Grapevine

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

In this issue

Seven states appropriate total of over $1 billion for operating expenses of higher education for fiscal year 1975-76. Average 2-year weighted gain is 30 per cent...

Two-year average weighted gains for the seven states:

Kentucky.............. 25 per cent.......
Virginia.............. 34 per cent.......
Wyoming.............. 44 per cent.......
Hawaii.............. 41 per cent.......
Maryland.............. 20 per cent.......
Mississippi........... 32 per cent.......
Utah.............. 32 per cent.......

Labor organizations favor low or zero tuition fees...

Twenty-six national organizations of many types form coalition for lower tuition fees...

"History has supported the axiom that public education is the most productive long-term investment that Texas can make in its future well-being. Today we should act to strengthen that investment."

-- Governor Dolph Briscoe, addressing the legislature and the people of Texas.

Statement of ownership and circulation of Grapevine is on page 1290 (reverse hereof).
Table 33. SEVEN STATES REPORT WEIGHTED AVERAGE TWO-YEAR GAINS OF THIRTY PER
CENT FOR FISCAL YEAR 1975-76

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>States</th>
<th>Year 1965-66</th>
<th>Year 1973-74</th>
<th>Year 1975-76</th>
<th>2-yr gain per cent</th>
<th>10-yr gain per cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>(6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three states previously reported on page 1284 of GRAPEVINE (April 1975)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three states</td>
<td>99,108</td>
<td>378,204</td>
<td>496,638</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>401</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaii</td>
<td>17,006</td>
<td>57,295</td>
<td>83,255</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>48,275</td>
<td>172,826</td>
<td>207,451</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td>25,931</td>
<td>112,868</td>
<td>149,363</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>476</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah</td>
<td>24,891</td>
<td>66,373</td>
<td>87,848</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>215,211</td>
<td>787,566</td>
<td>1,024,555</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>376</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Weighted average percentages of gain

Jacob O. Stampen, Senior Research Associate for Policy Analysis for the American Association of State Colleges and Universities (One Dupont Circle-Suite 700, Washington, D. C. 20036) has studied current conditions in the states and classified them in an interesting manner. For example, with reference to the four states named in Table 33 above, he says:

Hawaii "has a budget surplus and low unemployment;" and its strategy is "to improve services and control growth."

Maryland "has a budget surplus but also high unemployment." Therefore the strategy is to "invest surplus in short-term projects, such as capital construction and highway expansion, to create jobs and stimulate the economy."

Mississippi "has a budget surplus and low unemployment," and the strategy is to "improve services and control growth."

Utah "has a budget surplus but also high unemployment," with strategy the same as indicated for Maryland, above.

We must add that the quoted statements do not apply to single states alone, but to groups of states within which the named states are classified.

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.
HAWAII. Appropriations of state tax funds for operating expenses of higher education, fiscal year 1975-76:

Table 34. State tax-fund appropriations for operating expenses of higher education in Hawaii, fiscal year 1975-76, in thousands of dollars.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institutions</th>
<th>Sums Appropriated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U of Hawaii*</td>
<td>$86,348</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific supplemental appropriation</td>
<td>1,961</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WICHE</td>
<td>287</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student loan fund</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collective bargaining</td>
<td>10,227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less tuition and other U of</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaii generated revenues</td>
<td>-15,582</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$83,255</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Includes 1 university campus, 2 four-year colleges, 7 two-year community colleges and Leahi Hospital.

The figures are tentative and may be slightly changed if the Governor vetoes any items. They are slightly understated because funds for certain fringe benefits such as retirement contribution, health and medical and social security contributions are intergovernmental transfers and cannot be computed at the beginning of the fiscal year.

The total for fiscal year 1975-76 appears to be a gain of 41 per cent over the comparable figure two years earlier.

Addressing the legislature early in 1975, Governor Ariyoshi of Hawaii said:

"The University of Hawaii was particularly handicapped in its programs during the period of fiscal restraints. I am pleased to report that, with your support for our budget proposals, the University will be back 'on track' during the forthcoming biennium."

MARYLAND. Appropriations of state tax funds for operating expenses of higher education, fiscal year 1975-76:

Table 35. State tax-fund appropriations for operating expenses of higher education in Maryland, fiscal year 1975-76, in thousands of dollars.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institutions</th>
<th>Sums Appropriated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Maryland</td>
<td>$119,323</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Incl medical units, ag exp sta, ag exten serv and branch campuses)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State colleges -</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Towson</td>
<td>12,592</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morgan</td>
<td>8,394</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frostburg</td>
<td>5,075</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowie</td>
<td>4,770</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coppin</td>
<td>4,183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salisbury</td>
<td>3,656</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U of Baltimore</td>
<td>2,826</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Mary's Coll of Md</td>
<td>2,333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trustees of St colls</td>
<td>2,342</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal, s c's - $46,171</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State scholarships</td>
<td>4,321</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher Edn Loan Corp</td>
<td>527</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer center</td>
<td>984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council of Higher Edn</td>
<td>542</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aid to private higher edn</td>
<td>4,338</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State aid for comm colls</td>
<td>30,988</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Board for comm colls</td>
<td>257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$207,451</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The total for fiscal year 1975-76 appears to be a gain of 20 per cent over the comparable figure two years earlier.

A student of the current situation in the states has classified Maryland as "having a budget surplus but also high unemployment"; and "a tendency to invest surplus in short-term projects such as capital construction and highway expansion, to create jobs and stimulate the economy." This may in part account for the relatively low rate of two-year increase.
MISSISSIPPI. Appropriations of state tax funds for operating expenses of higher education, fiscal year 1975-76:

Table 36. State tax-fund appropriations for operating expenses of higher education in Mississippi, fiscal year 1975-76, in thousands of dollars.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institutions</th>
<th>Sums appropriated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U of Mississippi</td>
<td>$13,107*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching hospital</td>
<td>8,766</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Medicine</td>
<td>8,825</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Dentistry</td>
<td>1,060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Nursing</td>
<td>1,051</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pharmaceutical research</td>
<td>617</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal, U Miss - $33,427</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi State U</td>
<td>15,644*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experiment stations</td>
<td>6,346</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coop extension service</td>
<td>5,474</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coll of Veterinary Medicine</td>
<td>814</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forest products lab</td>
<td>415</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State chemical lab</td>
<td>526</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal, Miss St U - $29,219</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U of Southern Mississippi</td>
<td>14,005*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Nursing</td>
<td>1,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cont ed nursing</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal, U of S - $15,324</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jackson State University</td>
<td>8,085*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delta State University</td>
<td>4,675*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alcorn State University</td>
<td>3,241*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miss Valley State University</td>
<td>3,196*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi U for Women</td>
<td>3,881*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Nursing</td>
<td>1,077</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal, MUW - $4,958</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational education</td>
<td>18,918</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State aid to junior colleges</td>
<td>17,560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gulf Coast Research Lab**</td>
<td>4,366*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research &amp; Development Center***</td>
<td>3,092</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing ed aid program</td>
<td>1,245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SREB program</td>
<td>991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education &amp; Research Center</td>
<td>489</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State scholarship program</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board of Trustees office</td>
<td>302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical ed loan program</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>$149,363</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Appropriated to the Board of Trustees for allocation to the eight universities and the Gulf Coast Research Lab.

**A non-degree granting institution.

***A non-degree granting institution with its program intimately related to those of the state institutions.

The total for fiscal year 1975-76 appears to be a gain of 32 per cent over the comparable figure two years earlier.

UTAH. Appropriations of state tax funds for operating expenses of higher education, fiscal year 1975-76:

Table 37. State tax-fund appropriations for operating expenses of higher education in Utah, fiscal year 1975-76, in thousands of dollars.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institutions</th>
<th>Sums appropriated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Utah</td>
<td>$34,297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Medicine</td>
<td>3,736</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Hospital</td>
<td>1,029</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Development Ctr</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research support</td>
<td>969</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special enterprises*</td>
<td>583</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal, U of U - $40,717</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah State University</td>
<td>15,901</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ag exper station</td>
<td>1,931</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooperative extension</td>
<td>1,537</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research support</td>
<td>267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecology Center</td>
<td>247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Research Lab</td>
<td>431</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special enterprises**</td>
<td>380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal, USU - $20,694</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Colleges</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weber State College</td>
<td>10,431</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah Tech Coll, Salt Lake</td>
<td>3,863</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Utah State Coll</td>
<td>3,241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah Tech Coll, Provo</td>
<td>2,440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dixie College</td>
<td>1,611</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snow College</td>
<td>1,488</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coll of Eastern Utah</td>
<td>1,251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal, S C's - $24,325</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Agency</td>
<td>513</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statewide television</td>
<td>631</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooperative nursing</td>
<td>422</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WICHE</td>
<td>281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer services</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student loans</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic awareness</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>$87,848</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Includes: educationally disadvantaged, $423,300; coal research, $24,200; seismograph stations, $87,000; Museum of Natural History, $48,500.

** Includes: educationally disadvantaged, $64,000; Southeastern Utah Continuing Education Center, $80,900; Uintah Basin Continuing Education Center, $186,700; Man and His Bread Museum, $48,500.

The total for fiscal year 1975-76 appears to be a gain of 32 per cent over the comparable figure for two years earlier.
LABOR ORGANIZATIONS HAVE MUCH TO SAY FOR LOW OR ZERO TUITION FEES IN HIGHER EDUCATION

Increasing proportions of students in public universities and colleges are themselves wage-earners, or the sons and daughters of working people with low or middle incomes. It is not surprising that wage-earners "who know which side their bread is buttered on" are heavily in favor of reduced tuition fees.

AFL-CIO BACKS LOW TUITION

The Executive Council of the AFL-CIO has adopted a statement strongly supportive of the low tuition concept, and the institutional aid necessary to maintain low tuition. The text of the statement adopted during the Executive Council's meeting in Bal Harbour, Florida in February follows:

The AFL-CIO has consistently supported the principle of low tuition in higher education and free tuition at least through the junior college level. Events have unfortunately been moving in the opposite direction. Mounting costs and diminishing federal, state, and private financial support have caused college tuition to rise sharply. Increasing numbers of young people are finding themselves priced out of the colleges and universities. It is a vicious cycle. As enrollments fall short of expectations, per student costs increase and a new wave of tuition increases follows, followed by a further decrease in enrollments.

The AFL-CIO has joined in a renewed campaign for low tuition with a number of educational organizations including the American Association of State Colleges and Universities, the National Association of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges, and the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges. The campaign must be carried to the federal government and to the state legislatures.

To the families of American workers, tuition costs are a matter of critical importance. Well-to-do students can afford the costs and graduate free of debt, while the widening gap between available student aid and high tuition costs denies access to higher education to the sons and daughters of low and middle-income families.

With the passage of the Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963 and the Higher Education Act of 1965, the federal government accepted a share of the responsibility for meeting the costs of higher education, but under the Nixon Administration most of these programs died for lack of funding. Institutional grants have been all but terminated. Even the annual grants to the land-grant colleges which began during the presidency of Lincoln were ended by the Nixon Administration.

What federal funds have been available for higher education have been increasingly limited to student aid, largely restricted to students from low-income families. In his 1976 budget, President Ford proposes to reduce even this by $133,000,000 despite increasing tuition.

Higher education is an investment in human resources. The AFL-CIO urges the federal and state governments to establish funding levels high enough to insure the future stability of colleges and universities and to keep tuition low enough so that the costs of education are not shifted to students and families that cannot afford the burden.
Twenty-six organizations* representing public colleges, teachers, veterans, women, labor groups, and minority groups have formed a National Coalition for Lower Tuition in Higher Education.

The Coalition's statement said that the groups "join in support of the historic principle of low or no tuition at universities, colleges, and community colleges in the United States. We also endorse adequate financial support for higher education in order to make low tuition possible."

The statement continued, "We believe that insuring equal access to higher education is a matter of the highest priority for all Americans. We have joined to reverse the alarming trend to higher tuition levels, and to oppose proposals which would force most students to take out expensive, long-term loans to pay for their education."

The participating organizations have pledged to take such steps as the following as well as to ask other interested groups and individuals to do the same:

1. Give the campaign for lower tuition or no tuition high priority in each organization.
2. Publicize widely these views through publications and meetings of the organizations.
3. Inform the leaders of state governments--governors, legislators, candidates, members of governing boards and special study commissions--of their concerns about low tuition.
4. Inform members of Congress and federal officials. Urge them to review all present and proposed federal higher education programs in terms of their effect on tuition policies.

The statement concludes: "All Americans have a stake in lower tuition. The progress of our nation as a whole depends on a growing pool of well-educated and productive men and women.

In Union There Is Strength

The success of the coalition will lie in how well it is able to accomplish steps three and four above. Issuing a statement of joint concern is only a prelude to the real task of convincing the policy-makers of how sincere the groups are in their campaign for low or no tuition.

Over the past few decades the states' support for institutions of higher education has continued to grow, but so have the reports of commissions and committees which advocate that students (or parents of students) should bear the entire cost of their education and that a complicated scheme of student loans should be established. There are indications, however, that the "high-water mark" for student fees may have been reached.

The coalition does not have elected officers, but the American Association of State Colleges and Universities and some other associations are providing a staff function. It is hoped that the united voice will be directed toward the state and national legislatures and will be effective enough to be heard.

* A. Philip Randolph Institute, American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, American Association of State Colleges and Universities, American Association of University Professors, American Association of University Women, AFL-CIO, American Federation of Teachers, Americans for Indian Opportunity, Association of Community College Trustees, City University of New York, Coalition of Labor Union Women, Communications Workers of America, El Congreso Nacional de Asuntos Colegiales, International Brotherhood of Teamsters, International Ladies Garment Workers, National Association of Concerned Veterans, National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges, National Education Association, National Farmers Union, National Student Association, National Student Lobby, Operating Engineers Dual Enrollment Program, Secretariat for the Spanish-Speaking of the National Conference of Catholic Bishops-U.S. Catholic Conference, Student National Education Association, United Auto Workers International, and Women's Equity Action League.

Not copyrighted. If you quote or paraphrase, please credit the source in appropriate manner. M. M. Chambers, Illinois State University, Normal, Illinois 61761