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

# **GRAPEVINE**

SINCE 1958 25th YEAR

Number 295

\_\_January 1983

Page 1853

## 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

\* \* \* \* \* \*

"The individual student is the immediate beneficiary, but it is the state that is the principal beneficiary of higher education, because of the social and economic gains to all of the society from a more educated and productive citizenry."

-- William Friday, President University of North Carolina

\* \* \* \* \*

# PERCENTAGES OF TOTAL POPULATION IN EACH STATE ENGAGED AS STUDENTS IN HIGHER EDUCATION

There is a certain usefulness in simple large-scale nationwide figures, or "macrostatistics," though they always cover a multitude of sins. The ratio of all persons enrolled in colleges and universities in a given state to the total population of the state is a concept that has not been much circulated or thought about.

In California this ratio appears to be about one person in 12, or slightly over 8 per cent of the people. In Arkansas it is approximately one person in 33, or three and one-third per cent. In three other states it is less than one person in 25, or less than 4 per cent. In three states the percentage is more than seven but less than eight; in three others it is more than six but less than seven. Thus seven states, led by California are at the top of the list; and four states, including Arkansas, are at the bottom.

All other states are in the range between 3.99 and 5.99 per cent. The fifty-state average is 5.47 per cent, or one person in eighteen. In the Soviet Union, with 250 million people and 5 million students, the ratio seems to be roughly one person in 50 or 2 per cent.

### A Measure of the Level of U.S. Civilization?

If taken literally, and without regard for the numerous factors that may be pertinent, the ratio of students to total population might be called a rough measure of the level of culture of any state or nation involved.

However, any thoughtful observer must be aware of some of the problems of definition and delimitation that accompany large-scale accounting, such as:

(1) the difficulty of drawing a sharp line between secondary and higher education:

(2) differences among the states as to proportions of full-time and parttime students, and as to proportions of students at different agelevels and academic levels;

(3) varying percentages of students attending private and public institutions of higher education and the extent to which either the institutions or the students are assisted by tax support.

Innumerable additional factors tending to make each state unique are present, so that it should be unthinkable to treat them as comparable with absolute precision. Yet, too, the states, with all the diversities of their social and economic settings and their various facilities for higher education, nevertheless bear sufficient resemblance to each other to justify a simple and easily comprehensible ranking of this kind.

Table 54 ranks the states in descending order as to their percentages of total population enrolled as students in higher education in Fall 1981. "Attendance rates" thus derived seem in a few states to be twice what they are in a few others—a fact already noted and discussed by some enlightened commentators on the future of higher education.

<sup>\*</sup>For example, Howard R. Bowen in his very important book, <u>Investment in Learning</u> (Jossey-Bass, 1977).

Table 54. RATIO OF STUDENTS IN HIGHER EDUCATION TO TOTAL POP-ULATION OF THE FIFTY STATES.

ULAT	ION OF THE FIFTY	STATES.
Rank	State	%
1	California	8.021
2 3	Arizona	7.560
3	Massachusetts	7.294
4	Rhode Island	7.226
5	Washington	6.781
6	Utah	6.672
7	Alaska	6.183
8	Vermont	5.979
9	Nebraska	5.976
10	Kansas	5.878
11	Wisconsin	5.872
12	Colorado	5.837
13	Illinois	5.826
14 15	New York	5.780 5.728
15 16	Oregon Michigan	5.554
	_	
17	Maryland	5.483
18	North Dakota	5.433
19	Oklahoma	5.430
20 21	Delaware	5.390 5.375
22	Virginia New Hampshire	5.279
23	Connecticut	5.243
24 -	Minnesota	5.179
25	South Dakota	5.092
26 27	Texas	5.061
28	North Carolina New Mexico	5.059 4.995
29	Nevada	4.990
30	Hawaii	4.989
31	Missouri	4.971
32	Iowa	4.920
33	Ohio	4.846
34	Indiana	4.617
35	Montana	4.588
36	Idaho	4.531
37	Wyoming	4.529
38	Florida	4.453
39	Tennessee	4.409
40	New Jersey	4.400
41	Pennsylvania	4.380
42	South Carolina	4.317
43	Alabama	4.306
44 45	West Virginia	4.271
45 46	Mississippi Louisiana	4.233 4.164
47	Kentucky	3.958
48 49	Maine	3.917 3.546
50	Georgia Arkansas	3.334
	/II KUIISUS	0.004

#### (Continued from page 1854)

Referring to Table 54, it is clear that thirty-nine of the states are "densely packed" in the area between 3.99 and 5.99.

It is also noticeable that among the top one-third of the rankings (5.5 and above), no state south of the Ohio River appears. In fact, the states of the lowest one-fourth of the distribution (below 4.5) seem all to be concentrated in the Southeast, except for Pennsylvania, New Jersey, and Maine.

The northern tier along the Canadian border consists of eight states in the top one-half (Washington, North Dakota, Minnesota, Wisconsin, Michigan, New York, Vermont and New Hampshire). Added to these eight are three states of southern New England (Massachusetts, Connecticut and Rhode Island) and the bloc of Delaware, Maryland and Virginia.

The three West Coast states are all in the higher-ranking group, as are also Arizona and Alaska. Utah ranks relatively high, perhaps because of high rate of high school graduation, Mormon support of education, and large in-migration to the private Brigham Young University.

Other states standing above the median include Illinois and a bloc of Great Plains states: Kansas, Nebraska, Colorado, Oklahoma, and South Dakota.

No earth-shaking conclusions can be offered or assumed from this simple exhibit. But it is probably worthy of examination, thought, and replication at intervals in the future.

Sources for deriving the percentages in Table 54: Enrollment figures are from the National Center for Education Statistics as reported in The Chronicle for Higher Education, July 14, 1982, page 10. Population data are from U.S. Census Bureau as reported in U.S. News and World Report, December 29, 1980/January 5, 1981, page 8.

Table 56. APPROPRIATIONS OF STATE TAX FUNDS FOR ANNUAL OPERATING EXPENSES OF STATE COMMUNITY-JUNIOR COLLEGES, FISCAL YEAR 1983 AND TWO PRIOR FISCAL YEARS, IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS.

	Year	Year	Year	2-yr gain	
States	1980-81	1981-82	1982-83	Percent	
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	
Washington	164,591	184,570	184,570	12	
Virginia	98,138	105,524	117,282	20	
Massachusetts	61,869	65 <b>,</b> 000*	78,609	27	
New York+	63,311	69 <b>,</b> 480	74,683	18	
Oklahoma+	46 <b>,</b> 940	57 <b>,</b> 010	69,696	48	
South Carolina	51,471	56,057	58,767	14	
Minnesota	37,649	44 <b>,</b> 986	44 <b>,</b> 987	19	
Alabama	44,745	41,559	44 <b>,</b> 981	0	
Georgia+	33,638	38,593	40,768	21	
Colorado+	26 <b>,</b> 900	34,326	37,659	40	
_	20 500	20 652	24 004	7	
Tennessee	32,588	32,653	34,804	7	
Connecticut	27,071	27,695	30,862	14	
Nebraska	17,652	18,702	19,403	10	
Delaware	15,216	17,426	18,681	23	
Rhode Island	14,050	14,994	16,567	18	
Nevada	10,229	11,508	12,911	26	
	8,207	8,750	8,807	7	
West Virginia		2,715	3,551	47	
New Mexico+	2,411 756,676	831,548	897 <b>,</b> 588		
Totals			057,500	19	
Weighted average percentage of gain 19					



<sup>+</sup>This state also appears in the table of state-aided community colleges.

#### Return postage guaranteed

Illinois State University, Normal, IL 61761

#### GRAPEVINE

M. M. Chambers, Editor Gwen B. Pruyne, Managing Editor

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. Non-Profit Org. U.S. POSTAGE PAID Normal, Illinois Permit No. 1



Table 55. APPROPRIATIONS OF STATE TAX FUNDS IN AID OF LOCAL PUBLIC COMMUNITY-JUNIOR COLLEGES FOR OPERATING EXPENSES, FISCAL 1983 AND TWO PRIOR FISCAL YEARS, IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS.

6.	Year	Year	Year	2-yr gain
States	1980-81	1981-82	1982-83	per cent
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
California	1,092,215	1,107,518	1,068,626	-2
Texas	252,348	334,959	365,045	45
Florida	243,489	279,453	296,337	22
North Carolina	173,442	193,923	204 <b>,</b> 359	18
New York+	176,209	174,481	189,046	7
Illinois++	147,606	154,575	155 <b>,</b> 290	5
Michigan	122,417	134,902	137,000	12
Maryland	49,699	58,326	61,915	25
New Jersey	52 <b>,</b> 883	55,663	56,188	6
Ohio	43,738	44,532	53,659	23
Iowa	48,313	47,015	49,253*	2
Pennsy <b>l</b> vania	42,000**	44,600	47,700**	14
Oreg <b>o</b> n	51,222	5 <b>1,</b> 347	46,855	-9
Arizona	44,164	30,431	42,362	<del>-</del> 4
Mississippi	32,579	36,191	40,247	24
Missouri	33,265	36,286	37,853	14
Wyoming	20,628	22,215	28,913	40
Kansas	18,813	20,066	22,849	21
Arkansas	13,142	13,394	14,344	9
Colorado+	7,041	8,635	9,824	40
Indiana+++	7,540	8,477	8,667	15
Georgia+	5 <b>,</b> 875	5,937	6,137	4
Idaho	4,506	4,334	4,889	8
North Dakota	2,213	3,055	3,056	38
Montana	2,081	2,493	2,644	27
Oklahoma+	355	454	506	43
New Mexico+	325	338	338	4
Totals	2,688,108	2,873,600	2,953,902	,
Weighted average				10

local tax support

<sup>\*</sup>This figure may be understated as not including salary increases.
+This state also appears in the table of state community-junior colleges.
++Includes State Community College of East St. Louis which does not receive

<sup>+++</sup>For Vincennes University, a two-year community college largely supported by the state but partly by the county.

<sup>\*\*</sup>Estimated

#### PUBLIC TWO-YEAR COLLEGES IN THE NATIONWIDE SCENE

The community-junior colleges, of which there are about 1,000 public and about 200 private, make up somewhat more than one-third of all institutions of higher education in the nation, and enroll more than one-third of the total of headcount students.

Annually for a decade or more, GRAPEVINE has included tables separately summarizing appropriations of state tax funds for annual operating expenses of two-year colleges.

Many cautions are necessary in interpreting Tables 55 and 56 in this issue. Two small tables can not encompass the diversities among all 50 states.

Ten states do not appear in the two tables, for various reasons. For example, Wisconsin's statewide system of Technical, Vocational, and Adult Schools is omitted simply because its local units though they are two-year public institutions, some of which in many ways approximate the functions of comprehensive community colleges—have never been so named and are regarded as unique to Wisconsin and not as a part of the widespread "junior college movement" which has spread remarkably in many other states.

# University Branches Excluded

Alaska, Hawaii, and Kentucky do not appear in Tables 55 and 56 because their public two-year "community colleges" are in fact integrated branches of the respective state universities, supported and administered by the parent institution. Thus they are of a distinct type, of which there are 150 or more in various states across the country.

Observe that of the total of forty states listed in the two tables, five appear in both. This means that the five have both types of community colleges: Table 55, local support and control, with state financial aid; and Table 56, virtually all support coming from state tax funds.

Thus the two tables are not all-inclusive of the fifty states, but they provide an approximation of the nation-wide scene with respect to the two most prevalent types of public two-year colleges, with the comprehensive community college as the model, generally but not exclusively.

## <u>Understated Approximation</u>

To draw a rigid line between technical and vocation instruction on the one hand and general education on the other, from GRAPEVINE data or within any brief treatment, is impossible. Some states have grouped all their two-year institutions under some such title as "Technical and Comprehensive Education" or "Area Colleges." Some others have two distinct statewide systems for (1) community colleges and (2) vocational-technical institutes.

In at least one such instance (North Carolina) appropriations are reported only for the two systems combined. GRAPE-VINE's request to correspondents is simply to include "schools wherein a majority of the students are high school graduates or adults."

Separate systems of Voc-tech institutions in some states (Minnesota, Kentucky, Alabama) also do not appear in Tables 55 or 56. It is neccessary to be aware that the presentation is not allinclusive, but only a somewhat understated approximation of the highly diversified nationwide scene.