

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

SINCE THIRTEENTH
1958 YEAR
Number 151 February 1971 Page 951

GRAPEVINE

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

IN THIS ISSUE

Florida needs to update its state tax system 952

Indiana state universities want improvement of tax support at large main campuses and at regional campuses as well, currently a little faster at the latter 952

Idaho develops elaborate unit cost formulas 953

Iowa Board of Regents oppose any rise in fees 954

Minnesota state colleges have authority to confer doctoral degrees; one or more may develop new-type doctoral programs and eventually be re-named state universities 955

Oklahoma makes modest request for fiscal year 1971-72; may improve its ten-year record as slowest gainer in state tax support of higher education 956

NEW DOCTORAL DEGREES: Diversification, Expansion, Improvement;-- Not Short-sighted Restriction 956

Statement of ownership and circulation of GRAPEVINE is on page 952 (reverse hereof).

FLORIDA. Chancellor Robert B. Mautz of the State University System has recently said: "Higher education is costly, but the benefits to the State far exceed the investment in tax dollars.... There is no way to continue on our present course without a reform in the tax structure of the State."

Profoundly true. GRAPEVINE comments that Florida is one of a small handful of populous states presently having no individual or corporation income taxes-- an important source of revenue used in some forty states.

In fact, Florida's per capita state and local taxes collected in fiscal year 1968-69 are reported as \$330, far below the average among the fifty states, which was \$380.

Source of the quotation above is the weekly Memo of the Florida Board of Regents, Vol. 3, No. 49, December 14, 1970. (107 West Gaines Street, Tallahassee, Florida 32304).

INDIANA. Press reports indicate that the askings for state tax funds for operating expenses for Indiana's four state universities for biennium 1971-73 will be submitted to the budget bureau in two versions, "minimal" and "desirable",

(Continued in next column)

INDIANA (Cont'd from preceding col)

and will aggregate \$452,800 and \$491,700. For Indiana's Bloomington campus, the figures are said to be \$110,200 and \$115,800.

With some reservations as to exact comparability with former years, it would seem that the requests for the Bloomington campus are only about 24 per cent and 31 per cent above actual appropriations for the preceding biennium.

The askings for the whole four-university system, including the four-year and professional school complex at Indianapolis and the several other regional campuses in other towns, appear to be about 48 per cent and 60 per cent above appropriations for the preceding biennium.

These ratios are in general consonance with current trends in some other states; namely, the commuter institutions, especially the urban institutions and the expanding two year institutions, are growing and receiving increased support at considerably faster rates than the main campuses of the major universities.

This imbalance may be tolerable for the present for the sake of hastening the dissemination state-wide of opportunities for education beyond high school; but it must not go so far as to damage the major state university campuses, with their great graduate and professional schools, and their momentum as advancing centers of learning. That would be "blunting the spearhead."

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

IDAHO. The Office of Higher Education has prepared requests for appropriations of state tax funds for operating expenses of higher education for fiscal year 1970-71, on a "formula basis" in which eight levels of instruction are distinguished, and a cost-per-credit-hour assigned to each.

Certain all-campus services not adaptable to the credit-hour formula are figured separately on the basis of experience. There is also an additional set of askings for new programs, necessarily arrived at neither by formula nor by prior experience.

Formulas tend rapidly to become out of date, and to chain the institutions to the past, unless the persons who construct the requests constantly emphasize that the use of the formula is only a beginning step which must be followed and accompanied by decisions based on sources which no formula can provide, and that formulas must be revised at least annually.

Despite these dangers, GRAPEVINE offers here a few inklings of the current Idaho formula:

Assumed costs per credit hour:

Doctoral programs	\$152.64
Above master's level	93.28
Masters' programs	67.84
High-cost upper division	67.84
Medium upper division	42.60
Basic upper division	33.92
High-cost lower division	25.44
Basic lower division	16.96

Library costs are computed separately at four levels:

Doctoral programs	\$17.12
Masters' programs	8.56
Upper division	4.28
Lower division	2.14

Beyond this are several types of costs whose connection with credit-hours are very tenuous. In Idaho some of these are expressed in dol-

lars per student, using head-count rather than any full-time-equivalent because these services are likely to cost about the same per student regardless of the size of his credit-hour load.

Some, but not all, these services as now computed in Idaho, are:

Assumed costs per student:

Administration	\$31.80
News bureau, alumni office, computer, and other	31.80
Student personnel services	49.92
Athletics	13.62

Source of all the foregoing figures is Idaho Higher Education, the small periodical newsletter issued by the Office of Higher Education, 413 Idaho Street, Boise, Idaho 83702. (Vol. III, No. 4, December 1970).

Limitations of Cost Figures

It is unnecessary to warn that in the present condition of cost-accounting in higher education there is no standardized and universally accepted method. This makes extremely hazardous any attempt to compare the present Idaho figures with purportedly similar figures for any institutions or systems outside the state of Idaho.

It is very seriously questionable whether any techniques of cost-accounting can ever be developed that will be sufficiently refined and sufficiently flexible to fit reasonably the actual work of instruction and research, so as to reflect any really meaningful impression of what actually goes on in higher education.

Here let me quote from Harold W. Stoke, an experienced and wise university administrator of this century: "The cost accounting kind of mind will never be happy with higher education."

IOWA. Askings for appropriations of state tax funds for operating expenses of Iowa's three state universities (exclusive of the two institutions for the handicapped which are also governed by the State Board of Regents; and exclusive of state aid to junior colleges, now called area colleges in Iowa) are approved by the Board of Regents for a total of \$223,756,000 for the biennium 1962-63. Compared with the actual appropriations for biennium 1969-71, this represents a gain of about 25 1/2 per cent.

While this would be a modest gain compared with nationwide average expectations, it must be remembered that Iowa has only small gains in population and has no enormous cities. Over the ten years 1960-70, Iowa was one of the nation's slowest gainers in state support of higher education, with a total of only 193 1/2 per cent increase. Only five other states showed lower rates of gain. 1/

For capital outlay for the institutions under its governance, the Board of Regents is requesting direct appropriations of \$21 million (including \$7.7 million to replace tuition income pledged for debt retirement on certain existing and proposed projects), plus authorization to issue \$25 million in bonds. These outlays would be almost identical with the anticipated requirements for biennium 1971-73 in the ten-year capital plan formulated by the Regents in 1969, as required by statute. (Unfortunately the legislature of 1969 did not provide for the requirements of 1969-71. Thus the 1972-73 request would go only about half way toward catching up with the ten year plan).

(Continued in next column)

Tuition Fees Already High

Iowa's Board of Regents notes tuition fees at its universities are at the top among comparable universities in an eleven-state midwestern region, having been raised by 60 per cent last year. These fees are now contributing more than 30 per cent of the Iowa universities' general education budget, whereas ten years ago they contributed 18 per cent. The Board of Regents thinks they can not be raised further without serious restrictive effects on public educational opportunity. 2/

The source of the foregoing is a four-page document, To the People of Iowa: A Brief Report on a Matter of Concern, recently issued by the Iowa State Board of Regents (Grimes State Office Building, Des Moines, Iowa 50319).

Substantial retrogressive steps were taken in 1969 and 1970, especially in such midwestern states as Indiana and Iowa, to reverse the wholesome trend of a century toward free public higher education at all levels. This is restrictive of the expansion and improvement of educational opportunity.

1/ Documented in detail at page 425 in Higher Education in the Fifty States, Danville, Illinois 61832: Interstate Printers and Publishers, Inc., 1970. 453 pp. \$10 postpaid.

2/ See the convincing statement by the Iowa Board of Regents on "The Role of Student Fees in the Finance of Higher Education", at pages 98-101 in Higher Education: Who Pays? Who Gains? Danville, Illinois 61832: Interstate Printers and Publishers, Inc., 1968. 302 pp. \$6.95 postpaid.

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

MINNESOTA. One request before the 1971 legislature will be that of authorizing at least one of the six state colleges to be re-named "state university" after establishing appropriately limited doctoral degree programs.

GRAPEVINE thinks the issue is of tremendous importance in the long range. Therefore we have taken the liberty of borrowing from the Minnesota State College System Newsletter, Vol. 2, No. 10, December 1970 (407 Capitol Square Building, 550 Cedar St., St. Paul, Minnesota 55101) the following reproduction of a recent editorial in the Minneapolis Journal:

We have inserted the underscoring for emphasis, and have added a brief comment on page 956.

University Status for State Colleges?

PROPOSALS for a second public university in Minnesota, in the past, have been looked upon as unwise by many educators and have been rejected as too costly by the Legislature. The idea has prevailed that resources for advanced graduate work should continue to be concentrated solely at the University of Minnesota. The state colleges have been primarily undergraduate institutions, with limited programs leading to masters' degrees; the authority given to them in 1967 to grant doctoral degrees has not been used.

But the trend of converting state colleges to universities has been growing around the country. University designation has no standard definition, but it helps in recruiting faculty, in obtaining government and foundation grants and in general academic prestige. Many faculty members at Minnesota's state colleges now are eager for university status for the institutions—not simply for the label, but also for the expanded academic programs which would be established.

Chancellor G. Theodore Mitau and Vice-Chancellor David Sweet have proposed a procedure for gradually moving the state college system into limited doctoral-level studies. The plan would not duplicate the specialized graduate research leading to Ph.D. degrees at the University of Minnesota. Rather, it would provide programs leading to the "practitioner" degrees, doctor of arts and doctor of education, considered by the state-college officials to be more useful in

the teaching and administrative work done by many of their graduates.

The Mitau-Sweet proposal emphasizes that such programs would not be permitted to weaken the quality of undergraduate education at the colleges. As approved by the State College Board Friday, the changes would be contingent upon separate appropriations and approval by college accreditation agencies and the Minnesota Higher Education Commission.

The board will ask the Legislature for funds to plan a doctoral program for one or more of the colleges by the fall of 1973. Only colleges accredited to grant doctoral degrees should be permitted to become "universities," the board decided, but the group would be designated as "Minnesota State College and University System."

Recently the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, in a report recommending sweeping revision of the academic degree system, urged greater use of the doctor of arts degree. This degree, primarily for the non-research teacher, would combat narrow specialization and would enhance the importance of teaching, the commission said.

The state college officials have designed a proposal for advance graduate work which seems to fit the special character of their institutions. We hope the State College Board, the Higher Education Coordinating Commission and the Legislature will judge it carefully as an innovative and responsible effort to raise both status and academic quality of the state college system.

MINNESOTA (Continued from page 955)

Expansion and Improvement:
Not Fearsome Restriction

The matter of new doctoral programs and of the upgrading of the "developing universities" is a very live issue in many states, as well as in Minnesota.

Some of the private universities are announcing cutbacks in their doctoral programs. Some educators in the private sector are predicting oversupplies of holders of doctoral degrees, especially in the humanities and social sciences.

Their manipulations of statistics rest on an apparent assumption that "doctoral degree" will always continue to mean only the conventional research-oriented Ph.D., and that there will be no need or demand for increasing numbers of persons broadly educated up to the doctoral level. Thus they would foreclose the greatest opportunity in history to improve the teaching in colleges and schools at all levels, and to elevate the general standard of education of the whole population.

This kind of shortsightedness has been repeatedly exposed within the past half century. In the late 1930's Walter M. Kotschnig's warning that too many Ph.D.'s would bring on a Hitlerian revolution was soon exploded. In the 40's Seymour E. Harris's warning of too many bachelors' degrees was soon proved wrong, and he now admits he was mistaken (much to his credit). At least twice the planners of engineering education have made huge blunders, presenting us at one time with a painful oversupply, and a few years later with the most acute shortage of engineers in history. The medical doctors have maintained such an undersupply that the indices of individual and public health in this country now fall below those of half a dozen other nations.

Legislators and governors

(Continued in next column)

(Continued from preceding column)
will recognize that the policy for doctoral-level programs should be full speed ahead.

OKLAHOMA. Total requests for appropriations of state tax funds for annual operating expenses for fiscal year 1971-72 for public higher education in Oklahoma are \$99,934,204.

This is for the system of 20 state universities and colleges and their seven appended agencies of instruction, research, and public service. Actual appropriations for the current fiscal year 1970-71 were \$69,467,133; and for fiscal year 1969-70, two years ago, \$59,552,133.

Thus the present request represents an increase of slightly more than 34 per cent over actual appropriations two years earlier-- a modest asking in view of the rate of growth of tax-supported higher education in the fifty states.

Oklahoma's askings are arrived at through highly regimented methods involving the use of complicated formulas set forth in some detail in a 44-page document, Operating Budget Needs of the Oklahoma State System of Higher Education for the 1971-72 Fiscal Year (Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education, State Capitol, Oklahoma City, January 1971).

For rigid "formula financing" Oklahoma's scheme is something of a model; but in the background of the picture is the fact that over the decade 1960-1970 Oklahoma came out in fiftieth place among all the states, with the lowest ten-year rate of gain in state tax support of higher education.

Moreover, insofar as such matters can be appraised by such measures as average faculty salaries, student-faculty ratios, and the like, Oklahoma's institutions are in general inferior to those of adjacent states, below average among the 16 states of the South, and well below nationwide norms.