
For allocation**	1,083
Health professions loans***	305
Dental school contracts+	150
LESS estimated student fees++	-11,000
NET total	22,736

- \* Formerly Southern State College; now a branch of the U of South Dakota.
- \*\* Chiefly \$812,700 for plant maintenance and \$141,000 for scholarships and loans.
- \*\*\* Direct to students to enroll in health professions schools out-of-state.
- + Paid to out-of-state dental schools to guarantee places for South Dakota students.
- ++ Deposited in the state General Fund and later included in the legislative appropriations to the institutions.

Ranking of the Fifty States According to Different Measures

GRAPEVINE's figures for fiscal year 1971-72 have been employed by the National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges, and also by the weekly Chronicle of Higher Education, to compute a ranking of the fifty states according to the amounts of state tax funds per citizen appropriated for annual operating expenses of higher education.

Interested persons from various states have commented that any single ranking of that kind has severe limitations as a mirror of the truth; and that when it is exhibited it should be in conjunction with some explanation of its limitations, and also in conjunction with one or more other rankings of the states bearing on the adequacy of their tax support of higher education.

Accordingly GRAPEVINE offers in this issue three additional rankings of the fifty states, all of which were prepared by the Council on Higher Education of the State of Washington, 1020 East Fifth, St., Olympia, Washington 98504:

(1) Combined state and local appropriations per \$1,000 per capita personal income;

(2) Percentage of student enrollment in public institutions to total population of the state;

(3) Percentage of private institution enrollment to total enrollment.

After exhibiting those three tabulations on pages 1050 and 1051, we conclude on page 1052 with excerpts from a statement by the Council on Higher Education of the State of Washington regarding the situation in that state, and concerning some of the limitations of state rankings in general. We are grateful for these contributions.

GRAPEVINE does not circulate appropriations of state tax funds per student, believing that the great variations in costs of programs for students at different levels and in different types of instruction renders statewide averages unsuitable for interstate comparisons.

Table 47. Combined State and Local Appropriations Per \$1000 of Per Capita Personal Income 1970-1971.

State	Appropriations Per \$1000 Income
1. Mississippi	\$20.19
2. Wisconsin	19.15
3. Wyoming	18.87
4. Arizona	18.12
5. Hawaii	17.91
6. North Dakota	15.39
7. Idaho	15.25
8. Alaska	14.90
9. California	14.67
10. Utah	14.33
11. New Mexico	14.29
12. <u>Washington</u>	<u>14.09</u>
13. Colorado	14.01
14. North Carolina	13.81
15. Oregon	13.70
16. Montana	13.65
17. Kentucky	13.59
18. West Virginia	13.10
19. Louisiana	12.84
20. Kansas	11.94
21. Michigan	11.91
22. Illinois	11.83
23. Maryland	11.64
24. New York	11.57
25. Iowa	11.40
26. Minnesota	11.15
27. Texas	11.08
28. Georgia	10.85
29. Alabama	10.82
30. Florida	10.49
31. South Dakota	10.40
32. Indiana	10.20
33. Tennessee	10.08
34. South Carolina	10.02
35. Vermont	9.99
36. Missouri	9.78
37. Delaware	9.67
38. Arkansas	9.66
39. Maine	9.51
40. Nebraska	9.42
41. Virginia	9.37
42. Oklahoma	9.30
43. Ohio	8.45
44. Rhode Island	8.43
45. Nevada	8.22
46. Pennsylvania	7.79
47. Connecticut	7.50
48. New Jersey	6.53
49. Massachusetts	5.25
50. New Hampshire	4.75
<u>Average</u>	<u>11.34</u>

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

Table 48. Percentage of Student Enrollment in Public Institutions to Total Population 1970-1971.

<u>State</u>	<u>Percent Enrolled</u>
1. North Dakota	4.42
2. Arizona	4.35
3. Montana	4.12
4. Colorado	4.03
5. Utah	3.95
6. Hawaii	3.89
7. Wyoming	3.87
8. Oregon	3.84
9. California	3.83
10. <u>Washington</u>	<u>3.70</u>
11. Kansas	3.38
12. New Mexico	3.31
13. Wisconsin	3.17
14. Idaho	3.15
15. South Dakota	3.15
16. Oklahoma	3.06
17. Michigan	2.94
18. Nebraska	2.84
19. Minnesota	2.83
20. Delaware	2.73
21. Texas	2.69
22. Mississippi	2.61
23. West Virginia	2.52
24. Louisiana	2.42
25. Missouri	2.30
26. Vermont	2.30
27. Maryland	2.27
28. Rhode Island	2.24
29. Florida	2.19
30. Iowa	2.18
31. Illinois	2.17
32. Alabama	2.16
33. Nevada	2.15
34. Indiana	2.11
35. North Carolina	2.10
36. Ohio	2.10
37. Tennessee	2.09
38. Virginia	2.08
39. Arkansas	2.07
40. Kentucky	1.99
41. New Hampshire	1.90
42. Alaska	1.88
43. Georgia	1.88
44. Connecticut	1.85
45. Maine	1.83
46. New York	1.81
47. South Carolina	1.61
48. Pennsylvania	1.55
49. Massachusetts	1.55
50. New Jersey	1.28
<u>Average</u>	<u>2.42</u>

Table 49. Percentage of Private Institution Enrollment to Total Enrollment 1970-1971.

<u>State</u>	<u>Percent Private Enrollment</u>
1. Massachusetts	63.6
2. Rhode Island	58.7
3. Vermont	47.2
4. New York	45.3
5. Pennsylvania	44.6
6. Connecticut	41.6
7. Utah	38.9
8. Iowa	26.8
9. New Jersey	36.0
10. South Carolina	33.8
11. Maine	32.6
12. Illinois	31.2
13. North Carolina	30.9
14. Indiana	30.6
15. Tennessee	29.8
16. Missouri	28.2
17. New Hampshire	27.5
18. Ohio	26.1
19. Nebraska	24.8
20. Idaho	23.9
21. South Dakota	23.0
22. Kentucky	22.9
23. Virginia	21.8
24. Maryland	21.5
25. Georgia	21.3
26. Florida	20.9
27. Delaware	19.6
28. West Virginia	18.9
29. Texas	17.8
30. Alaska	17.1
31. Alabama	16.6
32. Arkansas	16.5
33. Wisconsin	16.4
34. Louisiana	15.7
35. Oklahoma	15.6
36. Kansas	15.2
37. Michigan	14.3
38. Oregon	13.4
39. Minnesota	13.2
40. Colorado	12.9
41. <u>Washington</u>	<u>12.4</u>
42. California	12.1
43. Mississippi	12.0
44. Hawaii	9.6
45. Montana	7.8
46. New Mexico	7.3
47. North Dakota	4.3
48. Arizona	2.3
49. Nevada	.5
50. Wyoming	---
<u>Average</u>	<u>26.01</u>

Excerpts from statement by the Council on Higher Education of the State of Washington:

Factors Affecting Per Capita Tax Support of Operating Expenses of Higher Education in Different States

First, per capita comparisons of higher education costs overlook the proportion of the population enrolled in the institutions. Washington's rate of enrollment in public higher education is one and one half times the national average. Only nine other states have a higher proportion of their population enrolled in institutions of higher learning.

Secondly, Washington's private colleges account for only 12 percent of total higher education enrollments as compared to a national average of 26 percent. Forty states have a higher proportion of private college enrollments. This dependence on public higher education places a heavy burden on the taxpayer of this state since the vast majority of this state's students attend public institutions.

Third, per capita comparisons of state appropriations alone compound the problem. Tax support for higher education in Washington comes solely from state sources. In over half of the states, local taxing districts provide a substantial portion of community college revenues and in some cases support municipal universities. When per capita comparisons exclude local support, Washington receives an artificially high ranking.

Finally, despite the implementation of large tuition and fee increases last year, charges to students in Washington are low relative to other states. In addition, a large portion of all tuition charges in this state are allocated to capital improvement projects. For example, fifty percent of the community college fees are earmarked for construction projects. The combined effect of low fees plus earmarking to capital improvement projects means that State appropriations must bear the major portion of higher education operating support. This again leads to invalid assumptions about public higher education support in Washington when viewed solely from the viewpoint of per capita state tax expenditures for operational programs.