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CHAPTER I

THE PROBLEM IN ITS SETTING

The recent rapid expansion of higher education is a matter of public record. Enrollment increases have been caused by the high number of births immediately following World War II, the desire of more high school graduates to go to college, and by new programs of student aid that enable them to do so. At the same time, dramatic changes have occurred in the higher education establishment as it has expanded to meet the increasing demand for new knowledge and the need of individuals for more and continuing education. These changes have irrevocably altered the face of private higher education, but to an even greater degree have affected public institutions.

The tremendous surge in the numbers of college-age youth coupled with the ever-growing needs for trained manpower and retrained manpower has made political leaders aware more than ever before of the close relationship between a strong economy and highly educated citizenry.¹

As costs have soared and governance has become more complex, state-wide coordination of higher education has become an increasingly important issue. Research for the development of long-range planning has become a key word in the world of the institutions of public higher education.

The idea of state planning for higher education has been gaining substantial acceptance. . .the reasons are obvious. Public higher education is more important than it has ever been before in our history. It is also more expensive. The two factors together call today for a degree of careful determination of policy and program which did not seem necessary before.2

Governments at all levels, federal, state, and local, have been reorganizing their administrative structures so that they can be more responsive to current needs, and they have taken steps to prepare for the future either by creating planning agencies or by assigning planning responsibilities to existing agencies.3 The creation of special agencies to plan and coordinate higher education has been part of this movement.

________________________________________________________________________


3Imogene Pliner and Hubert C. Lindsay, Coordination and Planning (Baton Rouge, Louisiana: Louisiana Public Affairs Research Council, September, 1966), p. 1.
One of the most influential factors leading to the strengthening of the state's role is the coordinating agency which acts in liaison between the state and national capitols and the higher education institutions.  

In this study, it will be assumed that the issue of the coordination of higher education involves a political entity being operated for educational purposes and will focus on the arena in which two meet and mesh. Gould has said,  

An all encompassing reality is clear: adherence to the advocacy of an expanding system of public higher education has now become one of the most popular positions in current political life. A new set of attitudes is emerging in many of our states, based upon a desire, first, to know the facts about higher education, and second, to do what appears appropriate in light of the facts. The problem and danger, however, occur when the questioning of governmental committees and staffs reaches into areas of academic competence and scholarly judgement.  

The Concept of Coordination  

One definition of coordination given by Webster's dictionary is, "To regulate and combine in harmonious action." This would seem to imply, for higher education or any other governmental program, some

---


central body that can achieve or at least work toward objectives of a common and beneficial nature. This concept of coordination is a positive rather than a negative one, for unless positive aspects are emphasized in an atmosphere of cooperation, results may be neither harmonious nor beneficial.\(^6\) Unfortunately, the need for cooperation has often been described in negative terms: to economize by eliminating wasteful and unnecessary duplication of programs, to cut budget requests, to prevent the establishment of new institutions, and to prevent the expansion of existing institutions. It is argued that coordination leads to stifling of initiative, too much standardization, ultimate mediocrity, and a loss of freedom in higher education which is essential to its growth and development. James L. Miller, Director of the Center for the Study of Higher Education of the University of Michigan, stated that the idea of coordinating agencies existing primarily to say no to the institutions "is a false picture of how the agencies should operate, and further, it is a false picture of the way most of them do operate." He further pointed out that, in states with coordinating agencies, there has been a marked increase in state appropriations,

the number and quality of programs offered, and establishment of new institutions especially junior and urban colleges. Miller continued:

There is a negative aspect to this only in the sense that every institution probably cannot have everything it would like to have. The plan for meeting the state's needs necessarily entails the development of the right programs in the right places. When the wrong institution in the wrong place is interested in a particular course of action, the answer must then be no.\(^7\)

There is little doubt that the needs of higher education will continue to expand, at least in the foreseeable future, and that there will be increasing emphases on quality education. Both of these eventualities will require large increases in funds. There are at least four reasons why this will be true, in the opinion of one researcher who has conducted a number of studies in higher education.\(^8\)

1. The rapidly increasing enrollments will require at least a doubling of current annual operating budgets within a decade.

2. Research, long recognized as a prime function of universities, is now popularly regarded as essential to the national welfare and security. Institutions are under tremendous pressure to expand

\(^7\)Ibid., p. 4.

their research activities, and support for this function is being demanded on a scale undreamed of in the past.

3. Besides the expansion in the volume of teaching and research, the quality of institutional programs urgently needs strengthening. Particularly necessary is a substantial and rapid rate of increase in faculty salaries.

4. The accelerating rate at which new discoveries are adding to the store of human knowledge has greatly increased the demands for graduate and advanced professional studies. These levels of education are very expensive to maintain.

Few would argue that the wasteful spending of public funds is undesirable, whether it be for education, welfare, highways, hospitals or any other governmental program. There are many reasons why coordinating agencies for higher education have been established, but certainly one of the most frequent has been the wish to economize. S. V. Martorana, Executive Dean of the State University of New York, has noted that, since there is competition for state funds to finance programs and services and since control is by persons outside educational institutions (the governor and legislature), there is coordination

---

Pliner, p. 3.
even in those states without agencies. He continues,

...the question is not whether or not there shall be coordination but which agency in state educational and governmental structure is going to do the coordinating. If coordination, that is, the resolution of differences in objectives and programs of the several colleges and universities in a state, does not occur at a level below the governmental decision making represented by the legislature and the governor, the legislature and governor must inevitably make relevant decisions as part of their responsibility for orderly direction of over-all governmental affairs. Coordination occurs; it is definitely there, but under these circumstances it is postponed to the final hour of decision making, is confused with other much broader social and economic issues, and is often tossed into the arena of partisan politics. The legislature in effect becomes a super board of higher education. . .10

Most of the states have recognized that it is better that educational policy be made by an agency whose primary concern is education, an agency oriented toward research and planning with the time and staff to gather and analyze data to serve as a basis for wise decisions, and with continuity rather than the high rate of turnover experienced by most governors and legislators.11


11 Pliner, p. 5.
The Commission on Goals for Higher Education in the South suggests that:

Each Southern state should have a central agency for long-range planning and coordination of higher education. This agency should:

1. Be given a clear statement of its mission and responsibility.
2. Have sufficient authority to carry out its responsibility.
3. Be staffed with personnel of sufficient caliber not only to perform its duties well but to command respect among the educators and educational administrators of the state.
4. Devote its main attention to long-range planning rather than to annual or biennial budgets and budget requests.
5. Deal with educational programs and objectives as well as buildings and physical facilities.
6. Respect the traditional freedom of the institutions but cut out costly overlapping and needless duplication.
7. Take into consideration all the educational resources of the state when developing its plans.

The Commission urges colleges and universities to stimulate increased public understanding of their efforts and moral and financial support for their programs. The goals of opportunity, excellence, efficiency, and social invigoration, will be reached only if there is
better understanding of and commitment to higher education.  

The History of Coordination

The organization and administration of higher education in the United States has undergone considerable change in the past three centuries. The bulk of college enrollments has shifted through the years from private institutions to public as shown by Table 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Private</th>
<th>Public</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1900</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1930</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970*</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980*</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985*</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Projected


As a result of this phenomenon, states have moved in the direction of institutionally-governed, state coordinated systems of higher education at an increasing rate (Table 2). The trend toward development of these systems can be divided historically into four periods:  

1. From colonial days to the mid-19th Century, the period of complete autonomy of private institutions. Each college established its own programs and objectives with little notice of the activities of other institutions. There was little concern and little need for coordinated systems since there were few institutions, few students, few programs, and small sums of money involved.

2. From the mid-19th Century to the 1940's, the period of the creation of single state-wide governing boards. Boards for higher education have few European traditions or counterparts, and thus have been considered primarily an American innovation. They developed during colonial times to provide church groups with some control over the colleges they established and financed. A later reason for using lay people on the boards was that, since higher education is vital to society and its advancement, the public should have a voice in policy determinations. When states began to establish publicly-supported colleges and universities—before and after the Morrill Act—the idea

of a lay board to govern these institutions was continued as a matter of course. The board concept was carried further when states began to create agencies to govern higher education. This came as a result of expansion, diversity, and complexity within and between autonomous units. The need for a coordinated system emerged when it became apparent that future development and policy decisions affected all higher education in the state and hence should not be decided by individual institutions.

The first approach toward coordinated systems was to consolidate governing boards of individual institutions into a single state-wide governing board, but "clearly the movement, if such it could be called, toward 'one big board and no others' had practically spent itself by 1940." Since a governing board has authority to determine matters of internal administration of each institution, it naturally follows that it has authority to coordinate over-all policy among institutions. The question must be asked whether this permits maximum coordination or whether one board can successfully govern and coordinate a large number of complex institutions. In any case, the idea of a board

---

is so firmly established today that few would advocate another approach, even though a single administrator is usually recommended for other governmental programs. This, of course, reflects the basic procedural and philosophic differences between academic administration and public, military, or business governance.

3. From the 1940's through the 1950's, the period of the creation of informal voluntary arrangements. It has been difficult to determine how many states used this approach and at what time these arrangements were established.

Often the agencies of voluntary coordination have come into existence rather casually, and some of them have continued for long periods in a somewhat inchoate condition or rudimentary stage.¹⁵

Advocates of the voluntary approach point out that such a method allows institutions a maximum of freedom. There are disadvantages with the informal approach in that it lacks leadership and a central staff for research and long-range planning. Since decisions usually must be unanimous among the institutions represented, there is a tendency toward preservation of the status quo and domination by the largest institution. Formed as they are by institutional representatives

¹⁵Ibid., p. 63.
(presidents or board members) and having no legal status, such boards frequently find themselves in a purely reactive position.

Without exception the well-known voluntary structures have arisen only after the state legislature orders one or threatens to establish a single governing board or a coordinating agency with legal power. One of their main purposes is to ward off imminent threats of outside controls.16

4. From the 1950's until today; the period of the creation of formal state-wide coordinating agencies concerned with research, policy, and planning. As Table 2 shows, Kentucky is considered to have the oldest operating coordinating board even though the composition of that board was changed in 1966. The advantages of this type arrangement are:

The popularity of these agencies can be attributed to the ease of establishment by state legislation, to their desirability in the eyes of the institutions when compared to a single governing board, and to the improvement in quality of professional staffs and the resulting improvements in practices of coordinating agencies. Existing institutions and governing boards continue to operate. The coordinating board attempts to provide order and planning either by regulating directly certain phases of operations such as programs and budgets, or by advising the governing boards (trustees), legislature, and governor of desirable courses of action, or by both means.17


### Table 2

**Development of Coordinating Agencies among States by Year Created and Type of Agency**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Coordinating Agency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>1965</td>
<td>Coordinating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>1965</td>
<td>Coordinating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>1965</td>
<td>Coordinating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>1965</td>
<td>Coordinating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>1963</td>
<td>Voluntary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>1963</td>
<td>Coordinating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>1963</td>
<td>Coordinating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Hampshire</td>
<td>1963</td>
<td>Voluntary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>1963</td>
<td>Coordinating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>1963</td>
<td>Coordinating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td>1962</td>
<td>Coordinating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>1961</td>
<td>Coordinating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>1961</td>
<td>Coordinating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>1960</td>
<td>Coordinating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah</td>
<td>1959</td>
<td>Coordinating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>1956</td>
<td>Coordinating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>1955</td>
<td>Coordinating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>1955</td>
<td>Coordinating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>1955</td>
<td>Coordinating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>1951</td>
<td>Voluntary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>1951</td>
<td>Coordinating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>1945</td>
<td>Governing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>1945</td>
<td>Governing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
<td>1941</td>
<td>Coordinating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhode Island</td>
<td>1939</td>
<td>Governing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alaska</td>
<td>1935</td>
<td>Governing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>1934</td>
<td>Coordinating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>1931</td>
<td>Governing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>1929</td>
<td>Governing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td>1913</td>
<td>Governing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td>1912</td>
<td>Governing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Dakota</td>
<td>1911</td>
<td>Governing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td>1910</td>
<td>Governing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>1909</td>
<td>Governing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>1905</td>
<td>Governing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Dakota</td>
<td>1897</td>
<td>Governing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montana</td>
<td>1889</td>
<td>Governing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td>1864</td>
<td>Governing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>1784</td>
<td>Coordinating</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Organizations for Coordination

J. G. Paltridge of the Center for Research and Development in Higher Education of the University of California at Berkeley has described the enormous changes in the forms of coordination which have taken place among all the states over the past twenty-five years. On the basis of that survey, as it is cited by Robert O. Berdahl in his Tentative Research Outline for A Study of State-Wide Systems of Higher Education, Paltridge has categorized the predominant pattern of each state's organization for coordination into one of five types or three sub-types which are defined in Table 3.

Using these categories of types and sub-types, Paltridge developed a chart of the organizations in existence during certain years in the recent past (Table 4).

Paltridge has concluded that the following trends are in evidence:

1. Voluntary coordinating mechanisms have given way to statutory organizations (such as in Colorado, Ohio, and Michigan).
2. Coordinating agencies with loosely circumscribed regulatory powers are being given broader powers (such as in New Mexico and Texas). Coordinating organizations which have exercised

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type #1</th>
<th>No coordinating organization created by statute, nor voluntary association performing a significant coordinating function.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Type #2</td>
<td>Coordination by voluntary association of institutional representatives the aim of which is some form of coordination on an inter-institutional level.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type #3</td>
<td>Coordination by a single or consolidated governing board which has governing authority over all public higher education institutions, or all except the junior colleges.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type #4</td>
<td>Coordination by a governing-coordinating board. This category was created to accommodate the characterization of the New York system where legal responsibility has been placed in one board to govern several institutions and to coordinate certain policies and/or functions of a number of other four-year institutions. Some authors have classified this board as a &quot;coordinating board,&quot; others as a &quot;single or consolidated board.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type #5</td>
<td>Coordination through boards or commissions created by statute but not superceding the institutional boards. Sub-types of this form of organization are:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a. An advisory board composed, in the majority, of institutional representatives or other professional educationists.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b. An advisory board composed, in the majority, of public representatives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c. A regulatory board, one which has legal responsibility for organizing, regulating, or otherwise bringing together the overall policies or functions in areas such as planning, budgeting, and programming, but which does not have authority to govern institutions. These boards are composed entirely or in the majority of public representatives.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

### TABLE 4

**TYPES OF ORGANIZATION IN USE IN SELECTED YEARS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>States characterized by</th>
<th>1940</th>
<th>1950</th>
<th>1960</th>
<th>1963</th>
<th>1965</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. No coordinating organization</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Voluntary associations</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6*</td>
<td>6*</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Consolidated governing boards</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Governing-coordinating board</td>
<td>0**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5a. Coordinating-advisory, with institutional representatives</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5b. Coordinating-advisory, with public representatives</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5c. Coordinating-regulatory, with public representatives</td>
<td>1**</td>
<td>1***</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total States (including territories of Alaska and Hawaii)</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Between 1960 and 1963 three states discontinued voluntary coordination and three adopted it.

**The New York Board of Regents, founded in 1784, fits closely the modern concept categorized herein as Type 5c. The Board of Trustees, State University of New York, organized in 1949 did not supersede the Regents. The latter governs a large number of institutions and coordinates the budgets and certain other affairs of other public institutions, and therefore sets the dominant (and unique) characteristic of this state's organization, which hereafter is classified as Type #4.

***Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education, first organized in 1941, is the first modern version of this type.
advisory powers only are being asked to become more regulatory (such as in Wisconsin). In other states, pressures are mounting for more regulatory powers to be given to these organizations.

3. Organizations whose controlling boards have been composed of representatives of the institutions are changing to boards of lay persons representative of the public (such as in Maryland and Kentucky). Others are adding lay persons to the boards and giving them the majority position (such as in Wisconsin). Still others are simply adding more public representatives though still not placing those lay persons in the majority position (such as in California).

It would appear that the proponents of voluntary associations are swimming upstream against a strong tide at the present time. Voluntary agreements among institutions have, in general, failed in the past to provide leadership in planning for future programs and expansion. In those cases where full and complete coordination and management functions have been legally invested in a single board, it has been possible to have precise financial management and communication usually involving allocation by formula. However, most of the states concerned with such a device are operating only a few institutions. In other states, the coordinating agency takes the form of a "super-board" imposed over existing and continuing institutional boards. This form of coordinating-advisory-regulatory board controls selected
activities but is restrained from general powers of management. While retaining much of their original autonomy, institutions found in this pattern are subject to the planning functions of the super-board, and it is precisely in this planning activity and function that such an agency form appears to present its greatest strength. Those boards using public members tend to have final authority in decision-making, while those boards having fewer or no public members tend to be advisory.

It should be quite obvious that the movement toward coordination and regulation of higher education is a post-war phenomenon for the most part which reached its peak of activity in the years after 1950. Berdahl states that, "a large number of these changes have occurred in the last nine years, since Lyman Glenny gathered the evidence for his pioneering study of coordinating patterns." Even now, in addition to Kentucky, the states of Pennsylvania, New Jersey, Connecticut, Massachusetts, and Minnesota are embarking on or have just completed alterations in their modes of coordinating higher education. There appears to be no single state plan considered to be an ideal or model for other states to emulate. Instead, states have created or

---

are creating agencies to fit peculiar traditions, needs, and goals in
their search to achieve a quality system of higher education that will
meet the needs of today and tomorrow. Clearly, flux is the current
pattern, with many states necessarily making their decisions in this
field without knowledge of the strengths and weaknesses of practices
in other states. Opinions differ markedly on the healthiness of
current developments. At one extreme, it is claimed that any coordina­
tion other than that voluntarily undertaken by the institutions them­
selves deprives the latter of their autonomy and prevents them from
achieving excellence in education. At the other, tough-minded
politicians are insisting that, if colleges and universities are going
to demand vast and increasing amounts of public funds, they must be­
come more sensitive to the public interest and, if necessary, surrender
important powers to centralized planning and coordination. There are
many in the middle, however, who would argue that while a certain
lessening in the complete independence of colleges and universities
may result from state planning and coordination, the essential attri­
butes of autonomy can be retained under a "good" system.

21 This is the well-known position upheld by Professor M. M.
Chambers in many of his publications and addresses.
Berdahl offers the following rule of thumb or rationale as a suggested definition of such a good system:

...the coordinating process can be viewed as one reconciling the numerous differences which exist within higher education and between it and the state as wisely and as felicitously as possible. There are two possible ways to say that the coordinating is "good;" first, because the process operates with relative ease of conflict resolution, or second, because it results in "wise" policies. When there are strong disagreements, we cannot prove which side has the wisdom, and even if we could we do not know whether forcing the wise decision is worth the cost if it comes at the price of considerable disruption of the balance of power. Those who are sure that one side or the other is "right" will probably evaluate the coordinating body by its ability to reflect that view; but we feel it is safer to assume that any body operating through time in a sensitive context such as higher education should make its policies with a maximum of consensus (from both sides) and a minimum of force majeure. There may be occasions when a good coordinating body must be prepared to stand up aggressively to either state government or the universities;...but these occasions should be rare.22

The facts of life are, then, that coordination is and will continue to be a reality which university people must accept in fact, if not in principle.

Coordination In Other States

A pattern of categories different from the Paltridge formulization was established in 1966 by Emogene Pliner and Hubert C. Lindsay of the Public Affairs Research Council of Louisiana on the subject of statewide coordinating agencies. Methodology for this research included a

22Berdahl, Research Outline, 1966.
survey questionnaire covering many aspects of these agencies which was submitted to the various states. Much useful data was produced, which will be drawn upon liberally. In the case of Kentucky, the instrument was completed before the occurrence of the recent statutory change which has been mentioned. A copy of this completed document relative to the Kentucky Council was furnished by PAR.

Paltridge's set of types and sub-types was refined into the following four divisions by the PAR study:

1. No coordinating agency.
2. A governing board.
3. A coordinating board.
4. A voluntary association.

Data generated by the PAR study questionnaire shows clearly that there is no particular relation between type of coordinating agency and geographic region. The eleven states without some type of state-wide coordinating board for higher education range from Maine to Hawaii and include states in all regions. Table 5 lists those states and the number of public institutions being operated.

Several of these states have very few public institutions to coordinate and, hence, there may be little, if any, need for a coordinating agency. Notable examples are Delaware with two public institutions, and Hawaii with one. One of the states with a number of institutions,
### TABLE 5

**STATES WITH NO COORDINATING AGENCY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Total Colleges and Universities</th>
<th>2-Year College</th>
<th>4-Year or More College</th>
<th>University</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaware</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaii</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maine</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vermont</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Virginia</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyoming</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

West Virginia, recently completed a study in which college and university presidents and members of the governing boards of higher education participated. The study recommended the creation of a state-wide coordinating board and legislation was to have been introduced in the January, 1967, session.  

A total of fifteen states have boards of the governing type. Seven of these agencies are called Board of Regents or State Board of

---


Regents, while four are entitled State Board of Education or State Board of Higher Education. In Rhode Island and Mississippi, the agency is called a Board of Trustees while one state, Idaho, has named its governing organization by the combined title State Board of Education and Board of Regents. Table 6 lists these states and the number of public institutions being operated, ranked in order by the year in which the board was created. The total numbers of institutions are demonstrably larger in this group compared to the states in Table 5.

**TABLE 6**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Year Created</th>
<th>2-Year College</th>
<th>4-Year or More College</th>
<th>Prof. or University</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td>1864</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montana</td>
<td>1889</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Dakota</td>
<td>1897</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>1909</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td>1912</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>1929</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>1931</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alaska</td>
<td>1935</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Dakota</td>
<td>1938</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td>1939</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhode Island</td>
<td>1939</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td>1944</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>1945</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>1945</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>1965</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Pliner, pp. 10-11.
A total of twenty-one states have boards for higher education of the coordinating type. Table 7 shows that most of the states which operate large numbers of public institutions fall into this category. A great diversity of titles also exists within this grouping, including the following:

- 2 Boards of Regents
- 1 State Regents
- 1 Board of Educational Finance
- 3 Boards of Higher Education
- 1 Coordinating Committee
- 2 Coordinating Councils
- 1 Commission on Coordination
- 1 State Advisory Commission
- 2 State Boards of Education
- 3 Commissions on Higher Education
- 1 Liaison and Facilities Commission
- 1 Coordinating Board
- 1 Council on Public Higher Education

21

Table 7 lists these states and the number of public institutions being operated, ranked in order by the year in which the board was created.

There are three states in which voluntary associations for coordination exist. There are no similarities between the titles of these associations and no particular geographic relationship.

- Indiana Conference for Coordination
- New Hampshire Coordinating Board of Advanced Education and Accreditation
- Maryland Advisory Council for Higher Education
Table 7 presents the same information related to number of institutions being operated and year of creation as Tables 6 and 7.
TABLE 8

STATES WITH A VOLUNTARY ASSOCIATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Year Created</th>
<th>2-Year College</th>
<th>or More Prof. School</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>1951</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Hampshire</td>
<td>1963</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>1964</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Pliner, pp. 10-11.

Some Characteristics of Coordinating Boards

Coordinating boards vary considerably in numbers of members. Table 9 shows the number of board members among 34 of the 39 states with some type of coordinating agency. (Information was not available from the remaining five states.) The number of board members ranges from 7 to 18, with 9 as the median. In addition, governing boards tend to be smaller than coordinating boards.

In most states all or a majority of board members are appointed by the governor, usually with the consent of the Senate, and represent the general public. All of the governing-type boards except Nevada's follow this pattern. There are legal prohibitions against representatives of the institutions of higher education holding membership on the board in the majority of states. The coordinating-type boards, more than the governing-type, tend to have institutions of higher
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Board Members</th>
<th>Total Types</th>
<th>All</th>
<th>Governing</th>
<th>Coordinating</th>
<th>Voluntary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Total No. States | 34 | 13 | 19 | 2 |

Source: Pliner, p. 20.

Education represented and in two states, California and Minnesota, educational representatives constitute the majority of board members. In Kentucky, institutional representatives had constituted a majority of the voting membership until the composition of the board was changed June 16, 1966, so that lay members now constitute the voting membership.²⁵

The term of office of board members ranges from one year for some board members in California to 15 years for all board members in

²⁵Pliner, p. 20.
New York. Table 10 shows that the median or most frequent length of term is six years. Since all states use staggered terms, there is usually a relationship between the number of members and the length of term in order to rotate membership. With two exceptions, gubernatorial appointments fill vacancies that might occur prior to the expiration of a term. Those exceptions are Georgia and Mississippi where vacancies are filled by the vote of other board members. States do not have special legal provisions for removing board members but, like other public officials, they can be removed for cause.

TABLE 10

TERMS OF MEMBERS OF COORDINATING BOARDS AMONG STATES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term of Board Members (Years)*</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No. of States</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Term for majority of board members if there are differing terms.


Most boards meet monthly, but other variations do occur. In Kentucky, quarterly meetings are held. The overwhelmingly predominant practice is for officers of the board to be selected by other board members.
Committees can play an important role in studying and submitting recommendations on a particular matter before a board makes a final decision. Almost all boards assign major functions or areas of study to committees. Some states use representatives of institutions and professional staff for advisory committees. Such committees can acquaint the board with outside views and can help establish better rapport between the institutions and the board.

All studies on coordinating agencies emphasize that the employment of a director of outstanding ability and a highly qualified professional staff is of the utmost importance. Yet, several boards report that their biggest problem is recruiting and retaining qualified professional staff to gather the meaningful and reliable information on which to base intelligent planning. Most states now employ an executive director and a professional staff but with wide variations in size and financial support. Comparisons of the gross budgets of the various boards is not particularly meaningful unless accompanied by a detailed explanation of the dedications of these funds. The numbers of professional staff members employed by all types of boards in the various states range from none in South Carolina to a high of 17 in California, 20 in Texas, and 25.5 full-time equivalent in Oregon. \(^{26}\)

\(^{26}\)Pliner, pp. 30-31.
Research conducted by the professional staff of coordinating agencies covers a wide variety of endeavors which are of variable depth and quality, but most of these attempt to be state-wide in scope to provide inter-institutional data on a comparable basis. A list of the duties, assignments, and functions performed by the professional staff would include the following tasks:

1. Devise a Master Plan.
2. Revise the Master Plan periodically.
3. Perform space utilization studies.
4. Project enrollments.
5. Study manpower needs.
6. Assist or supervise construction projects.
7. Study program duplication.
8. Analyze class size.
9. Analyze faculty loads.
10. Study student admission policies.
11. Study student dropouts.
12. Analyze institution operating budgets.
13. Analyze construction needs and requests.
15. Codify uniform forms and procedures.
Planning as a Function of Coordination

The role of a coordinating board or agency may appear to be strictly one of arbitration or mediation but, in fact, it extends much further. Today, its principal legal duty is the adoption of a formal approach to master planning for improving educational quality and for expanding programs and faculties. One practitioner of coordination has defined planning as a "process of determining policies and programs of governmental action." As a concept, master planning is even newer than the creation of the agencies authorized to develop a plan and keep it current. Appearing in the newer laws as a keynote for the functioning of state coordinating agencies, comprehensive master plans must establish long-range goals for higher education. The planning process is important in order "to achieve excellence and to gain the highest possible return for every dollar invested in higher education." Chancellor J. Broward Culpepper of the Florida governing-coordinating board, points out that:

Growth, expansion and development simply cannot be permitted to go forward without master

---


28Pliner, 35.

plans and careful decisions as to best ways to proceed in meeting justified needs in higher education. In all of our planning there must be emphasis upon quality, and no outlay should be made except upon careful justification.  

The distinction between a master plan and a general survey has been described as follows:

The characteristics which distinguish the master plan from most state surveys are the variety of subjects studied; the volume of data collected; the depth of analyses; the integration of programs, budgets, and building priorities to provide a unity of purpose; the full inclusion of the non-public institutions; and the means for step-by-step implementation of the plan, with simultaneous review and revision leading to fulfillment of major goals.  

Institutions of higher education have been charged with at least three major responsibilities:

1. The preservation of knowledge and the preservation of cultural heritages.

2. The dissemination of knowledge and the training of productive citizens.

3. The advancement of knowledge and the enhancement of cultural values.

---

30 Pliner, p. 35.

The extent to which a particular institution will direct its efforts to one or all of these responsibilities will depend upon:

1. The traditional role or identity of the institution.
2. The specific responsibilities with which it is charged by its governing board.
3. The particular resources and facilities of the institution.
4. The specific demands placed upon the institution by the community, state, or region which the institution serves.

Institutions of higher education can best serve the state and society in which they are located by defining their role as an agent of society and directing their major efforts to the functions they can best perform. The underlying assumption of centralized planning is that all institutions in a state or region cannot serve all functions of higher education equally well and that there must be a division of labor. Planning in higher education stems from this assumption. It is, in essence, therefore, a process of deciding how the duties and responsibilities should be divided and for what purposes.

---

There should be a thorough survey of the programs and services carried out at each institution of higher education to determine costs, future enrollments, quality and availability of faculty, utilization of facilities, future needs of the state for trained manpower, and the state's financial ability to meet future needs of higher education.

The plan should define the role and scope of each institution. This involves determining if an institution should be a two-year school, a four-year school, or extend into the graduate field. It also includes a determination of the kinds of programs that should be provided at each institution, such as technical training, professional fields, research, extension, and other public services. The role and scope of an institution should permit flexibility in development, but any change should be made only after careful consideration of why it is desirable and how it fits into the overall state plan. The master plan should develop means of controlling unnecessary and undesirable proliferation and duplication of programs. It should also study possibilities of channeling students into different types of programs and institutions through guidance and counseling and through admission standards.33

A comprehensive master plan should also provide a system of priorities in constructing new buildings, provide for better utilization of

33 Pliner, p. 37.
space and for longer periods, stimulate the competence of the faculty, and make better use of faculties, exchange of library books, and cooperative degree programs. The master plan should be reviewed and revised periodically to reflect new ideas and needs.\textsuperscript{34}

Not the least of issues in planning for higher education is a lack of understanding of change as a process. Our knowledge of planning as opposed to the making of plans is far more limited than the plethora of state study commissions and master plans would indicate.\textsuperscript{35} Change is inevitable but not synonymous with progress. Educational change in the past has been spasmodic, but educational change in the future must be more systematic in order to achieve the maximum degree of excellence possible. This implies more than a passive acceptance of only those resources which happen to be allocated. It requires that those concerned with planning seek a better understanding of the processes of invention, innovation, dissemination, adoption, and adaptation.\textsuperscript{36}

The crucial need in higher education planning is for useful criteria by means of which to set priorities for educational objectives. The

\textsuperscript{34}\textit{Ibid.}, pp. 37-38.

\textsuperscript{35}\textit{Fincher}, p. 7.

\textsuperscript{36}\textit{Ibid.}, p. 8.
establishment of priorities implies that educational decision-making is a choice among alternative actions and programs which can be compared in some way with each other. There is the further implication that educational objectives and alternatives can be ranked in order of their importance to the state or society.\(^{37}\)

It is not within the province of this thesis to dwell at length on the issues in planning, nor to develop planning methodology, but at least one set of planning criteria deserve mention:

1. The "criterion of proportionality" views planning in terms of population variables, a democratic yardstick. This line of thought holds that educational opportunities should be proportional to numbers of people.

2. The "criterion of comparability" wherein the educational accomplishments of other states are viewed, evaluated, and imitated.

3. The "criterion of complimentarity" implies that institutions assist each other in the development and continuance of programs. If need be, one institution surrenders its claim in deference to the greater ability or potential of the other. This line of thought produces more cooperative rhetoric than cooperative action and would seem to be less evident than is generally regarded.

\(^{37}\) Ibid., p. 9.
4. A fourth criterion for assigning priorities in education must be mentioned because it is, in reality, the most potent; it is what might be called "a criterion of finite dollars and pressure politics." Viewed realistically, the criterion implies that if funds are available, that institution or program will receive them for which there is the most public pressure.\[^{38}\]

The necessity for state-wide planning is now generally accepted by all concerned, and, recognizing their own limitations, legislatures generally assign to coordinating agencies the task of recommending public policy for higher education. The responsible exercise of that power to plan, to expand, to determine, and to recommend necessarily takes from both the universities and the state authorities a valued traditional function. In turn, this provides the coordinating agency the means to political leadership. Caution needs to be exercised, however, so that the board for state planning of higher education strives for influence rather than raw power, for respect rather than notoriety, for agreements rather than controversies, for satisfactions rather than fame, since "planning as a process cannot be separated from the operation of the activity involved."\[^{39}\]

\[^{37}\text{ibid.}, \text{pp. 9-11.}\]

\[^{39}\text{Millett, p. 225.}\]
Relationships Between the State and Higher Education

The term state-wide coordination of higher education implies certain sets of relationships between those power structures, the state and the institutions. The important issue that is related to every aspect of coordination is the amount and the type of control a board should have over institutions.

Foremost consideration should be given to empowering a board with sufficient control to develop and implement a state-wide plan. This means basically the power to require the institutions to provide necessary information, to obtain approval for the addition of new programs, and to limit curricular, research, and service activities to the role prescribed for them in the state plan. A board with too much controlling power infringes upon the responsibilities of governing boards and administrators, but with too little power, there can be no coordination. If control is used positively to assure the continued and economical growth of institutions toward excellence, then it is probable that the cooperation of all who are interested in higher education will be obtained.  

At least one expert in the field of the study of systems of coordination has advanced the notion that the general movement toward coordinating boards of citizen members with substantial powers has

---

been accelerated by three trends now better understood and better identified than previously. They are:

1. The coordinating agencies are exercising more and more political leadership in formulating and advocating policies for development and expansion of higher education.

2. More and more federal grant programs for higher education are being state-oriented rather than institution-oriented.

3. The non-public colleges and universities are becoming more involved in public policy-making and coordination for all colleges and universities. As the coordinating board stands in liaison between the public college and the state, so too, does it increasingly serve this function for the non-public institutions in relation to both the state and the public colleges. In this social process, another force with political power is added.

Glenny continues with the argument that, while both collegiate administrators and state government policy-makers find most activities of coordinating agencies to be acceptable, their conception of the political role of the agency remains unclear. Yet, that role may now be the most important of all those played by coordinating agencies since it makes possible a new and different kind of positive educational

---

41Glenny, Campus and Capitol, p. 29.
leadership. The coordinating process is a political one involving powerful social agencies such as colleges and universities with their intellectual independence and autonomy on one side and the central policy-formulating authorities of the governor and legislature on the other side. The coordinating agency, situated between these two powerful political forces, seeks to identify with both in order to achieve satisfactory solutions to developmental and financing problems of higher education.

The increase in political influence of the coordinating board results directly from the support of the governor, legislators, and college administrators, the great majority of whom work for the broad public interest. Hence, the forces which could destroy the coordinating agency by direct and indirect attack actually have in most cases given it the support and confidence necessary for success. State-wide, long-range planning is the principal legal power which allows the coordinating agency to gain a degree of political leadership. The success and longevity of the coordinating agency are determined largely by its attitude toward maintaining high level dialogue and results less from powers granted or assumed by the agency than from its composition and its conception of leadership.42

42 Ibid., p. 33.
Subordination of colleges and universities to a coordinating board does impair institutional autonomy, but the degree of that impairment may be viewed in comparison to the actual and not the theoretical autonomy which formerly existed. College and university administrators (and faculties) have sometimes proposed that higher education should be a self-regulating fourth branch of state government entirely independent of legislative and executive controls while at the same time the state would provide and continue its financial support. The real issue is the degree to which coordination infringes on institutional freedom essential to the attainment of its objectives, especially those involving the exploration of new ideas and the critical assessment of society itself.\textsuperscript{43}

Finding the proper position for public institutions of higher education within the overall scheme of state government is an old problem, but the concern of college administrators with drawing a line between proper and improper controls by the state has been particularly acute in recent years. Inspired as it is by the allegedly praiseworthy goals of economy and efficiency, the new centralization has nevertheless seemed to many educators to pose a grave threat to the traditional

\textsuperscript{43}Pliner, p. 37.
freedom of state colleges and universities and to open up avenues of political pressures on the campus.44

No state college or university can be completely free from political control. As a public institution, it must share in the problems and benefits of a democratic community. Politics is much more than the sum of interference, harassment, and manipulation. It is the avenue through which a democratic society reaches peaceful decisions. Any discussion of political influence upon higher education must balance the proper with the improper. Most of the politics involving higher education is confined to the triangle formed by the governor, the legislature, and the public institution, and the political issue nearly always turns on the appropriation of educational funds.45

College officials are well aware of the dangers, but they recognize that the only way they could be removed completely from political influence is to be removed from the workings of state government. As long as it is a part of the state system, the institution has access. Shutting off access weakens the educator's voice. The real issue is the question, "Has statewide coordination unified the educational institutions without sacrificing distinctive characteristics of individual


45 Moos and Rourke, pp. 227-230.
institutions, and improved the relationship between state governments and higher education." 46

The heart of the difficulty lies in establishing a proper sphere of authority for a coordinating body without undercutting the traditional legal responsibilities of institutional governing bodies. College administrators would emphatically deny the assumption that state agencies of central control should treat education in much the same manner as they deal with other departments of state government. Education is a unique activity, so different in its essential nature that it withers in an atmosphere of control to which most state activities can accustom themselves. 47 In their zeal to apply planning controls over higher education in the name of economy and tidy administration, some state officials have forgotten the compelling reasons that led to the grant of legal autonomy in the first place. Education is far too precious a matter to be threatened, however remotely, by misunderstanding, misinformation, or genuine grievances between the capitol and the campus. 48

46 Ibid., 231.
47 Ibid., 1959, p. 3.
48 Ibid., pp. 15-16.
Colleges and universities need freedom not merely as an administrative convenience but as a basic source of creative energy and as an indispensable means to all their achievements. Without freedom, teaching and research are impossible. To be sure, this freedom is not at all inconsistent with proper accountability to the community and to public officials in both the legislature and the executive branch on matters of general finance and university policy.\textsuperscript{49} Educators and their boards will continue to support wholeheartedly the idea that colleges and universities must be fully accountable for all public funds, that they must strictly observe the laws of the state and reasonable regulations derived therefrom, and that they must be economical in all feasible ways. They will not support but rather oppose unwise legislation and bureaucratic restrictions that either directly or indirectly limit intellectual freedom or hamper the free functioning of a college or university.\textsuperscript{50}

By far a greater part of the law defining the status of higher education is legislative rather than constitutional in its immediate origins. While the interest of legislators in the problems of higher education is applauded by college officials, it must be said that

\textsuperscript{49}\textit{Ibid.}, p. 42.

\textsuperscript{50}\textit{Ibid.}, p. 242.
educators are apprehensive where the concern has spread into internal policy areas traditionally regarded as the responsibility of the institution. The definition of internal educational policy is often a subject of disagreement between educators and legislators.51

There is a dispute over the extent to which an institution of higher education should be responsive to the immediate will of the public as expressed through the will of the legislature, a body politic which supposedly is a mirror for the prevailing interests of society. While educators are sensitive to community demand, they are required to look beyond immediate necessities to the broader demands of scholarship.

College administrators seldom question the right of a representative body to make basic policy decisions in higher education as in other areas of state activity, since higher education, supported by states, is part of a national, even international, tradition. Nor do they dispute the fact that legislatures are acting within their proper authority in exercising general oversight over the administration of colleges and universities. Yet a legislature defeats its own purposes when it constantly makes detailed judgments.52 A frequent example of

51 Ibid., pp. 18, 259.
52 Ibid., pp. 274-75.
this unfortunate and unwise exercise of power concerns the distribution of appropriated funds to the various institutions by legislative action. It is better for the coordinating agency to handle this function than the legislature since it can have a keener insight into the needs of each institution. More flexibility can be provided, and the allocations can be kept on a more current basis.

Few university board members or presidents question the authority of a state legislature to enact such laws regarding higher education as are thought to be in the best interests of the people of that state. Neither would they question the right of a legislature to make such appropriations as it finds desirable and feasible to all agencies of state government, including higher education. It does not follow, however, that all legislation is wise or that a legislature will foresee in every case the implications of a law affecting higher education or the manner in which it may be enforced. What higher education welcomes from the legislature is a steady stream of information about the available resources of the state, thereby enabling the schools to plan ahead in the light of the economic realities of the state.

College officials also need information about particular needs of the state that may be served best by the facilities of the colleges and universities.

53 Ibid., p. 237.
universities in order to design and implement new thrusts in instructional, research, and public service programs. The authority for decisions to approve or eliminate programs even to the course level and to approve new departments, schools and even colleges within an institution has been given to many coordinating agencies. Glenny has commented on this trend:

Data collected by coordinating agencies for purposes of program analysis cover such items as the number and types of different programs, the number and size of classes, total credit hours produced per class and program, credit hours produced per faculty member, and other factors which show scope, quantity, and productivity of the educational enterprise.

Operating within the context of a long-range plan, the coordinating agency with this information, has an opportunity to encourage development of quality in all new programs necessitated by new students, technological breakthroughs, and graduate and professional specializations. Programs are assigned to those institutions which merit consideration on an honest appraisal of efficiency and quality of their operations and future potential. The agency prevents continuance or duplication of unneeded programs.\(^{54}\)

Points of stress between politicians and educators focus principally on four areas:55

2. Purchasing.
3. Personnel management.

The day-to-day controls imposed upon spending by colleges and universities from the beginning to the end of each fiscal year easily represent the most controversial area in the range of contact between the state and higher education. Institutions may dissent from the judgment of budget officers and legislative committees on the proportion of the state's financial resources that should be allocated to higher education. They may also be resentful of such adverse comments as may crop up in the post-audit of a school's financial records. But they cannot reasonably quarrel with the necessity of a state's exercising such

appropriations control and post-audit control over the activities of the colleges and universities. 56

Controls affecting everyday disposition of funds is the area where the average college official feels that proper control most often translates itself into improper interference. Conflicts which may arise in such situations pitting judgments against each other need to be resolved by confidence and good faith and skill by college officials on the one hand, and by a sense of restraint and proportion by both state and college administrators in exercising separate responsibilities. 57

Centralized purchasing is viewed with mixed feelings by college officials. When it is a source of financial savings by mass buying of office supplies and other standard material, there is agreement on its value. This implies that state purchasing techniques do not cause undue delay in procurement. But conflict arises over the matter of purchasing equipment for advanced research and scholarship.

One of the enduring tenets of higher education is that faculty and staff should be governed exclusively by the educational institution they serve. Underlying this arrangement is the belief that the unique and sensitive responsibilities of both professors and administrative

56Moos and Rourke, p. 103.

57Ibid., p. 104.
staff justify such autonomy. The possibility of bold political intrusion on the educational system affords clear justification for protecting educational personnel from outside interference. Outright exemption of higher education from personnel controls has brought the greatest reduction in tension and improvement in the personnel programs of colleges and universities.58

Nowhere is this more obvious than in the quest for dignity by the smaller state colleges. In the double standard which sometimes prevails in higher education, state universities rest on the state constitution while their sister colleges stand only on statutory law. Some colleges have grown jealous of the university's favored position, and, in their scramble for full privileges, have precipitated new controls from the state capitol.59

University building booms have fostered new controls over nearly every phase of capitol outlay projects, and centralized state building agencies have appeared as increasingly important elements in the story of state-college relations. To the state official, the reason for this ascendancy of the central building office is obvious. The way to preserve orderly, balanced development is for a single state agency

58Ibid., p. 181.

59Ibid., pp. 200-201.
to hold a restraining hand over acquisition and construction, and the presence of a central agency can help reduce architectural and other fees. College officials are divided on the question of central control of capital outlay and construction. Where supervision amounts only to formal approval of plans, friction is slight. Tensions climb when building agencies are given broad powers to control planning, contracting, and construction of educational buildings. In some states, universities have felt themselves victims of administrative pitfalls and what amounts to policy control through the device of controlling expansion. College officials are convinced that a university which cannot control its own capital outlay cannot determine its academic program. State officials, however, are quick to reply that the huge expenditures for college building activities must, in the name of sanity, be balanced in light of the overall needs of the state. \textsuperscript{60} State building officials stress the practical value of their role. Yet, state control over capital funds has often provided tremendous political leverage for those bold and skillful enough to grasp the opportunity. \textsuperscript{61}

\textsuperscript{60}Ibid., p. 131.

\textsuperscript{61}Ibid., pp. 132-133.
Chambers has suggested the following list of seven salient features of institutional autonomy which should be granted to and maintained by state-supported public colleges and universities.\(^\text{62}\)

1. The governing board should have control of funds which are not deposited in the state treasury.

2. The governing board should not be required to accept the state treasurer as ex-officio treasurer, or depend on the attorney general for legal services, or be required to submit to a pre-audit.

3. There should be lump-sum, not line-item budget appropriations.

4. No employee should be subject to regulations of the state civil service system.

5. The institutions should not be required to purchase through a state purchasing office.

6. There should be no state auditor or publisher or printer who would determine university printing or publication.

7. The governing board should have sole authority to set tuitions and fees, and fix salaries.

The Committee on Government and Higher Education recommends the following list of five relationships which should exist between the state and higher education:\(^{63}\)

1. The allocation of financial resources is a function of the legislature.

2. The determination that the funds appropriated are used for the purpose allocated is a responsibility of the various state agencies.

3. The colleges and universities should give the legislative and executive branches all information necessary to the effective discharge of their responsibilities.

4. The legislature is justified in seeking coordination. In the absence of satisfactory voluntary coordination, another way of achieving this goal must be found.

5. Within the general framework of the state system, each institution should be granted maximum autonomy in fiscal operations, management of personnel, and the academic program.

Summary

In recent years, noticeably definite trends have occurred in the creation by statute of special agencies to plan and coordinate higher

\(^{63}\)Moos and Rourke, pp. 177-178.
education in the various states. These trends indicate that most states believe it is better that educational policy be made by an agency whose primary concern is education, and that such an agency should be composed of appointed lay members who are charged with organizing formal approaches toward planning for allocations of resources, expansion of facilities, and program determinations. A legitimate field of study is emerging which probes the political relations, alliances, complications, conflicts, and processes of decision-making involved in the matrix which includes higher education and state government as it is focused upon this coordinating board or agency. There is need to determine general patterns in state-higher education relations by investigating those conditions which exist in the particular states.
CHAPTER II

PURPOSE AND PROCEDURES

This study was made to investigate the interface where the two worlds of politics and higher education meet, mesh and clash. In particular, it was intended to be an in-depth analysis of the Kentucky Council on Public Higher Education. The Kentucky Council was changed by the legislature in 1966 to become the ninth state system using a coordinating-regulatory board composed of public members. This action has particular implications for the study of educational change, since the Kentucky Council formerly included institutional representatives with voting powers. Presidents of public colleges and universities remain as members of the Council but no longer have voting rights.

The purpose of the study was to show that the Council, as it was established in 1934, was isolated and separated from the mainstream of state government and from public political dialogue while the voting members were drawn from the institutions to be coordinated. Being insular, the Council had not developed a two-way system of
political responsiveness in its relations with state government. Thus, the Council was unable to reach decisions on major policy questions and unable to enforce minor decisions. Once those were finalized, this situation negated the effective use of the Council's powers unless the institutions themselves were agreeable (this, in fact, if not legally, comprises a voluntary association) and brought on the statutory change in 1966 to a type of board wherein only lay members, appointed by the governor, have voting powers.

The study will describe the general areas of the history of statewide coordination and planning in Kentucky as it concerns the Council on Public Higher Education; the relationships between public higher education in Kentucky and the state government, both historically and at present; and an assessment of possible future trends or directions in which the course of coordination in Kentucky might move. Also, the study will describe the particular areas of What the Council is and what it does; Why this particular form was adopted in Kentucky, charting the course of events from 1934-1966; and How the agency accomplishes its mission. It will identify Who the important figures have been in the history and development of the Council along with their particular contributions. A summary with conclusions will attempt value judgments concerning the importance of certain aspects of the history of the Council. The summary will portray the Council as it sees
itself, and as it is perceived by the forces of higher education and state government. Conclusions will also comment upon the actions of various individuals in politics and higher education who have been influential in the story of coordination in Kentucky. In addition, an attempt will be made to assess critical issues which may appear to be potentially vital to the future further development of the Council.

Questions which were asked and problem areas which were explored included the general area of legislation; perceptions of the Council, its machinery, and its effectiveness; planning functions and identification of needs; appraisal of state public institutions, and their relations to each other; the degree of flexibility and openness to experimentation existing in the state system; finally, those provisions for continuing studies of the needs of higher education and those evaluative programs which have been set in motion were examined.

The method used in this investigation is largely descriptive and expository. The description of the origin and development of the Council and its work is historical in nature and based principally upon documentary evidence.

General literature related to the fields of higher education and politics and to this topic in particular were surveyed. Historical documents of interest were found in libraries and archives in Kentucky, particularly in the state capitol and the Kentucky room of the Louisville
Public Library. Attempts were made to examine minutes of the meetings of the following groups:

2. The Advisory Committee to the Council.
3. The Board of Regents of the State Universities.
4. The Board of Trustees of the University of Kentucky.
5. The State Board of Education.

Other sources of material which were consulted included the following:

1. Newspaper "morgues."
2. The Kentucky Common School Laws.
4. The Journals of the Kentucky House and Senate.
5. The Kentucky Statutes.
6. The Biennial Reports of the Superintendent of Public Instruction.
7. Bulletins of the State Department of Education.

Research on this topic was accomplished by travel to the state of Kentucky, and within its borders. Three trips were necessary, in the following manner:

1. A one-week visit for the purpose of reading, filming, and recording material accompanied by a few selected interviews.
2. A two-week visit for the purpose of interviews with persons from education and government having familiarity or expertise on this subject.

3. A one-week visit to complete the research and pick up as many as possible of the loose ends which inevitably developed.

The Kentucky Council administers one major land-grant university, four regional state universities, one state college, and nine state community colleges under the aegis of the state university. Research on this topic was conducted through visits to the major university, the regional universities, and the state college.

The proposed research study and the dissertation which grew out of it contain the following data:

1. The details of What the present Council is, what its powers and procedures are, and who its members are.

2. The details of Why the Council was changed, inasmuch as causation was able to be fixed, attempting to discover the particular social mix of the times (1965-66) in Kentucky which dictated the adoption of this particular system of coordination. In addition, there is value in an attempt to chart closely the course of the Council during the years after 1950, noting changes of emphases and the reasons for those changes. A dissertation by Adron Doran (now President of
Morehead State University) in 1950 documented the history of the Council from its inception in 1934.

3. The details of how the agency accomplishes its mission; this is the heart of the study and involved semi-structured interviews with:

   a. University and college presidents, trustees, deans, business officers, faculty members and students.

   b. Governors; former governors; officers in finance or budget departments; chairmen or members of finance, appropriations, and education committees of the legislature; members of legislative research councils; directors, staff, and members of the Council on Public Higher Education.

   c. Newspaper editors, and other interested private persons as they become known, including jurists.

   d. Representatives of private institutions of higher education.

4. The final section should be a summary of the findings, a synthesis of the data generated, and a series of conclusions by the writer. These opinions will include good points of the Kentucky system as well as bad points which should be change or eliminated. One of the problems connected with the study will be the development of criteria for making such judgments.
During the course of the many interviews undertaken, it was necessary to ask general and open-ended as well as specific questions. Key persons in the worlds of higher education and state government were asked, as Berdahl suggests, to

To sort out from a list of powers over decisions in budget review, educational policy, research, public service, etc., those which constitute the essential attributes of college and university autonomy; those which belong to state government to insure at least minimum responsiveness of higher education to the public interest; and those which fall into no-man's-land, sometimes belonging to one world and sometimes to the other. 64

Some of the general and specific questions to be asked, and problem areas to be explored include:

1. Is the present legislation adequate? Should there be coordination in Kentucky at all?

2. What are the perceptions by various people of the management powers of the board? What is the existing machinery for implementing those powers?

---

3. What is the quality and adequacy of the agency staff? How efficient and effective is the Council in its operation and in its ability to attract increased state support for higher education?

4. What planning functions are being assigned, and which of those are being carried out? What is the status of identification of immediate and long-range needs?

5. What are the implications for higher education of changing state political and economic conditions, now, and in the foreseeable future?

6. What is the current state of appraisal of existing institutions and planning for new ones? How effectively do the various levels—secondary, junior college, four-year, and graduate—of education mesh?

7. In accordance with the definition of role and scope of each institution, what appraisal and/or approval of operations of each institution exists?

8. What is the degree of flexibility and openness to experimentation which exists in the state system? What is the migration pattern of faculty, presidents and board staff? What degree of alienation of faculty and students exists in the system; and what are their respective roles (or lack of same) in decision-making?
9. What provisions have been included for continuing studies of the needs of higher education and the most effective use of resources? What evaluation procedures have been set in motion?
CHAPTER III

THE HISTORY OF COORDINATION IN KENTUCKY

This study was intended to be an in-depth analysis of the Kentucky Council on Public Higher Education. One definition of analysis according to Webster's Dictionary is "the separation of a whole into its constituent elements (using) this process as a method of studying the nature of a thing or of determining its essential features." Procedurally, the study promised to describe the general area of the history of statewide coordination and planning in Kentucky as it concerns the Council on Public Higher Education. By its very nature, historical data seems to lend itself to a pattern of description involving basically a chronological development. Within that pattern, it would seem an appropriate method to separate the whole (the Council) into its constituent elements (powers, actions) in order to study its nature. The study promised to describe the particular areas (essential features) of what the Council was and what it did; how it accomplished its mission; and who were some of the important figures offering contributions to its development. As a result of such determinations it may be possible
to isolate the reasons Why the particular form of coordination adopted in Kentucky was chosen.

The story of the development of a coordinating agency for higher education in the Commonwealth of Kentucky seems to divide itself into several episodes:

1. The Primitive Era, 1906-1934: The period of the establishment of Normal Schools, Normal Executive Councils, the rise of the University of Kentucky, and the creation of the Council on Public Higher Education.

2. The Early Years, 1934-1956: The period of the Council as it began to work, with functions to perform but without staff or facilities, concentrating upon teacher education programs.

3. The Maturing Years, 1956-1965: The period that saw appropriations for professional staff and facilities for the Council, resulting in the beginnings of research studies, planning, budget formulas, and other means for realizing its assigned tasks.


The Primitive Era
1906-1934

The idea of the creation of machinery by which higher education could be coordinated is not new in Kentucky. Indeed, the Commonwealth was one of the first states to establish such means. Determination of the curricular offerings of the colleges and universities has a history
in Kentucky dating back to 1906. In that year, the General Assembly created and established the following:⁶⁵

1. A Normal School at Richmond—Eastern Kentucky State Normal.

2. A Normal School at Bowling Green—Western Kentucky State Normal.

3. A Normal Executive Council to govern both institutions, to devise courses of study, and to coordinate programs.

This Council included the Superintendent of Public Instruction as chairman and the Presidents of the Normal Schools. It is noteworthy that a concept was initiated at this time which survived for more than sixty years: that the executive officer of the public lower schools, an elected official, should preside over the affairs of higher education. Only in the reorganization of 1966 was this chain broken.

In 1924, other State Normal Schools were established at Morehead and Murray, and another Normal Executive Council was created; again, this group was formed by the State Superintendent and the two Presidents.⁶⁶ The twin Executive Councils began to meet

---


together in 1926, and each Normal School was placed under the control of a Board of five Regents. There is a familiar historical pattern in evidence, relating to the development of the four Kentucky Normal Schools. As in many other states, there have been four stages: Normal School, Teachers College, general purpose College (1948), then regional State University (1966).

The University of Kentucky at Lexington is the principal state university of the Commonwealth and is a land-grant university under the Morrill Act. Although Kentucky is the second oldest state among those not members of the original Confederation of thirteen states, the idea of a state university did not take root in the Commonwealth until after the Morrill Act in 1862; and it was not until 1865 that the Kentucky Agricultural and Mechanical College was first established as a division of the private, denominational college known as Kentucky University. Mindful of this event, the University celebrated its centennial in 1965. Actually, it did not exist as a separate institution until 1878 when it was separated from the private Kentucky University and re-established on a campus given by the city of Lexington with its first buildings provided by Lexington and the

The Agricultural and Mechanical College became "State University" in 1908, and the University of Kentucky in 1916. Prior to the 1934 Council, no attempt seems to have been made to coordinate the University with the teachers colleges or to coordinate the operations of Kentucky State College with any of the other institutions. However, as early as 1908, the University and the Normal Schools presented a united request to the legislature, this request having been formed by committees of Regents from the Normal Schools and Trustees from the University. The General Assembly of 1908 responded by appropriating $200,000 to the state university and $15,000 to each of the state normal schools for buildings and improvements. The Attorney-General, James Breathitt, issued an opinion that questioned the constitutionality of these appropriations; he advised the state auditor not to pay them. It is quite possible that subsequent financial problems of the institutions of the state system in Kentucky concerning

68 Loc. cit.


capital outlay moneys stems from this legal precedent. Probably in an early attempt to relate the teacher training activities of the Normal Schools with those of the College of Education of the University, the Dean of the College was invited to participate in all meetings of the Normal Executive Councils as a non-voting member. This action was taken in 1928 and, in 1932, the President of the University, Frank L. McVey, was invited to become an ex-officio member.72

**What the Council was**

The Kentucky Council on Public Higher Education was the first agency in the nation of its kind, and came into being during a thorough reorganization and revision of the legal provisions for public schools and higher education in the Commonwealth. This action, in 1934, was a result of the report of the Educational Commission established by the 1932 legislature. The report called for a comprehensive "School Code," including abolition of the Normal Executive Councils. The new Council on Public Higher Education was to consist entirely of

---

professional educators and institutional representatives and was to number among its members:  

1. The State Superintendent of Public Instruction as chairman.  
2. The Presidents of the four State Teachers Colleges.  
3. The President of the University of Kentucky.  
4. The Dean of the College of Education of the University of Kentucky.  
5. One member of the Board of Regents from each of the Teachers Colleges.  
6. Three members of the Board of Trustees of the University.  
7. Two members of the State Board of Education.  

House Bill No. 1, creating the Council on Public Higher Education, provided that said Council should "meet at least twice each year." This statute also provided that the Council should have power:  

1. To coordinate the work and determine the curricular offerings of the five public institutions of higher learning, for white persons in Kentucky; namely, the University of Kentucky, Eastern Kentucky State Teachers College, Western Kentucky State Teachers College, Murray State Teachers College, and Morehead State Teachers College, on the basis of efficiency and economy.  

---

75 Ibid., p. 318.
2. To determine the amount of entrance fees and the qualifications for admission to each of the above mentioned institutions of higher learning for white persons.

3. To consider budgetary requirements of each of the above mentioned institutions of higher learning in Kentucky, and on the basis of needs of the various institutions, as indicated by the individual budget submitted, to recommend to the State Budget Committee or other proper authority a budget covering the needs of the five institutions.

4. To require such reports from the executive officers of each of the above mentioned institutions of higher learning as it may deem necessary for the effectual performance of its duties.

5. To publish at least biennially a report of the educational and financial affairs of the five institutions of higher learning for white persons maintained by the Commonwealth.

6. To elect, if it deems necessary, a part-time or a full-time secretary

**The Early Years**

1934-1956

**Actions of the Council**

One of the powers assigned to the Council in 1934 was that of determining the amount of fees to be charged by the institutions. Through the years, Kentucky has distinguished between "fees"—incidental, for the purpose of supporting special services—and "tuition." During the years, the Council has directed the exercise of its power and authority in this area toward the state colleges, rather than the
University. As substantiation of this observation of minimal control over University fees, those charges were raised in 1950 without action by the Council—even without discussion. 76

Another of the charges by the General Assembly to the Council concerned establishment of admissions requirements to State Colleges and the University. This subject was one of the first introduced at the first meeting of the Council, at which time a study committee was set up. 77 The committee did not meet, did not submit any recommendations of its own, but did urge the Council to accept the report of a Committee on Entrance Requirements of the Association of Kentucky Colleges and Secondary Schools. 78 There is no record of further official action on this matter, and little, if any, record of cooperative planning on the part of the Council in developing uniform qualifications for admission to member institutions. 79 A review in 1950 of the

76Doran, p. 73.
77Minutes of the Council, May 6, 1935.
78Doran, p. 76.
79Loc. cit.
catalogs of the institutions indicated some uniformity, but there was still considerable latitude in admissions requirements. 80

The Act of the General Assembly which created the Council provided that it shall "consider the budgetary requirements of each of the state institutions of higher learning on the basis of the needs of the various institutions as indicated by the individual budgets submitted, recommend to the Department of Finance a budget covering the needs of the institutions." 81 Until 1950, in Doran's words: 82

The Council on Public Higher Education has never functioned very efficiently or enthusiastically in the area of preparation of a uniform budget for all of the institutions. In fact, so far as the official records indicate, the Council has submitted only one budget to the Department of Finance covering the united requests of the institutions of higher learning.

Part of the problem was the constitutional provision (still in effect) that the Superintendent of Public Instruction—Chairman of the Council was an elected official, not eligible to succeed himself. 83 Often budget-preparing time coincided with the changes of administration which voided any sense of continuity. In these cases, the

80Ibid., p. 78.
82Doran, p. 80.
83Constitution of the Commonwealth of Kentucky, Section 93.
Council did little more than approve every budget requested by the various colleges and the University. Sometimes, those requests had already been submitted to legislative committees when examined by the Council, thus representing. . ." no more than cooperative approval and sanction of what the institutions had already done individually."

Again, "there is no indication that the budget committee did more than approve the requests of the presidents. . .the Committee seems to have made no effort to evaluate the needs of the institutions represented by the individual requests." Until 1950, no action had been taken

. . .toward drafting a unified budget of the institutions of higher learning based upon the needs of each institution. Thus, because of the failure of the Council to act on the matter of presenting the budgets as a unified program, the institutions of higher learning are compelled to present their budgets individually to the Director of the Budget. Whatever benefits could have been derived through cooperative effort in presenting a unified budget have been lost by default of the Council.

Item 5 of the Act of 1934 required the Council to publish a biennial report on the "educational and financial affairs" of the state

84Doran, p. 82.
85Ibid., p. 83.
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institutions of higher learning. The Council failed to perform this function during the period of 1934 to 1956, losing the advantage of an opportunity to act in a manner which would aid in bringing the problems of the academic community to the attention of the state. It is only fair to repeat, however, that the Assembly had made no appropriation to finance the publication of this report, instead urging that the cost be borne by the institutions. In addition, the chairman and secretary were both state officials, fully engaged with administrative functions and leadership responsibilities, while the Council members were fully engaged in the operation of the institutions.

Since the General Assembly, while expecting annual reports to the Council from member institutions, did not specify what these reports should be, the Council was not compelled by law to submit any certain number or particular type of report. It was left to the discretion of the Council to determine which reports were necessary.\textsuperscript{87} Only two reports were filed regularly throughout the years 1934-1950. Both of

\textsuperscript{87}\textit{Ibid.}, p. 87.
these dealt with teacher education, and were titled: 88

1. **Annual Report for Colleges to the Division of Teacher Training and Certification of the State Department of Education.**

2. **Program of Teacher Preparation.** (This outline of curricular offerings was also submitted to the Division of Teacher Training and Certification of the State Department of Education.)

An important means for coordinating higher education was granted to the Council as the power to determine curricular offerings of the member institutions. 89 Regardless of the original intent of that assignment, the Council interpreted its duty to lie only in the determination of curriculum in the area of teacher training. No work had been done on curricular determinations in any other field by 1950. 90 The leadership for most of the accomplishments in the field of teacher education was provided by the Advisory Committee on Teacher Training appointed by the Council as a working body to make recommendations relative to all phases of teacher training and certification programs. 91

The School Code, adopted in 1934, required the certification of public school personnel by the State Board of Education, but those

88Ibid., p. 90.


90Doran, p. 92.

91Ibid., p. 101.
certificates were to be issued upon the completion of a teacher training curricula. The criterion for certification is thus curricular and was determined by the Council on Public Higher Education. The State Board of Education could publish its rules and regulations according to which the certificates were to be issued, including both the legal requirements for certification and the kinds of certificates to be issued. This provided the framework within which the Council determined curricula offered by the approved teacher training institutions of Kentucky. Any private or non-state-supported college was allowed to offer a teacher training program but it had to "comply with the rules and regulations of the State Board of Education," and be "equivalent to any or all of the curricula prescribed for the state institutions of higher learning." Clearly, the Council had a legal mandate to provide coordination for public and private higher education in this area.

The 1934 School Code specified three general groups of teachers certificates, as follows:

1. Elementary Certificates
   a. Provisional, based upon a two-year curriculum and valid for three years.

---
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2. High School Certificates
   a. Provisional, based upon a four-year curriculum and valid for four years.
   b. Standard, based upon a five-year curriculum and valid for five years.

3. Administrative Certificates
   a. Provisional, based upon a four-year curriculum and valid for four years.
   b. Standard, based upon a five-year curriculum and valid for five years.

4. Attendance Officers', based upon a two-year curriculum and valid for three years.

The space being consumed by this discussion of the aspects of teacher education is justified, because, during the first two decades of its existence, the Council was preoccupied with articulation with the public schools, and programs of teacher education dominated its agenda and actions. This is not surprising in view of these facts:

1. The state public school executive was the chairman.
2. Four presidents of teachers colleges were on the Council.
3. Four teachers college Regents were on the Council.
4. Two members of the State Board of Education were on the Council.
5. The voting power of the Dean of the College of Education of the University was equal to that of the President.
In any case, the first effort of the Council to prescribe curricular offerings for teacher training institutions was one providing that specific training be given in the subject field in which the prospective teacher was expected to work. 96 Specific subject area majors and minors were required, but those areas of concentration were later enlarged. 97

It should be pointed out that the certification information cited above mentions five-year courses or curricula. This was specified to include "the requirements for a Masters degree in a standard graduate school." 98 Since the mid-1930's, then, the teachers colleges have been engaged in a graduate program for all practical purposes, though only in education. The professional degree granted, following an overhauling of the five-year curriculum in 1940, was the Master of Arts in Education. 99 There were two optional plans available; Plan I, with a thesis, or Plan II without a thesis, but with an additional six semester hours of course work.

Following the Cooperative Study of Teacher Education in the mid-1940's, the teacher education curriculum was revised. In addition,

96Ibid., p. 111.
97Ibid., p. 115.
98Minutes of the Council, May 6, 1935.
99Minutes of the Council, September 27, 1940.
House Bill 389 of the General Assembly of 1950 repealed those portions of the 1934 School Code which specified kinds of certificates and the conditions for their issue and renewal. The sole authority was vested in the State Board of Education to issue certificates based upon curricula prescribed by the Council on Public Higher Education.\footnote{Doran, p. 141.}

The drafter and sponsor of that bill was Adron Doran, then Speaker of the House of Representatives, later Secretary to the Council, now President of Morehead State University; also the author of the dissertation on the work of the Council during the years 1934-1950 which has been such a valuable source-work to this writer and many others.

In his chapter "Summary and Recommendations," Doran thought that, until 1950, the Council had been very effective in the area of teacher education, very ineffective in performing many of its other duties.\footnote{Ibid., p. 146.} In his opinion, Council had performed its functions of determining entrance fees and admissions qualifications with some degree of success, though without establishing uniformity.\footnote{Ibid., p. 147.} It appears that in the matters of reports from the institutions, formation of united

\begin{enumerate}
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\end{enumerate}
budgetary requests, and the employment of an Executive Secretary the
Council was least effective during the years 1934-1950. Doran feels
that there were factors which affected the performance of the Council.\textsuperscript{103}
Foremost among these was a total lack of funds granted by the legis-
lature even though the Council was a state agency. More funds could
have:

1. Permitted the publishing of biennial reports of the member schools.

2. Covered the expenses of the members of the Council for performing necessary duties, rather than requiring the institutions to pay such costs.

3. Enabled the Council to employ a permanent secretary.

Doran also felt that the composition of the membership of the Council
had adversely affected the performance of its duties. In particular, he
cited these points:\textsuperscript{104}

1. Institutional-representative members unable to be objective.

2. The elected, non-succeeding status of the State Superintendent who chaired the Council.

3. Possible cleavage or rivalry between three positions; the State Colleges, the University, the State Department of Education.

\textsuperscript{103}Ibid., p. 149.

\textsuperscript{104}Ibid., pp. 151-152.
Citing the fact that the full membership of the Council had never been in attendance at a single meeting during sixteen years of existence, Doran suggested the following:

1. Enlarging the membership of the Council by appointing laymen.

2. Providing adequate funds to finance the work of the agency.

3. Requiring more frequent meetings.

4. Redefining, clarifying, and expanding the duties of the Council.

5. Electing a permanent secretary.

6. Placing Kentucky State College under a governing board with representation on the Council.

These recommendations were both perceptive and prophetic, and all of the suggested actions became reality during the sixteen years to follow.

The Council began to move ahead at an increasing pace during the early 1950's, providing a forum for decision and policy-making on matters of common interest and concern. There was realization that the time had arrived for the Council or some other public body to discharge the broad functions of coordination, studies of needs, and policy-making.

\[105\text{Doran, p. 153.} \]

\[106\text{Ibid. , p. 155.} \]
implicit in the legal provisions that led to its establishment. There was varied and continued discussion, both within and outside the Council, concerning ways and means of implementing its proper role in the pattern of higher education of the Commonwealth. A grim note was sounded by Chairman William Butler (Superintendent of Public Instruction) as he urged the group to meet regularly and to redefine, clarify, and expand its duties so that more effective coordination could be achieved. Mr. Butler warned that, if cooperation was not provided through planning by educational leaders, "it likely will be imposed through a planned and dictated program administered by edict from authority outside the education profession." The members agreed, and formed a committee authorized to formulate a working program to implement the legal responsibilities of the Council.

Five other noteworthy citations appear at various places in the Minutes this period of the early 1950's. They were:

1. Kentucky State College was authorized to have its own Board of Regents, was removed from the control of the State Board of Education, and was granted representation on the Council.

---

109 Loc. cit.
2. The Commonwealth of Kentucky entered into the Southern Regional Education Compact and began to participate in the Southern Regional Education Board program in 1951.\textsuperscript{111}

3. The Council entered into the national Kellogg project, forming a Kentucky Cooperative Committee in Educational Administration. The Southern Center for these programs of preparation and certification was George Peabody College in Nashville.\textsuperscript{112}

4. A Report of the Task Force of the Committee on Functions was submitted to Secretary Doran by R. W. Wild, Director of Public Relations, University of Kentucky. This brochure, Working Together to Serve Kentucky, promoted the efforts at coordination of the Council and the member schools. The edition numbered 50,000 copies at a cost of $3550, which was borne proportionally by the institutions.\textsuperscript{113}

5. President Donovan of the University of Kentucky pointed out that there was still no unified budget and that the institutions still functioned separately with no knowledge of each other.\textsuperscript{114}

Significant events began to occur regularly after 1954, events which reflect the booming economy of the nation at large and the growing diversity of business and industry in Kentucky. The General Assembly had made an appropriation to the Council for the first time—$1,000 per

\textsuperscript{111}Minutes of the Council, March 17, 1952.

\textsuperscript{112}Minutes of the Council, February 16, 1954.

\textsuperscript{113}Loc. cit.

\textsuperscript{114}Loc. cit.
year for each fiscal year of the 1955-56 biennium. That session also created the Council on Regional Education to administer the Veterinary Medicine program between the Commonwealth of Kentucky, the Southern Regional Education Board, and Alabama Polytechnic Institute (Auburn) for white students, Tuskegee Institute for Negro students. The Secretary of the Council on Public Higher Education was designated Secretary of this new Regional Council.

This relative degree of prosperity must have been a new feeling for the Council, for during the next meeting an unresolved discussion took place about whether the Council was properly a fiscal agent to handle money. This issue came about as a result of approval by the Kellogg Foundation of a grant-in-aid request of $3,600 per year for four years. The purpose of this grant was assistance in the program of preparation of school administrators.

The meeting of the Council on November 23, 1955 produced two important developments. One of these was a letter from James L. Miller, Jr., then a member of the Division of the Budget of the Department of Finance, Commonwealth of Kentucky. Mr. Miller suggested

115 Minutes of the Council, February 16, 1954.
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117 Minutes of the Council, June 20, 1955.
the idea of a full-time staff for the Council and further proposed that a budget for this staff be presented to the General Assembly during its next session. The Miller budget of $15,470 for 1956-57 and $14,650 for 1957-58 was adopted, but the Council hedged a bit and exhibited a lack of confidence in legislative appropriations. Fearing the loss of even the $1,000 annual appropriation made for 1954-55 and 1955-56 if the large request was denied, two requests were made:

1. A total request (Miller's figure).

2. A request for $1,000 per year for the biennium in case No. 1 was denied.

Another action was taken at the same meeting which showed more courage—a motion was passed to put into effect in the summer of 1956 in the University and the State Colleges, the provisions of the Supreme Court decision on segregation. 118

**Actions of the state government affecting higher education**

As a border state, Kentucky has been subject to the traditions and pressures of both North and South. Entirely Southern in its earlier segregation laws, the Commonwealth had established Kentucky State College in 1866. Located in the capitol city, Frankfort, this land-grant

---

institution was for the purpose of providing a curriculum of teacher education for Negro teachers. Kentucky State did not have a board of regents, but was under the direct control and supervision of the State Board of Education. The State Superintendent acted as Chairman of this group. The first break with this pattern of segregation came in the 1950 General Assembly. Actions taken by this body pre-dated the various Supreme Court decisions by several years. Senate Bill 100 modified Kentucky Revised Statutes 158.020 to provide that any course above high school level in any institution of higher education (public or private) could be offered to any person, provided:

1. The institution chose to do so.

2. That such course was not available at Kentucky State College for Negroes.

The immediate effect of this action was to open graduate study in teacher education to negro teachers.

During this time, there was continuing sentiment for more effective coordination of higher education in Kentucky. In an editorial, the Louisville Courier Journal suggested putting all institutions under a single governing board to supplant the separate Boards of Regents and Trustees. This move would be for the purpose of integrating activities

---

119 Doran, p. 12.
to effect savings by avoiding duplications and competitions. A bill (Senate, No. 343) had been introduced in the 1948 regular session of the General Assembly to establish such a single board of control composed of fifteen members with the governor as chairman. Though reported favorably by the Rules Committee, the measure was never acted upon by the Senate.

The year 1954 marked the beginning of a new era for education in the lower schools of Kentucky. As the result of an intensive analytical study, the Commonwealth took a major step toward improving and modernizing its public school program by passing the Minimum Foundation Program law. In 1956, the General Assembly implemented the enactment of this legislation by providing the necessary appropriated funds for the following:

1. At least a minimum school program for every child in the state regardless of where he lives.

2. An opportunity for the people in any school district to go beyond the minimum program whenever they decide to do so.

---


121 *Doran*, p. 166.

3. A sharing of educational responsibility between the state and local school districts.

4. The school district’s contribution to be based on local ability to support an educational program.

The declaration of the intent of the legislature was stated in the following manner: 123

...to assure substantially equal public school opportunities, through a foundation program for those in attendance in the public schools of the Commonwealth, but not to limit nor to prevent any school district from providing educational services and facilities beyond those assured by the foundation program; and to provide as additional state funds are made available for the public schools, for the use of such funds for the further equalization of educational opportunities.

Need for such a program of assured support of public schools had existed since ratification of the Kentucky Constitution of 1891. That document included a provision—the infamous Section 186—which plagued the state for more than sixty years. It was impossible to establish an efficient or adequate system of schools while Section 186 stipulated that state school funds were to be distributed on the basis of the number of school age children residing in a county, whether they were enrolled in the public schools or not. Also, the local ability to pay for education was ignored. 124 Another restrictive aspect of the Constitution was Section 158 which limited school districts to a rigorous and stifling

123 Kentucky Revised Statutes 157.310.

124 Beyond the Minimum, p. 19.
two per cent ceiling on bonded debt. A 1952 Advisory Committee on Educational Policy was created and appointed by the Legislative Research Commission which resulted in the determination of state and local needs. The public was then informed of these needs. The results of this investigation were published as lists of both strengths and weaknesses of education in the state. The following were labeled critical.

1. A shortage of trained teachers.
2. Deplorable school housing.
3. Inadequate school transportation.
4. Small attendance centers.
5. Limited curriculum.
6. Insufficient administrative and supervisory personnel.
7. Inadequate library and instructional materials.

These items were included in a Bulletin of the State Department of Education which also concluded that the distribution plan for the state school fund must be based on need and ability to pay if educational opportunities were to be provided all children on a fair and economical basis. This bulletin also pointed out that the pupil-census basis for distribution of funds perpetuated inequities, rewarded non-attendance of school

125 *Loc. cit.*

children, and ignored the need for insuring that a low pupil-teacher ratio be established and maintained. What had happened, of course, was that the possibility existed for unscrupulous school officials to create a feudal empire of political control based upon a policy of encouraging school drop-outs for purposes of financial manipulation. Indeed, it was possible for a county superintendent to become the local political overlord, since he had the most patronage to hand out.

The Foundation Program amended Section 186 to abolish pupil-census methods of distributing state funds in favor of a state and local partnership to provide a minimum program of education in each school system. The basis for calculation was the classroom unit, which was considered the most appropriate method for Kentucky's needs. The years since 1954 have seen the state change from a predominately rural to an almost equal rural-urban division. Its economy has been in transition from agriculture to industry; its per capita and total income is rising faster than the national averages. Kentucky's population growth, as shown by Table 11, has been much below the national average. However,
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the economically improved circumstances of those residents who remained in the state is shown by Table 12 on Median Family Income.

TABLE 11

POPULATION GROWTH IN KENTUCKY AND THE UNITED STATES, 1900-1960  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Kentucky Actual</th>
<th>% Change</th>
<th>United States Actual</th>
<th>% Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1900</td>
<td>2,147,000</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>75,995,000</td>
<td>20.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1910</td>
<td>2,290,000</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>91,992,000</td>
<td>21.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1920</td>
<td>2,417,000</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>105,771,000</td>
<td>14.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1930</td>
<td>2,615,000</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>122,775,000</td>
<td>16.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1940</td>
<td>2,846,000</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>131,669,000</td>
<td>7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950</td>
<td>2,945,000</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>151,132,000</td>
<td>14.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960</td>
<td>3,038,000</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>179,323,000</td>
<td>18.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 12

MEDIAN FAMILY INCOME IN KENTUCKY AND THE UNITED STATES, 1950-1960  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Kentucky Actual</th>
<th>1950</th>
<th>1960</th>
<th>Per cent of Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,032</td>
<td>$4,051</td>
<td>$2,019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td></td>
<td>4,969</td>
<td>5,660</td>
<td>691</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


As the material well-being of the residents of the state has improved since 1954, dramatic changes have occurred in education. Perhaps the most impressive of these improvements has been the increase in the level of professional preparation of teachers and administrators. In 1954-55, only 59.2 per cent of the teachers and administrators held bachelor's degrees or higher. This figure stood at 94.3 per cent for the 1965-66 school year, one of the highest in the nation. At the same time, the number of emergency teachers and administrators fell from 2,838 to 855. Kentucky has not had the proliferation of small school districts that has complicated the progress of education in other states. During the past decade, the total number of districts has been reduced from 224 to 200. The total number of public schools has dropped from 4,241 to 2,057. The total of one-teacher schools has declined from 2,238 to 422. Pupil-teacher ratios have dropped from 26.6 to 24.3 while the number of students has increased from 492,830 to 616,859. During the same period, the number of teachers has grown from 18,525 to 25,348. The holding power of Kentucky high schools has increased more rapidly than the national average, but it still falls short of the total retention per 1,000 registered by the nation as a whole. Graduates of Kentucky high schools in 1956

toted 22,796, and 31 per cent of this total enrolled in college. In 1965, 41,253 students graduated from high school and 43.9 per cent of this group enrolled in college. All is not ideal, however. Many buildings and classrooms have been constructed during the life of the Foundation Program, but the need is even greater now than when the Program began a decade ago. In 1954-55, a total of 7,000 new classrooms was needed to accommodate excess enrollments and to replace unsatisfactory facilities. In 1966, a total of 7,103 classrooms was needed, at a total estimated cost of $213,101,570. Another factor that cannot be ignored is the low level of educational attainment of Kentuckians. According to the 1960 census, Kentucky was tied with South Carolina for last place with median years of schooling for adults 25 years and older being 8.7 years. Kentucky's median years of schooling increased one grade level during the twenty year span, 1940-1960, while the median schooling increase for the United States during the same twenty year period was 2.2 years. Kentucky ranks 48th among 50 states in per cent of ninth-graders graduating from high school. That these citations of low educational attainment, illiteracy, high school drop-outs do not prevail in all parts of the state, can be

---
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shown to be a reflection of educational deprivation in economically disadvantaged areas.\textsuperscript{144}

This brief digression from the higher education story will prove to be relevant in subsequent pages; a foundation formula for the State Colleges was developed and met with wide acceptance following the noteworthy success of the public school foundation programs.

It must be pointed out, however, that at least one writer in this field of state budgeting for higher education feels there is no indication that higher education formulas or cost analysis procedures have been modeled upon or even significantly influenced by any local school foundation programs.\textsuperscript{145} Accepting his judgment on matters of cause and effect, it is still noteworthy that one foundation program in Kentucky followed the other in quick succession. There are similarities in objectives and characteristics.

Another knowledgeable participant on the financial scene in Kentucky is inclined to give a larger degree of credit to grass-roots local support developed during the school foundation struggle. The

\textsuperscript{144}\textit{Ibid.}, pp. 16-17.

successful attempt to sell the idea of the value of education and the
wisdom of supporting it was made by a partnership combining the Kentucky
Education Association (the organization of teachers and administrators)
and the State Department of Education. Caught in the upturn of national
prosperity, influenced by the actions of surrounding states, education
became a public matter in Kentucky and was adopted as a popular
political issue. Inevitably, the word "foundation" became a symbol
of responsible support for reasonable educational programs.146

Personnel of the Council

When the organization of the Council was completed on May 6, 1935, the Superintendent of Public Instruction, James H. Richmond, was chairman. While suggesting that the Council elect a secretary, the General Assembly had made no provisions for funds to hire such a person. Mr. R. E. Jaggers, Director of Teacher Education and Certification of the State Department of Education, was appointed secretary and remained in that capacity until he left the department in 1947. Another custom of precedent seems to have been set, because his successors as Director of Teacher Education and Certification were asked to serve as secretary of the Council until 1956. Miss Louise Combs fulfilled

146Interview with Dean J. C. Powell, Eastern Kentucky University Office of Business Affairs, March 20, 1967.
this function during the years 1947-1952 and again from 1954-1956. Adron Doran served from 1952 until he resigned his position in 1954 upon being appointed President of Morehead State College. In those early years the Council met infrequently; a total of fifty-one meetings took place during its first twenty-five years of existence.\footnote{Report of the Council on Public Higher Education for the Biennium ending June 30, 1963 (Frankfort: The Council, January, 1964), p. 1, mimeographed.}

Agitation during 1946-1947 seems to suggest that the Council again had realized the necessity for appointing an executive secretary to serve as a coordinating agent for all phases of higher education. Doran says that:

The Council undoubtedly had concluded from its experiences in unifying teacher education in Kentucky, through the efforts of its secretary as Director of Teacher Training, that equally important results could be obtained if the Council should provide a person who could promote cooperation in the field of higher education.\footnote{Doran, pp. 66-67.}

John Fred Williams, then Superintendent of Public Instruction and Chairman of the Council proposed the employment of an executive secretary, to perform the following duties:\footnote{Unpublished Minutes of the Council on Public Higher Education, December 19, 1946.}

1. Study problems of education in the state which can be solved through higher education, and bring the results of such study before the Council for consideration and action.
2. Be an agent of the Council in carrying out the policies adopted.

3. Receive such reports from the colleges as the Council may prescribe.

4. Prepare such reports as the Council may want to release, including the biennial report.

5. Take the lead in promoting studies that are desirable in the development of higher education in the state.

6. Do those things under policies of the Council, which will coordinate and unify higher educational services in the interest of Kentucky.

7. Perform such other services, prescribed by law, as the Council directs.

A job description such as this appears to be a completely reasonable mandate for the exercise of educational leadership. Several alternatives for financing the salary of this secretary were considered, none of them involving an appropriation from the legislature.\(^{150}\) R. E. Jaggers seems to have been the choice of the Council, in which case there would have been no separation of the powers and functions of the Secretaryship from the area of teacher education. Dr. Jaggers would have remained as Director of Teacher Education and Certification in addition to his new duties as Executive Secretary.\(^{151}\) However,


\(^{151}\)Doran, p. 69.
Dr. Jaggers resigned in September, 1947, so this plan to enlarge the work of the Council was never put into operation since he was the man "around whom the program was to be built and upon whom its execution seemingly depended."\textsuperscript{152}

Completing his first decade in 1955 as President of Murray was Dr. Ralph H. Woods, formerly Director of Vocational Education in the State Department of Education. Western Kentucky State College inaugurated a new President that same year, Kelly Thompson, who had been serving the institution for twenty-three years in the positions of Director of Public Relations, Assistant to the President, and Acting President.

\textbf{The Maturing Years}\\\textit{1956-1965}

\textbf{Personnel of the Council}

The General Assembly of the Commonwealth of Kentucky meets only in even-numbered years. Early in its 1956 session, on February 4, \textsuperscript{152}Loc. cit.
House Bill 398 was passed to amend Section 164.020 to read as follows:

1. Coordinate the work and determine the curricular offerings of the state institutions of higher learning in Kentucky, on the basis of efficiency and economy.

2. Determine the amount of entrance fees and the qualifications for admission to each of such institutions.

3. Consider the budgetary requirements of each of such institutions and, on the basis of the needs of the various institutions as indicated by the individual budgets submitted recommend to the Department of Finance a budget covering the needs of the institutions.

4. Require such reports from the executive officers of each of such institutions as it deems necessary for the effectual performance of its duties.

5. Publish, at least biennially, a report of the educational and financial affairs of such institutions.

6. Elect a secretary on the recommendation of the chairman. The Council shall elect such staff as may be necessary, limited to available appropriations, on recommendation of the chairman. The staff shall be determined in the same manner as other state employees.

Items 1-5 of this Section are reaffirmations of previous charges to the Council. Item 6, however, was a significantly new move which opened a new era. At last, the opportunity had arrived for the Council to employ

\[153\] Kentucky Revised Statutes.
a full-time staff person, since the Assembly also appropriated $13,570
to the Council as an administrative budget for 1956-57. James L. Miller
was appointed Executive Director to work under the general supervision
of the new Chairman, Superintendent of Public Instruction Dr. Robert R.
Martin, new President of Eastern Kentucky University. The new
Director announced that he would initiate the practice of analysis of
expenditures and suggested that the several institutions adopt the uni­
form accounting procedures of the National Association of College
Business Managers. In addition, the Executive Director was
authorized to employ clerical help in the person of a clerk-steno IV.
The Secretary of the Council was not classified as a staff position,
so Miss Combs agreed to continue serving without pay in the role of
responsibility for minutes of the meetings. Office space for the staff
was to be furnished by the State Department of Education.

During the next decade, several changes of professional staff
personnel took place which disrupted the continuity of the central
office. In 1958, Mr. Miller requested and was granted a leave of ab­
sence to pursue graduate studies at the University of Michigan. As


a temporary replacement, Mr. Don Bales of the State Department of Education, agreed to serve as acting director and secretary on a part-time basis. He served in this capacity until February 23, 1960. At the meeting on that date Miss Combs was reelected secretary upon Mr. Bales' resignation, but the position of Executive Secretary remained vacant.

Under the gavel of Chairman William Butler, new Superintendent of Public Instruction, the Council filled its vacant staff position in 1960 by electing Mr. Ted C. Gilbert as Executive Secretary. Mr. Gilbert was expected to furnish liaison between the state government and higher education as a man who knew the general problems of education in Kentucky. His qualifications for this role included experience as the former Superintendent of Schools at Maysville, Kentucky; and as the Assistant State Superintendent of Public Instruction. During his career, Mr. Gilbert had also served for a short period as the Superintendent of Public Instruction during a time span between the end of one man's term and the assumption of office by his elected successor.

During 1962, the Council underwent still another change in its professional staff. Mr. Gilbert resigned to become Assistant

156 Minutes of the Council, May 9, 1960.
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Superintendent of the Louisville City Schools and was replaced by Dr. Ellis Hartford of the University of Kentucky who was also elected Secretary.

The period 1963-1964 saw several other changes in the personnel of the Council and its staff. These hold a degree of significance since those persons remained in office as late as April, 1967. Two new presidents were installed: Dr. John W. Oswald as the President of the University of Kentucky, and Dr. Carl M. Hill as the President of Kentucky State College. Dr. Oswald formerly held a post as Vice-President of the University of California, while Dr. Hill, a noted scientist, was from Tennessee A. and I. in Nashville. The Executive Secretary of the Council, Dr. Ellis F. Hartford, resigned April 11, 1964, and was replaced by the re-employment of Mr. Ted C. Gilbert.

Actions of the Council

As the Council began to operate with its first full-time staff, it found itself charged with a new responsibility. A Medical Scholarship program was to be initiated on a contract basis between the Council and the University of Louisville Medical School. The contract called

---

158 Minutes of the Council, July 9, 1962.
159 Minutes of the Council, October 15, 1962.
for a sum of $500,000 to be paid for instructional and research programs, with a subsidy of $1,500 per student.\textsuperscript{160} (This was obviously a device for the payment of state funds to a private institution, although there was no doubt that Kentucky was in the midst of a dire shortage of doctors at that time. The University of Louisville Medical School was the only medical training facility in the state.)

More in line with its previous course of action, the Council spent considerable time discussing a request from the State Board of Education relative to a substitution of experience for the student teaching requirement in teacher education curricula. Retreating somewhat from its earlier strong position, the Council refused to make any further public statement on integration during 1956.\textsuperscript{161}

The value of a professional staff member became increasingly evident in succeeding meetings, which followed agendas prepared by the Executive Director. As the pace quickened, the Council at its two meetings of 1957 considered such items as the following:

1. The help of the Council in sponsoring Science Institutes and Regional Science Conferences.

\textsuperscript{160}Kentucky Revised Statutes, 1956, House Bill 1, Article 14, Section 4.

\textsuperscript{161}Minutes of the Council, May 24, 1956.
2. A suggested constitutional amendment specifying that the State Superintendent of Public Instruction be chosen by an appointed board, rather than on an elective basis.

3. A suggestion by the Director for committee study to determine the position of the Council concerning political activity on the campuses.

4. A suggestion by the Director to publish studies--it was decided to consider each item separately. An enrollment study with projections was agreed upon, but there was some question as to the method of financing the publication.

5. The Director was given authority to classify Council employees within the state civil service system.

6. The Presidents and Deans were directed to formulate a uniform calendar.

7. Uniform accounting systems were adopted in all institutions.

8. An administrative budget for 1958-1959 was approved.\textsuperscript{162}

It has been noted previously that the Council found itself without a director at the meeting of February 23, 1960, upon the resignation of Mr. Bales. Minutes of that meeting also list the fees to be charged by the Medical School of the University of Kentucky.\textsuperscript{163} This is the only indication in the Minutes, the official record of the Council, that

\textsuperscript{162} Items 1-8 have been extracted and paraphrased from Minutes of the Council, January 24, 1957, and July 16, 1957.

\textsuperscript{163} Minutes of the Council, February 23, 1960.
a Medical School was even in existence. Thus the Council ignored completely the inter-state tug of war and political battle preceding the establishment and construction of the Albert B. Chandler Medical Center. The Council apparently chose not to implement its legal role of coordinating the role and scope of higher education during this struggle between the Universities of Kentucky and Louisville. In the end, the second medical school was established in Lexington, and has become a large and significant complex of research, education, and service.

After Mr. Gilbert's first appointment the Council re-established its central office and resumed certain functions and studies in cooperation with the institutions. During this period, 1960-1961, the Council considered such items of business as approving a fee increase at the University of Kentucky to pay interest on revenue bonds, specifying that only registration fees should be used, and not special fees. 164

Some word of explanation should be made that revenue bonds are a means of providing capital for construction at Kentucky's colleges and universities wherein student fees are pledged to retire the bonds. Careful distinction is always made between registration fees (dedicated

164 Minutes of the Council, October 20, 1960; February 10, 1961; and April 8, 1961.
to debt service) and special fees (not applied to bonds). This practice may be peculiar to the Commonwealth of Kentucky due to an archaic debt limit provision in the state Constitution of 1891. The state general fund can be encumbered only to the unrealistic amount of $500,000. Other general obligation bonds must be approved by referendum. Other specific provisions of the 1891 document included Section 186 (that specified school support should be based on census count) and a provision limiting the salary of any state official to the amount of $5,000 annually. Literal interpretation of this latter section had prevented college and university presidents and faculty members from receiving salaries commensurate with institutions in other states until repeal of this provision during the 1940's.165

General fund income in Kentucky (or in any other state) could not provide large enough sums for both operating and capital construction. The Commonwealth has used direct appropriations of tax funds to a limited extent for the financing of academic or non-income-producing buildings. This method has the advantage of involving no borrowing and no interest charges. Table 13 shows the amounts appropriated during the five fiscal years, 1959-1964.

165A particularly interesting and illuminating description of this situation may be found in the book by the former President of the University of Kentucky, Keeping the University Free and Growing (Lexington: University of Kentucky Press, 1956).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>U. of K.</td>
<td>338,575</td>
<td>843,646</td>
<td>486,945</td>
<td>2,878,083</td>
<td>982,302</td>
<td>5,530,050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern</td>
<td>138,073</td>
<td>1,306,803</td>
<td>28,832</td>
<td>92,947</td>
<td>8,156</td>
<td>1,634,811</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western</td>
<td>40,745</td>
<td>144,711</td>
<td>45,600</td>
<td>78,943</td>
<td>7,830</td>
<td>318,829</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morehead</td>
<td>100,771</td>
<td>79,636</td>
<td>258,329</td>
<td>482,817</td>
<td>5,556</td>
<td>927,109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murray</td>
<td>67,619</td>
<td>145,395</td>
<td>298,433</td>
<td>72,634</td>
<td>16,210</td>
<td>600,311</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K. State</td>
<td>9,700</td>
<td>52,877</td>
<td>27,180</td>
<td>166,883</td>
<td>15,499</td>
<td>272,139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>695,483</td>
<td>2,653,068</td>
<td>1,146,319</td>
<td>3,772,326</td>
<td>1,036,053</td>
<td>9,303,249</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Revenue bonds became a subterfuge for avoiding the constitutional debt limit, and were probably the only way necessary academic buildings could have been constructed to meet the onrush of enrollment increases. In the fall elections of 1966, an attempt was made to change this provision and others by referendum. The constitutional amendment issue was defeated by a 3.6 to 1 majority.

Student fee income was chosen as the vehicle for debt service of revenue bonds, since those amounts could be projected. Fee income is reduced by the total amount of debt service, and the state appropriation is increased by a like amount. Such parts of the annual income from student fees as are not used for bond retirement become available for current annual operating expenses. In reality, then, the building programs are state supported by this unusual means, but the bonds are issued in the name of the governing board of the institution involved. Conflict becomes possible since all appropriations are from the general fund; if one institution has vastly larger building programs it also has vastly larger debt service needs, but that amount will be appropriated. The institution in question does not gain in unrestricted funds, but the total financial pie of resources available for higher education is thus reduced at a cost to the other schools. The Council has never taken a position on the approval of building programs. Each institution has the autonomy to determine building needs, but a crash construction program inevitably reduces the finite number of dollars available to all other institutions.
There is good reason to finance a major part of the necessary capital outlays for a growing state system of public higher education by borrowing, with repayments spread over a period of years not exceeding the probable useful life of the buildings. To some extent this shifts a part of the cost from the taxpayers of the present generation to those of a future generation, who will also be enjoying the benefit of the facilities. Interest charges will practically double the original cost, but, in the meantime, the present generation can have the use of the buildings which are imperatively needed now, as well as the future generations who will help pay for them. Table 14 shows the distribution of revenue bonds issued by the six institutions during the fiscal years 1960-1964.  

Table 14

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>U. of K.</td>
<td>8,000,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8,700,000</td>
<td>16,700,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern</td>
<td>2,000,000</td>
<td>3,500,000</td>
<td>3,000,000</td>
<td>2,000,000</td>
<td>10,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western</td>
<td>1,300,000</td>
<td>2,800,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4,100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morehead</td>
<td>1,425,000</td>
<td>1,400,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,950,000</td>
<td>4,775,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murray</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,400,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2,360,000</td>
<td>3,760,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K. State</td>
<td>400,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>400,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>13,125,000</td>
<td>9,100,000</td>
<td>3,000,000</td>
<td>15,010,000</td>
<td>40,235,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

167 *loc. cit.*
It is probable that general obligation bonds issued by the state could be marketed bearing a rate of interest 0.4 or 0.5 per cent lower than the rate required on the revenue bonds of the several institutions backed only by anticipated student fees. This would, of course, produce annual savings of $400,000 to $500,000 on each $100 million of bonds issued.\textsuperscript{168} The practice of depending upon student fees is not good in principle, and is not in widespread national use. In a time when increasing numbers of academic facilities are needed, this practice strengthens the already irresistible temptation toward continual raising of student fees, thus narrowing the scope of educational opportunity by excluding students unable to pay high fees. The issue is whether the cost of academic buildings, which are the property of the state and are of permanent utility for at least a generation shall be charged to the students or to the taxpayers of the whole state. The expansion and improvement of public higher education is not solely of benefit to the students involved; but benefits, directly or indirectly, every resident of the state.\textsuperscript{169}

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
\item \textsuperscript{168}\textit{Ibid.}, p. 286.
\item \textsuperscript{169}\textit{Ibid.}, p. 287.
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}
A study of auxiliary enterprises at the several institutions to determine whether they were self-sustaining; it was found to be the case.

Residence halls, dining halls, and related student service structures customarily should pay for themselves through user charges which cover the cost of construction, renovation, and day-to-day operation. While there may be a slight co-mingling of accounts in getting a new project underway (for land acquisition, initial planning and/or site development) the bulk of the operation is paid for through income resulting from room rentals, dining hall sales and payments for related student services. These capital expenditures are classified as "self-liquidating" since they are paid for by direct user charges.

Little, if any, public moneys are involved in these facilities. Table 15 shows the expenditures by the six institutions for construction of this type during the fiscal years 1960-1964.

The financing of dormitories, dining halls, and related student service structures from which regular income is expected at little or no expense to the taxpayer is approved in practically every state.

Summary of Capital Construction for the Fiscal Years 1960-1964: During this period the six state institutions spent an aggregate total of $83,812,054 on their capital construction projects. Of this total,

\[170^\text{Ibid., p. 291.}\]

\[171^\text{Loc. cit.}\]
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>U. of K.</td>
<td>2,173,042</td>
<td>1,906,114</td>
<td>2,182,676</td>
<td>1,010,457</td>
<td>7,272,289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(390,826)</td>
<td>(496,174)</td>
<td>(178,587)</td>
<td>(84,002)</td>
<td>(1,149,589)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern</td>
<td>2,127,993</td>
<td>3,775,554</td>
<td>3,727,562</td>
<td>2,505,812</td>
<td>12,136,921</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(337,691)</td>
<td>(150,618)</td>
<td>(36,635)</td>
<td>(98,994)</td>
<td>(623,938)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western</td>
<td>741,349</td>
<td>1,015,224</td>
<td>1,201,615</td>
<td>1,318,156</td>
<td>4,276,344</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(144,288)</td>
<td>(84,005)</td>
<td>(55,312)</td>
<td>(31,890)</td>
<td>(315,495)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morehead</td>
<td>736,555</td>
<td>881,402</td>
<td>1,647,522</td>
<td>1,470,778</td>
<td>4,736,257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(92,316)</td>
<td>(113,440)</td>
<td>(38,978)</td>
<td>(121,127)</td>
<td>(365,861)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murray</td>
<td>1,173,042</td>
<td>1,735,492</td>
<td>1,187,923</td>
<td>1,703,351</td>
<td>5,799,808</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(181,248)</td>
<td>(186,433)</td>
<td>(71,916)</td>
<td>(141,903)</td>
<td>(581,500)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K. State</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>64,151</td>
<td>60,583</td>
<td>725,138</td>
<td>849,872</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(10,250)</td>
<td>(19,200)</td>
<td>(40,600)</td>
<td>(40,000)</td>
<td>(110,050)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>6,849,544</td>
<td>9,377,937</td>
<td>10,007,881</td>
<td>8,733,692</td>
<td>34,969,054</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1,156,619)</td>
<td>(1,049,870)</td>
<td>(412,028)</td>
<td>(517,916)</td>
<td>(3,136,433)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The figure in parentheses represents a state appropriation of tax funds (for land, site development and equipment) which should be subtracted from the larger figure to obtain the purely "self-liquidating" expenditure (Kentucky State College, 1960-61, excepted).

$11,754,433 came from direct appropriations from state tax funds, while the remaining $72,057,621 came from payments by students. Of this amount, $31,822,621 went to self-liquidating facilities, such as residences, dining halls, and student centers. The remaining $40,235,000 went toward the financing of academic facilities under the guise of revenue bonds.173

The six institutions expended a total of $49,500,000 on academic facilities during this time (40,200,000 from pledged student fees and $9,300,000 in state tax funds). These same colleges built "self-liquidating" auxiliary enterprises worth $34,969,054 during the period in question ($31,822,621 from direct user charges plus $3,146,433 from public funds).174

Late 1961 saw the first mention in the Minutes of a consolidated budget request, but another significant development was appearing on the horizon. Governor Combs had appointed a Study Commission on Public Higher Education under the chairmanship of Dr. Otis C. Amis. During the process of its fact-finding study and deliberations, the Commission had met with Mr. Gilbert and the institution presidents. In his memorandum to the Commission, dated September 8, 1961, Mr. Gilbert

173bid., p. 293.

174loc. cit.
eloquently presented a defense of the Council as a coordinating agency from his vantage point as Executive Secretary. His paper urged that the Council be maintained in its existing form, with no changes in basic philosophy. The following particular points of interest have been extracted from that paper:175

1. Through its geographical contiguity, its historical relations, and its Southern Regional Education Board program participation, Kentucky had been under continuing pressure to establish a governing board imitative of several of the deep South states. In the opinion of the Secretary, there should be no consideration of a move of this type, even though a "State Board of Higher Education" was recommended in a study of public higher education in Kentucky by the Legislative Research Commission in 1951.

2. Kentucky had insisted through the years that it was unable to support increased programs of higher education, and that its existing operations were of inferior quality. In the Secretary's professional opinion, the state had "no reason to consider itself to be at a disadvantage as it compares its program in public higher education with those of other states in the southern region."

3. By generally accepted measures of quality, the leading institutions of higher education are not located in states where the strong control agencies are in use. The conclusions of the Secretary were that strong controlling state agencies had not brought better quality to those southern states than had been realized in Kentucky.

175 Ted C. Gilbert, Memorandum, September 8, 1961.
4. By implementing a larger and stronger staff for the Council, the Secretary felt much more progress in coordination could be realized immediately. A program of basic higher education research, coordination of instructional and administrative practices and programs, a more fair and equitable apportionment of state funds for support to the institutions; these could be realized within the present statutory framework of the Council.

The minutes of the Council's meeting of December 12, 1961 include a position paper representing the approved attitude of the members of the Council toward the Study Commission. That paper was entitled "Statement of the Presidents of Kentucky's State-Assisted Institutions of Higher Education to the Governor's Commission for the Study of Public Higher Education," and is presented in its entirety as Appendix A.

In summary, that paper presents the views of the presidents on the matters of (1) the coordination of public higher education in Kentucky, (2) the correlation of academic and professional training for teachers, and (3) criteria for determining the locations of institutions and the program of institutions of higher education in the state.

On the subject of coordination, the statement of the presidents expressed a belief in the worth of voluntary cooperation and a desire to support the previous statements of Mr. Gilbert. On the subject of teacher training, the statement of the presidents expressed the opinion that Kentucky had achieved as fine a balance between academic and professional training as had been developed anywhere. It was the judgment
of the presidents that no new centers or institutions of higher education should be established until the existing institutions were adequately supported.

At a later point in the same meeting of December, 1961, the following excerpts from A REPORT OF THE FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE GOVERNOR'S COMMISSION ON THE STUDY OF PUBLIC HIGHER EDUCATION was read into the minutes:

The Council, composed largely of the Presidents of the state institutions of higher learning and the members of their boards, all with vested interests, lends itself to limited vision of the responsibility for the development of the higher educational program of the state and to political maneuvering. The Commission on the Study of Public Higher Education feels that this should be remedied by the appointment of a lay board, or commission, composed of some nine to thirteen members, to serve for staggered terms for a period of four years (more years if the constitution would allow). This Commission should be appointed by the Governor and should have an executive staff whose chief functions would be to do research along the lines of programming, financing and the various other types of research. The membership of this Commission or Board should be composed of the highest quality of citizenship in the State of Kentucky.

This statement shows complete rejection by the Commission of the position taken by the Council. It thus precedes by five years the establishment of a lay board for higher education. In reaction to the Report of
Findings the Council discussed and proposed the following: 176

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR STRENGTHENING THE COUNCIL ON PUBLIC HIGHER EDUCATION

After full discussion of the issues, the following recommendations were unanimously adopted as steps toward strengthening the work of the Council: 177

1. That the Council request that the law establishing the Council be so changed as to include three additional lay members appointed at large by the Governor; that the law designate that the Council meet four times a year; and that two absences without cause (from two regular meetings) give the Council authority to drop appointed members from membership.

2. That the Governor include in his budget request to the 1962 legislature the proposed budget as submitted by the Council on Public Higher Education for the 1962-64 biennium as another step in strengthening the Council.

3. That the Council be given authority on basis of continuous study to determine when and where new institutions of higher education should be established.


177 Loc. cit.
4. That the Council go on record as opposing the establishing of a State Board of Higher Education, as recommended by the Governor's Commission on the Study of Public Higher Education.

5. That the Executive Secretary be requested to convey to the Governor the recommendations made by the Council.

The resolution of these conflicting points of view show a victory for the presidents over the Study Commission, since House Bill 484 of the General Assembly of 1962 provides:

Section 1. There shall be a Council on Public Higher Education in Kentucky to be composed of the president or chief executive officer of the University of Kentucky, Eastern Kentucky State College, Western Kentucky State College, Murray State College, Morehead State College, and Kentucky State College; a member, other than the Superintendent of Public Instruction, of the board of regents of each of the state colleges to be selected by the board of regents of each state college; three appointive members of the board of trustees of the University of Kentucky to be selected by the board of trustees of the University of Kentucky; two lay members of the State Board of Education to be selected by the State Board of Education; the Dean of the College of Education of the University of Kentucky; the Superintendent of Public Instruction, who shall be chairman of the Council; and three additional lay members from the state-at-large to be appointed by the Governor for regular terms of four years. The initial appointment of these three lay members shall be for terms of two, three, and four years respectively. When the Council meets to consider curricula for teacher training, three persons who are from accredited institutions of higher learning, who are

178 Kentucky Revised Statutes, Sections 164.010, and 164.060.
not members of the Council, and who have been appointed by the Executive Committee of the Association of Kentucky Colleges and Universities, shall be invited to meet with the Council in an advisory capacity. Unexcused absences from two consecutive meetings of the Council shall be cause for disqualification of Council members.

Section 2. The Council shall meet at least four times each year at such times as it determines by resolution. Special meetings may be called by the chairman. Upon request of three institutions represented on the Council, the chairman shall call a special meeting.

Section 3. Appropriate $29,000 for the 1962-63 fiscal year and $45,000 for the 1963-64 fiscal year to the Council on Public Higher Education for the purpose of expanding the research and coordination staff, activities, and services of the Council.

The same year, 1962, saw a crisis reached and passed in relation to Kentucky State College in Frankfort. Although not dealt with at any length in the Minutes, a considerable body of opinion had been generated that the institution had become obsolete, unduly costly, and should be closed. A team of consultants--M. M. Chambers, Broadus Sawyer, and Thomas Pullen--was employed. The task of this group was to perform a study, submit a report, and make recommendations. The principal conclusions reached are as follows:

1. Kentucky State College should be continued as a state-supported four-year degree-granting college

---

of liberal arts, with other specified programs, open to all qualified persons irrespective of race, religion, or sex.

2. Kentucky State College should immediately be enabled and encouraged to serve the recent high school graduates of Frankfort, Franklin County and adjacent counties by providing two-year community-junior college courses suitable to the demand, as it develops from year to year.

3. Kentucky State College should accomplish a gradual expansion of its service to state and community; gradual progress in racial integration of faculty and students; and numerical increase of faculty and students commensurate with the obvious need for junior college and senior college facilities in the capitol city of Frankfort and its surrounding area. It follows, that during this all-important transition period, state support for the college should be generously increased.

4. Kentucky State College should immediately be enabled and encouraged to strengthen and enlarge its instruction in political science, public administration, and business administration, and to enroll employees of the state government in evening and Saturday classes in these departments of instruction.

5. Kentucky State College should continue as one of six senior state institutions of higher education in Kentucky, governed by its own institutional Board of Regents.

6. Kentucky State College should not be decapitated to become a two-year community-junior college.

7. Kentucky State College has before it a multiple function which involves gradual changes and expansions in its programs of instruction, gradual shifting in the racial composition of faculty and student body, substantial increase in the numbers of students and faculty, and the "growing pains" and problems that accompany these changes over a period of several years.
In the main, these findings, recommendations, and conclusions have been, and are being followed and implemented. President Hill of Kentucky State College characterizes the institution as one which is at present an exciting example of racial integration in reverse. Since no indications of race are maintained on forms or records, the college has no idea what the present racial mixture of the student body really is. 180

Table 16 presents a composite of the growths in full-time equivalent student enrollments of the member institutions in Kentucky's state system of public higher education during a ten-year period from 1956-1966. Great increases are noticeable for all colleges and the University. The details of those increases are presented in Table 17, which shows relative percentages of growth.

The decade for which these enrollment figures have been presented is also the decade since the Council added full-time staff. It is clear that the University and Kentucky State College show lesser percentage growths than the average to accompany their lesser than average appropriations which were previously noted. Eastern and Western show large increases, though Western gained the most students.

180 Interview with President Carl M. Hill, March 23, 1967.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>U.K.</th>
<th>Eastern</th>
<th>Ky. State</th>
<th>Morehead</th>
<th>Murray</th>
<th>Western</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1956</td>
<td>6,956</td>
<td>2,073</td>
<td>543</td>
<td>989</td>
<td>1,956</td>
<td>1,840</td>
<td>14,357</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1957</td>
<td>7,815</td>
<td>2,320</td>
<td>575</td>
<td>1,138</td>
<td>2,080</td>
<td>1,921</td>
<td>15,849</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1958</td>
<td>7,892</td>
<td>2,395</td>
<td>595</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>2,312</td>
<td>2,179</td>
<td>16,873</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1959</td>
<td>7,660</td>
<td>2,532</td>
<td>647</td>
<td>1,739</td>
<td>2,383</td>
<td>2,495</td>
<td>17,456</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960</td>
<td>7,878</td>
<td>2,893</td>
<td>589</td>
<td>2,015</td>
<td>2,763</td>
<td>3,126</td>
<td>19,264</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1961</td>
<td>8,670</td>
<td>3,975</td>
<td>687</td>
<td>2,378</td>
<td>3,331</td>
<td>3,928</td>
<td>22,569</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1962</td>
<td>9,554</td>
<td>3,775</td>
<td>792</td>
<td>2,572</td>
<td>3,392</td>
<td>4,353</td>
<td>24,438</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1963</td>
<td>9,956</td>
<td>4,337</td>
<td>840</td>
<td>2,886</td>
<td>3,709</td>
<td>5,146</td>
<td>26,874</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1964</td>
<td>11,809</td>
<td>5,101</td>
<td>1,015</td>
<td>3,442</td>
<td>4,619</td>
<td>5,925</td>
<td>31,911</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1965</td>
<td>14,393</td>
<td>6,507</td>
<td>1,153</td>
<td>4,220</td>
<td>5,443</td>
<td>6,646</td>
<td>38,362</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1966</td>
<td>15,680</td>
<td>7,240</td>
<td>1,220</td>
<td>4,928</td>
<td>6,092</td>
<td>7,629</td>
<td>42,789</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Kentucky College and University Enrollments.
TABLE 17

ENROLLMENT INCREASES FROM 1956-1966 IN FULL-TIME EQUIVALENTS, INCLUDING PERCENTAGES OF GROWTH

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>1956</th>
<th>1966</th>
<th>% Increase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University of Kentucky</td>
<td>6,956</td>
<td>15,680</td>
<td>up 225%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Kentucky</td>
<td>2,073</td>
<td>7,240</td>
<td>up 349%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Kentucky</td>
<td>1,840</td>
<td>7,629</td>
<td>up 415%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morehead State</td>
<td>989</td>
<td>4,928</td>
<td>up 498%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murray State</td>
<td>1,956</td>
<td>6,092</td>
<td>up 311%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky State</td>
<td>543</td>
<td>1,220</td>
<td>up 298%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS</strong></td>
<td>14,357</td>
<td>42,789</td>
<td>up 298%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While Eastern was receiving larger financial support, Morehead's percentage of increase is the largest by a sizeable margin.

During an earlier discussion of revenue bonds, it was explained that debt service for those obligations was included in the general fund appropriations. Therefore, it is possible for a college or university with a lesser enrollment (Eastern) to be given a larger appropriation than an institution with more enrollment (Western) due to more rapid construction programs.
TABLE 18

PERCENTAGES OF TOTAL FULL-TIME EQUIVALENT ENROLLMENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1956</th>
<th>1961</th>
<th>1966</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University of Kentucky</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Kentucky</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Kentucky</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morehead State</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murray State</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky State</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It may be seen by this percentage profile (Table 18) that the five-year period 1956-61 saw a major shift in college attendance habits of Kentucky students. The University's previous position as the recipient of one-half of all public higher education enrollments was diminished by 10 per cent—a figure involving 2,257 FTE students. Since that time, the rates have maintained a fairly steady pace. Murray State and Kentucky State do not show the same growth trends for 1956-66, suggesting that those schools have not been faced with the crushing increases within a short time as have Eastern, Western, and Morehead. During the decade Murray has fallen from third to fourth in size, while Western has risen from fourth to second; Eastern has dropped from second to third, while Morehead has grown into a strong fifth
place. This growth has been unplanned at the state-wide level, based upon an open door admissions policy for instate students, with the only limitation being residence space.

Pursuant to direction of the Council, an Advisory Committee on Financial Studies presented a report at the meeting of April 20, 1963. The assignment of the Committee was to develop a formula to serve as a basis for requests for state appropriations to be used by the state colleges and, insofar as possible, the University. The committee report agreed that the primary considerations in formula development were:

1. The formula must provide support for all phases of the educational and general programs of the institutions adequate to provide educational services at a desirable level of quality and adequate to maintain necessary services related to the educational program.

2. The formula must provide for equity among the state institutions in the distribution of state funds appropriated for higher education.

These concepts of adequacy and equity are generally recognized as the basic elements of a "foundation of support" approach; the committee then realized that it was attempting to develop a "Foundation Program for Public Higher Education in Kentucky." With these foundation concepts in mind, the committee set out to develop a formula that would meet the needs of the state institutions and ensure that state funds were distributed fairly.


182 Ibid., p. 2.
concepts in mind, the committee considered that Eastern, Western, Morehead, and Murray State Colleges were sufficiently similar to present no significant problems in formula development. Significant differences would be encountered in the other two institutions. 183

1. University of Kentucky

It was recognized that the programs of the University of Kentucky differed significantly from those of the State Colleges. These differences were, generally, that the University offered programs in professional colleges and graduate programs at the doctoral level not offered by the State Colleges; and public service and research programs larger in scope than those offered by the State Colleges. It was agreed that the Committee would attempt to develop a formula based on the programs of the State Colleges and then apply this formula to those programs of the University that were similar in scope.

2. Kentucky State College

It was recognized that the relatively smaller enrollment at Kentucky State College would create problems in the Foundation formula approach since certain costs of operation are fixed and unrelated to the size of the institution. Therefore, it was decided that the formula should be built around the programs of the four State Colleges similar in size and special considerations afforded Kentucky State in application of the formula so as to provide adequate support of its programs.

Operationally, the intention was to compare the undergraduate programs of the University with all other institutions, then add those necessary

183Loc. cit.
budget items reflecting the increased costs of graduate and professional programs. The implication is unavoidable that the University planned to participate in the foundation program. In the case of Kentucky State, the formula was to be applied, after which the college could present justification for other costs not reflected in data generated strictly on an enrollment basis. In practice, the University has never participated in application of the formula but has preferred to continue presenting its budget on a justified basis.\textsuperscript{184} It is the only institution which follows a plan involving action by its governing board wherein the Trustees approve the budget and release it to the public at a press conference.\textsuperscript{185} Budgets of the State Colleges are not acted upon by the various Boards of Regents and are not public information until the appearance of the Governor's Executive Budget. Kentucky State College has presented, and has been granted, additional funds other than formula-based computations.

\textsuperscript{184} Interview with Executive Vice-President A. D. Albright, April 7, 1967.

\textsuperscript{185} This procedure is explained in detail by former President Donovan in \textit{Keeping the University Free}, etc.
Turning its attention to a study of formula approaches in current use in other states, the Advisory Committee discovered the following common principles:¹⁸⁶

1. Student enrollments were universally used as the base for developing an assessment of need for instructional costs.

2. Related and general institutional costs were related to the pupil base either directly or indirectly with few exceptions.

3. Formula approaches ranged from extremely simple to very sophisticated techniques of calculation.

4. Certain aspects of the cost development are usually treated on a historic and/or justified cost basis.

The Committee concluded, on the basis of the principles stated above, that a formula could be developed which would meet the requirements of adequacy and equity without being unduly complicated.¹⁸⁷ Further, the Committee suggested that the help of outside consultants experienced in work with higher education in other states might be of value. The Council gave its approval to this plan to secure assistance through consultants. Accordingly, a proposal requesting a grant to defray the expenses of consultative services was addressed to the Ford Foundation, which granted approval for contracting with the firm of Peat, Marwick,

---

¹⁸⁶Report of the Advisory Committee, p. 3.

¹⁸⁷Loc. cit.
and Mitchell of New York.\textsuperscript{188} The following excerpt presents a portion of the Report of the Advisory Committee, assisted by consultants:\textsuperscript{189}

SECTION VI

Foundation Program Formula

The Advisory Committee on Financial Studies recommends the adoption of the following method of calculating budget requests under the Foundation Program for Public Higher Education in Kentucky.

I. Total Instructional Costs

A. Instructional Salaries

1. Using the predicted enrollment for the specific year of the request, as approved by the Executive Committee of the Council on Public Higher Education, calculate faculty needs using faculty-student ratios as follows:

- Freshman-Sophomore years \( \frac{20}{1} \)
- Junior-Senior years \( \frac{16}{1} \)
- Graduate program \( \frac{12}{1} \)

2. Distribute the faculty needed as determined in A-1 above into the four academic ranks by placing 25 per cent of the faculty need in each rank.

3. Calculate the cost of Instructional Salaries by multiplying the number of faculty needed in each rank by the national average salary for that rank for colleges as

\textsuperscript{188}Report, p. 4.

\textsuperscript{189}Ibid., pp. 27-29.
shown in Table 5B of the Higher Education Salaries, 1961-62, published by the Office of Education, U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; adjusted to the mean salary for University of Kentucky undergraduate faculty, and projected to the specific year of the request by adding a 5-per cent per year increase. For the years of the next biennium, these average salaries are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>1964-65 Average Salary</th>
<th>1965-66 Average Salary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>$11,824</td>
<td>$12,415</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>10,244</td>
<td>10,758</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
<td>8,782</td>
<td>9,221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructor</td>
<td>6,961</td>
<td>7,309</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Total the salary costs for each rank to obtain the total costs for Instructional Salaries.

B. Other Costs Related to Instruction

1. To provide for Other Costs Related to Instruction, calculate an amount that will equal 25 per cent of the Total Cost of Instruction when the cost of Instructional Salaries (A-4) equals 75 per cent of the Total Cost of Instruction. This will provide funds for clerical and technical assistance, supplies and materials, replacement of equipment, other costs of instructional departments, and the cost of programs related to instruction.

C. Add the Cost of Instructional Salaries and the Other Costs Related to Instruction to determine the Total Cost of Instruction.

II. Calculation of Total General and Educational Costs

Step 1 Divide the amount determined for Total Cost of Instruction above by 63.5 to obtain the base unit.
Step 2  Multiply the base unit by the factor shown to obtain the amounts to be included for other general and educational costs or supply data in accordance with specific directions:

Total Cost of Instruction
(from I-C) $ __________

Library (base unit x 5.5) ___________

General Expense, including student services, staff benefits, and General Institutional Expense (base unit x 13.0) __________

Maintenance and Operation (base unit x 13.0) __________

Administration (base unit x 5.0) __________

Laboratory School (justified costs) __________

Research (justified costs) __________

Public Service (justified costs) __________

Total General and Educational Costs $ __________

III. Provisions for Kentucky State College

Kentucky State College shall calculate its request using the formula set forth above and then recommend adjustments to the formula for approval by the Executive Committee and Council.

IV. Provisions for the University of Kentucky

The University of Kentucky shall calculate its request using the formula for the Colleges of Arts and Sciences, Education and Commerce (Doctoral Programs excepted) and make the following additions:

1. An amount for doctoral and professional colleges program faculty based on a student-faculty ratio of 5-1, a distribution of faculty need according to present faculty proportions,
and using mean salary levels determined by adjusting the formula salary levels as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Professor</th>
<th>25 per cent increase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>20 per cent increase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
<td>17 per cent increase</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other costs for doctoral and professional programs will be included on a justified basis.

2. Budget requests for the various Community Colleges shall be made in addition to the above and based on historic and justified costs.

The additive amounts so determined by the University of Kentucky shall be recommended by the Executive Committee for the approval of the Council.

The Executive Committee named in the text of the Report refers, of course, to the presidents of the institutions. This budget formula is based entirely upon student enrollment projections, mean salary levels and a 5 per cent annual improvement factor. There are two very obvious "fudge factors" built into this process. One of these concerns the use of part-time and special students in building up enrollment totals; and the other is simply a manipulation of 20-1 student-faculty ratios. Nevertheless, this simple formula met with the approval of all six state institutions. The University approved of it for the other schools, but declined to participate.

Item 5 in the original 1934 legislation which created the Council on Public Higher Education specified that a biennial report should be
prepared concerning the educational and financial affairs of the institutions. The initial example of such compliance with legislative intent appeared July 15, 1963, submitted by Chairman Harry M. Sparks and Executive Secretary Ellis F. Hartford. The entire report ran to a length of twenty-four typed pages, but was condensed for inclusion into the Minutes; it is presented as Appendix B in the latter form. The report appeared in a format which identified the nine functions or charges provided by statute and discussed the work of the Council under those headings. Under function I, Coordination, the report reviewed the actions of the various committees established by the Council. Under function II, the Determination of Curricular Offerings, the report mentioned that a committee had begun to prepare a tentative plan for joint programs of graduate study. Under the heading Determination of Entrance Fees, Function III, the report expressed a viewpoint that student fees had risen to a level which should not be exceeded. No action was reported concerning function IV, the Determination of Admissions Requirements. A brief review of the development of the Foundation Program and plans for its use were presented under the headings of functions V and VI, the Consideration of Budgetary Requirements and the Recommendation of Joint Budgets. Under function VII, Required Reports from the Institutions, the report confessed that no comprehensive system of reporting had been established except for enrollments.
Since function VIII specifies the Publication of a Biennial Report, and since this was the initial report of the activities of the Council which had been filed during its twenty-nine years of existence, no previous action to fulfill this function was in evidence. Under the heading of function IX, Participation in the Southern Regional Education Board, the report offered a review of the status of the four existing programs.

It is particularly noteworthy that the proposed inter-institutional programs of joint graduate study mentioned in Sections I-C-2 and II of the report have never been implemented. No graduate student has been enrolled in such a program as late as March 24, 1967.190

The complete, uncondensed biennial report of 1963 also included a table demonstrating the increasing share of the higher education burden being borne by the state-supported institutions. Tables 19, 20, and 21 present that data in Total Fall Enrollments. Table 19 shows Kentucky's college-age population for three selected years and the numbers of students from that population enrolled in all institutions in the state, whether public or private as well as the percentage represented. Table 20 presents data showing the number of high school graduates for each of ten years, the number from that group who are college-bound, the percentage of college-bound students, the total fall enrollments in

190 Interviews with officials of all public colleges and universities during early 1967.
six state schools, and the percentage of native-born students who attend those six institutions. Table 21 presents data gathered in 1966 which will reflect upon the 1963 projections of enrollments and shows those to be conservative. The picture at a glance in 1963 showed:¹⁹¹

**TABLE 19**

**COLLEGE-AGE POPULATION, BY NUMBER OF STUDENTS ENROLLED IN ALL INSTITUTIONS, BY PERCENTAGES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1950</th>
<th>1961</th>
<th>1965*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky's College-Age Population</td>
<td>187,000</td>
<td>182,193</td>
<td>217,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number Enrolled in College</td>
<td>28,798</td>
<td>50,285</td>
<td>72,912</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage Enrolled in College</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
<td>27.6%</td>
<td>33.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Projected

TABLE 20

KENTUCKY HIGH SCHOOL GRADUATES FOR SELECTED YEARS, NUMBER OF THOSE GRADUATES ATTENDING COLLEGE, PERCENTAGE ATTENDING TOTAL FALL ENROLLMENTS IN SIX STATE INSTITUTIONS, PERCENTAGE OF ALL KENTUCKY COLLEGE STUDENTS ATTENDING STATE INSTITUTIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Number State High School Graduates</th>
<th>Number Attending College</th>
<th>Percentage Attending College</th>
<th>Total Fall Enrollment in Six State Institutions</th>
<th>Percentage of all Kentucky College Students Attending Six State-Supported Institutions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1956</td>
<td>22,565</td>
<td>7,071</td>
<td>31.3</td>
<td>16,513</td>
<td>46.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1957</td>
<td>23,278</td>
<td>7,510</td>
<td>32.3</td>
<td>17,728</td>
<td>47.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1958</td>
<td>25,262</td>
<td>8,789</td>
<td>34.8</td>
<td>18,854</td>
<td>47.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1959</td>
<td>26,679</td>
<td>9,337</td>
<td>35.0</td>
<td>19,856</td>
<td>48.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960</td>
<td>29,278</td>
<td>10,759</td>
<td>36.8</td>
<td>22,039</td>
<td>49.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1961</td>
<td>30,612</td>
<td>11,238</td>
<td>36.7</td>
<td>25,877</td>
<td>52.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1962</td>
<td>27,742</td>
<td>10,274</td>
<td>37.0</td>
<td>27,149</td>
<td>52.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1963</td>
<td>28,315</td>
<td>10,759</td>
<td>38.0</td>
<td>29,660</td>
<td>54.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1964*</td>
<td>35,473</td>
<td>13,820</td>
<td>39.0</td>
<td>34,552</td>
<td>56.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1965*</td>
<td>38,900</td>
<td>15,910</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>39,509</td>
<td>58.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Projected

TABLE 21

ACTUAL FALL ENROLLMENTS IN STATE-SUPPORTED INSTITUTIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1964</td>
<td>35,585</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1965</td>
<td>43,598</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1966</td>
<td>49,474</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[192\text{Kentucky College and University Enrollments 1966 (Frankfort: The Council, December, 1966), p. 23.}\]
Projections have been made which show that the state schools may receive as much as 65.6 per cent of the Total Fall Enrollment in the year 1970, based upon public institution figures of 62,625 of a total enrollment of 95,475 for all higher education in the state.193

The Council meeting of October 24, 1963, saw another report filed by the Executive Secretary noting progress in terms of the legally constituted functions. Extracted from the Minutes, that report appears as Appendix C. Under the heading of Coordination, the report noted various committee actions including the preparation of a request to the Governor that the Council be designated the state agency to prepare a state plan if the pending federal legislation offering aid to higher education were passed. No developments were reported in the areas of curriculum, fees, or admissions. It is interesting to note at this time that the only tuition-free institutions of higher education in Kentucky are not the state universities, colleges, community colleges or vocational schools; but are two private ones, Alice Lloyd and Berea. There the commitments are to the underdeveloped and impoverished mountain regions motivated by humanitarian concerns.194 On the subject of budgets, the report noted that progress was being made toward


194Higher Education in Kentucky 1965-1975, p. 15.
the formulation of budget requests for the next biennium. Under the heading of Required Reports from the Institutions, this 1963 Interim Report of the Executive Secretary pointed out that there were difficulties connected with securing information from some of the institutions. Comments on the SREB program were limited to a statement that places for an additional number of trainees were being requested.

Such a large degree of inactivity on the part of the Council as is exhibited by this report points out its lack of attention to the fulfillment of its specified legal functions.

A general feeling of amicability existing on the Council during this period is best characterized by the following statement by President Kelly Thompson, of Western Kentucky State College:195

I have been associated with higher education in Kentucky for thirty-five years, and the coordination and cooperation presently existing among the six state institutions is better than I have ever seen it during that time.

Actions of the state government affecting higher education

Prior to 1953, as has been stated, no particular formalized system was in existence for budget submission by the higher education establishment in Kentucky. In that year, the state budget division interested

itself to a larger degree in the budgeting of the institutions. The budget analysis for higher education and other members of the division staff worked cooperatively with the college presidents toward the development of a set of guidelines. During the decade 1953-1963, this procedure was modified and improved upon each biennium. The state budget division is a branch of the office of the Commissioner of Finance, which is an extremely powerful agency in Kentucky's state government. The budget division office acts as a branch of the Governor's office for planning and budgeting purposes. It has sometimes appeared that this agency performs decision-making functions and policy determinations rather than its preferred tasks as a service bureau. Since Kentucky is conceded to be a strong governor-weak legislature type of political structure, the executive budget as it is prepared by the budget division becomes the last word in financial planning. It is highly unusual for any question to be raised concerning budgeted items or amounts, and it is a mark of considerable lack of confidence in the governor if the legislature does not ratify the executive budget as presented. "Budget-breaking" is Frankfort terminology for questions about allocations by

---

196 Budget and Finance information paraphrased from interviews with Dr. James L. Miller, Jr., Dr. John Barrows, Dean J. C. Powell, Dr. Donald Clapp, Vice-President Dero Downing, Business Manager P. W. Ordway, Mr. Billy F. Hunt, Mr. Russell McClure, Mr. Harry Largen.

197 Interview with Finance Commissioner Felix Joyner and Budget Division Director, Roger Buchanan.
the General Assembly. This situation is greatly abhorred by the executive branch in all its agencies. Another implication is exposed by this description of the budgetary process; legislative committees do not hold hearings during the formulation of the budget. Many issues simply never become matters of public debate and discussion, and chances for legislative pork-barrel projects are removed. All power must flow from the governor, thus to be settled in private rather than public negotiations.

The budget division continued to assist the institutions of higher education with preparation and review of requests, with appropriate further refinements and improvements. This procedure was accompanied by larger increases in state appropriations from the general fund as demonstrated by Table 22, though the point has been made several times that rising affluence and a more permissive attitude toward education coincided with this growth cycle.

An analysis of the data contained in Table 22 provides the following points of comparison which are presented in Table 23. Clearly, the University of Kentucky has not been supported at even the average rate of growth in state appropriations during the period covered by this data. Certainly, if this institution was to have been the graduate center for the state system it has not been supported in a fashion befitting expensive programs of graduate study. Eastern shows a support rate
### TABLE 22

GENERAL FUND APPROPRIATIONS FOR PUBLIC HIGHER EDUCATION BY BIENNIALS, 
IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>U.K.</th>
<th>Eastern</th>
<th>Ky. State</th>
<th>Morehead</th>
<th>Murray</th>
<th>Western</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1951-52</td>
<td>3,612</td>
<td>446</td>
<td>347</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>446</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>5,711</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1952-53</td>
<td>4,241</td>
<td>526</td>
<td>434</td>
<td>432</td>
<td>555</td>
<td>585</td>
<td>6,773</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1953-54</td>
<td>4,203</td>
<td>520</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>427</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>579</td>
<td>6,679</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1954-55</td>
<td>4,783</td>
<td>625</td>
<td>440</td>
<td>472</td>
<td>616</td>
<td>669</td>
<td>7,605</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1955-56</td>
<td>4,781</td>
<td>625</td>
<td>440</td>
<td>472</td>
<td>616</td>
<td>669</td>
<td>7,603</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1956-57</td>
<td>6,608</td>
<td>831</td>
<td>501</td>
<td>689</td>
<td>812</td>
<td>850</td>
<td>10,291</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1957-58</td>
<td>6,757</td>
<td>927</td>
<td>527</td>
<td>671</td>
<td>904</td>
<td>945</td>
<td>10,731</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1958-59</td>
<td>8,007</td>
<td>1,131</td>
<td>583</td>
<td>879</td>
<td>1,046</td>
<td>1,089</td>
<td>12,735</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1959-60</td>
<td>8,957</td>
<td>1,255</td>
<td>629</td>
<td>983</td>
<td>1,156</td>
<td>1,183</td>
<td>14,163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960-61</td>
<td>11,745</td>
<td>1,648</td>
<td>697</td>
<td>1,245</td>
<td>1,559</td>
<td>1,648</td>
<td>18,542</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1961-62</td>
<td>14,685</td>
<td>2,048</td>
<td>829</td>
<td>1,532</td>
<td>1,899</td>
<td>2,065</td>
<td>23,058</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1962-63</td>
<td>19,112</td>
<td>2,434</td>
<td>850</td>
<td>1,956</td>
<td>2,235</td>
<td>2,562</td>
<td>29,149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1963-64</td>
<td>20,356</td>
<td>2,689</td>
<td>869</td>
<td>2,138</td>
<td>2,471</td>
<td>2,855</td>
<td>31,378</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1964-65</td>
<td>26,660</td>
<td>4,028</td>
<td>1,049</td>
<td>2,624</td>
<td>3,127</td>
<td>4,271</td>
<td>41,759</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1965-66</td>
<td>30,552</td>
<td>4,660</td>
<td>1,350</td>
<td>3,046</td>
<td>3,654</td>
<td>5,010</td>
<td>48,272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1966-67</td>
<td>38,552</td>
<td>6,534</td>
<td>1,600</td>
<td>3,951</td>
<td>4,777</td>
<td>6,425</td>
<td>61,839</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1967-68</td>
<td>45,552</td>
<td>7,640</td>
<td>1,900</td>
<td>4,625</td>
<td>5,648</td>
<td>7,542</td>
<td>72,907</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Executive Budgets, Commonwealth of Kentucky
TABLE 23

GENERAL FUND APPROPRIATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1951-52 to 1956-57</th>
<th>1956-57 to 1966-67</th>
<th>1951-52 to 1967-68</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University of Kentucky</td>
<td>$3,612,000 to $6,608,000 up 183%</td>
<td>$6,608,000 to $38,552,000 up 583%</td>
<td>$3,612,000 to $45,552,000 up 1261%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Kentucky</td>
<td>446,000</td>
<td>831,000</td>
<td>7,640,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Kentucky</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>850,000</td>
<td>7,542,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morehead State</td>
<td>360,000</td>
<td>689,000</td>
<td>4,625,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murray State</td>
<td>446,000</td>
<td>812,000</td>
<td>5,646,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky State</td>
<td>347,000</td>
<td>501,000</td>
<td>1,900,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>$5,711,000</td>
<td>$10,291,000</td>
<td>$5,711,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$10,291,000</td>
<td>$61,839,000</td>
<td>$10,291,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$5,711,000</td>
<td>$72,907,000</td>
<td>$5,711,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

consistently higher than the average, while Western is also above the mean, though to a smaller degree. Morehead and Murray seem to approximate the average, while Kentucky State maintains its position as the "exception."
Increased levels of support for Eastern and Western have been at the expense of the University and Kentucky State, while again, Morehead and Murray seem to progress at an even rate through the years covered by these data. It is essential to point out that there was never a method for determining these requests on any other basis than simple ratification by the Council of institutional budgets. No attempt has been made to allocate by percentage to individual institutions.

Table 25 shows state tax appropriations in fifty states during the period 1961-1967, including the two-year gain during 1965-1967, and the six-year gain over the period covered. By this measure, Kentucky demonstrated a 221 per cent increase which is the leading

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University of Kentucky</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Kentucky</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Kentucky</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morehead State</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murray State</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky State</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 25

APPROPRIATIONS OF STATE TAX FUNDS (IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS) FOR OPERATING EXPENSES OF HIGHER EDUCATION IN 4 ALTERNATE FISCAL YEARS (1961-1967), WITH CHANGE OVER MOST RECENT 2 YEARS AND TOTAL CHANGE OVER PERIOD OF 6 YEARS IN DOLLAR GAINS AND PERCENTAGE GAINS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>States</th>
<th>Fiscal years ending with odd numbers</th>
<th>1965-67</th>
<th>1961-67</th>
<th>2-year gain</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>6-year gain</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>(6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td></td>
<td>$22,397</td>
<td>$22,659</td>
<td>$30,421</td>
<td>$41,409</td>
<td>$10,988</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alaska</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,323</td>
<td>3,301</td>
<td>5,300</td>
<td>7,314</td>
<td>2,014</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td></td>
<td>16,218</td>
<td>21,007</td>
<td>29,742</td>
<td>40,492</td>
<td>10,750</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td></td>
<td>13,551</td>
<td>16,599</td>
<td>20,369</td>
<td>28,722</td>
<td>8,353</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td></td>
<td>221,592</td>
<td>277,708</td>
<td>351,982</td>
<td>489,102</td>
<td>137,120</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td></td>
<td>24,332</td>
<td>31,255</td>
<td>35,837</td>
<td>51,916</td>
<td>16,079</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td></td>
<td>13,080</td>
<td>15,948</td>
<td>19,706</td>
<td>34,104</td>
<td>14,398</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaware</td>
<td></td>
<td>3,734</td>
<td>5,094</td>
<td>6,889</td>
<td>8,740</td>
<td>1,851</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td></td>
<td>41,412</td>
<td>53,452</td>
<td>75,695</td>
<td>95,477</td>
<td>19,782</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td></td>
<td>26,605</td>
<td>32,162</td>
<td>41,770</td>
<td>59,193</td>
<td>17,423</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaii</td>
<td></td>
<td>5,825</td>
<td>8,515</td>
<td>12,580</td>
<td>23,868</td>
<td>11,288</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td></td>
<td>8,800</td>
<td>10,127</td>
<td>11,203</td>
<td>15,490</td>
<td>4,287</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td></td>
<td>90,290</td>
<td>116,293</td>
<td>148,170</td>
<td>204,403</td>
<td>56,233</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td></td>
<td>50,163</td>
<td>62,709</td>
<td>80,134</td>
<td>104,312</td>
<td>24,178</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td></td>
<td>34,861</td>
<td>39,705</td>
<td>48,328</td>
<td>61,285</td>
<td>12,957</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td></td>
<td>27,938</td>
<td>35,038</td>
<td>44,103</td>
<td>54,781</td>
<td>10,678</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td></td>
<td>19,672</td>
<td>29,573</td>
<td>42,782</td>
<td>63,166</td>
<td>20,384</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td></td>
<td>44,557</td>
<td>46,760</td>
<td>65,031</td>
<td>87,139</td>
<td>22,108</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maine</td>
<td></td>
<td>5,599</td>
<td>7,429</td>
<td>9,709</td>
<td>13,457</td>
<td>3,748</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td></td>
<td>25,166</td>
<td>30,678</td>
<td>39,177</td>
<td>61,567</td>
<td>22,390</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### TABLE 25 (Contd.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>13,361</td>
<td>16,503</td>
<td>28,415</td>
<td>40,000*</td>
<td>11,585*</td>
<td>40*</td>
<td>26,639*</td>
<td>199*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>101,836</td>
<td>109,759</td>
<td>138,063</td>
<td>196,425</td>
<td>58,362</td>
<td>42*</td>
<td>94,589</td>
<td>93*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>38,920</td>
<td>45,117</td>
<td>55,059</td>
<td>72,463</td>
<td>17,404</td>
<td>31*</td>
<td>33,543</td>
<td>88*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td>18,347</td>
<td>19,863</td>
<td>25,931</td>
<td>36,720</td>
<td>10,789</td>
<td>41*</td>
<td>18,373</td>
<td>100*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>25,641</td>
<td>33,603</td>
<td>46,847</td>
<td>74,817</td>
<td>27,970</td>
<td>59*</td>
<td>49,176</td>
<td>192*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montana</td>
<td>11,231</td>
<td>10,661</td>
<td>13,367</td>
<td>16,784</td>
<td>3,417</td>
<td>25*</td>
<td>5,553</td>
<td>49*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td>15,218</td>
<td>17,078</td>
<td>18,820</td>
<td>21,894</td>
<td>3,074</td>
<td>16*</td>
<td>6,676</td>
<td>44*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td>4,107</td>
<td>5,325</td>
<td>6,518</td>
<td>7,695</td>
<td>1,177</td>
<td>18*</td>
<td>3,588</td>
<td>87*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Hampshire</td>
<td>4,106</td>
<td>4,733</td>
<td>5,104</td>
<td>6,435</td>
<td>1,331</td>
<td>26*</td>
<td>2,329</td>
<td>57*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>24,457</td>
<td>34,179</td>
<td>45,816</td>
<td>75,652</td>
<td>29,836</td>
<td>65*</td>
<td>51,195</td>
<td>209*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>11,239</td>
<td>14,372</td>
<td>18,636</td>
<td>26,088</td>
<td>7,452</td>
<td>40*</td>
<td>14,849</td>
<td>132*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>94,116</td>
<td>163,656</td>
<td>228,614</td>
<td>353,793</td>
<td>125,179</td>
<td>54*</td>
<td>259,677</td>
<td>276*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>30,574</td>
<td>36,815</td>
<td>51,431</td>
<td>79,462</td>
<td>28,031</td>
<td>54*</td>
<td>48,888</td>
<td>160*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Dakota</td>
<td>9,368</td>
<td>10,505</td>
<td>12,109</td>
<td>13,989</td>
<td>1,880</td>
<td>15*</td>
<td>4,621</td>
<td>49*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>45,326</td>
<td>55,620</td>
<td>67,670</td>
<td>93,269</td>
<td>25,599</td>
<td>38*</td>
<td>47,943</td>
<td>106*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
<td>27,020</td>
<td>30,020</td>
<td>35,505</td>
<td>41,867</td>
<td>8,362</td>
<td>25*</td>
<td>14,847</td>
<td>55*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>28,719</td>
<td>34,263</td>
<td>39,998</td>
<td>54,811</td>
<td>14,813</td>
<td>37*</td>
<td>26,092</td>
<td>91*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>43,472</td>
<td>56,187</td>
<td>68,819</td>
<td>110,000*</td>
<td>41,181*</td>
<td>60*</td>
<td>66,528*</td>
<td>153*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhode Island</td>
<td>5,271</td>
<td>7,697</td>
<td>10,283</td>
<td>15,387</td>
<td>5,104</td>
<td>50*</td>
<td>10,116</td>
<td>192*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td>13,141</td>
<td>15,440</td>
<td>19,286</td>
<td>27,464</td>
<td>8,178</td>
<td>42*</td>
<td>14,323</td>
<td>109*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Dakota</td>
<td>8,128</td>
<td>8,702</td>
<td>12,338</td>
<td>14,251</td>
<td>1,913</td>
<td>15*</td>
<td>6,123</td>
<td>75*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>17,023</td>
<td>22,359</td>
<td>31,892</td>
<td>47,939</td>
<td>16,047</td>
<td>50*</td>
<td>30,916</td>
<td>181*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>72,133</td>
<td>90,282</td>
<td>114,156</td>
<td>165,707</td>
<td>51,551</td>
<td>45*</td>
<td>93,574</td>
<td>130*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah</td>
<td>13,139</td>
<td>15,580</td>
<td>19,154</td>
<td>24,891</td>
<td>5,737</td>
<td>30*</td>
<td>11,752</td>
<td>89*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vermont</td>
<td>3,399</td>
<td>3,750</td>
<td>5,445</td>
<td>6,885</td>
<td>1,440</td>
<td>26*</td>
<td>3,486</td>
<td>102*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>29,861</td>
<td>34,625</td>
<td>42,421</td>
<td>64,134</td>
<td>21,713</td>
<td>51*</td>
<td>34,273</td>
<td>115*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>47,441</td>
<td>58,387</td>
<td>71,973</td>
<td>94,980</td>
<td>23,007</td>
<td>32*</td>
<td>47,539</td>
<td>100*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Virginia</td>
<td>16,919</td>
<td>20,743</td>
<td>23,761</td>
<td>32,294</td>
<td>8,533</td>
<td>36*</td>
<td>15,375</td>
<td>91*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>37,417</td>
<td>44,670</td>
<td>60,410</td>
<td>95,160</td>
<td>34,750</td>
<td>57*</td>
<td>57,743</td>
<td>154*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyoming</td>
<td>4,935</td>
<td>5,916</td>
<td>6,707</td>
<td>8,773</td>
<td>2,066</td>
<td>31*</td>
<td>3,838</td>
<td>78*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td>1,513,980</td>
<td>1,892,432</td>
<td>2,441,476</td>
<td>3,465,966</td>
<td>1,024,490</td>
<td>421,951</td>
<td>1,986,129</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Estimated. Report not available when this tabulation was completed Sept. 1, 1966.

Source: M. M. Chambers, "Grapevine," a higher education newsletter, published at Indiana University.
figure for all states. As might be expected, California and New York demonstrated the largest dollar gains. Kentucky's strong showing produced the following rankings:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kentucky was</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>from the top in</th>
<th>Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26th</td>
<td>1960-61</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>27th</td>
<td>1962-63</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20th</td>
<td>1964-65</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19th</td>
<td>1966-67</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15th</td>
<td>in two-year dollar gains</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16th</td>
<td>six-year dollar gains</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Such a determined effort to improve the support of higher education should be credited to the following influences, and possibly to others, also:

1. Passage of a 3 per cent sales and use tax in 1960 provided $102 million in the first year; at the same time $12 million was cut from income taxes for a net gain in revenues to the state of $90 million. To show how significantly this altered the financial condition of the state treasury, it is only necessary to point out that the total of state tax income for that year was $212 million. The new sales tax furnished revenues in amounts nearly double the previous level. Cash thus became more readily available for higher education and other state services.

In 1966, state tax revenue income was $342 million, of which $166 million was produced by the sales tax.  

\[198\text{Ibid., 1966-67.}\]

\[199\text{Kentucky Executive Budget, 1962-63.}\]
2. A strong posture of support for higher education by the past two governors, who have been in office during the life of the sales tax, Bert Combs and Edward Breathitt.

3. The formula, which presented a more rational basis for allocations than existed previously.

4. General legislative support for the institutions which found themselves caught in the enrollment squeeze.

Table 26, prepared by Billy F. Hunt, Associate Director of the Council, compares expenditures for higher education in selected states for the years 1964-65. The major effort exerted by Kentucky to improve its support is demonstrated by the fact that:

- Kentucky ranks 15th in population (in this group)
- 15th in per capita income
- 12th in legislative appropriations
- 7th in expenditure per person
- 4th in per cent of per capita income spent for higher education.

During the same 1962 session in which it modified the Council to include public members, the legislature passed over acts pertaining to higher education. One of the more significant of these was House Bill 234, which provided:

Section 1. As used in this Act, unless the context requires otherwise, "Board" means the Trustees of the University of Kentucky.
TABLE 26

Higher Education Expenditure Data for Kentucky, Contiguous States and Other Selected States for 1964-1965

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Legislative Appropriation (1964)</th>
<th>Legislative Population (1964)</th>
<th>Expenditure Per Person</th>
<th>Per Capita Income (1964)</th>
<th>Per Cent of Per Capita Income Spent for Higher Education</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>$30,421,000</td>
<td>3,426,000</td>
<td>$8.88</td>
<td>$1,781</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>351,982,000</td>
<td>18,077,000</td>
<td>19.47</td>
<td>3,112</td>
<td>0.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>75,695,000</td>
<td>5,651,000</td>
<td>13.39</td>
<td>2,294</td>
<td>0.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>41,770,000</td>
<td>4,295,000</td>
<td>9.73</td>
<td>2,003</td>
<td>0.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>148,170,000</td>
<td>10,545,000</td>
<td>14.05</td>
<td>3,042</td>
<td>0.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>80,134,000</td>
<td>4,843,000</td>
<td>16.55</td>
<td>2,588</td>
<td>0.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td>44,103,000</td>
<td>2,227,000</td>
<td>19.80</td>
<td>2,513</td>
<td>0.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>42,782,000</td>
<td>3,160,000</td>
<td>13.54</td>
<td>1,893</td>
<td>0.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>138,063,000</td>
<td>8,154,000</td>
<td>16.93</td>
<td>2,764</td>
<td>0.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td>25,931,000</td>
<td>2,298,000</td>
<td>11.28</td>
<td>1,493</td>
<td>0.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>46,847,000</td>
<td>4,473,000</td>
<td>10.47</td>
<td>2,446</td>
<td>0.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>228,614,000</td>
<td>17,872,000</td>
<td>12.79</td>
<td>3,108</td>
<td>0.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>67,670,000</td>
<td>10,151,000</td>
<td>6.67</td>
<td>2,641</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>68,819,000</td>
<td>11,492,000</td>
<td>5.99</td>
<td>2,571</td>
<td>0.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Car.</td>
<td>19,286,000</td>
<td>2,523,000</td>
<td>7.64</td>
<td>1,690</td>
<td>0.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>31,892,000</td>
<td>3,800,000</td>
<td>8.39</td>
<td>1,876</td>
<td>0.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>114,156,000</td>
<td>10,391,000</td>
<td>10.99</td>
<td>2,222</td>
<td>0.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah</td>
<td>19,154,000</td>
<td>973,000</td>
<td>19.69</td>
<td>2,273</td>
<td>0.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>42,421,000</td>
<td>4,367,000</td>
<td>9.71</td>
<td>2,270</td>
<td>0.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W. Virginia</td>
<td>23,761,000</td>
<td>1,824,000</td>
<td>13.03</td>
<td>1,885</td>
<td>0.69</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Section 2. The University of Kentucky Community College System is established. Each Community College shall provide a two-year college curriculum.

Section 3. A Community College shall be maintained in Ashland, Covington, Henderson, Cumberland, and Elizabethtown, and the Board shall convert any University facilities existing in these communities to the uses of the Community College program.
Section 4. There shall be established and maintained a Community College, provided however, that no community college in existence as of the effective date of this Act shall have its pre-existing name changed except upon recommendation of its local advisory board, in each of the following locations: Prestonsburg, Blackey-Hazard, Hopkinsville, Somerset, each to be established as funds are made available.

Section 5. (1) The board has the same powers with respect to the Community Colleges that it has as to the University of Kentucky in general. The board shall designate each Community College with a name that includes the words "Community College." (2) The board shall encourage and may accept donations of land or funds or both to be used in the acquisition, construction, or operation of Community Colleges. The board may commemorate donations from private persons or corporations with suitable memorials. (3) The board may accept Federal Grants to be used in the acquisition, construction, or operation of Community Colleges.

Section 6. (1) The Governor shall appoint a local Advisory Board for each Community College. Each local Advisory Board shall serve in an advisory capacity to the board and the head of the Community College on the operation of the Community College. (2) Each local advisory board shall consist of seven members. A member's term is four years; however, when appointing the initial members of the local advisory boards, the Governor may appoint some members for terms less than four years. Local advisory board members shall receive no compensation for their services, but shall be paid for their actual and necessary expenses.

Such a pattern of university-operated community colleges is believed to be unique among state-wide systems of public higher education among the various states.
Passage of the Higher Education Facilities Act by Congress in 1963 necessitated the gubernatorial appointment of a State Commission. In accordance with the guidelines of this Act, Governor Edward T. Breathitt appointed a group representing all sectors; public higher education, private higher education, municipal institutions, and the general lay public. At first, the Council had requested that it be designated as the state agency to implement this Act with added representatives for private institutions. This proposal was not acceptable to the primate institutions and the idea of a separate Commission took shape. The state institutions represented 54.4 per cent of the total college enrollments, the private colleges 31.1 per cent and the municipal institutions 14.5 per cent. As a result, it was decided that the Commission should include five representatives of the public institutions, three representatives from the private institutions, one from the municipal institutions, and six representing the general public. This would form a commission consisting of fifteen members who should be appointed for staggered terms of one, two, and three years. No money would be forthcoming for the administration of this Act, so it appeared that staff work would fall upon the staff of the Council. A more detailed account of these actions and deliberations attendant upon the formation of the Commission appears as Appendix D.
Using the staff of the Council, with Mr. Gilbert as Secretary, this group developed a State Plan for administering funds available under Title I of the Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963 (Public Law 88-204). When the next Congress passed the Higher Education Act of 1965 (Public Law 89-329), this same Commission was designated the official body to perfect a State Plan for administering Title IV-A. Again, the Council offices in Frankfort became the site of meetings, and the Council staff and Mr. Gilbert performed necessary services since the Commission on Higher Education was not provided with funds for this purpose.200

A Change of Structure
1965-1966

The Commission on Higher Education received a further charge from the Governor to inaugurate an in-depth study of the needs in higher education of the Commonwealth of Kentucky during the coming decade. Accordingly, the Commission engaged the services of a consulting team composed of M. M. Chambers, Raymond Gibson, and Truman Pierce. These consultants were introduced to the Council in July, 1965, and embarked upon a lengthy study.201 Thus began the prelude to the series

200 Interview with Mr. Ted C. Gilbert, February 22, 1967.

201 Minutes of the Council, July 12, 1965.
of reports, recommendations, actions, maneuvers, and legislation which led to the changed constituency of the Council on Public Higher Education after thirty-two years of existence as a coordinating body. Those conditions and causes which precipitated the charge to the Commission on Higher Education, the employment by that group of a Survey Team, the resultant pair of reports culminating in executive recommendation and legislative action have variously been ascribed to several sources. It must be understood that such responsibility does not appear in any documentary form which may be substantiated—therefore, the following list of reasons has been compiled from many interviews.

1. Legislative concern over accountability and coordination of the vast and increasing sums of state funds being requested and appropriated. The prime issue in all state systems of higher education is always money.  

2. A long-lived, lingering feeling that Kentucky should have a "State Board of Higher Education." This position has been represented by the Louisville Courier-Journal, the most influential mass media source in the state.

---

202 Interviews with House Majority Leader John Young Brown, President Thomas Spragens, Centre College.

203 Interview with Mr. Lisle Baker, Council member, Vice President, The Louisville Courier-Journal.
3. Active participation by the University of Kentucky in the agitation to consider a lay board as a means of protection against encroachments by the other institutions. 204

4. A desire by the executive branch and the financial offices to be rid of back-room, "private-treaty" type budget requests. 205

5. The most important reason for the change in form of the Council is very simply that the Governor wanted it changed, so that some effective planning might be accomplished for higher education. 206

The Survey Team (Chambers, Gibson, Pierce) prepared a monumental document *Higher Education in Kentucky 1965-1975*, which was a report to the Kentucky Commission on Higher Education. Disagreement among the three-man Survey Team resulted, as is clearly shown by the list of Principal Recommendations which appears as Appendix E. 207

Upon receiving the report from the Survey Team, the Commission presented its report to the Governor. That report with recommendations

---

204 Interview with Executive Vice-President A. D. Albright, The University of Kentucky.

205 Interviews with Finance Commissioner Felix Joyner, Development Director (former Budget Director) Robert Cornett.

206 Interviews with Governor Edward T. Breathitt, former Governors Lawrence Weatherby, and Bert Combs.

appears as Appendix F, and was forwarded under the letter of transmittal which initiates Appendix F.

For purposes of clarity, while comparing these two sets of recommendations, let the numerical divisions of the Report of the Survey Team be called "items," while equivalent divisions of the Recommendations of the Commission shall be called "points." The Commission endorsed Survey Team Section I Items 1 (regional college graduate programs), 2 (regional colleges to be renamed as universities), 3 (University of Kentucky graduate programs), 4 (research and service programs of the regional universities), 5 (master's degree programs at Kentucky State College), 6 (University of Louisville should become a state university); but did not deal with Item 7 (a new four-year Northern Kentucky State College) at all, other than to state the general concept (Commission Recommendation 6-d) that the Council on Public Higher Education should recommend locations of new colleges after a study of needs. The 1967 Council is well aware that there is considerable need in the northern Kentucky and an increasing degree of pressure for the establishment of some sort of institution. Testimony at the April 3, 1967 meeting of the Council, which was attended by this writer, evidenced both the degree of awareness and the intention of the Council to make a decision soon.
Item 8, specifying educational facilities within commuting distance was likewise deleted from the Recommendations, as was Item 11 dealing with specific suggestions about community colleges relative to the Louisville-Jefferson County area. This question is currently under study by a committee of the Council. Item 12 refers to Paducah Junior College, the only existing example in the state of a community college which receives local support. Negotiations are currently underway on the question of bringing this sturdy pioneer into the state system of public higher education.

Items 9 (University of Kentucky Community Colleges) and 10 (regional university community colleges) were included in the Commission report under the general heading of meeting increasing needs in undergraduate education. Survey Team Items 13 (coordination of community colleges and vocational-technical schools) and 14 (functions of community colleges) became Points 7 and 8 in the Recommendations of the Commission.

From Survey Team Report Section II, the Commission endorsed Items 15 (general obligation bonds replacing revenue bonds for academic buildings) and 16 (continuation of revenue bonds for non-academic buildings) almost in their entirety. Item 17, dealing as it does with specific appropriations was deleted, and Item 18 (free or low tuition) was changed in the Commission's Recommendations (Point 12) to reflect a different philosophy of tuition charges.
In Section III, Organization and State Level Structure, Item 19 (distinguished professor corps) was omitted from the Commission report, but Item 20 (the autonomy of governing boards) was adopted directly as Point 14. The Commission's Point 13 was taken from Chambers' minority report Item 25 (Boards of Regents of nine laymen, appointed for nine years), and in reality referred to the existing practice wherein the State Superintendent of Public Instruction is the Chairman, though he is an ex-officio member of the State College Boards of Regents; and for the Governor to be Chairman, though an ex-officio member of the University Board of Trustees. Item 21, the question of constitutional status, was deleted from the Commission's Recommendations.

The crucial, or "hard," decision concerning the composition and duties of the Council on Public Higher Education appears in pages 8 and 9 of the Recommendations of the Commission. Point 15 describes the make-up of the Council in a fashion that agrees more closely with Gibson and Pierce rather than Chambers, though with a major difference—that presidents shall be non-voting members of the Council. There is no mention in any portion of the Report of the Survey Team of this concept.

In Section D, Duties of the Council, the Commission departed rather radically from the Report of the Survey Team. A list of nine functions was specified, related somewhat to the earlier legislation
(KRS 164.020) but with increased powers. It is noticeable that these powers and duties do not include the phrase "to coordinate the state institutions of higher education" which formerly appeared in all statutes referring to the Council since its origin in 1934. A sizeable body of opinion and fear exists in the regional institutions that control was intended rather than coordination.

In its 1966 Regular Session, the General Assembly passed legislation which included the essence of the Recommendations of the Commission, though couched in somewhat different phrases. Only two deviations occurred from the list of powers and duties: (1) the requirement of an annual report rather than a biennial report; and (2) that the Council should appoint an Executive Director. The following sections from the Kentucky Revised Statutes are relevant to this study, to the Report of the Survey Team, and to the Recommendations of the Commission:

164.010 (4527-1; 4527-2; 4527-3) COUNCIL ON PUBLIC HIGHER EDUCATION: MEMBERSHIP, TERMS.
There shall be a Council on Public Higher Education in Kentucky, to be composed of nine lay members appointed by the Governor and of the president or chief executive officer of each four-year state institution of higher education in the state. The nine lay members shall constitute the voting membership of the council. They shall be appointed for regular terms of four years, with the initial appointment of two members for one year, three members for two years, two members for three years and the remaining two members for four years. Any person holding either an elective or appointive state office or
who is a member of the governing board of any state or private college or university in Kentucky shall be ineligible for membership or appointment on the council during his membership or term of office. When the council meets to consider curricula for teacher education, three persons who are from accredited institutions of higher learning, and who have been appointed by the Executive Committee of the Kentucky Association of Colleges, Secondary and Elementary Schools, shall be invited to meet with the council in an advisory capacity.

164.020 (4527-1; 4527-3) POWERS AND DUTIES OF COUNCIL. The Council on Public Higher Education in Kentucky shall:

1. Engage in analyses and research to determine the overall needs of higher education in the Commonwealth.

2. Develop and transmit to the Governor comprehensive plans for public higher education which meet the needs of the Commonwealth. The plans so developed shall conform to the respective functions and duties of the state colleges and universities, the community colleges, and the University of Kentucky as provided by statute.

3. Determine the amount of entrance and/or registration fees and approve the qualifications for admission to the public institutions of higher education. In determining the entrance and/or registration fees, for non-Kentucky residents, the council shall consider the fees required of Kentucky students by institutions in adjoining states, the resident fees charged by other states, the total actual per student cost of training in the institutions for which the fees are being determined, and the ratios of Kentucky students to non-Kentucky students comprising the enrollments of the respective institutions.

4. Consider the requirements and review the budget requests of the institutions of public higher education as to their appropriate level of support considering the functions of the institutions and the anticipated available resources for higher education. The individual institution's budget requests, including tuition and/or registration fee schedules for all categories of students, along with council recommendations, shall be submitted to the Governor through the
Department of Finance not later than November 15 of each odd numbered year.

5. Require such reports from the executive officer of each of such institutions as it deems necessary for the effectual performance of its duties.

6. Publish annually a report of the educational and financial affairs of the institutions and disseminate other information relating to higher education.

7. Approve all new professional schools and review and make recommendations to the Governor regarding proposed new community colleges and four-year colleges.

8. Approve curricula for teacher education.

9. Elect a chairman annually from the voting membership. The council shall appoint an executive director and such staff as may be necessary; and their salaries shall be determined in the same manner as other state employees.

10. Shall constitute the representative agency of the Commonwealth in all matters of higher education of a general and state-wide nature which are not otherwise delegated to one or more institutions of higher learning. Such responsibility may be exercised through appropriate contractual relationships with individuals or agencies located within or without the Commonwealth. The authority includes but is not limited to contractual arrangements for programs of research, specialized training, and cultural enrichment.

164.125 UNIVERSITY PROGRAMS, REQUIREMENTS.

1. The University of Kentucky shall provide:
   a. Baccalaureate programs of instruction;
   b. Graduate programs of instruction at the masters, doctoral, and post-doctoral levels, including joint programs beyond the masters level in cooperation with other institutions of higher education in the state;
   c. Professional doctoral instruction including law, medicine, education, engineering, and dentistry.

2. The University of Kentucky shall continue to be the principal state institution for the conduct of state-wide research and service programs.
3. The University of Kentucky is authorized to provide programs of a Community College nature in its own community comparable to those listed for the Community College System, as provided by this chapter.

164.290 (4527-37) STATE UNIVERSITIES RECOGNIZED; NAMES; KENTUCKY STATE COLLEGE.

1. The state colleges now designated as Eastern Kentucky State College, Morehead State College, Murray State College, and Western Kentucky State College may be known and recognized as Eastern Kentucky University, Morehead State University, Murray State University, and Western Kentucky University upon approval by a majority of their respective Boards of Regents, and the filing of certified evidence of such approval by any of such Boards with the Secretary of State and the Legislative Research Commission.

2. Kentucky State College located at Frankfort, Kentucky, is a land-grant state college and, as such, all the provisions of KRS Chapter 164, with the exception of the provisions of KRS 164.320 concerning the appointments of the initial Board of Regents, applying to the other four state colleges shall likewise apply to Kentucky State College.

164.295 PROGRAMS OF STATE UNIVERSITIES. The four state colleges which may be recognized as state universities pursuant to KRS 164.290, and Kentucky State College shall provide.

1. Baccalaureate programs of instruction;

2. Graduate programs of instruction at the masters degree level in education, business, and the arts and sciences and programs beyond the masters degree level to meet the requirements for teachers, school leaders, and other certified personnel.

3. Research and service programs directly related to the needs of their primary geographical areas.

4. And, may provide programs of a Community College nature in their own community comparable to those listed for the University of Kentucky Community College System, as provided by this chapter.
UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY COMMUNITY COLLEGE SYSTEM: CURRICULA. The University of Kentucky Community College System is established. Each Community College shall provide:

1. A general two-year academic curriculum with credits transferable to two-year and four-year colleges and universities;

2. Technical and semi-professional programs of two years or less; and

3. Within a two-year college curriculum, courses in general education, including adult education, not necessarily intended for transfer nor technically oriented.

The newly constituted Council on Public Higher Education met in the Governor's Conference Room in the Capitol Building in Frankfort on August 2, 1966. The meeting was called to order by Governor Edward T. Breathitt, who made a brief statement emphasizing the tremendous responsibility facing council members for the coordination of public higher education in Kentucky. He indicated he believed his appointments of lay members to the council were among the most important appointments he would make during his administration and that one of the major accomplishments of his administration had been in the field of higher education. The Governor expressed his appreciation to members who had also served on the Commission on Higher Education and assured his strong support to the state-supported institutions of higher education.208

208Minutes of the Council, August 2, 1966.
Mr. William Abell, who was elected temporary chairman, asked for the complete support of the presidents of the various institutions. He was assured that such cooperation would be forthcoming during a discussion which also clarified the rights of the presidents toward full participation in the meetings with the exception of voting. Since the new legislation had changed the title of the position from Executive Secretary to Executive Director, it was necessary to take action to re-appoint Mr. Ted C. Gilbert in order to comply.

During its few months of existence, the Council has moved slowly while its members become oriented to their duties. Many standing and special committees have been appointed by Chairman Abell in accordance with the current Rules and Procedures adopted on September 20, 1966. Of special significance is the Committee on Budget Format. The main objective of this committee should be to develop guidelines for a standard format to present to the Council in time that it might be used by the six state-supported institutions for budget requests before the November 15, 1967 deadline. The Committee (Chairman Edward F. Pritchard, Jr., President Oswald, and President Martin),

---


210 Loc. cit.
has urged that the format contain various classifications and definitions specified prior to the beginning of the process of budget preparation. The committee suggested that it should be the responsibility of the Council staff to prepare this format in cooperation with the Department of Finance and the appropriate officers of the six institutions.  

This concludes the official record of the Council at this point in time and in its history and development. Many projects are underway during this period of marking time which will sooner or later be brought to resolution and it shall be the direction of these resolutions which shall direct the writing of the next chapters in the history of the Council.
CHAPTER IV

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

This study was made to investigate the interface where politics and higher education meet. It has assumed, in Usdan's words, that "politics and education are inseparable. . education is a political enterprise because it must compete with other governmental functions for limited resources." When it is enlarged to encompass a broader arena than the operation of government, politics may be considered the theory of managing affairs of public policy or the practice thereof. Easton writes:

"If the consequences of an act are more or less directly related to the way in which binding or authoritative decisions are made and executed for a society, we normally call them "political" acts. The central characteristics of political actions are first, that they are decisions which are accepted as authoritative (also described as legitimate or binding); and second, that they are so accepted by most members of society most of the time."

---


Higher education is inescapably involved in the political process of decision-making since the actions of these institutions may have considerable impact upon the kinds of decisions that are made for a society, to exclude the consequences of their behavior from a political system would be to take a restricted and superficial view of politics. It is for this reason we must include within the system, not only the behavior of institutions that are clearly political, but also those aspects of the actions of institutions that have political consequences, though the orientation of these institutions may lie in a different direction. 214

The nature of decision-making in higher education involves a collective effort to reach policy conclusions of educational relevance which will have political consequences. This matrix

... can be seen to be a circular and never-ending process. ... factors within the environment as related to yesterday's decisions and to the problems at hand, merge into spheres of related factors of varying relevance, size, and strength. In the hands of powerful individuals these factors are selected and used as issues to help mould public and official opinion. The resulting debate helps to create a consensus at the varying levels of the educational, political, and social strata of society. Ultimately, a series of positions taken by key individuals lead frequently to compromise and eventually to new policies and legislation. In this decision-making process the educational and political domains, of necessity, remain inseparable. Future policy problems will produce new "actors" and the juxtaposition of numerous other factors with their own

214 Loc. cit.
degrees of relevance. Thus the general process of decision-making will probably continue unchanged but appear unique in its specific application to a problem. 215

The Political Interface

Kentuckians are adept politicians. The state seems to be the developer of statesmen who learn and exercise the art of compromise in its best sense. 217 Politics and higher education have been deeply involved with each other, but a public crisis involving open hostility between those two worlds has not yet occurred in Kentucky. Inevitably, should such a public feud erupt, higher education would be bruised, and the colleges and universities would carry their scars for a long time. Kentucky is fortunate that such hostilities have never taken place to injure her public system of higher education.

There must be a state-level agency for principal decision-making in higher education. The question, in Kentucky, as in other states, is: should this be coordination or control? If it is to be the latter, then the process involves command, clothed with authority to issue mandates. If it is to be the former, then the process involves


216 Interview with Dr. John Leslie, Manager of Economic Development, Spindletop Research (Lexington, Kentucky: March 21, 1967).
an agency of liaison, of cooperation, of intercommunication, of public information, with the duty of deliberating and making recommendations to the Governor, the Legislature, the institutional governing boards and the public. This pattern looks to the maintenance of an ongoing coordination through the exercise of an advisory role.\textsuperscript{217} In either case, the coordinating agency must perform the necessary efforts to reach policy conclusions which will be both authoritative and accepted by the worlds of higher education, politics, and the general public.

\textbf{What the Council Was}

Ultimate decisions about the shape and support of the statewide system of public higher education are formulations about political policy. These powers reside in the hands of the Governor and the General Assembly of the Commonwealth of Kentucky. The Council on Public Higher Education was created by statute to function as a statewide agency for making recommendations in exercising its advisory role. In this capacity, it functioned well in coordinating many aspects of higher education. It was able to achieve collectively what no one person or institution was able to do. All of this occurred providing that no one disagreed. When that took place, the Council was helpless. The public

\textsuperscript{217}Higher Education in Kentucky 1965-1975, p. 317.
was never permitted to view the washing of higher education's dirty linen, because the men involved did not allow it. Any success the Council has had must be credited to characteristics of behavioral theory, rather than to structural theory. For all practical purposes, the Council always was a Council of Presidents who dominated the lay members because (1) technical problems forced the lay members to step back while the professionals talked; and (2) the presidents of the institutions in Kentucky have been uniformly able men in the recent past.

The presidents of the four regional institutions are political powers in themselves. The appointments of each of the four presidents had political overtones, and they are the executive officers of politically placed institutions. Not one campus in Kentucky, including the Community Colleges, was originally located in response to a determination of need, but it is possible that higher education could not have been brought into those areas by any other means. Let it be very clearly stated that these men are not political hacks. They are strong, capable administrators who have developed the institutions with great energy, sincerity, and devotion. In fact, it is quite possible that these political presidents have succeeded where a typical academic man might have surrendered during the lean times. Each of the four has functioned in the leadership role for his institution in a fashion that has many admirable qualities. The presidents of the regional universities are influential in
the legislature, have large local influence and power almost to the point
of making fiefdoms of the institutions. They were powerful enough
politically to force a compromise which traded the lay-board council
for university status over the opposition of former Governor Weatherby
and others who wanted the University of Kentucky to remain the only
University in the state. However, their colleges were open to the
charge of being insular and academically shallow.

The executive officers of the two atypical institutions came into
office through the traditional patterns of selection by the governing
boards. There appear to be no political moves involved in the appoint­
ments of President Oswald of the University of Kentucky and President
Hill of Kentucky State College. Both men came to their respective in­
stitutions when those enterprises were at low ebb and have presided over
spectacular cycles of growth. Both men came into office during an eight
year period of liberal attitudes toward higher education exhibited by
Governors Combs and Breathitt.

Why the Council Was Reorganized

The Council on Public Higher Education was changed from a board
dominated by college presidents to a board of laymen, because the
Governor desired that it be changed. With a strong Governor state such
as Kentucky, the Governor is much more exposed and more subject to
pressures through a raw system of bargaining. Such pressures and bargaining are beneath the dignity of higher education, and the public is entitled to more professionalism. The new form of the Council is to be a buffer between state government and higher education, not because the Council was politically unresponsive, but because it was too political itself. The Council is intended to provide a means for settling collisions before they reach the Governor's office and represents an achievement of maturity at this point in the development of both state government and higher education. A solution was found before the impasse was reached.

Other factors which influenced the change include the undeniable split between the four regional colleges and the University, while Kentucky State was successful in maintaining enough neutrality to prevent being crushed by the giants. A lay Council protects the University from being outvoted by the other institutions, and it is the hope of state government that the lay Council will protect the regional institutions from unhealthy competition with one another.

What the Council Did

It is one thing for a strong president to function as a strong individual in behalf of a single institution. It is quite another thing for the same strong presidents to function collectively as a coordinating board
for higher education. The old Council spent most of its time considering teacher education, which was one appropriate function but only one of many it should have considered. Uniform admission standards would have been a fit subject for Council action. It seems that, at times, the only criterion for admission was available living space. The Council never did achieve coordination on budget requests, just agreement. The formula brought in larger appropriations than had been granted previously but provided only equity based on enrollment rather than program. Being based upon enrollment projections, the formula assumed all institutions would grow at the same rate. The projections were very accurate in total number but did nothing to show at which institution the students would appear. Presenting as it did only figures and numbers without narrative, the formula probably cost the institutions money they could have gotten through justification. An unknown program is always easier to cut than one with which the public is familiar. Strong suspicion existed in the Finance and Budget offices that the formula used student-faculty ratios which were computed at 20-1 while reality was closer to 24-1 or 26-1. Distribution of faculty was considered to be placed in ranks of 25 per cent each when a more accurate, realistic figure might have been 40 per cent Professor-Associate Professor and 60 per cent Assistant Professor-Instructor. Frustrations resulting from these manipulations may have caused the Finance
Commissioner, the second most politically powerful man in the state, to recommend lower support figures to the Governor than more careful documentation would have produced. The new form of the Council must try to see whether it can secure funds for higher education which the old organization could not get. Program budgeting, as it has been practiced by the university during the last two biennia, is one means for achieving this purpose. The situation strongly implies and even demands that the Council continue to receive support from Kentucky's Governors, particularly the next one, who will be elected in the fall of 1967.

What the Council is Now

Governor Breathitt was very careful with his appointments to the lay board. Knowing that higher education in Kentucky had not been a burning public issue, he did not wish to see it become one. In fact, recent Governors of Kentucky have been circumspect with appointments to Boards of Regents and trustees. The inevitable disputation which has occurred in the past was kept behind closed doors by the political expertise of the presidents and the frustration level did not rise high enough to break out into the open. To combat this danger the Governor scrupulously avoided "vest-pocket" appointments of people directly aligned with any institution. As it happens, three of the nine Council
members have private school backgrounds, but this was not a factor.

Three are alumni of the University of Kentucky, two received their degrees from out-of-state schools, and one member has no college degree. There are no members from the other five institutions. Simply stated, there is not a large pool of competent, well-educated leadership talent available in Kentucky. A large exodus occurred after World War II of men who would now be in the 40-50 year age bracket with experience in leadership and public service. Most successful, middle-aged people in business, industry, and the professions are not graduates of the regional schools because those institutions were Teachers Colleges at that time. Since appointing the Council members, the Governor has not interfered in any fashion, and it is doubtful if several of the present members of the board would tolerate any such interference or political dabbling. The present tenor of the board is definitely toward a policy of coordination rather than control, although the Council has sweeping powers it may choose to exercise. For that matter, so did the previous form of the Council which chose to refrain from following its statutory mandates. While it proceeds slowly, trying to secure agreement, the present Council seems to be holding to a non-threatening posture. Its future lies in establishing respectability and confidence; in allaying the very real fear that exists among the regional institutions that a "California system" will be imposed upon them through domination of
the Council by the University of Kentucky. Unless, of course, the Council does choose to impose a California system of interlocking community colleges, state colleges, and a pinnacle university.

**Trends and Issues**

**The University of Louisville**

There is a very live issue in the state due to the uncertain status of the University of Louisville. The Report of the Survey Team suggested that this uniquely municipal-private-state institution should become part of the state system. There seems to be no basic disagreement with this general concept. But there is widespread disagreement concerning the method of relationship that would be proper. The question is: how does the University of Louisville join the state system? If it becomes the University of Kentucky at Louisville, then a California system is on the way which would confirm the worst fears of the regional presidents. This problem will be one of the two first issues and decisions confronting the Council. The other concerns the method of preparation for budget requests which must be submitted by November 15, 1967. An indication of the direction in which the Council might move will be given by these two policy decisions.
The professional staff of the Council

There are several other crucial issues both internal and external which the Council must face and solve if it is to fulfill the high promise intended for it at its inception. One of the most important of these is the internal question dealing with the executive leadership and the staff of the Council. Once the direction of the philosophy of the Council has been decided, will the demands placed upon the staff be different ones? The Council must formulate its policy in order to clarify the roll of the director's position. In the past, the board did not consider itself strong and did not want or need a strong executive of the chancellor-type, since coordination and not control was desirable. Coordination, not control, is still desirable, but will the position still be conceived as a "secretariat?" The traditional duties of the Executive Director have involved following policies established by the Council; executing, not initiating. The institutions and the Council were one and the same, presenting an apparent unified force and a common public front. This posture required an executive with experience in education and skill in administration to perform such housekeeping functions as the Council directed which were within the means and abilities of the available staff. There can be no doubt that the low pay levels have rendered staff recruitment and retention almost impossible even in Kentucky, where such professional positions traditionally rank lower
than in many other states. A lay board will require much more objective research data upon which to base decisions since policy-making will no longer be accomplished by committees of professionals. The lay members cannot hope to have broad knowledge, but may certainly bring different viewpoints to the Council than were formerly presented and it will be the job of the staff to document those viewpoints by assembling data. When the presidents had voting power they could operate as a bloc, but now they must persuade the Council toward a particular point of view, almost in the manner of a jury hearing arguments from counsel. A different level and type of staff work is implied by the presence of the professional presidents than if those men were removed or shut off from the Council. It is difficult enough for a Board of Regents to understand the problems of a single institution. It is practically impossible for a lay board to hear a single presentation and gain any degree of perception concerning the peculiar problems of that institution. If the presidents are not on the Council, a strong chancellor is mandatory. But they are on the Council in this case, so a middle level is indicated. If there is no change in the functions of the director and staff, if the staff continues to depend only upon that research data furnished by the institutions and does not prepare more data itself, then there has been no reorganization. The Council will be less effective than it was before the change in structure. If the Council does only those things which
are agreeable to the institutions nothing has been changed. In that case why have a lay board, or why not let the presidents vote? Decisions which might not be agreeable to the institutions should rightfully be made only upon the basis of unimpeachable objective data if the hopes of the Governor for a Planning Agency are to be fulfilled. An underfinanced, under-staffed secretariat will not be able to supply enough of that unimpeachable, objective data.

**Programs of graduate study**

Another crucial issue which the Council will be forced to face is: how good is each institution? The impetus for such judgments will come from the increased autonomy granted the four new universities to initiate graduate programs. There were opponents to the allowance of these roles and functions who feared the resumption of unhealthy competition. The regional institutions harbor a long-standing resentment that the University of Kentucky was responsible for denying them graduate programs which could have been of service to their geographic areas about the state. Certainly, the University is vulnerable to the charge that its graduate school has not been productive in numbers of graduate degrees in recent years. Table 27 will show the doctoral productivity of the University for the years 1960-1965.
### TABLE 27.

**DOCTORAL PRODUCTIVITY OF THE UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY 1960-1965**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ed.D.</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engr.D.</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There is no discernible pattern in these figures, but it is clear that the output is deficient. In the United States, there is one doctoral degree conferred in proportion to each 13,113 persons in the population. In Kentucky, one doctoral degree was conferred by the University for each 76,924 persons, only 17 per cent of the national average. Kentucky ranks twenty-fourth among the states in population but thirty-second in doctoral productivity. Kentucky also shows the smallest percentage of growth in the rate of doctoral productivity of all the states in the Southern Regional Education Board.\(^{218}\) The University can plead that, in allocating the meagre appropriations it

---

\(^{218}\) Higher Education in Kentucky 1965-1975, pp. 77-82.
received, undergraduate instruction and service programs were allowed higher priorities, and this is probably true. It is also probably true that the graduate school was starved by a lack of graduate students from the regional colleges, by stiff-necked admissions policies, and a lack of graduate assistantships. If there is a shortage of professional skills in Kentucky, and there seems to be no doubt of that fact, there are legitimate functions to be performed by the regional institutions. It is to be hoped that the trend may be reversed which shows an ever-increasing number of Kentucky-born graduate students leaving the state. A study needs to be made to discover what proportion of those persons return to the state after completion of a degree program, but it could be surmised that the percentage would not be great. The Council is charged with the duty of approving new graduate programs. Decision in these matters could be aided by research which will show that farsighted Deans have been embarked for several years on a course dedicated to the building of stronger academic faculties by the device of requiring academic areas in programs for education degrees. Those faculties may now be deployed toward the construction of masters degree programs.
The community college system

Packed with similar emotional content is the issue of the Community College system which will confront the Council eventually. Now attached to the University of Kentucky, those institutions were originally political plums rather than the results of surveyed needs or expressed local desires except in the cases of Covington and Ashland. The political facts of life seem to be that those fledgling institutions would have collapsed if the University had not taken them over at the request of Governor Combs. There is still no evidence of the existence of a willingness to furnish enough local support to enable these institutions to survive without the present combination of state funds and University Administration. The Report of the Survey Team offered several ideas on this general topic. One suggestion was that two-year colleges should be established as rapidly as practicable in order to bring educational opportunity within twenty miles of the homes of as many young people as possible. A question was raised whether the responsibility for two-year colleges should pass to the regional institutions for the creation of a satellite system in those areas of the state. No further action or recommendation has appeared from an official source on this subject. Probably for as long as the colleges remain in a monolithic structure under the University will the threatened feeling of the regional universities be present. Yet, there seems to be neither
agitation for a separate state board for the two-year colleges nor for a plan to surrender them to local control. The Survey Team pointed out that Kentucky had fourteen Area technical-vocational schools which seemed to function well, though without appreciable academic offerings. The community colleges, on the other hand, offered very limited terminal programs of curricula. Thus, many towns in Kentucky had half-a-loaf which is not better than a comprehensive two-year facility. In response to this demonstration of need, the University has moved to inaugurate technological programs into its community colleges. The placement of campuses is one of the definite powers of the Council, and it is to be hoped that some thought will be given to the problem of outmigration of Kentucky undergraduate students from those areas which offer no opportunities for post-high school education. Community colleges in educationally-deprived areas of the state will definitely result in increased college enrollments as the holding power of the high schools continues to grow with an accompanying increase in the number of high school graduates who enter colleges and universities. The research data gathered by the Survey Team showed that the counties in Kentucky which have the highest percentage of high school graduates who continue on to college are those counties in which a facility for higher education is located. Conversely, those thirty counties which have the lowest percentage of college-bound students have no such available facility.\footnote{Higher Education in Kentucky, 1965-1975, pp. 119-123.}
There is a possibility for some innovative practices in cooperative or inter-state arrangements at locations along the Ohio River, where Ohio and Kentucky might be able to exchange students and facilities on an in-state-fee basis. There is no need for the continuation of the feeling that the river is a barrier between the states.

Possible future problems

Two issues remain to be considered. One of these deals with the Council directly, while the other deals with higher education in general without direct application to the Council. Reference to a question dealing directly with the Council pertains to a possible merger of that body with the Commission on Higher Education. The Commission is concerned with higher education in Kentucky on the whole; including private and municipal institutions. It was established to evaluate and prepare plans of recommendation to the U. S. Office of Education for the division of federal grants-in-aid to all the institutions. Merger is being discussed and has been suggested by some members of both groups, which now share the use of the same staff. Under the present arrangement, these members feel the Commission is neglecting its potential for studies in depth as a basis for planning in the total area of higher education in Kentucky. On the other hand, if the Commission is to continue as an independent agency, it is felt that suitable separate staff and quarters should be maintained.
Public higher education in Kentucky may be facing a stiff battle over the allocation of funds for all education with the forces representing the public schools. It is no secret that increasing militancy in the latter camp is in evidence, and this may be the prelude to the first open battle over education fought in public. The general feeling of the public school people is not that higher education was especially favored by the last Executive Budget, just that lower education was not favored enough. In case such a schism occurs, the public schools will win hands down since the Kentucky Education Association represents the single largest bloc of political power in the state. It is to be earnestly hoped that enough increased property-taxation revenues will be forthcoming to forestall any such unfortunate crisis.

**Relationships between higher education and state government**

The new form of the Council was intended to be free to recommend policy in an objective manner based upon objective data furnished by research. A substantial feeling existed in the general populace and state government that persons involved in the operation of institutions of higher education could not be objective enough in decision-making which affected the welfare and future of those institutions, which follows generally the theory of boards. A board of public representatives would be better able to furnish educational leadership which would assume
responsibility for decisions. The crucial distinction is of course, the ability to provide educational leadership while maintaining institutional autonomy. The colleges and universities in Kentucky have traditionally enjoyed great, almost complete autonomy in many matters.

Some of the elements of autonomy which have proven to be sources of conflict in other states include lump-sum or line-item appropriations, pre-auditing, state civil service personnel policies, capital outlay procedures, centralized purchasing, and supervision of publishing facilities.

During the years it has been in operation, Kentucky's foundation formula for the support of higher education has freed the institutions from harassing pre-audits, since the institutions are not bound by the features of the formula. Once the appropriations have been granted to the institutions on a lump-sum basis, with no line-item conditions or clauses, there appears to have been little or no political pressure from the Governor or the legislature concerning the utilization of funds. Such salutary restraint merits considerable praise.

Kentucky has also escaped the tendency toward over centralization apparent in some states concerning personnel policies. All college and university governing boards are free to employ all personnel, academic and non-academic, without reference to the Department of State Personnel. There is no statutory salary schedule for college and
university employees, which permits flexibility, efficiency, and autonomy.

On the question of fiscal autonomy, the picture is not so bright. Only the University of Kentucky is empowered by statute to conserve and invest private contributions or endowment funds. This should be broadened to include the regional universities as well. All college and university operating funds are disbursed by the State Treasurer and remain in his custody. Though this procedure does not appear to cause undue delay or harassment, the various institutions are staffed and equipped for that purpose; this anachronism should be remedied.

A lengthy discussion in an earlier chapter reviewed Kentucky's bonding practices for academic buildings and self-liquidating projects which must be also approved by the Finance Commissioner and the State Property and Buildings Commission. In addition, the institutions are required to cooperate with the Engineering Staff of the Department of Finance on specifics of planning, and with the Department of Revenue on site acquisition. These practices seem out of date and unnecessary. All of the institutions have complete campus master plans prepared and are proceeding to follow them, phase by phase. Curiously, the Council could never see a need for such master planning at a statewide level.

Obsolete requirements concerning the advertising for bids on purchases at unreasonably low dollar limits are an undesirable feature of the centralized purchasing system which keeps the institutions tied
to the purse strings of the State Treasurer. The State Director of Purchases also has jurisdiction over the printing and publishing enterprises of the institutions of higher education, with authorization to edit and reduce publications. It is difficult to find any merit whatsoever in this principle or the method of fiscal centralization. There is no doubt that the fiscal affairs of the institution should be subjected to the scrutiny of annual post-audits by some external fiscal agency, but centralized purchase, deposits, and editing are archaic expressions of authority that produce unnecessary delays and inconveniences in the operation of the colleges and universities. In addition, these are incongruous with the liberal autonomy possessed by the institutions in other, larger matters.

Miscellany

An interesting sidelight to the general subject of higher education in Kentucky is an observation that a steady stream of bright and capable young men have gone forth from the Budget Division in the state government to other posts. Many of these persons have found riches in higher education where they have made significant contributions to the financial operations of the institutions and the Council. The probable reasons for this behavior are two-fold; the Budget Division is in a unique position from which to obtain an overview of all state agencies, and
that the pay scale for budget analysts is so low that they are lured away very quickly.

Involved in the confusion surrounding a new type of Council is a paradoxical situation that was apparently overlooked by the Survey Team and the Commission on Higher Education. Formerly, the Council was a group of professional educators who spent most of their time considering matters of teacher education and certification. Now, teacher education is the province of two lay boards and under no professional scrutiny at other than advisory levels. The present state of relations between the Council and the State Board of Education offers no hint of future patterns which might be developed. Legally, the new Council possesses the same powers over matters of teacher education curricula that the old Council had.

On college and university campuses in some states there is a degree of alienation and unrest which does not seem to be evident in Kentucky. Some observers feel this is due to (1) the lack of graduate research centers where undergraduate students are in more danger of mistreatment, and where faculties have other interests than teaching; and (2) to students from rural areas of Kentucky who are docile (perhaps too much so).
Kentucky's image has been that of a backward, pauper, "dogpatch" state where there was terrific competition for dollars. Yet, 67 per cent of the general fund has been spent on education. The institutions of higher education seem to have been well treated by the state. While they did not receive the appropriations that were wanted or needed, they seemed to get all that was possible. It could very well be that the greatest shortage in the state is not money, but concerns the critical allocation of scarce personnel resources. Probably, Kentucky's economic capability for support of public services, presently and in the future, has been consistently underestimated. In terms of producing state and local income, the Commonwealth could do more than it has been doing and thus afford generous and growing support to public higher education.

By keeping the state property-taxation structure abreast of the times with appropriate modifications reflecting the rapidly changing economic conditions, augmented state revenues will help higher education act as a magnet to draw and develop industrial progress. Several sections of the Report of the Survey Team present documentation suggesting that the citizens of Kentucky have actually been lightly taxed, which refutes a common feeling that the state has very limited resources.

Reduced to its essence, the conclusion of this thesis is that the Kentucky Council on Public Higher Education was changed for the better.
at a time when such change was indicated but before damage had occurred. Much desirable autonomy existed under the old form, and it is possible for autonomy to continue to exist in a healthful manner. A board composed of lay members, with university and college presidents present in advisory capacities represents a workable compromise which has real promise. The old form had simply outlived its usefulness and its ability to perform the necessary functions of coordination in this era when there are so many stresses and pressures upon higher education.
APPENDIX A

STATEMENT OF THE PRESIDENTS OF KENTUCKY'S STATE-ASSISTED INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION TO THE GOVERNOR'S COMMISSION FOR THE STUDY OF PUBLIC HIGHER EDUCATION
September 14, 1961

Gentlemen:

We are appreciative of the opportunity to meet with you today and to respond briefly to your invitation to present our views on the matters of (1) the coordination of public higher education in Kentucky, (2) the correlation of academic and professional training for teachers, and (3) criteria for determining the locations of institutions and the program of institutions of higher learning in the state.

In response to the first matter mentioned above may we say that while we believe that statewide planning is desired and necessary and that sound state planning may indeed result in encouraging the wisest use of the state’s resources, and in maintaining an orderly pattern of operations and relationships, we must also take note of the parallel public concern with the question of enforced coordination of the state university and other institutions. The new interest in this arises from different sources, for different reasons: from some who have an interest in ascertaining that some particular phases of state educational planning become effective in the immediate future; from others who have an interest only in limiting expenditures.
A single board of control for the public institutions within a state is not a panacea. Experience with this mechanism is uneven among the states where it has been tried and at best it cannot deal adequately with the institutions outside its jurisdiction. Further, merely amalgamating boards of control or creating a "super board" does not automatically achieve the result desired among the institutions directly concerned. In the more complex situations, particularly, there should also be carefully designed plans for integrating the administration of programs and the general objectives of the programs. Without such integration, a super-board plan may transfer confusion from one arena to another.

In the end, it is our belief that the effectiveness of state planning rests with the willingness of the individual institutions to participate and with the desire on the part of each to work with others in the attack on larger problems. Such willingness and desire will be expressed only when there is no threat, direct or indirect, to the institution's autonomy or individuality, when there is no possibility of regimentation or political force. "The objective," says the Educational Policies Commission, "should be maximum voluntary cooperation, arrived at by continuing study and supported by whatever framework of agreement is advantageous." All efforts at coordination must in the end depend upon the action of individual institutions--action based
upon voluntary judgment, action designed to preserve the individuality of the institution within the pattern of the whole American democratic enterprise.

With this background in mind, the presidents of the six state-assigned institutions of higher education wish to express complete agreement with the statement already presented to the Commission by the Executive Secretary of the Council on Public Higher Education.

In considering the second matter mentioned in the memorandum of your chairman addressed to the presidents on August 31, 1961, we should like to express the opinion that Kentucky, through the Council on Public Higher Education, has moved further and more surely in the proper correlation of academic and professional education for teachers than practically any state in the nation. The action taken by the Council within the past two years to establish an even stronger general education program for teachers than had been in existence before has been lauded by persons interested in such matters from every state in the union. Liberal arts advocates, as well as professional educators, agree that Kentucky has placed itself in a position of real leadership through its frontier thinking and planning in teacher education. The efforts to strengthen the program of teacher education have resulted in decreasing the number of hours of purely professional education to the point where Kentucky now has a smaller percentage of its total program
devoted to such courses than all but three states. It is the general con-
sensus that Kentucky has achieved as fine a balance between academic
and professional training as had yet been developed.

The final question of the establishment of criteria for determin-
ing the locations and programs of institutions of higher learning in
Kentucky must be answered upon the basis of an even more important
and far-reaching question for the Commonwealth. The real answer to
this question is to be found in "dollars and cents." It is our unanimous
and considered judgment that no new centers or institutions should be
established until the existing institutions of higher education are ade-
quately supported on a basis which will place the support of our insti-
tutions on a comparable level with those of the states with which we
must compete for staff and students. A conservative figure for the
construction of any new facility would be at least $850,000 and the
annual operating budget for a minimal program would amount to approx-
imately $185,000 to $200,000. To establish any new institutions
would require either additional state support in large amounts or a
lessening of support for the existing institutions. At this point, we
feel that neither of these alternatives could be justified, and only if
the state finds greatly increased revenues could consideration be given
to such recommendations.
In closing, may I say, gentlemen, that the achievement of a new level of greatness for the state-assisted institutions of higher learning in Kentucky will not become cheaply or easily. It will require a tremendous expenditure of intelligent effort, as well as money, under circumstances that may be at times extremely frustrating. But we believe that the rewards for fulfillment of our destiny are commensurate with the difficulties we may encounter. Let us, then, advance with courage and constancy to an even greater dedicated search for Truth so that sooner than men predict we shall live in an era when every person shall have the opportunity to rise to his or her full stature.
APPENDIX B

REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE SECRETARY
The functions of the Council on Public Higher Education are nine in number, as provided in KRS 164.020, clauses 1-5, and KRS 164.540. It seems appropriate to discuss the work of the Council under those headings.

I. Coordination

Efforts to effect coordination have been undertaken by the following means:

A. A system of standing committees representing all institutions has been started, to make studies and recommendations concerning major matters for which the Council is responsible. This is designed to provide the Council with adequate information upon which to base policy decisions and action.

B. Increased use of procedures of referral of substantive matters to the appropriate standing committee or to a special committee named for a particular purpose to be studied and reported back to the Council with recommendations. This policy does not obligate the Council to adopt the recommendations but it does provide for full consideration of all points of view and considerations related to a given matter in the expectation that this will be reflected in the policies and decisions of the Council. It is our recommendation that this should become an explicit policy of the Council to be implemented with more standing committees and the provision that all important proposals coming to the Council be first studied by the appropriate committee and then referred to the Council for action.

C. The experience of the past year clearly indicates that much effective practical coordination results from the meetings of the committees established by the Council. Some cases in point are:

1. The first meeting of the Advisory Committee on Financial Studies disclosed
the need for approaching the Division of Purchasing concerning the yearly schedule which had been announced. Consequently, the six institutions supplied memoranda covering the items and schedules that were involved from which a joint report was made to the Division with the result that this matter was re-studied and some changes made.

2. Meetings of the Executive Committee disclosed some problems arising from the different calendars for the academic year, a matter which was referred to the Special Committee on Joint Graduate Study (which was asked to include the registrars), in studying the possibility of a common calendar for the institutions which might be put into effect at some future date—a matter which is still under consideration.

3. In a similar fashion, this Special Committee and the registrars defined "special" and "unclassified" students and recommended the adoption of a quality point system based on four grades which was adopted by the Council at the last meeting.

D. Opportunity for more coordination grows out of committee work and studies for the Council. For example, the many studies and researches done by individual members and subcommittees in the course of the work by the Advisory Committee on Financial Studies led to a current briefer study by a subcommittee of the possibility of a common classification of expenditures and receipts in the six business offices of the institutions of public higher education.

II. Determine curricular offerings of the institutions of public higher education.

A. The principal undertaking of the Council with respect to curricular offerings has been done by a special committee established to study the possibility of developing joint programs of graduate study
through cooperative arrangements among the University and the State Colleges. This committee composed of several deans of the respective institutions has studied several types of joint programs which have been developed among the institutions in half a dozen states. At the moment, a subcommittee has in preparation a tentative plan for a joint program of graduate study for the preparation of school leaders which would involve the cooperation of the University and four of the state colleges. The progress report of this special committee has been published for the Council.

B. Current discussion of the new standards for graduate study of the Southern Association (to which all six institutions of public higher education belong) may provide the occasion for setting up the special committee as a standing committee on "academic programs" to provide the Council an appropriate group to study proposed curricular programs brought to the Council.

C. It is evident from the minutes and records of the Council that there have been relatively few (other than teacher education) curricular programs that have been brought before the Council on Public Higher Education for approval.

III. Determine entrance fees.

A. A relatively recent study of the fees in institutions of public higher education in other states, particularly those neighboring Kentucky, was reported to the Council in 1962. Subsequently, the Council raised student fees. The fees for September, 1963, are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resident Students</th>
<th>Non-Resident Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$75.00</td>
<td>State Colleges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$81.75</td>
<td>University of Kentucky</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
It should be noted that this increase has brought the fees to an all-time high. It represents a point which should not be exceeded in the judgment of the presidents and other members of the Council. It is our observation that the Council would tend to be committed to the "low cost tuition" principle for the benefit of students who attend the State Colleges and the University. A second observation is that the Council would do well to continue to emphasize that expenditures for higher education represent an investment for the state.

B. The average cost to the state for each graduate in the 1962 graduating classes of the six institutions was $2,708. In the same year nation-wide studies show that the average life-time earnings of college graduates (at 1962 prices) would total about $460,000. Comparative figures for high school graduates would total something more than half that figure, or $242,000. It requires little imagination and computation to show that the average college graduate will in a few years pay back to the state in increased taxes far more than its investments of $2,708 in comparison with tax returns of high school and elementary graduates.

IV. Determine admission requirements

There have been no significant developments or proposals concerning this responsibility of the Council by that group during the year. Certain studies and developments in the six institutions have not been included here.

V. Consider budgetary requirements—Study of financial needs

Much of the time and effort of the Council staff and the administrative officers of the six institutions have gone into a major study of the financial needs of the six institutions and of the basis for a Foundation Program for Public Higher Education. During a five month period (November 15, 1962-April 20, 1963) the newly established Advisory Committee on Financial Studies (composed of top business officers and assisted by the six presidents, the Council staff, plus
two consultants from Peat, Marwick and Mitchell, provided through a grant from the Ford Foundation, worked on this project. The end result was the Foundation Program for Public Higher Education in Kentucky which was adopted by the Council on its meeting of April 20, 1963. This new approach to the formulation of joint budget requests was designed to achieve two objectives: Adequacy of support and Equity in distribution of funds appropriated. The formula included in the foundation program, together with its other provisions, will be utilized in computations upon which the budget requests for 1964-66 will be based.

VI. Recommend joint budget to the Department of Finance

It is the present plan of the Executive Committee of the Council to use the foundation program as the basis for computing the costs of the implementing of the foundation program during 1964-66—a step which will be taken after the September, 1963, enrollments are known and further projections made. The results of this committee will form the basis for the joint budget requests which will be presented to the Division of the Budget at the appropriate time. This will represent the first occasion of a joint budget request in more than a decade.

VII. Require reports from the institutions

The Council has established no comprehensive system of reporting by member institutions. An annual report of "Enrollments" is made. Upon various occasions, the Council has assisted in getting reports from the six institutions which are requested by various state departments of all state agencies. An example may be cited in the new policy by the Division of Budget requesting all state agencies to submit a projection of their needs and plans for an eight-year period. This was done in December, 1962, and January, 1963. It may well be that the Council will wish to give some attention to this matter soon.
VIII. Publish a biennial report

It is our understanding that there have been no formal published reports of the Council in the past. For many years the Council had no staff and its work was done by staff members of the State Department of Education. It appears, however, that the situation has changed and that this statutory requirement should be met. It is clear that the Governor expects to receive a report from the Council at the same time that the other state agencies make their report for the current biennium and it is our purpose to provide a report of this nature.

IX. Implement the participation of the Commonwealth of Kentucky in the SREB program

All standing committees for the SREB programs have met during the year and the respective programs have operated at near capacity. The program can best be illustrated by a table of facts and figures:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>In Program 1962-63</th>
<th>Approved for 1963-64</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Blind and Deaf Teacher Education</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forestry</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Health</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veterinary Medicine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st year</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd year</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd year</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th year</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>44</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Various reports indicate that most of the students participating in these programs are making creditable showings. It was reported to the Council on April 20 that more than half of the Kentucky students in the program of Veterinary Medicine had ranked in the upper half of their respective classes. All committees have met and approved applicants for the 1963-64 academic year with the exception of the Committee on Special Education which will meet on July 17, 1963.
APPENDIX C

INTERIM REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE SECRETARY
I. Coordination

Principal activities in this area have been in connection with meetings of the Executive Committee with the Advisory Committee on Financial Studies (engaged in calculations related to budget requests, and development of a projection and uniform chart of accounts); and of the joint Alumni Council in connection with plans for area meetings of alumni and citizen leaders. These developments will be referred to in reports of the committees. Some further work has been done to complete the tentative draft of "Rules and Procedures" for action by the Council.

The need for clearance with the office of the presidents concerning the attendance and participation of faculty and staff personnel from state institutions in meetings arranged by state departments and agencies (in order that the appropriate person(s) may be designated) has been brought to the attention of the Department of Finance following request by the Executive Committee.

Prepared a communication for the Executive Committee to the Governor requesting that the Council on Public Higher Education be designated the state agency to prepare a state plan and coordinate plans and applications if and when the pending Federal aid to higher education legislation passes.

The program for certification of junior high school teachers approved by action of the Council on July 15, 1963, was transmitted to the State Board of Education and approved by that body on September 2, 1963.

Certain activities of this type will be referred to in connection with the function of considering budgetary requirements.

The huge task of coordination involved in the Governor's Conference on Higher Education would require a lengthy catalog to record.
II. **Determine Curricular Offerings**

No requests for approval of curricula or changes in curricular programs have come before the Council since the last meeting. Certain studies looking to the possibility of joint graduate study programs are still in a subcommittee of the Special Committee on Joint Graduate Programs.

III. **Determine Entrance Fees**

There is nothing to report on this topic.

IV. **Determine Admission Requirements**

There have been no new developments on the part of the Council in this field but certain studies are in progress in various institutions which will be reported in due course.

V. **Consider Budget Requirements**

Much of the time and effort of staff and committees alike has gone into continued studies and work related to the preparation of the budget requests for the next biennium. This has involved (a) two conferences with officials of the Department of Finance, Budget Division; (b) meetings of the Advisory Committee on Financial Studies, the Executive Committee, and a joint meeting; (c) memoranda transmitting the requests and instructions from the Department of Finance and agenda for discussion upon same by the Executive Committee; (d) coordinate request of the Budget Division for information upon anticipated needs for the next biennium for the six institutions, five replies to date; (e) making a new projection using September, 1963, enrollment data for use in budget calculations; (f) preparation of a tentative budget request for the work of the Council in 1964-66, a summary of which has been circulated to members in advance of this meeting.
VI. **Recommend Joint Budget**

In view of the time factor and needs of the several institutions for action by their governing boards, it is presumed that it will be necessary to call a special meeting of the Council to approve the 1964-66 budget request shortly before the November 15 deadline. This would mean that Council members should receive data for study in advance of the called meeting.

VII. **Require Reports**

The annual enrollments study is under way. Forms went out in mid-September and most reports have been returned including five member institutions. It is hoped that all data will be in hand shortly in order that the report can be completed and distributed by December. Last year an institution with one of the lowest enrollments held up preparation of the final report for several weeks. Five state institutions have filed rosters of students' names and addresses according to Council policy.

VIII. **Publish a Biennial Report**

The Executive Secretary requests any suggestions and instructions from the Council concerning the nature and content of the report to be made upon the work of this organization during the biennium. As noted before, it is clear that the Governor expects a report from the Council as a state agency as a matter of policy.

IX. **Implement Participation in SREB Programs**

The Advisory Committee on Veterinary Medicine Programs requested the Council to request an increased number of places for trainees in Southern Regional Education Board Programs for the coming biennium. This has been discussed and cleared with the Southern Regional Education Board staff, Auburn University authorities, and the president of the Kentucky Veterinary Medicine Association. A press release on the total SREB program was prepared and used in August.
Passage of the Higher Education Facilities Act by Congress necessitated the gubernatorial appointment of a State Commission.

Council actions and deliberations concerning this development appear in the Minutes of January 13, 1964, as follows:

The Executive Committee met and appointed a sub-committee to work with representatives of the non-public institutions concerning the designation of a State Commission by the Governor for the administration of the Higher Education Facilities Act.

The Executive Secretary reported that he had attended a meeting in Atlanta recently sponsored by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare at which time this legislation was reviewed by the staff of the U. S. Office of Education. He reported on the plans made by other states for the establishment of a State Commission to implement the Act, and emphasized the Commission must be representative of all segments of higher education in the state and of the general public.

The Chairman of the Executive Committee, Dr. Ralph Woods, asked Dr. Robert Martin to report on the status of the proposal to establish a state commission in Kentucky to implement the provisions of the Higher Education Facilities Act.

Dr. Martin reviewed the action of the Council at its last meeting when it was decided to reiterate the request to the governor that the Council, with added representatives for private institutions, be designated as the state agency to implement this act. A meeting was arranged to which all higher education institutions in Kentucky were invited or to be represented in Lexington on December 20. At this time the proposal was presented that the Council be designated as the state agency with the Council membership augmented by three additional non-public higher education representatives. Dr. Martin said that it soon became evident at the meeting that this type of approach was not acceptable to the representatives.
of the private institutions. There was considerable discussion, and the participants in the meeting explored the idea of a separate commission, apart from the Council, and organized on a proportional basis. The state institutions represented 54.4 per cent of the population in the colleges, the private colleges 31.1 per cent and the municipal 14.5 per cent. As a result, it was decided the Commission should have five representatives of the public institutions, three representatives of the private institutions, one from the municipal institutions, and six representing the general public. This would be a commission consisting of fifteen members who should be appointed for staggered terms of one, two, and three years. The entire group unanimously agreed to this organization of the state commission.

A sub-committee composed of Presidents Oswald, Hill, Davidson, Mills, and Martin was appointed to present this plan to the Governor. They found that the Governor had had many communications concerning this matter and that he was deeply appreciative of the efforts of all the colleges to work out a solution to what he had thought would be quite a problem for him.

It was agreed that the six state institutions would decide on their five representatives, the private institutions will decide on their three representatives and the municipal institutions will decide on their one representative. A list of fifteen names, taken from all the colleges in the state, will be furnished the Governor from which he, if he so desires, may choose the six lay citizens to be appointed on the commission. Dr. Martin stated the list of fifteen lay citizens was made on basis of nominations on a proportional basis by the sub-committee, taking into consideration the list of names submitted by the various colleges. He pointed out, however, that the list submitted to the Governor would be simply one list of names in alphabetical order, with no divisions.

Dr. Oswald said he would like to commend Dr. Martin's work as chairman of the sub-committee. He said that the meeting ended in complete unanimity with what he thought was a very good solution.
Dr. Hartford asked that one matter be kept in mind in further plans for the state commission, namely, that the Council should request funds for additional staff and operations if the staff work of the new commission should fall on the Council staff. He said there would be no money forthcoming for the administration of the Act until the Congress votes an appropriation to put it into operation in which case Federal funds will be available to reimburse the state for the staff and operational costs of the state commission.

Drs. Martin and Thompson felt it would be a little premature to ask the Governor for funds at this time. Dr. Martin said the Commission must be established first, and then they must decide whether or not they will want their own staff or if they will want the Council to do their staff work. Both seemed to think the Governor will make money available for interim financing.

Dr. Sparks expressed the feeling that the Council would be ready to offer their cooperation to the new state commission.
APPENDIX E

PRINCIPAL RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE SURVEY TEAM
I. THE TYPES OF INSTITUTIONS AND THEIR DEVELOPMENT

1. The four regional state colleges, already multipurpose institutions, should expand graduate studies at the masters' level on arts and sciences, business administration, and education as rapidly as qualified faculties and resources become available. These programs should be initiated under the authority of the respective Boards of Regents and the appropriate accrediting associations.

2. The four regional state colleges should be renamed regional universities: Eastern Kentucky University, Western Kentucky University, Murray State University, and Morehead State University.

3. The University of Kentucky, as a principal University in the Commonwealth, should expand and strengthen its graduate programs. Special attention should be given to the preparation of college teachers in cooperation with other state universities.

4. The regional state universities should develop appropriate research and service programs for their geographic areas as rapidly as resources permit.

5. Kentucky State College should be authorized to develop graduate programs at the masters' level, in keeping with its expanding and changing mission.

6. The state legislature should invite the University of Louisville to become a state university.
7. Northern Kentucky State College, a new four-year state institution, should be initiated in Covington, to absorb and include the present Northern Community College. The new four-year college should have its own Board of Regents and constitute an additional major state institution of higher education in Kentucky, to serve the quarter of a million population in the compact and populous northern enclave of the state, the second largest urban concentration in the Commonwealth.

8. Two-year educational facilities beyond high school should be established within commuting distance, wherever practicable, of every Kentucky high school graduate.

9. Consistent with previous legislation, the University of Kentucky should continue the development of a statewide system of community colleges.

10. Each of the regional state universities, Northern Kentucky State College, the University of Kentucky, and Kentucky State College should expand and retain the comprehensive community college programs on their own campuses.

11. The University of Louisville should develop two community colleges in the metropolitan area; one in downtown Louisville and one near the geographic center of the county, the latter on a campus of 300 to 500 acres to be developed as the undergraduate college of the University of Louisville, releasing the present University of Louisville campus for graduate and professional programs.
12. The Paducah Junior College is to be continued as a locally supported, locally controlled, state-aided two-year college, with state aid increased progressively toward one-half of the annual operation expenses, without decreasing the rate of local tax support.

13. The community colleges and area vocational-technical schools, when located in the same communities, should be encouraged to coordinate their programs in all ways possible, with the aim of progressing toward comprehensive facilities for education two years beyond high school in each community.

14. The community colleges should each serve the following functions:

a. two-year college parallel or arts and sciences curricula, with credits transferrable to four-year colleges and universities.

b. occupational, technical, and sub-professional programs of two years or less, for students who expect to enter gainful employment immediately upon completion.

c. courses in general education not necessarily intended for transfer nor occupationally oriented, and

d. special opportunities of the foregoing types wherever practicable, for adults in the community.

II. A TEN-YEAR PROGRAM OF FINANCING PUBLIC HIGHER EDUCATION

15. The legislature should propose and submit to the electors a measure authorizing the issuance of up to $50 million in general obligation bonds of the Commonwealth of Kentucky, in each of the ensuing five
fiscal bienniums, for capital improvements at the state institutions of higher education. Only as and when such a measure is adopted by the legislature and the electorate, the custom of financing academic buildings by pledging and using students' fees for the retirement of so-called "revenue bonds" should be gradually discontinued, and declared contrary to public policy. Such revenue bonds require a rate of interest substantially higher than general obligation bonds of the state; and the use of student fees for debt service on academic buildings is not good in principle.

16. The custom of financing non-academic buildings (residence halls and student service buildings) largely by issuing revenue bonds payable only out of income from such buildings (charges for room, board, and related services purchased by students) should be continued; and their respective governing boards of the several institutions should be authorized by law to issue such bonds when deemed necessary, without obtaining the consent of any state agency.

Such bonds do not create a debt against the state. Their issuance is a question of educational policy intimately related to the timely and proper expansion of the institutions. No consent is required for the universities in Michigan and Minnesota; and in 1965 the Iowa Legislature removed such a requirement for the financing of residence halls.
17. A ten-year plan of state tax support for annual operating expenses of public higher education in Kentucky contemplates necessary increases of state appropriations to reach a statewide total of approximately $130 million for the fiscal year 1971, and $190 million for the fiscal year 1976.

18. Although the Commonwealth of Kentucky should recognize the historic principle of tuition-free public higher education, for the foreseeable future moderate fees should be continued while the trend toward increasing fees is halted. This applies only to public institutions, and only to students who are residents of Kentucky.

III. ORGANIZATION AND STATE LEVEL STRUCTURE FOR HIGHER EDUCATION

19. A small corps of nationally and internationally distinguished professors should be recruited on limited contracts at salaries necessarily substantially higher than those of ordinary senior professors, and made available on a flexible basis to the public institutions of higher education at the invitation of the presidents and governing boards of each institution.

20. Each governing board, acting through the institution's president, shall be autonomous in administering the budget, programs, services, and in the employment of personnel.
21. When a Constitutional Convention is convened in Kentucky, each institutional governing board, and the Kentucky Council on Public Higher Education should be given constitutional status; and the policy of investing each institutional governing board with exclusive control of all funds of the institutions should be declared in the institution.

Regarding the composition and duties of the Kentucky Council on Public Higher Education, following are the recommendations of Raymond C. Gibson and Truman M. Pierce, not concurred in by M. M. Chambers.

22. The Council should perform the following functions:

a. Engage in research to determine the needs for higher education and resources to meet those needs.

b. Conduct studies to determine needed facilities, operating budgets and other needs.

c. Coordinate budget requests for higher education and submit a budget to the Governor. In preparing the final budget, the Council should consult with the Commissioner of Finance.

d. Approve all new graduate work beyond masters' degrees, professional schools and establishment of any new centers of learning.

e. Engage in the dissemination of information on higher education which is of interest to the public.
23. The staff of the Kentucky Council on Public Higher Education should consist of an Executive Director who is a specialist in educational planning and specialists in finance, facilities, and community colleges.

24. Each state college or university should be governed by a Board of Regents composed of nine laymen appointed by the Governor. The term of office should be nine years with one member to be appointed each year.

Regarding the composition and duties of the Council, following are the recommendations of M. M. Chambers, Chairman of the Survey Team, not concurred in by Raymond C. Gibson and Truman M. Pierce.

25. The Kentucky Council on Public Higher Education should be continued as presently constituted, except that the three advisory members appointed by the Executive Committee of the Kentucky Association of Colleges, Secondary and Elementary Schools should be given full voting membership only when the Council is deliberating on the Administration of the Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963 or subsequent Acts of Congress necessitating a state agency broadly representative of all types of higher education.

26. The duties of the Council should be continued as specified in Section 164.020, Kentucky Revised Statutes, except that Subsection
(1) should be amended to become Subsections (1), (1a), and (1b) as follows:

(1) Coordinate the work of the state institutions of higher learning in Kentucky, on the basis of efficiency and economy;

(1a) Determine the curricular offerings of the state institutions of higher learning for teacher education, as a basis for certificates authorized and issued by the State Board of Education.

(1b) Recommend regarding establishment of any new centers of higher learning.

27. The staff of the Kentucky Council on Public Higher Education should consist of an Executive Secretary and two Research Associates for (1) Finance, and (2) Facilities, augmented by additional high-level specialists in (3) Education two years beyond high school, (4) Graduate and professional education, and (5) Statewide public information on higher education.

28. Each state university or college now operating should be governed by a board constituted as at present, except that memberships ex officio should be abolished at the end of the term of office of the present incumbent in each case.

Regarding the terms of appointed members, no term longer than four years is now possible until the state Constitution is changed by amendment or judicial interpretation. Authorization of terms of seven years is recommended.
APPENDIX F

1. LETTER OF TRANSMITTAL

2. HIGHER EDUCATION IN KENTUCKY, 1965-1975
January 17, 1966

The Honorable Edward T. Breathitt, Governor
Commonwealth of Kentucky
Frankfort, Kentucky 40601

Dear Governor Breathitt:

The Commission on Higher Education, appointed by you to study the educational needs of the state during the next ten years, has now completed its deliberations and has developed recommendations for establishing a basic program to meet these needs. The recommendations adopted by the Commission are set out in a report to you dated January 7, 1966 and enclosed with this letter.

Of the 16 recommendations made, 14 were adopted unanimously and the remaining recommendations, one relating to the changing of names of four of the state colleges and the other relating to the voting powers of a reconstituted Council of Higher Education, by a split vote. On the first recommendation 15 members supported the recommendation made and 3 members dissented. On the second recommendation, 11 members supported the recommendation made and 7 partially dissented.

It should be pointed out that Mr. Bartlett, one of the members of the Commission, was unable to attend any of the Commission meetings at which the matters covered by our report were discussed; consequently, his vote in favor of recommendations 2 and 15 was given without having had the opportunity of hearing the arguments made by the minority voters on these items.

In connection with the studies made by the Commission, a Survey Team employed by the Commission has made a comprehensive study of the state's higher educational system. This study is now at the printer's and will be available approximately the 26th of January. In that study the Survey Team makes a number of implicit and explicit recommendations covering matters other than those set out in the basic program recommended by the Commission. The Commission did not deem these additional recommendations necessary for establishing a basic plan to meet the state's needs, and consequently the Commission took no position with respect to them.

Sincerely yours,

William H. Abell, Chairman
Commission on Higher Education
HIGHER EDUCATION IN KENTUCKY
1965-1975

Recommendations to the Governor of Kentucky for Establishing a Basic Program to Meet the State's Higher Education Needs in the Coming Decade

What Kentucky Now Has

Kentucky has thirty private colleges, enrolling a little less than 30 per cent of all students beyond high school in the state. It has the University of Kentucky, the principal state university (which is one and the same as the land-grant institution) at Lexington, with nine two-year community college branches located in different towns. It has four middle-sized, rapidly growing multi-purpose institutions (at Morehead, Richmond, Bowling Green, and Murray) which were once normal schools, then teachers' colleges, and now state colleges. It has Kentucky State College at Frankfort, now serving students of all races and growing toward the fulfillment of several purposes, both statewide and regional. Finally, the state has the historic municipal university at Louisville; and the locally controlled 33-year-old Paducah Junior College.

This statewide system has made excellent upward progress in recent years. But as yet Kentucky is below the national average in the
numbers of high school graduates who obtain some education beyond high school. This lag can be corrected; but higher education is growing so fast throughout the nation that "we have to run fast in order to stand still." This is also true of the diversification of the scope and the upgrading of the quality of Kentucky's total program of higher education. Although it is moving upward, it has a long way to go.

What the Needs Are

In the fall of 1965 Kentucky had a total of 73,068 students in both public and private colleges and universities within the state. There is every reason to believe that this total will rise to about 130,000 by the fall of 1975. During this ten-year period the enrollment of the private colleges as a whole will increase by about 50 per cent; while that in the public institutions will very nearly double. Thus the percentage of students in private colleges may decline from 30 per cent to perhaps 23 per cent; but by and large, all colleges, public and private, will be larger and better financed than they are today.

The foregoing enrollment figures are "head-counts," including all enrolled students whether full-time or part-time. To get a more exact measure for purposes of projecting finances, we have reduced the current figures to "full-time equivalents." In the fall of 1965 the public institutions alone enrolled 45,215 "full-time equivalents." This total is
expected to rise to about 94,500 in the fall of 1975—a little more than double the existing figure.

In short, Kentucky's public higher education system must somehow be equipped and expanded to accommodate twice as many students in 1975 as they do today. At the same time the scope and quality of higher education must improve (as it is already doing now); and whatever increases in costs per unit that arise from inflation, costly but indispensable scientific apparatus, better staffs for teaching and research, library advancement, and relatively heavier loads at the more expensive levels in graduate and professional schools must be met.

The Need of Financing

Especially since the enactment of the sales and use tax in 1960, Kentucky has made commendable progress in providing appropriations of state tax funds for annual operating expenses of public higher education. Without this, the great growth in size and in quality of the public institutions of higher education which has recently taken place would have been impossible.

It is probable that, with a doubled load in mere numbers of students, plus increased variety and scope of offerings, upgraded quality, and more students at the higher levels of college education, as well as higher unit costs of essential equipment and higher salaries and
wages, the public higher educational enterprise of the state will require, by 1975, appropriations of state tax funds for annual operating expenses that will more than triple those for 1965. Much of the same movement will occur throughout the nation. Kentucky must do her part to maintain adequate educational opportunities.

One of the compelling reasons for this is the intimate relationship between expanded and improved public higher education and economic growth. Institutions of higher education attract industries, which in turn add to the state's ability to appreciate and support better higher education. This upward spiral is already visibly in motion in several parts of Kentucky.

Another compelling factor is the relentless change in the occupational distribution of the working population, brought about and continuing on account of the rapid advance of technology. The day when a man could look forward to supporting a family by common labor is fast passing.

The proportion of the labor force engaged in unskilled labor has long been decreasing and will continue to decrease. So great is the gain in productivity per man-hour in agriculture that the proportion of farmers and farm workers in the labor-force in Kentucky dropped by 47 per cent during the decade 1950 to 1960, and continues to go down. Meanwhile the proportions of workers in sales, service, and clerical
categories increase dramatically, as do also those in technical, professional, and managerial work, practically all of which require at least some education beyond high school.

At a time when the state's economic future requires that a major portion of all high school graduates obtain at least some education beyond that level, and when the population of college age is increasing at an extraordinarily fast rate, public higher education must undergo huge expansion, and tax support of public higher education will command a large percentage of the gross personal and corporate income in the state.

The state must begin now to meet the education challenge of the coming decade. In order to provide an orderly plan to meet the state's needs, the Commission submits the following recommendations:

A. THE TYPES OF INSTITUTIONS AND THEIR DEVELOPMENT

1. The four regional state colleges, already multi-purpose institutions, should expand graduate studies at the master's level in arts and sciences, business administration, education, and other appropriate fields as rapidly as qualified faculties and resources become available. These programs should be initiated under the authority of the respective Boards of Regents and the appropriate accrediting associations.
2. The four large multi-purpose state colleges should be re-named regional state universities: Eastern Kentucky State University, Western Kentucky State University, Murray State University, and Morehead State University. Kentucky State College should be authorized and encouraged to develop graduate programs at the master's level and should be accorded university status when it has achieved this end.

Three members of the Commission, Doctors Oswald and Lunger, and Monsignor Murphy, are of the opinion that any redesignation of public institutions of higher education should be based on educational criteria established by the Council on Public Higher Education in its role as the statewide planning agency for higher education; and any redesignation should follow a recommendation of the Council after applying these criteria. For this reason they dissent from recommendation No. 2.

3. The University of Kentucky, as a principal university in the Commonwealth, should expand and strengthen its graduate programs at the doctoral and post-doctoral level. Special attention should be given to the preparation of college teachers in cooperation with other state universities. It should further expand as is needed professional doctoral instruction, including medicine, law, dentistry, engineering, and education; and should serve as the principal state institution for the conduct of statewide research and service programs.
4. The regional state universities should further develop appropriate research and service programs for their geographic areas as rapidly as resources permit.

5. The State Legislature should invite the University of Louisville to become a state university.

6. To meet the increasing needs for undergraduate education the following should be done:

   (a) the state universities and colleges and the University of Kentucky should expand their undergraduate programs;

   (b) the University of Kentucky, consistent with existing legislation, should continue to expand the two-year community college system;

   (c) the state universities and colleges should retain and expand comprehensive two-year community college programs on their own campuses; and

   (d) the Council on Public Higher Education should study and make recommendations to the Governor of the need for establishing new community colleges and four-year state colleges.

7. The community colleges and area vocational-technical schools, when located in the same communities, should be encouraged to coordinate their programs in all ways possible, with the aim of progressing toward comprehensive facilities for education two years beyond high school in each such community.
8. The community colleges should each serve the following functions:

(a) two-year college-parallel or arts-and-science curricula, with credits transferable to two-year colleges, four-year colleges and universities;

(b) technical, and semi-professional programs of two years or less, for students who expect to enter gainful employment immediately upon completion;

(c) courses in general education not necessarily intended for transfer nor technically-oriented; and

(d) special opportunities of the foregoing types, wherever practicable, for adults in the community.

B. THE FINANCING OF A TEN-YEAR PLAN FOR PUBLIC HIGHER EDUCATION

9. The present full-time equivalent enrollment of the public institutions of higher education is 45,215. By 1970 projections indicate a full-time equivalent enrollment of 71,300 and by 1975 a full-time equivalent enrollment is 94,500. This more than doubling of the enrollments in ten years will require a large amount of capital construction, both at existing institutions and at any new institutions that might be established. It is recommended that capital funds for this construction be provided from general obligation bonds of the Commonwealth of Kentucky. When such a practice is initiated by the Legislature, the present custom of financing academic buildings by pledging and using
student fees for the retirement of so-called "revenue bonds" should be
gradually discontinued.

10. The custom of financing the construction of non-academic
buildings (residence halls and student service buildings) largely by
issuing "revenue bonds" payable only out of income from such buildings
(charges for room, board, and related services purchased by students)
should be continued; and the respective governing boards of the several
institutions should be authorized by law to issue such bonds when
deemed necessary.

11. The large increase in enrollment over the next decade will
also require increasing state funds each year for operating costs of the
public institutions of higher education. These costs could conceivably
more than treble over the next ten years. A long-range financial plan
for meeting these needs should be prepared by the Council on Public
Higher Education in its role as a statewide planning agency for higher
education for presentation to the Governor and subsequent Legislatures,
and should be reviewed each year by the Council in the light of changing
conditions.

12. While low-tuition public higher education for residents of
the state should continue to be the goal, the present schedule of fees
charged these students will have to be continued for the foreseeable
future. These fees should be reviewed periodically by the Council on Public Higher Education; there should continue to be a differential between fees charged students who are residents and those who are not, and this differential should continue to be carefully studied.

C. ORGANIZATION AND STATE-LEVEL STRUCTURE FOR HIGHER EDUCATION

13. Each state university or college should continue to be governed by a board constituted as at present. However, memberships ex-officio should be abolished as of the end of the current term of office of the present incumbents. Upon the expiration of the present term of each ex-officio member, the Governor shall appoint a new member and the Board shall then elect its own chairman.

If terms of longer than four years become permissible, members should be appointed for a term of seven years, and the terms of the members should be staggered.

14. Each governing board, acting through the institution's president, shall be autonomous in administering the budget, programs, and services of the institution, and in the employment of personnel.

15. The membership of the existing Council on Public Higher Education in Kentucky should be reconstituted so that the membership of the Council will be composed of nine laymen appointed by the Governor and of the president or chief executive officer of each four-year
public institution of higher education. The appointed members of the Council shall be voting members, and the presidents or chief executive officers of each institution shall be non-voting members. Individuals who are members of the governing board of any state college or who hold any appointive or elective state office shall not be eligible for appointment to the Council while holding such membership or office.

The nine laymen shall each be appointed for a term of four years, but if longer terms become permissible, it is recommended that terms of nine years be used. Irrespective of the length of term, it is recommended that the terms of members be staggered.

The following members of the Commission, Doctors Doran, Hill, Martin, Thompson, and Woods, and Messrs. Ross and Trevathan, while agreeing with the change in composition recommended, believe that the presidents or chief executive officers of the reconstituted Council should be full voting members. To this extent they dissent from recommendation No. 15.

D. DUTIES OF THE KENTUCKY COUNCIL ON PUBLIC HIGHER EDUCATION

16. The duties and responsibilities of the Council on Public Higher Education should be restated, and the duties and responsibilities of the Council should be as follows:

(a) to engage in analyses and research to determine the overall needs for higher education in the Commonwealth;
(b) to develop and transmit to the Governor overall statewide plans of public higher education to meet the needs of the Commonwealth within the framework of the recommendations of this report, such work to be done on a continuing basis;

(c) to approve all new professional schools and review and make recommendations to the Governor regarding proposed new community colleges and four-year colleges in the state;

(d) to review budget requests of the several public institutions (1) as to their appropriate level of support for the functions of the institutions, and (2) as to the anticipated available resources for higher education. These requests shall be forwarded to the Governor and the Department of Finance with recommendations concerning each of the institutions;

(e) to approve curricula for teacher training. When the Council meets to consider curricula for teacher training, three persons who are from accredited institutions of higher learning, and who have been appointed by the Executive Committee of the Kentucky Association of Colleges, Secondary and Elementary Schools, shall be invited to meet with the Council in an advisory capacity;

(f) to determine the amount of entrance fees and to approve qualifications for admission to each of the public institutions of higher education;

(g) to require such reports from the executive officers of each of such institutions as it deems necessary for the effectual performance of its duties;

(h) to publish at least biennially a report of the educational and financial affairs of such institutions and engage in the dissemination of such other information on higher education as is of interest to the public;
(i) to elect a chairman of the Council from the membership. The Council shall appoint such staff as may be necessary, limited to available appropriations, to carry out the duties of the Council. The staff shall be employees of the Council; shall be responsible to the chairman as representative of the Council; and their salaries shall be determined in the same manner as other state employees.

In the opinion of the Commission the foregoing recommendations, if adopted and implemented, will provide the means for meeting the educational demands of the state in the foreseeable future and for coordination and continued planning to meet these needs. The Survey Team employed by the Commission has made a number of additional implicit and explicit recommendations in its report, covering areas other than those set out above. The Commission did not deem it necessary to include these recommendations in establishing a basic plan to meet the state's educational needs, and the Commission has taken no position on them.

Respectfully submitted,

KENTUCKY COMMISSION ON HIGHER EDUCATION

Members of the Commission:

William H. Abell, Chairman
T. J. Bartlett
J. B. Bell
Mrs. Rexford S. Blazer
Philip G. Davidson
Adron Doran
Earl F. Hays
Carl M. Hill
Irvin E. Lunger

Robert R. Martin
John F. Murphy
Henry Y. Offutt
John W. Oswald
George T. Ross
Thomas A. Spragens
Kelly Thompson
B. L. Trevathan
Ralph H. Woods

William H. Abell, Chairman
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For

Semi-Structured Interviews With Persons in Higher Education

1. Should there be coordination of higher education in Kentucky?
   a. If so, what form of agency should be involved?
   b. If not, what should be the procedure for the dealings between the state government and the institutions of higher education?

2. What is your view of the Council?
   a. Is the new form promising or practicable?
   b. How effective or practicable was the old form?
   c. What are the essential differences between the two forms?
   d. How do you view the attitudes of the present members of the Council toward higher education in general, and toward public higher education in particular?

3. What are the present powers of the Council which are acceptable to higher education?

4. What were the powers of the former Council which were:
   a. Acceptable
   b. Unacceptable

5. What are the essential differences between the two forms in their relationships with the state government?

6. What are the essential differences between the two forms in their relationships with higher education?

7. What is your view of the quality and adequacy of the staff of the Council?

8. How do you account for the change in the form of the Council after so many years of existence?

9. What forces, pressures, or persons were responsible or were involved in the change of form?
10. What has been the attitude of state government toward the allocation of the total resources of the state in relation to higher education?
   a. In terms of total amounts?
   b. In terms of appropriations to individual institutions?

11. What are the statutory or de jure procedures for budget requests?

12. What are the actual or de facto procedures?

13. What is your opinion of these differences?

14. What approach to political leadership do the various institutions have (or does your institution have)?

15. On the general subject of planning
   a. What provisions and procedures are a part of your institution?
   b. What provisions and procedures were a part of the activities of the old Council?
   c. What is your feeling about the potential for planning in the activities of the new Council?

16. What have been the issues in higher education in the past, and how have those issues affected your institution?

17. What do you feel will be the issues of the future relating to higher education, and the possible effect of those issues on your institution?
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INTERVIEW SCHEDULE
for
Semi-Structured Interviews with Persons in State Government

1. Should there be coordination of higher education in Kentucky?
   a. If so, what form of agency should be involved?
   b. If not, what should be the procedure for handling the necessary duties involving the state-supported institutions?

2. What is your view of the Council?
   a. Is the new form promising or practicable?
   b. How effective or practicable was the old form?
   c. What are the essential differences between the two forms?
   d. How do you view the current members of the Council?

3. What are the powers of the Council now?

4. What were the former powers of the Council which were:
   a. Desirable
   b. Undesirable

5. What are the essential differences between the two forms in their relationships with the state government?

6. What is your view of the quality and adequacy of the Council's staff?

7. How do you account for the change in the form of the Council after so many years of existence?

8. What forces, pressures, or persons were responsible or were involved in the change of form?
   a. Has there been a political change of climate?
   b. Has there been an economic change of climate?

9. What has been the attitude of state government toward the allocation of the total resources of the state in relation to higher education?
   a. In terms of total amounts?
   b. In terms of appropriations to individual institutions?
10. What are the statutory procedures for budget requests involving the Council, the Budget Division, and the General Assembly?

11. What approach to political leadership do the various institutions have?

12. What do you feel have been the issues in higher education in the past?

13. What do you feel will be forthcoming issues concerning higher education?
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Personal interviews were held with the following persons during the course of this investigation:

**State Government**

Governor Edward T. Breathitt

Lieutenant-Governor Harry Lee Waterfield

Bert Combs, Former Governor

Lawrence Weatherby, Former Governor, now President Pro-Tem of the Kentucky Senate

John Young Brown, House Majority Leader, Kentucky General Assembly

Felix Joyner, Finance Commissioner

Robert Cornett, Development Director, former Budget Division Director

Roger Buchanan, Budget Division Director

Dr. Harry Sparks, State Superintendent of Public Instruction

Dr. Sidney Simandle, Director of Teacher Education and Certification, State Department of Education

James T. Fleming, Chairman, Legislative Research Commission

**Members of the Council**

William H. Abell, Chairman, President of the Commonwealth Life Insurance Company

Lisle Baker, Jr., Executive Vice-President, *Louisville Courier-Journal* and *Times*
Edward F. Pritchard, Jr., lawyer, Frankfort, Kentucky

Dr. Albert B. Harris, General Practitioner, Louisville, Kentucky

Mrs. C. C. Lowry, President, State Federation of Women's Clubs, Murray, Kentucky

Staff of the Council

Ted C. Gilbert, Executive Director

Billy F. Hunt, Associate Director, former budget analyst

Mrs. Florence Johnson, Secretary

Higher Education

Kentucky State College

President Carl M. Hill

University of Kentucky

Dr. A. D. Albright, Executive Vice-President

Dr. John Barrows, Director of Institutional Research

Dr. Donald Clapp, Coordinator for Program Budget Planning

Dr. Ellis Hartford, Dean of Community Colleges

Dr. Lyman Ginger, Dean, College of Education

Eastern Kentucky University

President Robert R. Martin

J. C. Powell, Executive Dean

Dr. Thomas Stovall, Vice-President for Academic Affairs

Dr. Andrew J. Brookema, Director, School of Music
Western Kentucky University

President Kelly Thompson

Dero G. Downing, Vice-President for Administrative Affairs

Dr. Raymond L. Cravens, Vice-President for Academic Affairs

Harry Largent, Business Manager, former budget analyst in the Budget Division

Morehead State University

President Adron Doran

Russell McClure, Administrative Assistant to the President, former budget analyst in the Budget Division

Murray State University

President Ralph H. Woods

Dr. Ray Mofield, Assistant to the President

P. W. Ordway, Business Manager

Wilson Gnatt, Registrar

President Phillip G. Davidson, University of Louisville

President Thomas A. Spragens, Centre College

Dr. M. M. Chambers, Indiana University, Chairman of the Survey Team

Dr. James L. Miller, Jr., Director, Center for the Study of Higher Education, the University of Michigan; former budget analyst in the Kentucky Budget Division.
Other Interested Parties

Allan M. Trout, capitol correspondent, *Louisville Courier-Journal*; sage of the press corps

S. G. Van Curon, editor, *The State Journal*, Frankfort

Dr. John Leslie, Manager of Economic Development, Spindletop Research Corp.

Locations Visited

Eastern Kentucky University

Western Kentucky University

The University of Kentucky

Murray State University

Morehead State University

Kentucky State College

Centre College

Berea College

University of Louisville

Spindletop Research

Offices of the Council

Capitol Building

Capitol Annex

Capitol Office Building-State Department of Education

Louisville Public Library

*Louisville Courier-Journal*; *The State Journal*
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