

M. M. Chambers, U.H.S. 4200-G
Center for the Study of Higher Education
The University of Michigan
Ann Arbor, Michigan

Number 25

JANUARY 1961

Page 161

GRAPEVINE

* * * * *

A newsletter on state tax legislation; state appropriations for universities, colleges, and junior colleges; state support of public school systems; legislation affecting education at any level. There is no charge for GRAPEVINE, but recipients are asked to send occasional timely newsnotes regarding pertinent events in their respective states.

IN THIS ISSUE

Georgia.....161	Massachusetts....166
Illinois.....161-162	Minnesota.....166-167
Iowa.....163-165	New York.....167
Kansas.....165-166	Washington.....167-168

With bright new 1961 GRAPEVINE begins its third year. As an infant should, GRAPEVINE is growing rapidly in capacity for service, thanks to the alertness of many key persons in 50 states.

This is the season of survey reports to governors and legislatures. In this issue you will find reviews (with gloves off) of important reports in Iowa, Kansas, and Washington. You will also find timely newsnotes from several other commonwealths, from New England to the Pacific, and from Georgia to Minnesota, as indicated above. The forthcoming sessions of 47 state legislatures offer an exciting prospect.

* * * * *

GEORGIA. Four constitutional amendments having bearings on education were on the ballot November 8, 1960. Two were approved: (1) to increase 15-mill limitation on tax levies by counties for support of education to 20 mills; and (2) to require an appropriation by the legislature for payment of rentals under leases of the State School Building Authority and the University System Building Authority.

Two were defeated; (1) to increase the membership of the State Board of

Education from 10 to 15 members; and (2) to make the Commissioner of Agriculture a member *ex officio* of the Board of Regents of the University System of Georgia.

ILLINOIS. The State Commission of Higher Education, a body of 9 laymen (prominent citizens) set up by statute in 1957 to make studies and recommendations regarding the biennial budgets of the 6 state institutions, and in general about the development of higher educational facilities in (Continued on page 162).

ILLINOIS (Continued from page 161)

The state, was originally intended to be a permanent body. Its office is at 160 North La Salle St., Chicago 1. Robert Johns served as full-time Director until September 1960, when he accepted a vice presidency at the University of Miami (Florida) after which he served only a minor fraction of his time. Harry S. Manley is Deputy Director.

The legislature of 1959 directed the Commission to produce, by April 1961, a "plan for unified administration" of state-supported higher education in Illinois. Under this mandate, the Commission has recently released a 1,500-word draft of a proposed statute, and an 1,800-word statement concerning its recommendations.

The proposed statute would create a Board of Higher Education of 11 members appointed by the governor and senate for overlapping terms of 6 years. Tenure would be limited to 2 terms (12 years), and no member of the governing board of any state institution would be eligible until after 1967.

A provision that no more than one member shall have been an undergraduate, and no more than two members shall have been a graduate student in any one institution may at first blush seem innocuous, but on second glance would seem almost to guarantee that the University of Illinois and Southern Illinois University would be under-represented in proportion to their size and importance. So-called "equity" among several institutions seems always to operate to the disadvantage of the one or two principal state universities.

The proposed board would be a planning agency, with power to veto any and all plans of the institutions. It would be an agency of budget review, with authority to revise institutional budgets and recommend a total budget to the legislature.

One section prohibits any representative of any of the universities to have any official relations with any committee of the legislature except by or through the new board. In effect, it seems that when the board presented its case in a committee hearing, adversary witnesses would be excluded. This will bear some careful thought.

In its statement, the Commission states briefly but clearly four choices which faced it. It could have recommended (1) Abolition of all existing institutional governing boards, to be supplanted by one governing board for all the institutions; (2) continuing the existing governmental boards, but with their powers sharply clipped by a new superimposed board in command of planning and budgeting; (3) continuing the present structure exactly as it is, with a non-coercive superimposed commission; or (4) devising and encouraging a system of wholly voluntary inter-institutional liaison and statewide coordination.

The Commission wisely rejected No. 1, but veered close to that end of the spectrum by recommending No. 2, and rejecting Nos. 3 and 4 out of hand. This is a vote of no confidence in non-coercive methods. One may wonder whether the Commission is sufficiently familiar with the merits of systems that are either non-coercive or wholly voluntary, as demonstrated in California, Michigan, and Minnesota, each of which is far famed for one of the world's most distinguished universities as well as for a superior system of lesser state institutions. Voluntary coordination is also a success in Indiana and Ohio, as well as in Washington and Colorado. There are many who are fearful of the ultimate results of locking a major state university (Continued on page 163)

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, The University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Mich.

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

ILLINOIS (Continued from page 162)
into a tight statewide bureaucracy. It may be no accident or coincidence that the state universities of California, Michigan, and Minnesota have demonstrated an esprit unexcelled anywhere, a devotion to excellence that is unsurpassed, and accomplishments in science and the humanities that are virtually without parallel. These have substantial endowment funds and large fractions of their plant assets derived from non-tax sources, and have long been accorded a large measure of autonomy -- never regarded as just another branch of another state department, but as unique "developmental arms of the state" meriting freedom in their own planning. Can this idea be foreign to Illinois?

IOWA. Pursuant to the act of 1959 directing the Legislative Research Bureau to study the needs for public and private higher education, and appropriating \$25,000 for the purpose, Raymond Gibson, professor of higher education at Indiana University, was employed to conduct the study. His summary report, Resources and Needs for Higher Education in Iowa, is a 68-page pamphlet well illustrated with some 60 graphs and charts in color.

The document boils down to 30 specific recommendations, of which 10 are addressed to the legislature, 14 to the boards, administrators and faculties in colleges and universities, and 6 to the State Department of Public Instruction.

Regarding community colleges, the report urges that the legislature adopt a plan of organization and support, including authorization for regional colleges in locations where at least 500 students appear to be available. (This is reminiscent of Iowa's bumpily unhappy experience in recent decades, when at times too many junior colleges were hastily begun on a too-skimpy population and financial base, and hence could not succeed). A significant added feature of the recommendation is that the state should pay at least half the costs of the community colleges, for capital outlays as well as for annual operations.

institutions of higher education. One would relieve the State Board of Regents of responsibility for the State Schools for the Blind and Deaf and the State Sanatorium. This can be unreservedly praised. The special institutions just named are stepchildren of the Board of Regents, but require more than a fair share of its time, which should be devoted exclusively to the 3 major institutions of higher education.

Another would remove the limitation on the number of alumni of each state institution who may serve on the Board of Regents (Present law limits this to one alumnus of each of the 3 institutions). The best current theory is that the appointing power should be allowed wide discretion in selecting appointees without restrictions of this kind.

Outstanding is the explicit recommendation that the legislature should appropriate sufficient funds to raise the salaries of professors by an average of \$3,000; those of associate professors by \$2,000, and those of lower ranks by \$1,000 for the year 1961-62; and provide for a further increase of 8% in all instructional salaries for the year 1962-63.

Few will quarrel with the recommendation that the legislature should adopt a long-range building program for the 3 major state institutions (The prediction is that their undergraduate enrollment will increase to 36,000 by 1970, plus 8,000 graduate students, making a total of 44,000 students).

Considering statewide college enrollments as a whole, the prediction is that undergraduate enrollments will rise from 45,000 in 1960 to 76,000 in 1970, an increase of 70%. Graduate enrollments will rise from 4,000 in 1960 to at least 8,900 by 1970, an increase of 122%. This forecast that the rate of growth in graduate enrollments will outpace the rate of growth in undergraduate enrollments is very probably correct. It takes account of the fact that the "center of gravity" in higher education is moving upward. It is noteworthy, too, that nearly all of

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

MINNESOTA: Table 11 (Cont'd. from p. 166)

- ** Includes \$2,300,812 from the county.
- *** Includes 21 separate undertakings, mostly in the nature of research, including some agricultural research.
- **** Newly established at the plant of a former branch agricultural school and experiment station.
- x This is an increase of 25.8% over the preceding fiscal year.
- y This is an increase of 9.2% over the request for 1961-62.

Most of the requested increases are for salary improvement and additional staff. These are based on 3 different student-faculty ratios, depending on the levels and types of instruction and research, as in Table 12.

Table 12. Student-faculty ratios for 3 different types and levels of instruction and research at the University of Minnesota.

Types and levels	Student-faculty ratio
(1)	(2)
Undergrad and pre-professional Liberal Arts, Education, etc.	19.0 to 1
Technical and professional Technology, Law, Agriculture, Forestry, Home Economics, Business Administration, Pharmacy, Dentistry, etc.	12.7 to 1
Graduate School and medical The Graduate School, medicine, Veterinary Medicine	6.3 to 1

This affords an inkling of the necessary intricacy of the task of developing normative data for the operation of a great university. No one at Minnesota would maintain that either the classifications or the ratios in Table 12 are final, perfect, or ideal; but they provide a working notion of what is required, and help to dispel the erroneous idea that a university can be compared with a 4-year college.

NEW YORK. Following closely on the heels of the historic report of the Governor's Committee on Higher Education in New York State (GRAPEVINE pages 157-160) comes the proposal by the Committee To Look To the Future, of the Board of Higher Education of the City of New York, that the 4 city colleges and 3 community colleges be developed into a great

in the world (present enrollment, 91,000 students).

Much of the proposed structure is already in existence and operation. The principal new feature would be a program of advanced graduate studies leading to the Ph. D., and eventually some new graduate professional schools, probably including a medical school. Among the present students, 7,600 are already Master's candidates. The upward development is essential, says the Committee with much cogency, to attract federal, state, and private money to the support of graduate education and research; and is needed not only to educate more people to higher degrees, but also to strengthen and upgrade the excellence of the undergraduate colleges.

WASHINGTON. The study of education at all levels, authorized and financed by an appropriation of \$75,000 by the 1959 legislature, proceeds under the auspices of the legislature's Interim Committee on Education, with James F. Nickerson of Montana State College as Study Director. Five subcommittees composed of prominent citizens have submitted their reports and recommendations to the Interim Committee, which is also advised by a 15-member Governor's School Advisory Council headed by Charles E. Odegaard, president of the University of Washington.

The 5 subcommittee reports are contained in a 113-page printed document entitled Citizens' Committee Reports and Recommendations: Interim Study of Education, published by the University of Washington at Seattle 5. A 13-page printed condensation and abstract of the reports is also available.

There are 24 recommendations (some of them multiple) in the report on "Education Beyond the High School" (Pages 15-34 of the larger document). Two of these are especially refreshing: (1) "That the present state system for governing post-high school educational agencies be continued and that cooperative (voluntary) statewide coordination among such agencies be continued and encouraged; (2) "that expansions of scholarship opportunities should take place within the framework of such existing pro-

WASHINGTON. (Continued from page 167)
Scholarship Foundation; and that a state-financed scholarship, loan, or gift fund is not the most desirable solution to the financial problem. (Italics mine).

The first of these propositions evidences an admirable aplomb and level-headedness in the face of the ill-considered uproar now current in several states, whipped up by the advocates of formal bureaucratic "superstructures" to consolidate or coordinate the control of state-supported higher education in one huge monolith in which the several institutions would be more or less extensively subject to the statutory coercive powers of a single statewide "master board" or "super board," thus tending to push the institutional governing boards into obscurity (if not to abolish them altogether), and to reduce the college and university presidents toward the level of civil service clerks.

In making its recommendation against a state scholarship system, the subcommittee notes that the private colleges urge not only state scholarships, but also a state loan or gift fund; but specifically rejects these pieces of advice. (Contrast, for example, the fact that Gibson's report to the Iowa Legislative Research Bureau advocates a state "tuition scholarship" system). For a digest of the Iowa report, see this GRAPEVINE, pages 163-5. While clearly declaring that state scholarships are not "the best solution", the Washington subcommittee failed to say, so far as I have discovered, what the "best solution" is: namely, keeping public higher education accessible tuition-free or at only nominal fees.

The subcommittee wants the 3 state colleges of education to have their names changed to "state colleges", and to concentrate on teacher-education and liberal arts, with no aspirations to become universities; and it wants no new state college established until the present ones reach enrollments of 12,000 to 15,000 students or more.

Notable are the recommendations that the University of Washington should provide enlarged programs of undergraduate instruction in the evening; that the state

should support such programs; and that all state institutions should increasingly develop their summer sessions as regular full-fledged parts of their programs, with addition state support.

The subcommittee observes that in 1959 the private institutions (12 in number) were enrolling nearly one fourth of the total college enrollment in the state; notes that they are developing programs to increase their capacity; and urges them to "actively pursue their planned expansions in order that they may continue to bear their full share of the anticipated increase in enrollment."

The State Census Board estimates that Washington's population aged 18-24 will reach 450,000 by 1970 (84% greater than in 1950), and that total college enrollment in the state will exceed 90,000 by 1970, as compared with 51,000 in 1959.

In 1959 the 10 public junior colleges enrolled 8,500 full-time student-equivalents, or 16% of the total college enrollment. A new junior college is scheduled to begin this year in Port Angeles.

The subcommittee rightly thinks that "the orderly and controlled expansion of junior colleges constitutes a major means by which certain critical needs of post-high school education can be met"; and recommends, probably wisely, that the practical criteria for the establishment of new junior colleges should be determined and publicized by the State Board of Education, and not frozen into statutory law. It recognizes expressly, however, that junior colleges are institutions of higher education, not to be regarded as exclusively the concern of the elementary and secondary school authorities. It believes substantial state aid to junior colleges for operating expenses and for capital outlays should be continued, and that "steps should be taken to assure that all funds allocated by the state to and for junior colleges... and all funds from fees, be expended only for junior college purposes." The State Board of Education should go on with a continuing statewide survey of potential junior college areas.