

# Grapevine

SINCE  
1958

30th  
YEAR

Number 347

JUNE 1988

Page 2181

## TIMELY DATA CIRCULATED WHILE CURRENT

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

### IN THIS ISSUE

IS THERE A POSITIVE SIDE TO COST CONTAINMENT? . . . . . 2182-2183

By David A. Longanecker  
 Executive Director, Minnesota Higher Education Coordinating Board

GRAPEVINE is pleased to continue a new feature of contributed essays by experts in the states. This is a speech which was presented at the Annual Meeting of the State Higher Education Finance Officers, Seattle, August 1987.

Table 78. APPROPRIATIONS OF STATE TAX FUNDS FOR OPERATING EXPENSES OF HIGHER EDUCATION IN TWENTY-TWO STATES, FISCAL YEARS 1978-79, 1986-87, AND 1988-89, WITH PERCENTAGES OF GAIN OVER THE MOST RECENT TWO AND TEN YEARS.  
 (In thousands of dollars)

States	Year 1978-79	Year 1986-87	Year 1988-89	2-yr gain Percent	10-yr gain Percent	Page
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	
Thirteen states previously reported*						
Thirteen states	4,670,148	8,869,467	9,949,569	12	113	
Colorado	237,310	423,132	475,181	12	100	2184
Georgia	346,731	714,004	812,299	14	134	2184
Idaho	83,322	126,030	144,987	15	74	2185
Iowa	275,065	404,701	479,042	18	74	2185
Kansas	222,216	325,725	382,326	17	72	2186
New Mexico	119,474	250,719	268,800	7	125	2186
Tennessee	312,799	615,764	673,881	9	115	2187
Virginia	425,797	902,068	1,033,096	15	143	2188
Washington**	382,750	628,981	719,437	14	88	2187
<b>Totals</b>	<b>7,075,612</b>	<b>13,260,591</b>	<b>14,938,618</b>			
<b>Weighted average percentages of gain</b>				<b>13</b>	<b>111</b>	

\*In GRAPEVINE, Table 66, Page 2175, (May 1988)  
 \*\*Revision of FY1988-89 data previously reported in GRAPEVINE, Table 41, Page 2138, (September 1987).

## IS THERE A POSITIVE SIDE TO COST CONTAINMENT?\*

The answer to this question is yes; it better be or those of us who work in postsecondary education at the state level are all going to lead fairly sad professional lives. Now, why do I say that? I don't believe anyone can look ahead rationally at the factors affecting both postsecondary expenditures and revenues without coming to the conclusion that cost containment will be, and must be, the name of the game in the future. Let's look for a minute at expenditures. Some of you may be familiar with the finance work of Massey and Hopkins at Stanford University, which suggests that higher education expenditures, by their very nature, must grow more rapidly than costs for other goods and services in our economy. Indeed, many experts within higher education accept growth in postsecondary expenditures of one to two percentage points greater than inflation as normal over the long term. While I, personally, believe this thinking represents a time bomb, our record suggests that it fairly closely reflects current reality. And this assumes our current environment.

But, the future is likely to present tougher challenges than we even face today. If demographers are correct, we will face a tougher lot to educate. Students from educationally disadvantaged backgrounds cost more to serve. Without doubt, it's worth the investment, but it still will require more resources than we are investing for that purpose today. Furthermore, the world of the future will be a high tech world in which most of us will have to expend substantial new resources--both human and hardware--to be considered serious partners. And there are other factors that will force our expenditures up as well. Ralph Kerr, the SHEEO from Utah, listed a number which included faculty salary catchup, uncontrollable costs (such as insurance and library acquisitions) capital improvements and financial aid. This perspective from the expenditure side provides one strong rationale why cost containment will be an issue.

In addition, however, there is the revenue side. Many of us in the states are riding high in terms of the percentage of public funds which have been devoted to postsecondary education. In Minnesota, as I suspect in many other states, there is increasing interest in reducing taxes and not much visible interest in increasing taxes. Further more, demographics suggest that the citizenry of the future will have less self-interest in postsecondary education than does that of today. Families, because they will be smaller and space their children more closely together, will have an intense interest in postsecondary education for fewer years. Additionally, a larger portion of the population will be the elderly who traditionally have had no or only modest involvement themselves in postsecondary education. All of these factors suggest likely limits or reductions in postsecondary education's share of state revenues.

So, that is why I say there had better be a positive side to cost containment. And I believe a number of us who have faced budget crises in recent years have learned that, indeed, there is a positive side. I'd like to talk briefly about three generic cost containment strategies the states have used.

### Three Cost Containment Strategies

The first is the use of incremental budget cuts. This strategy is perhaps the most common approach used by states. In Minnesota, in the early 80's, this was the strategy basically used in achieving seven budget cuts in an 18-month period of time. Most recently, we have witnessed similar responses in the Southwestern United States, and [In mid 1987] the State of Illinois received an across-the-board incremental budget cut of five percent. The results of this strategy have been mixed. Because planning in postsecondary education has traditionally been inadequate, the initial response in postsecondary education was nearly disastrous. You will know of what I speak: deferred maintenance, curtailed library and scientific equipment acquisitions, erosions in faculty quality, which have been felt in various ways (the loss of stars to higher bidders, the loss of young faculty, and the increased reliance on part-time faculty). But the disaster led to important reforms. It forced institutions and states to do more strategic planning and it trimmed fat we would not have dealt with otherwise. Minnesota, for one, is much healthier today--that is, postsecondary education is more vibrant--than it was before its budget crises in the early 1980s. The second generic strategy is incentive funding. There are some very creative approaches that have evolved. Some focus on changing the inputs into the educational process, like the Utah effort to encourage the use of new technologies, and the links to economic development initiatives that have

---

\*Responsibility for the contents should be attributed to the author.

popped up everywhere (not unlike the measles), and some quality improvement efforts as well. The incentive funding approaches focus on the outcomes of our educational process, regarding results rather than effort. The quality assessment efforts in Tennessee and Indiana are examples of this general approach. The third generic approach is what we might call creative revenue enhancement. That is, getting more money to operate our enterprise. Essentially, this has been Minnesota's approach since 1982. We combined increased state funding with increased tuition revenues and increased private dollars to pump additional funds into a system of higher education which we feared was in jeopardy because of constrained resources. So, given the likely future that we face, how do these three general strategies measure up as cost containment approaches? In addressing this question, I would like to reverse the order and look first at revenue enhancement.

#### Revenue Enhancement

There are some very positive elements in the use of revenue enhancement as a cost containment tool. Increasing tuition, in particular, shows promise. Obviously, increasing tuitions increases the revenues which will help offset our projected expenditure increases, but this is not the real advantage. The real advantage is as a device to control subsequent cost increases. Secretary Bennett is dead wrong about price increases, at least in the public sector. An increase in costs in the public sector may indeed help control future cost increases for the following reason. Increasing public tuitions to a more reasonable level will bring the consumer more actively into the financing equation. If the consumer shares in cost increases and the consumer's share more clearly matches the value of the good provided--and we do provide a valuable good--those consumers will become more involved in helping to control those costs. Unless the increase in tuition is reflected in an increase in quality, the consumers will begin to look for alternative products. I am not suggesting in this approach that we go to full cost pricing. Rather, I am suggesting a more rational approach to setting tuitions and a more realistic sharing of the public and individual costs of providing this service. Furthermore, if one looks seriously at increasing tuition, it is imperative that this type of policy be combined with a healthy financial aid program if we are not to erode equality of educational opportunity. The dilemma for me in this approach is that the desired outcome of increasing revenues is higher quality, but there is no assurance that that outcome will result. Indeed, it is possible that additional funding may not radically change our educational product and; thus, may simply contribute to reduced output per dollar invested or, in economic terms, to reduce productivity. Which leads nicely into the second approach, that is, incentive funding.

#### Incentive Funding and Planning

I believe that incentive funding is the key to quality improvement in the future. But the incentive funding must be appropriate to the problem at hand and, thus, cannot be too bureaucratized if it is to remain effective as a catalyst for change. The third general approach is planning. You will remember earlier I tied planning and incremental budgeting together. At this point I want to focus just on the planning side of this. Long range strategic planning will be the most difficult to achieve but it is the most necessary key to increased productivity in the future. It is the only strategy of the three I have outlined which suggests an approach to doing more with less, rather than doing more with more. Yet, it is awfully difficult in a noncrisis environment to accomplish serious strategic planning. I believe that the planning for the future that we face means planning for fundamental change in the educational process, because the key to effective cost containment is increased cost effectiveness. Otherwise, we're talking about reduced quality, which we simply cannot afford. To increase cost effectiveness, however, means to get greater productivity in all aspects of our enterprise. It means achieving greater output per faculty member; it means achieving greater output per square foot of facility space; it means greater output per dollar devoted to student services, as well as other areas.

And this enhanced productivity will occur only with significant change. Enhanced revenues may help, at least in the short term, by providing the revenues necessary to achieve substantial change. Incentive funding can provide a catalyst for change. But the key to success rests in strategic long-range planning which will be the most difficult strategy to pursue. In relatively good times, within real-life bureaucratic organizations, it is terribly difficult to effect change. But we must change substantially if we are to remain an affordable option for educating the citizens of tomorrow. I can assure you that if we do not change two things will happen. First our relatively noncrisis-oriented environment of today will become a crisis, which will force us into a strong planning mode. And, second, entrepreneurs in the nonpublic sector will respond to the void remaining. Thus we must respond to the issues of cost containment and we must not do so from a reactive stance.

COLORADO

Table 79. Appropriations of state tax funds for operating expenses of higher education, fiscal year 1988-89, in thousands of dollars.

<u>Institutions</u>	<u>Sums appropriated</u>
(1)	(2)
University of Colorado*	84,060
Health Sciences Center**	89,932
<u>Subtotal, U of C,</u>	<u>173,992</u>
State Board of Agriculture***	72,706
Ag experiment station	7,225
Ag extension service	6,672
Veterinary medicine & hosp	5,404
Forest service	2,694
<u>Subtotal, St Bd of Ag</u>	<u>94,701</u>
U of Northern Colorado	27,139
Colorado School of Mines	11,140
Trustees of State Colleges+	45,825
State Community Colleges	52,052
State aid to district jr colls	12,621
Occupational education	25,993
<u>Subtotal, SBCCOE</u>	<u>90,666</u>
Auraria Higher Ed Center++	
Council on Arts and Humanities	1,108
State Historical Society	1,594
Colorado Advanced Tech Inst	2,243
Commission on Higher Education	1,433
Student aid	24,364
Vet and Ntl Guard tuition	374
Other	602
<u>Subtotal, CCHE,</u>	<u>26,773</u>
<u>Total</u>	<u>475,181</u>

\*Appropriated to the Board of Regents for allocation to the campuses at Boulder, Denver and Colorado Springs.

\*\*Includes \$41,922,273 for indigent medical care.

\*\*\*The State Brd of Agriculture governs the U of Southern Colorado, Ft. Lewis College and Colorado State U.

+Includes Mesa State College, Metropolitan State College, Western State College and Adams State College.

++Funded by transfers from the Regents of the U of Colorado, Trustees of State Colleges and the State Community Colleges.

GEORGIA

Table 80. Appropriations of state tax funds for operating expenses of higher education, fiscal year 1988-89, in thousands of dollars.

<u>Institutions</u>	<u>Sums appropriated</u>
(1)	(2)
University of Georgia	170,365
Ag experiment station	32,397
Coop extension service	31,328
Veterinary med exper sta	2,834
Skidaway Inst of Oceanography	1,471
Marine extension service	1,146
Marine Institute	897
Vet med teaching hospital	466
Minority business enterprises	334
Athens/Tifton veterinary labs	57
<u>Subtotal, U of G,</u>	<u>241,295</u>
Medical College of Georgia	62,628
Talmadge Memorial Hospital	31,398
Family practice residency prog	5,546
Desegregation program	369
<u>Subtotal, MC of G,</u>	<u>99,941</u>
Georgia State University	84,727
Georgia Institute of Technology	70,770
Georgia Tech Research Inst	9,856
Education extension services	585
Advanced technology devel ctr	1,235
Agricultural research	987
Center for Rehabilitation Tech	887
<u>Subtotal, GIT,</u>	<u>84,320</u>
Senior Colleges -	
Georgia Southern College	26,640
Valdosta State College	18,103
West Georgia College	17,987
Kennesaw College	16,635
Columbus College	13,566
Southern College of Tech	12,253
Georgia College	12,125
Fort Valley State College	11,311
Savannah State College	10,409
Albany State College	10,389
Augusta College	10,206
Armstrong State College	8,783
Georgia Southwestern College	8,324
Clayton State College	7,371
North Georgia College	7,297
<u>Subtotal, S C's,</u>	<u>191,399</u>

(Continued in the next column)

GEORGIA (Cont from preceding column)

Junior Colleges -	
Abraham Baldwin Ag College	6,740
Macon College	5,543
Middle Georgia College	5,492
Darton College	4,738
South Georgia College	4,285
Gainesville College	4,280
Floyd College	3,744
Atlanta Metropolitan College	3,667
Brunswick College	3,633
Dalton College	3,615
Gordon College	3,383
Bainbridge College	2,285
Waycross College	1,754
East Georgia College	1,605
DeKalb College	11,689
<u>Subtotal, J C's,</u>	<u>66,453</u>
Regents of University System	5,032
SREB payments	12,215
Repairs/rehabilitation funds	20,305
Medical scholarships	729
Regents opportunity grants	600
Regents scholarships	200
<u>Subtotal, R of US,</u>	<u>39,081</u>
Unallocated reserve	5,083
<u>Total</u>	<u>812,299</u>

Note: Since FY1984-85, teachers' retirement funds, which were previously reported as separate line items, are included in institutional figures. This should be kept in mind if comparisons over time are made for the institutions.

IDAHO

Table 81. Appropriations of state tax funds for operating expenses of higher education, fiscal year 1988-89, in thousands of dollars.

<u>Institutions</u>	<u>Sums appropriated</u>
<u>(1)</u>	<u>(2)</u>
University of Idaho	42,873
Ag research & coop extension	11,964
WAMI medical education	1,841
WOI veterinary medicine	942
Forestry research	119
Geological survey	417
<u>Subtotal, U of I,</u>	<u>58,156</u>

(Continued in the next column)

IDAHO (Cont from preceding column)

Boise State University	30,206
Idaho State University*	26,905
Lewis-Clark State College	4,821
<u>Unallocated</u>	<u>1,500</u>
Junior College support	6,407
<u>Vocational education</u>	<u>15,375</u>
State Board of Education	641
Scholarships and grants	362
Medical education	614
<u>Total</u>	<u>144,987</u>

\*Includes \$305,000 for the dental education program.

IOWA

Table 82. Appropriations of state tax funds for operating expenses of higher education, fiscal year 1988-89, in thousands of dollars.

<u>Institutions</u>	<u>Sums appropriated</u>
<u>(1)</u>	<u>(2)</u>
University of Iowa	148,790
Psychiatric hospital	6,272
Hospital school	4,777
Oakdale campus	2,660
Family practice med training	1,596
<u>Subtotal, U of I,</u>	<u>164,095</u>
Iowa State University	121,453
Ag and home ec exper station	14,368
Cooperative extension service	14,275
Fire service education	389
Livestock research	300
<u>Subtotal, ISU,</u>	<u>150,785</u>
University of Northern Iowa	48,208
Board of Regents	547
<u>Subtotal, Regents programs</u>	<u>363,635</u>
<u>Area Colleges</u>	<u>80,939</u>
College Aid Commission	
Pvt college tuition grants	28,895
State scholarships	750
Voc-tech tuition grants	644
University of Osteopathy	715
Science & math student grant	450
GSL repayment	85
Commission central office	279
Work study	2,650
<u>Subtotal, CAC,</u>	<u>34,468</u>
<u>Total</u>	<u>479,042</u>

NEW MEXICO

Table 83. Appropriations of state tax funds for operating expenses of higher education, fiscal year 1988-89, in thousands of dollars.

<u>Institutions</u>	<u>Sums appropriated</u>
<u>(1)</u>	<u>(2)</u>
University of New Mexico	78,072
Medical school	19,300
Cancer center	1,516
Medical-related programs	7,055
State medical investigator*	1,719
Research centers	1,024
Gallup branch	2,187
Los Alamos branch	949
Valencia branch	1,147
<u>Subtotal, U of NM</u>	<u>112,969</u>
New Mexico State U	48,249
Ag experiment station	6,345
Ag extension service	4,785
St Dept of Agriculture*	3,568
Research Center	1,668
Alamogordo branch	2,084
Carlsbad branch	1,363
Dona Ana branch	1,306
Grants branch	1,083
<u>Subtotal, NMSU</u>	<u>70,451</u>
Eastern New Mexico U	13,054
Roswell branch	3,501
Clovis branch	3,030
<u>Subtotal, ENMU</u>	<u>19,585</u>
NM Inst of Mining & Tech	10,509
State Bureau of Mines*	2,258
Research Center	1,683
<u>Subtotal, NMIMT</u>	<u>14,450</u>
NM Highlands U	9,267
Western New Mexico U	6,339
Community Colleges	
Northern New Mexico CC	3,305
Santa Fe Comm Coll	3,072
San Juan College	510
New Mexico Junior College	423
<u>Subtotal, CC's</u>	<u>7,310</u>
Vocational Technical Schools**	
Technical-Vocational Inst	13,984
Luna Area Vocational School	3,707
Tucumcari Area Vocational Sch	1,076
<u>Subtotal, Voc-tech</u>	<u>18,767</u>

(Continued in the next column)

NEW MEXICO (Cont from preceding column)

Commission on Higher Education	915
WICHE	64
State work-study	1,892
Student Incentive Grants	3,783
Student loans	193
Student grants	601
Student exchange grants	2,066
Student interns	148
<u>Subtotal, CHE</u>	<u>9,662</u>
<u>Total</u>	<u>268,800</u>

\*State function administered through the institution.

\*\*Vocational-technical schools are reported for the first time. Comparable amounts are included in calculating the percentages of gain over two and ten years.

KANSAS

Table 84. Appropriations of state tax funds for operating expenses of higher education, fiscal year 1988-89, in thousands of dollars.

<u>Institutions</u>	<u>Sums appropriated</u>
<u>(1)</u>	<u>(2)</u>
University of Kansas	89,726
Medical center	48,577
<u>Subtotal, U of K,</u>	<u>138,303</u>
Kansas State University	90,975
Veterinary medical center	6,530
<u>Subtotal, KSU,</u>	<u>97,505</u>
Wichita State University	42,095
Pittsburg State University	18,784
Emporia State University	17,957
Fort Hays State University	18,321
Kansas Technical Institute	3,533
Board of Regents*	7,160
<u>Subtotal, Regents System,</u>	<u>343,658</u>
Aid to Washburn University	4,706
Aid to community colleges	33,962
<u>Total</u>	<u>382,326</u>

\*Includes \$5,942,603 for student aid.

TENNESSEE

Table 85. Appropriations of state tax funds for operating expenses of higher education, fiscal year 1988-89, in thousands of dollars.

Institutions (1)	Sums appropriated (2)
University of Tennessee System	
Knoxville	117,567
Chattanooga	24,729
Martin	19,250
Space Institute	4,104
Medical Units:	
College of Medicine	25,880
Family Medicine	3,039
UT Memphis	37,393
Ag Experiment Station	13,916
Ag extension service	16,799
Coll of Veterinary Medicine	8,860
Municipal Tech Advisory Service	947
County Tech Advisory Service	673
Institute for Public Service	2,100
Statewide cont education	1,358
University-wide admin	2,027
<u>Subtotal, UT,</u>	<u>278,642</u>
Board of Regents System	
Board of Regents Universities	
Memphis State U	72,202
East Tennessee State U*	48,452
Middle Tennessee State U	39,264
Tennessee Technological U	31,310
Tennessee State U	24,116
Austin Peay State U	15,890
<u>Subtotal, BRU</u>	<u>231,234</u>
State Community Colleges	
Chattanooga	10,824
Shelby	9,368
Roane	8,489
Walters	7,710
Cleveland	6,101
Volunteer	6,471
Jackson	5,687
Columbia	5,436
Motlow	4,539
Dyersburg	3,311
<u>Subtotal, CC's</u>	<u>67,936</u>

(Continued in the next column)

TENNESSEE (Cont from preceding column)

State Technical Institutes	
Memphis	12,449
Nashville	7,939
Knoxville	5,437
Tri-Cities	3,947
<u>Subtotal, TI's</u>	<u>29,772</u>
Area Voc Tech Schools	24,814
Brd of Regents, admin	2,502
<u>Subtotal, BofR System</u>	<u>356,258</u>
Higher Education Commission	1,344
Contract education**	2,808
Tenn. Student Assistance Corp	12,360
Centers of Excellence	19,269
Vocational Improvements	1,800
Campus Centers of Emphasis	1,400
<u>Total</u>	<u>673,881</u>

\*Includes: \$13,646,000 for College of Medicine and \$2,093,000 for family practice.

\*\*Includes SREB and other contract education programs administered by the Higher Education Commission.

Notes: Not included above are the following state appropriations: \$8.3 million for Chairs of Excellence and \$450,000 for Academic Scholarships, both of which are endowments with the income going to the institutions, and \$10 million in capital funds for the purchase of instruction and research equipment at the institutions.

WASHINGTON

Table 86. Appropriations of state tax funds for operating expenses of higher education, fiscal year 1988-89, in thousands of dollars.

Institutions (1)	Sums appropriated (2)
University of Washington (Incl medical school)	217,796
Washington State U (Incl ag research & exten)	125,119
Western Washington U	36,302
Eastern Washington U	34,926
Central Washington U	29,538
Evergreen State College	17,088
Community Colleges	232,440
Higher Ed. Coordinating Brd	26,228
<u>Total</u>	<u>719,437</u>

**VIRGINIA**

Table 87. Appropriations of state tax funds for operating expenses of higher education, fiscal year 1988-89, in thousands of dollars.

Institutions (1)	Sums appropriated (2)
University of Virginia	114,927
Hospital Division	38,023
Clinch Valley Coll	4,201
<b>Subtotal, U of V</b>	<b>157,151</b>
Va Poly Inst & State U	107,589
Extension Division	31,400
Research Division	28,047
<b>Subtotal, VPI &amp; SU</b>	<b>167,036</b>
Va Commonwealth U	110,066
Health Sci, hospital	52,256
<b>Subtotal, VCU</b>	<b>162,322</b>
College of William & Mary	30,801
Richard Bland Coll	2,529
VIMS	10,005
<b>Subtotal, CW&amp;M</b>	<b>43,335</b>
Other Colleges and Universities	
Old Dominion U	46,681
George Mason U	49,311
James Madison U	31,829
Norfolk State U	24,645
Radford U	24,763
Virginia State U	15,587
Mary Washington College	10,498
Longwood College	10,653
Virginia Military Inst	9,786
Christopher Newport College	8,894
<b>Subtotal, C's &amp; U's</b>	<b>232,647</b>
<b>Community Colleges</b>	<b>177,556</b>
<b>Student Aid*</b>	<b>18,236</b>

(Continued in the next column)

**VIRGINIA (Cont from preceding column)**

State Council of Higher Educ	3,565
Scholarship Assist (CSAP)	4,302
Eminent scholars	5,600
Regional grants & contracts	727
Tuition Assist (TAGP)	17,535
Virginia Scholars Prog	600
Outstanding faculty program	65
Maintenance of excellence	1,229
Library services	304
Clinical faculty prog	145
<b>Subtotal, SCHE</b>	<b>34,072</b>
Other Higher Education	
Eastern VA Med Auth (EVMA)	10,130
Innov Tech Auth	12,165
SREB	100
Southeastern Univ Res Assoc	1,000
VCBA--equipment	10,700
VA Inst of Sci Research	50
Equal opportunity plan	5,744
Marshall research ctr	110
Melchers/Monroe memorials	156
VA Foundation-humanities	586
<b>Subtotal, Other</b>	<b>40,741</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>1,033,096</b>

\*Includes appropriations made directly to higher education institutions for student aid as well as student aid to:  
 Dept of Health (In \$1,000s) 100  
 Dept of Rehab Services 214  
 EVMA 35  
 Total 349

Note: Included in the statewide total are the following appropriation to private institutions (in \$1,000s):

Aid to student attending pvt or out-of-state insts	19,669
Appropriations to non-state agencies	34,841
<b>Total, private</b>	<b>54,510</b>

**Non-Profit Org.**  
**U.S. POSTAGE**  
**PAID**  
 Normal, Illinois  
 Permit No. 1

Center for Higher Education  
 College of Education  
 Illinois State University, Normal, IL 61761-6901

**Grapevine**

Edward Hines, Director and Editor  
 M.M. Chambers, Founding Editor  
 Gwen B. Pruyne, Managing Editor

Responsibility for any errors in the data, or for opinions expressed, is not to be attributed to any organization or person other than the Editors.

GRAPEVINE is circulated to key persons in the fifty states. Not Copyrighted.