

M. M. Chambers  
Department of Educational Administration  
Illinois State University, Normal, Illinois 61761

SINCE  
1958

SIXTEENTH  
YEAR

Number 187

February 1974

Page 1195

GRAPEVINE  
\* \* \* \* \*

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

IN THIS ISSUE

State Tax Support for two-year colleges and institutes . . . 1196

State aid for local public community-junior colleges for three fiscal years in 27 states shows weighted average two-year gain of 30 to 35 per cent . . . . . 1197

State junior colleges in 16 states show weighted average two-year gain of approximately 35 per cent in appropriations for annual operating expenses . . . . . 1198

State tax-fund appropriations for annual operating expenses of vocational-technical institutions in 15 states have two-year gain of 66 per cent . . . 1199

THE FUTURE OF DOCTORAL STUDIES: The second report of the National Board on Graduate Education . . . . . 1200  
Free choice for students is best policy . . . 1200  
Good advice to the states. . . . . 1200

\* \* \* \* \*

"Unless boards of trustees, the public, and students, know what education is and are convinced that it is worth defending, the most sophisticated of cost studies will be meaningless.

"Worse than meaningless, they become harmful, because there is nothing meaner than a statistical mean that becomes a standard, permitting no deviation."

--Lucigrace Switzer, editor of  
College and University Business

- STATE TAX SUPPORT FOR ANNUAL OPERATING EXPENSES OF
- (1) LOCAL PUBLIC COMMUNITY-JUNIOR COLLEGES IN 27 STATES;
  - (2) STATE JUNIOR COLLEGES IN 16 STATES; AND
  - (3) TWO-YEAR VOCATIONAL-TECHNICAL INSTITUTIONS IN 15 STATES

The most popular financial and governance structure for two-year comprehensive community-junior colleges appears to be the one in which the local college derives its primary support from a local taxing subdivision, but also is the beneficiary of substantial financial aid from the state. A few years ago there were as many as 31 states in which that structure prevailed, at least in part. However, Table 75 (page 1197, this issue) indicates that the number of such states had declined to 27 by fiscal year 1973-74. This is because a few states have abandoned that plan and made their public two-year colleges wholly state-supported so far as tax funds are concerned. Changes of this kind limit the meaning of comparisons of nationwide totals from year to year. With that limitation in mind, it is possible to say that the amount of state tax funds appropriated as state aid to local public junior colleges for fiscal year 1973-74 was nearly \$1 billion, and that this represented a rate of gain of between 30 and 35 per cent over similar appropriations for fiscal year 1971-72, two years earlier. This contrasts with the weighted average rate of gain of 25 per cent over the same period for state tax support of operating expenses of all higher education.

At least 16 states now operate state junior colleges. Table 76 (page 1198) indicates that the total of appropriations for annual operating expenses of these institutions exceeds \$300 million--a gain of about 35 per cent over similar appropriations for fiscal year 1971-72, two years earlier.

An insurmountable difficulty arises in bringing into the picture the specialized "area vocational-technical schools," widely varying proportions of whose students are below the level of high school graduation. Table 77 (page 1199) shows only 15 states that report these institutions as "higher education" in their correspondence with GRAPEVINE. Table 77 must be understood to be fragmentary, and leaving a very jagged line marking the lower limits of "higher education." The significant feature is that these 15 states reported a weighted average gain of 66 per cent over the recent two years, indicating rapid increases in state support of the vocational-technical type of institution.

A fourth type is the "university branch" or "regional campus" which exists in many states in varying numbers, and is particularly important in such states as Wisconsin, Indiana, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Kentucky, and South Carolina. State funds for this type are so generally carried within the budgets of the parent universities, unsegregated and unreported to GRAPEVINE, that no very meaningful tabulation of them is possible.

Note that two, three or even four of the above types may and do coexist in the same state at the same time; hence the name of one state may appear in all three tables. A lengthier discourse on this complicated subject appeared on pages 1100-1104 of GRAPEVINE for December 1972.

---

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.

Address communications to M. M. Chambers, Department of Educational Administration,  
Illinois State University, Normal, Illinois 61761

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

Table 75. State tax-fund appropriations as state aid for operating expenses of local public junior colleges for fiscal years 1971-72 through 1973-74.

States	Year 1971-72	Year 1972-73	Year 1973-74	2-year gain per cent
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
California	179,310	215,849	219,816	22 1/2
Florida	85,455	110,922	121,970	43
New York	95,700	90,900	117,100	22
North Carolina	58,542	58,542	83,638*	43
Illinois	55,549	68,118	71,664	29
Michigan	52,665	57,383	65,873	25
Texas	47,133	55,787	51,552	9
New Jersey	24,425	29,548	38,038	58
Maryland	23,599	27,778	31,157	32
Oregon	18,400	21,000	25,060	36
Iowa	12,170	13,800	22,504	85
Pennsylvania	15,409	18,235	19,113	24
Arizona	11,432	13,696	17,758	55
Ohio	10,608	12,817	16,654	57
Missouri	11,336	13,415	15,386	36
Mississippi	10,350	11,385	13,800	33
Kansas	3,196	3,916	8,148	155
Colorado	3,917	5,600	4,885	25
Wyoming	3,379	3,379	4,718	39 1/2
Arkansas	1,240	1,940	4,400	255
Georgia	2,131	2,280	3,050	43
Oklahoma	3,449	4,486	2,274**	- 34
Idaho	1,025	1,305	1,801	76
Indiana	929	1,048	1,454***	56 1/2
North Dakota	1,034	1,034	1,133	9 1/2
Montana	---	---	983	
New Mexico	250	250	245	- 2
Totals	732,633	844,413	964,174	
Weighted average 2-year percentage gain				31 1/2

\* This is an undivided sum appropriated for both local public junior colleges and vocational-technical institutes.

\*\* This sum is for six colleges that are local and state subsidized. Eight older colleges are state supported.

\*\*\* This is for the original Vincennes University, chartered in 1806 as a private corporation.

Table 76. State tax-fund appropriations for operating expenses of state junior colleges in sixteen states, fiscal years 1971-72 through 1973-74.

States	Year 1971-72	Year 1972-73	Year 1973-74	2-year gain per cent
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Washington	58,745	58,745	74,443	26 1/2
Virginia	22,767	34,291	40,735	79
New York	39,943	34,966	40,427	1
Massachusetts	19,730	23,507	28,314	43 1/2
Minnesota	16,857	18,431	18,976	12 1/2
Connecticut	14,254	17,070	17,583	23
Alabama	12,376	11,834	17,102	38
Georgia	10,930	12,353	17,000	55 1/2
Colorado	12,478	11,586	14,341	15
Tennessee	7,839	10,222	11,645	48 1/2
Nebraska	---	---	8,649*	Not comparable
Oklahoma	3,810	3,881	7,716	102 1/2
Rhode Island	3,340	7,170	6,909	107
Delaware	3,602	4,201	6,489	80
Nevada	737	1,098	3,400	361
West Virginia	979	1,864	2,294	134
Totals	228,387	251,219	316,023	
Weighted average 2-year percentage gain				34 1/2

\* As of July 1, 1973.

NOTE: State junior colleges are so called because their operating expenses are supported not by local taxing districts, but from appropriations of state tax funds, supplemented in many cases by tuition fees.

Some states have both local public and state junior colleges. Such states appear in both Table 75 and Table 76. For example, Colorado, Georgia, New York.

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

Table 77. State tax-fund appropriations for operating expenses of vocational-technical institutions in fifteen states, fiscal years 1971-72 through 1973-1974.

States	Year 1971-72	Year 1972-73	Year 1973-74	2-year gain per cent
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Wisconsin	15,526	22,775	40,119	158
South Carolina	9,291	11,187	17,818	92
Mississippi	9,840	11,200	13,876	41
Alabama	10,291	10,841	13,334	30
Ohio	6,428	9,582	11,504	79
Colorado	7,113	7,172	9,317	31
Iowa	5,275	5,275	6,200	17 1/2
Indiana	4,056	4,736	5,812	43
Maine	3,302	3,939	5,363	62 1/2
Connecticut	4,548	4,617	4,776	5
New Hampshire	2,564	2,623	3,378	32
Idaho	1,605	2,150	2,906	81
Montana	1,675	1,775	2,628	57
Louisiana	1,862	1,889	2,227	19 1/2
Vermont	1,180	1,125	1,272	8
Totals	84,556	100,886	140,530	
Weighted average 2-year percentage gain				66

NOTE: Table 77 is an incomplete fragment, not purporting to be fully representative of the nationwide picture of state support of vocational-technical institutes.

There is great variation among these institutions in different states and within the same state, as to the proportion of their students and courses properly styled "postsecondary" or higher education; and a sharp line between secondary and higher education is practically indeterminable.

## THE FUTURE OF DOCTORAL STUDIES

The National Board on Graduate Education is a body of 25 persons set up by the Conference Board of Associated Research Councils, which in turn is an agency of four national groups: (1) the American Council on Education, (2) the Social Science Research Council, (3) the American Council of Learned Societies, and (4) the National Research Council. It is based at 2101 Constitution Avenue, N. W., Washington, D. C. 20418. Its chairman is David D. Henry; its staff director, David W. Breneman.

As of November 1973 the Board issued its second report, a modest but cogent 30-page pamphlet, Doctorate Manpower Forecasts and Policy.

### Free Choice for Students Is Best Policy

By way of introduction, the document notes three approaches to the problem of the future supply of highly educated persons: (1) "manpower planning," (2) "human capital analysis," and (3) "the principle of free student choice."

The first two are rejected as inappropriate and inadequate, and the third is endorsed. It is emphasized, however, that the federal government has responsibility to organize and operate a much better system than now exists for the collection and analysis of data on the manpower market for highly educated persons.

The argument for free choice for students is substantially the same as advanced by Howard R. Bowen in his recent landmark article on "Manpower Management and Higher Education" in the 1973 Winter number of the Educational Record (Vol. 54, pp. 5-14).

Said Bowen: "Misconceptions...express fear of education, fear that it is expanding too rapidly or in the wrong directions. They lead to proposals to restrict the growth of education, to ration places in various programs, to plan the educational system so that it will produce the "right" number of persons to fill a predicted number of slots in the future labor market... What is needed, instead, is an educational system that continues and extends the American tradition of responding to the free choices of students... The number of places in various programs and in the whole system would be set in response to student choices, not in response to dubious labor market projections."

The Congress and the Administration are recipients of slaps on the wrist for "short-run, stop-and-go policies" which are "highly destabilizing and very inefficient."

The Board says specifically that "The most academically talented young people in each college graduating class (should) have the opportunity to attend high-quality graduate institutions. Competitive federal fellowship programs, such as the National Science Foundation predoctoral science fellowship program, should be maintained and broadened through appropriate federal agencies to cover all academic disciplines--humanities, social sciences, life sciences, physical sciences, and engineering."

The federal government and the universities, says the Board, should accept joint responsibility for ensuring access to, and successful completion of, graduate degree programs for minority group members and for women.

### Good Advice to the States

Addressing state governments, the Board says: "If graduate education is to continue viable and diverse with respect to the types of students enrolled, if it is to be available in major urban areas, and is to serve varied markets for highly educated manpower, opportunities for new programs and new combinations of talent should remain open."

Application of rigid single standards of quality to diverse programs, and the use of simplistic formulas for appraising graduate education, are warned against as productive of great harm. "The lengthy process of building excellent graduate programs can be undone very rapidly, and when they need to be built again, as some of them surely will, the costs will be enormous."