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

Number 46NOVEMBER - DECEMBER, 1962	Page 315
GRAPEVINE * * * *	
A newsletter on state tax legislation; state appropriations for universities and junior colleges; state support of public school systems; legislation aff education at any level. There is no charge for GRAPEVINE, but recipients ar send timely newsnotes regarding pertinent events in their respective states.	ecting easked to
IN THIS ISSUE	
Alaska. State bond issue of \$5,950,000 for capital improvement of University of Alaska approved by 3 to 1 3	16
California. State bond issue to provide over \$220 million for capital expansion of University, state colleges, and junior colleges approved at the polls 316-3	17
Georgia. Additional operating appropriation of \$1,100,000 provides further faculty salary increase of 5%, making total increase of 9% for 1962-63	17
Iowa. Three presidents agree higher education needs for 1963-65 \$20 million for capital outlays and increase of \$28 million in operating funds	17
Maryland. Transfer of teachers' retirement appropriation from University of Maryland to State Teachers Retirement System necessitates a correction of Grapevine's tabulation	17
Massachusetts. Proposed amendment to authorize graduated personal income tax defeated at polls	18
New Mexico. Commission on Statewide Higher Education Problems will work 18 months on developing report	18
New York. Legislature creates new organization to expedite the \$1 billion academic building program over the ensuing period of about seven years	18
North Carolina. Governor's Commission on Education Beyond the High School recommends expansion of public higher education	
Rhode Island. Voters approve state bond issue of \$6 1/2 million 31	19
HIGHER EDUCATION IN CANADA	ra :

Statement of ownership and circulation of GRAPEVINE is on page 316, (reverse hereof).

ALASKA. The proposed state bond issue of \$5,950,000 for capital improvements to the facilities of the University of Alaska was approved at the polls on November 6, 1962 by a vote of 3 to 1.

President William R. Wood regarded this as a strong vote of confidence in the university, and a recognition of its necessity of growth. The university is establishing a major Arctic Research Center, with emphasis on the biological sciences, and \$3 1/2 million of the bond proceeds will be used for construction of the first unit of a research complex which will ultimately become larger.

The bond proceeds will also provide for large additions to the engineering building (\$1,700,000), a warehouse and maintenance shop (\$600,000), and a fire protection facility (\$150,000).

The development of scientific research at the University of Alaska is of keen interest to various agencies of the federal government. In August 1962 President Wood and the Board of Regents received a report (supported by grant No. G-15386 from the National Science Foundation) from a committee of nine eminent biological scientists headed by Donald S. Farner of Washington State University, recommending the establishment of an Institute of Arctic Biology at the University of Alaska and stressing numerous relations and interactions of state and national interests in advancing research in arctic biology.

CALIFORNIA. The proposed state bond issue of \$270 million, chiefly to finance new buildings at the University of California, the state colleges, and

the junior colleges, was approved at the election of November 6, 1962.

A similar proposal had been defeated at the primary election in June, apparently because the wording on the ballot was too brief and vague to make clear the intent that the major part of the proceeds would be used to finance higher educational plant.

The successful proposal specified that not less than 80% of the funds are to be used for the building construction, equipment and site acquisition needs of the University, the state colleges, and the junior colleges. It is contemplated that the allotments to the three segments of the higher educational system just named will be respectively about \$102 million, \$101 million, and \$20 million. Expenditures for some of the projects were authorized in the 1962-63 budget, and most if not all the others will be included in the 1963-64 budget.

Popular approval of the proposal gives continued evidence of California's faith in public higher education.

The University of California is now studying the possibility of changing from two-semester operation to year'round operation, possibly on the fourquarter plan. Budgets for year-'round full-scale operation of the Berkeley,
Los Angeles, and Santa Barbara campuses are being prepared for the Regents, with a target date of mid-1965. Substantially increased legislative appropriations would be necessary for the stepped-up operating expenses under year-'round operation.

The University of California at Berkeley is also to have a \$5 million

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

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

CALIFORNIA. (Continued)

auditorium-theater, to be built without the use of public funds. The students have expressed a willingness to have \$5 each added to activity fees and applied to the auditorium project. The Regents have agreed to lend the construction money, to be repaid over a period of years.

GEORIA. Recently an additional appropriation for fiscal year 1962-63 was made to the Board of Regents of the University System, in the amount of \$1,100,000, for the special purpose of providing an additional salary increase for the faculties. The special increase is of 5%, and when added to the increase already previously provided for in the appropriation act of 1961 for the fiscal year 1962-63, amounts to a total increase of 9% for 1962-63 over the previous fiscal year.

The total of state tax funds appropriated to the Board of Regents for 1962-63 is now \$36,370,000, of which the Board has allocated \$32,162,229 for operating expenses, and \$4,055,600 for capital outlay, with a balance of \$152,171 unallocated.

IOWA. The Des Moines Sunday Register for October 21 in a four-column story reports interviews with the presidents of Iowa's three state institutions of higher education: Virgil M. Hancher of the State University of Iowa, James H. Hilton of Iowa State University, and James W. Maucker of the State College of Iowa.

The Register's story, two weeks in advance of the November election, was timely in view of the fact that up to that time neither of the major candidates for governor had publicly placed any emphasis on state support of higher education.

The three presidents are agreed that the legislative session of 1963 is crucial, representing the "last clear chance" to make orderly provision for the expansion of their educational plants. Students born during the immediate

post-war "baby boom" are now in the high schools, and will storm the colleges in full force in 1965 and 1966. Often as much as three years must elapse between the time an approriation is made for a new building and its actual opening for use.

The needs of the three big institutions for financing new facilities during the fiscal period 1963-65, in the order named above, are respectively \$8.9 million, \$8.5 million, and \$2.7 million.

Operating expenses for the biennium 1963-65 need to be increased by a total of approximately \$28 million for the three institutions.

MARYLAND. A CORRECTION is necessary in the Maryland line of Table 6 (GRAPEVINE, page 313), because the teachers' retirement appropriation for the University of Maryland was made directly to the university in 1960-61, but was transferred to the State Teachers' Retirement System for 1961-62 and 1962-1963. Therefore, the appropriations for the three fiscal years named, as shown in Table 6, are not properly comparable.

The resulting distortion can be corrected by subtracting the University of Maryland teachers' retirement appropriation for 1960-61 (\$1,300,000) from the total for that year, which reduces it to \$24,734,000. The dollar gain over the 2-year period 1960-61 to 1962-63 then becomes \$5,075,000, and the percentage gain becomes 20 1/2%, instead of the 14 1/4% erroneously shown in Table 6.

While this change necessitates comparatively small corrections of the 50-state totals in Columns 3 and 6 of Table 6, it does not effect any change in the nationwide percentage gain over the 2-year period, which is approximately 24 1/2%, as stated in Table 6.

MASSACHUSETTS. The proposed constitutional amendment which would have authorized the legislature to enact a graduated personal income tax, was on the ballot for the election of November 6, 1962, after having been approved by

two prior sessions of the legislature, as required. It was defeated at the polls by an astounding vote of about 5 to 1.

Massachusetts already has a flatrate income tax, levied at different
rates for three different types of income. It is reported that the graduated
income tax amendment was opposed by nearly all the newspapers in the state, and
not supported by organized labor, despite
the fact that labor would be presumed to
favor it as an alternative to a state
sales tax, which is regressive.

The League of Women Voters is said to have provided almost the only organized support. A major overhauling of the state revenue system will almost certainly come within a few years, and the events of 1962 seem to make it likely that first reliance will have to be placed on a state general sales tax.

NEW MEXICO. Launched in September 1962, a "New Mexico Commission on Statewide Higher Education Problems", a citizens' group of 28 persons, is expected to spend about 18 months developing a report with recommendations regarding the future of public higher education in the state.

NEW YORK. The current status of the expansion of physical plant for higher education in the state is of interest. The State Dormitory Authority was reported as of November 1, 1962, to have 42 dormitory projects in various stages of design and construction, involving an estimated \$74 million total cost and intended to provide about 17,000 beds, and in addition 17 dining hall projects to cost \$14 million and provide 8,400 seats.

As to classroom, laboratory, and other academic buildings, more than 100 projects aggregating some \$237 million were under contract and were in either construction, bidding, or design phases. About one-fifth of these were actually under construction.

A new state agency, the State University Construction Fund, created by the 1962 legislature at the suggestion of Governor Rockefeller in response to complaints that from 4 to 6 years

elapsed between the authorization of a building and its readiness for occupancy, is now in process of taking control of the academic building program which is expected to involve an outlay of about \$1 billion over the next seven years to double the capacity of the campuses comprising the State University of New York by 1970.

Significantly, the legislature removed this function from the Department of Public Works and turned it over to the new agency, whose first general manager is General David W. Traub, retired Controller of the U.S. Army. The general thinks he can reduce the "lead time" to 2 or 3 years, which is more nearly normal.

This step partially to disentangle the state university's affairs from the red-tape maze of the state's administrative bureaucracy is overdue in New York as well as in many other states, especially those of the Northeast. The logic of it would have been better if the new agency had been placed under the jurisdiction of the president and board of trustees of the state university.

Nevertheless it is an important straw-in-the-wind indicating the trend toward rescuing vitally essential affairs of state universities from the grip of state administrative offices in whose hands they may be unduly delayed and all but defeated. It is a step toward "the efficiency of freedom."

NORTH CAROLINA. The Governor's Commission on Education Beyond the High School has recommended several changes by way of reorganization and expansion. The State Board of Higher Education, created in 1955 and modified in 1959, would again be shaken up, to emerge as a 12-member board with the president of the University of North Carolina as a member ex officio, and to include three additional college presidents.

The Commission also recommends that the two-year community colleges at Charlotte and Wilmington be expanded into four-year institutions during 1963-65; and that the state's network of community colleges (now numbering five, with a sixth authorized) be developed into a system of at least 15 such colleges.

RHODE ISLAND. The voters approved on November 6, 1962 state bond issues to provide \$2 million for a new adult education and community college building for the University of Rhode Island in Providence, \$2 1/2 million for expansion and development of the University of Rhode Island at Kingston, and \$2 million for expansion and development of Rhode Island College at Providence, making a total of \$6 1/2 million for these two institutions.

An additional proposal of \$700,000 in state bonds for the development of the state vocational school at Corliss Park in Providence was also approved.

The voters also authorized the Board of Trustees of State Colleges to issue up to \$20 million of "revenue" bonds (not pledging the credit of the state, but only the pledged revenues of self-liquidating facilities for housing, dining, and other auxiliary purposes) at the University of Rhode Island and at Rhode Island College.

HIGHER EDUCATION IN CANADA

University Costs and Sources of Support, a 35-page publication by Edward F. Sheffield and Claire M. ApSimon, is Number 4 in an excellent series on Financing Higher Education in Canada, currently being issued by the Canadian Universities Foundation, 75 Albert St., Ottawa 4, Canada. Interested persons may obtain one copy gratis; additional copies at 25¢ each.

Some of the highlights, as reported in the October 1962 number of University Affairs, the small quarterly bulletin also published by the Foundation at the Ottawa address, are

"University operating expenditure more than doubled in the five years preceding 1960-61, and is likely to do the same in the succeeding five years.

"The three chief sources of university operating income, including research funds, are the provincial governments, the federal government, and tuition fees."

(In 1960-61, the respective percentages from these three principal sources

were, about 36 1/2%, 24%, and 25%).

"In 1956-57, of university funds for all purposes (operating and capital outlay) 57% came from governments. By 1960-61, governments' share had risen to 63%.

"Less than one per cent of Canada's gross national product is devoted to higher education."

The approximate similarity with familiar proportions in the United States is notable.

Two quotations regarding policy are noteworthy:

Lord James of Rusholme: "As I see it, the choice before us is not whether considerable expansion of higher education will take place or not. It is rather whether we shall accept this expansion reluctantly, and in constant fear of dilution and decline of standards, or whether we shall plan boldly, realizing that in order to transmit without debasing them the values for which universities stand to new students and new institutions, we have got to think afresh of precisely what those values are. The expansion of the universities is not simply an administrative exercise. It is part of a great social change which demands that we ask constantly what are the unique contributions which universities can make to a good society and how, as teachers, we can promote them. The principles on which we admit or exclude have got to be rational ones. And for those who are excluded, other means must be provided for obtaining that further education the desire for which is one of the most characteristic and most encouraging features of our time."

N. A. M. MacKenzie: "It is frequently said by those who would limit the enrolment of students in universities and colleges that the attendance of those who fail is an extravagant waste of substantial amounts of public monies. I would just like to note in passing two things: (1) that the individual concerned, either himself or his family, invests far more in his education than does the public; (2) and even in the

case of those who fail I am enough of an optimist to believe that if the universities are as good and as valuable as we claim them to be and they ought to be, then for any student a year or more spent in the environment of a university, even if the student is academically unsuccessful, should not be and is not likely to be entirely wasted."

Dr. R. W. B. Jackson, speaking of the ninth report of the Atkinson Study of the Utilization of Human Resources (relative to methods of predicting success in university studies):

"For the best students in high school, and for the poorest, our predictions are reasonably good. For the other students-- certainly from the point of view of an individual applicant,-- our results leave so much to be desired that we should in all fairness admit that our predictions of success or failure for a student, John Jones, might as well be based on the flip of a coin, where his school record falls anywhere in the wide middle range."

NEW BOOK ON HIGHER EDUCATION

Many readers of GRAPEVINE have at hand a copy of THE CAMPUS AND THE PEOPLE, a 75-page pamphlet by M. M. Chambers which appeared in 1960, treating some of the important issues infresh and fluent fashion.

In December 1962 the same publisher will release another and slightly larger pamphlet (about 125 pages) by Chambers, entitled CHANCE AND CHOICE IN HIGHER EDUCATION.

Both pamphlets are obtainable from THE INTERSTATE publishing house, Jackson at Van Buren Streets, Danville, Illinois.

The new book is in considerable part a result of the author's experience during 1961-62 as executive director of the Michigan Council of State College Presidents, the voluntary agency of cooperation among the ten state colleges and universities which compose the second largest statewide system of public higher education in the United States.

Adapted from addresses made in Philadelphia, Lincoln, Chicago,

Baltimore, and Biloxi, to organizations such as the National Legislative Conference, the Association of Governing Boards of State Universities and Allied Institutions, the American Association of University Women, the Southern Regional Education Board, and others, the book deals realistically with the main issues needing to be resolved with respect to public higher education.

Should student fees in public universities and colleges be held where they are, raised, lowered, or abolished?

What are the pro's and con's of massive student loan programs, encouraging students to borrow heavily for college expenses?

How much autonomy is necessary for state universities and colleges in the management of their fiscal and academic affairs, free from hampering controls emanating from Statehouse administrative offices?

At what rate have state appropriations of tax funds for operating expenses of higher education been increasing in recent years?

Are private gifts to public institutions increasing?

What will be the future role of the federal government?

What do we know now about the relation between higher education and economic growth of the state and the nation?

Will "growth industries" of the future cluster around university research centers?

Do employers consider the presence of community colleges and technical institutes when determining the location of new industrial plants?

These are some of the questions (but by no means all) that receive attention in the new book CHANCE AND CHOICE IN HIGHER EDUCATION.

Not copyrighted. If you quote or paraphrase, please credit the source in suitable manner.