

NATIONAL GOVERNORS' CONFERENCE
HONOLULU, HAWAII
June 27, 1961

The Chairman of the Conference Planning Committee has suggested that I open our discussion by reflecting some of my own views on the financing of higher education. I have chosen to approach the topic from familiar ground, i.e., from our own experience in Florida.

The experience of Florida may be of peculiar value because we have compressed into so few years so much of our growth. In 1950 there were 2.8 million people in Florida. Today there are over 5 million. In 1950 there were 34,000 students in college in Florida. Last Fall, just 10 years later, there were 64,000 students. The larger part of this growth came in institutions which operate with public support -- they experienced an increase in enrollment to $2\frac{1}{2}$ times that size during that period.

Because we expect a continuation of this growth pattern, we must plan for higher education as we move.

At the beginning of this decade our problem became apparent and our Florida Legislative Reference Bureau undertook to make a study of post-war developments of the state university system. Following that year our governing board of the institutions of higher learning organized a council of distinguished educators from across the nation to assist us in making an appraisal of higher education in Florida. Without that study we would have found it impossible to anticipate or meet the expansion that we have experienced. Without that study and subsequent studies we would be unaware that the 64,000 students now in our institutions would number 158,000 by 1970.

of less than degree length that are appropriate vary from locality to locality. If these local variations are to be taken into account there must be local participation in the support and in the control of institutions that are able and willing to provide such programs. In Florida we have community junior colleges in 14 areas of the state to offer such services along with strong programs of general education, and all of these institutions receive local as well as state support. These institutions afforded an important dimension to higher education, and the local support they receive is another approach to the financing of college level education.

Some people eye the ever growing student body itself as a source of additional revenue. Perhaps they are right in doing this, but I do not believe that this will prove to be an acceptable solution in the long run. Individuals are no longer the principal beneficiaries of higher education, for society itself is so dependent upon its college educated manpower that it is to our common interest to provide educational opportunities beyond the high school for all who can profit from them.

The democratic institutions in this country, in my judgment, are more secure by virtue of the fact that we have strong, privately financed, and privately controlled institutions of higher learning. As we obtain adequate support for our publicly controlled institutions, we must avoid the disruption of the flow of support to private institutions. If indeed through our tax structures or otherwise we stimulate private interests to step up their support for private colleges and universities we will be meeting our educational needs, and at the same time we will

help assure the diversity in higher education upon which our freedoms depend.

As Jefferson recognized the necessity for education in a democratic state, so let us recognize that now it is the widespread diffusion of knowledge and understanding at the college and university levels upon which our further progress depends. This recognition will prompt us to find the amount and the kinds of support that are really required for this basic function of state government.

This we can do, and this we must do, without endangering the very ends we seek.

I mention one more very important source of educational funds: the private grant. Because Florida is so young we have not accumulated the social capital which many of you are fortunate to have in your jurisdictions. Within the last month, however, we have established an education and research foundation, and have secured the commitment thereto by large corporate entities within the state for the purpose of supplementing salaries of both public and private institutions of higher learning to insure that we are able to secure at least some of the finest minds in the world.

While frugality may not be in vogue today, certainly frugality is not a new concept in America. With each step westward, on each new frontier our fathers found that resources were scarce and that the stakes were high. As the frontiersmen of yesteryear demonstrated clarity of purpose, and as they made very careful application of their limited resources to the attainment of those purposes, the expanding horizon of each new

frontier became reality -- a part of the stable and settled America.

In our determination to make appropriate but demanding programs of higher education to as many of our citizens as can profit therefrom, we are on a new frontier. If the horizons before us are to become a settled reality in the American culture, we must recapture the arts of frontier frugality, for once again the resources are limited and the stakes are high.

One of the most significant tools with which we met this enrollment explosion was the system of community junior colleges. In 1950 we had 5 such colleges. Today we have 25. Just last week I signed into law a measure creating 3 more, at the same time vetoing a measure creating yet a fourth. The increase in enrollments over this decade in junior colleges in Florida has been 16 fold, and we are just beginning. Indeed, some of the facilities, if not the bulk of them, are still very temporary in nature pending completion of construction programs now under way.

For many years our university system in Florida has consisted of two White universities and one Negro university. These institutions have been rapidly and continually expanded and improved. In addition we have begun a new institution of higher learning which already has the first 2 years of enrollments under way; we have scheduled another institution for construction during the coming biennium, and we have yet another such institution in the planning stage for the biennium two years hence.

This is the background for our financial needs. In addition to the vast quantities of money for capital outlay required, we have attempted to upgrade our faculties, and in the legislative session just completed provided an increase of salaries for staffs at our institutions of higher learning approximating 20% across the board.

As we look ahead, it would be easy to panic. Some would eliminate or greatly reduce, college enrollment by arbitrary limitations. This is an unacceptable alternative in Florida where our need is to expand educational opportunity rather than contract it. We have made the decision for better or forworse that appropriate educational opportunities beyond the high school

will be provided for all our young people who are both willing and able to profit from rigorous intellectual programs at the college level.

Yet I would point out to you that while we see the ever expanding financial need we are conscious of the need of providing an economy into which young people graduate which preserves for them at least as much opportunity for advancement in a free society as that which was granted to their less well educated forebears. At the same legislative session at which we increased college salaries 20%, we balanced our budget and did so without any increase in taxes. Obviously this required a dedication in an increasing proportion of our state revenue to education, and it is perfectly clear to us that the new industry which is coming to Florida in such volume and the expansion of our native industry which is going on at such a great pace, is occurring not only because of our favorable climate but also because of our favorable tax climate. If it be true that tax structures developed elsewhere in the nation are driving the geese that lay the golden eggs to Florida, we do not intend to claim so many of those eggs that the birds abandon their new nest. Basically, therefore, our challenge is that of challenges of all states, somewhat intensified because of our rate of growth: to find the ways in which our proper governmental functions can be carried on successfully with the resources which can be gleaned from our expanding economy without stunting the very growth which we profess to cherish.

We in Florida are dedicated to the proposition that, saving only the will of God, the minds of men, young and old, are our greatest resource, have the greatest potential for good, and must be provided with maximum opportunities for development.

If we are to provide such opportunities in the long run, we must find ways in which every dollar that we spend for higher education makes its greatest possible contribution toward the ends we prize most.

In my judgment there are three principal avenues in which to channel our efforts to obtain a maximum return for the money spent on higher education.

First of all we must determine precisely what it is that we seek to accomplish through our expenditures for higher education. While there is something inherently exhilarating about institutions of higher learning, we must be clear in our understanding that colleges and universities are means to ends, and not ends in and of themselves. A clear definition of our objectives for our systems and institutions of higher learning must be formulated in such a way that we can concentrate our resources at those points best calculated to serve the purposes we value most.

Secondly, we must provide appropriate mechanisms to facilitate and adequate incentives to prompt the development within higher education itself, of more effective procedures and practices than now generally prevail.

Third, we must insure that in the process of developing great universities we do not permit uneconomic duplication of instructional areas and unwise proliferation of instructional offerings.

We have deemed it wise in Florida to provide one board of control for all our universities so that they might be operated as part of a coordinated unit. We have strengthened, and propose further to strengthen the staff services for this board to enable it to deal more effectively with the complexities which confront it.

While I understand something of the hesitation that educators evidence when their "institutional sovereignty" is threatened, I am fully convinced that a well-coordinated, state-wide, effectively operated system of institutions, each with its own distinctive character and purpose, is a necessary prerequisite to the meeting of our responsibilities for higher education within the resources which we can properly dedicate to that function. The ways in which we can and will provide such systems of higher education will vary across the nation, and quite properly so.

Whether it be through a state-wide governing board, through a coordinating board, through a board of educational finance, through a commission on higher education, or through some other mechanism, we must provide the incentives which will prompt the institutions of higher learning to utilize their resources more effectively than they are doing now. Ways of increasing the productivity of the teaching faculties must be found and followed; that is, we must utilize ways by which the talents of our best qualified teachers will reach with undiminished effectiveness greater numbers of students than they now reach.

We can do this if we are willing to provide incentives so that (1) students will be encouraged to select programs which they can pursue with profit, thus reducing the drain which occurs when students undertake to do that which they cannot do, (2) instruction will be given in groups that are no smaller than is demonstrably necessary to achieve effectively and well the purposes for which the instruction is given, (3) increasingly larger share of the responsibility of students will be placed upon the students themselves, (4) the deadwood in the curriculum, i.e., that which is not required to accomplish the purposes of

the institution, is identified and eliminated, (5) electronic and mechanical devices will be employed to conserve teaching manpower, (6) semi-professional assistants will be employed to permit the professionally educated faculty members to concentrate on that which only they can do, and (7) the instructional load will be distributed more uniformly throughout the calendar year, thus utilizing both the faculty and the physical plant during the summer months to a greater extent than is now commonly done.

If we provide faculty salaries which are commensurate with those paid to similarly qualified people in business and industry we can increase the manpower available for teaching. This means, however, that we must concentrate our resources more on manpower and brainpower than on mortar and bricks. While Florida colleges and universities utilize instructional space somewhat more intensively than the national average, we cannot and will not continue to add instructional space with the expectation that a room will be used no more than 20 periods per week. We must spend on construction and on the operation of the physical plant no more than is required for the programs of the institutions to be carried out with a high degree of efficiency. A significant part of the enrollment increases which we anticipate will be accommodated through the more intensive use of instructional space.

Furthermore, if we are to be successful in our effort to win for higher education the consideration and the support it requires, we must formulate our legislative requests in ways that will enable the Legislatures to act upon them more intelligently.

Once it was assumed that the more details we could obtain about the operation of our colleges and universities, down to the names and the salaries of each clerk and each janitor, the better we would understand the financial requirements of those institutions. While some people still insist upon having great volumes of data, there is now widespread recognition that the great masses of insignificant, uninterpreted data reduce the probability that college and university budgets will be acted upon with understanding.

It is my judgment that one of the most significant developments in the financing of higher education is now to be found in the ways in which budget requests are formulated and presented to the Legislatures for consideration.

In Florida, until recently, our legislative budgets looked like the composite of the telephone directories of New York City, Chicago, San Francisco, and Honolulu. The new budget form, in similar terms, is more nearly the size of the telephone directory of Ewa or of Kaneohe on this island. But the brevity of the document does not limit its usefulness because it is designed to focus on the basic elements in the budgets and upon the policy questions on which the budgets are based.

The budget requests for instructional services are based on precise statements of the anticipated instructional load, showing the number of student semester hours of credit at each of three levels (freshman and sophomore, junior and senior, and graduate). The proposed student teacher ratio for each of the three levels is identified, and the number of fulltime-equivalent teaching faculty members being requested is calculated and shown in the request.

The requests for personnel for research and for extension show the number of full-time-equivalent positions requested for these functions; and the number of these positions is related to the number of instructional positions to indicate the emphasis to be given to research and to extension in relation to that to be given to instruction.

In addition to the total amounts for salaries, our budget requests reflect policy decisions relative to the distribution of the faculties among the several faculty ranks as well as to the average salaries to be paid. The requests also show the number of positions to be filled by graduate students and by student assistants.

While we must do all that we can to assure that the dollars spent for higher education make their maximum contributions to the ends we prize most, we have to recognize that the expanding enterprise of higher education will require larger sums of money than we now spend.

As we seek to identify additional funds for higher education - for any and all functions of government for that matter - I would urge that we expect each level of government to provide, to the fullest extent possible, the support that is required for the functions which are appropriate for it to manage and to control.

Personally, I resist every effort to shift responsibility for the financing of any governmental service to a level of government above the one through which that service can be provided effectively and efficiently.

As I have watched the state government in Florida assume the major responsibility for the support of the public schools, I have observed that the local school districts (which in Florida are the counties) have grown increasingly reluctant to do for themselves all that they can do. With each decrease in local initiative with regard to the schools we have moved that much closer to a state-wide system of public schools with the Legislature making the kinds of decisions which local school boards really ought to be making.

If Federal funds are granted for the purpose of assisting education at college or any other level, it is my hope that these grants will be made as a refund to the states of income taken from her people through the greater taxing resources of the Federal Government, and not as grants for the accomplishment of specific objectives.

It is my judgment that the best solution to our problems, both state and national, is for the higher levels of government to serve as collection agencies, turning back to the states and to the local governments revenue to be used for the purposes and in the ways determined by the receiving governmental unit. In that connection, let me point out that I advised the Legislature of Florida in its last session that although I resisted any more state taxes for state purposes, I favored the use of the taxing power of the state to meet expanding needs of local governments in view of the fact that the ad valorem tax, the traditional work horse, was carrying in many instances a maximum burden.

While the state as a whole is generally the appropriate unit for the management of publicly supported higher education, the kinds of technical, semiprofessional, and terminal programs