

**HIGHER EDUCATION IN VIRGINIA**

*Report of the*

**VIRGINIA ADVISORY LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL**

*To*

**THE GOVERNOR**

*and*

*The GENERAL ASSEMBLY of VIRGINIA*



**(HOUSE DOCUMENT No. 8)**

**COMMONWEALTH OF VIRGINIA**  
*Division of Purchase and Printing*  
**Richmond**  
**1951**



Members of Council

---

EDMUND T. DeJARNETTE, Chairman

BENJAMIN T. GUNTER, JR., Vice-Chairman

W. R. BROADDUS, JR.

PAUL CROCKETT

HARRY B. DAVIS

J. D. HAGOOD

WILLIAM H. IRVINE

M. M. LONG

MOSBY G. PERROW, JR.

---

Staff

JOHN B. BOATWRIGHT, JR.

G. M. LAPSLEY

WILLIAM R. MILLER

Members of Committee

PAUL CROCKETT

ROBERT F. BALDWIN, JR.

W. C. CAUBILL

GEORGE DAMM

HARRY B. DAVIS

WERT FAULKNER

ROBERT H. TUCKER

---

Consultant

FRED J. KELLY

	<u>Page</u>
House Joint Resolution No. 47	1
Report of Council	3
Consultant's Report	13

#### TABLE OF CONTENTS

##### Report of Council

Introductory	3
Findings	4
Recommendations	8
Suggested Legislation	9
Background of Findings and Recommendations	12

##### Consultant's Report

Letter of Transmittal	13
I. Background of the Study	13
II. Developing an Adequate Higher Education Program	17
A. Broadened Services	18
B. The Present Program	20
C. Needed Adjustments	21
D. Financing the Program	25
III. Improving Coordination in Virginia	26
A. The Present Situation	26
B. Illustrations of In-coordination	27
C. Present Statutory Machinery for Coordination	31
D. Present Programs of Voluntary Coordination and Cooperation Among the Institutions	32
E. How Coordination is Handled in Other States	34
F. Recent Studies in Arkansas and Texas	37
G. Recent Study in Illinois	44
H. The Essentials of a Satisfactory Coordinating Mechanism	44

<u>Conclusion of Report of Council</u>	48
--	----

##### Appendix A

Some Considerations Underlying the Financial Support of Higher Education	49
Specific Policy Statements Relating to Certain Items in Resolution 47	58

##### Appendix B

Data About the Institutions	64
Table of Contents, Appendix B	65

LIST OF TABLES OTHER THAN IN APPENDIX B

Numbers of Students Graduated from Each Institution with a Major in Each of the Selected Departments	27
The Number of Small Classes (8 or Fewer Students) for Undergraduates Taught During 1950-51	29
State Appropriations for Current Operations of Public Colleges and Universities, 1939-40 Per Capita of Total Population	51
State Appropriations for Higher Education Related to Population and Total Income of the States, 1947-48	52
Residents of Each State Attending Institutions of Higher Education Either Within or Outside their Home States per 1000 of Total Population, 1949-50	52
Number of Students in Virginia Colleges in Proportion To State Population, 1850	53
Percentage of Educational and General Income from Each Source	53
Percentages of Out of State Students in Publicly Controlled Institutions in a Few States	57

HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION NO. 47

Directing the Virginia Advisory Legislative Council  
to study certain matters in connection with the  
State-supported institutions of higher education.

Whereas, ever larger sums both for maintenance and operation and for capital outlay are being requested and furnished the State-supported institutions of higher education and this entire matter deserves careful consideration; now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Delegates, the Senate of Virginia concurring, that the Virginia Advisory Legislative Council is directed to study and report on the State-supported institutions of higher education.

The Council shall make a thorough study of the State-supported institutions of higher learning, including those devoted to or conducting medical education, giving particular attention to possible consolidation of overlapping functions, and any other matters which in its opinion result in inefficiency or duplication of expense and effort. The Council shall specifically consider in its study the following matters in the case of each of such institutions:

(a) The determination at regular intervals of the units costs of instruction at the several institutions and in the several fields of learning taught at each.

(b) A well-designed system of accounting that would provide for a detailed cost analysis of the auxiliary operations apart from the instructional fields; such as dormitories, dining halls, farms, book and supply shops, and other revenue-producing activities.

(c) The financial operations within the several institutions and critical review of the proposed budgets for operations and for capital development. Long range capital improvement plans should be developed.

(d) Intensive study of the fields of learning to be engaged in by the several institutions so as to eliminate all unjustifiable duplication of offerings.

(e) The policy to be established with regard to the numbers of out-of-State students to be accepted into the respective institutions. These might vary among the several institutions.

(f) Studies of the location and attainments of students after leaving the institutions with a view toward determining the extent to which the benefits afforded through these institutions are translated into community services.

(g) The policies governing the admission of students and whether this ought to be regularized and based upon objective testing before entrance, and whether there should be fairly uniform testing standards applicable to the respective fields of learning to which the applicant seeks admission.

(h) Whether there should be established specific and uniform provisions governing all of the institutions requiring the students to pay a fixed percentage of the instructional costs, with appropriate differential rates for Virginia residents and out-of-State students.

(i). Whether out-of-State students should be expected to contribute

HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION NO. 47

substantially what it costs to provide their instruction.

(j) The award of scholarships provided at State expense at the institutions of higher education and policies governing same, to involve among other things competitive selection, financial needs of the student and the needs of the State for persons equipped in particular fields of knowledge and training.

(k) The need for a well-designed plan for educational loan funds for students with appropriate safeguards attached to the administration of these funds to insure against unnecessary losses.

(l) The revenues of these institutions from the State, private sources and from student, the apportionment of State funds to these institutions; relationship of State appropriations to these institutions and State appropriations to the public free schools, and such other matters as the Council deems appropriate.

The Council in its study may call upon any department or institution for information and assistance, and may employ such technical, secretarial and other personnel as it may deem necessary in its work.

The Council shall complete its study and make its report to the Governor and General Assembly not later than September one, nineteen hundred fifty-one.



## HIGHER EDUCATION IN VIRGINIA

Report of the

Virginia Advisory Legislative Council

RICHMOND, VIRGINIA  
August 13, 1951

To: HONORABLE JOHN S. BATTLE, GOVERNOR OF VIRGINIA  
and  
THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA

The General Assembly of 1948 made provision for a special commission to study the State-supported institutions of higher education. That commission was not appointed and instead Governor Tuck requested that the Commission to Study State and Local Revenues and Expenditures undertake that study in addition to its other work. The latter commission, after investigation, found the subject too complex to cover in the time available; it did, however, consider one aspect of the matter and reported to the General Assembly of 1950 requesting that a complete and thorough study be made. The General Assembly of 1950 directed the Virginia Advisory Legislative Council to make the study set forth in the resolution preceding this report.

The Council requested Paul Crockett of Yorktown, Member of the House of Delegates, to act as Chairman of a committee to make the preliminary investigation and report. The following committee members served with Mr. Crockett: Robert F. Baldwin, Jr., Norfolk, Member of Senate; W. C. Caudill, Pearisburg, Member of Senate; George Damm, Arlington, Member of House of Delegates; Harry B. Davis, Norfolk, Member of House of Delegates; Wert Faulkner, Glasgow; and Robert H. Tucker, Richmond. John B. Boatwright, Jr., and G. M. Lapsley served as Secretary and Recording Secretary, respectively, to the committee.

The committee at the inception of its work realized that the task confronting it required the services of the best technical assistance that might be retained. The major research agencies in the United States in this field were consulted with a view to the retention of the best qualified of them. In the course of negotiations, it developed that a member of the staff of the United States Office of Education of the Federal Security Agency might be available in a private capacity to the committee. A conference was held with Dr. Fred J. Kelly, Specialist in Higher Education, United States Office of Education, following which arrangements were completed for Dr. Kelly to serve as consultant to the committee.

The Auditor of Public Accounts was requested to make certain financial studies of the fiscal operations of the institutions. These studies furnished data of inestimable value.

The Bureau of Population and Economic Research of the University of Virginia cooperated wholeheartedly in the compilation of factual data. This work has been of major importance in the study.

Many State officers and agencies, and State-supported and private institutions of higher education, and their officers, have been of great help to the committee in the furnishing of answers to questionnaires and to requests for information on almost every phase of this study.

## HIGHER EDUCATION IN VIRGINIA

Whatever merit this report may have depends to a large degree upon the assistance obtained from all these sources.

The consultant met with the presidents of the State-supported institutions, and visited their campuses to obtain firsthand information to guide him in his work. The committee also met with the presidents and sincerely appreciated their varied and valuable contributions. A spirit of mutual respect and cooperation obtained throughout the study.

The results of similar studies in other states were carefully reviewed in an effort to obtain suggestions which might be helpful here. It was found that many of these studies emphasize the same problems of higher education as are found in Virginia.

The committee carefully considered the data before it, the views of the presidents and other interested individuals, and the report of the consultant, and submitted its findings and recommendations to the Council.

The committee has materially assisted the Council by submitting its report in ample time to afford a thorough review of the report and the underlying data. The Council is impressed with the excellence of the work of the committee and with the breadth of knowledge displayed by the consultant. The State is most fortunate in having been able to obtain the services of such an outstanding group in an undertaking having the scope and complexity of the present one.

The Council has been greatly impressed with the problems confronting the State in the field of higher education and the solutions which are hereafter presented. The attention of all who are interested in the field of higher education and its relation to the public free schools is directed to the following findings and recommendations:

### FINDINGS

- I. Virginia has ten publicly controlled institutions of higher education, some of which maintain branches at centers away from their main campuses. These ten institutions provide education in the liberal arts and sciences, both undergraduate and, to a less complete extent, graduate, and in teacher training, agriculture, home economics, engineering, military science, business administration, law, medicine, dentistry, pharmacy, and nursing.
- II. Important areas of higher education in need of further development by Virginia's publicly-controlled institutions include:
  1. Research to improve the effectiveness of public school teaching and the consequent better training of public school superintendents, principals and teachers.
  2. Public education in the field of health, especially in keeping well.
  3. Research to improve the conservation and utilization of the State's natural resources, comparable with the research program now carried on in agriculture.
  4. Short technical and semi-professional courses to prepare for the

## HIGHER EDUCATION IN VIRGINIA

many types of callings which require post-high school training but do not require four-year curricula.

5. Research in the basic arts and sciences to assure constant improvement in our cultural standards.
  6. Social and economic education of both youth and adults to prepare for a better understanding of our increasingly complex state, national and international problems.
- III. There are six boards, all appointed by the Governor, controlling higher education in Virginia: one for the University and Mary Washington; one for V. P. I. and Radford; one for V. M. I.; one for William and Mary; one for the Medical College of Virginia; and one (the State Board of Education) for Longwood, Madison and Virginia State College. These boards have been created at different times and for different purposes. Each operates with commendable eagerness to build up its own program.
- IV. The several institutions and their governing boards have had little occasion to develop a concept of a unified State-wide system of higher education into which the program of each institution would fit and thus enable each institution to contribute to an integrated, strengthened system of State higher education. Indeed there has been no statutory machinery through which a State-wide integrated system of higher education would logically come about.
- V. The failure to develop a State-wide concept of higher education has had several effects:
1. Institutional welfare rather than State welfare has tended to dominate the planning by the several institutional officers and governing boards.
  2. Competition rather than cooperation among the institutions has often characterized their relations with each other and with the General Assembly.
  3. Institutional programs have not taken due account of the needs of the State. Illustrations are cited in Item II above. Another example is the increased development of liberal arts programs in teacher training institutions while the State has a serious and growing shortage of well trained teachers.
  4. There has been a tendency for each institution to enlarge unduly the scope of its offerings both by adding courses in fields historically associated with it and by extension into fields not heretofore served by it, thus accentuating the problem of duplication. The cost of duplication is not limited to professional fields, but is found to a great degree in the maintenance in two or more institutions of senior college departments of instruction in the arts and sciences for very small numbers of students.
  5. There has been no administrative machinery to deal constructively with the potential development of the State-supported system of higher education.

## HIGHER EDUCATION IN VIRGINIA

6. There has been no policy making agency to deal on a State-wide and continuing basis with such questions as:
  - a. Student aid in the form of loans, grants, scholarships and jobs.
  - b. Admission requirements for (1) Virginia students and (2) out-of-State students.
  - c. The extent to which the fees charged (1) Virginia students and (2) out-of-State students should pay the cost of their education.
  - d. Graduate as well as undergraduate courses and instruction.
- VI. For the proper functioning of the legislative process in making appropriations and in fixing legal responsibilities, the Governor and General Assembly urgently need an administrative mechanism to present a unified budget in terms of a State-wide program of higher education. This budget for (1) maintenance and operation and (2) capital outlays, should be based upon an evaluation of the functions and operations of the several institutions as parts of a State-wide plan designed to meet the needs of the people of the State. Such a mechanism would be a great aid to the Governor and the General Assembly both during and between sessions in providing advice with respect to requests for funds.
- VII. The present Virginia plan of coordination through a voluntary council of presidents is not designed to meet, nor will it meet, the needs of a State-wide program of higher education due to the absence of facilities for long-range planning of a unified and comprehensive program and to the lack of suitable means of integrating the budgetary requests from the six governing boards.
- VIII. The need for a coordinating mechanism is generally recognized among persons most closely connected with the administration of institutions of higher education. There is some sentiment for creating such an agency to serve only in an advisory capacity to the Governor, particularly in the field of budget making. This concept, however, fails to meet the needs of the situation, particularly in that: (1) the group would serve the General Assembly only indirectly, because to the extent that its advice were available to the General Assembly its usefulness as a confidential advisory group to the Governor would be impaired; (2) personnel of the necessary calibre would not be readily available for service on a group whose recommendations were known only to the Governor; (3) the activities of the group would be limited by the desires of the Governor and would depend for their effectiveness upon the views and interest of succeeding Governors; and (4) if the members of the group are to serve in a confidential relationship with each Governor, all the membership should be appointed by him, thus no continuity of experience or policy would be established whereas long and overlapping terms are essential to enable the Board to acquaint itself with the programs of the institutions and with the over-all State needs in higher education.
- IX. Virginia institutions receive a smaller proportion of their support from State appropriations and a larger proportion from student fees than is the case in most other States.

## HIGHER EDUCATION IN VIRGINIA

- X. Appropriations for higher education have maintained for many years the same relative position percentage-wise to other educational appropriations and to the general fund.
- XI. With the help of the State Auditor of Public Accounts the institutions operate systems of fiscal controls which are excellent for keeping account of the condition of the several funds. Data are provided by the system which make possible general and specific cost studies of the institutions. The system makes possible determining the degree to which each activity - instruction, boarding, lodging, health service - is self-supporting at each institution.
- XII. The present is an excellent time to establish a workable plan to evolve a State-wide system of higher education taking into account the facilities at the institutions and the needs of the State, because:
1. A continuation of the present system will increase the expense to the State without a corresponding increase in needed educational services.
  2. The need of public schools for a trained and efficient corps of teachers is extreme and getting worse.
  3. The capital outlay program at the colleges is providing a greatly improved plant and the State's program should now guarantee the most efficient utilization of this plant and the careful justification of additional plant in terms of a State-wide plan.
  4. The colleges are faced with a probable decline in enrollment due to the lessening of the G. I. program and the present national mobilization.
  5. There are movements to establish at least two additional public colleges under the control of separate boards.
- XIII. For the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950, the State contributed \$5,900,000 for maintenance and operation of the institutions of higher education. It cost the institutions \$5,800,000, almost exactly the same amount, to operate and maintain their grounds and buildings. What Virginia does, therefore, for higher education, is to provide land and to build and maintain their physical plants. This amounts to 28.11 per cent of the cost of providing the education and research programs of the institutions. The remaining 71.89 per cent of the cost is met from other sources, such as student fees, endowment income, and Federal grants.
- XIV. The resolution directing the study requires consideration of unit costs, revenue producing activities, financial operations within the institutions, duplication, ratios of resident and non-resident students, contributions of graduates of the institutions, admission policies, policies as to the ratio of the cost of instruction to be met by students, scholarships and loan funds, and revenues from public and private sources. These have been matters of continuing interest and concern. The Council feels that these matters are of such volume and detail that they could not properly be covered in its recommendations. They have been thoroughly considered, and it is the opinion of the Council that every question raised

## HIGHER EDUCATION IN VIRGINIA

in the resolution not specifically covered herein will be, in time, resolved by the creation of the State Board of Higher Education recommended in this report.

### RECOMMENDATIONS

- I. That there be created a State Board of Higher Education for Virginia.
- II. That the board be composed of nine members, eight outstanding laymen of the State, appointed for overlapping terms of eight years by the Governor and confirmed by the General Assembly, and the State Superintendent of Public Instruction, ex officio, the terms of two appointive members to expire each biennium.
- III. That the Board develop plans for a comprehensive unified State-wide program in higher education and to that end the Board have authority to appoint a full-time executive secretary whose duty it would be to assemble and interpret data and other evidence required by the Board in carrying out its responsibilities and who will carry through with policies adopted by the Board.
- IV. That in developing and carrying out its program the Board avoid central domination but depend upon maintaining strong institutions and to that end encourage to the fullest extent possible the initiative and sense of responsibility of each institution.
- V. That the governing boards of the several institutions continue to function as at present subject to the policies adopted by the State Board within the limits of its jurisdiction.
- VI. That the Board receive the budget requests from the several institutions for (1) maintenance and operation and (2) capital outlay, and develop from them a coordinated budget for presentation with its recommendations to the Governor.
- VII. That the General Assembly make appropriations to the respective institutions as in the past in the light of the recommendations of the Board and the Governor.
- VIII. That the Board be charged with continuous study, looking to the solution of problems such as (a) the extent to which students both resident and non-resident should pay the cost of their education; (b) the admission requirements for resident and non-resident students; (c) student aid programs; (d) the types of services that should, and those that should not, be self-supporting.
- IX. That the Board be charged with the duty of determining in what fields of higher education the respective institutions shall specialize and of assigning responsibility therefor to the end that uneconomical and inefficient practices be eliminated so far as possible.
- X. That the Board cooperate with the State Board of Education in matters of interest to both the public schools and the State-supported colleges and universities, particularly in college admission requirements, teacher training programs and determining the ratio of appropriations to public schools and to institutions of higher education for both (a) maintenance and operation and (b) capital outlay.

## HIGHER EDUCATION IN VIRGINIA

- XI. That that clause in the Appropriation Act under which, if institutional revenues increase, general fund appropriations are reduced, be so amended as to permit an institution to accumulate a reasonable reserve for expenditure under policies approved by the Board, and that legislation be passed that will facilitate the efforts of the institutions to build up their endowment funds.
- XII. That the following bills be enacted into law:

### A B I L L

To provide for the coordination of the State-supported system of higher education; and to this end to amend the Code of Virginia by adding in Title 23 a chapter numbered 1.1 containing sections numbered 23-9.1 through 23-9.10, creating a State Board of Higher Education; providing for the appointment, qualifications, terms of office, and compensation of the members thereof; vesting such Board with certain powers and duties; requiring certain budget requests to be submitted to such Board and providing for consolidation thereof and the submission of a consolidated budget estimate; and to provide for cooperation between certain agencies as to coordination between the system of public free schools and the State-supported system of higher education; to appropriate funds, and to repeal certain statutes.

Be it enacted by the General Assembly of Virginia:

1. That the Code of Virginia be amended by adding in Title 23 a chapter numbered 1.1 containing sections numbered 23-9.1 through 23-9.10, as follows:

#### CHAPTER 1.1

##### State Board of Higher Education

§ 23-9.1 (a) There is hereby created a State Board of Higher Education for Virginia, hereinafter sometimes referred to as the Board. The Board shall be composed of laymen selected from the State at large without regard to political affiliation. Appointees shall be selected for their ability and all appointments shall be of such nature as to aid the work of the Board and to inspire the highest degree of cooperation and confidence. No officer or employee of, or other person connected with any institution of higher education in this State shall be eligible for appointment to the Board.

(b) The Board shall consist of nine members of whom eight shall be appointed by the Governor subject to confirmation by the General Assembly at its next regular session; the Superintendent of Public Instruction shall serve as a member ex officio. Of the first members of the Board appointed by the Governor, two shall be appointed for terms of eight years, two for terms of six years, two for terms of four years, and two for terms of two years.

## HIGHER EDUCATION IN VIRGINIA

Successors to the persons so appointed shall be appointed for terms of eight years. All terms shall begin July one. Appointments to fill vacancies occurring prior to the expiration of the term of office shall be for the unexpired term.

(c) No person having served on the Board for a term of eight years shall be eligible for reappointment to the Board for two years thereafter.

(d) Appointive members of the Board shall receive a per diem compensation in the amount set forth in § 14-29.1 of the Code of Virginia for each day spent, and shall be paid their actual expenses incurred, in the performance of their duties as members of the Board.

§ 23-9.2 The Board may appoint a full-time executive secretary, who shall possess such qualifications as the Board deems requisite to assist in the discharge of its duties. He shall perform such duties as the Board may require of him. The Board may also employ such other personnel as may be required to assist it in the exercise and performance of its powers and duties.

§ 23-9.3 The Board shall constitute a co-ordinating board for the University of Virginia, Mary Washington College of the University of Virginia, the Medical College of Virginia, the Virginia Military Institute, Longwood College, Madison College, the College of William and Mary in Virginia, the Virginia State College, the Virginia Polytechnic Institute and Radford College, Woman's Division of the Virginia Polytechnic Institute.

§ 23-9.4 The Board is hereby charged with the duty of assembling data and with the aid of the presidents or superintendent of the several institutions preparing plans under which the several State-supported institutions of higher education of Virginia shall constitute an integrated and co-ordinated system. Such plans shall indicate the responsibility of the individual institutions for developing programs in specified fields of undergraduate and graduate education. The Board shall have the power to limit any institution to such curriculum offerings as conform to the plans adopted by the Board.

In carrying out its duties the Board insofar as practicable shall preserve the individuality, traditions and sense of responsibility of the respective institutions.

§ 23-9.5 The Board shall study questions requiring State-wide policies in higher education and shall make recommendations with respect to such questions (a) to the institutions of higher education (b) to the Governor or (c) to the General Assembly, whichever is appropriate. The Board shall seek the views and advice of the president or superintendent of each institution in arriving at these policies.

§ 23-9.6 The Board shall cooperate with the State Board of Education in matters of interest to both the public schools and the State-supported institutions of higher education, particularly in connection with college admission requirements and teacher training programs, and in determining the ratio of appropriations to public schools and to institutions of higher education for both (a) maintenance and operation and (b) capital outlay.

§ 23-9.7 The governing board of each institution of higher education supported by the State shall biennially prepare and transmit to the Board its budget request for maintenance and operation and for capital outlay. In the light of these requests, and in the light of the needs of the State for higher



## HIGHER EDUCATION IN VIRGINIA

education, the Board shall prepare an estimate of such needs for each year of the ensuing biennium coordinating the budget requests for all the institutions but identifying the proposed budget for each institution, and submit the same within the time prescribed by § 2-48 of the Code of Virginia to the Governor, who shall deal therewith as provided by law. Such estimate shall constitute, for each institution named in § 23-9.3 the estimate required to be submitted under § 2-48 of the Code of Virginia.

Nothing herein shall prevent any institution from appearing through its representatives or otherwise before the General Assembly or any committee thereof at any time.

§ 23-9.8. In addition to the other powers and duties herein imposed upon the Board, the Board shall undertake such studies in the field of higher education as the Governor and General Assembly, or either of them, may require of it from time to time.

§ 23-9.9. The powers of the governing boards of the several institutions over the affairs of such institutions shall not be impaired by the provisions of this act except to the extent that powers and duties are herein specifically conferred upon the State Board of Higher Education.

§ 23-9.10. In making the studies herein directed and in the performance of its duties hereunder the Board shall, insofar as possible, seek the cooperation and utilize the facilities of existing State departments, institutions and agencies.

2. To carry out the purposes of this act there is hereby appropriated to the State Board of Higher Education the sum of thirty thousand dollars for each year of the biennium beginning July one, nineteen hundred fifty-two. Payments from this appropriation shall be made on warrants of the Comptroller issued upon vouchers signed by the chairman of the Board or such other person as shall be designated by the Board for such purpose.

3. If any provision of this act, or the application thereof to any person or circumstance, is held invalid, by a court of competent jurisdiction, the remainder of this act and the application of such provision to other persons or circumstances shall not be affected thereby.

4. All acts and parts of acts in conflict herewith are repealed to the extent of such conflict.

### A B I L L

Declaring the public policy of the State in respect  
to endowment funds of State-supported institutions  
of higher education.

Whereas, the State-supported system of higher education can be greatly strengthened by increases in the endowment funds of the several institutions of higher education derived from private sources; and

Whereas, prospective donors to the endowment funds of the several institutions hesitate to contribute thereto on the ground that, to the extent that the income of the respective institutions is increased from private

## HIGHER EDUCATION IN VIRGINIA

sources, the State will withdraw its support; and

Whereas in Section 10 of Chapter 33 of the Acts of Assembly of 1927 the General Assembly, by setting endowment funds and income therefrom apart from other revenues of and appropriations to the institutions of higher education, indicated an intention that endowments are to be in addition to such other revenues and appropriations; now, therefore,

Be it enacted by the General Assembly of Virginia:

1. § 1. It is hereby declared to be the public policy of the State to encourage the State-supported institutions of higher education in Virginia in their attempts to increase their endowment funds.

§ 2. It is further declared to be the public policy of the State that, in measuring the extent to which the State shall finance higher education in Virginia, the availability of the endowment funds of institutions of higher education shall not be taken into consideration in, nor used to reduce, State appropriations or payments therefrom; but such funds shall be used in accordance with the wishes of the donors thereof to strengthen the services rendered by these institutions to the people of the Commonwealth.

### SUGGESTED AMENDMENT TO APPROPRIATION ACT

It is suggested that the language of the Appropriation Act, now carried as § 28 of Chapter 578, Acts of Assembly, 1950, be changed as follows:

§ 28. Every appropriation set forth in the foregoing provisions of this act for any State institution and made payable from the general fund of the State treasury is to supplement revenues earned and collected by such institution, exclusive of such revenues paid into the general fund of the State treasury, and shall be paid from the general fund of the State treasury only insofar as shall be necessary to provide for the maintenance and operation of such institution; each such appropriation may be reduced by the Governor insofar as the same is not so required; provided that, in the discretion of the Governor and if recommended by the State Board of Higher Education, each institution of higher education may, if revenues earned and collected by such institution exceed estimates, be allowed to accumulate from such revenues an amount not in excess of ten per centum of the total appropriation to such institution, which sum shall be available for reappropriation to such institution as a reserve to meet extraordinary conditions.

---

### Background of Findings and Recommendations

The masses of material accumulated by the committee and which are the underlying data for the findings and recommendations above set forth are too voluminous for inclusion in this report. They are well summarized in the report of the consultant which now follows:

HIGHER EDUCATION IN VIRGINIA

REPORT OF THE CONSULTANT ON HIGHER EDUCATION

to the

COMMITTEE OF THE VIRGINIA ADVISORY LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

---

Letter of Transmittal

---

Gentlemen:

I have the honor to submit herewith my report as your consultant. In doing so I wish to record my keen appreciation of the cordial cooperation you have given to me as my work has proceeded. I am deeply interested in the problems you face and earnestly hope that you will find the soundest solution for them.

I am grateful to the staff of the Division of Statutory Research and Drafting for the kindly and effective way they have done everything possible to facilitate my work. The presidents and other officers of the institutions and officers of the State Department of Education have given freely of their time in supplying information and counsel. Of especial value has been the cooperation of the State Auditor of Public Accounts in carrying out unit cost studies at the several institutions.

Respectfully submitted,

Fred J. Kelly

July 1, 1951

\* \* \* \* \*

Report of Consultant

I. The Background of the Study

Virginia has had a very interesting experience with State-sponsored educational surveys. Each of these surveys included studies of the State's publicly controlled colleges and universities. In the last thirty-two years the General Assembly has authorized five such studies and the Governor one. The General Assembly and the successive Governors have thus manifested a deep interest in higher education. But more, they have manifested a troubled sense of uncertainty about whether the State was getting one hundred cents worth of higher education for each dollar it was appropriating for these colleges and universities.

Let us recall first what the 1950 General Assembly had principally in mind when it directed the Virginia Advisory Legislative Council to make the present study. It passed House Joint Resolution No. 47.

## HIGHER EDUCATION IN VIRGINIA

This Resolution directed the Virginia Advisory Legislative Council to "make a thorough study of the State-supported institutions of higher learning \* \* \* giving particular attention to possible consolidation of overlapping functions, and any other matters which in its opinion result in inefficiency or duplication of expense and effort". The Resolution then sets forth 12 particular problems which the Council is instructed to consider in its study.

In making the study thus defined it will be useful for the Council to have in mind what the previous studies dealt with and what their principal conclusions were. I shall do little more here than to call attention to them but they merit careful examination.

The first Virginia State survey of education was ordered by the General Assembly of 1918. The Education Commission which was then created consisted of members of both houses of the General Assembly, the State Superintendent of Public Instruction and three educators appointed by the Governor. The director of the survey was Professor Inglis of Harvard University. The Report, a volume of 400 pages,<sup>1</sup> is devoted mainly to the public schools. It has two sections, however, dealing with teacher training. Even though in 1916, only three years earlier, the four boards then in control of the four normal schools for white women had been abolished and the schools placed under a single State Normal School Board, the Education Commission recommended the abolition of the State Normal School Board, and that the normal schools be placed under the control of the State Board of Education.

The language of the Commission in making the above recommendation is significant: "This arrangement will not only make possible the conduct of the normal schools in more intimate connection with the public school system, but will aid in the solution of the related problem in Virginia, namely, the reduction in number of the present multiplicity of boards". (p. 35)

The recommendations of the survey staff contain the following paragraph which is indicative of an awareness of the need for coordination even if it appears a bit confused as to the machinery for accomplishing it: "That the control and supervision of all normal schools and of all teacher training departments of State institutions be centralized in the State Board of Education and that the several Boards at present exercising such control be abolished". (p. 160)

Thus, as early as 1919 the problem of coordination among the State colleges and universities was felt to be acute in the field of teacher training.

The second comprehensive survey<sup>2</sup> was the one authorized by the General Assembly of 1927. The report of the Survey Staff and of the Educational Commission of Virginia to which the Staff reported was made public in 1928. Its treatment of the field of higher education occupies 85 printed pages in addition to voluminous tables. All the important aspects of higher education were studied.

<sup>1</sup> Education Commission's Report to the Assembly of Virginia, Richmond, Everett Wadley Company, 1919

<sup>2</sup> Public Education in Virginia, a Report of the Educational Commission of Virginia, Richmond, Superintendent of Public Printing, 1928

## HIGHER EDUCATION IN VIRGINIA

Recommendations were made by the survey staff and repeated by the Educational Commission of Virginia touching most of the problems revealed by the study. While these recommendations covered such questions as admission requirements, the education of women, provisions for research, increased faculty salaries and many others, the first eight recommendations dealt with how to eliminate duplications at the several institutions. Reminiscent of the 1919 report duplication appeared to be the central issue of the study in 1928 just as it is in the present one. It will be remembered that the Educational Commission in 1928 recommended the creation of the office of Chancellor of Higher Education as a method of bringing about coordination among the programs of the several colleges and universities controlled by the State.

In 1935, the Governor requested Dr. William H. Stauffer to study and report upon certain aspects of the financing of State institutions of higher learning in Virginia. In his report <sup>1</sup> Dr. Stauffer includes much information about income, expenditures and per student costs at the several institutions. He concludes his report with a series of recommendations to remedy the faults he found. While growing out of his studies of costs the recommendations cover many basic educational policies. What Dr. Stauffer says about duplication is summed up in his conclusion No. 2: "The duplication of similar work among the institutions in certain fields calls (attention) to a need for an allocation of instructional functions which will best serve the citizens of the State with greater economy". (p. 67)

Again in 1944 the General Assembly created the Virginia Education Commission to "make a thorough and complete study of the system of public free schools in Virginia" and "a like study of the present methods of educating, instructing and training the teachers in said schools". This latter charge required an examination of a very important function of all the State controlled colleges and universities except two. This function, teacher education, is the dominant function of some of the institutions.

The Commission made two reports <sup>2</sup>. In both of these, an array of facts and recommendations reveal a comprehensive grasp of all the major problems confronting the State in its efforts to strengthen the teaching personnel in the public schools.

Following the Introduction, the first and most basic chapter in the second report cited above is entitled "Closer Integration of Effort Needed". Here is a very thoughtful proposal for the creation by law of a "Council on Teacher Training". The functions of this Council would be "policy formation and coordination of effort among the State Department of Education and the several institutions represented".

<sup>1</sup> Higher Education in Virginia, Report by Wm. H. Stauffer, House Document No. 3, Richmond, Division of Purchase and Printing, 1936.

<sup>2</sup> The Virginia Public School System, a Report of the Virginia Education Commission, Senate Document No. 1, Richmond, Division of Purchase and Printing, 1945  
and  
Teacher Training in Virginia, a Supplementary Report of the Virginia Education Commission, Richmond, Division of Purchase and Printing, 1945.

## HIGHER EDUCATION IN VIRGINIA

Here again is a recognition of the fact that in the field of teacher training which touches not only most of the publicly controlled institutions but the privately controlled ones as well, the central problem is coordination.

In 1947, Griffenhagen and Associates were engaged to study the many aspects of state government. Their report No. 11 submitted to the Commission on Reorganization of the State Government deals with publicly controlled colleges and universities. It is entitled "Proposed Department of Higher Education"<sup>1</sup>. This report gives for each publicly controlled college and university in Virginia a fairly full account of its development, functions, legal authorizations, administrative staff, income and expenditures. This account is followed by comments designed to point out needed changes at the several institutions. The final section of the report contains recommendations on organization and allocation of functions.

Central among these recommendations is that there should be created a single State Board of Higher Education to replace the present governing boards of the several institutions, and that a chancellor of higher education should be the executive officer of this board.

Thus once more coordination is seen to be the central problem in the minds of those who studied the State program of higher education.

The above hasty review of the five previous State surveys or studies is sufficient to reveal that the main problem which troubled the 1950 General Assembly was the same as the problem which troubled the General Assembly or the successive Governors for three decades. That problem is, "how may Virginia have the most effective and economical system of State controlled colleges and universities? What degree of coordination of institutional programs is required to assure such a system and how may this coordination be best accomplished?"

It seems appropriate to raise the question, "Why does this problem persist?" Repeatedly the General Assembly has had facts assembled and recommendations made looking to the solution of this problem. Why has no recommended solution been accepted?

Perhaps if the Council in its present study can answer that question it will be able to direct its own study more wisely. Certain it is that what is most wanted is an arrangement under which the successive General Assemblies and the people they represent will have full confidence in the administrative management of the State colleges and universities; that the programs these institutions maintain are operated with but one purpose, namely to serve the interests of the State and the Nation; that the appropriations which these institutions request have been examined and approved by an agency competent to see the total State program of higher education and qualified to understand the relationship of each institution to that total.

Perhaps much good has come from each of the previous State studies. It must be acknowledged, nevertheless, that on the main issue of all of them, the case seems to lie about where it did thirty years ago. Possibly the reason is not hard to find. Each study report contained many recommendations.

<sup>1</sup> Proposed Department of Higher Education being Report No. 11 prepared by Griffenhagen and Associates for the Commission on Reorganization of the State Government 1947 (mimeographed)

## HIGHER EDUCATION IN VIRGINIA

Many of these recommendations any General Assembly would be bound to find controversial. By their very nature, many of these recommendations concerned matters which Assemblymen could not be expected to agree upon. In fact most Assemblymen would probably regard many of the issues involved in these recommendations as being outside their special field of competence. Is it not likely that the inclusion of an array of such recommendations in previous reports may have accounted at least in part, for the fact that little has been done to solve the main problem, namely, coordination? At any rate, my first suggestion is that the study of 1951 shall give primary emphasis to coordination and to the machinery best designed to bring it about. I believe the final report should contain no recommendations concerning matters which should be sifted first by some permanent State agency qualified to study the whole gamut of policies underlying the system of State controlled colleges and universities.

In other words, I believe the present study should concentrate on solving the problem of coordination. It should avoid distracting recommendations concerning detailed controversial matters. When once the machinery to assure a State-wide coordinated program is set up, most of these controversial matters will be settled properly outside the halls of the General Assembly. They will be settled by a State educational agency which will be set up for that purpose. This agency will become more competent with each year of its experience. It will be able to see each educational problem in its proper relation with all other educational problems. Problems thus solved are likely to stay solved. The General Assembly will be less likely to feel the need of frequent State studies of higher education, but can give its attention to matters of policy which have a bearing upon appropriations or upon the welfare and interest of the State. Of course such a State Educational Agency must always be subject to control by the General Assembly.

### II. Developing an Adequate Higher Education Program

The special committee of the Virginia Advisory Legislative Council invited the writer to serve as its consultant, following a conference in which it was agreed that the study should concentrate on the question of the proper set-up for the coordinated control of higher education in the State. Some consideration was to be given to the several questions in the Joint Resolution No. 47 but as consultant, I was to devote my time mainly to the issues involved in a sound plan for Virginia to follow in administering her State program of higher education.

In carrying out this assignment, there are two separate tasks: First I must undertake to portray as clearly as I can a picture not so much of what Virginia's program of higher education is now but rather what it seems destined to become in the early future; and secondly, I must then indicate the essentials of the administrative set-up which seems to me best designed to enable Virginia to carry out that program with maximum efficiency and economy. In other words before a plan for economical administration can be recommended, one must have a clear view of the program to be administered.

The first of these two tasks is the more difficult. It calls of course for an understanding of the services now being rendered by the ten existing institutions. But these services must be viewed against a background of the many yet unsolved educational problems which Virginia in common with many other states now faces. Planning for the higher education of tomorrow is the most important task of the higher educational leaders of today.

## HIGHER EDUCATION IN VIRGINIA

It is not enough, therefore, to plan for the economical and efficient administration of the present programs of the ten institutions. The needed programs must first be envisaged. The plan of administration must then be devised which will most nearly assure the economical carrying on of that program.

### Broadened Services.

What, then, in broad outline, in addition to present services of the ten institutions, are the essentials of that higher education program which Virginia may wish to develop for tomorrow?

1. Strengthened elementary and secondary schools. This needs no argument. Wherever one looks he sees children and young people who might be healthier in body, more self-reliant in spirit, better informed about today's problems, and more capable in their work if they had had better schools. To improve these schools through better prepared teachers is a first obligation of higher education.

A program of research in education comparable with the program of research in agriculture as now carried on by the Virginia Polytechnic Institute, would no doubt bring about improved methods in teaching as significant as the improved methods now used in farming. Setting up in consequence of this research more effective programs for the education of public school superintendents, principals and teachers would pay rich dividends. Providing new teachers with in-service aids to help them reach their maximum effectiveness would be merely to increase the return on the money already invested in their education.

All these things call for careful research and for a broader and more carefully integrated program of teacher training by most of the colleges and universities of the State, not alone those colleges under the control of the State Board of Education.

2. Better health. We are all proud of the achievements of our doctors, dentists and medical scientists. The lengthened span of life, the near eradication of such diseases as smallpox and malaria, the recent development of a long list of wonder drugs, and the generally greater alertness of people to the care of their bodies, particularly their teeth, all testify to the great strides made in improving health.

But these achievements must not be allowed to blind us to the yet unsolved problems in the field of health. The doctors are the first to acknowledge these needed improvements. Better facilities for the care of the sick must go hand in hand with improved measures to prevent sickness.

The measures for preventing sickness while still calling for much research are basically educational. Virginia with her two medical schools may well lead the states in that program of popular education to keep people well.

To be more specific, colleges of medicine everywhere have given almost sole attention to training doctors, dentists, pharmacists and nurses to care for people who are sick. To be sure here and there practitioners carry on certain preventive measures. Dentists notify their patients periodically of the time for another visit to the dentist. School systems arrange with doctors, dentists and nurses for periodic examinations of



## HIGHER EDUCATION IN VIRGINIA

school children. But even these measures are essentially methods of detecting disorders in their incipient stages, not methods of keeping disorders from beginning in the first place. Even schemes of so called health insurance are devices to assure the patients' ability to avail themselves of medical care when they are sick, not devices to help them stay well.

There are a few schools of public health to train doctors to engage in activities designed to keep people well. Graduates of these schools are found mainly in the employ of State, county or city boards of health, city school systems and the like. Maybe that sort of division of labor between curing the sick and preventing sickness is necessary. Maybe a single individual would find too difficult the preparation for both services. In any case both services are necessary.

While states are trying to solve the problem of getting medical service for rural communities; while communities here and there are contributing to the cost of building small hospitals and of equipping clinics so as to attract good physicians; while these and other efforts are being made to improve medical care, maybe it is time to combine with those efforts corresponding efforts toward preventing sickness. Imagine the services that could be performed by even one public health nurse in each county! But how can a doctor make his living if he keeps people well? How can a dentist make his living if teeth don't decay? Or why should a drug store not be a health store where people can buy the kinds of foods public health doctors recommend as well as the drugs the physician prescribes?

These questions are the sort which the health experts must answer. Medical schools, especially those supported in part from public funds, should help to answer them for tomorrow.

3. Better research in the conservation and utilization of the State's natural resources. One of the State's richest resources is agriculture. Fortunately, the statesmen of decades ago saw the need for research in agriculture. Every state now has its agricultural experiment station. We are all acquainted with the almost miraculous gains in the quality of grains, fruits, livestock and other agricultural products. These gains have been made largely as a result of research and the educational program carried on to spread its findings.

But developments with other natural resources, seafood, minerals, coal, waterpower, etc., wait upon research in the university comparable with the current research in the land-grant college.

4. Short technical and semi-professional courses. For every engineer, industry needs several technicians. Doctors and dentists need laboratory technicians to help them. Practical nurses can do much to solve the nurse shortage. In almost every professional pursuit there is need for persons with less than full professional training. Besides there are increasing demands for skilled workers in the many callings needed to keep the wheels of this modern machine age running.

These are all responsible callings, training for many of which may well be above high school. How Virginia is going to provide such short-course technical and semi-professional training is still largely an unsolved problem.

5. Research and more effective teaching in the basic arts and sciences.

## HIGHER EDUCATION IN VIRGINIA

Where would the DuPont Company be today if for decades it had not been putting millions of dollars a year into developing new chemical products? Almost every wide-awake industrial concern boasts to its stockholders of the large amount of their money it is spending for research. But the State, whose interest is the general welfare of the people, has thus far put meager funds into the support of a research program looking to the improvement of the arts and sciences basic to human welfare. We are worried about the standards of the pictures we see at the movies; we are amazed about the corruption revealed by the Senatorial investigations; we read about mounting juvenile crime with dismay; but we don't seem to know what to do about these and scores of kindred problems. Our teaching in the arts and sciences, both in high school and college, has not solved them.

These in the social realm are comparable with the problems of science which constantly face industry and which industry solves through research. The State should maintain at its institutions of higher education research comparable with the scientific research laboratories of industry, and then carry out to the schools and colleges the materials for more effective teaching to undergird and raise our cultural standards.

6. More effective education for meeting today's social and civic responsibilities. Without waiting for the results of more systematic research, there is much that can be done to prepare for the difficult problems faced today. First, the period of general education can be vitalized and extended at least two years beyond the high school for increasing numbers of young people. The social, economic, and political situation both at home and abroad is too complex for young people of high school ages fully to comprehend. Their period of formal education needs to be extended.

Second, opportunity can be greatly expanded for adults, young and old, to grow in understanding of problems they must solve. Education is a continuous process throughout life and the kaleidoscopic changes taking place in society and the ideological conflict which is disturbing the nations make it imperative that a program be available which will keep adults abreast of these changes.

This program, lengthening the general education program for the high school graduates and expanding the opportunities for the education of adults, is probably the most urgent of all the demands facing higher education today. If we are to make our democratic institutions strong enough to meet the exigencies of the decades ahead, we must have positive action to that end. This is a real challenge to those who are mapping the course for higher education to take.

### The Present Programs.

Against the background of these six expanding services demanded by the conditions of today, (and there are many others) what can be said about the programs now carried on? A university with its women's branch; a polytechnic institute with its women's branch; a college; a military institute; a medical college; two teachers colleges serving also as liberal arts colleges; and a college for Negroes. In scope and in quality, as evaluated by their own presidents, these institutions are not unlike institutions in other states, better than many, not so good as some. Though rooted far back in distinguished history, they have not been too observant of the primary lesson of history, namely, adjust to the present and prepare for the future by understanding the

## HIGHER EDUCATION IN VIRGINIA

past. With a few notable exceptions they have been no more bold than their neighbors in meeting present needs and in programming for the future.

This is not intended to reflect discredit upon Virginia's institutions. As judged by traditional standards, on the whole they measure up well. If Virginia is satisfied with traditional performance, then she needs only to provide for the continued growth of her institutions along the lines of their present programs. If, however, Virginia wishes to meet the well recognized needs of tomorrow and to measure up to the vision of her son, the sage of Monticello, the greatest educational statesman this country has yet produced, she may wish to take a more leading position among the states in the quality of higher education she provides.

### Needed Adjustments.

It seems appropriate that your consultant indicate what in broad outlines he thinks the distinctive developments in the State's colleges and universities would need to be if the State moves in the direction of the expanded services outlined above. In doing so he wants it to be clear that he is not trying to say what the State of Virginia ought to do. Rather he is pointing out what he believes are the distinctive services which the present ten publicly controlled institutions will need to perform if the State wishes to have an outstanding system of higher education.

These services fall into four categories:

1. The first of these is what is customarily connoted by "The Comprehensive University". It is the university of the people, the capstone of the public school system. It is an institution working in close relation with the high schools. It provides easy transition from high school to the appropriate unit of the university for qualified young people of a wide variety of interests. It prepares these young people for all types of social, technical, professional and research services. It carries on research activities and educational programs needed to develop the State's resources. It seeks answers to the State's agricultural, technical, scientific, health, social, civic and economic problems. It stimulates the continuing education of the adult population to aid them in their enjoyment of and participation in the ever changing life around them. This "Comprehensive University" is only the modern version of Jefferson's concept of a State university a century and a half ago.

In about half the states this "Comprehensive University" is a "Land-Grant University". Why do I use the term "Land-Grant University"? Because by it is emphasized the distinguishing feature of the American State University, an institution set up to serve the higher education needs of all the people of the State. By the Land-Grant Act (The Morrill Act) of 1862, this country broke away from the university concept of Europe. The United States in the middle of the last century was a pioneer country. It was trying to give every man his chance according to his talents. But the colleges and universities of those days were patterned largely after the European universities which existed essentially to meet the needs of the professional and leisure classes. The curricula were distinctly classical and professional. In most European countries a small fraction of the young people were admitted to the secondary schools which prepared for admission to the university. The universities were a part of the machinery designed to perpetuate class distinctions then prevalent in European society.

## HIGHER EDUCATION IN VIRGINIA

This concept was alien to the new equality of opportunity which was the dominant note in the Constitution of the United States. The pioneers here wanted not a dual system of education - vocational for the masses, cultural for the few. They wanted a system of schools and colleges available alike to all who were capable of doing the work they required. The classical curriculum of the European university did not seem best suited to this common purpose. A more practical, serviceable college education was needed for those who were laying the foundation for a new democratic society.

Agricultural and mechanical societies throughout the country agitated for a new type of college. A few agricultural colleges were established before 1860, but on the whole the American College and university clientele of that time - the 1850's - resisted the change. They clung to the classical tradition. Many of their leading professors had been educated in the European universities. In the main only those young people preparing for professional or political or managerial life were attending our universities.

The wave of protest from the people, particularly the farmers, finally resulted in the passage by the Congress of the Land-Grant Act in 1859. Unfortunately President Buchanan vetoed it. It was passed again in 1862 and signed by President Lincoln. By this Act, public land was made available to establish in each State a college to serve the needs of the industrial classes. These colleges were to stress agriculture and the mechanic arts, but "without excluding other scientific and classical studies".

Each state could decide whether this land-grant college should be a part of its State university or whether it should be a separate institution. About half the States, including Virginia, established the land-grant college separate from the State university. The other half established the land-grant college as a part of the State university. But whether separate from, or a part of, the university, the land-grant concept of a people's university has come to set the pattern of thinking concerning all State-supported higher education in practically all the states.

In Virginia, V. P. I. and Virginia State College are the land-grant institutions. As such in addition to "other scientific" and general studies, they not only educate their students for all sorts of agricultural, engineering and business occupations, but they maintain a far-reaching agricultural research program, and an adult education program reaching farmers and their families in every county of the State. They thus demonstrate in their limited field what the land-grant university concept means. The need now is to expand this type of service to the other fields of higher education in the State.

In Virginia there are two groups of institutions embraced within this concept of a comprehensive university. For the Negroes, Virginia State College. It is a comprehensive, all purpose university, expected to render on one campus essentially the same services as are carried on by the University, V: P. I. and the teachers colleges. The fact that the Virginia State College is under the control of the State Board of Education which also controls Longwood College and Madison College must not lead to the erroneous conception that the State College is limited to teacher training. It is the only institution maintained for Negroes by the State. Negroes need essentially the same quality and types of higher education as do the whites. Except for such professional and graduate schools in the other State institutions as admit Negroes, Virginia State College should, and in the main does, offer a program embracing all curricula required to meet the higher education needs of the

Negroes of the State.

Naturally the expanded services mentioned earlier in this section are needed alike for Negroes and whites. The State has built a relatively high grade institution at Petersburg and it is assumed that the State will continue its efforts to develop Virginia State College so that it meets the newly recognized needs of Negroes as effectively as the other institutions meet the same needs of whites.

For the whites, the comprehensive university embraces five institutions: the University of Virginia with its woman's division, Mary Washington College; the Virginia Polytechnic Institute with its woman's division, Radford College; and the Medical College of Virginia. The fact that these five institutions are on five campuses must not obscure the fact that all are required, working together, to fill out the concept of what in many states is a single land-grant university. In many states, the programs carried on by these five institutions are carried on by the comprehensive university on a single campus.

In Virginia, then, the closest possible cooperation must be maintained among these five institutions in order that the State may realize the full value of the comprehensive university concept. Service to the people, whether research, campus instruction or adult education, must be the key note in all of their departments. This service must of course include the highest quality of work for young people of outstanding talent in all lines, for a comprehensive or land-grant university is no less an intellectual center than is any other great university. But in addition it must prepare its students for the variety of common callings which require post-high school training. Unless the State decides to establish community colleges under public school auspices the comprehensive university must establish either day or evening technical and semi-professional classes in communities within reach of the people who want such education. It must stimulate and aid communities to carry on programs of adult education dealing with the many problems and issues confronting men and women today. In short, the comprehensive university must consider the State as its campus, and the people's problems as its material of instruction.

The fact that Virginia has five campuses devoted to this work instead of one may well prove of distinct advantage provided unity of program is achieved among its several parts. Within that unified program each institution can play its distinctive role. The essential thing is that they plan and work together so that from all of them combined the State gets the service signified by the "Comprehensive University".

2. The second of these services is what is connoted by the liberal arts. Liberal arts and science are, of course, taught at the several State-supported institutions. But it is in this field that the 32 privately controlled colleges in Virginia play their most important part. The State has a vital interest in the effectiveness of the work done by these private colleges. Their services are of inestimable value to the State. In the Autumn of 1950, there were 13,760 students attending these private colleges (not all liberal arts colleges). This is more than 40% of all the college and university students in Virginia.

How can the State manifest its interest in the continued development of these private colleges? Its only financial contribution is to exempt their property from taxation. But it may be able to provide stimulation through the work of one of its publicly controlled liberal arts colleges. What college

## HIGHER EDUCATION IN VIRGINIA

could be better suited for this purpose than the College of William and Mary, revered as the second oldest college in the United States? It will be remembered too that William and Mary was a privately controlled institution from 1693 to 1906. In fact it came to be publicly controlled largely because of financial difficulties. It still has many features of a privately controlled college, and aspires to increase its endowments so as to permit it to partake even more of the nature of a private college. Its buildings are in part included in the remarkable restoration of the historic town of Williamsburg.

Here, then, is the rare opportunity for the State to encourage the development at William and Mary of a program which will be as suggestive and helpful as possible to all the privately controlled colleges of the State. Let the orientation of William and Mary be more toward the private colleges than to the other public ones in recognition of the immeasurable contribution of the private colleges to the State's welfare.

To be thus helpful, William and Mary must be enabled not only to carry on a liberal arts and sciences program of superior quality. It must utilize devices for measuring the effectiveness of its procedures. It must provide the fullest opportunity for its faculty to try new methods. It must point the way whereby the liberal arts college is to become ever more effective in raising not only the intellectual level of the people but their moral and spiritual levels as well. If democracy as a way of life is to succeed, that success will rest upon not only an informed citizenry, but also upon morally and spiritually strong individuals playing the leading roles.

Liberal arts colleges can be a most important instrumentality to accomplish this purpose. But if they are to be most effective in their efforts, they, like any other social institution, must be constantly stimulated to avoid the binding grip of tradition. They must face the problems of today and face them courageously.

The State can well afford to maintain at William and Mary a proving ground where carefully devised procedures in liberal arts education will be tried out and evaluated not only for the benefit of the students there but for the influence such try outs may have on the other liberal arts colleges in the State.

3. The third of these services is to provide leadership for the military departments of our government. Our hope that we could before now dispense with all but a skeleton of military service is again dashed. Our young people seem destined to have to be prepared for war even if chiefly as a measure for preventing war. Under these circumstances it is fitting that the young men with inclinations and talents in that direction should have an institution of highest possible standing devoted to their training. Virginia Military Institute should, therefore, be encouraged to maintain and develop its distinctive military training features and thus enabled to train in the future as it has in the past some of the country's ablest military leaders. In doing so it will at the same time prepare its students for effective participation in non-military pursuits.

4. The fourth of these services, while mentioned last, is of first importance. I refer to the education of teachers. Practically all the publicly controlled institutions and most of the privately controlled ones have teacher training as one of their objectives. The State Board of Education is responsible for certificating teachers. The State Department of Education is charged with

## HIGHER EDUCATION IN VIRGINIA

helping the communities to develop ever better schools. There is, therefore, no dearth of interest in the problem of preparing teachers for their all-important work.

But in spite of this, many of the leaders in teacher training in the State feel disheartened. Teachers are leaving the profession for better paying work. Young people are hesitating to prepare for teaching because the calling lacks prestige. Teacher training institutions are emphasizing their liberal arts programs as a means of attracting young people who may later in their course enter teacher training curricula. The State Board of Education controls three of the public institutions but there has not been developed a satisfactory plan for coordinating the efforts of all the institutions engaged in the task of training teachers.

Good public schools are the only sure undergirding for government by the people. Schools can be no better than the teachers. If well trained teachers are not available, the public is the main party concerned. Hence, to correct the situation complained of above, the active interest of the public must be enlisted. In addition, the teachers themselves must make their voices heard in behalf of better prepared teachers. Teacher training must be given a strategically important place in the organization of each institution where teachers are trained.

Then, under the leadership of the State Department of Education, all these forces, the public, the teachers and the institutions which train teachers, should be organized to develop a program which is designed to obtain for the State an adequate supply of well trained teachers. Research in education should be fostered in appropriate places. Demonstration schools should be maintained where best practices may be observed. Superior teachers in many schools should direct prospective teachers through their apprenticeship period. In short, the State's system of schools, colleges and universities should recognize jointly the responsibility of preparing teachers, and the public should assume responsibility for making the conditions such that competent persons will prepare for and remain in teaching.

### Financing The Program.

Above has been discussed briefly a more comprehensive program in higher education which the needs of today and tomorrow seem to call for. There have been suggested, also, the particular services the several institutions might render in carrying out such a program. The question of financing such a program will call for careful study by the State's leaders. Only one element in such a study will be indicated in the following paragraphs.

Basic to the consideration of this entire question of developing a more comprehensive program of higher education is the responsibility the State assumes for maintaining a State system of colleges and universities. Under the heading of "Some Considerations Underlying the Financial Support of Higher Education" there is discussed in Appendix A of this report the State-aid versus the State-support approach to the question of maintaining State controlled institutions of higher education. The State-aid approach assumes that the principal gainer from higher education is the student. Therefore whether few or many young people attend college is of no great concern to the State. On the other hand, the State-support approach assumes that the principal gainer from higher education is the State, that expenditures for higher education are largely an investment in the State's future development and that educated people are required to assure that development.

## HIGHER EDUCATION IN VIRGINIA

Of course these two approaches are not mutually exclusive. There are values to the student and values to the State. But some states, and Virginia is among them, lean toward the State-aid approach while other states, particularly those in the central and farther west, lean to the State-support approach. It is of very great importance that the distinction between those two points of view about the State's relation to higher education be understood by the leaders in Virginia. It can hardly be expected that Virginia will care to develop the more comprehensive State program described above unless it is committed to the belief that higher education is of primary importance in the development of the State. The advantage to the student is, of course, significant, but the essential reason for State support of higher education is the contribution which higher education makes to public welfare.

This completes the brief discussion of the four distinctive services which the ten institutions of higher education might render with advantage to the State. Its main purpose has been to indicate what functions would probably need to be assigned to the several institutions if the State should wish to develop a more comprehensive system of higher education. Possibly, too, this discussion will help to allay any fears that a central coordinating board, if created, would operate to curb the initiative or destroy the individuality of the several institutions. Differences of function are important among the institutions, and each institution would be expected to be encouraged by a central board to concentrate on carrying out its distinctive function.

### III. Improving Coordination in Virginia

#### The Present Situation

Public higher education in Virginia is under the control of six boards all appointed by the Governor. One board controls the University of Virginia and Mary Washington College. Another board controls Virginia Polytechnic Institute and Radford College. A third controls the Virginia Military Institute. A fourth controls the Medical College of Virginia. A fifth controls the College of William and Mary. A sixth (the State Board of Education) controls Longwood College, Madison College and Virginia State College. Some of these institutions, notably William and Mary, maintain branches which afford educational opportunities in communities other than the ten locations of the institutions named above, but for purposes of this report it seems unnecessary to name them.

The value to the State of the services of these six boards is very great. The deep interest in the institutions taken by six groups of distinguished citizens is thus assured. Each institution (or group of institutions) has the benefit of the judgment of its particular board on the basic policies under which the institution operates. A separate board tends to give to each institution a feeling of full responsibility for the success or failure of its program. It thus encourages initiative on the part of the institutions' officers, and a feeling of enthusiasm and loyalty on the part of officers, faculty, students and alumni.

One important consequence of this deep interest of institutional boards is that great care is taken in the selection of leading faculty members, particularly the institutional presidents. A visit to each institution has impressed your consultant with the high caliber of the presidents serving Virginia State colleges and universities. These presidents, in turn, can assure the selection of superior persons for the faculties.



## HIGHER EDUCATION IN VIRGINIA

There is no substitute for this type of leadership, and conscientious devoted institutional boards are an important safeguard of it.

### Illustrations of In-coordination

Along with the obvious advantages of multiple boards, there are certain disadvantages. The State colleges and universities are a part of the State's agencies designed to assure the best development of the State's resources, both human and material. As such, they must operate as a coordinated system rather than as so many unrelated institutions. Their programs must be administered with a view to serving the State's interest. Unnecessary and costly duplication of offerings must be avoided. Important higher educational needs must not remain too long unmet.

A brief review of the present situation reveals the following:

(1) Many of the institutions have a rich background of history and tradition. The status quo of each institution is jealously guarded by its officers, its alumni and by the State itself.

(2) The General Assembly and the Governor of the State have indicated their doubts about the present method of administering the State's higher education programs by ordering five State-wide studies of higher education within the last thirty-one years. These are described in the first section of this report.

(3) The duplications of curricula and courses on the several campuses which seemed to be the major reason for most of these State-wide studies and which were described in the earlier study reports still exist about as they have been in the past.

Without implying criticism of the present offerings in the several institutions, it is appropriate to call attention to certain duplications that would seem to call for special justification. These data fall into two categories: (1) small numbers of departmental majors, and (2) small classes.

Only a few illustrations will be cited to make the problem clear:

(1) In 1949-50 the numbers of students graduated with a major in the selected departments are shown in Table I.

Table I. Numbers of Students Graduated from each Institution with a Major in each of the Selected Departments, 1949-50.

	French	Spanish	Mathematics	Library Science	Chemistry	Physics	Political Science	Psychology	Sociology
University	3	3	2		38	6	17	53	14
V. P. I.					18	20			2
V. M. I.					14				
William & Mary	5	9	21	4	22	18	15	28	20
Mary Washington	3	3	8		15		6	43	12
Radford	3	3	8		4	14			10
Longwood	3	2	7		8			1	7
Madison	2	1	7	6	7	1		7	

Source: U. S. Office of Education, Earned Degrees conferred, 1949-50 Circular No. 282.

## HIGHER EDUCATION IN VIRGINIA

The figures in the above table suggest such questions as these:

Is it necessary for each college to maintain specialization majors in departments where the numbers continuing on to graduation are so small?

What would be the effect of discontinuing major sequences in, say, psychology at Longwood, and transferring the few students desiring to major in psychology to some other college?

Or discontinuing the French majors at Mary Washington, and transferring those majors to some other college?

It will be remembered that to carry even three students through the junior and senior specialization years, advanced courses must be carried for them throughout two years. If those students were transferred to some other institution where strong departments were being maintained for a sufficiently large number of students, these few additional students could be taught with a very little extra cost. A considerable saving would thus be effected and probably, too, better education would be given to the students.

The other question, that of small classes, is related to the first. It does, however, go beyond the first. Whether a college maintains a department major in, say, sociology is one question the answer to which may depend chiefly on the number of students desiring to major in sociology. How many different courses in sociology the college offers is a different question. How many small classes are taught may depend as much on the latter question as the former.

In considering this question in the Virginia institutions, it will be noted in Table II that the small classes are not found preponderantly in duplicating schools such as medicine, law and engineering. Small classes are found quite as largely in departments within colleges of arts and sciences, including the institutions devoted mainly to training teachers.

The question may well be raised, whether for a bachelor of arts degree, or a degree suited to the prospective teacher in elementary school or high school, a long list of highly specialized courses in a single department is necessary or even sound educational practice. It is recognized that there are many factors involved in the decision of an institution to offer a course for, say, four students. Some small classes are no doubt justified. But the number of such classes in Virginia seems large.

HIGHER EDUCATION IN VIRGINIA

TABLE II

The Number of small Classes (8 or fewer students) for Undergraduates  
Taught during 1950-51 (Note 1)

Numbers of classes essentially for  
undergraduates enrolling 8 or fewer  
students, 1950-51 September to June

DEPARTMENT	University	Mary Washington	V. P. I.	Radford	V. M. I.	William & Mary	Longwood	Madison	Va. State College	Totals
1. Agriculture			21						23	44
2. Architecture	8		16							24
3. Bacteriology			2	1						3
4. Biology			2	3		5	3		3	11
5. Botany			2	3						5
6. Business and commerce		4	2	10		3	4		6	29
7. Chemistry	1		12	7		5	6	4	3	38
8. Economics and accounting						3	2			5
9. Education	4		6	2		16		3		31
10. Engineering, Aeronautical	3		2							5
11. Engineering, Chemical (& ceramics)			9							9
12. Engineering, Civil			4							4
13. Engineering, Electrical			8							8
14. Engineering, Mechanical			7							7
15. Engineering, Other engineering			4						3	7
16. English		4	1		2	9	8	3	3	30
17. Fine Arts (and Drama)	12	3		9		14	3	1	7	49
18. Forestry	2		1							3
19. Geography							1			1
20. Geology			8							8
21. History		1		2		3	3			9
22. Home Economics			27	10		5	12	8	6	68
23. Industrial Arts						1				1
24. Journalism				1						1
25. Language, classical	8	5				7	4	6		30
26. Language, modern, French	2	1		3		4	2	4	7	23
27. Language, modern, German	2	1		4		3		4	2	16
28. Language, modern, Spanish	2	3		3		5	6	2	2	23
29. Language, modern, Russian	2	2								4
30. Language, modern, Other languages	1	2								3
31. Law (Jurisprudence)						4				4
32. Library Science				2			4	5	5	16
33. Mathematics (and statistics)		1	5	9		7	6	2	1	31
34. Metallurgy (and mining)			6							6
35. Military or naval science	5									5
36. Music	3	4		7			12	1	5	32
37. Philosophy	6	2				4			2	14
38. Physical education		1		5			4			10
39. Physics	3		2		2	8	3		1	19
40. Political Science	4	1				1	2			8
41. Psychology		2		3		3	4	1	6	19
42. Religious education and Bible	1			1						2
43. Sociology						1			2	3
44. Zoology			4	3						7
45. Other	1		2	1						4
TOTALS	70	37	151	86	4	111	89	44	87	679

Note 1. Branch institutions are omitted because they constitute a special problem. The Medical College of Virginia is omitted because it had no small classes.

## HIGHER EDUCATION IN VIRGINIA

It will be noted that exclusive of Virginia State College, there were a total of 592 classes with 8 or fewer students taught for undergraduates in 1950-51. Without doubt there was justification for many of them. If even half of them could have been eliminated by different administrative practices in the several institutions and by better coordination of programs among the institutions, a reduction of about 300 classes would have been accomplished. Assuming that these classes average 3 hours per week and extend for one semester, ten of them would account for the teaching load of a teacher for a year teaching 15 hours per week. These 300 classes would mean the equivalent of 30 full-time teachers.

The facts about small numbers of majors and the considerable list of small classes are not here given to indicate the need for any specific change at any particular institution. The facts do suggest the need of careful study by some agency which is looking at the several institutional programs from the point of view of the State's interest. Maybe these small classes and small numbers of majors can be justified but the reasons must be such as to satisfy the people who support the institutions.

(4) There are large and populous areas of the State that are not well served by publicly controlled institutions. The policy of establishing branch institutions has been followed by William and Mary and to a lesser extent by Virginia Polytechnic Institute and by Virginia State College. The policy has not been followed by the other institutions, even though the services they (particularly the University) could provide would be as valuable, no doubt, as the services provided by the present branch institutions. In other words, inadequate consideration has been given to State-wide planning when establishing branch institutions.

(5) Coeducation is generally accepted at William and Mary, while admission of women to the University is strictly limited. Instead a separate woman's college is maintained at Fredericksburg as a branch of the University. Much closer coordination has been worked out between Radford College and V. P. I. than between Mary Washington College and the University. Both Longwood College and Madison College now admit men students, although for decades they were institutions for women only, and no adequate legal provision has yet been made for either college to admit men students.

The question of coeducation seems to need further study and should be decided at each institution in the light of policies developed for the State as a whole. This does not imply uniformity at all institutions.

(6) The State has not provided an adequate supply of well qualified public school teachers. At the same time two former normal schools have been removed from the jurisdiction of the State Board of Education and have adopted programs likely to reduce their emphasis on teacher training, particularly for elementary teachers where the teacher shortage is most acute.

(7) There is no State-wide policy guiding the ten institutions in respect to such practices as their teaching loads, faculty retirement policies, student fees, and the like. This does not imply that there should be uniformity among the institutions in these matters.

(8) There are inadequate provisions for meeting certain State-wide

## HIGHER EDUCATION IN VIRGINIA

needs such as technical and semi-professional curricula of less than four-year length and an adequate supply of trained personnel in various fields such as nursing. In short, there is no adequate machinery to carry on continuous studies of the needs of the State for non-degree programs of higher education and to plan how best to meet those needs.

(9) There are inadequate means for bringing about effective relations with the high schools and thus assuring smooth continuity of the educational program throughout all levels. Collegiate education should be a continuation of the education carried on in the high school just as the high school program is a continuation of the work of the elementary school. The approach of the institutions to the high schools is on a competitive basis rather than the basis of a State-wide plan. This is confusing to the student and costly to the State.

(10) Even though the State Board of Education has organized the Advisory Council on Schools and Colleges, there is still inadequate coordination of the teacher training programs of the several institutions. The State Board of Education has jurisdiction over three institutions and has organized a cooperating committee in which these three and Radford College participate. But the University, Mary Washington, V. P. I., and William and Mary also train teachers and there is urgent need of better coordinating the teacher training programs of all of them ( and the private colleges also) so as to meet the vital need of well trained teachers for the public schools of the State.

(11) Many of the State's institutions are expanding into the field of graduate work. Commendable steps have already been taken on a voluntary basis to coordinate the programs of the several institutions, but much more needs to be done if graduate work is to be stimulated, is to be kept on a high standard and if expensive duplication is to be avoided.

(12) While special studies need to be made of such duplicating schools as engineering and medicine, negotiations now under way between the two medical schools suggest that there are ways to exchange services with advantages both to the institutions and to the State.

### Present Statutory Machinery for Coordination

Even though there are six boards of control each presenting its own budget request every biennium, it must not be assumed that there is no provision in the State government to coordinate these requests. The State budget officer, who is essentially a part of the Governor's office, receives all the budget requests and goes over them with the representatives of the institutions and their boards. This is commonly done in the first instance in a series of visits to the several institutions. The Governor and representatives of the General Assembly usually participate with the State budget officer in these conferences.

During the course of the hearings with the Governor, the budget officer, and representatives of the General Assembly, proposals which seem to indicate duplication or other evidences of incoordination among the several institutions are naturally questioned. Sometimes items are eliminated, or changed in amount. The budget requests, or such modifications of them as the Governor and budget officer approve, are then incorporated into the

## HIGHER EDUCATION IN VIRGINIA

comprehensive State budget report.

The State budget report thus made up goes to the General Assembly in the form of a bill containing the appropriations recommended by the Governor and his advisors. There a second process of checking on the essentiality of items begins by the committees on appropriations. Representatives of the institutions and their boards usually have opportunity to (and do) discuss their budget proposals with these committees. Here again evidences of overlapping or duplication, as well as other items, may be questioned. Hence, the General Assembly in finally making the appropriations acts as a coordinating body.

The difficulty confronting the Governor, the State budget officer and the General Assembly is that in considering the budget request of an institution no one of them can have adequate information upon which to base a sound judgment with respect to the over-all State program of higher education. That they feel the need of a better device than they have to evaluate and coordinate the proposals coming to them from the institutions is evidenced by the frequent State-wide studies they provide for. In the absence of such device they must and do make decisions anyway. They constitute the principal statutory machinery at present for coordinating the programs of the several institutions.

Under the authority vested in him, the Governor frequently exercises certain coordinating functions, usually related to finances. For example, the Governor's authorization of March 9, 1949, established a uniform scale of salaries to apply, within the institutions' ability to pay from appropriations, to all institutions except the University and the Medical College. Again, all appointments to positions on the several faculties are subject to approval by the Governor. He utilizes the personnel division of the State government for this purpose. Even though the teaching personnel are not within the jurisdiction of the State merit system, their appointment papers clear with the same personnel division as handles the merit system appointments. While the desirability of this arrangement may be questioned, it is designed to bring about a measure of central State control and thus assure a degree of coordination among the appointment policies of the several institutions.

The fact that the State Superintendent of Public Instruction is a member ex officio of all the six governing boards brings a measure of coordination into the programs of all ten institutions.

### Present Programs of Voluntary Coordination and Cooperation Among the Institutions

There are many evidences of a fine spirit of cooperation among the officers of Virginia's State colleges and universities. There is a clear determination on the part of the several presidents to work together to minimize the major evils of competition and to develop such coordinated programs as they can. Mention of a few of these evidences will serve to illustrate this commendable cooperative spirit.

(1) The Council of Presidents. For many years the presidents of the several State educational institutions have worked together as a Council. Meeting regularly, altho not frequently, they have discussed the problems common to all of them. These include in addition to their annual budgets,

## HIGHER EDUCATION IN VIRGINIA

avoiding as much duplication as possible, admission requirements, fees for out-of-State students, and the like. While no authority can be exercised by the Council over any institution, the Council exerts real influence, particularly at those times when its leadership is strong.

(2) The Advisory Council on Schools and Colleges. The State Board of Education has jurisdiction over Longwood College, Madison College and Virginia State College. It can function, therefore, to bring about good relations among these three institutions and between them and the public schools. All the undergraduate colleges, however, have need for a close working relation with the public schools. There is particular need for unity of purpose and coordination of programs among all institutions engaged in training teachers.

To accomplish these purposes, there has been set up the Advisory Council on Schools and Colleges to work with the State Board of Education. Although working without legal status, the Council proves to be a helpful device to spread understanding of the problems common to schools and colleges, and to strengthen the program of teacher training in the colleges.

(3) The Coordinating Committee representing four of the State Colleges which place major emphasis on teacher training. Even though these colleges participate in the Advisory Council mentioned in (2) above, they have developed the Coordinating Committee for the more intensive study of teacher training problems. The principal device they use is an annual work shop of several days during which, in cooperation with the State Department of Education, their representatives work out possible answers to the principal problems confronting teacher trainers.

(4) The State-wide Extension Program. In many states, the several institutions of higher education engage in off-campus class instruction in many communities throughout the State. Not infrequently classes are organized in the same community by two or more of the colleges. Such practices usually represent unjustifiable duplication. In Virginia an agreement has been worked out by which the University of Virginia Extension Division administers practically all extension class work utilizing for the purpose faculty members in nearby accredited institutions on a contract basis. A very extensive program of off-campus class instruction is thus carried on with a minimum of duplication of effort and with simple but apparently effective administrative organization.

(5) The State-wide High School Senior Testing Program. As an aid in the guidance of students and in determining their admission to college the standing of high school students on a standard college-ability test is very useful. The colleges, in cooperation with the high schools, have worked out and now operate a State-wide testing program which all the institutions make use of.

(6) The Coordinated Program of Graduate Work in Education. As teachers in the public schools in larger and larger numbers advance their education beyond the bachelor's degree, the problem of providing high quality graduate study for them becomes difficult. Few of the institutions at which they did their undergraduate work have graduate schools. A voluntary but well coordinated plan for Virginia is under consideration whereby facilities in many institutions will be utilized and high standards assured.

## HIGHER EDUCATION IN VIRGINIA

The graduate degree will be granted only by an institution which regularly grants graduate degrees.

The above six illustrations will serve to indicate the earnest efforts now put forth to coordinate on a voluntary basis the work of the several institutions.

### How Coordination is Handled in Other States

Through the past thirty-five years, in addition to other lesser changes in many states, fourteen states one after another have adopted sweeping plans to bring about better coordination of the programs of their institutions of higher education. All of these States except one formerly had multiple board organizations. These plans will be briefly discussed.

Three types of coordination have been adopted. There are variations, even within these types, but the principal distinctions among the State systems can be brought out under these types.

#### 1. A single governing board with no educational executive officer.

This is the pattern followed in Arizona, Florida, Iowa, Idaho, Kansas and South Dakota. Iowa has a finance committee of three non-board-members appointed by the board, who devote their full time to the problems which are basically financial and budgetary. The board of regents in Kansas works in close relation with the State business manager through whose office regulations for purchasing and plans for account keeping are made.

From the arrangements made in these States, the focus of interest in coordination would seem to be financial rather than educational. Coordination of educational programs in so far as it is brought about is expected to come through cooperation of institutional officers, primarily presidents and business officers, and through the pressure which emanates from consideration of budgets and appropriations. Some of the institutional heads in these States contend that ample coordination is accomplished by these means, and that the system is quite satisfactory. Others contend that the State programs do not provide as effective coordination of educational programs as might be desired. All agree that this plan is particularly deficient in its poor provisions for planning a comprehensive program to meet the State's needs.

As one interesting device for providing a central board of control with an unbiased appraisal of its educational program, Iowa's use of a periodic survey (about every ten years) by out-of-State educational leaders is suggestive. In this way, the State board of education which controls Iowa's institutions of higher education maintains a periodic check upon the educational programs it maintains.

#### 2. A single governing board with an educational executive officer, usually called chancellor.

Georgia, Montana, New York, North Dakota and Oregon exemplify this form of organization. In addition, North Carolina has combined the University at Chapel Hill, the College of Agriculture and Engineering at Raleigh and the Woman's College at Greensboro under a single board,



## HIGHER EDUCATION IN VIRGINIA

although the other State institutions are still governed by separate boards. A borderline State lying between types 1 and 2 is Mississippi which has a central board with an executive secretary who exercises less authority than does the executive officer in each of the five States named in group 2, but more authority than any officer of the board exercises in the States in group 1.

The title of the chief executive officer of the central governing board in Georgia, Montana and Oregon is Chancellor; in North Dakota, Commissioner of Higher Education; and in North Carolina and New York, President. The heads of the several institutions operating under the central boards in all these States are designated as presidents except in North Carolina where the title of Chancellor is used.

The essential characteristic of this group of States is their attempt to develop a unified system of higher education under one head. The institutions are regarded as constituent units of the system. The approach to the legislature is through a single board and in some States the appropriation is made in a lump sum to the board. The allocations of the appropriations are then made to the several institutions by the board.

The presence in the organization of a chief executive officer (chancellor) is designed to assure unification of the educational programs of the several institutions, thus making possible well coordinated budgets for presentation to the legislature. The presence of such an officer makes possible also a more satisfactory allocation of funds to each institution in case the legislature appropriates less than the budgets approved by the board.

There are a number of special functions which the Chancellor's office is coming to perform to a greater or less degree for all the institutions under the board's jurisdiction. Among these may be mentioned: (1) purchasing of major items of educational equipment; (2) operating a merit system for the non-educational personnel; (3) maintaining an architectural service to aid in planning and erecting buildings; (4) operating retirement systems for all institutions; and (5) serving as an approving agency for the chartering of new colleges. These and other special functions which can be carried on better on a State-wide than on an institutional basis are believed to represent some of the economies that may be claimed for the single board scheme.

Comments of reputable citizens in these States emphasize both strengths and weaknesses of the system. Among the strengths regarding which there seems to be general agreement are:

- a. A single board with a thoroughly competent executive officer tends to bring about unity of purpose and plan among the institutions comprising the system.
- b. It reduces unjustifiable duplication of educational offerings and thus substitutes cooperation for competition among the constituent institutions.
- c. The plan develops good will on the part of both the public and members of the legislature, and tends to turn the interest of legislators to the comprehensive State program and away from institutional rivalries.
- d. There are economies in operating some functions on a State-wide

## HIGHER EDUCATION IN VIRGINIA

basis rather than on an institutional basis.

Among the weaknesses which are believed to inhere in the plan as it operates in at least a number of these States are:

a. A satisfactory line of authority between the office of the chancellor and of the institutional president is difficult to draw.

b. There is a tendency for the board to regard the institutions as arms of a central university rather than a group of federated institutions, thus reducing the degree of autonomy of each institution and hence reducing the authority and prestige of the institution head and other officers so much as to make the positions unattractive to first rate persons.

c. The tendency to build up more and more administrative and supervisory functions in the Chancellor's office is hard to resist because the chancellor is regarded as the principal if not the sole contact between the institutions and the board. This tendency slows up administration and undermines the work of certain administrative officers in the institutions.

d. Loyalty of its friends is an important asset of any institution. It is difficult to build up loyalty to a State system comparable with the loyalty to an individual institution.

One variation of these first two plans is worthy of note. The State board of control for higher education operates within the jurisdiction of the State board of education, in Florida and New York, and administers all levels of education in Idaho and Montana.

The peculiar significance of this arrangement is its recognition of the need for coordination not only among the several institutions of higher education in a State but also among the several levels of education. One of the problems confronting education in most of the States arises from the fact that the control over elementary and secondary education is exercised by one agency while the control over higher education is exercised by another. The colleges which were established to train teachers are an exception in many States where they are under the control of the State board of education.

3. A central board with strictly limited functions, and separate boards for the several types of institutions.

The last plan to be discussed is represented by Oklahoma. In this relatively new State there have existed for many years the following boards of regents: one for the University, one for the women's college, one for the military academy, one for the six institutions specializing in agriculture and engineering (including the university for Negroes) and one for the six State colleges (formerly teachers colleges). Ten years ago, the State created the State Board of Regents for Higher Education to coordinate the programs carried on by all these boards but left in existence the boards which administer the institutions as before.

The distinctive feature of the Oklahoma plan is the strict limitation of functions vested in the central overall board. This board has five functions as prescribed in the State Constitution. These are to: (1) prescribe standards, (2) assign curricula, (3) grant degrees, (4) recommend to the legislature budget allocations to each institution and (5) recommend to the legislature proposed student fees.

## HIGHER EDUCATION IN VIRGINIA

The legislature later provided for the following budget procedure: The board receives the budget requests from all the institutional boards, and from these requests compiles a single budget for higher education which it presents to the legislature. After the legislature makes a lump sum appropriation in whatever amount it sees fit, the overall board makes allocations to the several boards at certain periods throughout the biennium covered by the appropriation. With the sum thus allotted, each board (through the institutional officers) manages the institution or institutions under its jurisdiction subject only to the authority vested in the central board.

To carry out such a program, the central board has a chancellor with a very small staff. His office is concerned not with administrative actions such as approving appointments, approving allotments of funds to the several departments of an institution, or approving salary changes. His office is concerned rather with assembling data with respect to needs for higher education in the State, and that justify allotments of funds to the several boards, and that will guide the central board in its decisions with respect to the successive budget proposals it makes to the legislature. The chancellor and the central board are free to devote their major attention to these policy problems because they are not burdened with the details of administration at any institution.

In addition to the plans found in the 14 states mentioned above, there is a plan of voluntary coordination which deserves mention. As indicated earlier in this report, the Council of Presidents in Virginia performs useful service in developing common understanding of many problems on the part of the presidents of all the State institutions.

This plan with many variations is found in several states. Perhaps the state where it functions most effectively is Ohio. In that state there are six publicly controlled institutions, all universities. Almost 10 years ago the six institutions joined to create a coordinating council consisting of the president, the chief finance officer and a board member from each institution, 18 Council members in all. This council has no legal status but it considers many problems affecting the programs of the several institutions. Its principal function is to work over the several budget proposals and agree so far as possible upon a total budget for each of them which all institutions will combine in advocating.

In evaluating the work of the Ohio Council, account must be taken of the fact that the legislature of Ohio years ago enacted statutes delimiting the functions of the then existing State universities in Ohio.

Another approach along similar lines is represented by the law passed by Indiana in 1949. By this law the State institutions were required to "cooperate in working out a formula to be presented to the legislature and any other proper authorities for budgetary purposes". Thus the institutions were required to agree among themselves on the basis of division among them of whatever total the legislature appropriated for higher education.

### Recent Studies in Arkansas and Texas

Arkansas and Texas are, like Virginia, among the states with many boards in control of their institutions of higher education. Both Arkansas and Texas provided in their 1949 legislative sessions for comprehensive studies of their systems of publicly controlled colleges and universities. In

## HIGHER EDUCATION IN VIRGINIA

preparation for their 1951 sessions of their legislatures each state published a report in January, 1951.

As might have been expected, the Commission on Higher Education in Arkansas and the Legislative Council in Texas each centered its report on the need for some plan of coordinating the work of the several institutions. Because of the similarity between the situations in Arkansas and Texas and the situation in Virginia, the findings and recommendations in these two reports are made a part of this report.

At this writing, neither state has enacted laws to give effect to these recommendations.

From a Report - January 1951, to the  
Legislature of the State of Texas by the  
Texas Legislative Council

Composed of

10 members of the House of Representatives

5 members of the Senate

THE TEXAS LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL, after a careful review of Staff Research Report No. 51-4, "Public Higher Education in Texas" and No. 51-2, "The Community Colleges of Texas," after holding of a public hearing, consultation with the Advisory Committee on Higher Education and with interested citizens, and a due deliberation and consideration of the subject. FINDS:

1. That Texas has no statewide coordinated "system" of higher education, which results in uneconomical operation and, in all probability, does not give the people of Texas full value for the funds expended.

2. That the central reason for the lack of efficiency lies in the fact that the roles of the several institutions are not limited or clearly defined, thus giving rise to an unplanned and uncoordinated system with unnecessary duplications of programs, overlapping functions, competition among the institutions, and general inefficiency from a statewide viewpoint.

3. That there is now no central direction to the system and no effective facility to eliminate unnecessary duplications, overlapping functions, and competition, and bring order to the State system.

4. That this problem is enhanced by the fact that student enrollment is likely to increase by at least one-third within ten years, and there is no way to plan for this additional load in an effective and economical manner.

5. That a distinction should be made between the kind of a study made by the Council which has been directed more to defining the problem and working toward the machinery necessary to give us an effective system of higher education and the kind of constant study of the needs of Texas for different educational programs and the definition of the number and the roles of the institutions in supplying these programs efficiently. The first has been

## HIGHER EDUCATION IN VIRGINIA

done; the latter remains the central problem.

6. That there are many problems which are beyond the purview of any one institution, and there is no framework in which to seek solutions.

7. That costs have gone up and are likely to go even higher--there is no overall attempt or facility to eliminate program duplication, to coordinate effort and facilities to the best interests of the State.

8. That the techniques of financing promote competition for students to such an extent that there is a tendency to lower standards and spread programs in an effort to attract students.

9. That there is lack of information and understanding of the educational program and it is impossible to tell whether the State is getting a dollar value out of the money spent in Higher Education from an overall State point of view.

10. That Texas has much to be proud of in connection with its Higher Education program--especially in terms of the availability of educational opportunity for the people of the State.

11. That there are many situations that point to the fact that there are no facilities for making decisions in Higher Education from a statewide viewpoint.

12. That there is considerable fear on the part of the educator and many citizens of a central authority in the education field and thus some reluctance to take a chance with any central agency. However, because of the failure of past efforts (begun in 1921 with a survey and a restudy in 1923 with recommendation in 1925, the 1929 act placed recommending powers in the State Board of Education, another study and recommendation in 1933) because of the increased future educational needs facing the State in the next decade, and because of the necessity of bringing these demands for educational service into balance with a sound State financial program we feel the time has come for the Legislature to face the issues involved and take the necessary action.

THEREFORE, THE TEXAS LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL RECOMMENDS:

1. That the State accept its responsibility in the field of Higher Education by providing leadership and coordination; however, maintaining local autonomy in the administration of institutional affairs in order to protect the genius of American freedom of education.

2. That this be done by creating a coordinating agency on Higher Education with authority and responsibility to determine the role of each institution, the degree programs to be offered and the services to be rendered. This identification of role and determination of function of each institution is a job requiring detailed study and constant surveillance to meet the changing need of the State in Higher Education and at the present there is no way to accomplish it.

3. That the coordinating agency shall not have authority to determine administrative practices in institutions of higher learning, content of courses, faculty employment, schedules, or any other matter that pertains to the

## HIGHER EDUCATION IN VIRGINIA

administrative policies that fit into the framework of the role and function of the institution.

4. That any institution may appeal a determination on its role by the coordinating agency to the Legislature; if the institution does not file an appeal within 90 days--then it would become final. If an appeal is filed, briefs shall be prepared and presented to the next session of the Legislature for final decision.

5. That the coordinating agency shall have the power to instruct the Comptroller of Public Accounts to stop the issuance of warrants for any institution found violating its role or function.

6. No new public institutions of higher learning of junior or senior rank shall be created without the approval of the coordinating agency and a report of the new institution's role should be made to the Legislature.

7. That the coordinating agency shall consist of a board and shall be provided with a small staff, largely research, to assist it with its duties and shall have the power to secure whatever information it desires concerning higher education.

8. That no programs or degrees should be added by any educational institution which were not in existence on October 1, 1950 without the specific approval of the agency (any emergency exception could be made prior to functioning of coordinating agency by TEA which could also handle exceptions for Lamar in accord with Legislative intention if needed).

9. That the agency coordinate the preparation and presentation of institutional budgets, making recommendations to the Legislative Budget Board and certifying whether the Budgets are for programs within the institution defined role; also, the agency shall present an overall integrated program budget analysis.

10. That the coordinating agency study continually all phases of Higher Education and make recommendations to the Legislature for the improvement of the educational system.

11. That the coordinating agency take the leadership in cooperative arrangements with boards and staff of the institutions to work on problems for the improvement of Higher Education, such as standards, best practices, transfer credits, etc.

From a Report January 1951, to The Governor and  
the Members of the General Assembly of Arkansas  
by

The Arkansas Commission on Higher Education  
consisting of

5 persons appointed by the Governor  
5 members of the House of Representatives  
3 members of the Senate  
8 representatives of the state colleges and  
universities.

## HIGHER EDUCATION IN VIRGINIA

### GENERAL CONCLUSIONS

More than three-quarters of a century ago the State of Arkansas accepted the responsibility for providing its citizens public facilities for higher education. In all, nine institutions have been established and maintained by the State. Some have advanced from the high school to the junior college to the senior college level. New courses of specialized study have been added, physical plants have been expanded, entire degree-granting schools have been established.

The services these institutions have rendered the State are beyond calculation. They have changed in character and function as the State has changed, altering their concepts to meet the increasing demands of the people they served. All the institutions, from their inception, have operated under severe financial handicaps. While the State has made regular appropriations for each institution, the appropriations have rarely kept pace with their steady expansion. One result has been that the college students of Arkansas have had to bear a large share of the financial burden of operating these institutions - a situation which has deprived many deserving young people of an opportunity for higher education.

Under these circumstances, the sound and enduring progress made by these institutions is remarkable. In many cases lack of funds has been made up by the dedication of administrative and faculty personnel and by the determination of young Arkansans to obtain an education no matter what the personal sacrifice might be.

In the course of its survey this Commission has found certain major weaknesses in the system of higher education in Arkansas. But in no case has it found cause for personal criticism of the men and women now holding positions of responsibility in these institutions. Without reservation, the Commission can commend them for the job they have done and are doing.

### RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THE CONTROL OF HIGHER EDUCATION

The fact that Arkansas maintains more institutions of higher learning than many states has led some observers to the conclusion that the State has too many colleges. In terms of the financial support it has made available to them, this is probably true. But in terms of the need for higher education in the State it is not true. There is not too much higher education in Arkansas; but there are serious questions, stemming principally from financial limitations, concerning the kind and quality now available.

Historically, the General Assembly has exercised its principal control over these institutions through its appropriations. Each institution is at present autonomous, operating under a board of trustees fully empowered to conduct its internal and external affairs. There are virtues in this independence, as the Commission recognizes. But there are also hazards. There has been a natural tendency for the General Assembly to consider the problems of each institution - and they are usually financial - separately. The institutions, therefore, have had no option but to compete for legislative favors. The result has been a piece-meal approach to appropriations for higher education in Arkansas which has sometimes favored one institution at the expense of another.

The competition among the institutions has had other adverse results.

## HIGHER EDUCATION IN VIRGINIA

The original limitations of transportation which dictated the geographical location of some institutions have long since vanished. No institution now draws its students exclusively from its immediate area. Since every institution has an understandable ambition to grow in size and importance, and since appropriations have often been contingent upon enrollment, all the colleges now gladly accept, if they do not actively recruit, students from any section of the State. In some cases special courses have been established to meet the demands of comparatively few students, with a resulting disproportion of work load for instructors, a lowering of standards of instruction, and a generally uneconomic operation. In the absence of effective coordination, several institutions have responded to the pressure for additional teacher training by establishing off-campus centers of instruction and offering correspondence courses. In some cases the institutions were not adequately equipped or staffed for these activities, but competition for students nevertheless developed among them.

The autonomous character of the institutions has also made them peculiarly subject to local pressures from the communities in which they are located. Identity of the institution with its own locale is desirable for the most part. But in some cases local pride and local interest have forced upon the institutions courses of study which they were not adequately equipped to offer. The inevitable result has been a lowering of the standards of instruction and the devaluation of degrees.

Competition among the institutions in one sense is healthy, and the Commission believes that the identity of each should be maintained to the highest possible degree. But the wholly independent growth of each institution without regard to the overall needs for higher education in Arkansas is fundamentally unsound. The State has accepted the responsibility for supporting these institutions; it must also accept the responsibility for coordinating their activities to the end that the highest return may be obtained from the funds available for higher education.

There does not now exist in Arkansas any agency staffed and equipped to exercise the necessary degree of control over the whole system of higher education. This is a function, which obviously must be wholly divorced from politics with the exception that any control agency for public institutions must ultimately be answerable to the legislature. The Commission therefore recommends that the General Assembly immediately establish a Board of Control to coordinate the institutions of higher learning in Arkansas, and endow it with these powers:

1. To receive, evaluate and coordinate budgets from the University and the State Colleges and present to the General Assembly a single budget containing recommendations for separate allocations to each of them.
2. To allocate academic functions among the University, the two Teachers Colleges, and State Colleges, this power of allocation to be limited to programs of study leading to the granting of degrees, to terminal programs intended to be completed below the degree level, and to all off-campus instruction. Authority to determine the nature and content of instruction within these limits shall remain with each local board of trustees.
3. To maintain a continuing study of higher education in Arkansas and keep the University and State Colleges and the General Assembly advised of the results of such studies.



## HIGHER EDUCATION IN VIRGINIA

4. To represent the State of Arkansas in negotiating and executing contracts for extra-state instruction to the extent such instruction may be authorized by law.

The first recommended function would not, of course, reduce the ultimate authority of the General Assembly to determine the appropriation for each of the institutions. The proposed Board of Control would operate in this regard as an agency of the legislature-working out, on the basis of individual requests, an overall budget which would in its opinion meet the current needs for higher education in Arkansas.

The second function is a necessary corollary of the first. If the Board of Control is to have the responsibility for recommending a total budget for higher education in the State, it must have the authority to see that the funds thus made available are put to their best use. For instance, if a single institution contemplated adding to its curriculum new courses of study, the Board of Control would have to weigh the proposal in terms of the total needs of all the institutions; if it approved the addition it would then recommend to the General Assembly the appropriation of funds sufficient to guarantee that the new courses would measure up to accepted standards. The third function also is closely related to the first; if the Board of Control is to intelligently serve the General Assembly as the coordinating agency for state institutions of higher education, it must maintain current information as to their operation and needs and as to the public demand and need for higher education in the various specialized fields.

The fourth recommendation would designate the Board of Control as the agency to enter into contracts with other states under the regional plan for education now getting under way in the South. No such agency now exists.

The Board should establish a professional staff which would include an executive secretary and such other personnel as may be needed.

The executive secretary should be an educator of recognized accomplishment in his profession, possessing broad experience in the field of education and the personal qualities that would enable him to work effectively with the educators and business and professional people of the State. His salary should be \$12,000 per annum.

The executive secretary should be appointed by the Board and should serve at the pleasure of the Board.

Other professional personnel should be appointed by the Board on the recommendation of the executive secretary.

The Board should maintain an office at the State Capitol in Little Rock.

It should not be inferred from these recommendations that the Commission contemplates the wholesale curtailment of the functions of any existing institution. On the contrary, the Commission recognizes that each of the state colleges has met and will continue to meet a very real need in Arkansas. Each should continue to serve as an academic center for the area in which it is located - making available general and specialized courses of study adequate to meet local demand. Nor does it contemplate that the authority of local boards of trustees should be reduced except to the degree necessary to insure that each institution shall fit into the overall pattern of higher education in the

## HIGHER EDUCATION IN VIRGINIA

State without needless and expensive overlapping of functions. Each college president under this proposal would continue to be answerable only to his own board of trustees, and each board would continue to exercise, through him, full control over the internal affairs of the institution.

### Recent Study in Illinois

In the 1949 session of the General Assembly in Illinois, a bill "to Create a Commission to Study the Administration and Financing of Higher Education in Illinois", passed the House of Representatives but failed to pass the Senate. The conditions which seemed to require a survey were so pressing, however, that Governor Stevenson arranged with the U. S. Office of Education to make a limited study.

It was agreed that the overhead control of higher education in the state was the most urgent problem demanding solution. The staff of the Division of Higher Education of the U. S. Office accordingly concentrated their studies upon that problem. Their report entitled "Report of the Study of the Structure of the State Tax-supported System of Higher Education in Illinois" was published by the Governor of Illinois in December, 1950.

This report cites the essential facts which point to the need of better coordination of the programs carried on by the three boards controlling higher education in Illinois. There then follow descriptions of six alternative proposals for bringing about better coordination in Illinois. These descriptions are accompanied by arguments, pro and con, concerning each alternative. Space will not permit copying these proposals here but anyone studying seriously the problem of coordinating the programs of higher education in any state would do well to read the comprehensive analysis of the problem found in the Illinois report.

### The Essentials of a Satisfactory Coordinating Mechanism

In this section will be discussed the principal elements of a satisfactory coordinating set-up. While it is possible to draw upon the experience of the several states for certain opinions, unfortunately there is no way of deciding on a completely objective basis which plan is the best.

(1) The first criterion of a satisfactory plan of coordination is that the identity and individuality of each institution must be preserved. Just as it is impossible to build a strong state if the individual citizens are weak, so is it impossible to build a strong system of higher education if the individual institutions are weak. The officers of each institution must have a deep sense of responsibility for the success of the institution. The loyalty of the staff, the students and the alumni must not be undermined. That elusive but basically important spirit connoted by the term "morale" must be a positive force on every campus.

For the purpose of assuring strong individual institutions, there is no substitute for strong leadership on each campus. It must be remembered that a college is not a factory where activities can be largely standardized and output measured in some kind of units. A college is an association of human beings. The mainspring of its operation is spiritual, and is built up of inspiration, intellectual challenge and high purpose. Without leadership able

## HIGHER EDUCATION IN VIRGINIA

to give direction to these spiritual forces, and to make them effective in the control of student energies, the institution cannot hope to meet its primary obligation to the State.

(2) The second criterion of a satisfactory coordinating set-up is that the strong institutions envisaged in the first criterion should be brought to function within a framework of State interest. It is not inconsistent with strong individual institutions that the boundaries for the services of each institution should be fixed by some agency charged with looking after the State's interest. It will not weaken the spiritual power of an institution to prevent its services from spreading outside its distinctive function into fields that might be covered more effectively or more economically by some other institution. In short, in order that each institution may be assured of public understanding and public support of its program, the people and their representatives in the General Assembly must be assured that each institution is rendering its own distinctive service and that there is no unnecessary duplication of offerings among the institutions; that there is no costly competition for students and for funds among the institutions; that each institution conducts its program in a spirit of cooperation with other institutions thus encouraging the original admission of students to an institution on the basis of the State's interest, and the later transfer of students to other institutions where such transfer is in the State's interest; that policies affecting the availability of higher education to the State's qualified young people such as faculty personnel policies, student fees, coeducation, and relations of the institutions with the high schools are considered first from the point of view of the State; and that the institutions in their biennial requests to the General Assembly constitute a coordinated system of higher education for the State rather than that they should appear as ten essentially independent programs sponsored by six controlling boards.

(3) The third criterion of a satisfactory coordinating set-up is that it should provide for the collection of information upon which educational needs can be determined, sound policies can be established, and budget requests for higher education when finally submitted to the State budget office can be justified. This information would be serviceable to the several institutions in guiding their own developments. It would be serviceable, too, in determining whether there are important higher education needs not being met and if so how such needs may be met with efficiency and economy. It would help State officials such as the Governor, the budget officer, and members of the General Assembly to reach necessary decisions with greater confidence than at present.

Such a coordinating mechanism should be designed, then, to solve many problems which affect the operation of all the institutions but which cannot be solved by the institutions acting separately. It is assumed that to have these problems solved would strengthen rather than weaken each institution. It would help to assure to each institution the fullest possible opportunity to accomplish its distinctive purposes.

What are the essential features of a coordinating mechanism that will satisfy the above three criteria?

(1) As to personnel and composition for policy making.

Obviously such a coordinating mechanism must be composed of persons who command the respect and inspire the confidence of the best informed

## HIGHER EDUCATION IN VIRGINIA

people of the State. It must comprise persons who know not only the value of higher education as an essential factor in the State's development, but who place the State's interest above their loyalty to any institution. If possible, the personnel should include men and women who understand the relations of higher education to other activities which the State supports and who are acquainted with the forces which fashion legislation, including appropriations.

In addition to personnel such as described above, this coordinating mechanism should have constantly available the knowledge and experience of the leaders of the institutions. Most of the policies adopted for the State as a whole will affect some or all of the institutions. The presidents of the institutions, or their representatives, should have full opportunity, therefore, to participate in the deliberations leading to the establishment of any such policies.

To make this concrete, if the State decides to have such a coordinating mechanism, it might create a State Board of Higher Education. This Board should consist of nine persons, eight appointed by the Governor and confirmed by the General Assembly, and the State Superintendent of Public Instruction, *ex officio*.

No members of the boards controlling the several institutions should be appointed to membership on the State Board of Higher Education, but no other limitation such as geographical location, or race, or party membership should be imposed upon the appointments. One State utilizes a group consisting of the Chief Justice of the State Supreme Court, the Secretary of the State Teachers Association and the State Superintendent of Public Instruction to submit a panel of names from which the Governor makes appointments to the State Board of Higher Education. Such a device is not regarded generally as necessary to assure the selection of persons of the highest caliber. It does, however, emphasize the strong feeling on the part of most people that it is of utmost importance in making appointments to such a board, that no influence should be allowed to enter other than fitness for the performance of the duties of the board.

To assure to the board the full cooperation of the presidents of the several institutions in its development of policies looking to a coordinated State-wide program, provision should be made when the board is created for the presidents individually to present any proposals they care to, for the consideration of the board and provision also for the attendance of all presidents at perhaps two meetings of the board each year. The presidents would thus become in effect an advisory body on educational planning.

The term of each appointive member of the board should be eight years except that the first appointments would be staggered from two to eight years, two terms expiring in two years, two in four years, two in six years, and two in eight years.

Members of the board should serve without salary. They should be reimbursed for expenses incurred in the performance of their official duties and should be paid a *per diem* similar to that paid members of the General Assembly for time devoted to their official duties.

The board should decide upon its form of organization, adopt its own by-laws, elect its own officers, and decide upon the place and frequency of its meetings.

## HIGHER EDUCATION IN VIRGINIA

### (2) As to functions.

Realizing that the first criterion of a satisfactory coordinating set-up is that the separate institutions shall remain strong, and so far as possible, autonomous, the State Board of Higher Education should be limited in its functions to those activities: (a) which foster and promote coordination. This will involve coordinating the budget requests of the several institutions, controlling major program developments at the several institutions so as to avoid unnecessary duplication, suggesting expanded services where found to be needed, and establishing policies required for close cooperation among the several institutions; (b) which enhance public understanding and appreciation of the values of higher education; (c) which are designed to develop a comprehensive State-wide plan for meeting the State's needs for higher education; and (d) which provide the flow of information essential to the determination of State-wide policies and adequate to justify budget requests.

The State Board of Higher Education should not infringe upon the duties of the several governing boards but should facilitate their work and the work of the institutional officers in administering their institutions within the State-wide policies established and within the funds available to them.

It should be made clear that in coordinating the budget requests for presentation to the Governor, the board should retain at all times the identity of the budget requests from the several institutions, and make public its budget recommendations. Furthermore, the General Assembly will be expected to continue its practice of making appropriations to the institutions separately.

### (3) As to qualifications of the executive officer.

Only such staff should be employed as will enable the State Board of Higher Education to carry out the above defined limited functions. A competent executive secretary of the Board is essential to make most effective the deliberations of the Board and to see that its decisions and policies are properly executed. This executive officer must possess a high quality of educational statesmanship. He must be able to work understandingly with the leaders in the several colleges and universities of the State, must be able to interpret the program of higher education to the leading citizen groups throughout the State, must be able to gather and interpret information concerning possible duplications of offerings among the institutions, and work with the institutions to determine the procedures best designed to eliminate costly and unnecessary duplications, must be able to relate educational programs to budgets in order to prepare for the Board a coordinated budget for all institutions for presentation to the Governor.

While this executive officer will have practically no administrative duties in relation to the several institutions, he must be able, without administrative authority, to exercise effective leadership in helping to develop a sound State program of higher education.

The executive secretary should be elected by the board and his salary and duties fixed by the board. It is assumed that in the assembling of information he and the board will have the cooperation of other state agencies of government as well as of officers of the several institutions of higher education. Therefore a small office space and a very small staff should suffice. Perhaps one statistical clerk and a secretary will be found adequate as the

## HIGHER EDUCATION IN VIRGINIA

staff to help the executive secretary, depending on the program the board develops.

In summary, it will be recalled that for decades Virginia has been troubled about the problem of incoordination of the programs of her State colleges and universities. In spite of five previous State-wide studies which recommended some method of coordination, the situation remains essentially as it has been for decades except that as appropriations increase, the problem seems to get more serious.

Significant and commendable efforts are being made on a voluntary basis to increase the areas of cooperation among the institutions. These efforts are believed to be inadequate, however, because they are essentially ameliorative rather than constructive. They do not satisfy the people who still believe the institutions are managed essentially to satisfy institutional interests rather than State interests.

The problem confronting Virginia is common to many States. In various ways fourteen states have developed machinery to increase coordination among their institutions. Three other states have made studies in the past biennium and now have before their 1951 legislatures proposals for increasing the coordination of their several institutions.

The best method of coordination for Virginia is believed to be the creation of a state board of higher education with functions limited to those activities designed to develop a State-wide concept of higher education, and coordinating the programs of the several institutions in line with that concept.

### CONCLUSION OF REPORT OF COUNCIL

The Council believes that those reading the report of the consultant set forth above will concur in the recommendations of the Council which are set forth on page 8, and following, which the Council herewith renews.

In conclusion, the Council wishes to acknowledge its indebtedness to the Committee and to its consultant for the splendid task performed in analyzing the Virginia higher education system and in pointing a way in which it can be improved, and to the many other persons who assisted in the study. It particularly wishes to commend the Auditor of Public Accounts for his contribution in determining the unit costs at the several institutions and supplying other data regarding their financial affairs. And it extends its hearty thanks to the heads of the several institutions and those of their staff who cooperated fully and furnished it with much of the data on which the recommendations are based.

In closing, the Council wishes to state that it considers this report a monument to the members of the Committee and Dr. Kelly, the consultant.

Respectfully submitted,

EDMUND T. DeJARNETTE, Chairman  
BENJAMIN T. GUNTER, JR.,  
Vice-Chairman  
W. R. BROADDUS, JR.  
PAUL CROCKETT

HARRY B. DAVIS  
J. D. HAGOOD  
WILLIAM H. IRVINE  
M. M. LONG  
MOSBY G. PERROW, JR.

## HIGHER EDUCATION IN VIRGINIA

### APPENDIX A

#### Some Considerations Underlying the Financial Support of Higher Education.

##### Student Fees.

The discussion of fees in this section will be limited to fees charged for tuition and related services. Charges for board and room are in a different category and should not be commingled with fees charged for instruction. The two charges should as far as possible be kept separate in the accounts maintained by the institution, and each should be used only for the purpose for which it is collected.

How much ought publicly controlled colleges to charge students for instruction? On first thought that seems like a simple question. Colleges are always in need of more money. Why, then, should not student fees be fixed at whatever amount is believed likely to bring in the most money? To determine the optimum fee (so runs this assumption), the college must strike a nice balance between two outcomes: a fee as large as students can pay, but not so large as to deter students from attending. In other words, charge all the fees the traffic will bear.

But the question of student fees is not so simple as that. Any serious consideration of student fee policies at publicly controlled institutions reveals that the roots of the problem reach into the basic philosophy underlying public education. Is public education maintained essentially to make a better State, or essentially as a service to the individuals being educated? There is widespread agreement on this question so far as elementary and high schools are concerned. The public school system is maintained essentially as a necessary undergirding of a democratic State. On the higher education level, however, there is still wide disagreement. Opinions range from one extreme to the other. Some contend that students should pay the full cost of college education because the benefit is largely theirs. Others contend that the State should pay the full cost because the State is the principal gainer from the college education of its young people. Most opinions fall somewhere between these two extremes.

This difference in viewpoint has tended to follow geographic lines. In the older States along the Atlantic seaboard there are many who hold that the State has done its part when it provides buildings for its publicly controlled colleges and universities. The institutions should obtain funds for their current operation from other sources, chiefly student fees. While this extreme view has not crystalized into law in any State, it influences legislation in many states. Appropriations to publicly controlled colleges and universities in such states tend to be regarded more in the nature of State aid than as State support. The responsibility for financing the colleges is held to rest upon their boards of control rather than upon the State. State appropriations are regarded more as a means of enabling the institutions to balance their budgets than as a manifestation of the State's responsibility for maintaining the institutions.

Among the newer States, the opposite view more largely prevails. The responsibility for maintaining satisfactory programs of higher education is thought to rest with the State. The institutions are authorized generally to accept gifts, endowments and students fees to help the State carry its

## HIGHER EDUCATION IN VIRGINIA

responsibility, but the amount of the fee they may charge is usually small and often limited by law. In fact the publicly controlled colleges and universities in several of the states have been prohibited by their state constitutions and statutes at various times from charging tuition fees at all. A few illustrations of these prohibitions will serve to indicate the attitude of the people of these newer states.

### Constitutional or Statutory Prohibition of Student Fees.

For many years the University of Texas operated under a law which provided that it be "open to all persons of both sexes in this State on equal terms, without charge for tuition". A more recent statute fixes the tuition fee for Texas students at \$25.00 per semester.

Similarly for many years Oklahoma institutions operated under a "no tuition" statute. In recent years legal authority has been granted to charge fees.

Article 16 of the Wyoming Constitution adopted in 1889 reads as follows:

"Tuition free. The University shall be equally open to students of both sexes, irrespective of race or color; and in order that instruction furnished may be as nearly free as possible, any amount in addition to the income from its grants of lands and other sources above mentioned, necessary to its support and maintenance in a condition of full efficiency, shall be raised by taxation or otherwise under provisions of the legislature."

The idea of free tuition seems to have gained favor in the United States Congress by the middle of the 19th century. In the laws of 1851, Chapter 3, is reported an Act of the United States Congress to incorporate the University of Minnesota in the Territory of Minnesota. Section 12 of that Act reads as follows:

An Act of the United States Congress to  
incorporate the University of Minnesota.

(Laws of 1851, Chap. 3.)

"Section 12. The admission fee to the University and the charges for tuition in the several departments thereof shall be regulated and prescribed by the Board of Regents; and as soon as in their opinion the income of the University will permit, tuition in all the departments, shall be without charge to the students in the same who are residents of the territory."

### The Philosophic Issue.

This attitude toward student fees is not so important because of its effect upon the income of the institutions as it is because of the philosophy it exemplifies. These constitutional and statutory prohibitions against fees grew out of the belief that public education involving public support should extend from the first grade through the university. The advocates of this view held then and still hold that the welfare and the development of the state require free university education the same as free elementary education. The state



## HIGHER EDUCATION IN VIRGINIA

is the gainer when its youth in large numbers develop their skills and talents. It is true that in part these youth do use these skills and talents thus developed to make their living but that is largely incidental. The public benefits from the availability of good public spirited engineers, lawyers, teachers, and the like. It is better for the public at large, say these advocates of free higher education, that education for these professional services should not be limited to those who can afford to pay a tuition fee. This is particularly pertinent with reference to education for tax supported services such as public school teaching and public college teaching.

What is said about educational programs for prospective professional men and women can be said with even greater force for programs designed to prepare young people for their duties as neighbors, as parents, as citizens, as community leaders. If a large measure of individual freedom is to be preserved in a state, people must assume their social, economic, and civic obligations without coercion. Otherwise democracy cannot last. Such assumption of obligations by individuals calls not alone for elementary and secondary education for nearly everyone, but also for higher liberal education for many. The state's safety, prosperity and social progress rest upon widespread knowledge of economics, of sociology, of government, of art, of history, of chemistry, of zoology, to say nothing of agriculture, home economics, public health and the other professional fields. The state, so say the advocates of free higher education, can no more afford to impose barriers to higher education than to elementary education.

### Comparisons among States.

In this difference of philosophy are found the principal reasons why the newer states appropriate a larger amount for higher education per capita of total population, and a larger fraction of their total income for higher education than do the older states and why a larger fraction of the youth in these newer states continue their education beyond the high school. A few figures will indicate the degree of this difference.

#### State Appropriations for Current Operations of Public Colleges and Universities, 1939-40, per capita of Total Population.

New England States	\$ .75
Middle Atlantic States	.55
South Atlantic States	.81
Virginia	.88
West North Central States	1.67
West South Central States	1.60
Mountain States	2.17
Pacific States	2.10

Source: U. S. Office of Education, Statistics of  
Higher Education, 1939-40, page 26.

The Bureau of Population and Economic Research of the University of Virginia made a study of data yet unpublished supplied by the U. S. Office of Education for 1947-48. Only a few middle western states were cited for comparison. From that study the following figures are taken.

## HIGHER EDUCATION IN VIRGINIA

State Appropriations for higher education related to population and total income of the States, 1947-48.

	Per Capita State Appropriations for Higher Ed.	Per Cent of Total Income Payments of the State Appropriated for Higher Ed.
The Nation as a Whole	\$2.34	.18
The South	2.19	.24
Virginia	1.74	.17
Indiana	3.07	.24
Iowa	4.36	.34
Minnesota	3.73	.30
Washington	6.01	.42
Wisconsin	3.38	.26

Residents of Each State attending Institutions of Higher Education either Within or Outside their Home States per 1000 of total population, 1949-50.

	Students whose homes are in the State per 1000 of the total population in the State, 1949-50.
United States	16.8
Maine	10.3
Massachusetts	21.4
Connecticut	16.2
New York	20.4
New Jersey	9.7
Maryland	18.8
Virginia	8.6
North Carolina	11.3
South Carolina	11.3
Georgia	12.4
Florida	12.9
Indiana	18.3
Illinois	17.2
Iowa	17.0
Missouri	16.7
Minnesota	18.5
Wisconsin	14.9
Nebraska	17.1
Kansas	19.7
Oklahoma	20.0
Washington	19.3
Oregon	17.7
Utah	35.4
California	19.2

Sources - U. S. Office of Education and U. S. Bureau of the Census

## HIGHER EDUCATION IN VIRGINIA

It is interesting to note in relation to the above figures that a century ago Virginia was at the forefront of States in the number of students in her colleges in proportion to total State population. According to the United States Census as quoted by Heatwole in his A History of Education in Virginia (page 209) Virginia not only ranked high but stood first among the six leading states. The figures for 1850 are as follows:

			White Population	Total Population
Virginia	1	student to	722	1213
Ohio	1	student to	1521	1557
Massachusetts	1	student to	1588	1615
Connecticut	1	student to	1529	1630
New York	1	student to	1773	1790
Pennsylvania	1	student to	2011	2110

### Decision for Each State to Make.

It will not be inferred from the above that the policies followed by the several states place any state wholly in the full-cost-fee category or wholly in the no-fee category. The question for each state to decide is whether it shall move in the direction of a larger share of support from fees or a larger share of support from the state. Bearing upon that question, the following considerations seem pertinent:

1. Publicly controlled institutions have been raising their fees markedly during recent decades. But from other sources of income have come also increasing amounts so that the percentage of total educational and general income derived from tuition fees has not changed much for the country as a whole. From the accompanying figures it will be noted that in publicly controlled institutions the percentage of income derived from student tuition fees was just under 20% in both 1929-30 and in 1939-40. It is not possible

### Percentage of Educational and General Income from Each Source

Sources	Publicly Controlled In-stitutions			Privately Controlled Institutions			Va. Public Institutions
	1919	1929	1939	1919	1929	1939	1939
	1920	1930	1940	1920	1930	1940	1940
Productive Funds	3.7	2.6	2.3	15.3	15.4	23.4	8.1
Public Funds	67.8	61.8	68.3	2.5	2.1	3.7	41.8
Private gifts	2.1	3.8	1.8	42.6	33.0	12.8	2.2
Student Fees for tuition	} 26.4 { 19.7 19.1 }			} 39.6 { 25.0 52.9 }			28.5
Other Sources							} 12.1 8.5 }

Source of data: U. S. Office of Education Reports

## HIGHER EDUCATION IN VIRGINIA

to break down the figure for "fees and other sources" for the year 1919-20, nor are the figures for the late 40's comparable with earlier years because of the veterans program. Hence no figures are included for any year after 1939-40.

It will be noted, too, that the publicly controlled institutions get about 2/3 of their income from public sources - State, local and Federal. They get about 5% from endowment income and gifts. The remainder comes from a variety of sources, chiefly from educational activities carried on by instructional departments.

But if there has been little change in the percentage of income from the various sources in publicly controlled institutions, the same cannot be said for privately controlled institutions. The percentage from private gifts to privately controlled institutions markedly decreased from 1919-20 to 1939-40. To compensate for this, the percentage from student fees rose sharply, till in the latter year the students paid more than half the cost of their education in the privately controlled institutions. It is difficult to see what is to reverse this trend. Therefore privately controlled institutions seem likely to have to rely largely upon students able to pay a relatively large tuition fee, along with students who are granted scholarships.

This fact tends to increase the obligation of the States to keep the fees of publicly controlled colleges and universities low. Otherwise, in the absence of any counterbalancing policy, more and more will the opportunity for higher education be denied young people in the lower income brackets. What this may mean as a long-term policy for a state, is not difficult to foresee. The development of a social and educational stratification of society based upon economic status would thus be encouraged, and the State would lose the advantages which come from the education of some of its best minds.

If a State wishes to avoid this prospective outcome it will wish to examine its policies to discover whether by some means it is making possible college and university attendance by the maximum number of its most capable young people in families in the low income brackets. It can at least check its support basis against the national average. Are its publicly controlled institutions receiving 2/3 of their operating income from public sources? Are these institutions depending upon student fees for more than 1/5 of their operating costs?

From the preceding figures it will be noted that the publicly controlled institutions in Virginia obtained in 1939-40 only 41.8% of their educational and general income from public sources. A breakdown of that figure reveals that less than 30% came from the State, a little more than 10% from the Federal government, and the rest from local city, county and district sources. This 41.8% is less than 2/3 of the national average of 68.3%.

From student tuition fees, on the other hand, Virginia publicly controlled institutions collected 28.5% of their educational and general income as compared with 19.1% for public institutions in the country as a whole.

2. The second consideration bearing upon the question of student fees is the program of student aids provided either by the institutions or by the state. The state may choose to maintain a student aid program to help the well qualified students who need financial aid to enable them to attend college, and thus justify charging other students fees such as will cover a larger

## HIGHER EDUCATION IN VIRGINIA

fraction of the institution's support. It must be borne in mind, however, that increasing the size of the student fee will not add proportionately to the fee income because fewer students will be able to meet the cost. With any increase in fees there are bound to be a larger number of qualified students who require student aid to enable them to attend.

(Attention is called to a special report made in July 1951 by the Virginia Advisory Legislative Council on Student Loans and Scholarships).

Regardless of the size of the student fee charged, or even where no fee is charged, a student aid program is called for if many of the most talented youth are not to be denied higher education and the state thus deprived of the services of their educated minds. Expenses of college attendance aside from student fees are more than many prospective first rate students can meet without financial aid. Hence the student aid program should not be determined solely by its relation to the size of the student fee. If the state wishes to assure itself of the development of its greatest resource, its children and youth, it will devise a student aid program adequate for that purpose. While there is not space here to discuss such a student aid program, it should be said in passing that it may well consist of three aspects: scholarships, primarily to help the new students get a good start; work aids by which the students, once established in college, may earn their expenses (the College of William and Mary has an excellent work aid program); and loans for those students who are within, let us say, two years of graduation from curricula which train them to earn a good living.

A careful study was made by Professor Paul H. Farrier of V. P. I. of the number of high school graduates in Virginia who do not go to college because of their inability to meet the cost. His conclusion was that of the 1949 graduates, "somewhere between thirty and forty-two per cent of our high school graduates in the upper fourth of their classes would like to go to college but do not do so for lack of money". This means that about 1500 top quartile young people each year finish the high school and then because of the cost of further education are unable to continue. Probably an equal number below the top quartile would be able to increase greatly their contribution to society by virtue of a college education but are unable to attend college because of lack of means.

In all the colleges of Virginia, public and private, there were 8,734 first year students in the fall of 1950. The number of fully qualified high school graduates who would like to have entered, but could not because of cost, was more than a third as many as did enter Virginia colleges.

In the data on unit cost which appear in the final Table in Appendix B of this report will be found the fees charged by the several State institutions.

3. The third consideration bearing upon student fees in publicly controlled colleges and universities is the differential in fees charged out-of-state students. This question was studied carefully by a special committee of the Virginia Advisory Legislative Council in 1943. The report of the Council appears in Senate Document No. 6, 1943 and should be examined in connection with this study.

The question is frequently asked, "Why should the taxpayers of Virginia help to educate students from North Carolina?" The most plausible answer is, "They shouldn't". But the question is not that simple. Several factors

## HIGHER EDUCATION IN VIRGINIA

enter to complicate it. First, in many cases, institutions in an adjoining state are frequently more accessible than like institutions in one's own state. Why should a student travel 200 miles to the university in his own state rather than 25 miles to the university in an adjoining state?

Secondly, there are family ties, institutional loyalties, or other personal reasons for young people attending institutions outside their home states. Thus residents of North Carolina will wish to attend Virginia institutions, and residents of Virginia will wish to attend North Carolina institutions. Why should there not be an even trade?

To indicate something of the extent to which this sort of trading of students among adjoining states goes on, a few figures may be cited from Circular No. 279a published in October, 1950, by the U. S. Office of Education. In 1949-50, 1025 students from North Carolina were attending colleges or universities in Virginia, while 2101 students went from Virginia to North Carolina. From West Virginia 1162 students went to Virginia while 517 Virginia students went to West Virginia. From Maryland, 863 students went to Virginia, while 1259 Virginia students went to Maryland. From the District of Columbia 482 students went to Virginia, while 4822 went from Virginia to the District of Columbia. If you note the population centers in Virginia not within easy reach of suitable colleges you will have the chief explanation of the exodus of Virginia students.

While 12298 non-Virginians were in Virginia colleges and universities, 14366 Virginians were in colleges and universities outside of Virginia. The numbers going to and coming from adjoining states account for a considerable part of the in-migration and out-migration of Virginia students. It may be safely inferred in the case of most of them it was a matter of convenience. If their home states had established institutions as satisfactory and as accessible as were those in an adjoining state most of the migration would have stopped. It is questionable policy for a state to penalize a student who must go outside his own state because institutions in an adjoining state are more satisfactory or more accessible.

Thirdly, there are certain curricula not maintained in many states. Students in States where veterinary science for example, is not taught should be able to attend a school of veterinary science in some other state. The development of the Board of Control of Southern Regional Education bears testimony to the importance of this problem.

Fourthly, the issue of probably greater importance than the above three combined is the inestimable advantage to the young people in one state to have on their campuses young people from many other states. In a country like the United States, there is danger of provincialism on a state basis. College life should provide every young person with contacts which lead him to appreciate the common life of the several states and as far as possible of foreign countries too. The essential requirement is that the students from other states and other lands shall be of a high quality, thus contributing to the upgrading of the institution's standards.

The case for encouraging the attendance of out-of-state students was well put by one of Virginia's college presidents in a recent letter addressed to the consultant. Said he: "Only this morning I heard a former Rhodes Scholar say, (and he is a real scholar) that formal education at Oxford is overrated; that the real educational opportunities at Oxford are informal, the

## HIGHER EDUCATION IN VIRGINIA

cosmopolitan student body, the college housing system which encourages social and intellectual development and, of course, the Oxford traditions, atmosphere, sports, libraries, summer vacation travel, etc."

The Bureau of Population and Economic Research of the University of Virginia gathered some very pertinent data bearing upon the practice of Virginia in comparison with other states with reference to the number of out-of-state students attending their publicly controlled institutions. Out of 22936 students attending the publicly controlled institutions in Virginia in 1949-50, 16835 were residents of Virginia. That is, 6101 students, or 22%, were residents of some other state or foreign country.

The comparable percentages of out-of-state students in publicly controlled institutions for a few other states were:

Maryland	41 percent
North Carolina	19 percent
South Carolina	19 percent
Georgia	19 percent
Florida	9 percent
Indiana	22 percent
Ohio	11 percent
Illinois	8 percent
Minnesota	12 percent
Wisconsin	12 percent

It thus appears that Virginia stands relatively high in the percentage of out-of-state students attending her publicly controlled institutions.

For the above four reasons, out-of-state fees should be such as to facilitate the interchange of students among states wherever and to the extent that valuable purposes will be served thereby. It goes without saying that the state's first obligation is to its own young people. But beyond that, fees may be fixed on a reciprocal basis, that is, Virginia may charge North Carolina students what North Carolina charges Virginia students. Again, out-of-state fees may vary not only among institutions but among curricula in a given institution. Size of the fee charged should take into account courses and curricula where students may be added without appreciably increasing costs because enrollment in the particular courses or curricula is small. Above all, effort should be made to encourage rather than to discourage out-of-State students where attendance of such students will not add materially to the State's appropriation.

### Endowments in Publicly Controlled Institutions

Virginia is almost unique among the States in the long partnership between endowment income and State appropriations which has existed in at least three of her institutions. Basically this has been due to the general attitude, described earlier in this report. The State has held to the state aid view rather than to the state support view of her publicly controlled institutions. Accordingly the institutions, particularly the University, sought to build up their endowment funds to assure them a steady and adequate income.

The State, however, has tended to regard the income from endowments as a part of the regular budget income and so to make its appropriations supplementary to the other income. What this has meant is that endowment

## HIGHER EDUCATION IN VIRGINIA

income has been too generally used to offset State appropriations.

With the passing decades, donors of endowment funds have realized more and more generally that endowment gifts under those conditions do not seem to strengthen or to enrich the program of the institution so endowed. Such gifts appear to serve only to reduce by the amount of the income from such gifts the appropriations made by the State. On this account the stream of endowment gifts to public institutions for general maintenance purposes has almost dried up.

Because of the difficulty of drawing a line sharply between general purpose income and special purpose income, donors have become more and more reticent about giving endowment funds for even restricted purposes to publicly controlled institutions unless the State has adopted a clear-cut policy to protect the income from those endowments against being regarded as an offset for State appropriations. Many potential donors would like to identify their gifts with publicly controlled institutions because they recognize the basic strength which State support gives such institutions. But they don't want to compete with the State. It will help Virginia's institutions to develop special services beyond what the State is yet ready to support if the State will adopt a policy which will protect present endowment funds, and will assure prospective donors that their gifts will not be used to reduce State appropriations.

In summary, Virginia contributes from taxation a smaller percentage of the cost of her public institutions of higher education than do most States, and charges her students a correspondingly larger percentage of the cost. This raises a question of basic policy as to whether higher education in State supported institutions is to be regarded as of value primarily to the state or to the students. If the former, the whole question of fees, both for in-state and out-of-state students should be decided on the basis of how the value to the state can be made the greatest. At least some additional program of student aids should be adopted to assure the opportunity of college attendance to the potential leaders among Virginia's young people. Virginia should take the necessary step to encourage endowment gifts to her publicly controlled institutions.

### Specific Policy Statements Relating to

#### Certain Items in Resolution 47.

In the light of the background given in the preceding pages, policy statements may now be ventured relating to the four items in Resolution 47 which concern student fees. These statements have been developed by the consultant after mature consideration of each policy by the presidents of the State colleges and universities. It is believed that none of these policies are appropriate matters for action by the General Assembly at least until they have been cleared with the recommended State Board of Higher Education. They should be flexible and subject to adjustment from time to time by the governing boards of the several institutions, under policies developed by a central coordinating board. Following are paragraphs quoted from Resolution 47:

Item (e) "The policy to be established with regard to the numbers of out-of-state students to be accepted into the respective institutions. These might vary among the several institutions."



## HIGHER EDUCATION IN VIRGINIA

Preliminary to the establishment of any policy with respect to numbers of out-of-State students each institution should admit, there is need for uniformity of definition of out-of-State, or non-resident student. The several institutions at present use different definitions. To indicate something of the complexity of the problem, a quotation is here cited from a letter dated June 12, 1950 from the Attorney General of Virginia to the State Superintendent of Public Instruction:

"The problem of classifying students as State students and non-state students has been a troublesome one, but I know of no specific way of eliminating the difficulties. The question of whether a person is a bona fide resident of Virginia is strictly a factual one and for that reason each case must be determined on its own peculiar facts. It is for this reason that this office has consistently refused to lay down a hard and fast rule to be applied in determining whether or not one is a State student, but has attempted to assist the several institutions by pointing out various factors which would be pertinent in making such decisions and by rendering opinions as to the status of particular students from given sets of facts.

"The starting point in making the determination of whether one is entitled to the various benefits afforded residents or citizens of Virginia is Section 23-7 of the Code of 1950, which reads as follows:

'No person shall be entitled to the admission privileges, or the reduced tuition charges, or any other privileges accorded by law only to residents or citizens of Virginia, in the State institutions of higher learning unless such person has been a bona fide citizen or resident of Virginia for a period of at least one year prior to admission to such institution, provided that the governing boards of such institutions may require longer periods of residence and may set up additional requirements for admitting students.'

"I direct your attention particularly to the requirement that residence or citizenship must have been maintained for at least one year prior to admission to the institution. It seems to me that this requirement which is a prerequisite to once being entitled to any privilege accorded only to residents or citizens of Virginia would answer some of Dr. Daniel's problems, since he states that in some instances the persons applying for grants-in-aid have not lived in the State at all or for only a short period of time.

"In making the determination of whether one is a bona fide resident or citizen, the payment of capitation taxes in Virginia is a factor to be considered. However, there are other factors. Items which immediately come to mind are age of the student and whether he or she is dependent upon another; the residence of the person on whom the student is dependent; the length of such person's residence; place of payment of income and personal property taxes, and the ownership of real estate in Virginia.

"If upon an examination of these factors it appears that the individual's ties to Virginia are stronger than those to any other place, and if he presently intends Virginia as his permanent home, then he is a bona fide citizen within the meaning of this act, provided, of course, that these conditions have existed for at least a year."

In fairness to the institutions and in order to provide a uniform

## HIGHER EDUCATION IN VIRGINIA

standard to determine the extent to which the institutions are admitting out-of-State students it is recommended that the Board of Higher Education, heretofore in this report recommended to be established, fix a uniform definition applicable alike to each of the institutions for the determination and classification of non-resident students.

Assuming that a satisfactory definition of "non-resident" has been arrived at, the consultant now suggests the following policy statements bearing upon the numbers of non-resident students to admit to the public colleges and universities.

1. No well qualified Virginia resident should be denied admission to any State college or university in order to admit out-of-State students. However, the value to the institutions, to the Virginia students, and to the State in having a considerable fraction of out-of-State students on the several campuses is so great that encouragement of their admission rather than discouragement should characterize the spirit of the regulations governing their numbers.

2. Uniformity of policies among the several institutions should not be expected.

3. In general no specific quota of out-of-State students should be inflexibly fixed except where total admissions are limited to a fixed number. Instead, high scholastic and leadership standards should be required of out-of-State students and the numbers limited mostly by such standards.

Probably an exception should be made in the case of schools like medicine when the applications for admission far exceed the numbers to be admitted, where graduates tend to go anywhere in the United States to practice, and where the cost is high. Some regional or nation-wide scheme should be adopted which would relieve a state of the burden of maintaining such schools for more students than the needs of the state require.

4. Reciprocity among contiguous states in fixing out-of-State fees is sound in principle as a method of lessening the handicap imposed upon students for whom the State does not provide suitable educational opportunities within easy reach. This will bear upon numbers.

5. The policy is desirable of the State's paying to other states the cost of those forms of education which it does not provide, as exemplified in the program of the Board of Control of Southern Regional Education.

6. The evidence indicates that a number of Virginia publicly controlled institutions admit higher percentages of out-of-State students than do similar publicly controlled institutions in most other states. Therefore, it is desirable to establish for the several curricula in each institution a percentage of out-of-State students whose attendance appears to be justified in the interest of the institution, of the Virginia students and of the State. Any out-of-State students in excess of that percentage should be charged a fee adequate to cover the full cost of their education.

For example, suppose it is agreed that in a given school of the University, one out-of-State student to each three Virginia students would be enough to secure the well recognized advantages of out-of-State students. These out-of-State students would be admitted on the terms of the present or

## HIGHER EDUCATION IN VIRGINIA

some other agreed upon differential in tuition fees for out-of-State students. Any out-of-State students in excess of this number would be charged the full cost of their education. Or to accomplish the same object by another approach, the fee for all out-of-State students might be fixed at an amount calculated to cover the full cost of instruction, but provision made for out-of-State scholarships to make up to the requisite number of selected students the difference between the full-cost fee and some established lesser out-of-State fee.

Resolution No. 47, Item (g), "The policies governing the admission of students and whether this ought to be regularized and based upon objective testing before entrance, and whether there should be fairly uniform testing standards applicable to the respective fields of learning to which the applicant seeks admission".

1. Virginia high schools and colleges now cooperate in administering to high school seniors a well standardized college ability test. The results of that test are among the data used by the several institutions in determining admission of students. That is as far as the institutions should go in using the results of a common test.

2. Genius or other outstanding talent is frequently found in young people who depart from the norm. Progress is attained by utilizing variations from norms. Education, therefore, should encourage variations. Placing anything like sole dependence upon the results of any test now available when admitting students to college is unsound.

3. Just as the purposes of the several institutions differ from one another, so the admissions policies should differ. Each institution should attract to itself students interested in its purposes, and capable of carrying its courses successfully.

4. The important point to keep in mind about admission policies is that higher education is a continuation of high school education and therefore the closest possible relations with the high schools should be maintained in determining admission policies. A high school student personnel file for each student containing evidence bearing upon the student's interests, aptitudes and abilities is a most useful aid in deciding the question of his admission.

Resolution No. 47, Item (h), "Whether there should be established specific and uniform provisions governing all of the institutions requiring the students to pay a fixed percentage of the instructional costs, with appropriate differential rates for Virginia residents and out-of-State students."

1. The basis for determining fees is the value the student expects to get in relation to the value the State expects to get from the student's education. Obviously, then, there is no uniform percentage of costs which students in all curricula should pay. For example, students expect to get little monetary reward from their study of liberal arts and sciences, and small monetary reward from their study of teacher training subjects. The State, on the other hand, reaps a rich reward, monetary and otherwise, from people ready and able to live effectively as citizens. Preparation for effective citizenship is the principal purpose of liberal arts and sciences. But the study of law, medicine, engineering and the like is expected to lead to good monetary rewards. Fees determined by a fixed percentage of instructional

## HIGHER EDUCATION IN VIRGINIA

costs would largely ignore that difference in expected monetary reward. Variation of fees among curricula is sounder in principle than uniformity.

2. Out-of-State fees should be determined on other grounds than a fixed proportion of cost. This point is discussed earlier.

Resolution No. 47, Item (i), "Whether out-of-State students should be expected to contribute substantially what it costs to provide their instruction".

1. In the light of the values to the institution attended and to the State, out-of-State students should be admitted on a variety of bases, and no uniform policy should be adopted with reference to the fraction of instruction costs they should pay. For example, it is conceivable that no non-resident fee should be charged out-of-State students in curricula preparing elementary teachers as long as the shortage of such teachers is acute.

2. The purpose to be served by admitting out-of-State students in each institution and in each curriculum and the approximate number and types of out-of-State students required to accomplish that purpose should be determined as indicated in the discussion under Item (e) above. The fee should be fixed so as to facilitate getting the required number and the appropriate types of out-of-State students.

In order to ascertain the opinions of the institutional presidents with respect to the policy involved, the following question was asked of the Institutions of Higher Education:

In your opinion, should out-of-State students be required to pay the full cost of their instruction?

The following answers were unqualified:

Yes: Medical College of Virginia, School of Dentistry;  
The College of William and Mary;  
Madison College; and  
Virginia State College.

No: University of Virginia Medical School.

The University of Virginia said that the present fees covered the cost of instruction, but that additional assessment might be desirable for the distribution of other costs.

Virginia Polytechnic Institute said that the fees should be higher, but gave reciprocity as the primary consideration in ascertaining the proper fees.

Virginia Military Institute gave as its answer "approximately."

Longwood College impugned the categorical nature of the question, but said "the state should not be put to extra expense for non-residents."

Medical College of Virginia, School of Medicine, said that the answer was 'no' as to schools of medicine.

Radford College said that we should not require payment of the full cost

## HIGHER EDUCATION IN VIRGINIA

until neighboring states required it of our students.

### Summary

In the above brief consideration of some of the problems underlying the support of higher education, major attention has been given to student fees. This is for two reasons: first, a basic question of State policy is involved, and secondly, the House Joint Resolution No. 47 calling for the present study included four items directly concerned with student fees. Your consultant was not charged with finding answers to the questions raised, but with calling attention to some of the issues which must be faced in answering the questions about fees. This he has tried to do.

## HIGHER EDUCATION IN VIRGINIA

### Appendix B

#### Data about the Institutions.

In this section are brought together important data from several sources including the voluminous reports submitted by the institutions in response to the requests of the Committee. Only the summary tables will be included but the replies from the institutions have been carefully brought together and are on file in the Statutory Research and Drafting Office for use by the Committee.

No extended comment about these data seems called for. They afford a clear picture as they stand of the status of the institutions, their students, both resident and nonresident, their graduates, their income by source, their expenditures by purpose, their endowments, their unit costs, etc. Together these data clearly reveal that higher education in Virginia is a big enterprise. It is deserving of, and I am sure it is getting, the most serious consideration of the State's ablest citizens.

The topics covered in this appendix are given below:

Contents of Appendix B.

	<u>Page</u>
Enrollments	66
The Privately Controlled Colleges	68
Bachelor's and First Professional Degrees	68
High School Graduates	72
Out of State Students	74
Residence of Alumni	76
Income by Source and Expenditures by Purpose	77
Endowment Funds	82
Income of Privately Controlled Colleges	84
Student Recruiting	84
Capital Improvement Plans	86
Per Student Costs and Student Charges	86

## HIGHER EDUCATION IN VIRGINIA

### Enrollments.

In Table 1 are given the enrollments at the several institutions. One institution, V. P. I., has more than 5,000 students while Longwood has 601. The enrollments at the other institutions range between these two extremes.

More significant than the present enrollments is the change which occurred between 1930-31 and 1949-50 at the several institutions.

V. P. I., Mary Washington and Virginia State College have nearly trebled.

The University has nearly doubled.

Madison and Radford have increased by about one-half.

William and Mary has increased by about one-third.

V. M. I. and the Medical College of Virginia have increased only slightly, and Longwood has decreased.

This variation among the institutions should not be understood as a reflection upon the quality of the work in any of them. Rather it is an indication of the types of demand the young people of the State make upon the institutions, plus the fact that certain schools like medicine strictly limit their enrollments. That the largest increase occurred in V. P. I. and Virginia State College suggests that the program at these two institutions has a strong appeal. The same may be said for Mary Washington with the qualifying fact that Mary Washington serves a section of the State with a very rapidly increasing population.

The fact that the teachers colleges have increased as little as they have at the time that there is a serious shortage of teachers probably signifies the low esteem in which the young people hold the profession of teaching. To correct that situation is a problem of fundamental importance to the State.

It is interesting to observe that the increase in the number of Negroes attending the Virginia State College is greater percentage-wise, than the increase in the number of students in all the other State institutions combined.



Table No. 1

## Enrollments at the several State-supported Colleges

INSTITUTIONS	1930-31			1940-41			1949-50		
	U-G	Grad.	Total	U-G	Grad.	Total	U-G	Grad.	Total
University of Virginia	1745	546	2291	2105	639	2744	3468	1008	4476
U. of Va. Medical School	*	230	230	*	248	248	*	276	276
Mary Washington	548	*	548	1412	*	1412	1475	*	1475
Medical College of Va.									
School of Medicine **	*	359	359	*	295	295	*	354	354
School of Dentistry	*	121	121	*	120	120	*	190	190
School of Pharmacy	118	*	118	135	*	135	234	*	234
School of Nursing	184	*	184	174	*	174	188	*	188
Virginia Military Institute	723	*	723	735	*	735	853	*	853
Virginia Polytechnic Inst.	1659	100	1759	3242	229	3471	4979	294	5273
Radford College	597	*	597	606	*	606	955	*	955
Virginia State College	528	0	528	972	20	992	1409	55	1464
William and Mary	1496		1496	1290		1290	1944	46	1990
Longwood College	793	*	793	938	*	938	601	*	601
Madison College	814	*	814	1306	*	1306	1271	*	1271
Totals			10561			14466			19600

\* Not applicable

\*\* These figures include 3rd and 4th year classes, where a higher percentage of non-resident students prevails, because of a contract with West Virginia for the admission of students from that state at that level.

## HIGHER EDUCATION IN VIRGINIA

### The Privately Controlled Colleges.

In Table 2 (Page 69) are given data on numbers of students and fees charged at most of the privately controlled colleges in Virginia. This table indicates the extent of the contribution made to the State's higher education by the privately controlled colleges. It will be noted that while some of the colleges draw large percentages of their students from outside the State, many of them are chiefly for Virginia students. Of the totals, more than half are Virginia students.

From the data on fees charged for tuition, board and room, the table reveals wide variation. The colleges for women appear on the whole higher in their charges than the others.

### Bachelor's and First Professional Degrees.

In Table 3 (Pages 70 & 71) is presented the numbers graduating from Virginia's undergraduate colleges, public and private, in 1949-50. These figures, in a sense, represent the output. These graduates are classified according to the subject of their major interest, but do not include those graduating with a master's or a doctor of philosophy degree. The figures are taken from Circular No. 282, U. S. Office of Education.

HIGHER EDUCATION IN VIRGINIA

Table No. 2

ENROLLMENTS OF REGULAR STUDENTS AND FEES  
CHARGED IN PRIVATE ACCREDITED INSTITUTIONS  
OF HIGHER EDUCATION IN VIRGINIA

Academic Year 1949-50						
<u>College</u>	<u>Virginia Students</u>	<u>Non- Resi- dents</u>	<u>Total Stu- dents</u>	<u>Tuition Charge</u>	<u>Board (Average)</u>	<u>Room (Average)</u>
Bridgewater	385	123	508	\$300	\$240	\$100.00
Eastern Mennonite College	46	207	253	254	252	84.00
High School	92	89	181	99	252	84.00
Emory and Henry	320	161	481	220	280	70.00
Hampden-Sydney	320	97	417	360	360	70.00
Hampton Institute	362	897	1259	240	272	94.50
Hollins <sup>1</sup>	88	241	329	595	400	265.00
Lynchburg	506	98	604	340	129	45.00
Mary Baldwin	109	199	308	\$1200 <sup>2</sup>		
Randolph Macon	487	96	583	200	330	120.00
Randolph Macon Woman's College	164	29	193	\$1250 <sup>2</sup>		
Roanoke College	391	168	559	384	330	100.00
Sweet Briar	54	400	454	700	\$750 <sup>2</sup>	
University of Richmond Richmond College	938	182	1120	300	350	130.00
Westhampton	283	131	414	300	350	177.50
Virginia Union University	168	560	728	225	262	90.00
Washington & Lee University	341	895	1236	450	400	160.00
Totals	5054	4573	9627			

<sup>1</sup> Figures for academic year, 1950-51

<sup>2</sup> Inclusive fee.



HIGHER EDUCATION IN VIRGINIA

Bridgewater	Eastern Mennonite	Emory & Henry	G. A. Training School for Lay Workers	Hampden-Sydney	Hampton Institute	Hollins	Lynchburg	Mary Baldwin	Protestant Episcopal Theol. Seminary	Randolph-Macon (Ashland)	Randolph-Macon Woman's	Roanoke	Shenandoah Conservatory of Music	St. Paul's Polytechnic Institute	Sweet Briar	Union Theol. Seminary	University of Richmond	Virginia Theol. Seminary	Virginia Union University	Washington and Lee
16	1	1	1	1	7	1	8	1	11	9	9	16		14	3	25	13		26	4
6		34	23	1	19	1	43		17	11	10	26		14		115	35		16	86
18		5	3	11	12	1	9		17	11	10	10		56	1	7	7		9	2
7	4	6	11	101	101		21		14	26	17			1	13	7		24	22	
1		5	6	6	6		4		56	17	17			1	13	7		24	3	
10	2	18	2	2	1	6	13	5	12	32	15			8	28	1		23	25	
20	1	29	1	1	21	1	9	2	28	6	5			7	7	23		43	5	
5	1		1	1	36		3		35	10	3			1	4	64		48	24	
2		1	1	1	1	4	1	1	1	9	1			11	11	4		5	1	
6	1	9	1	1	5		6	6	7	7	9			7	9	5		9	1	
10	4		14	6	6	3	1	3	7	7	9		18		4	6		16		
3			2		3	3	6	3	11	1	4				2	2		2		
7					5	5	4	4	7	7	1				12	23	32		15	
3	12	1	14		6	6	6	5	5	7	8				2	7	7		9	
3		2			18	19	8	10	10	12					3	33	2		30	
3					8	10	5	30	30						2	2			7	
16					7													8		

## HIGHER EDUCATION IN VIRGINIA

### High School Graduates

In Table 4 (Page 73) are given the numbers of students graduating each year from Virginia high schools, and the numbers of these graduates indicated by the State Superintendent of Public Instruction to have entered college either in Virginia or elsewhere. The first of these figures represents the pool from which the institutions draw their Virginia students. The second represents the extent to which high school graduates think it desirable and find it possible to continue their formal education.

It is interesting to note that the number graduating from the State's high schools is no greater now than it was ten years ago. That reflects the decrease in the population of high school age due to the severe decline in the birth rate during the depression of the early thirties.

By including other private colleges not reported in Table 2 above, the total students enrolled in Virginia colleges, public and private, in the fall of 1950, were 33,666. This figure is nearly but not quite the equivalent of two graduating classes of the Virginia public high schools.

For comparative purposes, figures as to enrollment and graduates for the nation as a whole are included as Table 4-a.

Table No. 4

SCHOOL POPULATION (7-19 Yrs. Inc.); REGULAR DAY SCHOOL ENROLLMENT;  
HIGH SCHOOL GRADUATES FROM RECOGNIZED HIGH SCHOOLS; AND  
THE NUMBER OF SUCH GRADUATES WHO ENTERED COLLEGES  
OFFERING DEGREES. WHITE and NEGRO

Session	SCHOOL POPULATION			ENROLLMENT			HIGH SCHOOL GRADUATES			NUMBER GRADUATES ENTERING COLLEGE		
	White	Negro	Total	White	Negro	Total	White	Negro	Total	White	Negro	Total
1930-31	506,169	217,968	724,137*	419,152	158,914	578,066	9,046	845	9,891	3,031	351	3,382
1931-32	---	---	---	422,957	160,025	582,982	9,896	871	10,767	2,834	254	3,088
1932-33	---	---	---	426,270	160,616	586,886	10,577	926	11,503	2,536	328	2,864
1933-34	---	---	---	424,767	160,890	585,657	10,885	1,137	12,022	2,537	391	2,928
1934-35	516,683	214,360	731,043	429,029	161,503	590,532	11,701	1,248	12,949	2,796	413	3,209
1935-36	---	---	---	431,864	160,174	592,038	11,958	1,352	13,310	3,063	503	3,566
1936-37	---	---	---	429,405	158,081	587,486	12,808	1,547	14,355	3,339	469	3,808
1937-38	---	---	---	429,226	154,330	583,556	14,761	1,939	16,700	3,834	548	4,382
1938-39	---	---	---	422,924	153,075	575,999	15,183	2,346	17,529	3,682	535	4,217
1939-40	514,253	195,364	709,617	423,373	151,502	574,875	16,256	2,310	18,566	3,553	576	4,129
1940-41	---	---	---	422,408	152,031	574,439	16,683	2,696	19,379	3,656	621	4,277
1941-42	---	---	---	432,735	134,270	567,005	16,576	2,893	19,469	3,813	741	4,554
1942-43	---	---	---	411,196	145,514	556,710	15,915	2,825	18,740	3,227	684	3,911
1943-44	---	---	---	401,372	144,036	545,408	14,255	2,457	16,712	3,493	875	4,368
1944-45	485,383	177,349	662,732	404,207	145,448	549,655	13,670	2,804	16,474	3,994	944	4,938
1945-46	---	---	---	410,155	148,774	558,929	14,351	3,000	17,351	4,458	1,029	5,487
1946-47	---	---	---	413,473	151,601	565,074	16,805	3,522	20,327	4,770	1,140	5,910
1947-48	---	---	---	417,675	151,540	569,215	17,133	3,812	20,945	4,598	987	5,585
1948-49	---	---	---	429,824	153,904	583,728	14,714	3,243	17,957	4,159	918	5,077
1949-50	497,152	172,480	669,632	449,109	158,089	607,198	15,880	3,932	19,812	(Available from 1950-51 report)		

\* 1930 School Census

SOURCE: State Department of Education, July 16, 1951

NOTE: Above figures relate to enrollment and graduates of public schools only.

## HIGHER EDUCATION IN VIRGINIA

Table No. 4-a

### Enrollments in Public High Schools of the United States

1919-20	1929-30	1939-40	1947-48
2,200,389	4,399,422	6,601,444	5,653,305

### Enrollments in public and non-public High Schools in the United States per 100 population, 14 to 17 years of age

1919-20	1929-30	1939-40	1947-48
32	51	73	74

### Numbers graduated from public and non-public High Schools in the United States per 100 persons 17 years of age

1919-20	1929-30	1939-40	1947-48
16.8	29.0	50.8	54.0

### College Enrollment in the United States per 100 persons 18 - 21 years of age.

1919-20	1929-30	1939-40	1947-48
8	12	15	15 *

### Numbers graduated from College in the United States per 100 persons 21 years of age.

1919-20	1929-30	1939-40	1947-48
2.7	5.5	7.9	11.3 **

\* This figure excludes 1,266,898 veterans.

\*\* This figure includes veterans.

SOURCE: Statistical Summary of Education, 1947-48. Federal Security Agency, Office of Education, in the order cited, from Tables 16, 11, 13, 18 and 19.

### Out-of-State Students.

Table 5 (Page 75) gives the percentages of out-of-State students in the publicly supported institutions in Virginia. The problem of out-of-State students is discussed in Appendix A, pages 49-63. This table indicates the relatively high percentage of out-of-State students at some of these colleges and universities.

From the data on unit costs reported in the final table of this appendix it will be noted that in most of the public institutions the out-of-State students pay a large part of the cost of their education. Under these circumstances it is a compliment to the Virginia institutions that so many students from other states seek admission to the public institutions in the State.



HIGHER EDUCATION IN VIRGINIA

Table No. 5

Percentage of Out-of-State Students at the several State-supported Colleges

INSTITUTIONS	1930-31		1940-41		1949-50	
	% Out-of-State		% Out-of-State		% Out-of-State	
	U-G	Grad.	U-G	Grad.	U-G	Grad.
University of Virginia	57	59	58	58	43	51
U. of Va. Medical School	*	29	*	31	*	29
Mary Washington	14	*	35	*	35	*
Medical College of Virginia						
School of Medicine **	*	41	*	49	*	29
School of Dentistry	*	46	*	43	*	21
School of Pharmacy	16	*	8	*	7	*
School of Nursing	46	*	40	*	40	*
Virginia Military Institute	51	*	47	*	53	*
Virginia Polytechnic Inst.	15	14	25	42	19	37
Radford College	4	*	6	*	10	*
Virginia State College	20	0	35	10	14	5
William and Mary	Not Known		57		38	28
Longwood College	7	*	6	*	5	*
Madison College	Not Known		13	*	15	*

\* Not applicable.

\*\* These figures include 3rd and 4th year classes, where a higher percentage of non-resident students prevails, because of a contract with West Virginia for the admission of students from that state.

## HIGHER EDUCATION IN VIRGINIA

### Residence of Alumni

Just as there is interest in the number of out-of-state students who are attending Virginia's publicly controlled colleges and universities, so there is interest in the question of whether graduates of these institutions live in Virginia.

Information was sought from the alumni offices as to the present location of their living alumni. A good deal of effort was made by these officers to supply the information. The task of keeping information current concerning addresses of alumni is known to be expensive and formidable.

The completeness and reliability of the data on hand varies greatly among the institutions. It seems of doubtful value, therefore, to publish the partial figures available. Some observations bearing on the question may, however, be pertinent.

While most of the graduates of some of the institutions remain in the state, a considerable number of graduates of others of the institutions are now living outside the state. This is particularly true of certain professional school graduates like engineers, lawyers and doctors.

There is no criterion on which to base an answer to the question of how many graduates should remain in the state. Certain considerations may, however, be offered.

a. A state maintains its educational facilities for two purposes: first, to equip persons to carry on the services, civic, social and professional, which the state needs, and, second, to provide an opportunity to its young people to develop their talents for use anywhere.

b. No state has as complete a range of professional opportunities as is the range of interests and aptitudes of its young people. For example, the Bell Laboratories are located in one city in New York but the representatives of the Laboratories go to every state in the Union to obtain the young people prepared to work in them. It would be unfortunate for any state to deny its young people opportunity to train themselves for such scientific and technical occupations merely because the state had no Bell Laboratories.

c. Investigation might reveal that in any given line the fact that a high percentage of graduates were called to service outside the state was a real compliment to the state because it revealed that the state was offering its young people an opportunity to prepare for higher service than the state was yet able to provide them.

d. In most of the professional fields for which the colleges prepare, competition for jobs is on a national basis rather than a state basis. For example, medical internes are assigned to hospitals anywhere in the country with little relation to the location of the medical school in which the professional training was given. Graduates then seek as a location a place where opportunity seems best. It may well be that for every graduate of a Virginia medical school who locates outside Virginia, a graduate of another medical school locates in Virginia.

e. As long as there is a demand somewhere for the services of Virginia's young people after they have completed their college training, and

## HIGHER EDUCATION IN VIRGINIA

as long as there are enough well trained persons to carry on the jobs in Virginia which require college training, the State may rightly feel satisfied that its contribution to the colleges is justified. Its young people need the opportunity and the country needs their services.

### Income by Source and Expenditures by Purpose.

Table No. 6 (Pages 80 & 81) presents a statement of operations of the institutions of higher education of the Commonwealth of Virginia for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1950. It is presented in two parts: the first showing by sources the funds provided for the activities of these institutions; and the second analyzing the application of the funds provided. This statement was prepared by the Auditor of Public Accounts in condensed summary form from his reports on audit of the institutions of higher education for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1950. At the request of your consultant, the data were prepared to reflect the funds made available to these institutions by major sources rather than specific sources and to show the application of these funds by major rather than specific categories. If greater detail is desired by the reader this detail may be procured by an examination of the reports on audit from which the statement was prepared on file in the office of the Auditor of Public Accounts. These reports are voluminous and furnish elaborate details with respect to the sources of funds and purposes for which they were used.

This statement will give some indication of the size of the enterprise carried on by the state institutions of higher education. Readers are cautioned against comparing items for one institution with items of like name for another institution. The figures in the table were taken from the official audits of the several institutions and represent the amounts received or expended for the categories listed in the table. But a given category may include different items at different institutions. For example, income from students includes charges for dormitory room and dining hall where these facilities are maintained by the institution. Thus the income from students at Virginia Polytechnic Institute is larger than that at the University of Virginia, because Virginia Polytechnic Institute maintained dormitories and dining halls for most of its students, for which definite amounts were charged; while at the University of Virginia dormitory facilities were not as extensive and the cafeteria facilities were available at the option of the students. Furthermore, no fixed annual amount is required to be paid for board by the students at the University of Virginia. Consequently cafeteria income is not classified as student income, since no annual charge is made against the students for the services.

In the examination of the second part of the statement, which reflects the expenditures of the several institutions, similar care needs to be exercised. An institution which operates extensive dormitories must expend more for operation and maintenance of physical plant than does an institution of like enrollment but with few dormitories.

The statement is self-explanatory and in addition to showing the operations of the institutions presents also the percentage of each source of income to total income and the percentage of each resource available to the total resources available. Similarly, it reflects the percentage of each category of operation and maintenance to the total expenditures for operation and maintenance as well as the percentage of each type of expenditure to the total expenditures and the percentage of each item of the funds applied

## HIGHER EDUCATION IN VIRGINIA

for the institutions' activities to the total of all funds available for application to these activities.

Let me repeat: This table is accurate and was prepared to show the extensiveness of the operations of these institutions by major sources from which the funds were made available for their operations and the major purposes for which the funds were applied. It was not prepared to afford a basis of comparison of one institution with another.

Some of the items in this table that seem particularly worthy of note are the following:

1. The balances carried over from the previous year for capital outlays are very large and reflect in part the long delays involved these days in letting and executing building contracts. Even the balances on hand at the end of the year are large and again reveal difficulties in completing construction on time. Of course, in many cases buildings were not intended to be completed within the biennium.
2. The expenditures of over 7 million dollars for capital outlays during the year plus a considerable share of the 15 million in balances at the end of the year should help to correct the serious situation which has confronted the institutions in recent years in trying to care for rapidly increasing enrollments with little or no increase in plant.
3. The income from students is almost twice as much as the income from the State for operation and maintenance. Income from students includes charges for board and room where such facilities are provided by the institutions.
4. The University received more than a million from gifts and endowment income. William and Mary and the Medical College of Virginia also received appreciable sums from these sources. The total from gifts and endowments was about one-fourth as much as the State contributed for operation and maintenance.
5. The State contributed \$5,900,000 for maintenance and operation. It cost the institutions \$5,800,000, almost exactly the same amount, to operate and maintain their grounds and buildings. What Virginia does, therefore, for higher education, is to provide land and to build and maintain their physical plants. This amounts to 28.11 per cent of the cost of providing the education and research programs of the institutions. The remaining 71.89 per cent of the cost is met from other sources, such as student fees, endowment income, and Federal grants.
6. Of the \$1,584,000 spent for organized research half was spent by V. P. I., mainly on agricultural research.

HIGHER EDUCATION IN VIRGINIA

Table No. 6  
Pages 80 & 81

TABLE  
STATEMENT OF OPERATIONS OF THE  
OF THE COMMONWEALTH  
For the Fiscal Year

		F U N D S P			
		Balances July 1, 1949			
Institution		Operation and Maintenance	Capital Outlays and Debt	Total	Students
College of Williamsburg		\$ 580,120.89	\$ 743,326.18	\$ 163,205.29	\$ 742,079.87
William and Mary	Richmond	2,159.15	101,137.61	98,978.46	738,286.71
	Norfolk	60,452.43	269,813.69	209,361.26	329,401.27
Longwood College		48,466.48	1,057,255.03	1,105,721.51	319,709.22
Madison College		97,683.78	945,989.57	1,043,673.35	568,598.14
Mary Washington College		184,480.72	1,439,176.15	1,623,656.87	1,003,023.86
Medical College of Virginia*		156,617.64	139,802.97	296,420.61	398,336.13
Radford College		111,185.74	1,047,672.54	1,158,858.28	419,042.42
University of Virginia*		790,948.55	6,544,093.72	7,335,042.27	2,098,440.91
Virginia Military Institute		143,993.78	881,582.42	1,025,576.20	890,533.00
Virginia Polytechnic Institute#		362,876.53	4,109,372.74	4,472,249.27	2,551,262.82
Virginia State College	Petersburg	39,481.27	2,415,533.36	2,455,014.63	683,383.07
	Norfolk	42,280.70	328,500.00	370,780.70	113,539.10
Totals		\$1,335,282.72	\$20,023,255.98	\$21,358,538.70	\$10,855, 52
Percentage of Income		-	-	-	46.08%
Percentage of Funds Available		2.97%	44.58%	47.55%	24.17%

*Italics indicate deficit* \* Hospital operations excluded. # Includes Experiment Station, but excl

		F U N D S				
		E x p e n d i t u r e s				
		Operation and Maintenance				
Institution		Education and General	Organized Research	Operation and Maintenance of Plant	Other Activities	Total
College of Williamsburg		\$ 871,749.84	\$ -	\$ 453,847.99	\$ 89,091.35	\$ 1,414,689.18
William and Mary	Richmond	472,198.41	-	297,111.65	20,144.08	789,454.14
	Norfolk	336,825.93	-	63,416.78	-	400,242.71
Longwood College		316,328.03	-	237,720.03	35,954.58	590,002.64
Madison College		518,893.82	-	358,436.19	56,968.22	934,298.23
Mary Washington College		490,810.53	-	506,042.34	69,409.35	1,066,262.22
Medical College of Virginia*		880,010.21	287,369.57	84,059.78	128,102.02	1,379,541.58
Radford College		282,876.40	-	287,480.57	43,166.94	613,523.91
University of Virginia*		2,735,901.82	506,823.54	727,523.42	1,218,261.16	5,188,509.94
Virginia Military Institute		426,306.98	-	598,574.50	324,358.58	1,349,240.06
Virginia Polytechnic Institute#		1,836,117.38	790,620.65	1,669,730.67	743,272.34	5,039,741.04
Virginia State College	Petersburg	789,090.27	-	485,679.61	309,330.76	1,584,100.64
	Norfolk	188,296.80	-	36,265.18	77,949.34	302,511.32
Totals		\$10,145,406.42	\$1,584,813.76	\$5,805,888.71	\$3,116,008.72	\$20,652,117.61
Percentage of Expenses of Operation		49.13%	7.67%	28.11%	15.09%	100.00%
Percentage of Expenditures		35.55%	5.55%	20.34%	10.92%	72.36%
Percentage of Funds Available		22.59%	3.53%	12.93%	6.93%	45.98%

\* Hospital operations excluded # Includes Experiment Station, but excludes Extension Division

NO. 6

INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION  
ALTH OF VIRGINIA  
Ended June 30, 1950

R O V I D E D

I n c o m e						Total Income and Balances
Commonwealth		Federal Government	Gifts and Endowments	Other	Total Income	
Op- M	tion and enance Capital Outlays					
\$ 441,273.00	\$ 9,000.00	\$ -	\$ 191,919.43	\$ 241,751.48	\$ 1,626,023.78	\$ 1,789,229.07
105,385.77	140,000.00	8,007.50	76.93	51,157.33	1,042,914.24	1,141,892.70
54,500.00	500.00	-	643.13	22,030.42	407,074.82	616,436.08
264,259.67	15,000.00	3,162.00	436.93	10,745.56	613,313.38	1,719,034.89
279,915.00	10,000.00	-	-	111,915.04	970,428.18	2,014,101.53
241,590.00	10,000.00	-	6,204.09	31,430.24	1,292,248.19	2,915,905.06
442,549.43	76,885.09	228,259.21	180,273.40	202,722.15	1,529,025.41	1,825,446.02
196,755.00	10,000.00	-	50.00	259,564.11 <sup>a</sup>	885,411.53	2,044,269.81
1,455,710.00	149,250.00	280,205.29	1,008,411.71	1,030,814.66	6,022,832.57	13,357,874.84
416,070.00	30,000.00	835.84	28,548.17	72,959.24 <sup>b</sup>	1,438,946.25	2,464,522.45
1,345,760.25	32,000.00	400,829.83	54,968.86	1,434,449.51 <sup>b</sup>	5,819,271.27	10,291,520.54
622,797.40	8,000.00	33,520.44	7,275.56	297,389.22	1,652,365.69	4,107,380.32
67,705.41	-	-	-	76,498.95	257,743.46	628,524.16
\$5,270.93	\$490,655.09	\$954,820.11	\$1,478,808.21	\$3,843,427.91	\$23,557,598.77	\$44,916,137.47
25.19%	2.08%	4.05%	6.28%	16.32%	100.00%	
13.21%	1.09%	2.13%	3.29%	8.56%	52.45%	100.00%

udes Extension Division <sup>a</sup> Includes proceeds \$230,000 bonds <sup>b</sup> Includes proceeds \$490,000 bonds

A P P L I E D

Capital Outlays	Debt Service	Total Expenditures	Transfers to Agency and Endowment Funds	Reversions to the General Fund of the Commonwealth	Balances June 30, 1950	Grand Total
\$ 50,321.24	\$ 52,684.40	\$ 1,517,694.82	\$ 72,925.79	\$ 281.28 <sup>a</sup>	\$ 198,327.18	\$ 1,789,229.07
91,624.70	-	881,078.84	-	-	260,813.86	1,141,892.70
17,271.06	5,290.60	422,804.37	7,027.60	-	186,604.11	616,436.08
422,984.50	16,711.44	1,029,698.58	-	33,509.06 <sup>b</sup>	655,827.25	1,719,034.89
43,796.44	19,012.82	1,297,107.49	7,428.68	40.18 <sup>a</sup>	709,525.18	2,014,101.53
3,147.16	203,917.50	1,819,326.88	3,014.99	.02 <sup>b</sup>	1,093,563.17	2,915,905.06
48,496.29	57,196.49	1,535,234.36	20,789.76	3,600.00 <sup>b</sup>	265,821.90	1,825,446.20
415,942.25	16,685.25	1,046,151.41	6,156.00	189,904.26 <sup>a,b</sup>	802,058.14	2,044,269.81
2,341,959.26	94,893.48	7,625,362.68	73,802.57	2,946.08 <sup>a</sup>	5,655,763.51	13,357,874.84
444,930.20	43,205.04	1,837,375.30	2,716.11	87,087.90 <sup>a,b</sup>	537,343.14	2,464,522.45
1,803,707.06	119,814.57	6,963,262.67	5,850.41	385,121.14 <sup>a,b</sup>	2,937,286.32	10,291,520.54
633,925.00	45,047.17	2,263,072.81	-	56,000.00 <sup>a</sup>	1,788,307.51	4,107,380.32
1,800.00	-	304,311.32	1,062.74	-	323,150.10	628,524.16
\$7,215,905.16	\$674,458.76	\$28,542,481.53	\$200,774.65	\$758,489.92	\$15,414,391.37	\$44,916,137.47
25.28%	2.36%	100.00%	-	-	-	-
16.06%	1.50%	63.54%	.45%	1.69%	34.32%	100.00%

<sup>a</sup> Capital outlay

<sup>b</sup> Operation and maintenance

## HIGHER EDUCATION IN VIRGINIA

### Endowment Funds and Their Use.

From Table 7 (Page 83) we observe that five of Virginia's publicly controlled institutions have significant endowment funds. To a considerable extent these funds reflect the fact that the institutions have sought other than State sources for their support. In so far as endowments serve to enrich the program of an institution and to make possible a kind and quality of service which the State is not ready to support, endowments provide a most useful supplement to other incomes. Virginia is to be congratulated on the relatively large income derived from endowment sources.

It must be remembered, however, that few donors care to make gifts which are used essentially to offset State appropriations. Therefore, if Virginia is to keep open the flow of endowments to her publicly controlled institutions the State must protect the income from endowment funds from use in supporting the regular program which the State customarily maintains.



Table No. 7

## ENDOWMENT FUNDS AND ANNUAL ENDOWMENT INCOME\*

	University of Virginia	Virginia Polytechnic Institute	Virginia Military Institute	William and Mary	Medical College of Virginia
Total, all endowment funds	\$12,831,365	\$380,312	\$432,395	\$2,086,578.00	\$1,775,592.18
Total endowment income	542,825	11,560	28,686	99,242.86	69,283.69
Endowment funds not restricted	1,281,036	none	none	833,267.00	1,486,758.29
Unrestricted endowment income	54,192	none	none	50,205.33	58,115.79
Endowment funds subject to restrictions	11,550,515	380,312	432,395	1,253,311.00	288,833.89
Endowment funds restricted for scholarships	4,620,934	36,000	199,462	404,118.26	5,968.80
Endowment income restricted for scholarships	195,484	1,055	9,939	20,510.97	233.28
Endowment funds restricted for other purposes	—	—	—	849,192.74	282,914.51
Endowment income restricted for other purposes	293,149	10,505	18,747	28,526.56	10,934.62
Number of endowment scholarships	622	4	35	120**	2

\* State institutions other than those listed have little or no endowment.

\*\* Approximately 120 @ \$100 each.

SOURCE: Information furnished by institutions in response to questionnaire dated February 23, 1951.

## HIGHER EDUCATION IN VIRGINIA

### Income of Privately Controlled Colleges.

As an indication of the significance of the contribution made by privately controlled colleges and universities located in Virginia, information concerning the five items in Table 8 was furnished by each of the listed institutions for the year ending in June, 1950. The totals of the items for these four-year privately controlled institutions are given in the table.

Table 8  
Income from 3 Sources and Total Enrollments at 13  
Privately Controlled Colleges in Virginia

Receipts from Students	\$6,211,760.82
Endowment Income	902,229.19
Other Revenues	<u>1,328,343.83</u>
Total Income	\$8,442,332.84
Total enrollment of regular full time students, Fall, 1949, in these institutions	7069*

Institutions included in the above totals are:

Bridgewater College  
Eastern Mennonite College  
Emory and Henry College  
Hampden-Sydney College  
Hampton Institute  
Hollins College  
Mary Baldwin College  
Randolph-Macon College  
Randolph-Macon Woman's College  
Roanoke College  
St. Paul's Polytechnic Institute  
Sweet Briar College  
University of Richmond

\* The enrollment in St. Paul's Polytechnic Institute was not available and is not included in this total.

### Student Recruiting

One item of cost seems worthy of special mention, namely the cost of the annual information bulletin or catalog published by each institution. While this item is of considerable size, it would not merit special mention perhaps if it were not a part of the larger problem of student recruiting. The practices engaged in by the several institutions in recruiting students when the general approach to the high schools is competitive, is costly in time and far from satisfactory to the high schools whose school program is disrupted appreciably by a succession of visitors from the several institutions.

In states where the institutions operate in a closely coordinated fashion,

## HIGHER EDUCATION IN VIRGINIA

a single brochure representing the offerings of all the publicly controlled institutions is commonly published and sent to all high school seniors in the State. No other catalogs of the State institutions are sent to the seniors except on request by them. In some states, a college recruitment field day is held in the spring each year in some central place and all institutions have representatives there to meet the prospective freshmen contemplating entering college in the fall. This avoids the necessity of visits to the high schools by State college representatives.

In Table 9 is given the number of catalogs published for the regular academic year at each institution from which information was obtained and the cost of printing and mailing them.

Table 9

Numbers of Bulletins of Information for  
academic year, (excluding summer session  
and other special bulletins) and the cost of  
printing and mailing them.

	Number Catalogs Printed	Cost of Printing	Cost of Mailing
University (1950-51)	28,000	\$13,029	*
Mary Washington (1949-50)	17,000	4,089	\$235
V. P. I. <sup>1</sup> (1951)	8,500	3,200	123
Radford (1950-51)	5,000	2,106	*
William and Mary (1949-50)	15,000	4,878	177
V. M. I. (1950-51)	6,000	2,320	525
Longwood (1949-50)	14,000	2,511	*
Madison (1949-50)	12,000	3,815	*
Virginia State College (1950-51)	5,500	2,686	*

\* Information not available

<sup>1</sup> Special Prospectus Information concerning annual Bulletin of Information, not available.

## HIGHER EDUCATION IN VIRGINIA

### Capital Improvement Plans

One paragraph in Resolution No. 47 reads as follows:

- (c) The financial operations within the several institutions and critical review of the proposed budgets for operations and for capital development. Long range capital improvement plans should be developed.

The above paragraph from Resolution No. 47 would involve three separate studies if fully carried out. The first is a study of the financial operations within the several institutions. This has been done by the Auditor of Public Accounts in his annual audit reports of the several institutions and in his unit cost study of each institution. These are available from the Auditor and are reported briefly in Tables 6, 7, 11, 12 and 13 of this Appendix. The second is a study of the proposed budgets of the institutions. This could not be done until the early fall of 1951 because proposed budgets are not compiled until then. The third is a study of the long-range capital improvement plans. These plans are of necessity based upon the proposed educational programs of the institutions. These programs, in turn, would be a first concern of the Board of Higher Education recommended earlier in this report to be established.

In order to shed some light on the programs of capital improvements, a questionnaire was sent to the several institutions to determine the extent to which they are modeling their campus development upon a long-range plan of capital improvements. The great majority of the institutions have such plans. Some of such plans call mainly for the replacement of existing outmoded buildings; others appear to be based upon enlargement of the present physical plant.

### Per Student Costs and Student Charges.

It is important to know how much it costs per student to provide the educational program offered at each institution. At the request of the Committee of the Virginia Advisory Legislative Council the Virginia Auditor of Public Accounts computed such unit cost figures from the books and accounts maintained at each institution. This rather formidable task was made possible by two circumstances: (1) The Auditor of Public Accounts is responsible for determining for the several institutions the methods they use in keeping their financial accounts. Because of his long interest in unit cost studies, the Auditor has had set up in each institution the form of accounting which makes possible computing costs per student. (2) The Auditor made unit cost studies of the public colleges and universities nine years ago. In preparation for such an undertaking, he studied carefully both in Virginia and elsewhere the complicated problems involved in making such computations.

These unit cost studies are sources of most valuable information. They will no doubt be pursued with deep interest by the officers of the several institutions, by the members of the General Assembly and by many others. At the request of the consultant, the Auditor assembled from the several studies the data in Tables 10, 11 and 12. These tables give for the several institutions the per capita costs (meaning cost per full-time student enrolled), the amount of this cost paid by the student, and the amount of this cost met from other sources such as State appropriations, endowment income, income from services carried on by departments, gifts, etc. (The amount each

## HIGHER EDUCATION IN VIRGINIA

institution receives from these various sources is shown in Table 6.)

Space will not permit much comment on these tables. The high cost of medical education will strike the reader at once. In comparison with other medical schools these costs are not high, but they do make clear that medical education is a costly business.

Some curricula are practically or wholly self-supporting. Non-State students pay more than they cost at the Norfolk division of William and Mary and at the Norfolk division of Virginia State College. They pay nearly all they cost at Mary Washington.

It will be noted that some institutions (Table 11) make a profit on their dormitories, and all save one (Table 12) make a profit on their dining halls. At Mary Washington this profit exceeds \$110 per student.

Variations from institution to institution are large. Explanations for some of them were given to the consultant, and afford quite satisfactory reasons for such variation. Others will justify careful study.

Unfortunately comparable figures from other states are not available, but from his general knowledge of individual institutions, the consultant believes the cost figures in these Tables 10, 11 and 12 are not unduly high.

## HIGHER EDUCATION IN VIRGINIA

TABLE 10  
COMPARISON OF PER CAPITA COSTS FOR ADMINISTRATION AND GENERAL  
AND INSTRUCTION EXPENSES WITH AMOUNTS CHARGED STUDENTS

School	Per Capita Costs	Amount Charged		Total Charges Over or Under Costs	
		Virginians	Non- Virginians	Virginians	Non- Virginians
COLLEGE OF WILLIAM AND MARY:					
Williamsburg	\$ 449.28	\$ 192.00	\$ 370.00	\$ 257.28	\$ 79.28
Richmond	294.62	218.95	318.95	75.67	24.33
Norfolk	262.17	227.00	273.50	35.17	11.33
LONGWOOD COLLEGE	493.28	143.66	243.66	349.62	249.62
MADISON COLLEGE	426.85	203.68	303.68	223.17	123.17
MARY WASHINGTON COLLEGE	406.73	175.00	395.00	231.73	11.73
MEDICAL COLLEGE OF VIRGINIA:					
Medicine	1,236.48	436.25	636.25	800.23	600.23
Dentistry	1,029.52	436.25	561.25	593.27	468.27
Pharmacy	654.71	310.00	410.00	344.71	24
RADFORD COLLEGE	289.53	131.89	221.89	157.64	67.64
UNIVERSITY OF VIRGINIA:					
College of Arts and Sciences	520.65	179.19	379.19	341.46	141.46
Department of Graduate Studies	520.65	152.54	227.54	368.11	293.11
Department of Education	520.65	156.01	350.43	364.64	170.22
Department of Engineering	785.05	248.49	398.49	536.56	386.56
Department of Law	462.23	255.00	370.00	207.23	92.23
Department of Medicine	1,674.35	396.74	646.74	1,277.61	1,027.61
Extension Division	311.82	231.11	231.11	80.71	8
VIRGINIA MILITARY INSTITUTE	643.10	62.14	362.14	580.96	280.96
VIRGINIA POLYTECHNIC INSTITUTE	436.41	153.75	303.75	282.66	132.66
VIRGINIA STATE COLLEGE:					
Petersburg	459.57	141.00	176.00	318.57	283.57
Norfolk:					
Regular College	251.39	146.00	181.00	105.39	70.39
Vocational Trade	251.39	250.00	285.00	1.39	33.61

## HIGHER EDUCATION IN VIRGINIA

TABLE 11  
COMPARISON OF PER CAPITA COSTS FOR DORMITORY  
WITH AMOUNTS CHARGED STUDENTS

School	Per Capita Costs	Amounts Charged	Total Charges Over or Under Costs
COLLEGE OF WILLIAM AND MARY:			
Williamsburg	\$ 162.06	\$ 158.57	\$ 3.49
Richmond	150.92	177.50	26.58
LONGWOOD COLLEGE	157.23	(See footnote)	
MADISON COLLEGE	86.93	81.00	5.93
MARY WASHINGTON COLLEGE	103.81	126.00	22.19
RADFORD COLLEGE	101.50	90.00	11.50
UNIVERSITY OF VIRGINIA	145.25	111.98	33.27
VIRGINIA MILITARY INSTITUTE	154.07	195.00	40.93
VIRGINIA POLYTECHNIC INSTITUTE	77.31	84.00	6.69
VIRGINIA STATE COLLEGE:			
Petersburg	79.34	63.00	16.34

NOTE: The charge for room, board and laundry is not separated at Longwood College. The combined charge of \$350.00 for these services exceeded costs by \$18.06 per student equivalent.  
Virginians and non-Virginians charged same rates.

TABLE 12  
COMPARISON OF PER CAPITA COSTS FOR DINING  
WITH AMOUNTS CHARGED STUDENTS

School	Per Capita Costs	Amounts Charged	Total Charges Over or Under Costs
COLLEGE OF WILLIAM AND MARY:			
Richmond	\$ 215.29	\$ 276.00	\$ 60.71
LONGWOOD COLLEGE	174.71	(See footnote)	
MADISON COLLEGE	200.83	238.50	37.67
MARY WASHINGTON COLLEGE	204.13	315.00	110.87
RADFORD COLLEGE	185.60	225.00	39.40
VIRGINIA MILITARY INSTITUTE	185.93	450.00	35.93
VIRGINIA POLYTECHNIC INSTITUTE	270.14	288.00	17.86
VIRGINIA STATE COLLEGE:			
Petersburg	206.42	232.00	25.58

NOTE: The charge for room, board and laundry is not separated at Longwood College. The combined charge of \$350.00 for these services exceeded costs by \$18.06 per student equivalent.  
Virginians and non-Virginians charged same rates.

