

# GRAPEVINE

SINCE  
1958

21st  
YEAR

Number 247

January 1979

Page 1565

## TIMELY DATA CIRCULATED WHILE CURRENT

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

### IN THIS ISSUE

Alaska statewide total is corrected to \$74½ million. . . 1566

Delaware university reduces in-state tuition fee by \$60. 1566

Louisiana Baton Rouge campus of LSU corrected to read \$46½ million . . . . . 1566

Missouri Community College District of St. Louis reduces out-of-district and out-of-state tuition fees . . . . . 1566

Montana renews statewide property tax for university system for the fourth consecutive decade by a 2 to 1 popular plurality . . . . . 1566

New York will probably soon assume full tax support of the City University; but CUNY will probably not be merged with SUNY, and the city will probably retain its voice on the board. . . . . 1567

Pennsylvania former governor asks U.S. Supreme Court to invalidate statute requiring federal grants to be "reappropriated" by state legislature. . . . . 1568

Wisconsin cuts out-of-state fees at Platteville, to serve out-of-staters as a pilot project. . . . 1566

THIRTY-SIX "MEGAVERSITIES" GET \$100 MILLION OR MORE OF STATE TAX FUNDS FOR FISCAL YEAR 1979 . . .1569-1570

\* \* \* \* \*

"The distinguishing mark of the great scientist is apparently the pre-disposition of producing bold and speculative ideas."

--Ian I. Mitroff of the University of Pittsburgh, author of  
*The Subjective Side of Science*

ALASKA. The tabulation below is a revision of Table 50, page 1530, GRAPEVINE (July 1978):

Table 78. State tax-fund appropriations for operating expenses of higher education in Alaska, fiscal year 1978-79, in thousands of dollars.

	Sums appropriated
General appropriation	71,303
Special appropriations	
Salary increase	2,721
Research, Quick Look Satellite	214
Criminal justice (Anchorage)	314
Total	74,552

DELAWARE. After receiving a 9 per cent increase in legislative appropriations for fiscal 1979, the University of Delaware has reduced its tuition fee for in-state students to \$940--a reduction of \$60. This is a significant step for a state university in the northeast, where the fees are generally high by the standards of the South and West.

LOUISIANA. Correction for the Baton Rouge campus of the Louisiana State University System (Table 61, page 1537, GRAPEVINE, August 1978). The correct figure is \$46,520; the totals are correct as printed.

MISSOURI. The Community College District of the City and County of St. Louis has reduced tuition fees for students whose residence is outside the district. For district residents the fee continues at \$17 per credit hour. For residents of Missouri outside the district it is cut from \$35 to \$25; and for out-of-state residents it is cut from \$42 to \$35.

MONTANA. Enacted in 1948 was a law initiating a statewide property tax of up to 6 mills per dollar of assessed valuation, to be allocated to the state universities and colleges in Montana. It was to be submitted to popular vote every ten years for continuation.

In 1958 the measure passed by a 5,000-vote margin; in 1968 by 30,000 votes, and in November 1978 by 85,000 votes--affirmative 165,000 to 80,000 negative.

This does not argue well for the spread of California's meat-axe "Proposition 13," adopted by initiative June 6, 1978, drastically reducing property taxes in California, and touted in reactionary quarters as the spark that would set off a prairie-fire of state and national tax-cutting as the burning issue of the 1978 and 1980 elections, with scant regard for the needs of the public services.

WISCONSIN. The Regents of the University of Wisconsin System have voted to conduct a two-year experiment in reducing out-of-state tuition fees at the Wisconsin State University at Platteville, subject to approval by the governor and legislature in the 1980 budget.

The intent is to cut the present out-of-state fee of \$2,481 to \$1,489, in an effort to enable the institution to serve additional students from nearby communities in Illinois and Iowa--one more step toward providing better accessibility to higher education in border areas of many states. The Regents say Platteville will break even at the reduced fee if it attracts 251 additional out-of-state students.

-----  
GRAPEVINE 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 to numerous key persons in each of the fifty states.

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

M. M. Chambers, Illinois State University, Normal, Illinois 61761

NEW YORK. GRAPEVINE reported in No. 244, p. 1552 (October 1978) how Mayor Koch of New York City delayed the progress of the current master plan for the City University of New York, by ordering a study of it with recommendations by Harold Howe, 3d, drawing an emphatic protest from Chancellor Robert J. Kibbee, who decried the delay.

In November it appeared Howe had made at least a preliminary report reasonably promptly, in which he recommended that tax support of the University's four- and five-year colleges (of which it now has nine) be assumed by the state, relieving the city of any of the responsibility. Presumably the city would continue to provide a portion of the tax support of the nine junior (two-year) colleges, in a manner similar to the relationship between the counties and the state for the community colleges upstate.

*No Merger of State and City Universities*

Under Howe's recommendations, the City University would not lose its identity as a municipal university. It would continue to have its own governing board (the Board of Higher Education of the City of New York), though at this point it does not appear whether the members would be appointed by the governor and senate, or whether they would continue, as now, with some of their number chosen by the state and some by the mayor.

It may be, in view of the exodus of nine former municipal universities in several other states within the past half-century, from municipal tax support to state support, that the New York Legislature will decide City University must follow that road. Indeed it may be the best practicable way after 130 years in a different era during which City College (and eventually City University) was long unique--as tuition-free, of high quality, and high in popular esteem.

Chancellor Kibbee and members of the Board would prefer that the City continue to provide something like 15 per cent of the total tax support, they say, because this would help the City maintain a strong

voice in the governance of the University. There is something to be said for that; but if it does not prevail, it may be interesting to observe whether an appropriate degree of local control can be preserved without it. We need to outgrow the over-simplistic notion that in all matters and very literally "He who pays the piper calls the tune."

*City University Identity*

Mr. Howe was unquestionably right in giving great emphasis to the fact that the City has sufficiently diversified interests, sufficiently different from those of upstate, to justify having its University complex governed by a board of its own, and to justify being coordinate with the State University of New York, rather than being commingled with it in a single huge unmanageable bureaucracy.

The New York City Metropolitan Area has almost half the people of the State of New York, but it is a different culture and different way of life. This can be said without downgrading either; and in matters of higher education each of the two can best be allowed to move forward largely in accord with its own peculiar needs and preferences. Much futility and much hardship could be caused by trying vainly to meld them both into a homogenized mass.

*An Optimistic Future*

City University has been a step-child (or a political football, if you will) during most of the 1970's. It has lost its historic policy of free tuition. It has partly lost its prized policy of open admissions. It has lost considerable numbers of students and faculty members.

One hopes it will look forward eventually toward gaining added facilities, augmented public support and esteem, exceeding anything it ever had before.

A mighty challenge it is to operate a great popular system of public higher education for one of the world's largest cities.

PENNSYLVANIA. This carries forward the story, "Should State Legislatures Insist on Appropriating Federal Funds?" (GRAPEVINE, No. 227, pp. 1445-1446, May 1977).

*U.S. Supreme Court May Review a Pennsylvania Statute*

Prodded by a resolution of the National Conference of State Legislatures, and by the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations (a federal agency), the Pennsylvania legislature enacted a law requiring all federal funds granted to agencies of the state to be "reappropriated" by the state legislature before disbursement.

This amounts in effect to impounding the federal money until such time as the legislature meets and deliberates on whether to "reappropriate" some of it, all of it, or none of it. Inevitably it means unnecessary delays and hardships.

Milton J. Shapp, Governor of Pennsylvania in 1976 when the act was passed, vetoed it, but it was enacted over his veto. Later he sued in state courts to have it declared unconstitutional, but the state supreme court denied his plea.

In 1978 the U. S. Supreme Court was petitioned to review the decision, and it was given docket no. 78-642; but it was not known whether the Court would accept it for review.

The issue involves the Supremacy Clause of the United State Constitution, and the simple proposition that funds appropriated by the U.S. Congress are to be allocated as indicated in the Acts of Congress, and need no further legislative appropriation.

*32 Organizations Urge Review*

A friend-of-the-court brief has been filed with the Supreme Court by 32 national organizations, led by the American Association of State Colleges and Universities, the American Council on Education, the National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges, and others, arguing that the Pennsylvania decision unconstitutionally makes state law outrank federal law in the same field, and because it would limit the power of Congress over appropriations.

Moreover, the practical effect of the Pennsylvania law is to impair the effectiveness of federal programs designed to advance education and other general welfare programs, nationwide.

*An Example of Bad Effects*

An early illustration of hardships and losses resulting to the state and nation appeared in the first year of the operation of the Pennsylvania act, when the state department of education reported that five months of delay in making state appropriations of federal funds for aid to college students made it impossible for many students to know, a reasonable time before the beginning of the academic year, whether the funds would be available or not.

This was believed undoubtedly to have been a large factor in causing some decline in college and university enrollments in that year.

*Efficient Federalism Is Possible*

Smooth-working partnership between the federal and state governments is a necessity, because the organization of the nation's economy has long since made it necessary for the federal government to levy and collect roughly two-thirds of all public revenues; and there is no likelihood that this condition will soon be substantially changed.

This makes the complex system of intergovernmental transfers absolutely essential. In a word, nearly half of all local government expenditures is financed by federal and state governments. It is high time that the downward flow of funds from the higher levels be less impeded by needless jurisdictional quarrels.

It is *prima facie* illogical, unnecessary for any purpose, and productive of much loss of time and money to expect the state legislatures to seize and withhold federal grants and appropriations intended for public agencies within the state until the legislature itself can deliberate on each and "reappropriate" it in whole or in part.

The scheme is in part a device by which politicians of the extreme right wing hope to hamstring or defeat progressive domestic programs of the federal government.

M. M. Chambers, Illinois State University, Normal, Illinois 61761

THIRTY-SIX MULTI-CAMPUS MEGIVERSITIES RECEIVE \$100 MILLION OR MORE EACH  
IN APPROPRIATIONS OF STATE TAX FUNDS FOR FISCAL YEAR 1978-79

Among the fifty states are found: (1) multicampus state universities, and (2) conglomerates of institutions, sometimes statewide in an inclusive sense, but usually less than inclusive of all public higher education, under a single governing board.

To keep Table 79 within manageable size, it is limited to the largest of such units in the nation (recipients of \$100 million or more of state tax funds appropriated for operating expenses for fiscal year 1979).

The result is a listing of some 36 entities which we call "megaversities" for lack of a better word. Each embraces more than one campus--some only a few, but others many. The differences in numbers and sizes of the component campuses or institutions are very many.

Therefore the compact tabulation conveys only limited information. It shows nothing of the history of the megaversities, or of the multifold differences in their composition and operation.

According to the figures for fiscal 1979, the nine-campus University of California heads the list with \$753 million, followed closely by the State University of New York with \$738 million. Then comes the 19-campus State University and College of California with \$681 million. There are 8 systems between \$200 million and \$400 million, making a total of 11 above \$200 million.

The median among the 36 is approximately \$149 million. At the lower end of the scale are 12 entities between \$100 million and \$125 million.

The weighted average two-year gain for fiscal 1979 over fiscal 1977 (18%) is somewhat less than the 22 per cent for all fifty states. The ten-year gain for fiscal 1979 over fiscal 1969 (183%) is distinctly smaller than the 235 per cent reported for all fifty states. (Some of the 36 entities were not in existence in 1969; the figure for that year is the total for the institutions, as of that year, which later became components of the multicampus entity.)

The fact that the two-year and ten-year gains for these larger entities are smaller than the gains reported for all fifty states is partly accounted for by the inclusion in many of the 50 statewide reports substantial sums for state aid to local public community colleges, state-paid student financial aids, and other items not attributed separately to the institutions or multicampus entities.

The total of \$7,968,391,000 (for fiscal 1979) is about 47 per cent of the nationwide 50-state total of \$16,964,030,000. Apparently it can be estimated that nearly half of all state tax funds appropriated for operating expenses of all higher education for that year went to these 36 large entities.

Each of these composite entities contains one or more *major campuses* ranking as large comprehensive universities. A tabulation of the "main," "major," or "flagship" institutions is being prepared for a future issue of GRAPEVINE. It will show major universities receiving \$100 million or more.

The comments on this page apply to Table 79, on page 1570 (reverse of this page).

Table 79. THIRTY-SIX CONGLOMERATES GETTING \$100 MILLION OR MORE IN APPROPRIATIONS OF STATE TAX FUNDS FOR FISCAL YEAR 1978-79 (IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS), WITH DOLLAR GAINS AND PERCENTAGE GAINS OVER TWO YEARS AND TEN YEARS.

Megaversity Conglomerates	Year 1968-69	Year 1976-77	Year 1978-79	2-yr gain per cent	10-yr gain per cent
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
University of California	291,084	652,574	753,300	15	159
State U of New York	277,382	668,121	737,728	10	166
California State U & Col	238,783	638,126	681,241	7	185
U of North Carolina sys	90,229	298,139	380,483	28	322
U of Texas system	86,076	331,768	355,429	7	313
U of Wisconsin system	148,759	301,883	355,374	18	139
Regents of Georgia system	111,524	260,522	341,450	31	206
Florida State U system	92,328	268,027	336,669	26	265
U of Illinois	125,719	234,453	283,628	21	126
Iowa Board of Regents	79,773	174,529	211,075	21	165
Kansas Board of Regents	66,289	159,706	202,473	27	205
U of Minnesota	72,803	154,500	194,943	26	168
Arizona Board of Regents	48,311	153,989	179,423	17	271
Mississippi Trustees	39,269	103,208	165,641	60	322
(City U of New York)*	(75,480)	(128,050)	(160,754)	26	113
Oregon Board of Higher Ed	60,060	135,141	152,039	13	153
Louisiana State U system	46,391	107,425	151,550	41	227
U of Michigan	63,272	123,811	150,295	21	138
U of Missouri	73,246	127,709	148,894	17	103
West Virginia Bd of Regents	49,033	123,622	148,120	20	202
Ohio State U	60,295	136,252	147,105	8	144
Indiana U	60,787	121,302	142,916	18	135
U of Maryland	52,173	115,015	135,515	18	160
Utah Board of Higher Ed	33,695	102,937	132,047	28	292
U of Tennessee	33,721	95,039	125,877	32	273
Texas A & M system	40,597	104,410	115,006	10	183
U of Massachusetts	33,920	108,075	114,768	6	238
U of Hawaii	30,987	97,884	113,767	16	267
Pennsylvania State U	59,222	106,759	111,981	5	89
U of Alabama	19,646	74,210	109,326	47	456
Southern Illinois U	51,154	89,958	108,717	21	113
U of Nebraska	27,320	94,600	107,857	14	295
U of Kentucky	47,287	82,106	106,042	29	124
Rutgers, State U of NJ	39,292	81,201	103,375	27	163
Purdue U	51,348	88,976	102,510	15	100
Louisiana Brd of Trustees	43,556	85,126	101,073	19	132
Totals	2,820,811	6,729,153	7,968,391**		
Weighted average percentages of gain				18	183

\*For this municipal university, the sums in parentheses represent only appropriations of state tax funds, and exclude city appropriations.

\*\*This sum for the 36 conglomerates is approximately 47 per cent of the total of roughly \$17 billion of state tax funds for all higher education in fifty states.

The wide variety of the components of these 36 conglomerates, which are in 30 states, severely limits the meaning of the figures. They mean no more than that the sums go to varied numbers and types of institutions under a single governing board.