

M. M. Chambers
705 Stoddard Building
Lansing 23, Michigan

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

- Arizona's appropriations for operating expenses of higher education are 29% larger than two years ago..... 286
- Georgia repeals upper age-limits on admission to colleges and universities; enacts new state budget plan, with some modifications to provide flexibility in management of University System..... 286,287
- Kentucky's appropriations for operating expenses of higher education for the next two fiscal years are 50% and 35% higher than the comparable figures of two years ago..... 287
- New York's appropriations for operating expenses of higher education (including student aids) are up 41% over the comparable figures of two years ago..... 288,289
- South Carolina creates State Advisory Commission on Higher Education..... 289,290
- Virginia's governor and his predecessor both emphasize the importance of "a renaissance of education in Virginia"; the two 4-year metropolitan "branches" of the ancient College of William and Mary are emancipated from mother's apron-strings..... 290
-

ARIZONA. Appropriations of state tax funds for operating expenses of higher education for fiscal year 1962-63 are reported as in Table 88.

Table 88. State tax-fund appropriations for operating expenses of higher education in Arizona, fiscal year 1962-63, in thousands of dollars.

Institutions	Sums appropriated
(1)	(2)
U of Arizona	\$10,996
Arizona State U	7,569
Arizona State Coll	1,857
Total	\$20,422

The total represents a gain of slightly more than 29% over the comparable figure for fiscal year 1960-61, two years ago.

* * * * *

GEORGIA. The 1962 session of the Legislature which adjourned February 16 enacted a comprehensive state budget measure providing for a budget bureau in the governor's office with sweeping administrative powers, and prescribing the usual features of a tight executive budget system.

Budget requests of all agencies and departments, covering the next ensuing fiscal biennium, are to be submitted to the budget bureau by September 1 of even-numbered years; and the legislative session in odd-numbered years will appropriate funds for the biennium.

As often happens in such cases, the bill as first drafted applied to all state agencies without discrimination, including

the State University System. Two features would have been especially detrimental to the university system: (1) Requirement of a "line-item" budget for each institution, with prohibition of transfers of funds from one item to another; and (2) Provision for lapsing of all appropriations remaining unencumbered at the end of each biennium.

The Board of Regents of the University System argued convincingly that these features tend to produce not economy, but waste. A frozen line-item budget prevents the normal flexibility essential to efficient management, and the provision for lapsing causes hasty spending near the end of each fiscal period.

In the original bill these provisions would have applied even to the institutional income from non-tax sources; but the Regents were able to obtain the elimination or clarification of many of the provisions which would have adversely affected the efficient administration of the University System.

As reported on page 187 of GRAPEVINE (in April 1961), the 1959 act setting an upper age-limit of 21 years for admission of students to undergraduate work and of 25 years for admission to graduate work, was repealed by vote in both houses of the legislature in 1961; but the repealer was subsequently vetoed by the governor and never became effective. It was, however, enacted by the 1962 session and signed by the governor.

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, state support for elementary and secondary schools, and legislation affecting education at any level.

Address communications to M. M. Chambers, 705 Stoddard Building, Lansing 23, Michigan.

M. M. Chambers, 705 Stoddard Building, Lansing 23, Michigan

GEORGIA. (Continued from Page 286).

The 1962 session also enacted a slight change in the University System Building Authority Act, to permit revenue bonds for student housing projects to be issued to mature at forty years instead of thirty years. This will enable the University System to qualify for the 40-year loans of the Housing and Home Finance Agency, and thus somewhat reduce the amounts that would otherwise have to be charged to students as rental for dormitory rooms.

* * * * *

KENTUCKY. Appropriations of state tax funds for operating expenses of higher education for the biennium 1962-63 are reported as in Table 89.

Table 89. State tax-fund appropriations for operating expenses of higher education in Kentucky, for the two fiscal years 1962-63 and 1963-64, in thousands of dollars

Institutions	Sums appropriated	
	1962-63	1963-64
(1)	(2)	(3)
U of Kentucky	\$ 9,800	\$10,266
Medical Center	6,125	7,050
Ag Exten Serv	1,530	1,615
Ag Exp Sta	1,316	1,425
West Ky St Coll	2,555	2,848
East Ky St Coll	2,434	2,690
Murray St Coll	2,235	2,472
Morehead St Coll	1,957	2,138
Kentucky St Coll	850*	869*
Council Pub H Edn**	771***	791***
Totals	29,573	32,164

* Annual appropriations of approximately \$200,000 are also made to the Lincoln Institute in Shelby County, which serves as a practice school for prospective teachers enrolled in Kentucky State College.

** A coordinating and statistical agency first set up by the legislature in 1934.

*** These appropriations include \$500,000 annually for a contract program of medical education and research at the University of Louisville School of Medicine; about \$125,000 a year for various programs

of the Southern Regional Education Board (the largest of these being payments for veterinary students, aggregating \$73,500 a year); \$50,000 a year for musical education; \$45,000 a year for an "occupational qualification development program" which involves payment of \$100 per student per year to a municipal junior college under specified conditions; plus about \$125,000 for the biennium for the operation of the Council and its staff.

The total of \$29,573,000 for fiscal year 1962-63 appears to be a gain of a little more than 50% over the comparable figure for 1960-61, two years ago.

The total of \$32,164,000 for fiscal year 1963-64 also represents a gain of about 35½% over 1961-62, its predecessor by two years.

A new act provides for the addition of 3 lay members, to be appointed by the governor for 4-year terms, to the Council on Public Higher Education in Kentucky.

This will enlarge the Council to a membership of 21. It presently consists of 18, as follows: The president and one member of the board of regents of each of the 5 state colleges; the president and 3 members of the board of Trustees of the University of Kentucky (the governing board members being selected by their respective boards); two lay members of the state board of education; the dean of the college of education at the University; and the Superintendent of Public Instruction (Chairman).

The new act also specifies that unexcused absences from two successive meetings of the Council shall be cause for disqualification of a member; and requires the Council to hold regular meetings at least four times a year, instead of only twice a year, as hitherto.

* * * * *

NEW YORK. Appropriations of state tax funds for operating expenses of higher education for fiscal year 1962-63 are reported as in Table 90.

Table 90. State tax-fund appropriations for operating expenses of higher education in New York State, fiscal year 1962-63, in thousands of dollars.

Institutions	Sums appropriated
(1)	(2)
State University of New York	
Central administration	\$1,368
Cornell contract colls	
St Coll of Ag	8,405
St Coll Home Ec	1,894
Ag Exp Sta (Geneva)	1,824
St Coll Vet Med	1,593
Sch Indus & Lab Rel	1,472
General services	1,794
Various state insts	
University of Buffalo*	5,775
Downstate Med Coll	4,787
Upstate Med Coll	3,607
Forestry (Syracuse)	2,435
Long Island Center	2,370
Harpur College	1,796
Maritime Acad	1,150
Ceramics (Alfred)	1,022
Grad Sch Pub Affairs**	225
State university colls	
Albany	3,442
Buffalo	3,475
Oswego	2,899
Cortland	2,659
Oneonta	2,326
New Paltz	2,225
Brockport	2,147
Plattsburg	2,100
Potsdam	2,025
Geneseo	2,006
Fredonia	1,884
All st u colls (lump)***	420
Ag & tech institutes	
Farmingdale	1,978
Alfred	1,190
Morrisville	800
Canton	584
Cobleskill	626
Delhi	623
All st u insts (lump)****	1,000
Subtotal, State U of N Y	75,922

Table 90, continued

Operating expenses for higher education other than the State University	
Scholarships & fellowships	19,328
"Scholar incentive" paymts	23,600
Subsidies to City U of N Y	
For teacher education	15,000
For city colleges	9,515
For doctoral program	1,000
Aid to community colleges	7,100
N Y Higher Edn Asst Corp	5,090
Subtotal, other than SUNY	80,633
Grand total	156,555

* Metamorphosis from private to state ownership and control expected to be completed September 1, 1962.

** Operated with state subsidy by two private universities (New York and Syracuse) prior to 1961-62; now a separate unit of the State University of New York.

*** Includes \$320,000 for subsidies for summer programs, and \$100,000 for new clerical positions.

**** Includes an unallocated \$500,000 for utilities for new buildings, \$400,000 for the colleges' share of the National Defense Education Act student loan program, \$50,000 for a new sabbatical leave policy, and \$50,000 for costs of planning and development.

The total for 1962-63 apparently represents a gain of about 41% over the comparable figure for 1960-61, two years ago. Exact comparison is difficult on account of "deficiency appropriations", an occasional statewide appropriation for percentage salary increases for all state employees, and other adjustments.

The figures do not include "fringe benefits" such as retirement and health insurance programs, because these are appropriated on a statewide basis and subsequently allotted to departments and institutions.

It will be noted that less than half of the total annual appropriation is for operating expenses of all units of the State University of New York. The rate of gain over the 2-year period is substantially less than for the other

----- M. M. Chambers, 705 Stoddard Building, Lansing 23, Michigan -----

NEW YORK. (Continued from Page 288). items. The gain for the State University is about 35%, but this is due in considerable part to the contemplated addition of the University of Buffalo to the State University and a consequent additional appropriation of nearly \$6 million. Actually the gain for all other units of the State University collectively is only about 27%.

The fact that approximately half of New York's annual appropriations for operating expenses of higher education goes for subsidies to municipal and private institutions, directly or indirectly through payments to students, makes this state's system of support for higher education unique, and precludes exact comparisons with most other states, where public funds go only to public institutions.

If appropriations to the State University of New York alone are compared with those of other states, it must be kept in mind that these sums include only about half of the total currently appropriated annually for the support of higher education in New York State. The total of appropriations for student aids alone is nearly two-thirds as large as the appropriation for operating expenses of the State University; and the total of annual subsidies to the City University is one-third as large as the total appropriated for operating expenses of the State University.

* * * * *

SOUTH CAROLINA. The 1962 legislature created a State Advisory Commission on Higher Education, composed of 7 members to be appointed by the governor. Terms are 4 years (with 3 members appointed initially for 2 years). Trustees or employees of any state institution, or holders of any public office, are ineligible; and not more than 2 members who have attended the same institution of higher learning may be on the Commission at the same time.

A significant sentence in the act is: "Nothing in this act shall be construed as clothing the Commission with any apparent or inherent powers except those of an advisory nature."

Another notable provision is that "The Commission shall establish a Council of Presidents consisting of the presidents of the state institutions of higher learning," which shall meet at least four times a year, and two meetings will be held jointly with the Commission.

The Council of Presidents is authorized to establish committees "consisting of qualified personnel representing the various state-supported institutions of higher learning," either upon request of the Commission or on its own initiative, to "investigate, study and report on such subjects as (a) Academic planning, (b) Business and financial coordination; and (c) Library utilization and coordination."

The full statement of the Commission's responsibilities is quotable:

"The Commission is charged with the duty of making studies of the State's institutions of higher learning relative to both short and long-range programs which shall include:

"(a) the role of state-supported higher education in serving the needs of the state and the roles and participation of the individual institutions in the statewide program;

"(b) enrollment trends, student costs, business management practices, accounting methods, operating results and needs and capital fund requirements;

"(c) the administrative setup and curricular offerings of the several institutions and of the various departments, schools, institutions and services within each institution and the respective relationships to the services and offerings of other institutions;

"(d) areas of state-level coordination and cooperation with the objective of reducing duplication, increasing effectiveness and economies and eliminating sources of friction and misunderstanding;

SOUTH CAROLINA. (Continued from Page 289).

"(e) efforts to promote a clearer understanding and greater unity and good will among all institutions of higher learning, both public and private, in the interest of serving the educational needs of the people of South Carolina on a statewide level."

The statement is generally very well put, except for the last word of the final paragraph. It would have been better to say "statewide scale" rather than "statewide level". Probably no one wants to see higher education in South Carolina reduced to a "level", statewide or otherwise.

* * * * *

VIRGINIA. In his farewell message as chief executive of the state, former Governor J. Lindsay Almond, Jr., said:

"In a world where social health, industrial strength and technological achievement are the keynotes to survival, we must urge and sustain our colleges and universities to greater effort. Again I emphasize it is waste and folly to sustain mediocrity. We cannot afford to compromise the best in service and quality."

In his inaugural address, the new Governor Albertis S. Harrison, Jr., declared:

"If I were to fix one goal for Virginia in the final decades of this century, it would be the expansion of the minds of our people within the tradition of the Virginia character...In time past we have not expanded sufficiently our intellectual, cultural, and social horizons...I would like to see a renaissance of education in Virginia, creating an atmosphere in which the minds of our people may grow in vision as the opportunities for the use of the mind can grow in scope."

A press report indicates that the 1962 legislature has provided for a reorganization of the College of William and Mary System, which presently consists of the ancient college at Williamsburg and two 4-year affiliates (Richmond Professional Institute and Norfolk College) plus two embryonic 2-year divisions at Petersburg and Newport News, respectively; all under the Board of Visitors of the College of William and Mary.

The new act, effective in June 1962, is said to establish the Richmond Professional Institute and Norfolk College as autonomous institutions, each having a separate governing board of 14 members appointed by the governor, and a president appointed by the board. The College of William and Mary at Williamsburg will retain its own governing board and its own president, who will have subordinate to him a chancellor whose sole duty will be to supervise the operation of the 2-year branches, known as Richard Bland College at Petersburg and Christopher Newport College at Newport News.

If this report is accurate, it would seem that a significant step has been taken, away from the complicated "branch" system to which Virginia has hitherto clung in recent years, under which every new institution of public higher education had to be a "branch" of an older degree-granting institution.

It is reported that the College of William and Mary, with its ancient traditions of excellence in the liberal arts, social sciences, and law, felt it awkward to be teamed with its overgrown polyglot technical and professional offspring in Richmond and Norfolk; whereas these latter two institutions each located in a metropolitan area at a distance from the parent college, definitely have distinctive problems of their own which justify local autonomy.

* * * * *