

STATE AFFAIRS COMMITTEE

February 19, 1963

The meeting was called to order and Chairman Taylor made a preliminary statement concerning the hearing; that it was for the purpose of hearing opponents to S.B. 151 and 152; that members of the Board of Regents were in attendance at the express invitation of the Chairman. Mr. Reed was introduced and thereupon introduced Mr. Dannenberger, Mr. Austin, Mr. Evans, Mr. Hall, Mr. Bubb and Mr. Kincaid of the Board, stating that two members were not in attendance.

Mr. Reed stated that the proposal is of complex nature and that while the Board favors the orderly expansion of the state system they are opposed to 151 and 152 as now written. He explained specifically why the Board is in opposition to the measures and suggested an alternative. (See attached.) He suggested that the pros and cons were really not too far apart, and that they just needed to sit down together and work out a plan satisfactory to everyone. Mr. Doyen inquired how he reconciled his views with those of Dr. Hughes, and Mr. Reed replied that Dr. Hughes is a competent educator and interested in the education of Kansas youth, and quoted an article in the Pittsburg Sun of February 3rd, where Dr. Hughes was quoted as being "opposed to the establishment of a third university..." Miss Jacquart asked for an interpretation of certain sections of 151 and she was asked to wait until Clement Hall appeared; that Hall being an attorney could answer her question more competently. There was a great deal of interest expressed by members of the committees concerning the statement that the new Frank Lloyd Wright building contained less square footage than had been advertised. Mr. Reed quoted a clipping from the Wichita Eagle of September 11th, that "bids will be asked this month to build part of the Frank Lloyd Wright college of education center at the University of Wichita". He stated that the low bid on the proposed building is \$780,000, or \$40,000 per square foot as compared with comparable buildings on other campuses at \$26,000 per square foot. Mr. Marshall inquired if amendments would make the measure acceptable, and Mr. Reed replied that the Board would welcome amendments; that they are in favor of expansion of the proper kind.

Mr. Austin stated that at Manhattan and Lawrence, the expenditure of tax money per student was approximately \$1,131 and at Pittsburg, Hays and Emporia, approximately \$724.00. He stated that the difference between a university at Wichita and a college at Wichita would be \$1.7 per year, and would be even greater as enrollment increased. He stated that it was

his hope that the legislature would provide higher education at Wichita, but that it be coordinated with the present program. (See statement attached.)

Mr. Hall stated that it was the concern of the Board that there were too many divisions of government provided in the bills; that there were too many loopholes and the powers not clearly enough defined; that there were too many divisions of boards and governments for the plan to ever work effectively and efficiently. It was established that the present general obligation bonds of Wichita University is \$10,554,000 as of Jan. 30, 1962; and general revenue bonds in the amount of \$6,889,000. There was discussion concerning the office building owned by WU and with regard to an Endowment Board for the properties of the university. It was established that the Board of Regents would have no objection to an Endowment Association such as KU and KS now have, since its duties are clear cut and established.

Mr. Bubb spoke as an individual member of the Board of Regents, stating that the Wichita University question has been brought into politics, and that unless dedicated individuals work out a satisfactory plan, neither side will win, and Kansas will lose. (see attached.)

Mr. Joe Jagger appeared on behalf of the Farm Bureau, stating that he felt that Kansas could not afford a third university but that a liberal arts college was another thing; that it would impose a burden that might impair the quality of our education and efforts should instead be made to upgrade the curriculum. (see attached.)

The meeting was adjourned.

Clyde M. Reed, Chairman  
State Board of Regents  
House State Affairs Committee, Topeka  
House Ways and Means Committee, Topeka  
1 P. M. Tuesday, February 18, 1963

Chairman Taylor, Chairman Conard, members of the House State Affairs Committee, and members of the House Ways and Means Committee.

The State Board of Regents is appreciative of your invitation to appear here today to discuss Senate Bills 151 and 152, and matters related to them.

Your interest in hearing both sides of an important and complex public issue is in the best traditions of free legislative processes. This is the first opportunity the State Board of Regents has been afforded to make known its views before a current legislative body on a subject which will fall within its responsibilities if the pending measures are approved.

Let there be no misunderstanding about the position of the State Board of Regents.

We favor orderly expansion of this state's system of higher education. As much as any and more than most, we recognize it is necessary in the best interests of the state.

We are unalterably opposed to Senate Bills 151 and 152 as presently drawn. We believe they will create far more problems than they will answer.

We hold it to be tragic that the naked force of power politics has been applied to the solution of a question of higher education. At no time in the history of this state has higher education been subjected to the political pressures existing today on this issue.

Ours is an appeal to reason. Our hopes rest on fair play.

Whatever the current denials, Senate Bill 151 contains the seeds of a third state university, operating in total independence of other and established state institutions of higher learning.

You will note that the language of the proposition to be submitted to the voters of the city of Wichita centers on the phrase "a state university to be known as the University of Wichita." This passage is to be found on page 2 of the bill.

We read various statements to the effect that the University of Wichita can be operated in any manner the State Board of Regents sees fit. Yet the language of the <sup>legislative</sup> vehicle by which this is to come about contains a moral if not legal commitment to the contrary.

The State Board of Regents stands in complete opposition to the creation

of a third independent state university in Kansas. We firmly believe it cannot be justified by academic need. We believe as firmly it would place an unjustifiable burden on the state's resources and dilute rather than strengthen the quality of education in Kansas.

This is not the board's position alone. It is supported by the views of a group of distinguished American educators, enlisted 18 months ago to render an objective report on the future of higher education in Kansas.

These men served as consultants to Dr. Alvin C. Eurich in preparation of the Eurich Report. Their statements, released with their permission for public study, additionally refute the baseless allegations that the Eurich Report is the work of one man and one man alone.

Let me quote from the report of Dr. Carroll V. Newsom, former president of the New York University and now vice chairman of the board of directors of Prentice-Hall, Inc.

"As a result of my two recent trips to Kansas, I developed certain convictions in regard to the organization and financing of higher education in that state," Dr. Newsom states.

"It appeared urgent to me, in fact, that the state must take immediate and active steps to plan systematically for the future. If this is not done, it is probable that the state will end up with an octopus of diverse institutions under public support which will not really serve the needs of the state and, in addition will be inefficient and expensive."

Further Dr. Newsom states: "There is no foreseeable academic need for more than two state universities;....there is no foreseeable academic need in Kansas for more than two graduate schools providing course work leading to the doctorate....  
.....as a matter of interest I happen to believe that the day is past when all graduate work in an institution has to be centralized upon its campus."

Dr. Herman B. Wells, chancellor of the University of Indiana, was another of the distinguished educators who visited Kansas in the course of the study of our higher educational needs.

Dr. Wells says:

"Notwithstanding Wichita's past efforts in the field of business administration, additional in-service advanced courses are needed by Wichita business and industry leading to the master (degree) of business administration. These could be offered in Wichita by the University of Kansas in cooperation with the University of Wichita."

"If Wichita, for reasons of political expediency, must be taken into the state university system, it should come in as a division of the University of Kansas,

without/<sup>any</sup>independent status. I would then extend to Kansas State University the opportunity to offer such specialized courses as can be furnished by that institution."

From Dr. Oliver C. Carmichael, former chancellor of Vanderbilt University and now a member of the Board of Higher Education of North Carolina, comes this statement:

"In light of the facts presented to me, the graduate education needs of Wichita would not appear to warrant the establishment of a state university. The number of students seeking full-time graduate work would not be sufficient to support a university program. It may be some years hence there will be a need for a full-fledged university program at Wichita, but not now. The main emphasis of the institution should be on improving the undergraduate program."

Evidence supporting the opinions of these professional educators comes from another and quite independent direction. Only on Sunday, February 17, was an announcement from the Committee on Institutional Cooperation unprecedented in scope in the field of higher education.

What universities compose the Committee on Institutional Cooperation?

This is the list: The University of Chicago, University of Illinois, University of Indiana, State University of Iowa, University of Michigan, Michigan State University, University of Minnesota, Northwestern University, Ohio State University, Purdue University and University of Wisconsin.

Nine of those universities are state institutions, all located in states larger than Kansas and with greater resources. The other two are private institutions, among the most heavily endowed of any in the nation.

What is their goal? It is the institution of a "traveling scholar" program, designed to make it possible for a graduate student enrolled in one of the CIC universities to have the advantage on a term basis of special opportunities available at another.

The committee's chairman explains that "central in the graduate student exchange project is the aim to avoid costly duplication of efforts and expenditures when possible.....Such planning would apply particularly in areas where the cost of the best is very high and duplication is likely to result in mediocrity."

The goal of the State Board of Regents in Kansas is precisely the same. We want to avoid duplication in costly fields of graduate education, yet at the same time preserve and even expand maximum opportunity in that area. It is with this objective in mind we are asking the current session of the Legislature for authority to enter into interstate compacts with neighboring states in the fields of professional and specialized education.

Many states are studying the ways and means of expanding higher educational opportunities, as they must.

Among them is our neighboring state of Missouri and we would point out that a recent report in that state recommends two divisions of the University of Missouri be established in Kansas City and St. Louis.

Divisions of the University of Missouri, we would emphasize, not independent universities.

The budget of the St. Louis division, as outlined on page 6 of the Missouri report, would become a part of the budget of the University of Missouri, although a distinct and separate item. It would, in effect, hold the same relationship to the University of Missouri budget as our own medical center budget holds to that of the University of Kansas.

Further, graduate studies in both the Kansas City and St. Louis divisions would be under the general co-ordination of the dean of faculties, the University of Missouri, Columbia.

The Missouri report also specifies that an administrative council of the University of Missouri should be established to co-ordinate internal administration and program development of the Kansas City division. The council would be composed of the president of the University of Missouri, as chairman, and the presidents of the Universities of Missouri, St. Louis and Kansas City, and the dean of the graduate school, University of Missouri, Columbia.

A similar co-ordinating council for the University of Wichita is advanced in the Eurich Report. One of the authors of the Missouri report, incidentally, is Robert J. Keller of the University of Minnesota who participated in the comprehensive educational survey carried out in Kansas a few years ago at the Legislature's direction.

The weight of all evidence on the subject of graduate education is heavily on the side of co-ordination, not duplication. This, we submit should be our course in Kansas if we are to maintain quality education in the face of unprecedented numbers of students.

Our concern, meaning that of the State Board of Regents, is even greater on Senate Bill 152 than on Senate Bill 151. We believe that as written Senate Bill 152 creates another board for the University of Wichita which would make sound administration impossible and peaceful operation even more so.

Senate Bill 152 creates a nine-member state board of trustees to handle certain endowments of the University of Wichita, both past and future. Really, as we all recognize, it is specifically directed to the problem of the Colorado-Derby office building in downtown Wichita. The University of Wichita has title to that building.

Colorado-Derby is probably the most bizarre piece of educational financing in the history of Kansas. Its terms defy logical legal analysis.

The building ostensibly is a gift of the Ablah family of Wichita to the University of Wichita. Yet revenue bonds issued by the University of Wichita were necessary to finance its completion. Additional revenue bonds were issued against the building's income which, together with student library fees, financed the construction of a new library on the campus of the University of Wichita. In all, the revenue bond indebtedness charged directly or indirectly to the Ablah gift is \$3.6 million and the interest rate thereon is five per cent. Revenue bond interest on facilities at our present state institutions ranges from two and one-half to three and one-half per cent.

We have copies of the various deeds transferring the Ablah property to the University of Wichita. You are welcome to examine them. You may want to present them to the House Judiciary Committee for further examination.

Conflicts in operation and policy immediately arise. This income-producing property was removed from the Sedgwick County tax rolls by the State Board of Tax Appeals, upon the application of the University of Wichita, despite the fact it is in direct competition with privately-owned office buildings in Wichita.

All income-producing property held by the endowment associations of the University of Kansas and Kansas State University---save for one farm in Rooks County---is on the tax rolls for property levy assessments in its respective localities.

How can or should the State Board of Regents reconcile such a conflict? Our hands would be completely tied as regards the University of Wichita by the language of Senate Bill 152 as now written.

No provision is contained in Senate Bill 152 for making the trustees of the University of Wichita subordinate to the State Board of Regents.

Teaching and research functions could be financed by the Wichita trustees independently of the State Board of Regents or other state authorities and contrary to established practice followed now by our state schools.

The long-range implications of this highly un-coordinated plan are without limit. The loopholes are big enough to push through a full-fledged, complex university without the approval of the State Board of Regents and all others charged with responsibilities for higher education in Kansas, including the legislature.

Further the endowment associations of the two state universities are privately organized. Expenditures directly relating to their

institutions are subject to approval of the State Board of Regents.

No such provisions are contained in Senate Bill 152. Rather the board of trustees to be appointed by the Governor appears to have unlimited authority of its own to receive and expend gifts and bequests without regard to limitations on practices or programs relating to the University of Wichita but applying to other state universities and colleges through the State Board of Regents.

Unless resolved now, it is the feeling of the State Board of Regents this conflict will be a bone in the throat of higher education in the state of Kansas for many years to come.

We come now to another serious question involving the obligations of the University of Wichita.

It concerns an educational building on the Wichita campus, a contract for which was let on December 30, 1962. This is a building designed by Frank Lloyd Wright for the University of Wichita.

While a news release from the University of Wichita said the contract involves construction of a building containing 40,000 square feet of space, competent outside architectural authorities can account for only 24,890 square feet of enclosed space.

The contract was let for a sum of \$758,000. Using the independent figures on floor space, the cost per square foot thus is computed at \$30 for the enclosed area. This compares with an average of \$15 per square foot for all buildings erected on all state university and college campuses in Kansas since 1958.

The Wichita news release further stated the building will accommodate 1,000 undergraduate students and 400 graduate students.

Yet these same independent architectural authorities can find only four classrooms designated as such in the plans, together with office space and conference rooms.

This leads to the inevitable question of whether the announced educational building at Wichita is not in reality only the first phase of Frank Lloyd Wright's plan. If it is, in view of the time element involved, the completion of this building would become an obligation of the state, willing or not.

We further ask if this architectural fantasy is an indication of a prudent university administration bent on keeping student fees at a minimum to afford maximum opportunities for all.



Using the difference between the actual contract price of \$30 per square-foot and the \$15 average expended for state buildings, a saving of \$373,000 could have been realized by following state practices.

This \$373,000 could reduce fees for full-time equivalent students at the University of Wichita by \$90 for one year, actually placing them not too far above state university fees now charged in Kansas.

The plans for the Wichita educational building, complete with enclosed promenades, pools for fish and lilies, and other architectural gimcracks and teardrops are available for your inspection in the office of the state architect.

The greatest concern of all on the part of the State Board of Regents is to be found in the tactics pursued to put the University of Wichita into the state system.

Political excursions of the early 1920's and the late 1950's into higher education in Kansas pale into insignificance when placed alongside the pressures now being exerted.

If such political pressures are to be used to gain a place in the state system for any institution, is it not logical to assume they will be utilized continually in the future for its operational needs?

Power breeds power. A pattern is here being set which can plague higher education in Kansas for all time to come.

The State Board of Regents is composed of reasonable men. Our efforts are dedicated to the best system this state can provide for the education of the young people of Kansas.

We will not stand idly by, however, and permit the 29,435 students now enrolled in our state universities and colleges, their competent faculties and administrators and indeed the institutions themselves to become unwilling pawns in a game of power politics.

It will be a black day for Kansas if this is permitted to happen. It will be a blacker day still for higher education in Kansas, to which our future is so completely tied.

As regents, we stand ready to help work out any and all problems of higher education in Kansas in concert with other responsible men and women, in the interest of all of the young people of this state and of their future.

We believe this can be done if carried on in an atmosphere of good will and high intent, the basis on which all higher education problems should be resolved.

While we would warn at the same time of hasty compromises reached in the heat of legislative deliberations, we are encouraged by the attitude of Governor Anderson as expressed at his press conference Monday morning when he said he is not committed to Senate Bills 151 and 152 and has an open mind on other solutions of this problem. This is the spirit in which it can be ultimately resolved for the benefit of the state as a whole.

We should seek solutions which will solidify the state, not divide it. This cannot be done if empirical ambitions are permitted to prevail, if a few can inflict their will upon the state without regard to greater interests and welfare, including those of the City of Wichita itself.

Ours is an appeal to reason. Our hopes rest on fair play. The decision is yours.

Whitley Austin, Member  
Board of Regents, State of Kansas  
House State Affairs Committee  
February 19, 1963

May I present a few basic figures to this committee.

On the average, the state universities at Lawrence and Manhattan now require an annual expenditure of state tax money of \$1,131 per full-time student. The three colleges, Emporia, Pittsburg and Hays, on the average require \$724 in state tax money per full-time student.

The difference in cost may be explained by the advanced studies, the graduate and professional curriculums and the research programs at the universities. These upper-level and specialized programs are a characteristic of a university and differentiate a university from a college.

Using these averages, which are based on current tax costs, and applying them to the present enrollment at Wichita University on a full-time equivalent formula, we can make this estimate:

It would now require \$4.7 million in state tax money to operate the Wichita school as a full university. But it would require only \$3 million to operate it as a college. The difference to the taxpayers would be \$1.7 million a year. This difference, of course, would increase as the enrollment increased.

It has been said that Wichita would be only a medium size university. As a medium size university has not been defined, I cannot estimate what the additional cost in tax millions would be.

Senate Bill No. 151, however, makes no mention of a medium size university. It does refer frequently to an unlimited University. It implies that Wichita would be a full size university granting doctors degrees. It is so worded that the question upon which Wichita citizens would vote would be on the creation of a state university out of a municipal one. The related bill, No. 152, with its provisions for a second board conflicting with the Board of Regents in jurisdiction, also seems to envisage the operation of a full university at Wichita.

I can only conclude that the \$4.7 million tax cost of a university is built into these bills, a cost that would increase as the university enrollment increases, and increase at a university rather than at a college rate.

It has been said the Board of Regents can handle these matters later on. If the Governor and the Senate can be stampeded by the Wichita power bloc, what chance would a board appointed by the Governor and the Senate have?

May I interject a personal note. I am deeply interested in higher education. I come from a family of teachers, preachers and farmers. My sister is a teacher. My brother was a teacher until he was killed in action in the war. I have two children who soon will be in college. In my five years on the Board of Regents I have consistently advocated a state program that would give every Kansas youngster the opportunity for the highest quality education the state can afford.

These Senate bills, Nos. 151 and 152, by spreading thin the programs, by dividing authority, by diluting the instruction, by creating a third costly university would reduce the quality of Kansas education and would exact from the taxpayers a price that is more than Kansas can afford.

May I respectfully and earnestly express the hope that this Legislature will provide for higher education at Wichita but that it will do so without political or parochial considerations and that the facility it fashions will be coordinated with existing programs so that the students not only of the Wichita area but those of every part of Kansas may receive the best possible instruction Kansas can afford.

Mr. Henry A. Bubb, Member

Board of Regents, State of Kansas

House of Representatives State Affairs Committee

February 19, 1963

I speak as an individual member of the Board of Regents. It is my personal opinion that higher education in Kansas has been hit below the belt by dragging the Wichita University controversy into the political gutter. When glowing promises of new highways, turnpikes, local legislation, or threatened political demise for various individuals in our legislature are used to bring or not to bring a university into the State system under a plan not approved by the experts -- we have reached a new moral and political low in Kansas.

In my more than 35 years as an adult citizen, I can remember only twice when there was an attempt made to bring the Board of Regents into politics, and neither time was it as serious as the present time. The members of the Board of Regents give considerable time without any compensation (and that's as it should be), and they are dedicated to giving Kansas as good a system of higher education as we can afford. The circumstances surrounding the present bills, together with the content of the bills, if they are passed, will make it impossible for any Board of Regents to discharge their duties in the future as they have in the past.

Unfortunately, unless dedicated sincere Kansans on both sides can sit down immediately and work out a plan based on logic and reason, neither side will win, and the people of Kansas will lose.

The backers of Senate Bill No. 151 and Senate Bill No. 152 can not take the attitude of a General De Gaulle -- namely, that the tax payers of Kansas must follow our wishes -- or else. Wichita is our largest city, and a fine one; they deserve assistance for education from the State and I am sure most of the good citizens of that city do not want to carry on a life-time feud with the rest of their fellow Kansans -- just because there is a disagreement over how much support the State can afford to give.

I hope that personal differences and political ambitions can be put aside before it is too late, and that we can work out a plan which is educationally sound and economically feasible for the good of all citizens of Kansas.

NAME	ADDRESS	REPRESENTING
Emma A. Bebb	Topeka	Board of Regents
Whitney Austin	Salina	" " "
W. F. Dauenbarger	Concordia	" "
Jordan N. Jones	Wichita	Citizen
Robert H. Lusk	Wichita	Citizen
Mrs Alfred Giffert	Wichita	
William H. W. Logan	Wabots	self
Lynn of Whiteside	Wichita	Boeing Co
Clemens H. Nace	Coffeyville	Regent
Carl Kumpard	Independence	
Johanna Lopez	Wichita	
Herol Farmer	St. Scott	Leg's agent
John Vogel	Lawrence	
Mrs F. H. Heller	Lawrence	
Reed S. Highler	Pittsburg	
Mrs Rees Highler	Pittsburg	
Elliott L. Watkins	Hesper	Legislature
Floyd Louden	Cheney	Leg. Co. member
Doc Antunich	Lawrence	
Mrs. Pat Quessier	Wichita	League of Women Voters of Wichita
" RG Blandell	Wichita	
Mrs. Martin Dondlinger	Wichita	
Mrs. Julia A. Ocker	Wichita	
J. C. Uliatt	Legislature	
Mary Watson	Lawrence	citizen
Janet Coleman	Lawrence	citizen
Joe Jagger	Minneapolis	Farm Bureau
Clarence Rupp	Manhattan	" "

Statement of Joe Jagger  
to House State Affairs Committee  
on Behalf of Kansas Farm Bureau  
February 19, 1963

My name is Joe Jagger. I am a farmer at Minneapolis. Today I am here as a member of the Board of Directors of Kansas Farm Bureau, a voluntary farm organization of more than 79,000 families. I have been designated by the president of our organization to represent it here today.

I would like to say at the outset that the question of incorporating the University of Wichita into the state system of higher education was a subject of study in our 105 county organizations last year. The resolution adopted at our state convention in Topeka last November was not quite unanimous. But I believe it is a safe statement to say that at least 90 counties concurred in the final statement, and that vote bore out the advance recommendations which had been submitted by the individual county organizations in September.

First of all, we recognize that two separate questions are involved in the problem facing the legislature in connection with the facilities at the University of Wichita.

No. 1. Should the facilities at Wichita be taken into the state system of higher education to augment facilities now available at five other campuses in order to make a college education available to the growing number of Kansas high school graduates who desire to go on to college?

No. 2. In case the facilities at Wichita are brought into the state system of higher education should they be taken in as a third state university?

These are two separate propositions and there is a significant difference between the two. I would like to discuss the second one first. What is a university? It is true that the term university is sometimes used rather loosely. It is also true that a number of fine colleges in Kansas are called universities because that is what their founders chose to call them 75 or 90 years ago. But in the more limited definition of the term as it is commonly accepted among educators, there are only two institutions in

Kansas to which the term university can be accurately applied. I refer to the University of Kansas at Lawrence and to Kansas State University at Manhattan. And it has only been in the last few years that the scope of the institution at Manhattan was broadened so that it could be called a university.

The distinction between a university and a college is not a matter of semantics. A university is distinctive because of its doctorate and research programs, including many graduate courses leading to the masters degree. All of these are much more costly than undergraduate level work. Our members believe that the state is not prepared to finance three first rate state universities. I hope that I have not given you the impression that our members favored bringing Wichita University into the state system as a liberal arts college, but opposed taking over these facilities for the purpose of establishing a third university. Actually, an overwhelming majority of our members opposed both propositions.

A strong case can be made against proposition No. 1. To use our financial resources to expand our higher education facilities in the conventional pattern which has not changed substantially in many years could be extremely short-sighted. One of the alarming statistics is the rate of attrition (the drop-out) in the first year of college at our state institutions. I am informed that it is about 30 percent and in some of the more difficult curricula the rate is higher. It must be obvious that the waste is huge when the state of Kansas tries to provide college facilities for all high school graduates who want to matriculate and then finds that 30 percent do not come back for the second year.

The high rate of attrition in some subjects suggests that it is time that we develop some new concepts. Perhaps better counseling will reveal the need to expand technical training schools--a program in which the state has done little--rather than expand opportunities at liberal arts colleges.

But since the bill that has passed the Kansas Senate and is now under consideration in the House would bring in the facilities at Wichita as a third state university, my greatest concern is about proposition No. 2 as I have stated it. Whether Kansas can afford an additional liberal arts facility is one question. But whether Kansas can afford



a third state university is an entirely different question. The state legislature already has recognized an obligation to the high school graduates in the Wichita area by appropriating state aid to the University of Wichita, as well as to Washburn and to the junior colleges. To acquire the facilities at Wichita as an adjunct to the liberal arts campuses now being maintained might be a consistent expansion of a program of state aid. But to consider bringing in a third state university raises much more difficult problems.

Basically, we do not believe the state of Kansas has the resources to finance another state university with extensive doctorate and research programs, and at the same time to maintain high standards at the two existing universities and the three state colleges. Although one college president in recent days has said that legislative support of higher education in Kansas has not been surpassed in any other state, it is true that Kansas is not ranked high on the basis of many criteria used to measure the quality of higher education. Putting it bluntly, it has been a real strain in our state to "keep even" with our neighbors. To take on a third costly university can very well be the millstone that could impair forever the quality of the university program in Kansas.

The great majority of states have only one or two state universities. Most of these states have both population and resources greater than Kansas. It should be noted that Nebraska, Missouri, Minnesota, Illinois and Wisconsin have only one state university. It is my understanding that only Michigan has attempted to maintain three separate universities. One of these has suffered. Also, the financial position of Michigan is not one that Kansas wants to emulate.

The argument has been made that the concentration of population in Wichita deserves a third state university. Very few states have their universities located in their great population centers. In this area, Colorado, Oklahoma, Missouri, Illinois, Iowa, and Indiana do not have their universities in their population centers.

Job opportunities at Wichita have been cited as a reason for locating a state university there. It is my understanding that more people are looking for jobs at Wichita than in any other area of the state. However, even if unemployment were at a low level, and many jobs were available at Wichita, this would be an argument having real merit only

for students seeking a bachelor's degree. Those seeking doctor's degrees, and those associated with the research programs of a university usually are not looking for part time employment.

In conclusion, I want to say that we face a real challenge in the future to provide the educational opportunities our young people must have to cope with the problems of the space age. We simply dare not do anything which might impair the quality of our educational programs. A major effort will be necessary to provide the programs that are needed. We must concentrate our attention on up-grading the programs we now have, rather than run the risk of providing a second-rate education by spreading our resources too thinly.