

P U B L I C H E A R I N G

before

JOINT LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEE TO STUDY
AND REPORT ON THE SHORT AND LONG RANGE CAPITAL
NEEDS AND RELATED MATTERS IN THE FIELD OF PUBLIC
HIGHER EDUCATION, created pursuant to Assembly
Concurrent Resolution No. 8 [1964]

Held:
April 2, 1964
Senate Chamber
State House
Trenton, New Jersey

Members of Committee present:

Assemblyman C. Robert Sarcone [Chairman]
Assemblyman Raymond H. Bateman [Vice Chairman]
Senator Wayne Dumont, Jr.
Assemblyman Paul Policastro
Assemblyman Peter J. McDonough
Assemblyman Clarkson S. Fisher
Assemblyman William K. Dickey

* * * *

I N D E X

	Page
Clarence H. Stephans Newark College of Engineering	3
Dr. Mason W. Gross President, Rutgers, the State University	16
Dr. Frederick M. Raubinger State Commissioner of Education	64
Dr. Frederick L. Hipp Executive Secretary, New Jersey Education Association	21-A & 37-A
Mrs. Joseph Pritchett State Education Chairman League of Women Voters of New Jersey	29-A
- - -	
Assembly Concurrent Resolution No. 8	35-A
Letter from Dr. Ernest F. Dalton, President, N.J. Junior College Assn., dated March 26, 1964	39-A

SENATOR C. ROBERT SARCONE (Chairman): The hearing this morning is being conducted by the Joint Education Committees of the New Jersey Senate and the New Jersey Assembly pursuant to Assembly Concurrent Resolution No. 8.

The Committee members present this morning are: to my left, Assemblyman Policastro of Essex County, Senator Wayne Dumont of Warren County; to my extreme right, Assemblyman McDonough of Union County, and to his left, Assemblyman Bateman of Somerset County who is Vice Chairman of the Joint Committee, and Assemblyman Fisher from Monmouth County.

Before we commence, I would like to spread on the record Assembly Concurrent Resolution No. 8 which sets forth the guide lines for this study. I will read part of the Resolution now:

"It shall be the duty of the joint committee to undertake an immediate study relating to short and long range capital needs in the field of public higher education as the same relate to Rutgers, the State University, Newark College of Engineering, the several State colleges and county and community colleges and junior colleges. The joint committee shall obtain information on the extent to which and the terms under which Federal funds may be made available to New Jersey public higher education institutions, including community and junior colleges, and of the impact thereof on future State appropriations for public higher education. Such study shall, among other matters, include consideration of the practicability of the issuance of revenue bonds to finance construction of

housing and other self-liquidating facilities at residential colleges, an evaluation of the degree of efficiency in the occupancy ratio of classrooms, laboratories, auditoriums, athletic and other building facilities and of the success in obtaining admission to other institutions by students refused admission on the grounds of enrollment capacity."

That is paragraph 2 of the Resolution.

Now this morning we have scheduled the following witnesses, the first of whom will be Mr. Stephans representing Dr. Robert Van Houten, President of the Newark College of Engineering; then we will hear from Dr. Mason Gross, President of Rutgers; and if there is time within the morning session we will hear from Dr. Frederick Raubinger, our Commissioner of Education; thereafter, probably in the afternoon session, we will hear from Ernest R. Dalton, President of the New Jersey Junior College Association - we have a letter from Dr. Dalton, who will not be present this morning but we will read the letter for the record.

Dr. Alfred Dunn, President of the New Jersey Association of Colleges and Universities was invited but we did hear from the Doctor and we would like to indicate that on the record.

Then we will hear from a representative of the State League of Women Voters, and Dr. Hipp of the New Jersey Education Association. The latter will probably be heard during the afternoon session.

In order that you may understand how we will proceed, those who will make a presentation will be permitted to make

a statement - if you have a written statement and you desire to read the statement in its entirety, you may do so, but if you prefer that the statement be spread on the record and then desire to make a statement beyond that, you may feel free to do so.

After your presentation the Committee members may choose to question you with reference to your statement or in any other area where they feel that you might assist the Committee.

I would ask that each of you give your full name, address and indicate whom you represent.

Mr. Stephens, will you proceed, please.

CLARENCE H. STEPHANS: I am Clarence H. Stephens, 323 High Street, Newark, New Jersey, and I represent the Newark College of Engineering.

Senator Sarcone, Assemblyman Bateman and gentlemen of the Committee, Dr. Robert W. Van Houten, President of Newark College of Engineering, and Dr. William Hazell, Vice President, both had wanted very much to appear before you today to present these facts and figures concerning the College's growth pattern; but both are unavoidably prevented from being here by earlier commitments which require their presence out of the State.

They have asked me to appear in their name, and, for the record, I have given my full name and I am Director of Relations with Industry at the College, and Director of NCE's Special Courses Division.

There is no need for me, I am sure, to repeat the general statistics available concerning the growth of college-age population, except perhaps to point out that Newark College of Engineering feels the full pressure of this population "explosion" because, as a public institution, its tuition and fees make it possible for qualified students to attend an engineering college who otherwise might be prevented from doing so for economic reasons.

Perhaps I ought to say first that Newark College of Engineering has been engaged in careful study and planning since 1954. It was in that year that the Board of Trustees made its first proposals for expansion, which resulted in two new buildings, Cullimore and Weston halls, completed respectively in 1958 and 1960.

While this construction was in progress, and even before the general activity was begun leading up to the Public Colleges Bond Issue Referendum of 1959, the Board also instituted two separate studies of NCE's future needs, one by the College's own faculty and staff and the other by the New York space utilization firm of Taylor, Lieberfeld and Heldman. These were later augmented by the State Department of Education study known to you as the Strayer Report. All three, done separately and independently, were remarkably close in agreement concerning the College's future needs.

In essence, these studies indicated that the growth pattern of NCE to 1970, if made possible through the necessary construction, would see the College's day undergraduate student body grow from 1781 in 1961 to 2750 in 1965 and to about 4200 in 1970. In addition, our facilities are used for extensive evening undergraduate, graduate and special courses programs which, together with the day enrollment in the fall of 1963, totaled 6300. A comparable growth also can be expected in the evening programs in the years ahead.

It is perhaps appropriate to point out that with this growth in student population there is inevitably taking place a corollary growth in the services which NCE as a public institution feels obligated to offer to the general public, and in particular to industry.

As a result, the kind of construction needs the College faces is diversified, and includes such facilities as housing (students now come to us from all of New Jersey's 21 counties), additional food services, more extensive facilities for faculty in the form of offices and research areas, facilities for extended graduate programs on a full-time basis, space for extended professional and community services, and, of course, areas for parking.

The problem of land presented the most difficult barrier to active development of the College's facilities until the City of Newark generously offered to secure land through Urban Renewal procedures. NCE's new campus is now in the final stages of clearance for three new buildings, capitalized from the 1959 Bond Issue Referendum, which we hope will be completed in 1965.

With the availability of this new land, the Trustees could at last begin to put into effect its long-range plan to meet the College's growth needs, and to use the plan to determine the sequence of construction as funds become available.

The six-year capital improvement program presented to the State last November is based on this long-range plan. The Trustees believe that, should funds become available within the schedule projected, Newark College of Engineering can meet the pressures not only of qualified applicants, but also of the needs of the engineering profession and New Jersey industry.

A quick review of the plan for the immediate future as presented last November follows:

a. Dormitory for 250 students (\$1,810,500)

State's share \$905,250 (50% of cost). While State colleges receive 100% of cost, our Trustees feel that 50% is a reasonable amount to amortize through student charges.

Present demands for housing, being fulfilled in makeshift ways, exceed the capacity of this proposed dormitory. While basically a "com-muter's" college, enough students coming from distances that require more than one hour's time would use college owned housing, if available. The south-Jersey boy, or northwest-Jersey boy, finds it hard to attend because of the lack of housing.

b. Maintenance building (\$321,000)

The College lacks adequate workshop and storage facilities for the Department of Physical Plant. The present inadequate and scattered facilities can be put to other uses.

c. Library-Humanities Center (\$2,310,000)

Present area and a possible limited expansion of the library will not provide adequate library facilities for the planned expanded enrollment and program. Required diversification of curriculums, more independent work by students, graduate programs, particularly the doctoral program, place heavy demands on library services. This is a specialized library because of the character of the College, but it must also provide resources for the humanities program. It is logical to house the Department of English and Humanities and some of their special needs in this building also.

d. Land Acquisition (\$63,000)

One building is a converted factory building but it is "land locked" with no adequate access for deliveries of equipment and materials. It is proposed to acquire some property adjacent to the building to provide an off-street access for deliveries and parking.

e. Dormitory (\$1,991,550)

To accomodate increased enrollment. The estimated cost is higher because of an expected time interval between appropriations.

f. Academic-laboratory building (\$5,100,000)

An extension of a building to be constructed with 1959 Bond Issue Funds. This will provide the needed classroom and laboratory space for the expected enrollment increase. New facilities for Chemical Engineering, which are now housed in a converted factory at a short distance from the rest of the College, would also be constructed as part of this building.

g. Food service addition (\$850,000)

The food services planned for the 1965 enrollment would not be adequate for the 1970 projected enrollment.

h. Parking facilities (\$1,250,000)

Emphasizing the "commuter" characteristic of the student body, which is repeated each day by the evening students, the parking areas used by the additional buildings will need replacing.

That is my statement.

SENATOR SARCONE: Do you have copies of that statement?

MR. STEPHANS: I do, Senator.

SENATOR SARCONE: Well, before you leave, if you do have sufficient copies for the Committee, I would appreciate your leaving them.

MR. STEPHANS: I would be happy to do so.

SENATOR SARCONE: Now, Mr. Stephans, you have with you another representative of NCE, do you not?

MR. STEPHANS: Mr. Blanchard is from our staff as well.

SENATOR SARCONE: And what is his position with NCE?

MR. STEPHANS: He is Director of Public Relations in the College, Senator.

SENATOR SARCONE: Now, Assemblyman Fisher, do you have any questions?

ASSEMBLYMAN FISHER: No questions.

SENATOR SARCONE: Assemblyman Policastro?

ASSEMBLYMAN POLICASTRO: These needs are projected ahead for how long, sir?

MR. STEPHANS: These needs are projected for 1970.

ASSEMBLYMAN POLICASTRO: Aren't they needed right now?

MR. STEPHANS: Some of these needs, particularly the dormitory, are of immediate need to us.

ASSEMBLYMAN POLICASTRO: How much of these funds, this total, do you need right now?

MR. STEPHANS: The figures are projected - the additional state funds projected to 1970 are \$11,795,000.

ASSEMBLYMAN POLICASTRO: Mr. Stephans, could you tell

us what the needs are for the very near future, the next few months or before this year is out?

MR. STEPHANS: The amounts that are indicated for that include the dormitory, maintenance, library and land acquisition and this amounts to \$3,599,250, sir.

ASSEMBLYMAN POLICASTRO: And you feel that this should be available within this year?

MR. STEPHANS: Within the next year, yes, sir.

SENATOR SARCONE: Senator Dumont?

SENATOR DUMONT: Mr. Stephans, is any of this included in the Budget Message submitted by the Governor for the next fiscal year? He has in here \$300,000 for advanced planning for colleges - does that include any of your land acquisition?

MR. STEPHANS: I do not believe that it does.

SENATOR DUMONT: I notice that he has two other projects that you mentioned, the dormitory at \$905,000, and the Library-Humanities Building at \$2,310,000, but he indicates that they are in the projects, a number of them, about 34 to be exact, which can only be accomplished if \$67,000,000 in additional revenue is found for the next fiscal year. Those are two of the things that you mentioned, is that right?

MR. STEPHANS: Yes, sir.

SENATOR DUMONT: Now you said, I think, that you are constructing some buildings now out of the 1959 Bond Issue or you will have some that will be finished by the 1965 college year?

MR. STEPHANS: There are three buildings that are

currently in planning and construction is contemplated within the next few months. I mean, the initial stages of the construction.

SENATOR DUMONT: The construction hasn't actually started yet.

MR. STEPHANS: It has not.

SENATOR DUMONT: This is from the 1959 Bond Issue.

MR. STEPHANS: That's correct.

SENATOR DUMONT: What are those buildings?

MR. STEPHANS: There are three - one is the Student Center, another is the Physical Education Building, and the third is an Academic Building.

SENATOR DUMONT: What's the total cost of those three, or projected costs out of bond issue money?

MR. STEPHANS: The total, including land acquisition is \$7 million.

SENATOR DUMONT: Have the contracts been let for the construction of these buildings?

MR. STEPHANS: They have not. The bids should be received April 22.

SENATOR DUMONT: And when are these buildings to be completed and ready for occupancy?

MR. STEPHANS: 1965.

SENATOR DUMONT: The fall of '65. September, you mean?

MR. STEPHANS: That's the projected date, September, 1965.

SENATOR DUMONT: Thank you.

SENATOR SARCONE: Assemblyman McDonough?

ASSEMBLYMAN McDONOUGH: I just have two questions.
How many students do you house at the present time,
Mr. Stephans?

MR. STEPHANS: We house no students in our own dormitories because we have no dormitories. There are approximately 200 students at the present time that are housed in facilities around Newark. Now, this includes some use of hotel facilities, a few are in the YM-YWCA, most of them are housed in boarding houses in the Forest Hill-Roseville Section and some even in East Orange, but this amounts to about 200 students that we know of.

ASSEMBLYMAN McDONOUGH: None of this is subsidized by the college, is it?

MR. STEPHANS: None of it is. In fact, we have no control over that and I think this is an important consideration.

ASSEMBLYMAN McDONOUGH: One other question. You mentioned a proposed dormitory for 250 students at a cost of \$1,810,500 and then later, under your point E, you mentioned another dormitory at a cost of \$1,991,000 - are those two separate?

MR. STEPHANS: They are. The first is an immediate need, and the second projects itself to the increased enrollment figures for 1970.

ASSEMBLYMAN McDONOUGH: Thank you.

ASSEMBLYMAN BATEMAN: Mr. Stephans, you indicate that you have a need of \$11.7 million worth of projects by 1970. Could you allocate within those projects what you deem to

be a priority list? In other words, could you give our Committee what you think is most essential and then next most essential so that in getting these priorities we will know in your mind which is first. This doesn't indicate that the last one isn't important too but we would like to know what your priority line-up is.

MR. STEPHANS: Yes, I believe I can do that, Assemblyman Bateman.

First is the immediate need for the dormitory, the maintenance building, the library, that land acquisition for extending the facilities of one of our present buildings; the dormitory is next which takes care of the increased enrollment for 1970; the extension of the academic building; food service, that I mentioned, which again is dependent upon the increased enrollment expected for 1970; and then the land acquisition, and this latter is simply that as we build buildings on the land that is being acquired then it becomes necessary for us to take care of the parking situation because, as I understand it, the City of Newark has a certain schedule of requirements for parking per number of students.

ASSEMBLYMAN FISHER: What was your third priority? I missed it.

MR. STEPHANS: The library, sir.

ASSEMBLYMAN FISHER: Thank you sir.

ASSEMBLYMAN BATEMAN: That's a combination of library and humanities building?

MR. STEPHANS: That's correct. Library and facilities for the humanities' group, offices and space of that character.

ASSEMBLYMAN BATEMAN: I have just one other question.

You anticipate that most or the high percentage of your students in the future, up to and even through 1970, will be day students and not dormitory students? Is this changing? You obviously have a need for dormitories to house what is a small percentage of your students now. Do you see this picture changing or will you essentially be servicing boys and girls who are able to come to school and go home?

MR. STEPHANS: I believe on the basis of past pattern that an increasing number of students will come from other areas of the State and require housing. I am not in a position to identify the percentage but I still think that to a great extent NCE will be a community or commuter college.

ASSEMBLYMAN BATEMAN: Thank you.

SENATOR SARCONE: Mr. Stephans, you appear to be looking at a sheet - does this set forth in writing the priorities?

MR. STEPHANS: It is my understanding that this is a form that was submitted to the State last November and --

SENATOR SARCONE: Does that set forth the priorities or does it not? The reason I ask, if you can give us a written statement it will be helpful to the Committee, it would assist us.

MR. STEPHANS: This listing is in a priority list. If we can make a copy of this --

SENATOR SARCONE: Fine. Would you make them available to us?

MR. STEPHANS: Yes, Senator.

SENATOR SARCONE: It would assist us. We have taken notes and we have the record but this would assist us.

MR. STEPHANS: Yes, I will be happy to make that available.

SENATOR SARCONE: Mr. Stephans, has NCE determined what its enrollment will be for the September term, as yet? Has this been concluded as to how many will be admitted for the fall term?

MR. STEPHANS: Yes, 600.

SENATOR SARCONE: 600 will be admitted.

MR. STEPHANS: 600 freshmen.

SENATOR SARCONE: 600 freshmen?

MR. STEPHANS: Yes.

SENATOR SARCONE: How many applications were received for the fall term?

MR. STEPHANS: I would like to indicate, Senator, that there are between 1400 and 1500 applications from students whom we could take, qualified students whom we could take.

SENATOR SARCONE: And 600 were admitted.

MR. STEPHAN: And 600 will be admitted, yes, sir.

SENATOR SARCONE: Now, what is the total enrollment again? I believe you mentioned the present total enrollment.

MR. STEPHANS: The present total enrollment is about 2300.

SENATOR SARCONE: How many of the 2300 are non-residents?

MR. STEPHAN: Senator, I cannot give you an exact figure but it is very small, that is, non-residents of the State of New Jersey.

SENATOR SARCONE: Yes.

MR. STEPHANS: I would be inclined to say that there are perhaps 15 or 20 students out of that number who are non-residents, simply because our needs are for the people from the State of New Jersey.

SENATOR SARCONE: I have no further questions.

ASSEMBLYMAN McDONOUGH: Mr. Stephans, one other question.

Three counties in the State presently have been approved for the Junior College Program and funds are available for this program to get underway. Union County just finished their survey, as you probably know. Do you see any relief to your program by getting the Junior Colleges? As an example, Union County's intention is to go into a technical two-year post high school program. Will this relieve you people in any way?

MR. STEPHANS: I don't think that that is going to relieve the number of individuals who genuinely are qualified to go on to professional training. In fact, I think, sir, in time this will increase the need because there will be a number of these people who will want to advance themselves and would be qualified to advance themselves.

SENATOR SARCONE: Any other questions?

All right, Mr. Stephans, there are no further questions. We thank you for appearing here this morning and if the Committee does desire any further information we will communicate with you.

MR. STEPHANS: Thank you very much, Senator.

SENATOR SARCONE: Next we will hear from Dr. Gross.

Before Dr. Gross commences, I would like to say that while this is the first public hearing by the Joint Committee pursuant to ACR No. 8, the Committee has met in hearings which were not public and Dr. Gross and the representatives of Rutgers have appeared and have been very cooperative and have furnished a great deal of information to the Committee which the Committee has been taking under consideration.

I wish to thank Dr. Gross and his staff.

M A S O N W. G R O S S: I am Mason W. Gross a legal resident of Rumson in Monmouth County but a practical resident of Piscataway Township as President of Rutgers-The State University.

I am accompanied today by Mr. John Swink who is our Vice President and Treasurer and a resident of Westfield in Union County, and also by Mr. Metzger and Moore, as you will recall, my assistants for the purpose of cooperating with legislation in any way that they can.

I have no statement to make, Senator. We have filed with you various reports which is the basis of all our studies, including the projected building program which we were requested to file with the State Treasurer on November 1, last. This gives as clear an indication of our priorities as anything could.

I would simply like to make one point, which I think I have raised before, that we have reached the point now where any further increase in enrollment will cause us to have to think in terms of units of buildings along with individual buildings. In other words, it is not enough for

us to build another classroom in New Brunswick primarily I am thinking of - because we would have no place to house the students or feed them and so on. So we go ahead now in what might almost be called college units, where we have to provide the residences, the classrooms, the basic laboratories, and so on, all in one package.

I would like to say also that we have been in the same position as Newark College of Engineering just described, in being held up on using all our 1959 bond issue funds for building in the City of Newark. We are now underway with the building of the Law School as our first building with the 1959 funds and we have let all the contracts and work is commencing on that building.

We hope, before the end of the year, that we are going ahead with the other three buildings - the library and humanities building; the science building, which will be paid for out of bond issue funds; and also with a student center which will be a self-financing building. This will come when the final land is cleared. The delays, of course, in all cases here have been due to the cumbersome machinery of urban renewal.

We have had great cooperation from the City and we are, as I say, ready to go.

I think that would be enough for me to say by way of preface and I would be very happy to answer any questions.

SENATOR SARCONE: I will begin at the right this time.
Assemblyman McDonough?

ASSEMBLYMAN McDONOUGH: Well, I just have one question,

Dr. Gross, and this stems from our meeting last week.

I think you talked about this Route 18 cutting up some of your property. How much will that take away from you or what kind of a Chinese Wall will this develop?

DR. GROSS: Well, I think I can probably answer that. We don't really know because the plans are only tentative in that second stage of development of Route 18, but this would go through a tract of land which we call New Jersey Acres which has been reserved for medical school development, primarily. It would divide that into two halves, just about. We have about 150 acres here and it would just about split it right down the middle.

Now, I suppose we could get from one side to the other but from the point of view of putting a six-lane highway right down the middle of your campus, it is a little short of ideal.

ASSEMBLYMAN McDONOUGH: I would say so.

ASSEMBLYMAN BATEMAN: Dr. Gross, at our request your Admission Office is surveying the boys and girls who did not get into your class of 1963, the New Jersey boys and girls. It's probably too soon for the survey results to be in but could you give us some indication as to when we might have some results that we could see?

DR. GROSS: Well, the replies are coming in fairly quickly now. I think probably the bulk of them are in.

It's over 3,000 replies that you have had or was it 3,000 letters?

MR. SWINK: 3,000 letters were sent out. There have

been about 1327 replies.

DR. GROSS: I would rather imagine that it's going to get slower from this point on. We certainly won't get 100% returns on this. And I can say, as we expected, that the bulk of these people are somewhere in college. You realize, of course, the pattern of application nowadays - you apply to three or four places usually always hedging it pretty carefully so that you are pretty sure you can get into one of them. The guidance officers in the schools are very much more competent in their duties than perhaps they were in the past and they advise these kids very well as to where they have a good likelihood of going.

The students that we are talking about, that we would like to admit, are students very definitely in the top third of their high school classes and these people would qualify and, therefore, it's not surprising to us to find that most of them have gone in.

I am not at all sure what the pattern is going to be this year because this year you know it's roughly a 20% increase in the size of the graduating classes from the high schools without any corresponding increase, really, in places available in the colleges. So I don't know what the story is going to be.

ASSEMBLYMAN BATEMAN: I asked the question primarily because, as you know, we are trying to get a report back as quickly as possible and even if we had a preliminary report, in another week or so, it would be helpful to us as far as our report is concerned.

DR. GROSS: We can give you progress reports. In other words, we can send you a report down now as to where we are. But I think it's fairly safe to say that a great bulk of them have found a place in college. My feeling always has been that the best results on this kind of a quiz will come from the high schools themselves because they will be the only ones who know whether people don't get in. I mean, our rejects by going somewhere else displaced other people and you don't know what happens across the board but the high schools, I think, would have fairly complete information.

SENATOR SARCONE: Senator Dumont?

SENATOR DUMONT: Doctor, you have four buildings to be completed in Newark under the 1959 Bond Issue?

DR. GROSS: Yes, Senator.

SENATOR DUMONT: Have those contracts been let?

DR. GROSS: One of them, the law school.

SENATOR DUMONT: And what's the total cost of the four buildings?

DR. GROSS: The bond issue funds available are \$9 million. We have another \$1 million which goes into the law school half of which we raised privately and half came from earlier appropriations by the Legislature.

SENATOR DUMONT: When do you expect that these buildings will be completed?

DR. GROSS: The law school is just getting started.

SENATOR DUMONT: Will you have some kind of a ceremony in connection with that next Tuesday?

DR. GROSS: We are breaking ground. That's kind of a

euphemistic term.

SENATOR DUMONT: I see. Do you have any buildings that are authorized under the 1959 bond issue still to be completed in either New Brunswick or Camden?

DR. GROSS: No, sir. We have been completed in New Brunswick for some time and in Camden one building is fully a bond issue building and that is almost complete.

MR. SWINK: It will be used this summer, we hope, but if not this summer, this fall.

DR. GROSS: And the other one is a student center and there is some bond issue money in it but it is also self-financing to a large degree and that's about --

MR. SWINK: It's about one-third finished right now.

SENATOR DUMONT: The delay in Newark was caused by urban renewal?

DR. GROSS: The delay in both places is urban renewal. These are both tied in with urban renewal.

SENATOR DUMONT: And you expect these buildings to be completed by 1965, do you?

MR. SWINK: All except the three.

DR. GROSS: The three will be '66.

SENATOR DUMONT: 1966.

MR. SWINK: Or '67, depending on the land.

DR. GROSS: This is a very large tract of land, as you know, right in the center of Newark which is quite a problem to clear because of the relocation of the families and all the rest of that.

SENATOR DUMONT: I think we asked this question of Mr.

Swink when he was here before, but do you have any idea how many non-residents you have at Rutgers in the student body?

DR. GROSS: Across the board, which is not really the right answer, it's about 5%. But this does not really give you the full picture because in Newark and in Camden it's almost none, whereas in New Brunswick it runs about 10% to 12%.

SENATOR DUMONT: How many qualified students are you rejecting, that is, students whom in the opinion of your Admissions Office are qualified to attend Rutgers.

DR. GROSS: Well, the story, as released by the Director of Admissions this year, is that we have had to turn away some 4500 fully qualified students whom, had we the space for them, we would have been glad to admit.

We issued notices to about 7200 students, expecting about half of them. In other words, we expect to admit a freshman class, across the University, of about 3500 students. We have admitted 7200 and the normal expectation of admission officers is that you get about half of the number that you admit. Over and above that there are about 4500 that we have had to send reject letters to.

SENATOR DUMONT: You mean over and above the 7200 that you sent letters of acceptance to, or whatever they are called, you still had 4500 more you could accept, that were qualified.

DR. GROSS: That's correct. Yes, sir.

SENATOR DUMONT: Do you depend at Rutgers on the 4 year

record of students as much or more than you depend upon the results of, say, college board examinations?

DR. GROSS: Yes, sir, we do. We have all kinds of evidence coming in. We require both the verbal and the mathematical college board tests, the student has a scholastic aptitude test. We also study very carefully the full high school record, the tests administered at the high schools and then, very often, perhaps the most important item, the recommendation of the principal or the guidance director, whoever signs the application form.

I think I would like to add this that a study which was conducted by one of our admissions officers some years ago indicated that the best evidence we could get as to what the chances of success in college would be was the class standing in the high school. That actually correlated best. Now this is just a statistical thing, there is no real explanation for it.

SENATOR DUMONT: But you give that at least as much weight as the college boards?

DR. GROSS: Oh, yes, very definitely. The college boards really are guides and, you know, you have limits on this thing. If a boy is below a certain limit, he's going to be a pretty poor risk but the chance of his being high in his high school tests is also pretty small. But we think the high school standing, the standing in class in high school is a very important factor.

SENATOR DUMONT: Thank you.

SENATOR SARCONE: Dr. Gross, I recognize that some of the things I am about to ask you, you have already furnished to the Committee in detailed material but we would like to get on the record your comments this morning, if you will.

Doctor, I am referring to the Strayer Report of 1962 and as I recall it estimated a need of \$134 million in new construction at our State Colleges and Rutgers to 1970. In so far as Rutgers is concerned, Doctor, has there been any significant change in this estimate?

DR. GROSS: Well, there is one change in the footnote that I would like to call to your attention, which adds another \$5 million to it making it \$139 million. But I am sorry to say that our Board of Governors and I myself and Mr. Swink were never satisfied with that estimate, of course. We do not believe it was realistic. It was done on a projection from the previous bond issue and did not, in our opinion, represent the extra costs of construction in the buildings that would be needed. Our costs would be considerably higher than that. We, of course, filed in the program filed with the Treasurer the actual cost of the buildings we think we will need.

SENATOR SARCONE: Could you give any indication of that this morning, Doctor, for the record?

DR. GROSS: Well, in 1970 I would say the estimate would be much nearer \$200 million. You realize, sir, this, of course, is conditional. This assumes we are trying to meet the demand. Both the Strayer Report and our own study, the Heller Report, indicate what we believe to be the demand

for places at the State University and if we met the demand, as projected there, this would be the cost.

SENATOR SARCONE: Doctor, then as I understand it, since the Strayer Report you have undertaken a study --

DR. GROSS: Yes, sir.

SENATOR SARCONE: -- and as a basis of this study you now make the following recommendations. Is that correct?

DR. GROSS: I would like to put in just one statement. I am not quite sure whether we discussed this point informally or not.

The Heller Study and also, to a certain degree, the Strayer Study. make one assumption which is not necessarily valid. They do correctly, I think, project the State needs for public higher education, the needs to be met by the State Teacher Colleges, the Newark College of Engineering, as well as by the University. And when they go ahead to figure out what our own needs would be, the University, as a segment of this total need, they have kept the same percentages, roughly. In other words, at the time of the Heller Study or at the time of the Strayer Study we were taking about 42% of all the students who went to some form of public higher education in the State and they projected our future demands in terms of that 42%.

I simply want to say that that is an assumption which you might want to spend some time on because it might well be that a better plan would be to develop some other type of education. We might want to add a greater percentage to the State Colleges, for example. There is nothing fixed in that

particular sum.

Now, all of our financial assumptions are based upon that percentage being maintained about the same but there is real chance for study there, it seems to me.

SENATOR SARCONE: Gentlemen of the Committee, before we leave this discussion of the Strayer Report does any member of the Committee have any questions in line with what has just been developed?

ASSEMBLYMAN POLICASTRO: I would like to ask just one question, Senator.

Doctor, what would be an ideal figure to have in college, everyone you could get? Or how much would it cost per pupil. Say you had 500 new people, above what you can accommodate right now, and there would be a need, say, next year for 500 more, how much would that cost?

DR. GROSS: You means in terms of capital construction?

ASSEMBLYMAN POLICASTRO: Yes.

DR. GROSS: Well, we are actually figuring on - rather than project let me give you what we have been doing - we have been estimating in terms of 1500 students rather than 500. The reason for that is that this is an economical size for dining halls and that sort of thing. 1500 students is one of these packages that we have been talking about, the kind of thing that we might build on the Camp Kilmer land if that became available, and it would include dormitories and dining halls, as well as classrooms. I think that the estimate of what this would cost the State of New Jersey is about \$11 million. Now, this is minimal because this does not

assume any major additions to libraries, and so on, which would have to come sooner or later, but to get the basic classrooms, dormitories, dining halls, and so on, this --

ASSEMBLYMAN POLICASTRO: This would be just for capital improvement, it wouldn't include the professors you would need or the --

DR. GROSS: No. That's different. Our cost per student now is about \$1400 operating costs. So you can multiply it from there. But in terms of capital costs, in building these units, which would be the most economical way to build, it would cost us about \$11 to \$12 million from the State on the assumption that we would then get from the Federal Government, by borrowing, matching funds for dormitories, for dining halls and so on, and perhaps some scientific equipment.

ASSEMBLYMAN BATEMAN: \$11.9 million was the figure you gave us on the Kilmer package.

DR. GROSS: That's about right.

ASSEMBLYMAN POLICASTRO: And that's what you need right now?

DR. GROSS: Now the reason for that, of course, is at Kilmer, if we are lucky, we have the utilities there. If we build somewhere else we will have an additional cost for utilities. That's why I am being a little vague, Mr. Bateman.

ASSEMBLYMAN BATEMAN: You indicated to us, when we met with you, that we might know in June whether or not this was a possibility so far as the land was concerned. Is there any change in that?

DR. GROSS: There has been no change in it at all. We still hope to hear then and we might hope to hear sooner. I must say that I have been a little bit alarmed by the discussions from the Pentagon to the effect that they are so anxious to help Mr. Shriver's war on poverty that they might turn over some of their unused military camps to them. I hope they leave us just a little corner where we can build and get started on them.

That's been the only thing that has appeared on the horizon at all.

MR. SWINK: I think one thing that should be pointed out is that the package which Dr. Gross was talking about is at Camp Kilmer only. And we have other very serious needs in Camden and Newark and also on the Science Center so that really the package that we are talking about, which would make the most sense, so far as the University is concerned, is about \$23.6 million.

DR. GROSS: This is more than the 1500. I was trying to get a cost for --

MR. SWINK: I didn't want you think this was --

SENATOR SARCONE: We'll get to the priorities a little later. Our plan was to ask Dr. Gross to furnish us with priorities. I had hoped that we would conclude with the Strayer Report. Since I had opened the questions to the Doctor with the Strayer Report, I wanted to conclude them on the Strayer Report.

Now, are there any further questions on the Strayer Report and the subsequent study? Doctor, you referred to

the Heller Report. The Heller Report, as I understand it, predicts the need of Rutgers by 1980 to accommodate some 35,000 students at close to a half billion dollars in new construction. Now, do you accept this as a reasonable estimate and are your plans being predicated on this estimate?

DR. GROSS: Well, the two figures, the dollar figure and the estimated enrollment figure - the dollar figure is 1962 dollars which you have to adjust accordingly; the enrollment projection again represents demand and this would assume that we will have the demand.

I would say only this about the Heller figures, they did a study for us prior to the 1959 bond issue, making the same kind of projections for the future, and they were uniformly conservative, too conservative. So I don't think there is much chance of the Heller figures being extravagantly large. Now that assumes all the current factors without change.

SENATOR SARCONE: Do the members of the Committee have any other questions with reference to the Heller Report?

ASSEMBLYMAN BATEMAN: Heller Associates gave you a report on the feasibility of expanded year-round operations, which I have read. Have you formulated plans? They discussed, I know, trimester and everything else. Have you formulated your plans in this area?

DR. GROSS: This is still being studied - the application of the Heller Study to our own program - by

a committee under the chairmanship of Dean Easton of the College of Engineering, who has actually done a lot of independent work in this field himself.

We are inclined to favor at the moment, but it has not been finally determined, what they call the modified three-semester plan. One reason for that is that there will always be a large number of people who want to attend some kind of courses in the summer but who are not part of our regular undergraduate body. And we would like to keep space available for them.

Also, it's going to be difficult, without any doubt, to keep your semesters full, to keep your classrooms and what-not full for three even semesters so long as students graduate from high school just once a year. And that's your real problem, or basically once a year, let's say.

ASSEMBLYMAN BATEMAN: In relation to additional students that might be handled, is there any estimate of how much more it will cost to handle how many more children if you had a modified three-semester --

DR. GROSS: In the report itself, that is included. I have forgotten the figures. This, again, is ideal. I mean, this assumes that you are full throughout and we are skeptical about that.

ASSEMBLYMAN BATEMAN: Dr. Gross, when we met with you in New Brunswick we were furnished a priority group, a, b, c, and d. In addition, in the Governor's capital priorities program, some of these come in at different stages than they might be in what we got in priority group a, b, c, and d.

Is it possible to give us a closer breakdown of

priorities within your total group so that we can have, as I asked Mr. Stephans from the Newark College of Engineering, your best thinking as to your biggest emergencies?

DR. GROSS: We have a breakdown here dated March 12 and I am not at all sure -- this is broken down only in terms of years, which I would be happy to give to you.

In other words, what it really is is a kind of revision of the Governor's program which would bring it more in line with what we think our needs are. Obviously the Governor's program is dealing with the entire State and there are concerns for other departments and this throws us out of whack but we have to recognize the necessity for that. But if we had our own way, we've got another program, yes, speeded up considerably.

MR. SWINK: Five years rather than six.

DR. GROSS: Yes, that's what I speak of. We will be very happy to file a copy of this with you. We will have to send it to you. This is a marked copy.

SENATOR SARCONE: Doctor, ACR-8 directs this Committee to look into Federal Aid which we can reasonably expect to help meet our construction needs. Can you relate to the Committee what we can expect in this area for Rutgers?

DR. GROSS: Of course, primarily we are concerned here with two bills which were passed by the Congress last fall. One is primarily related to medical facilities and related facilities, and the other is for general college facilities - libraries, science buildings and so on.

Now, let's leave the medical out for a moment, because

that has not been determined sufficiently in any case. It would also affect our College of Pharmacy, our College of Nursing and things of that sort but primarily it would be for the medical school.

Now this other bill, as you know, is a complicated arrangement. No money has been appropriated as yet and we have been asked to get in touch with our Congressmen because apparently Congress isn't hearing from people as to what the immediate needs are.

The Governor has appointed a commission here in the State to determine a priority list in accordance with the requirements of the bill and we expect to file with them what we could do. Now, we could get assistance up to a maximum of one-third for science education buildings and the libraries. Those are the two primary construction areas in which this could work. And we do plan to file for assistance in connection with our Newark program.

One reason for the Newark thing is that since it has taken us so long to get under way the money that we have set aside really isn't adequate to do the job it was intended to do in 1959.

But we can get assistance and also increase our capacity in the library and in the science building to a certain degree.

However, the State of New Jersey, for all of its needs, will only get \$4 million under the present program. And they, I understand, are going to put their own ceilings on the amount -- well, no, I guess the Federal Government

has - \$2 million for any single project, not any single building.

We don't know all the rules and regulations. They aren't formulated yet. The great trouble is that the bills promise an awful lot but the rules, when they are formulated and the money available, cuts that down quite a good deal.

We, I think, would like to be able to apply for one-third of the cost of the library in Newark, which might give us as much as \$750,000; and also for one-third of the science building.

I think that we might well qualify this year because we have to have matching funds available and we do have the bond issue funds available. Most colleges would not have that much money available as of right now. So I think we might well qualify for that.

SENATOR SARCONE: Members of the Committee, does anyone have any questions relating to Federal Aid?

DR. GROSS: I might add, Senator, of course there are older bills which give you equipment funds for science, again on a fifty-fifty basis when the money is available but this is highly restricted money, really, and it's not basic construction.

SENATOR SARCONE: Doctor, ACR No. 8 directs the Committee to look into the practicability of revenue bonds to finance the construction of dormitory and other college facilities. Now, we have looked into the New York experience with its Dormitory Authority and at this point it appears to offer some advantage. What are your views on such an

arrangement and would this make Federal loans or grants, not otherwise available, available to us at Rutgers?

DR. GROSS: Do you want to comment on that.

MR. SWINK: Well, I think I'll answer the last question first because it wouldn't make anything more available to Rutgers than is currently available to us. Federal assistance is already available to us.

A state authority, such as New York has, - it would have this one advantage in so far as Rutgers is concerned in that we could borrow money at a cheaper rate of interest. However, I think that this could also be accomplished in an easier way and a better way in so far as the State is concerned and also so far as Rutgers is concerned if by legislation in some way it could be arranged so that the faith and credit of the State could be placed in back of these bonds, at least, well, for these revenue producing facilities. Just that alone would accomplish anything that the housing authority, without the establishment of the complicated machinery which is established in New York State.

I was in New York just last week and looked into some borrowing and this one point is the only point that keeps us from getting, let's say, less than 3% interest. We are now paying three and five-eighths. So the faith and credit of the State means a lot more than the faith and credit of Rutgers University. However, our credit is still good but it's worth a percentage point.

So far as financing dormitories completely at the rates that we charge, it's impossible. It would cost just

about twice -- in other words, the fifty-percent figure which Mr. Stephans from NCE quoted is about the participation that you need in a dormitory-dining hall in order to maintain the kind of rates that we are currently charging our students at Rutgers and amortizing the other half of it. We can do this comfortably on a fifty-fifty basis. We are charging \$350 a year for a room and we are charging \$450 for our dining hall.

DR. GROSS: And \$350 is about the standard dormitory rate across the country, private or public.

ASSEMBLYMAN BATEMAN: If this were two-thirds and one-third basis, for example, it might be reflected in an increase in cost.

MR. SWINK: Yes. I just tried to do this with married students and I came out short. You see, when you borrow from the government on HHEA you cannot include any of your fixed equipment - only your fixed equipment, not your moveable equipment. So actually what you are doing is borrowing about 55%. The other five you have to put in there for moveable equipment. But it works out on the total bill to about fifty-fifty.

SENATOR SARCONE: Doctor, I know you have furnished us with information regarding the next question but for the purpose of the record and those persons interested in what has transpired in connection with this study, the Committee has been considering what has been done in other areas with reference to providing in one-building unit dormitories and classrooms. Doctor, can you comment on this as to whether in your opinion this is good for education and

whether or not this is practicable and can be worked out?

DR. GROSS: Yes. You mean from the point of view of educational policy and practice.

SENATOR SARCONE: Yes.

DR. GROSS: I think it can, very definitely. Actually, of course, we do have now three large dormitories which have a double floor - two of them have double and one is single - classrooms in what would be the basement except it looks out nicely over the Canal. And it has proven perfectly satisfactory.

We would like to study this very carefully when we plan our new units at Camp Kilmer, hopefully, and I think we would very definitely plan to have a mixture of classrooms and dormitory rooms. I can see no reason against it and it seems to be quite feasible. This doesn't mean, of course, that only the students living in those dormitories would go to those classes. You would have a good deal of exchange. But I see no objection to it.

Michigan State has gone into this in a very big way and President Hannah seems to find it very successful. He admits that it is more successful in the freshman and sophomore years than it is further along but that's because, I think, the size and the distances that the students have to travel at Michigan State.

This is an educational policy, not a financial policy because you don't save anything by it.

SENATOR SARCONE: Well then, can you comment on the financial end?

DR. GROSS: Oh, I can't see where you would save a

nickel. No, it would be done purely on the basis of educational lines. I think there are advantages.

ASSEMBLYMAN BATEMAN: You don't see any saving at all?

MR. SWINK: The only saving you might have would be the cost of the roof.

SENATOR SARCONE: What the Committee had been pursuing, Doctor, as we indicated to you when we met with you and your staff, was the idea that a building might be constructed through bonds due to the fact that the dormitories would provide revenue where the classrooms would not. Would you tell us whether or not this would be an advantage that the State could avail itself of?

DR. GROSS: I can't see how you can cut down your square footage. And if you can't cut that down, you don't cut your costs. So you would be paying, your bonds would still take care of about a half of the square footage used for dormitories but there would be nothing left over for classrooms that I can see, in any way at all.

MR. SWINK: I took such a problem as you pose as a little extra-curricular homework one night and based it on a one thousand man dormitory and a thousand man dining hall and the classrooms would take care of a thousand students and at the rate that we currently charge for this, you come out with such a building with a \$305,000 deficit each year. In other words, this is how much money you would have to put in it each year to pay off 40 year bonds at 3 3/4%.

SENATOR SARCONE: Do any members of the Committee have any further questions on the last subject, the revenue bonds?

Doctor, the Committee has also been directed by ACR-8 and urged by others to look into various proposals which are apparently aimed at increased utilization of present facilities. Now, as to classroom utilization, is there any hope that we can meet, at least in some parts, the pressures of increased enrollments by increasing the degree of utilization of our classrooms by larger classes, the number of students in a classroom.

DR. GROSS: Well, we are trying to do that. In our recent building program we have included large lecture halls. As we progress with our plans for renovating some of the older buildings we want to get some more large lecture halls too, and wherever this can be done, we plan to do it.

We are also now exploring the use of television so that if you don't have large lecture halls you might give the same material in - through closed circuit television, that is, of course - two or more classrooms. And I think to the degree to which this can be done it is being done.

You get a certain kickback. I mean, the students are already complaining that they are miles away from any professor and never get to see anybody.

I think that this can actually work very well, particularly in large introductory freshman courses. And wherever it can, it is being done.

SENATOR SARCONE: Now, Doctor, you referred to the trimester plan previously. I would ask you for the record, do you support the idea, as an educational policy, of the trimester plan in an effort to increase utilization?

DR. GROSS: There are two approaches to this. One is in terms of accelerated programs for the students, making them go to school 12 months a year. The other one is to fill your classrooms, the plant utilization approach, let's say.

I think that the first approach, the accelerated program, is most unwise, educationally. I don't think that most students can do it. I think those who can will have the opportunity to do so but I don't think you should plan to have most of your students do this. But I think that you can, by bringing students in at different times in the year, achieve a program of maximum plant utilization and this is what we are studying in the hopes of achieving.

Of course, as you realize, we have a very large and flourishing summer session right now. Actually last summer I believe there were, very often for very short periods, on the campus some 21,000 people. So I think the plant is being used but we are still studying maximum utilization, and we could get more.

SENATOR SARCONE: Members of the Committee, are there any questions on utilization?

ASSEMBLYMAN McDONOUGH: Dr. Gross, I have one question. This is probably difficult to answer because of your academic subjects and scientific subjects but do you have any idea in your academic classes what the average size of the class would run today?

DR. GROSS: The average size of the class would be about 20. This goes right across the board from graduate students right down. It's about 20.

ASSEMBLYMAN McDONOUGH: Oh, you can divide it.

DR. GROSS: Well, that's just the number of classes divided into the number of students.

ASSEMBLYMAN McDONOUGH: Well, in your academic work in the freshman and sophomore courses --

DR. GROSS: Oh, a great deal higher.

MR. SWINK: The freshman class would be much higher than 20. We are taking the average.

ASSEMBLYMAN McDONOUGH: What would you say the average would be in the freshman and sophomore classes?

DR. GROSS: There aren't any classes as small as 20 and they run up to 400 in history courses, for example, and so on. See, we have these two new auditoriums which seat 450 people and the history courses - even the courses in art are running way up.

ASSEMBLYMAN McDONOUGH: 400? You must be teaching them out in the stadium.

DR. GROSS: No. We have these new auditoriums. They are very good. And the new Douglass classroom building will also have two auditoriums, one science and one for general business. Every one of our new buildings in the Heights has an auditorium but not as big as that.

I might say just in connection with that, I mentioned television. Our only television at the moment is in that -- I believe you saw that auditorium in the Physics Building - there are about 250 seats there which makes it impossible to do any demonstration at all for the students to see and they have worked out a closed-circuit method so that you can even

put your camera through a microscope and project it on an enormous screen. And this is quite fascinating. This is better education and something really good is coming out of all this. It isn't merely a space utilization project, it's really better, but you couldn't have afforded it except that you had the large numbers also.

SENATOR SARCONE: Are there any further questions on that subject? (No questions.)

Now, Dr. Gross, it has been suggested to the Committee that prior legislative consideration and approval of new programs was sometimes lacking, that is, new programs are initiated within available appropriations, with private and foundation grants, and later the Legislature is asked to approve a request for appropriations to continue or expand these programs. Now, would you say this is so? And we point to the Alcoholic Study at Rutgers and the Urban Study Center at Rutgers.

DR. GROSS: Yes. Well, yes. The R-R Statute requires us to get the approval of the State Board of Education if the project is going to anticipate any future charge on state funds. There is nothing in our statute which requires us to go to the Legislature. We have no objection to discussing it, of course, but the law actually requires approval of the State Board of Education.

Now we have three projects this year which we have requested them to approve in order to get the funds but in every case - excuse me, the three cases are quite different - the Alcohol Study Center is in a building which has been

erected half by private funds and half by federal funds. The project is totally financed by federal funds on a ten-year program. We have asked about \$20,000 simply for the upkeep of the building, which we would have to have whatever it was being used for - there is the building and this is what it would be. But in order to go through all the procedures we have asked approval of the whole program.

We have also asked for approval of the Eagleton Institute which has been set up as the result of a bequest to the University. Now we don't actually anticipate any request there. As you know, the Eagleton program works with the State Government, with the Legislature and what-not, and we felt that in order to make absolutely clear that there was never any collusion in any of these things, let's say, that we should be completely independent. So, although we have asked for approval, we have no anticipation of asking for funds for that program.

In the case of the Urban Study Center, this was a project which was started by the Ford Foundation with an initial grant of \$750,000 for a five year period. Neither the Ford Foundation nor we knew whether we wanted to continue this program, whether it was going to work out or not. Now we have completed three years of that program and are looking forward to the end, at least, of the first grant. We anticipate more funds from the Ford people but not as much. We do believe that this is a worthwhile program and, therefore, we would like to have it sustained, at least so far as its basic elements are concerned, on the regular budget. So this

year we have asked for formal approval of that in order to continue it. If we don't get approval, it goes out when the Ford Foundation grant is over.

I don't really think, Senator, there is a commitment here. We are perfectly well aware when we make appointments to this kind of grant that any appointment that we make does not carry tenure beyond the duration of the grant. So we can close these things out completely if we have to.

SENATOR SARCONE: Do any members of the Committee have any questions on this subject? (No questions.)

Now, Dr. Gross, I know you and your staff have provided the Committee in detail the program in connection with the two-year medical college at Rutgers, when you met with the Committee which was prior to what has been transpiring in connection with the present and only four-year medical school in our State. Now, Doctor, would you explain again, for the record, what the Rutgers program is in connection with a two-year medical school that you have been proposing and when you anticipate that it will be ready to receive students. And after you have concluded that, Doctor, perhaps you might relate to the Committee, as President of the State University, what it would entail to develop a four year medical school, a full medical school, by Rutgers, and if this were given consideration how that might be developed in the light of your present program.

DR. GROSS: Well, you will recall that about ten years ago the voters of New Jersey were requested to consider a referendum to establish a state-supported medical school.

That was defeated at the time and then with the development of the Seaton Hall School the heat seemed to be off for the moment. But it has been building up again and finally we discover, and this after considerable study, that we could develop a sound two-year program which was devised so that at the end of those two years our students could be admitted to other medical schools in the area.

Now this is established as a fact. There is no question but what the other medical schools would take them if we recommended them and since they have places for students in the last two years and would be glad to get more students they encouraged us to go ahead with the idea of providing the first two years of medical school.

We were successful in getting initial grants from the Kellogg Foundation to start our operations, employing some of the people that we would need to plan the school, and we have now collected something over \$3 million of which about \$2 million is available for construction.

Under the bill passed by Congress last fall, HR-12, we can theoretically get as much as \$2.00 for every \$1.00 from the Federal Government for the development of a medical school. I don't think we ever would get that much because the funds aren't available but we can get a very generous matching amount.

So we have been going ahead with our plans for the two-year school. We have a Dean. We have various members of the faculty who are there to help plan the program, to help raise the money and do all the essential things. We

have to borrow space from some of our neighbors. Colgate-Palmolive, for example, is generously giving us the space in their new research laboratory to house these faculty members as they come before we have any place for them and the plans have been going forward quit steadily.

Now, for a long time I refused even to talk about a four-year school. I didn't want anybody to think that we were really planning a four but planning a two-year school as kind of a wedge to get it in. We knew we could do this as a package and it was a self-contained package.

But there are certain things that a four-year school would do for the State of New Jersey which a two-year school won't. One of the most important things, in connection with a medical school, is that a student tends to remain in the orbit of the medical school from which he graduates. In other words, if he goes out to Stanford to medical school he tends to remain on the West Coast; if he goes to Chicago he tends to remain there. Therefore, the two-year school which sends them on elsewhere for the last two years doesn't have a holding power and we would like to have some of our best students feel they could get not only their full medical education but all the post-graduate medical education and all the contacts of a medical school which would be, I think, very good for the medical profession of the State and which they want.

So we have had to start thinking in terms of the fact that probably this thing must inevitably develop into a four-year school.

We have made no concrete plans in that direction except to say that in locating our buildings for the two-year school, we have made sure that there would be land available not only for the remaining development for the four-year school but for such other clinics and specialized areas which always tend to congregate around a medical school. We have the land there for that purpose, about 150 acres, as I mentioned a little earlier. And even our design of the building has in mind the possibility that it might be expanded into a four-year school too. So you plan it so you can go that far. But that's all that we have done so far.

Now, with respect to time, because of the timing on the Federal bill and the availability of funds, the earliest that we could open a building is certainly 1967. But the Dean thinks that it might be possible to take an initial small class in 1966. That would be our first regular class.

SENATOR SARCONE: Doctor, would there be some consideration given in the event that Rutgers - the State University finds that in and of itself/^{it}would desire to embark on a four-year medical school, or in the event that the needs of the State are such that we would require a four-year medical school, would there be any consideration to locating certain phases of the medical school not at Rutgers or on the Campus but in an area, which many people have been talking about, such as Newark where you have some existing facilities that might be utilized.

DR. GROSS: Well, Senator, I don't think there really are any facilities that could be utilized for the corps

training of medical students.

Now, if it develops to a four-year school, it would be like any other division of the University. It would not only have its basic teaching function and its research functions as an inevitable part of the program but it would also have its extension functions. And it has been our plan from the very beginning that this school would be a medical center for the State, it would work with all the hospitals it could establish profitable work with, it would work with the medical societies in the various counties and so on. I think it's more than likely that we could develop affiliations with one or more hospitals. We are establishing now an affiliation with Middlesex Hospital in New Brunswick for the relatively small part of hospital experience that two-year medical students need. And I think it is more than possible that we could establish this with hospitals elsewhere. But I think to take a medical school and try to scatter it would be just unbelievably unsound and very costly.

SENATOR SARCONI: Do you feel, Doctor - again, if you don't have an opinion as to this please do not respond to the question because it isn't a question of forewarning you but the Committee hasn't given you any notice as to this question - only give what has developed in our State in the last ~~several~~ weeks and I don't believe this Committee, which is studying the needs concerning higher education should close its eyes to a medical school which I think we all agree is so necessary.

From what you have said, Doctor, do you feel or do you not feel that it is an advantage to a medical school to be in an area such as Newark where it seems most medical schools are located.

DR. GROSS: Well, no.

SENATOR SARCONE: I'm not an educator, Doctor but I am led to believe that there are advantages in training doctors, particularly for the last phases of it to be in an urbanized area.

DR. GROSS: Oh, I think the students should have the experience of working with the city hospitals, and so on. But again the question of the physical location of your school - the opinion is almost uniform nowadays that it should be on a university campus where they have the benefit of the association with the students in the other graduate disciplines, where most of the faculty have that association.

Now one thing, for example, that we are planning to build in New Brunswick is what we call a science library at University Heights which would contain the medical library. And the Dean has suggested that one thing that we must have in that thing is a common coffee room where these medical students will meet the other students. I mean, it is tremendously important to get away from the trade school concept, to have these people think more in terms of their function as graduate students and professional students and not merely trade students.

Now, that doesn't mean that they don't have the experience in the other hospitals but the theory that you

couldn't get enough clinical patients without going to the center of a large city is pretty well exploded.

And let me just cite you the fact that Stanford University has just gone to fabulous expense of packing up their school which was in San Francisco and moving it out to the Campus at Palo Alto. I mean, this is the most clear testimonial of how important medical educators consider this to be, that they be on the university campus.

Now, of course, New Brunswick and Middlesex County generally today are more and more of a thickly packed area. And I have often pointed out that our students or our faculty could get from the proposed site of the medical school to the City of Newark much quicker than the students of Columbia could get from Presbyterian Hospital down to Bellevue. It actually takes less time although they seem to be much more scattered.

So I think that we really get all the advantages of the urban communities from our present site and none of the disadvantages, which are very considerable, of course. I mean, just the very fact of our 150 acres, it's pretty persuasive, I think.

SENATOR SARCONE: Doctor, excuse me, I didn't mean to interrupt but we have some students in the balcony who are touring the State House today and they have asked permission to appear here to witness the hearing. I would like to relay to the students that this is a hearing that is being conducted pursuant to an Assembly Concurrent Resolution which directs the New Jersey Senate Education

Committee and the New Jersey General Assembly Education Committee to jointly study the needs of the State of New Jersey for construction of buildings for higher education.

The man who is now testifying before the Committee is Dr. Mason Gross, President of Rutgers University - The State University.

DR. GROSS: Let's say we are trying to find them places in College.

SENATOR SARCONE: Now, seated here on my left is Assemblyman Fisher of Monmouth County, Assemblyman Policastro of Essex County, Senator Wayne Dumont of Warren County, and on my far right is Assemblyman McDonough of Union County, on my immediate right is Assemblyman Bateman of Somerset County who is Vice Chairman of the Committee, and I am Senator Sarcone of Essex County, the Chairman. Also we have Assemblyman Dickey seated in the rear and he is from Camden County.

We trust that you are having an enjoyable stay today. You may stay as long as you like.

SENATOR SARCONE: Gentlemen, are there any other questions with reference to the subject that we have just pursued?

ASSEMBLYMAN MC DONOUGH: Dr. Gross, after looking at the ratio upstairs there is only one that you can have unless you want to put this group over in Douglass College, so I will ask a question which will be directed to Douglass College. At the present time, Doctor, do we have any nursing training at Douglass College at the present time?

DR. GROSS: We have a program in connection with Cornell, where they spend three years at Douglass and then transfer to the Nurses School there. But, of course, as you know, we have our own College of Nursing in Newark which is a full undergraduate course.

ASSEMBLYMAN McDONOUGH: Now, with the expansion of the medical school will we expand the nurse's training facilities at Rutgers?

DR. GROSS: I think that we very likely will. This school has not been in existence more than about ten years and, as you may know, the whole business of the collegiate training of nurses has been undergoing a great deal of revision. So we have been keeping the lid on this, more or less. We admit a class of 50 students only for the first two years. But things are being better understood. Our costs are coming down and the question is whether we should keep this in Newark, which has a great advantage of having a lot of public health and other facilities such as social work facilities which are available to the students; or whether, in the event of development of a medical school, it should more properly be alongside the medical school. This is not decided. There are many arguments on both sides.

SENATOR SARCONI: Now, Dr. Gross, you referred this morning to Kilmer, the Camp Kilmer program very briefly. I know you have in detail furnished the Committee with that information. Would you this morning, for the record, indicate what the program is and what you anticipate?

DR. GROSS: So far as Camp Kilmer is concerned?

SENATOR SARCONE: Yes. I know you referred to it one day as a "bonanza."

DR. GROSS: A potential bonanza, let's say.

Well, Camp Kilmer itself is about 1,500 acres. The Army proposed to give up a good deal or has, in fact, indicated to GSA, and the Army has moved out of Camp Kilmer, it's now vacant. The proposal then would be to develop some kind of a plan whereby all the people involved could propose the future use of Camp Kilmer. And under the leadership of Commissioner Roe, the State of New Jersey has presented a plan which would give to Rutgers about 550 acres. The rest would go - some to industrial development, some to Piscataway Township for schools, some for Edison Township for schools. - a number of people are involved in this, Middlesex County in a small area for a park, and so on.

If we got this 550 acres, which has the tremendous advantage to us that it has a mile of common front here with our present property - this is why it is such an absolute natural from our point of view. - we would then be able, gradually, to absorb this tremendous demand that we see stretching ahead, which we have studied as far as 1980 but it will certainly go right on from there. And our proposal would be to build perhaps in terms of units for about 1500 students. You could pretty well project them coming along and see what years they would come and when you wanted to bring this in, and develop them as another residential center.

We would certainly plan to or we are currently planning to develop it on a co-educational basis. In other words, we would have probably some units for girls as well as units for boys in the Kilmer area because the demand for education of girls in this State has never been adequately met at all. It's about twice as hard for a girl to get in the State University now as it is for a boy. And this is just not reasonable. So we would plan to expand that as well out there.

The idea would be to make it a unit which would stand to the University in the same relation, roughly, as Douglass College does now, a fairly self-contained autonomous unit but within the total university and using the full university facilities.

From the geographical point of view it is an absolute natural. It has, as I mentioned, the further advantage of being fully equipped with utilities in fairly good shape. This would save us a tremendous amount of money, millions of dollars.

SENATOR SARCONI: I believe you indicated what the value of those utilities was in the event that they had to be constructed.

DR. GROSS: Oh, I think it would amount to about \$30 million.

SENATOR SARCONI: \$30 million?

DR. GROSS: Yes.

SENATOR SARCONI: Now, Doctor, would you tell us just a little bit more about the first unit, the one you expect

to be completed.

DR. GROSS: Yes. Well, as I say again, we picked the number of 1500 roughly because this seems to be a good number for a dining hall setup. I mean, your kitchen facilities will handle that. If you go much bigger, you would have to pretty near double it. So we picked that. It probably would be adjusted one way or the other. And we were planning to build dormitories for roughly that number, to provide the basic classrooms there and perhaps enough laboratories to do the introductory work, the less specialized laboratories.

The sciences - the students in the sciences will continue to use the big laboratories at University Heights and we would not have to duplicate them. Sooner or later we would have to build a library out there which, however, would be like the Douglass College Library, a college library rather than a university library of perhaps 200,000 volumes, something like that, 150,000 to 200,000 volumes. And it would then constitute itself as a teaching unit of the University with its own Dean, with its own faculty assigned to it - they would be part of the University faculty but that would be their primary responsibility.

ASSEMBLYMAN BATEMAN: If the Federal Government comes through with the land in June and if the Legislature and the Governor provided the \$11 million or thereabouts in the 1964-65 fiscal year, how soon would we have a campus at Kilmer?

DR. GROSS: You have to allow about two years from

the time you get your go-ahead signal.

ASSEMBLYMAN BATEMAN: 1967?

DR. GROSS: 1966, if we get it now. Well, it's two years from whenever we get the money and know we've got it. You can cut that down a little bit by anticipating, in terms of getting your architectural work done but you've also got to go through what is a fairly long business of arranging to borrow the money from the HHFA to match the State appropriated funds.

SENATOR SARCONE: Doctor, as the Committee was informed previously, we understand you have explored the idea of using existing buildings --

DR. GROSS: Yes.

SENATOR SARCONE: And from what we understand some of them cannot be used.

DR. GROSS: The great bulk can't be used. There are some that are fairly sturdy and could be used at least temporarily.

SENATOR SARCONE: Gentlemen, are there any other questions on this subject? (No response.)

Does any member wish to question Dr. Gross on any other subject?

SENATOR DUMONT: How much does your annual giving by your alumni amount to, Doctor?

DR. GROSS: Well, if you are talking in terms of actual alumni fund, it's getting up to \$250,000.

SENATOR DUMONT: And you press this vigorously every year?

DR. GROSS: Oh, yes. And it has increased. I remember ten years ago it was \$40,000. It has gone up on an average of twenty to twenty-five thousand dollars a year increase.

SENATOR DUMONT: Do you use this for a different project each year, ordinarily?

DR. GROSS: No. These are used very largely for additional scholarship funds. You see, the scholarship funds that we get via the State program take care only of tuition, just the bare \$400, and there are many, many students who couldn't come anywhere/^{near}us even with that, I mean, they still have no money on which to live at all. So we do use this money to a very large degree for scholarship funds.

SENATOR DUMONT: Now this \$400 tuition is very high relative to other state Universities, is it not? Quite high?

DR. GROSS: Yes. Penn State is higher. Vermont and New York, depending on the different schools, come pretty close to it and everybody else is considerably lower.

SENATOR DUMONT: Up until September 1, 1956, when the transition was completed, the State University, Rutgers was, of course, at least partially a privately endowed college. What was your endowment amount to today?

DR. GROSS: The market value is about \$28 million.

SENATOR DUMONT: \$28 million?

DR. GROSS: Yes. Most of which, as you realize of course, is earmarked for special projects. This would include the \$2 million for the Eagleton Fund, for example. That's earmarked. We have very little free funds in that.

SENATOR DUMONT: You mentioned under the Federal

legislation - I want to be sure this is right - there is only \$4 million available for the entire State of New Jersey. Is that right?

DR. GROSS: \$4 million plus. I don't know the exact figures.

SENATOR DUMONT: Is that per year or just this one shot?

DR. GROSS: That's this year.

SENATOR DUMONT: That's just this year.

DR. GROSS: Just this year.

MR. SWINK: To be a continuing project.

SENATOR DUMONT: It continues?

MR. SWINK: We anticipate it to be continued, maybe in greater amounts in the future.

DR. GROSS: It's only set up on a three-year basis but I think everyone expects that it will be continued.

SENATOR DUMONT: And not more than \$2 million of that \$4 million can be used for any one project. Is that correct?

DR. GROSS: Correct.

SENATOR DUMONT: And that's supposed to be about one-third of the cost?

DR. GROSS: Yes.

SENATOR DUMONT: These \$350 dormitory fee and \$450 for the dining hall, they are, of course, annual rates, are they not?

DR. GROSS: Yes. Two semester rates. I mean, that covers both semesters.

SENATOR DUMONT: But not the summer.

DR. GROSS: Not the summer. And as I say, they are just about standard. We always keep a watch on what they are charging across the border. You get some lower cost areas but by and large this is about it.

SENATOR DUMONT: That's all. Thank you.

SENATOR SARCONE: Any members of the Committee have any other questions in line with what has been developed by Senator Dumont or any additional questions?

ASSEMBLYMAN FISHER: I would just like to go back to the medical school business for a moment.

Wouldn't you think it would be much better, Doctor, in your projected thinking for the four year rather than the two?

I can see difficulties in trying to place these people after two years. Wouldn't it be better to launch your whole program into a four year medical school? I can see no real advantage in a two-year school.

DR. GROSS: Well, this thing is very largely planned on the basis of the Dartmouth College program. Dartmouth College runs a very successful two-year program. We've studied that thing. We've had advice from the Dean up there. Everybody gets placed.

ASSEMBLYMAN FISHER: Do they have any difficulty getting their people located?

DR. GROSS: They can put every single one of their students, whom they recommend, which I gather is every one, into the Harvard Medical School. They don't want to do that so uniformly because they are afraid of being known as a prep school for Harvard, which hurts Dartmouth's pride.

ASSEMBLYMAN FISHER: I see.

DR. GROSS: No, there's no question.

I might just cite one illustration. President Harnwell of the University of Pennsylvania, about two years ago, wrote to about 20 colleges and universities within a fairly reasonable radius of Philadelphia to come to a meeting and discuss the possibility of opening two-year programs because the University of Pennsylvania had enough spaces to take care of the graduates.

We have had an advisory committee of deans of all the people up and down this seaboard here - I mean, Harvard, Yale, Dartmouth, Columbia, Cornell, NYU, Pennsylvania, and so on, advising us on this and apparently there will be no problem whatsoever. If you have a class of - you admit a class of 64 students, there will be some attrition in that thing but there is apparently no problem about this.

ASSEMBLYMAN FISHER: Thank you, Doctor.

DR. GROSS: This is an argument for a two-year school, not against a four-year school.

SENATOR SARCONE: Doctor, I believe Senator Dumont does have a question in line with what was said and the manner in which the question was put to you. Since an important question, certainly facing everyone, is not only what the needs are and the priorities but how much in the way of dollars and cents it would cost, would you indicate to the Committee what it would cost if Rutgers were to attempt to embark on a four-year medical college, say at Rutgers.

DR. GROSS: Well, if you assume that you have to build, which you will probably have to do anyway, you would have to build a hospital, a teaching hospital with a minimum of 300 and probably an optimum of 500 beds to go with your medical school. And if you really look to the development of what goes into a modern medical school, you certainly could not do it, starting from nothing, including the two-year school, you could not do it under \$75 million.

SENATOR SARCONE: You couldn't do it under \$75 million?

DR. GROSS: No, sir.

SENATOR SARCONE: And if this idea which I have referred to previously, of using existing facilities in the area, although I admit you indicated there aren't any or something to that effect, we would not be able to save anything on that \$75 million?

DR. GROSS: No. If you look, for example, back at the 1951 report which the AMA gave - there were two reports at that time, both advising the Senate, Senator Clapp was Chairman of the Committee, - you will find that in order to use a hospital in Newark, for example, they would also have to build 500 more beds. So even moving in to use the hospital, you still have to have a teaching hospital completely under control of the medical school. So you don't really save much money. It's highly specialized space.

I was talking, for example, about the necessity of having a refrigeration room for your cadavers, - you don't

find these kind of things. Animal rooms - even in a two-year school, for anatomy and what not, your animal rooms will be one of your very large expenses.

SENATOR DUMONT: Before we get off the medical school, this \$75 million is contrasted with - what did you say for the cost of the two-year medical school?

DR. GROSS: The building program?

SENATOR DUMONT: Yes, sir.

DR. GROSS: Well, the optimum on that total cost we mentioned about \$15 million.

SENATOR DUMONT: \$15 million.

DR. GROSS: Yes. That, I hope, is high.

SENATOR DUMONT: So it would be five times as much, at least, for a four-year medical school.

DR. GROSS: Now, you have got to realize, this is progressive also, this wouldn't all come at once, and it does include a 500 bed hospital. Now these estimates are rough. I haven't checked these figures but I would say that this is about right; your 500 bed hospital costing you about \$25,000 a bed is going to be one of your biggest items, no matter what.

SENATOR DUMONT: Among other things, of course, a medical school, two-years, it would have more advantage if it were four, obviously, would be to supply New Jersey's hospitals with more interns and residents than the tough job that we have getting them today. Right?

DR. GROSS: Very definitely.

SENATOR DUMONT: Now, getting ack to the endowment

business for a moment, Assemblyman Batement, and I think all of us, would like to know how much do you derive annually by way of revenue from this endowment fund? What's your income from it?

MR. SWINK: It's just a little over \$200,000 and some of that goes right into some of the restricted funds. . . About \$70,000 goes into the operating budget.

SENATOR DUMONT: And the balance of that income is restricted?

MR. SWINK: Yes, most of it.

SENATOR DUMONT: And what did you say the principal purposes of the restrictions are, I mean the objectives?

MR. SWINK: Well, some of the large ones are the Eagleton Fund; and you have a Voorhees Fund which is for the operation of the Voorhees Chapel, which is a rather substantial one; and then you have a group of miscellaneous funds that are for scholarships or for loan funds. I don't know of any other large ones; we have an awful lot of little ones.

SENATOR DUMONT: Do you have an active policy of encouraging bequests by testators?

DR. GROSS: We don't have many rich people, that's our only problem.

MR. SWINK: We don't discourage them at all.

SENATOR DUMONT: How, actually, does this \$28 million endowment compare with other state universities?

DR. GROSS: Well, here again, it's right across the board. I just happened to see a report yesterday on Texas,

which of course is a state university, has something like \$350 million. That's oil money. They're just fantastic. Of course, Harvard has the largest endowment of any university; Texas is the second largest endowment, which is remarkable. And then they run down to one or two million dollars. So from the point of view of average in amounts we are very low because this was never a rich institution.

SENATOR DUMONT: Thank you.

SENATOR SARCONE: Gentlemen, Dr. Gross, as you recall was scheduled for 10 o'clock and he was kind enough to permit us to have another witness testify before him and he does have an engagement - probably due about now. And unless there are any other questions - and I know Dr. Gross will be most pleased, as he has indicated, to cooperate with the Committee and furnish us any further information that we may require, so if there aren't any matters that you feel are emergent, I would feel inclined with your permission to excuse Dr. Gross at this time.

DR. GROSS: Thank you very much, gentlemen.

SENATOR SARCONE: Thank you, Doctor.

State Commissioner Raubinger.

Commissioner, the Committee has planned on recessing at 12:45 but we felt that we might take advantage of the three-quarters of an hour and possibly proceed as far as we can with the idea that you possibly may be requested to return after the recess.

DR. RAUBINGER: Fine. I will be glad to do that.

SENATOR SARCONE: Now, will you please give us your full name.

F R E D E R I C K M. R A U B I N G E R: Frederick M. Raubinger, State Commissioner of Education.

SENATOR SARCONE: Commissioner, do you have a prepared statement that you wish to make?

DR. RAUBINGER: I don't have a prepared statement, Senator Sarcone, but I would like to speak from some notes here to lay a little background for your future questions.

SENATOR SARCONE: Before you do that, Commissioner, may I state, as I indicated previously, the Committee has met on a number of occasions at meetings which were not public and the Commissioner and the members of his department who appeared furnished us with much information and were most cooperative, for which we wish to extend our thanks to the Commissioner.

If I may, Commissioner, I would like to read into the record a letter which has no direct relation to you.

I referred earlier in the morning to the fact that Carröll V. Newsom, who is Chairman of the Governor's Committee on Higher Education, was invited to attend and I would like to read into the record his reply:

"I appreciated your letter of March 24, in which you invite me to 'present to the joint legislative committee any information or recommendations you feel it should have which you can and would like to present at this time.' Please extend to Messrs. Sarcone and Bateman my personal appreciation for this invitation.

"I must report, however, that the Governor's Committee on Higher Education has been obliged to move very slowly in analyzing the many difficult problems with which it has been faced. It is clear that New Jersey has critical deficiencies

in the field of higher education, and the Committee would like to be able to develop the strongest possible recommendations that might serve as a step toward the amelioration of the present situation. But, as of now, the Committee has not agreed to any recommendations. Thus, I would hesitate to present anything that does not have the concurrence of members of the Committee.

"I may say, under any circumstances, that the needs of New Jersey in the field of higher education are so very severe that it would be almost impossible for the newly-created joint legislative committee to make a mistake. Every institution in the State seems to need additional facilities of a great variety of kinds. On the basis of information presently available to institutional authorities and to the State Commissioner of Education, I would believe that the joint legislative committee could take positive steps to take advantage, insofar as possible, of the federal funds which may be made available to New Jersey educational institutions.

"It is my personal hope that the report of the Governor's Committee on Higher Education in New Jersey will be available by June 1 of the current year. Yours sincerely,
Carroll V. Newsom."

SENATOR SARCONE: All right, Commissioner Raubinger, you may proceed.

DR. RAUBINGER: Senator, first, I want to thank you for the opportunities, the last opportunity and this one, to appear before you and to discuss informally some of these questions.

I would like to point out, first, that the Department of Education and the State Board of Education have made, since 1954, a series of very significant studies, I think, having to do with education beyond the high school; and that these studies offer, in fact, a great deal of information upon which plans can be made for whatever development in higher education has to be made in future years.

I would like to refer to these briefly because I am sure that they may have been forgotten, some of the

early ones.

We began as early as 1954 to look ahead to the growth of the State and the growth of the students who would be looking for opportunities beyond the high school, and published the first booklet called "New Jersey's Under-graduates, 1954 to 1973," which was a projection of statistics and other relevant information appearing in this book and this was, at that time, distributed to the Legislature.

We followed that with a refinement of the first study. This appeared in 1957. This was called "The Closing Door to College, 1960 to 1970."

We followed that with a third report which report was financed by the Legislature, by appropriation. No, this is not the third one. The third one was a report on the two-year community college which was presented to the Legislature and the Governor in 1957.

Then the fourth report was "College Opportunity in New Jersey." That is this report. This is the report that led to the 1959 bond issue.

I mention these reports for this reason, that as we look backward on the figures and statistics that were presented in these reports we find that by and large these were pretty sound figures. Subsequent events since 1954 pretty well established the validity of the 1954 study, and so on with subsequent reports.

I would also like to say that these were not just studies involving public higher education. These started with the assumption that we have in this State, as well as out-of-State,

particularly in this State, a large number of colleges under private auspices and that these colleges take a number of New Jersey students in the State, a large number, and, therefore, we started asking them what their plans were for expansion and year by year what additional students these colleges thought they could accommodate.

Following that, then, we took the difference between whatever figure that was and what we considered the needs to be and applied these to the publicly supported institutions.

Now, the report which led to the bond issue in 1959 called for a doubling of enrollments as a result of the bond issue and following the completion of the buildings. And I would like to report some figures here. I will first confine these to the state colleges.

Now I would like to go back a little ways before I relate this to the bond issue, but the state colleges had in 1950-1951, 4,182 full-time undergraduates in all six colleges.

As a result of the 1951 bond issue, which raised \$15 million just for the state colleges, and the subsequent 1959 bond issue, the enrollment, full-time undergraduate, was increased to 14,053 for this current year. That's from 4,182 to 14,053.

So far as the bond issue itself is concerned, the state colleges did double their enrollment plus 2,000 more as a result of the commitment made when the 1959 bond issue was passed.

Now, the most recent report, of course, is the Strayer

Report and that looked ahead to the year 1970.

We still believe that the figures in the Strayer Report are essentially accurate. We think they are conservative but not terribly out of line.

I might point out that many of the figures having to do with needs beyond high school, of course, are based upon increase in number of births in the State plus in-migration of people into New Jersey.

The first wave of increased births began to hit the senior class of high school about 1960. This we knew would happen and this was part of the reasoning back of the 1959 bond issue. These were the children that were born in 1943 which was the first big wave of increased birth.

Then let me say that the high school classes leveled off from '60 to '61 to '62 to '63 at about the same number. There were no peaks during those years.

We also know, and the Strayer Report points this out, that beginning with this June, this graduation class, and continuing with next June's graduating class, we will have a sharp rise in the number of high school students. And this is what the Strayer Report was aimed at, primarily. This represents the big increase in births that was countrywide in 1947 and which then continued to increase in 1948 and 1949. So that all of our talk, I think, about needs has been based on facts. We tried to keep the emotion out of it and, to repeat, the facts in the Strayer Report are aimed at the knowledge that the high school graduating classes - this is public and private high schools - will show a sub-

stantial rise this June, above the level of the last five years, and will then show a further substantial rise in 1965.

You are aware, of course, of the two-year community college report and of the legislation which was passed following that report. And, very briefly, I would like to mention what has happened since.

There have been 15 counties that have had studies, there are four counties that have formally gone through the process of saying they are going to establish county colleges, and one, as a matter of fact, has already appointed its board of trustees and is now looking for a president of that institution.

So, it is my judgment, as I have expressed before, that the two-year county colleges are going to meet with popular favor. But, beyond that, that they are going to meet a real need and that they are going to be a key part of the opportunities beyond the high school which the State will provide from this time on out.

I would also like to report to you that the Commission to Administer Title I of the Higher Education Facilities Act, which is the Federal act for direct grants to public and private institutions, has been organized, the members have been named, the first committee meeting has been held and Washington has informally indicated that this Commission meets the terms of the Act. We are one of about 20 states so far that has cleared this particular hurdle.

We have a sub-committee of the Higher Education

Facilities Commission which is now working on a State plan which has to be presented to the Federal Government before applications can be made for grants.

This Act, under Title I, will bring into the State, provided matching money is available slightly more than \$6 million a year, \$4,700,000 of which is for four-year institutions, public and private; about \$1.3 million a year is for public two-year community colleges. This money has to be matched, say the private institutions, by about one federal dollar to two private dollars. For the public community colleges it's about forty cents out of the dollar from the Federal Government and sixty cents matching otherwise.

I simply mention this to you to indicate that is is on the road.

We have projected our own capital requirements for the six state colleges and we would be prepared to talk about those. Generally, they are the ones which were prepared in relation to the Strayer Report and they have been filed in the Governor's office in response to a request for long-range capital needs.

Now, to summarize, I think we do stand upon the needs, at least until 1970, as outlined in the Strayer Report. These require, according to the Strayer Report, \$134 million to be spent for capital construction by 1970. We somewhat agreed to \$125 million on a \$24 million a year pay-as-you-go basis if that were feasible. But I believe we could do a great deal toward meeting the needs at least until 1970 with that amount of money.

That, Senator, is kind of a preliminary statement. I know you do have questions but I would like to re-emphasize the fact ~~and~~ this, I think is not generally understood - that we have had studies, we have had figures, we have had a basis for planning running back to 1954. And I think these are sound figures that we have. I think they are figures that a person can rely upon with some confidence in planning for the future. At least we feel so.

Of course, these have all been available to the State and to the Legislature and to the Governor.

Now that's kind of an opening wedge here.

SENATOR SARCONE: Will you excuse me, Commissioner.

DR. RAUBINGER: Yes, Senator.

SENATOR SARCONE: Assemblyman Dickey, I know you probably are more comfortable there than you would be up here but I realize you haven't been afforded the opportunity to participate in the questioning, so would you please come forward.

ASSEMBLYMAN DICKEY: All right, Senator.

SENATOR SARCONE: Now, Assemblyman Dickey, do you have any questions you would like to ask of the Commissioner?

ASSEMBLYMAN DICKEY: Mr. Raubinger, as I understood your statement, your claim was for capital improvements \$125,000,000 to be spent at the rate of \$25,000,000 per year?

DR. RAUBINGER: Yes, that has been proposed.

ASSEMBLYMAN DICKEY: Would you care to just outline to us what the capital improvements are on a general outline basis over those years and where the improvements would be made, like at Glassboro or Trenton State College?

DR. RAUBINGER: Yes, Mr. Bambach has our figures on that.

EDWARD BAMBACH: We have submitted by individual college among the six, based on a period of years beginning with the 1965 fiscal year through 1969-70, the requirements based on the additional enrollments that we see coming to the several colleges by way of classroom buildings, library additions. We included dormitory facilities in order to point up the need, knowing that there is interest in possible other ways of financing such facilities. By way of illustration, I should point out that at Glassboro, because of the particular needs involved, we proposed originally that in 1965 funds should be provided for an additional classroom building, funds should be provided for an addition to the existing library, dormitory facilities should be provided in order to take up the overload of students that are renting rooms in the nearby community of Glassboro from private homeowners, -there are

approximately 400 such students living away from home and renting rooms in the community.- Together with the dormitory facility, we have projected that in the following year of 1966 we would need an addition to the existing food service building that was completed under the 1959 bond issue and was so designed and was intended at that time to have an additional cubicle added as additional dormitories are constructed.

Going beyond the 1966 year, we would again get into additional dormitory requirements - this is still Glassboro - and another classroom building at that time.

In 1968, we again, because of additional room would be in a position of having to increase the accommodations in the food service building, and in 1969 we would round out the proposed projects at Glassboro with a third classroom building.

I could go on for each of the colleges if you choose, but it would run pretty much along the same pattern.

ASSEMBLYMAN DICKY: May I ask the question whether we have now contracted for capital improvements using all of the existing bond funds of 1959?

DR. RAUBINGER: Yes.

ASSEMBLYMAN DICKY: And are those improvements now completed or are they still in process?

DR. RAUBINGER: Substantially so. The great bulk of the money - what we are doing now is cleaning up the jobs that could not be done until the other buildings were finished; for instance, we are remodeling the main hall at

Montclair which couldn't be remodeled until we had some place to put the people who formerly were housed there. These are clean-up jobs, but most of the buildings are built and occupied, and the remainder of them are almost all under bid or under construction, so the bond issue is about cleaned up now for the six state colleges.

ASSEMBLYMAN BATEMAN: I have several questions. There is one we are asking everybody and we'll get to that later. We discussed this previously with you. This is in regard to the development of your priority list within your priority list which you would deem to be the most emergent matters immediately within your own priority list. I know you have given such a list to the Governor and some of the projects appear in his list, but these may not appear in the same order that you might wish them because they are appearing with a lot of other projects in other fields. This is one thing that this Committee has asked for and I expect it will have.

DR. RAUBINGER: Well, essentially, of course, that is our priority list. We filed that as such.

ASSEMBLYMAN BATEMAN: The one you filed last -

DR. RAUBINGER: Yes, when we were asked to file something to coordinate with all of the other projects.

ASSEMBLYMAN BATEMAN: In other words, as they appear that is the priority?

DR. RAUBINGER: That is essentially so. I put a qualification on that, however, and that is this, that I don't think any list of that kind can be considered absolutely a final thing, and I'll tell you why: Sometimes when you

begin this college construction you have to coordinate something with something else. You may have to coordinate a dormitory with a classroom building; you may have to coordinate a classroom building with a food service building and, subject to that qualification, this would be a priority list, and when I filed that I also filed a statement saying that we would reserve the right to make the kind of conditions that I just described if the situation required it.

ASSEMBLYMAN BATEMAN: The Strayer Report indicated quite strongly that the educational opportunities for college undergraduates will be diminishing over a period of years up until 1970. Experience hasn't quite lived up to what he had in his report. In 1961, we had 46,000, or thereabouts, undergraduates who have gone to school out of New Jersey, and in 1963 your estimate is around 54,000. This indicates at least the problem of the Strayer Report, their percentages, and these are in figures. Would you say that we have underevaluated the ability to have our boys and girls placed in out-of-state colleges in the Strayer Report, and, if so, does that affect to some degree the basic conclusions of the Strayer Report?

DR. RAUBINGER: That's a very good question and I think we are in the process, as you may know, of refining those statistics. I think we will have to take into consideration the fact that of the - I think it was 44,000, the figure you gave - 33,000 are in private institutions outside the State; 11,000 are in public institutions outside the State,

and it is my belief, based on these figures, that the out-of-state private colleges will continue to accept and take a fairly large number of New Jersey students. I'll give you an example of what I mean: We had the raw statistics, say, on the State of Indiana. When we made a more careful study of that this year, we find that a great proportion of those are in one institution, which happens to be Notre Dame, which is a nationwide institution. I suspect that Notre Dame will continue to take New Jersey students if **they** apply and wish to go in about that same number. And that same thing would apply to Massachusetts where you have traditionally a great number of private institutions which draw from a nationwide audience, so to speak. I think that in Massachusetts we have about 3200 students in private institutions there.

I would draw this conclusion, I think, from what we have found so far in this study: I would guess that the type of institution represented by Amherst and Smith and Wellesley and Mount Holyoke and Williams and Harvard, to take the Massachusetts groups, would probably continue to take the same numbers as they are taking now. They might not expand enough to take the ratio of increase of students represented by growing high school classes, but my guess is that New Jersey high school students will continue to go in very large numbers to certain types of institutions outside the State.

We have 400 of our out-of-state people in Villa Nova, and I suspect that maybe 400 will continue to go to Villa Nova across the river, that sort of thing. So to that extent,

Mr. Bateman, we have taken this into account.

And the reason why I say I will still stand on the Strayer Report is that I think it was a conservative report to begin with, looking to 1970. And most people who have criticised it have done so on a conservative point of view, and the two things may sort of even themselves out.

Now, I don't know whether you accept this reasoning of mine or not. It may not be sound.

ASSEMBLYMAN BATEMAN: It's a hard one to answer, but if 8,000 of our boys and girls go out of state in 1963, from 1961 over a 2-year period, (1) you don't know whether that would increase in the same proportion to 1970, but if it continued to increase in a lesser proportion, based on the number of kids that are coming out of the high schools, the impact of our needs in New Jersey might well have to be reassessed for 1970. If they are taking this many more and are taking the load off us - and we discussed this in our private conversations - there are many boys and girls in New Jersey who prefer to go outside the State and will continue to go outside the State.

DR. RAUBINGER: Traditionally that has been true and we have to accept that fact, and nobody can argue against it. That's what they wish to do. I follow you and I think we do have to watch that as we go along.

ASSEMBLYMAN BATEMAN: Your department was working to get us an analysis of the number of high school graduates that applied last fall to get into any college, or to get into colleges, and didn't get into any college. That is a tough thing to throw out and I know you have been working

on it, but this also I think might be a significant figure.

DR. RAUBINGER: That's right. It is significant. I want to preface this by saying that our department has never used these figures of multiple applications, etc., in a publicity way, and we have been aware all along that, so far as the department is concerned, when you get the applications you will find people applying to six or eight colleges.

ASSEMBLYMAN BATEMAN: I wasn't getting at that, Commissioner. I was getting at the total number who apply to get in any college from our public schools. I am thinking about the significance of the figure, which I have never seen, of those who try to get into all kinds of colleges and don't end up in college.

DR. RAUBINGER: Well, this, of course, partly came at the suggestion of this Committee, although we were interested in it anyway. We have had a survey of the high school graduates of the June 1963 class who sought admission to college for 1964. We have 86 per cent returns from the high schools; that is, for the number of schools to date. There are 21,320 of those graduates who sought admission to college some place and got into college some place. There are 896 who sought admission to college but were not successful in getting in this June. Now this is based upon 86 per cent.

ASSEMBLYMAN BATEMAN: And of course it's impossible to ever find out why the reason for the 896 was.

DR. RAUBINGER: It was impossible for us, because it

would have meant that the high schools would have had to follow each one of these up and make a personal inquiry, and there wasn't time to do that.

SENATOR DUMONT: Commissioner, you answered Mr. Bateman on the question of private colleges outside New Jersey accepting or continuing to accept New Jersey students, but what about the public centers of higher learning outside New Jersey?

DR. RAUBINGER: I think it's invalid to say that many of these, maybe most of them, are going to be faced with the same thing that we would be faced with here - the choice between accepting somebody from the State of Kansas, if it's a Kansas institution, or taking an outsider. I don't think that any of them are going to want to close their doors completely to outside people because otherwise you would have a series of provincial institutions in different states with nobody from outside. But my guess would be, from what I have heard, and I am addressing myself to the 11,000 students who this year are in public out-of-state colleges, that the door would begin to close on some of these as time goes on.

SENATOR DUMONT: So the number they would take would decrease, despite the fact that the number of applicants from New Jersey might very well increase.

DR. RAUBINGER: I think that's right. I was distinguishing, Senator Dumont, between the out-of-state private and the out-of-state public institutions.

SENATOR DUMONT: Dr. Gross indicated that Rutgers, with their three locations, takes about five per cent over-all from outside the State. Now, what has been the relationship to the percentage of New Jersey applicants that other public

institutions of higher learning in other states take?
Is it higher than that? In other words, do our students
comprise more than 5 per cent of the student bodies of
other state universities?

DR. RAUBINGER: Well, I don't know the answer to that
directly, but I can give you these figures. I mentioned
that there are 11,000 New Jersey students in public colleges
outside the State. There are 1900 out-of-state students in
New Jersey colleges, but these include public and private
colleges. I believe those are the correct figures.

MR. BAMBACH: It is more than that.

DR. RAUBINGER: Excuse me now. We have 11,000 outside in
public colleges.

DR. MOSIER: The enrollment is about 10,000 youth from
outside New Jersey in New Jersey colleges.

DR. RAUBINGER: It is 1900 in public colleges. I will
correct that now. My figure had to do with out-of-state
students in public colleges in New Jersey. The total number
of out-of-state youth in all our colleges, both public and
private, as Dr. Mosier reminds me, is around 10,000.

SENATOR DUMONT: So about four out of every five are
in private colleges in New Jersey.

DR. RAUBINGER: That is correct.

SENATOR DUMONT: You stated, I think, that the 1959
bond issue has been completed so far as the six state
colleges are concerned.

DR. RAUBINGER: That's right.

SENATOR DUMONT: You mean that all the buildings have been completed, or the money has simply been awarded in some instances on contracts?

DR. RAUBINGER: Senator, substantially they have been completed and are occupied. As I attempted to say, this is more the clean-up job that is going on now, as I tried to indicate.

SENATOR DUMONT: So the only buildings left are those that were outlined to us earlier this morning - the Newark College of Engineering and Science and at Rutgers, in the Newark location, Newark campus.

DR. RAUBINGER: Where they haven't started at all, for reasons that were explained, I'm sure.

SENATOR DUMONT: What you really need here is \$25,000,000 increase then annually for the next five years for building funds?

DR. RAUBINGER: Yes.

SENATOR DUMONT: That has nothing to do with current operational expense increase at all, just buildings?

DR. RAUBINGER: This is just construction.

SENATOR DUMONT: Have you any figures on what you would need for higher education in both capital construction and current operations for the next five years, on the average per year?

DR. RAUBINGER: We have a ratio there. What is the one we have used for the operating costs? You could relate it, Senator, to how much increased enrollment these capital funds would accommodate, and you would have to take close

to a thousand dollars per student increased enrollment for the operating funds necessary to implement the construction at \$25,000,000 a year. Then, of course, first you would have to know what would the \$25,000,000 do in increased enrollment. We could figure that for you. I don't think we have those figures with us, but that is a gauge that we would go by.

SENATOR DUMONT: Well, is it fair to say that \$50,000,000 over-all would be required each year, or is \$25,000,000 in current operations much too high as contrasted with -

DR. RAUBINGER: It wouldn't be \$50,000,000. That's as much as -

SENATOR DUMONT: Well, would it be \$30,000,000 altogether?

DR. RAUBINGER: \$50,000,000 is as much as the State is putting in for current operations for all of the building of colleges at the present time.

SENATOR DUMONT: Yes, but half of this would be building expense.

DR. RAUBINGER: Half of the twenty-five million, you mean?

SENATOR DUMONT: No, I mean half of the fifty. I am trying to get whether it would cost as much for current operations as for buildings each year, or -

DR. RAUBINGER: No. I don't think it would go up in quite that proportion, not 50-50 - twenty-five million for building and twenty-five million for capital. I don't think so. At least, it hasn't been our past experience. But it would be certainly something that would be substantial,

because you've got to staff and teach these classes that come into the new buildings.

SENATOR DUMONT: It might be five or ten million dollars.

DR. RAUBINGER: Yes.

SENATOR DUMONT: Thank you.

ASSEMBLYMAN BATEMAN: Commissioner, I thought when I was asking you the question that we had a copy of the priority list which you gave to the Governor which appears in certain items here. We don't have yours and I would like to have Mr. Alito get it from you later on if that is possible.

DR. RAUBINGER: I'll give it to Sam this afternoon or -

ASSEMBLYMAN BATEMAN: We have it as it appears in here but I think it is different.

SENATOR SARCONE: Commissioner, if you want to say something, I would like to use the time to advantage, so go ahead and say it.

DR. RAUBINGER: I was just going to respond a little bit to Mr. Bateman's question there. [Addressing Mr. Bambach] Would you say what you've said -

MR. BAMBACH: I believe the list that you have is the one that includes proposed capital projects of all state departments.

ASSEMBLYMAN BATEMAN: Yes, this is all we have.

MR. BAMBACH: Within that list, the priorities outlined for the state colleges, as well as the other publicly supported institutions, would have been taken from the complete list of capital expenditures proposed for that period of time. The priority list, of which the Commissioner spoke,

would be scaled down from the total requirements, which on this list comes to about 48 million dollars for the six state colleges, depending on the amount of funds that would be available and within the reservation of revising the original forty-eight million dollar estimate, depending on the relationship between dormitories, classrooms and food service buildings as previously mentioned.

ASSEMBLYMAN BATEMAN: You lost me a little bit here. The priorities as we see them in the Governor's priority list are the same as were given by the State Department of Education; in other words, we could pick them right out of here? The reason I asked the question is, there is quite a difference. The State University had given us a set of four priority lists that they had, priority list a, b, c and d, which appear quite differently from what are in this list, so far as priorities, and some of them don't appear. What I wanted was your best thinking of what you initially gave to the Governor so that we can have that which we don't have now.

DR. RAUBINGER: I think what he is saying is - is the list which we submitted in the same order of priority as it appeared in this longer list, and what you are saying is, no. Is that right?

MR. BAMBACH: That's right.

ASSEMBLYMAN POLICASTRO: Well, did you see this? Did you see the Governor's-

MR. BAMBACH: Yes.

ASSEMBLYMAN BATEMAN: Well, at any rate, if we could have that, we would appreciate it.

SENATOR SARCONE: And, of course, if your priorities are any different today than they were, we would like to know that. I think Assemblyman Bateman was trying to get at the source of what your priority needs are.

DR. RAUBINGER: We will give you that through Sam.

SENATOR SARCONE: Are there any other questions at this time?

Commissioner, I have a series of questions that are rather general and which we would like to get on the record, and rather than commencing them at this time I think it might be best that we have about a five-minute recess, and perhaps at the afternoon session the other members may have additional questions.

We will reconvene at two o'clock.

[R E C E S S]

AFTERNOON SESSION

SENATOR SARCONE: Gentlemen, some of the members of the Committee are not present. Two of them had to leave. I believe Assemblyman Policastro will return. But we will proceed.

Commissioner, I have several general questions. You may have touched upon some, but for the record we would like a response. As I have indicated, you have, I believe in most instances furnished us with information previously. But since this is the first public hearing, we would like to get this on the record.

I believe in response to a question put to you by Assemblyman Bateman you did cover the first area and I believe you have given us a figure as to how many of our high school graduates want to go to college and actually cannot get into college on the basis of an 86 per cent return on a study which you are conducting.

DR. FREDERICK M. RAUBINGER: Yes, that's right.

SENATOR SARCONE: And we will undoubtedly receive the benefit of the complete study within the near future.

DR. RAUBINGER: I could add this: Some of these high schools may not respond. But as we have tabulated these, the trend is almost the same as more and more come in so you could almost project this, I think, if we don't get all of the 14 per cent.

SENATOR SARCONE: Commissioner, indirectly related to this question, I believe you had commenced to give a figure in response to Assemblyman Bateman's question and I believe he

interrupted you at that point because he was interested in a direct question. But I believe for the record perhaps the figure you were going to give might be something that the citizens of our state should know. And I believe you were about to give the figure of the total applications and I think you indicated later that while this is the total, some of the students applied to a number of institutions, and therefore this figure is not one that we can be guided by. I believe you felt there was a misconception - there might be a misconception. Would you give that figure, Commissioner?

DR. RAUBINGER: These are the figures of the people who applied and for whom there were no places?

SENATOR SARCONE: Yes.

DR. RAUBINGER: Well, this was a study we made of the applications in the State colleges for the Fall term of this year, 1963. We received 12,494 applications and of these 12,494, 8,073 were recommended for admission and 4,421 were not recommended for admission. What we did was to follow up with the high schools on the 4,421 applications.

SENATOR SARCONE: And then this is what you related previously?

DR. RAUBINGER: Yes.

SENATOR SARCONE: Fine. I didn't want to be redundant; I merely wanted to clarify it.

DR. RAUBINGER: This was not related to the first one that I gave you. The first one was all high schools, all applications anywhere. This had to do with the applications

just to the six State Colleges. We followed through on the 4,421 applications of people who were rejected at the State Colleges to see if they got in college some place or whether they were left out in the cold. That is what this one was about. I don't know whether you want any more on that or not.

SENATOR SARCONE: I think that will be fine for the time being.

Then you referred to the Strayer Report in the year 1962 which estimated a need of \$134 million in new construction at our State Colleges and Rutgers.

DR. RAUBINGER: And the Newark College of Engineering. I am glad you mentioned that because I may not have been clear today earlier, that all of these studies that we have made have applied to all of the institutions that are publicly supported, the six State Colleges, the University, and the Newark College of Engineering, and the Strayer Report recommending the \$134 million included all of these too.

SENATOR SARCONE: Of course, this goes to 1970.

DR. RAUBINGER: That's right.

SENATOR SARCONE: Now the Committee would ask this question for the record: Has there been any significant change in this estimate?

DR. RAUBINGER: No.

SENATOR SARCONE: I believe you responded to it.

DR. RAUBINGER: I think we still would stand on those figures.

SENATOR SARCONE: Now the Heller Report - it is our understanding it predicts the need at Rutgers by 1980 to

accommodate 35,000 students and close to one-half billion in new construction. Do you accept this as a reasonable estimate?

DR. RAUBINGER: Well, I haven't frankly studied the Heller Report in enough detail to reply to that question. I would still say that that part of it which goes up to 1970, I would rely on the Strayer Report. Beyond that, I couldn't answer.

SENATOR SARCONE: You have already indicated that you would furnish us your first and immediate priority needs and continued priority needs.

DR. RAUBINGER: That's correct.

SENATOR SARCONE: Now ACR 8 directs that this Committee look into the Federal aid we can reasonably expect to help meet our construction needs.

DR. RAUBINGER: Right.

SENATOR SARCONE: What can we expect in this area for state colleges, for N.C.E., Rutgers and for junior colleges?

DR. RAUBINGER: Well, let me distinguish this aid, if I may just for the record. There are several titles to this act and the title that has to do with direct grants for construction of undergraduate facilities is Title I. This state will get \$4,700,000 a year of Federal moneys under this title.- This is the title that is now administered by the Commission that I described earlier - for public and private four-year undergraduate facilities. Now how much of this would go to public and how much to go to private would depend upon the applications that are presented to the Commission

and upon the plan which is presented to Washington under which this act would be administered. In either event, it would mean, as I said, that this \$4,700,000 would have to be matched by \$9,400,000 in order to get the \$4,700,000. And I think it is not possible to determine at this time how much of this would go to the public colleges except to say this: If the appropriation is made this year by the Federal Congress the first \$4,700,000 is due in this fiscal year ending June 30th and then the next \$4,700,000 - and incidentally that can carry over to the next fiscal year. So for the remainder of this fiscal year and the next fiscal year, there is available to this state for four-year undergraduate facilities, public and private, \$9,400,000 in round numbers. There is nothing in the present budget in the way of construction funds at the moment for the public colleges to match any part of this, which would mean if it remained that way that of the \$9,700,000, then the priorities would have to be given almost exclusively to the private colleges in the state.

Now for public two-year colleges, there is \$1,300,000 a year allocated, beginning with this fiscal year and continuing for the length of the bill. Well, that is a fairly simple matter because as you know it can be matched against the county and state money for the two-year colleges. But that is the Title I.

There are other titles for loans which might make some difference to some colleges. The bill calls for \$120,000,000 for loans and in these the colleges apply directly to the United States Office of Education. That doesn't come under

the Higher Facilities Commission. But these, of course, have to be amortized and paid back. They are not grants.

Those are really the two titles that affect construction in any considerable degree in a general way.

SENATOR SARCONE: Do any members of the Committee have any questions relating to this subject? [No response.]

Now ACR 8 directs the Committee to look into the practicability of revenue bonds, Commissioner, to finance construction of dormitories and other college facilities. We have been looking at the New York experience with its Dormitory Authority and at this point it appears to offer some advantages. Now what are your views on such an arrangement? Would this make Federal loans or grants not otherwise available, available to us at State Colleges?

DR. RAUBINGER: It is my opinion that it would. If by that you mean that the state would create some kind of an authority with the right to issue, as you say, revenue bonds which would have a certain amount of self-amortization from income, that would be a considerable help, particularly to the State Colleges and to the Newark College of Engineering, and the reason is, as I understand it, that now we cannot build dormitories, for instance, without violating the Constitution - I mean, making a debt for the state - so that you have to include those in a bond issue or you don't get them. I think that there would be advantages to something of this kind, Senator, for dormitories. I haven't seen yet the advantages for classrooms.

SENATOR SARCONE: Any questions from the members of

the Committee on this subject?

ASSEMBLYMAN DICKEY: On this subject of dormitories, Commissioner, what percentage of the student body of a State College would you say should be provided with dormitory facilities?

DR. RAUBINGER: I think in my opinion it varies with the college.

ASSEMBLYMAN DICKEY: Let's take Montclair, for instance.

DR. RAUBINGER: Well, instead of just taking Montclair, if I could speak generally for a moment and make these observations, that colleges that are located in a highly-populated center are going to be attractive to commuting students because of the easy distance to the college. And personally I don't believe that you have to provide dormitories in a college located in a highly-urbanized area to the extent that you do in another part of the state where people would have to travel. So I would say that some of our State Colleges require dormitories for practical purposes more than others do. I think we need some more dormitories at the northern colleges, but there would be a limit beyond which you would not need them because of the commuting accessibility to the college in my judgment. Whereas you take Glassboro, which now is building up a reputation which attracts people from all over the state - it is pretty hard to commute from the northern part of the state to Glassboro. They might very well have a higher need or higher priority for more beds. I think this would have to be determined in relation partly to how many people couldn't go unless they had dormitories to

live in.

ASSEMBLYMAN DICKEY: Are there some specialties that are developed in the various colleges that make it attractive to go to, say, Glassboro from any part of the state?

DR. RAUBINGER: Well, there are beginning to be some and there are some planned. Let's take, Home Economics as a specialty. There are presently just two of the state-supported colleges that offer work in Home Economics, that is, Douglass College and Montclair. Very likely to serve South Jersey there should be a Home Economics facility in Glassboro and to that extent then, girls in a fairly-large region who wanted that subject might find it necessary to go to Glassboro rather than to some other college. There will be some specialties like that. That, incidentally, would also apply to Montclair in the degree that they do have some specialties that require dormitories. I don't mean to say they don't. I am simply saying there may be a difference in the extent or the degree to which additional ones would be needed.

ASSEMBLYMAN DICKEY: Well, can you give me any kind of an answer then as to the percentage of the student body that should be provided with dormitory space?

DR. RAUBINGER: I think that is very difficult to say. It goes back to some people's philosophy that you don't get a college education unless you live on the campus. I don't agree with that to the full degree. There are many people who have gone to college and have benefited from it without living at the college. Although, I can understand the

advantages and I would like to see dormitories at all of our six State Colleges. We have at the moment, to give you some figure to go by, 2800 beds out of 15,000 students enrolled. So 2800 out of 15,000 are housed. We are going to have to house more. Trenton is an example, for instance. We have about exhausted the commutation and we are putting them up in Ewing Township and all around. This in itself creates problems when you have to accommodate too many in a residential area such as Ewing and Lawrenceville and so on.

ASSEMBLYMAN DICKEY: Now on that subject, with reference to the charges made to the students for dormitory facilities, do they offset the maintenance cost of the facilities?

DR. RAUBINGER: Just the maintenance cost? They do more than that.

ASSEMBLYMAN DICKEY: I am not talking about amortizing the capital cost, but just the maintenance of it.

DR. RAUBINGER: Not completely, not completely in any of the colleges in the state at the present time. There has always up to this point had to be, like buying a house, a down payment before you take the loan and you make the down payment and I don't know precisely what that would be, 30 to 40 per cent perhaps. The rest would be out of fees. The experience has been that if you have to amortize too much of the cost, you have to raise the cost to where you begin to crowd people out of the dormitory.

ASSEMBLYMAN DICKEY: Well, let's not talk about the capital cost of the building, but rather just the maintenance

cost of the dormitories. Is that being offset --

DR. RAUBINGER: The janitorial and maintenance work - there is no question that is all offset in our state colleges, yes, plus more. We are putting money into the treasury, as Mr. Vermeullen knows, to help pay off the bond issue which built the dormitories and we have just raised our fees in order to be sure that we are making a sizable contribution. So we are not only covering the maintenance cost, but we are also returning money to help amortize these dormitories that were built from the bond issue.

ASSEMBLYMAN DICKEY: Then is it conceivable that if an Authority were set up to issue revenue bonds, this would be a feasible way of financing the capital cost of new dormitories?

DR. RAUBINGER: It would be a feasible way of financing a very substantial part of the costs, particularly in our case - and the case I am talking about now - if we were permitted to merge all of the revenues from all of the dormitories into one pot to help amortize the new dormitories that were built - you see what I mean - so that you got revenues from these 2800 plus 500 or whatever you were putting in in the way of beds.

Now I think we ought to sharpen our pencils pretty hard though before we say, "You can do it all." It is a pure arithmetic question and that is whether the cost of the whole thing per student rises so high that you are defeating your own purpose. That is what I was getting at.

ASSEMBLYMAN DICKEY: Without belaboring the subject,

it was my understanding that the rental to the students was going to be increased so as to begin to match the maintenance cost.

DR. RAUBINGER: Not the maintenance, sir. What we agreed to as being true was this, that our present rentals at the six state colleges were not sufficiently high to return to the state what we had promised to return during the 1959 bond issue. At that time we said, we can amortize a good bit of this bond issue money that is applied to dormitories out of fees. Then I think we all agreed this year that our fees were too low in comparison to other colleges and also in comparison to what we are trying to do in returning some of this money. So we have raised them for next year. That is a partial answer to your question, I guess. This does cover maintenance. It also returns more into the state treasury.

ASSEMBLYMAN DICKEY: The increase was from \$5 a week to \$7.50; is that correct?

DR. RAUBINGER: That's correct.

ASSEMBLYMAN DICKEY: Do you anticipate a further increase beyond that level?

DR. RAUBINGER: We don't anticipate it at the present time, no, and it is possible that in the future it might go higher. The only thing I can say is that our studies have shown that there is a law of diminishing returns when you go too high. You rule people out.

ASSEMBLYMAN DICKEY: Do you think if you raised the dormitory fees, say, to \$10 or \$12 a week, that it might mean

that some of the students who would want to attend one of the state colleges would probably not be able to go?

DR. RAUBINGER: Well, without hitting on the particular figure you mentioned, I am convinced, frankly, that after you raised it to a certain point, whether it is \$10 or \$12, I don't know, you would begin to do just what you say. There would be people who could not afford to come and live in the dormitories.

ASSEMBLYMAN DICKEY: Would they be more inclined then to commute since this is a relatively small state and our commuter facilities are very good?

DR. RAUBINGER: Well, that, of course, would depend upon the person and the distance of commuting. We have people now commuting 30 and 40 miles to the place out here at Ewing Township. I think that is a pretty long commute myself. We have people living up above Flemington, for instance. And we have people commuting to Montclair from Sussex County. I think when you spend too much time just traveling back and forth, there is probably something lost there too. So you almost have to draw yourself a reasonable commuting area and say, "These people can commute and beyond that distance they shouldn't."

ASSEMBLYMAN DICKEY: In other words, we couldn't then make all of our state colleges commuter colleges?

DR. RAUBINGER: To a degree, but not completely. I don't think they should all be commuter colleges completely, no.

ASSEMBLYMAN BATEMAN: Just as a matter of curiosity, is

it cheaper or more expensive for the people who live off campus, but around the campus?

DR. RAUBINGER: It is more expensive for those who live off the campus generally speaking.

SENATOR SARCONE: Any other questions on this subject?
[No response.]

Commissioner, the Committee has been directed by ACR 8 and also urged by others to look into various proposals apparently aimed at increased utilization of present facilities, in so far as classroom utilization. Is there any hope that we can meet, at least in some part, the pressures of increased enrollments by increasing the degree of utilization of our classrooms, first by increasing the size of the class rooms?

DR. RAUBINGER: The size of the classroom?

SENATOR SARCONE: That is, of the members of the class, the numbers. I don't mean physically, of course.

DR. RAUBINGER: I could tell you what we have been doing on this. For the past several years we have been making a twice-a-year study of the use of classrooms, themselves - how many hours a day they are in use. Then within the classroom, how many seats are occupied on any particular hour. And we have also been keeping a continuous study of the number of hours a week that the classrooms are used for scheduling and instructional purposes. One way that we were able to exceed the promise we made on the '59 bond issue was to increase the utilization of the buildings. We began to start earlier in the morning and go later in the evening and in some of the colleges running Saturday classes up until Noon or one o'clock.

We think we have - and I will be glad to give the figures to you - a good utilization of seats and classrooms now in all of our colleges. In three of them we are considering the possibility, I think I am correct in saying, of Saturday scheduling which doesn't presently exist. We are also making a study which has been under way for six months of year-around use of the buildings. This is not as simple as it first seemed as we have discovered. But we are going to continue with this study and hopefully this June have a complete report on that. I will be glad to give Mr. Alito our study. This is a study of each of the colleges - percentage of use of classrooms, percentage of use of seats in the classrooms and the hours of instruction.

SENATOR SARCONE: I believe you have already furnished it, but for the record we will accept it.

DR. RAUBINGER: Right.

SENATOR SARCONE: Any questions on this area from members of the Committee?

ASSEMBLYMAN DICKEY: I'd be a little bit interested, Commissioner, to hear your comments about the trimester plan for utilization of the college facilities.

DR. RAUBINGER: Well, the trimester has gotten to be kind of a stock word. It is one of several plans for utilizing buildings, particularly during the summer session. It may or may not be the best of the various plans. There is also a four quarters plan. There is also a modified trimester plan. There is nothing sacred about trimester as such. I would like to point that out. We have investigated the

experience elsewhere and we find that when you get into the summer, you don't always increase by one-fourth for several reasons. One is that most colleges have some utilization during the summer anyway, running summer session courses. Therefore a part of the facilities are used and can't be reused in this way. And the second thing is that there is always apparently up to this point a certain proportion of students who cannot afford to or do not want to or will not go the year around. So you are likely to have a smaller group in this last quarter or trimester or whatever it may be. Some of these things come out of the studies. I think we are all going to have to look very closely at our summer use of the buildings and that is what we are doing now.

ASSEMBLYMAN DICKEY: Do you feel that buildings that are in the state colleges now could be used in the summer considering the warm climate?

DR. RAUBINGER: No, not without air conditioning. That is one experience that we have found from every college we have talked to. I guess Alaska doesn't have it, but we didn't talk to them anyway. But over the country, they have all found it is impossible to do this unless you have air-conditioned classrooms. So I think this is one thing we would have to consider. And the other thing that I think people should know is this: Whereas it saves on the utilization of buildings, the first year you put it into effect you have to come up with a substantial increase in operating costs. We don't know, but if you put that in all six state colleges,

for instance, in one single year, and assuming that you had a full utilization, which you probably wouldn't have, you would have four or five million in operating costs that you would have to have for that year. Of course, thereafter, it wouldn't increase that much every year.

ASSEMBLYMAN BATEMAN: The Heller Report, for example, said for an increase of about 4,000 pupils on a modified trimester plan it would cost five million dollars more about per year to operate such a thing. Do you have any comparable figures?

DR. RAUBINGER: No, but I would accept those as being pretty reasonable. They may come pretty close to what we would estimate too.

ASSEMBLYMAN BATEMAN: For that many pupils?

DR. RAUBINGER: You said for how many pupils?

ASSEMBLYMAN BATEMAN: Approximately 4,000 they said.

DR. RAUBINGER: Well, that's not quite what we had for the 4,000. We figured -- How was ~~our's~~ coming out?

DR. EARL E. MOSIER: We assumed there would be 40 per cent of 14,000 students.

DR. RAUBINGER: Well, that's 5600. We figured about five million for that.

DR. MOSIER: There is another factor. The enrollment last summer was 7600, our summer school enrollment, and our total enrollment is 14,000. So you have a problem ultimately.

DR. RAUBINGER: Dr. Mosier reminds me that last summer - as a part of this report we have been going into summer utilization - we found there were 7600 people enrolled for six weeks on the six state college campuses. So that in itself

is something you have to discount when you are considering the year-around plan.

ASSEMBLYMAN DICKEY: Doctor, did the facilities provide air conditioning for those 7600 students?

DR. RAUBINGER: No, they did not, except the buildings that are air conditioned. But let me tell you that on the full-time thing -- These people come in for a class or two a day. When you are talking about the trimester, you are talking about a full college day where you would be coming in in the morning and staying until evening and not only a full college day, but it would be all summer - June, July and August. So I think there is a real difference there. I will say we have had some complaints, particularly in Glassboro, haven't we, about the uncomfortable conditions even during this session. What happens is that you have a person come in for one course or two courses and then he is off. He is not there all day.

SENATOR SARCONE: Any other questions? [No response.]

Commissioner, during one of your appearances or meetings with the Committee, we discussed with you the Montclair High School. It was the Montclair High School, wasn't it?

DR. RAUBINGER: College High School.

SENATOR SARCONE: The College High School at Montclair State Teachers College. Our questioning as you will recall went in the area, first, of what is the present function of this school - what does it serve - and I believe we went into the question of whether, if it doesn't serve a purpose

today when compared to the need for additional facilities at Montclair - whether or not this program should be continued. Now, Commissioner, I realize this Committee will make its own recommendation, but we would like to have your response as Commissioner of Education or at least your views on this question for the record.

DR. RAUBINGER: Yes. Well, as I have said before, the State Board of Education and I and the college and our staff of Higher Education have had this particular college high school under study for the last several years. I think I said that it has been in existence quite a long time. It is a very small high school. It is used for observation purposes by those who are preparing to be teachers. I said - and I think it is true - that because of its size and because of the nature of its student body, it very likely no longer no longer serves the purpose that it was originally intended to serve and I think that we shall have to try to find an arrangement with one of the comprehensive high schools in a district adjacent to the college, similar to the one we have with the Antheil School in Ewing for Trenton College for practice teaching and observation purposes and phase out the operation on the college campus. It occupies a building which could be used for additional college students and which I think should be used for that purpose. So that is about the story, but I would have to say this, that if we do that, we are going to have to request from the Legislature the right to contract as we have in some of these other colleges with a high school, such as Montclair or Clifton or one of the

close high schools - contract with them for services which would be involved in helping to prepare our teachers. That is about the picture, I think, as I see it.

SENATOR SARCONE: Of course, you have previously furnished the Committee with the details of the number of students attending this institution and the physical facilities.

DR. RAUBINGER: Right.

SENATOR SARCONE: Commissioner, I asked a question of Dr. Gross this morning and the Committee would like to put it to you as the Commissioner of Education of our state. It has been suggested to this Committee that prior legislative consideration and approval of new programs is sometimes lacking, that is, it is not obtained. New programs are initiated within available appropriations with private and foundation grants and later the Legislature is asked to approve requests for appropriations to continue or expand these programs.

First, would you say this is so? And I direct your attention to the new two-year proposed medical school, the Alcoholic Study Center at Rutgers and the Urban Studies Center at Rutgers.

DR. RAUBINGER: I think the question is a good one and I would respond to it this way: These are the days when colleges and universities are eligible for all kinds of grants, Federal, private and otherwise. I personally feel that when any of us accept a grant, it should be made clear whether this grant is one for a period of time, at the end of which it will be closed out, or whether it is one, the cost of which will be expected to be borne by the state thereafter.

And I think it should be clearly stated at the time that a grant is accepted which of the two it is. Personally, I would be happy to abide by that kind of an arrangement. That is my general feeling on that.

SENATOR SARCONE: Gentlemen, are there any other questions you would ask of the Commissioner?

ASSEMBLYMAN DICKEY: Commissioner, I think we asked this question of Dr. Gross: Can you tell me what percentage of the student bodies in the state colleges are from out of New Jersey?

DR. RAUBINGER: The percentage is so small, I couldn't even give you the fraction. The only out-of-state people in the state colleges are foreign students. We find that we are attracting from quite several countries certain students who wish to come to this country for certain special purposes and we have some of them from Africa, we have some from Germany and other places. These would run in the order of dozens and no more than that. Aside from that, we do not have any out-of-state people to our knowledge unless they have come in by subterfuge, but not as a policy.

SENATOR SARCONE: I believe, Commissioner, there are no further questions. Again we wish to extend our thanks as a Committee for your appearing here today and for your cooperation which you and your staff have rendered right at the outset. Of course, we may call upon you again within the very near future and we trust you will continue to cooperate.

DR. RAUBINGER: Any time, Senator, and may I say what I said before, that we are pleased to be of help whenever

we can be and all you have to do is call us.

SENATOR SARCONE: I see Dr. Hipp is here. Do you have a prepared statement?

DR. HIPPI: Yes.

SENATOR SARCONE: Do you desire to read it in its entirety or spread it on the record.

DR. HIPPI: If it is all right with you, I will refer to only one or two points.

SENATOR SARCONE: We will spread the complete statement on the record, Doctor. You may, of course, discuss either that which you have in the statement or go beyond that. For the record, would you please identify yourself, Doctor.

D R. F R E D E R I C K L. H I P P: I am Frederick L. Hipp, Executive Secretary of the New Jersey Education Association, speaking for the N.J.E.A.

We notice today that you have about every issue that has been mentioned in our paper touched upon by the questioning and also by the statements that have been made. And I have been very much impressed by the depth with which you have gone into the questioning. Therefore, I don't intend to dwell on the facts so much, but to say that the New Jersey Education Association supports the proposals in the Strayer Report and we raise the question: How do you make room for 32,000 more students on whom we can count in our growing junior and senior high schools? And how do you give them the college opportunities for which they and their parents are saving and planning? I imagine those are among the major questions facing the Committee.

We would like to suggest, as one organization, at least,

that to finance these proposals as well as other education problems in the elementary and secondary field, the adoption of either a general sales tax with food and drugs exempt, or a personal income tax, or a combination of these, or such other reasonable taxes as may produce sufficient revenue because we believe that as difficult as the tax decision may be, it is one that the Legislature must face if these problems are to be solved.

We have supported the recommendations of the Strayer Report because our own experience and evidence in the report convince us that the findings are true, and actually the report has been criticized much more because it's conservative rather than because it is too liberal.

We do not believe that the recommendations of the Strayer Report can be ignored without great loss of talent among the young men and women of our state and they should be put into effect, we believe, at the earliest possible moment. We are now two years behind the projection of the Strayer Report. We don't believe that the people of New Jersey can continue to vote down bond issues and to ignore taxes that would provide educational opportunities for our young people and at the same time expect to have a state that offers hope and a bright future and opportunity for our young people.

Now while we are talking about the expansion of the state colleges and the State University, I would like to make one point which may be a little bit aside from need, but it really isn't as we look back over the progress that

has been made in the last ten years in higher education in the state and in view of the resources available. There have been reports in the newspapers about bills being drafted that might change the present structure of administrative control over the state's public institutions of higher learning. The New Jersey Education Association has been pleased with what advancements have been made by these institutions under their present supervision by the State Board of Education. And if any suggestion for change is presented to the Legislature, we ask that it be given careful analysis. We would expect that public hearings would be held so that all interested parties have an opportunity to express their views on such proposals. And on behalf of the representatives of the State Board of Education and the Presidents of the state colleges and the New Jersey Congress of Parents and Teachers and the Federated Boards of Education and the New Jersey School Superintendents and the N.J.E.A., I have been asked to request that representatives of these organizations have an opportunity to meet with the Joint Committee of the Education to discuss such proposals should they be presented and we do think, as we look into the future, the progress that we continue to make in higher education will have much to do with the type of administrative control over these institutions. Thank you very much.

ASSEMBLYMAN BATEMAN: Before we get into the regular questioning, what proposals are you referring to and from whom would they be coming, Doctor?

DR. HIPPEL: Well, in the first place, we saw that

this was written up in the Newark News, that there was a possibility of a proposal for a Board of Higher Education that would be over the state colleges.

ASSEMBLYMAN BATEMAN: A separate board over, what, state colleges and the State University both?

DR. HIPPE: A separate Board of Education, as we understand it, would be over the state colleges and that the Board of Governors of Rutgers would operate as it still is and that the two would be subject to the State Board of Education and possibly the Legislature. In other words, the description of it is not specific as I have it.

ASSEMBLYMAN BATEMAN: And who was making it?

DR. HIPPE: And Senator Ozzard said that he was contemplating introducing such a bill. We are very much concerned, not that an improvement could not be made, but that if such a proposal is made, it be studied very carefully because we feel that the progress that has been made under the general supervision of the State Board of Education has been most desirable to date because we have an over-all Board that can help plan education over the state without competing institutions, at least competing public institutions. We think that could be wasteful and it could result in very harmful relationships between state institutions, the State Board and the Legislature if it is not properly set up.

SENATOR SARCONE: Of course, Doctor, that which you refer to is not emanating from the Committee which is conducting this study under ACR 8. What you read, as I understand it, is what Senator Ozzard has indicated, at least to

the press, that he intends to do.

DR. HIPPI: That's right.

SENATOR SARCONE: As I have indicated to you, as a colleague of Senator Ozzard in the Senate and as Chairman of the Education Committee, I will speak to the Senator either prior to or on Monday with reference to your request with the idea that all citizens who are directly interested in such a proposal might be heard.

DR. HIPPI: We do not wish to evaluate such a proposal at this time.

SENATOR SARCONE: No, but you wish the opportunity to be heard.

DR. HIPPI: What we are saying is that it should be very carefully studied and it should not be shot through the Legislature in a hurry.

ASSEMBLYMAN POLICASTRO: There is no legislation pending now.

DR. HIPPI: None at this time.

ASSEMBLYMAN POLICASTRO: Just to set your mind at ease, I understand he has changed his mind.

DR. HIPPI: That would set our minds at ease.

ASSEMBLYMAN POLICASTRO: Unless he made a statement since three weeks ago. That was brought up at the last hearing, wasn't it?

SENATOR SARCONE: Without curtailing you, I believe that if the Senator does what has been reported in the press, as I have indicated, I certainly will speak to him and knowing the Majority Leader as I do, I am certain he would give

everyone an opportunity to be heard.

DR. HIPPI: All we are asking is that it be carefully studied.

ASSEMBLYMAN BATEMAN: He has a reputation for doing what is right.

DR. HIPPI: He has a reputation of having done many good things for education.

SENATOR SARCONE: Are there any questions you might want to direct to Dr. Hipp in view of his experience or on his statement?

ASSEMBLYMAN BATEMAN: I would like to get into an area and I would preface getting into it with a statement of my own feelings that there isn't any question that we have a significant need for additional capital expenditures - but we are basing a lot of this on Dr. Strayer's report and frankly there is something in the report which disturbs me more and more and I would like your comments on it because it is significant to a real assessment of what our needs are. I got into this a little bit earlier. I notice in your report that you quote from the Strayer Report that 64 per cent of our approximately 90,000 high school graduates who do go to college - of 90,000 graduates in 1970, about 45 per cent of those will go to college and about 64 per cent of those who go to college will go to college in New Jersey institutions. This is a premise which is pretty fundamental to the whole report. Yet I see from the State Department of Education figures that 52 per cent of this '63 class is enrolled out of New Jersey. Now this is quite a significant shift from

the original Strayer suggestions as to what 1963 would be. In his report, 1963 would have been approximately 55-45 in state to out-of-state, which moves towards that 64 per cent figure. Yet here we are in '63 with 52 per cent of the class going out of New Jersey and Strayer says that this will be down to 36 per cent in 1970.

DR. HIPPE: Well, as I understand it, that is true in terms of percentages and there isn't any doubt but that is a very vital factor in determining the needs of the state. There isn't any doubt about that. At the same time, we are accommodating about 2,000 more students than were anticipated in the state colleges alone. In other words, there are more boys and girls than the percentages would have indicated in the original projections. The percentage of boys and girls going to college is increasing faster very likely than anticipated in the Strayer Report and that is one reason why we feel it is conservative. Also if colleges are made more readily available, you will get a higher percentage and with the junior colleges coming along, it is likely that they will feed more students into the colleges at the third year than have been fed in the past.

ASSEMBLYMAN BATEMAN: Do you think it would make good sense, in view of the ability of our state institutions to take 8,000 more this year than they took two years ago, for us to take a look at the figures that might have been used in the Strayer Report to see if in fact -- We are not contesting that there is a great deal more need, but it may be quite different from what the conclusions are.

DR. HIPPI: I think that a continuous study is necessary. As I understand it, the Legislature did make an appropriation to the State Department to have continuing studies in higher education, just to watch things like that, and I wouldn't think that you would want to take the Strayer Report and say, "This is true and this is exactly what is going to happen between now and 1970," but, in general, it very likely will on the conservative side. But I would certainly say that there should be these continuing studies.

We would like to see some beginning made to accommodate the need, even if it isn't the need that is projected in the Strayer Report, that we do not just sit and do nothing.

ASSEMBLYMAN BATEMAN: I wasn't even intimating that.

DR. HIPPI: I know exactly how you feel. You would do it tomorrow if you could.

SENATOR SARCONE: Any further questions of Dr. Hipp? There are no further questions, Doctor.

ASSEMBLYMAN BATEMAN: You never got away so easy.

SENATOR SARCONE: The Committee wishes to extend our thanks for your cooperation and your appearance here today and certainly your comments are part of the record and your complete statement will be made a part of the record.

DR. HIPPI: Thank you very much, gentlemen.

(The complete statement of Dr. Hipp can be found on page 37A of this transcript.)

SENATOR SARCONE: Is the representative of the League of Women Voters present?

MRS. PRITCHETT: Yes.

SENATOR SARCONE: Would you please give us your full name and your address and tell us who you represent?

M R S. J O S E P H P R I T C H E T T: I am Mrs. Joseph Pritchett, 1136 Locust Street, Camden, New Jersey, State Education Chairman of the League of Women Voters of New Jersey. And I do wish to thank you for this opportunity to appear before this Committee.

The League of Women Voters was pleased to see the creation of this joint legislative committee to study and report on the short and long range capital needs and related matters in the field of public higher education.

Higher education is becoming a prerequisite for profitable and satisfying employment. It is no longer enough, under the changing occupational requirements of today's age of automation, that youths merely attend a conventional school up to age 16 or 17, if neither employment nor additional training is open to them. There is a responsibility to all youths up until the time they have made a successful transition from high school to employment or to continued education and training in a two- or four-year post-high school institution.

The League's four year study of higher education convinced us that New Jersey's college facilities are inadequate for its qualified high school graduates. Although New Jersey

is the largest exporter of youth for higher education in other states, our public colleges still cannot meet the minimal needs of our college-bound youth, and last September turned away a substantial number of qualified applicants. Applications for next fall's freshman classes at the six state colleges are up 5,223 or 45 per cent over last year's at this time. The total number of applicants exceeds the 4,530 freshmen that will be admitted in September 1964 by a ratio of better than 3 to 1. In the field of professional training the record shows that about 80 per cent of our students go out of state for their legal, medical, dental or other professional degrees. New Jersey needs additional liberal arts facilities, two-year community colleges, graduate courses and professional institutions. Yet no money is being provided to build or operate such facilities.

While thousands of college age youngsters are being turned away from our state colleges, other states with similar pressures of increasing numbers of students are closing their doors to New Jersey students. Michigan State University has announced that it will limit the number of students it will accept from New Jersey because we are not doing enough for public higher education, and plans to take only 50 New Jersey freshmen in September 1964, which is a sharp cut from the 110 freshmen they admitted last year.

The League believes the lack of opportunity for higher education is a disservice not only to the students but to the industry in our state which needs highly trained young men and women. We find it shocking that with this demonstrated

need, New Jersey, the 6th wealthiest state, is 2nd from the bottom among all 50 states in its support of public higher education.

The estimated projected enrollments in the Strayer Report, and the minimum capital investment needs recommended, bore out our League expectations and confirmed our view that the state faces an enormous problem in prospective student enrollments.

We know exactly how overwhelming is the need for additional facilities, but we do not know what should be done first, or when, or where. It is our hope that this Committee will recommend a short and long range order of priority among present and proposed additional programs, and a fiscally-sound method of financing them, which will make New Jersey's public institutions of higher education worthy of the able and eager young people who are beating at our college doors.

I thank you for this opportunity.

SENATOR SARCONE: Are there any questions?

ASSEMBLYMAN BATEMAN: Just one question, Mrs. Pritchett - do you know of any other colleges other than Michigan State, which arose from some correspondence between the two Governors, I guess, that have taken any action or have you heard of any that informally have limited the number of New Jersey boys and girls?

MRS. PRITCHETT: I haven't heard of any who have formally announced this as has Michigan State University. Yet we did find that other universities were slowly limiting the number of New Jersey students that they were accepting.

I couldn't pinpoint another one exactly.

ASSEMBLYMAN DICKEY: Mrs. Pritchett, I want to welcome you particularly because I am from Camden County. I am very happy to have you here today. I notice that you point up the large number of applicants to our state colleges. Do you think this really gives us a true picture? Isn't it so that students apply at a number of colleges with the hope that they will be accepted at one of them or that they would be able to pick and choose between them?

MRS. PRITCHETT: Well, this is true that the applications of themselves don't give a completely true picture. But you do realize that even out of this overwhelming number of applications, only a part of them are accepted, and even the numbers that they would like to accept, they still can't. They can accept only so many because as Dr. Gross has said the number of students that they are turning away - that they are able to keep only perhaps the top 10 per cent of the high school graduating classes, that this really is not good for a university or for a state college because it doesn't give the student who is perhaps not in the top 10 per cent - maybe he is just in the top half - but if he is in this middle ground between the top half and the top quarter, he has a fairly poor chance of really attaining higher education.

ASSEMBLYMAN DICKEY: Do you know how many students there were in New Jersey last year who wanted to go to college who couldn't really get into college?

MRS. PRITCHETT: No, I don't have that figure, but I

could find it for you.

ASSEMBLYMAN DICKEY: Well, we did have some figures on it today and it was what I thought very surprisingly low, considering that they had such a large number who want to go to college and who ultimately did get into colleges, either private colleges in or outside of New Jersey, or public colleges in and outside of New Jersey. So those who really wanted to go and were qualified and who could not get in - that was a relatively small number.

SENATOR SARCONE: Mrs. Pritchett, I happen to make notes and I do trust that they are accurate. I have difficulty in reading my own writing. But the Commissioner of Education at the request of this Committee and his staff have embarked on a study wherein the applications that were actually filed for admission to our state institutions are being followed through to the extent that those who were not admitted are being checked at the high school level. I believe that the Commissioner indicated that as a result of an 86 per cent return on the survey or study, some 21,000 were admitted and 896 were not.

ASSEMBLYMAN BATEMAN: May I just amend that? Those were boys and girls who had applied to all colleges, not just to state colleges.

SENATOR SARCONE: All colleges. That's right. All colleges in New Jersey where applications were made. Approximately 21,000 actually got to college; 896 of those who applied did not. However, what the reasons were for the 896 not going, we don't know. We don't know whether there was a change in their thinking or desires. But the

Commissioner is continuing with this study and I am certain you will have these figures made available to you.

MRS. PRITCHETT: Thank you.

SENATOR SARCONE: Any other questions of Mrs. Pritchett?

[No response.]

Thank you very much, Mrs. Pritchett, for appearing. We do know of the League's interest in this matter. It has been continuing. We certainly are thankful that we did have a representative appear here today.

MRS. PRITCHETT: Thank you.

SENATOR SARCONE: Is there anyone present who wishes to appear and testify before the Joint Legislative Committee created pursuant to ACR 8? Not hearing anyone, I declare that the hearing is adjourned for today.

* * * * *

ASSEMBLY CONCURRENT RESOLUTION No. 8

STATE OF NEW JERSEY

INTRODUCED JANUARY 20, 1964

By Assemblymen BEADLESTON, HIERING, MORAITES, RANDALL,
WOODCOCK, VANDER PLAAT, MALLETT, Assemblywoman HIGGINS,
Assemblymen BATEMAN, KEITH, FISHER, KAY, SEARS, MARAZITI,
SMITH, A., DICKY and GELBER

Referred to Committee on Education

A CONCURRENT RESOLUTION creating a joint legislative committee to study and
report specially on the short and long range capital needs and related mat-
ters in the field of public higher education.

1 BE IT RESOLVED *by the General Assembly of the State of New Jersey (the*
2 *Senate concurring)*:

1 1. The membership of the standing committees on Education of the
2 Senate and General Assembly are hereby constituted and appointed a joint
3 legislative committee to make the study and report by this resolution directed.
4 The chairman of the Senate [Committees] Committee on Education is ap-
5 pointed chairman of the joint legislative committee and the chairman of said
6 committee of the General Assembly is appointed vice-chairman of said joint
7 committee.

1 2. It shall be the duty of the joint committee to undertake an imme-
2 diate study relating to short and long range capital needs in the field of
3 public higher education as the same relate to Rutgers, the State University,
4 Newark College of Engineering, the several State colleges and county and
5 community colleges and junior colleges. *The joint committee shall obtain*

EXPLANATION—Matter enclosed in bold-faced brackets [thus] in the above bill is not enacted
and is intended to be omitted in the law.

6 *information on the extent to which and the terms under which Federal funds*
 7 *may be made available to New Jersey public higher education institutions,*
 8 *including community and junior colleges, and of the impact thereof on future*
 9 *State appropriations for public higher education.* Such study shall, among
 10 other matters, include consideration of the practicability of the issuance of
 11 revenue bonds to finance construction of housing and other self-liquidating
 12 facilities at residential colleges, an evaluation of the degree of efficiency in
 13 the occupancy ratio of classrooms, laboratories, auditoriums, athletic and
 14 other building facilities and of the success in obtaining admission to other
 15 institutions by students refused admission on the grounds of enrollment ca-
 16 pacity.

1 3. The joint legislative committee shall have the powers granted pur-
 2 suant to chapter 13 of Title 52 of the Revised Statutes.

1 4. The joint committee shall be entitled to call to its assistance and avail
 2 itself of the services and advice of the State Board of Education, the Com-
 3 missioner of Education and the employees of the State Department of Edu-
 4 cation, the Boards of Trustees and Governors and the President, of Rutgers,
 5 the State University, the Board of Trustees of Newark College of Engi-
 6 neering and the presidents and officials of all publicly supported institutions
 7 of higher education in this State, the Governor's Committee on New Jersey
 8 Higher Education and of such other public or private agencies as may be
 9 available to it for such purpose and to employ such professional steno-
 10 graphic and clerical assistants and incur such traveling and other miscel-
 11 laneous expenses as it may deem necessary, in order to perform its duties,
 12 and as may be within the limits of funds appropriated or otherwise made
 13 available to it for said purposes.

1 5. The joint committee may meet and hold hearings at such place or
 2 places as it shall designate during the sessions or recesses of the Legislature
 3 and shall report specially its findings and recommendations to the Legisla-
 4 ture on or before June 15, 1964, accompanying the same with any legislative
 5 bills which it may desire to recommend for adoption by the Legislature.

STATEMENT BY THE NEW JERSEY EDUCATION ASSOCIATION OF NEW JERSEY NEEDS IN HIGHER
EDUCATION BEFORE THE JOINT EDUCATION COMMITTEES OF THE LEGISLATURE
Presented by Dr. Frederick L. Hipp, Executive Secretary, April 2, 1964

Open across the state now are the many college buildings provided by the \$66.8 million college bond issue passed in 1959. As fast as workmen finish, the classrooms are needed, used and filled. The bulge in college enrollments is with us--and only just beginning.

In 1961, the late Dr. George D. Strayer studied the 1962-70 period in higher education for the N. J. State Board of Education. His projections showed that there will be a substantial rise in the number of high school graduates; that a larger percentage will want to enter college; and, because of out-of-state restrictions and limitations, a larger percentage will have to be accommodated within the state. By 1970, he estimated, there would be 89,844 high school graduates, 44.6% of whom would enter college, and 64% of whom would be enrolled in New Jersey institutions.

This would mean 25,645 New Jersey college freshmen in 1970 instead of the approximately 14,000 who enrolled last fall. Of particular concern is the fact that the largest increases in freshmen classes--3,000 more students each year--come this year and next.

Dr. Strayer also foresaw a decided upswing in the number of New Jersey youths in full-time graduate and professional study programs.

By 1970, he found a total full-time student load of 104,308--some 47,438 in private colleges and universities and 56,870 in the public institutions.

Dr. Strayer calculated at least an increase of 32,474 full-time students for the public institutions over 1961.

The question before the Legislature is, "How do you begin to accommodate 32,000 more students by 1970?" Buildings do not go up overnight. They must be properly planned, bid, and built. Two to three years will elapse between the time a project is authorized and the time its classrooms and laboratories are ready for use by students. Our public colleges and university cannot increase their freshmen classes year after year unless they know that buildings are under construction to house these young people when they get to be juniors and seniors. This year, instead of finding that the public institutions are the open door to opportunities, high school seniors find the cutoff points rising. We are being more strict about entrance to college at a time when our economy and manpower needs tell us that more youngsters should be encouraged to pursue higher learning.

Dr. Strayer proposed an annual expenditure of approximately \$27,000,000 a year for five years. We have already lost two years on the report's original timetable.

The Strayer estimates were a bare minimum. They made no provision for rising construction costs. They did not count replacement of obsolete buildings and equipment. They did not allow for current deficiencies in plan and equipment that do not directly relate to additional load. They did not anticipate a very probable increase in graduate study and an upward shift from the present ratio of undergraduate to graduate-professional students.

(more)

We are not talking about ideal situations or wishful thinking. The Strayer proposal presents simple questions: How do you make room for 32,000 more students whom we can count in our growing junior and senior high schools? How do you give them the college opportunities for which they and their parents are saving and planning?

While we are mentioning the expansion of our State Colleges and State University, let me make one side point. There have been reports in the newspapers about bills being drafted that might change the present structure of administrative control over the State's public institutions of higher education. The New Jersey Education Assn. has been pleased with what advancements have been made by these institutions under their present supervision by the State Board of Education. If any suggestion for change is presented to the Legislature, we ask that it be given careful analysis. We expect that public hearings will be held so that all interested parties have an opportunity to express their views on such proposals.

Another aspect of higher education development concerns new junior colleges and technical institutes. Following a 1961 recommendation from the State Board of Education, the Legislature authorized the establishment of county colleges. The State promised to pay up to 50% of their capital costs and one-third of the annual operating costs up to a limit of \$200 per student.

Under a new federal law, the U. S. government will pay up to 40% of the county college construction costs. Two years of federal funds, totalling \$2 6 million, will be available this July. Four counties, Ocean, Atlantic, Cumberland, and Cape May--have already been authorized to proceed. By adding a \$1.7 million appropriation next year to \$200,000 remaining from the present budget to the federal matching funds, a total of \$6.4 million in construction can begin in those four counties.

The Governor has already indicated that our State will not qualify for new federal matching money next year for vocational education, even though New Jersey has the lowest proportion of students enrolled in such programs. We hope that a similar loss will not be experienced with regard to the federal money available for county colleges. Providing collegiate and technical instruction close to home would encourage many high school graduates to further their education. Our New Jersey businesses and industries need such trained talent.

To finance these proposals, our Association has long urged the adoption of a general sales tax with food and drugs exempt, or a personal income tax, or a combination of these, or such other reasonable taxes as may produce sufficient revenue.

As difficult as the tax decision may be, we believe it is one that the Legislature must face.

We have supported the recommendations contained in the Strayer Report because our own experience and evidence in the report convince us that the findings are true, and very likely conservative.

We do not believe that these recommendations can be ignored without great loss of talent among the young men and women of our State. They should be put into effect at the earliest possible moment. We cannot continue to vote down bond issues and to ignore taxes that would provide educational opportunities for our young people--and at the same time expect to have a State that offers hope, a bright future, and opportunity to our youth.



CENTENARY COLLEGE FOR WOMEN

A Two-Year College

HACKETTSTOWN, NEW JERSEY

OFFICE OF THE ACADEMIC DEAN

March 26, 1964

Mr. Samuel A. Alito
Director
Division of Legislative Information
and Research
State House
Trenton, New Jersey 08625

Dear Mr. Alito:

Thank you very much for your kind invitation to meet with Senator C. Robert Sarcone and Assemblyman Raymond H. Bateman on April 2. I have read the resolution very carefully and I can assure you that I am very much interested in the work which the joint committee is doing. The nature of the New Jersey Junior College Association is such that we do not collect data on building needs of our member institutions or on matters of admission. It is my opinion that the heads of the individual institutions and the staff of the New Jersey State Department of Education are far better prepared to assist the committee than I am, therefore, whereas I appreciate greatly the consideration which has been given me I feel that I should not take up the time of the committee with such generalizations as I would be in a position to offer. I would appreciate very much receiving a copy of the committee's findings and recommendations in order that the Association and I may be kept informed of what it is doing.

I will appreciate it very much, Mr. Alito, if you will convey this message to Mr. Sarcone and Mr. Bateman and thank them for their kind invitation to meet with them. I know that the Association will be most appreciative of any assistance the committee is able to render in securing financial assistance for the expansion of two-year college facilities in New Jersey.

Sincerely yours,

Ernest R. Dalton

Ernest R. Dalton, President
New Jersey Junior College Association

BRODART, INC.	Cat. No. 23-221

BRODART, INC.

Cat. No. 23-221

