

M. M. Chambers  
Education Building, Indiana University  
Bloomington, Indiana  
47401

SINCE  
1958

NINTH  
YEAR

Number 94

January 1967

Page 609

GRAPEVINE

\* \* \* \* \*

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

IN THIS ISSUE

- A word about the dollar ranking of state universities and colleges. . . . .610
- Sixty-four state colleges and universities having between \$3 and \$5 million of state tax funds for operating expenses, fiscal year 1966-67. . . . .611
- Massachusetts appropriates nearly \$44 million. . . . .612
- New Jersey will apparently locate the newly-acquired State College of Medicine and Dentistry on an urban renewal site in Newark . . . . .613
- West Virginia may debate free tuition for first two years in public colleges and universities . . . . .614
- Wisconsin asks, Is overcentralization in state government self-defeating? . . . . .614

-----  
Statement of ownership and circulation of GRAPEVINE is on Page 610 (reverse hereof).

A WORD ABOUT THE DOLLAR RANKING OF STATE UNIVERSITIES  
AND COLLEGES

Although there may be over 2,200 colleges and universities in the United States, as the Office of Education avers, only some 400 of them are state institutions.

This number is not so unmanageable as to preclude the making of tabulations small enough to be comprehensible.

There is something to be gained from close observation of what, where, and how the 400-odd state universities and colleges are, and especially how well they are supported by appropriations of state tax funds.

"Order is Heaven's first law"-- and an early step in obtaining knowledge of four hundred organisms is to range them in some obvious sequence. For this simple purpose, there is probably no yardstick that can be used with more facility than the net state tax-fund appropriations to each institution for annual operating expenses.

One need not be unaware that nearly all these institutions have other sources of substantial operating income (with proportions varying greatly among them), such as student fees, private gifts, and federal grants.

All these sources have been becoming more productive, and the evidence is strong that the trends will continue, with the single exception of student fees. These should, and probably will be, soon reduced or eliminated in the interest of a real extension of educational opportunity.

But no matter how far the non-state sources increase, these institutions are primarily state institutions, and their primary source of operating support is state appropriations, even though currently these may amount to less than half the total in some instances, especially among the larger state universities.

GRAPEVINE'S currently running series of tabulations, of which Table 8, page 611, is a segment, is a sort of "dry run" or "shakedown cruise" preliminary to next Fall's comprehensive report on fiscal year 1967-68, for which three states have already made appropriations (for the second year of the even-numbered biennium) and for which 47 states will have made appropriations before calendar 1967 is over.

If you observe serious errors or omissions in the tables, please notify GRAPEVINE.

GRAPEVINE is owned and circulated by M. M. Chambers. It 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 chiefly to persons in position to reciprocate by furnishing prompt and accurate reports from their respective states regarding tax legislation, appropriations for higher education, and legislation affecting education at any level.

Address communications to M. M. Chambers, Education Building, Indiana University, Bloomington, Indiana 47401.

M. M. Chambers, Education Building, Indiana University, Bloomington

THE SEVENTH AND EIGHTH BLOCS: 64 STATE COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES HAVING BETWEEN \$3 MILLION AND \$5 MILLION OF STATE TAX FUNDS FOR ANNUAL OPERATING EXPENSES, FISCAL YEAR 1966-67

Table 8. Sixty-four state colleges and universities in descending order of state tax support for annual operating expenses appropriated for fiscal year 1966-67, in thousands of dollars.

Institutions		Sums appropriated		Institutions		Sums appropriated	
(1)		(2)		(1)		(2)	
1	NY A&T Inst, Farmingdale	4,975		34	Morehead State U (Ky)	3,951	
2	NY St U Coll at Fredonia	4,958		35	West Chester St Coll (Pa)	3,937	
3	NJ St. Coll at Glassboro	4,923		36	U of NC at Greensboro	3,926	
4	Virginia St College	* / 4,888		37	NJ St Coll at Paterson	3,787	
5	Central Washington St Coll	4,879		38	U of Southern Mississippi	3,714	
6	NY St U Coll at Potsdam	4,792		39	NJ St Coll at Jersey City	3,684	
7	East Tennessee State U	4,791		40	Middle Tennessee St U	3,658	
8	Murray State U (Ky)	4,778		41	Wis St U, Stevens Point	3,657	
9	Northern Michigan U	4,768		42	Tennessee Polytechnic U	3,603	
10	Mankato St Coll (Minn)	4,755		43	Tennessee A&I State U	3,587	
11	Southeastern La College	4,657		44	Wis St U, Eau Claire	3,578	
12	Northeast La St Coll	4,618		45	Texas Southern University	3,570	
13	Wis St U, Whitewater	4,547		46	College of Wm and Mary	3,552	
14	Grambling College (La)	4,520		47	Texas Western College *** /	3,456	
15	U of North Dakota	4,504		48	McNeese St Coll (La)	3,435	
16	Central Conn St Coll	4,441		49	Newark Coll of Engrng (NJ)	3,418	
17	Kansas St T C at Emporia	4,426		50	NY A&T Inst, Alfred	3,403	
18	NJ St Coll at Newark	4,388		51	Morgan State College (Md)	3,398	
19	Lamar S C of Technol (Tex)	4,384		52	Southwestern Med Sch + /	3,387	
20	Marshall University (W Va)	4,378		53	Northeast Mo St Coll	3,359	
21	Sam Houston St Coll (Tex)	4,353		54	St Cloud St Coll (Minn)	3,279	
22	East Texas State U	4,349		55	Rhode Island College	3,270	
23	U of South Dakota	4,312		56	Southwest Texas St Coll	3,259	
24	Colorado State College	4,292		57	Texas Woman's University	3,238	
25	Oakland Univ (Mich) ** /	4,251		58	Wis St U, La Crosse	3,145	
26	Southern Conn St Coll	4,242		59	Clarion St Coll (Pa)	3,142	
27	NY St Coll of Forestry	4,191		60	Fort Hays Kansas St Coll	3,141	
28	Florida A&M University	4,188		61	U of South Alabama	3,102	
29	Towson St Coll (Md)	4,185		62	California St Coll (Pa)	3,042	
30	Kas St Coll of Pittsburg	4,170		63	Stephen F. Austin SC (Tex)	3,031	
31	Southeast Mo St Coll	4,094		64	Prairie View A&M U ++ /	3,009	
32	Indiana U of Pennsylvania	4,041		***	In University of Texas system		
33	Northern Arizona U	4,040		+	A unit in the U of Texas system		
*	Campuses at Petersburg and Norfolk			++	In the Texas Agricultural and Mechanical University system		
**	Outpost of Michigan State Univ.						

MASSACHUSETTS. Appropriations of state tax funds for operating expenses of higher education, fiscal year 1966-67:

Table 9. State tax-fund appropriations for operating expenses of higher education in Massachusetts, fiscal year 1966-67, in thousands of dollars.

<u>Institutions</u>	<u>Sums appropriated</u>
(1)	(2)
U of Massachusetts *	\$23,602
<u>Subtotal, U of Mass -</u>	<u>\$23,602</u>
State colleges -	
Boston	2,158
Salem	1,770
Bridgewater	1,579
Fitchburg	1,037
Westfield	990
Framingham	959
Worcester	952
Lowell	873
North Adams	507
Mass Coll of Art	440
Mass Maritime Acad	410
<u>Subtotal, st c's -</u>	<u>\$11,675</u>
Technological institutes -	
Lowell Tech Inst	2,628
Southeastern Mass T I	2,109
<u>Subtotal, tech insts -</u>	<u>\$4,737</u>
Community colleges ** -	
Massachusetts Bay	814
Quinsigamond	419
Holyoke	404
Berkshire	403
Northern Essex	380
Mount Wachusett	289
North Shore	285
Cape Cod	276
South Shore	252
Greenfield	225
Southeastern Mass	160
West Suburbia	19
<u>Subtotal, comm colls -</u>	<u>\$3,926</u>
<u>Total</u>	<u>43,940</u>

\* Includes main campus at Amherst, two-year branch in Boston now in operation; and planning costs for a medical campus to be established in Worcester.

\*\* Called "regional community colleges," these are in fact state institutions.

MASSACHUSETTS (Continued from preceding column)

The total of \$43,940,000 represents the annual legislative appropriations for operating expenses of the institutions, less the amounts of institutional receipts (chiefly tuition fees paid by students) turned into the state's general fund. If there is any valid reason for seizing tuition fees and commingling them in the general fund of the state, GRAPEVINE has never discovered it. Yet some states continue it.

Scarcely less unnecessary and futile is the practice of capturing the fees for the state treasury and holding them in special funds until appropriated by the legislature to the respective institutions from which they originally came. Yet this is still practiced by some states.

Fortunately most of the states having the top state universities have no statutes of this kind, and tuition fees remain on the campus to constitute a flexible resource at the discretion of the university governing board. This is one step toward institutional autonomy not yet accomplished in Massachusetts, though much progress was made in other respects in legislative acts of 1958 and 1962.

The net total of \$43,940,000 appropriated for fiscal year 1966-67 is nearly 10 per cent more than GRAPEVINE's estimate of \$40 million, used in our annual summary of the fifty states released in the fall of 1966. The margin of nearly \$4 million by which we undershot the mark for Massachusetts would mean a change of about one-tenth of one per cent in the nationwide total of somewhat over \$3½ billion appropriated by the fifty states.

The 2-year gain for Massachusetts (since fiscal year 1964-65) now appears to be about 54½%; and the 6-year gain (since fiscal year 1960-61), about 229%--both high because in 1960 Massachusetts was at a low point, from which progress is now being made. (Continued on page 613)

--- M. M. Chambers, Education Building, Indiana University, Bloomington, ---

MASSACHUSETTS (Continued from page 612)

President John W. Lederle of the University of Massachusetts, in his "State of the University" address September 20, 1966, epitomized the situation in Massachusetts and other Northeastern states when he pointed out:

"The great number of excellent private colleges and universities in Massachusetts, strongly oriented as they are toward national enrollments, are just not meeting the demands of Massachusetts residents for higher educational opportunities."

He was also able to report that an act of the General Court (state legislature) of August 1966 took further steps toward recognition of the necessary autonomy of the state university:

"Under its provisions, we are able to pay certain deans, School of Medicine department heads, and a selected number of professors, salaries above the ceiling imposed by the general salary schedule of the Commonwealth. This extremely important legislation moves us a step forward in our effort to become a leading state university."

In addition to the state appropriations for annual operating expenses (net figures exhibited in Table 9, page 612, this issue of GRAPEVINE), President Lederle also reported that the 1966 legislature appropriated \$14 million for capital improvements at the main campus in Amherst. Of this \$6 million is for construction of the University Research Center, and \$600,000 for the designing by Edward Durell Stone of a projected new 28-story library building.

Funds were also provided for the purchase of the building now occupied by the University of Massachusetts at Boston, along with planning funds for the acquisition of a permanent site; and continued planning money for the new School of Medicine in Worcester.

NEW JERSEY. It was reported early in December 1966 that the Board of Trustees of the New Jersey College of Medicine and Dentistry (now a state institution, recently acquired from the private Seton Hall University, which established it in Jersey City in 1956), had decided to relocate it in downtown Newark, a city of nearly half a million people.

The determination was said to be conditioned only upon Newark's guaranteeing by March 1, 1967 that a site of 50 acres would be ready for construction within a year, and that an additional 100 acres would become available for future expansion.

Mayor Hugh J. Addonizio of Newark expressed every confidence that the guarantees would be forthcoming. The area is within a rundown slum neighborhood that will undergo clearance and redevelopment under the federal-state-city urban renewal program.

The large Newark City Hospital will be adjacent or nearby. It is also said that the state will probably locate a large facility for mental health care in the immediate vicinity. Furthermore, the new College of Medicine and Dentistry would be a component of a growing academic complex that already includes the Newark campus of Rutgers, the State University, and the Newark College of Engineering. There seems to be strong probability that Newark will eventually have a great comprehensive and cosmopolitan state university center in what was once a deteriorating "central city".

Another site, more secluded and bucolic, on the 138-acre estate of Mrs. M. Hartley Dodge at the small city of Madison, was recommended by the 3-member site committee of the Board, but rejected by the Board in favor of the large-city location in central Newark. This is in accord with irreversible trends toward urbanization and the modernization of cities.

WEST VIRGINIA. Governor Hulett Smith is said to be ready to recommend that the 1967 legislature provide free tuition for two years' attendance at the state university and all state colleges for all West Virginia residents who meet the admission requirements of the respective institutions.

The estimated cost to the state would be \$3 million, which would be appropriated to the institutions in lieu of tuition fees. No other method of reducing or abolishing tuition fees would be possible at present, because all the institutions are already saddled with "revenue bonds" for capital outlays which pledge tuition fees for their retirement. The ill-founded policy of pledging student tuition fees for building construction is indeed obstructive of the movement toward free tuition; but of course such bonds could be refinanced by a general obligation state bond issue covering them, if the necessary legal steps were determined to be taken.

It is heartening to observe that in a state which was recently backward enough to divert student fees to building construction, there is now a governor bold and far-sighted enough to propose free tuition in spite of that handicap. Appropriations of state tax funds to the institutions in lieu of tuition fees would protect the holders of outstanding "revenue bonds" and at the same time enable the institutions to admit qualified students tuition-free.

Evidently Governor Hulett Smith has been observing the policy of "tuition reduction supplements" begun by the Pennsylvania legislature two years ago, and now in operation on a large scale, and has liked what he saw.

Here is something worthy of careful consideration in all the states, especially the comparatively few in which the institutions have been permitted or compelled to hock their student fees for the next 30 or 40 years to pay for academic buildings.

WISCONSIN. A plaintive and frustrated editorial appeared in a Milwaukee metropolitan daily on the day before Christmas, 1966.

After eleven years of the Wisconsin Coordinating Committee for Higher Education, which has, under the letter of the statute, "final authority in determining the single, consolidated budget requests" of the University of Wisconsin, the state colleges (now state universities), and that part of the operations of the system of Vocational and Adult Schools that is state-financed, the editorial-writer voices keen disappointment.

"Where was the Committee," says he, "when the State Building Commission hacked away at budget requests for starting new campuses in the Green Bay and Kenosha areas?"

"Where was it when the state college board of regents suddenly decided, unilaterally, that faculty salary requests should be revised?"

"Where was it when the University of Wisconsin slipped to the governor a \$216,000 request to start a new school of architecture at Milwaukee?"

The query as to whether the State Building Commission can "hack away" at university building requests should be decided by the attorney-general or the courts; and if the answer is affirmative, then legislation to keep that duty where it belongs, in the university governing boards, would be appropriate.

Who can possibly be in a better position to determine faculty salary requests than the university boards?

If the central fiscal authorities bog down for years, unable to ascertain that a school of architecture is necessary, why should not the university governing board submit a request for it?

It may eventually appear that Wisconsin's traditionally overcentralized state government is a severe handicap.