M. M. Chambers Dept of Ednl Administration and Foundations Illinois State University, Normal, Illinois 61761

GRAPEVINE

1958 Number 261

SINCE

<u>March 1980</u>

Page 1649

22nd

YEAR

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

THIRTY-EIGHT STATE UNIVERSITY MAJOR CAMPUSES 1650-1654

In Two Parts

1653

Focus on the comprehensive university campus as an indispensable center of learning.

* * * * *

"The mind-set of 'steady state,' heard to the point of nausea today, is deadly nonsense. A living organism is only in a steady state when it is dead, when there is no sign of life. . . the university must continue vital and creative. . . provide society with the new ideas and the talented people so greatly needed."

--M. D. McElroy, chancellor of the University of California at San Diego; former director of the National Science Foundation.

Table 50. MAJOR CAMPUSES RECEIVING \$100 MILLION OR MORE OF APPROPRIATED STATE TAX FUNDS FOR ANNUAL OPERATING EXPENSES IN FISCAL 1980, IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS.

Major	Year	Year	Year	2-yr gain
Campuses	1977-78	1978-79	1979-80	per cent
	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
U of California (Los Angeles)	172,665	174,828	203,452	18
U of California (Berkeley)	135,341	138,719	164,698	22
Ohio State U (Columbus)	131,732	141,105	161,773	23
U of Minnesota (Minneapolis-St. Pa		141,539*	161,043*	23
U of Illinois (Urbana)	126,259	140,856	157,460	25
U of Florida (Gainesville)	123,726	138,519	153,210	24
II of Michigan (Aug Aut au)	107 500	122 066	146 270	20
U of Michigan (Ann Arbor)	121,593	133,866	146,370	20 22
Michigan State U (East Lansing)	119,382	132,638	146,103	18
U of Wisconsin (Madison)	123,545	133,852	145,967	26
U of Washington (Seattle)	105,200	105,200	133,072	
U of California (Davis)	109,377	111,286	128,849	18
Texas A & M (College Station)	99,108	101,386	124,302	25
U of Iowa (Iowa City)	95,288	106,514	117,087	23
U of North Carolina (Chapel Hill)	97,647	101,540	116,182	19
U of Arizona (Tucson)	96,331	96,433	107,963	12
U of Georgia (Athens)	84,773	96,540	106,978	26
U of Texas (Austin)	73,422	78,212	106,816	45
SUNY (Stony Brook)	63,098	86,564	101,531	61
Totals	2,009,657	2,159,597	2,482,856	
Weighted average percentage of gai				24
*Fo.himoto.d				

*Estimated

STATE UNIVERSITY MAJOR CAMPUSES

We have recently discussed groupings of state institutions of higher education under a single governing board in 17 states; and a second type of grouping in the form of 23 large multi-campus universities. (GRAPEVINE, pages 1644-1647, including Tables 48 and 49.)

Here we take a different perspective, focusing on main or major campuses. In naval parlance, these are sometimes

spoken of as "flagship campuses" in a flotilla of other institutions; but some of them are not within either of the two kinds of groupings mentioned, and stand single. In such cases the larger campus usually may be said to be the principal state university in its state; though California has three, and Michigan and Texas each have two.

(Continued on page 1651)

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 curculated 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

(Continued from page 1650)

The Comprehensive Campus is Crucial

It would be difficult to think of a statewide system of higher education as consisting wholly of separate, fragmented and scattered campuses, each limited to one profession or one academic field, such as medicine, law, engineering, business, science, literature, mathematics, philosophy, music, painting, or sculpture.

A part of the essential idea of a university is the notion of comprehensiveness and cosmopolitanism. Development in each of the multifold arts and sciences and professions is aided by proximity to all the others in an academic community where the way of life involves curiosity, originality, initiative, inventiveness, and creativity, all stimulated by the ozone of intellectual effort.

EIGHTEEN CAMPUSES IN 1980 ARE LEADING CENTERS OF ADVANCED LEARNING

There's Nothing Like a University Campus

In such a community there is a prevailing idealism; not, of course, shared by all, but nevertheless present in greater degree than in run-of-the-mill human associations or enterprises.

Small colleges may foster a similar spirit in high degree, but they cannot match the advantages of the large university because the comprehensive and cosmopolitan campus has (1) an unmatched concentration of varied talents among its faculty and advanced students in scores of fields of knowledge; (2) abundant facilities in the form of libraries, laboratories for all the sciences, hospitals and clinics, studios for electronic communications, shops, experimental and demonstration farms, and equipment for numerous departments of engineering, as well as studios of the arts and music, theaters and auditoriums and lecture halls and classrooms for hundreds of different studies which contribute to the "unity of knowledge."

The Apex of the Learning Enterprise

The large state university campus, if worthy of its name, includes a Graduate School offering doctoral programs in

many departments of the arts and sciences, and several post-baccalaureate schools of the major professions. It also has increasing numbers of postdoctoral students pursuing instruction and research beyond the doctoral level.

All these post-baccalaureate units are heavily permeated with the spirit of research (which is a prosaic name for human curiosity), and breakthroughs are accomplished often enough to maintain a pervading sense of expectation of discovery to flourish on the campus.

Fortunately there are many more state universities of this general type than the 18 named in Table 50. But the 18 in Table 50 appear to be the only ones above the arbitrary cut-off point of \$100 million or more of appropriated net state tax funds for operating expenses in fiscal year 1980.

In fact, there are several quite near to the cut-off, but on the lower side; and we do not wish to leave any implication that a university having \$102 million of net state tax support is necessarily vastly superior to one having \$98 million. The reason for the cut-off is to produce a tabulation small enough to be read and pondered without a microscope; not a repellent yard-long sheet of fine print.

(Continued on page 1652)

A Few Comments

Of the 18 campuses in Table 50, only two are not either units of a multi-campus university, or under a single governing board with other institutions. These two are Michigan State University at East Lansing and the University of Washington at Seattle.

Eight are within multi-campus universities (usually the "flagship"): Ohio State U, U of Illinois, U of Michigan, U of Texas, and Texas A&M U. In California, Berkeley is the flagship; but very recently the state tax support of Los Angeles (once the "Southern Branch") has surpassed it; and Davis has become a third major unit of the nine-campus University.

Seven are under consolidated governing boards, five of which are statewide and bear the name of Board of Regents: in Arizona, Florida, Georgia, Iowa, and Wisconsin. In North Carolina the statewide governing board is called Board of Governors.

Confusing Terminiology in New York

The Board of Trustees of the State University of New York (SUNY) is a board that in 1948 was set up to manage pre-existing public institutions of higher education throughout the state, except the multi-campus City University of New York.

Therefore SUNY is properly classified as a consolidated statewide system, and it is named "University." This is something of a misnomer. Its numerous conglomeration of institutions now includes four "university centers," at Albany, Binghamton, Buffalo, and Stony Brook; but none of these had reached the \$100 million class prior to 1979 when Stony Brook burst through.

Money Is Not Everything

The \$100 million cut-off leaves many of the nation's well-known, well-established and highly respected state universities excluded from Table 50. The complexity and diversity of organization make the line of demarcation somewhat uncertain in some cases: Indiana U at Bloomington has about \$75,905,000 for fiscal 1980, but its large Health Division and some other units are not at

Bloomington, but at Indianapolis, only 50 miles away. If these units are taken to be a part of the main campus, then the total is \$121,424,000.

The University of Kansas is somewhat similarly situated: the campus at Lawrence has \$57,513,000; its Medical Center in nearby Kansas City has \$43,579,000; so if the two be considered a single-campus university, the total is \$101,092,000.

There are also several state universities quite near to the cut-off point, but on the lower side. We make the arbitrary cut-off not because we see money as the sole measure, but because it is easily and quickly applied to produce reasonably small and intelligible divisions, such as Table 50.

Land-Grant Universities

In the case of land-grant universities, GRAPEVINE adheres to its established custom of counting agricultural experimentation and agricultural extension activities as a part of the main campus, not as extraneous enterprises.

As to the effect of this practice. there are three types of universities in Table 50: (1) the principal state university is also the land-grant institution, such as Ohio State U, and U of Illinois at Urbana, and U of Wisconsin at Madison; (2) the principal state university is not a land-grant institution: U of Michigan, U of Washington, U of Iowa, and U of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, but there is another important and separate land-grant university in the same state; and (3) the institution in Table 50 is just such a separate land-grant university: Michigan State U, and Texas A & M U.

All in all, there are about 30 states in which the principal state university is land-grant, and about 20 in which it is not, but is "sister institution" to a separate land-grant university in the same state. (In about a dozen states of the South there is also a second land-grant institution formerly predominantly or wholly black.)

(Continued on page 1653)

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

The Pecuniary Picture of the 18 Top Campuses

Observe Columns 4 and 5 of Table 50: The range of appropriated state tax funds for operating expenses in fiscal 1980 is comparatively narrow, extending from \$100 million to roughly \$200 million.

U of Cal at Los Angeles has recently outpaced the "mother campus" at Berkeley to take top place in this ranking. State University of New York at Stony Brook has just this year squeezed past the \$100 million mark to take bottom place; and this is the first year in history that New York has ever had any state university up to that financial level.

The median point of \$133 million be-

longs to the University of Washington at Seattle.

As to increases over the most recent two years, the weighted average rate of gain appears to be 24 per cent-the same as reported for all state taxassisted higher education in the fifty states, perhaps a signal that the legislatures are not discriminating against the major campuses, as they have sometimes been urged to do from some quarters.

Unusually good rates of gain seem to have accrued to SUNY at Stony Brook and the University of Texas at Austin. These indicate commendable progress in the two states ranking second and third in total population.

TWENTY-THREE MAJOR CAMPUSES IN THE NEXT CLASS-INTERVAL

Table 51. STATE UNIVERSITY MAJOR CAMPUSES HAVING BETWEEN \$75 MILLION AND \$100 MILLION OF APPROPRIATED STATE TAX FUNDS FOR ANNUAL OPERATING EXPENSES IN 1980 (In thousands of dollars)

Wayne State U (Detroit) State U of N Y at Buffalo U of Illinois Med Ctr at Chicago LA State U (Baton Rouge) U of Connecticut (Storrs) U of Tennessee (Knoxville) Purdue U (W Lafayette, IN) N Carolina State U (Raleigh) Iowa State U (Ames) U of Texas Med Br at Galveston U of Massachusetts (Amherst) U of Missouri (Columbia)	98,237 98,087 92,322 91,231 90,983 88,676 87,232 87,023 86,403 85,123 84,700 84,521	U of Arkansas (Fayetteville) So Illinois U (Carbondale) Washington State U (Pullman) U of Cal at San Diego U of Maryland (College Park) Va Poly & State U (Blacksburg) U Cal at San Francisco U of Hawaii (Manoa) Indiana U (Bloomington) Temple U (state subsidy)* Va Commonwealth U (Norfolk)	81,442 80,952 80,541 80,414 77,947 77,851 77,755 75,905 75,555 75,368

^{*}Temple U in Philadelphia is a private university called "state related," and a part of the "Commonwealth segment" of higher education in Pennsylvania.

Note: At press time our figures from a few states and institutions were not complete; thus this listing is to be regarded as preliminary, not final. Among major campuses that may be within or near the category of Table 51 are Pennsylvania State University at College Park, the New Brunswick campus of Rutgers, the State University of New Jersey, and the University of Kentucky at Lexington.

As measured solely by the number of dollars of state tax funds appropriated for annual operating expenses in 1980, the 23 institutions in Table 51 might perhaps be called the "second cohort" of state university campuses, after the "first cohort" set forth in Table 50.

Probably the English language in our day lacks an accurate adjective to designate such a group, because there is no intellectually respectable way of appraising the relative quality and importance of universities.

It would be clearly nonsensical to speak of this group as second-level, second class, or second-rate; yet the group is exactly that if we place its boundaries at the \$75 million and \$100 million of annual state tax support, and simply look at no other yeardstick.

Equally silly would it be to refer to this group as "developing universities," because any university, be it largest or smallest, best or worst, is and always will be "developing" unless it is dead and decaying.

Nor can we tag this group as "emerging universities," because most of them have already emerged and have been highly visible parts of the scene for a long time. Both "developing" and "emerging" are often used in current parlance, but they are applied with better semblance of aptness to institutions several notches farther down the financial scale.

In fact, a considerable number of smaller and medium-sized universities, as measured by enrollments and tax support, have "emerged" and "developed" with commendable and often generally unexpected rapidity within the past fifteen years.

A Closer Look at Table 51

Prominent is the fact that five of the 23 campuses in Table 51 are separate land-grant universities (meaning that each has in its own state an important "sister university" that is non-land-grant). These are Purdue University, North Carolina State U, Iowa State U, Washington State U, and Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State U.

Another eight are combined land-grant (meaning that each is the state's land-grant institution, one and the same as the state's principal non-land-grant university). These are Louisiana State U and A and M College, U of Connecticut, U of Tennessee, U of Massachusetts, U of Missouri, U of Arkansas, U of Maryland, and U of Hawaii.

Indiana U is the principal state university, but is non-land-grant.

Three are medical campuses of large multi-campus universities: U of Illinois at Chicago, U of Texas at Galveston, and U of Cal at San Francisco. Virginia Commonwealth U was formed by merging the well-established Medical College of Virginia with an existing urban institution to develop a comprehensive university.

Wayne State U, once private, then municipal, became a state university in 1959. State U of New York at Buffalo was long a private institution, but became a state university in 1963.

Southern Illinois U grew from the normal school-teachers college tradition partly because it was for many years the only public institution of higher education in the southern one-third of a large and populous state.

Temple University in Philadelphia was a private institution for nearly a century, and continues as a private non-profit corporation, but during the late 1960's was taken under the wing of the state of Pennsylvania and began to be heavily subsidized. Pennsylvania adopted a similar course with the private U of Pittsburgh; but in 1980 Pitt was a little below the \$75 million cut-off for Table 51.

From the standpoint of statewide organization, 15 of the 23 are units (usually the "flagship") of multi-campus universities; only three are in consolidated systems: Buffalo, North Carolina State and Iowa State.

Five stand single: Wayne State, Washington State, Virginia Polytechnic and State U, Virginia Commonwealth U, and Temple University.